The discourse functions of insubordination in Spanish *wh*-interrogatives

Malte Rosemeyer
University of Freiburg

María Sol Sansiñena
KU Leuven

Abstract
Spanish makes frequent use of free-standing *que* 'that'-clauses in conversational interaction. Given that in such contexts, *que* 'that' does not syntactically depend on a previous matrix clause, such constructions have been treated as instances of *insubordination*. While a growing body of research has investigated the interactional patterns associated with declarative free-standing *que*-clauses, there does not yet exist a systematic analysis of its use in interrogative contexts. Our study analyzes insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives in a corpus of spoken informal Castilian, Argentinian and Chilean Spanish conversations. An interactional analysis reveals that insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives typically have a high degree of presuppositionality and consequently are used with anaphoric discourse functions such as repetition and interactional challenge. However, we also find cases in Madrilenian Spanish in which these constructions are used to introduce or specify changes in the discourse topic. We hypothesize that this change in the usage of insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives represents an instance of the historical process of *subjectification*.

Keywords: insubordination, *wh*-interrogative, question, Spanish, complementation

1.   Introduction

The objective of this paper is to describe the discourse functions of Spanish *wh*-interrogatives that are introduced with the complementizer *que* 'that', as in B's utterance in example (1), in spoken interaction. In a similar fashion as the use of *que*-prefaces in Spanish declaratives (see, e.g., Sansiñena 2015), the *que* in B's utterance can be said to have an indexical meaning; it serves to anchor the question to A's previous utterance in line 2.

(1) *Las gafas* (Conversation at a hairdresser, *apud* C-ORAL ROM, epubcv01)

    01 A: CLaro;=
        right
        'Right'
    02   =es   que como no llev-o   las gAfa-s
        be.IND.PRS.3SG that   because not wear- IND.PRS.1SG the glass-PL
        'The reason is that because I'm not wearing glasses'
    03   [no me las   VEo;   ]
        not me them see.IND.PRS.1SG
        'I cannot see them'
        [...]
    04 B: que   no   lleva-s   QUÉ?
        COMP not   wear-IND.PRS.2SG what
        'You're not wearing what?'

Our study is based on an interactional linguistic analysis of all occurrences of such *que*-prefaced, i.e. "insubordinated" *wh*-interrogatives in two corpora of spoken Spanish interactions from Madrid, Buenos Aires and Santiago de Chile. By systematically describing the interaction between formal features of the utterance, the communicative setting and the types of meanings expressed, we are able to discern regularities in terms of discourse structure.

        Based on the empirical evidence, we observe that insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives typically occur in contexts like (1) in which the proposition (here: 'A is wearing something') is activated. Accordingly, they frequently express anaphoric discourse functions; for instance, the *wh*-interrogative in example (1) asks for the repetition of a part of the previous utterance. However, we also find evidence that the use of insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives has in some cases advanced from such anaphoric to cataphoric discourse functions, in which a new topic is introduced into discourse. We model this distinction in terms of the notion of Question under Discussion (Ginzburg 1996; Roberts 1996 *et passim*) and hypothesize that the progression from anaphoric to cataphoric discourse functions

represents a diachronic process of *subjectification*. This change appears to be restricted to Madrilenian Spanish, as no evidence of the change is found in our Argentinian and Chilean Spanish data. By comparing our results to previous studies on insubordinated declaratives in Spanish, we observe differences between insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives and declaratives in terms of the type of indexicality of *que* (cf. Sansiñena 2015).

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we review previous studies on complement insubordination in Spanish, and in Section 3 we discuss the semantics of *wh*-interrogatives in relation to discourse management. After introducing the data used in the study in Section 4, we establish a typology of the discourse functions of insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives in Section 5. The results of our study are discussed in Section 6 and summarized in Section 7.

2.   Previous studies on complement insubordination in Spanish

Following Evans (2007), previous studies on insubordination in Spanish have established two definitional criteria, namely (1) the formal marking of a clause as a subordinate clause (such as the presence of complementizer *que* 'that') and (2) the use of that clause as a free-standing or main clause. Recent research distinguishes three main constructional types of complement insubordination, illustrated in examples (2–4) below, coming from Sansiñena (2015). Whereas in (2), the *que* supports the desiderative or optative reading co-expressed by the use of subjunctive morphology, in (3) the *que* + subjunctive mood establishes an exclamative-evaluative reading (see also Gras and Sansiñena 2017). Lastly, in (4) *que* can be said to have a discourse-connective function by drawing the listener's attention to a fact manifest in the situational context. Note that whereas in (4) the use of *que* is optional, in (2–3) it is obligatory.[1]

(2) *Que*   *le-s*   *v-aya*   *súper*   *bien*
     COMP   you.DAT-PL   go-SBJV.PRS.3SG   very   good
     'May everything go fantastic for you.'

(3) *¡Que*   *ten-ga*   *que*   *ven-ir*   *Tejerina*   *a*
     COMP   have-PRS.SBJV.3SG   COMP   come-INF   Tejerina   to
     explic-ar=os   *la-s*   *cosa-s!*
     explain-INF=you.PL   the-PL   thing-PL

---

[1] Note that the presence of *que* in (4) could easily become redundant if the speaker would, for instance, point to the grey sky to draw attention to the fact that there is evidence to show it may/will rain. In terms of the typology of situated meanings summarized in Table 1, this example expresses a *warning*.

'Lit. That Tejerina should come to explain things to you!'

(4) *Juan (.) que   v-a   a   llov-er*
     Juan   COMP   go-IND.PRS.3SG to rain-INF
     'Juan, it's going to rain.'

Within these three distinct macro-functions, previous studies have identified diverse *situated meanings* (in the spirit of Linell 2009) that derive from the interaction between formal features of the utterance and the communicative setting (see Gras and Sansiñena 2015, Fc.; Sansiñena 2015). For non-embedded indicative *que*-constructions, such as (4), most previous studies have focused on the formal and functional features associated with insubordination in declarative clauses (see Gras 2013; Gras and Sansiñena 2015, Fc.).[2] Table 1 below offers a summary of the fine-grained discourse functions for declaratives provided by Gras and Sansiñena (Fc.), which we later use to distinguish non-embedded indicative declaratives from non-embedded interrogatives.

Position/Type of turn	Situated meaning	Madrid	Santiago de Chile	Buenos Aires
Non-initial	Support of a prior claim	**X**	**X**	**X**
Non-initial	Extended quotative use	X	X	X
Initial: initiation	Warning	X	X	
Initial: initiation	Topic reintroduction	X		
Initial: response	Emphatic contrast	**X**	X	X
Initial: response	Elaboration		X	
Initial: response-initiation	Self-repetition	X	X	X

X = documented with high frequency
X = documented with relative frequency
x = documented infrequently

Table 1. Distribution of situated meanings per variety (Adapted from Gras and Sansiñena, Fc.)

---

[2] For an overview of the discourse functions of *subjunctive* insubordinate *que*-clauses, see Sansiñena, De Smet and Cornillie (2015a; b).

Gras and Sansiñena (Fc.) found that non-embedded indicative *que*-constructions tend to occur in non-initial position, where they give rise to relatively similar interpretations across the three varieties of Spanish under examination, in particular, meanings associated with the support of a prior claim and with reproduced discourse. Their study also showed variation amongst varieties with respect to the availability and relative frequency of all situated meanings identified in the corpus. Gras and Sansiñena (Fc.) state that such variation can be represented in terms of types of discourse dependency, distinguishing (i) the speaker's intervention, (ii) the immediately previous intervention by the interlocutor, (iii) the immediate communicative situation, and (iv) a previous communicative situation. As we will show, both the degree of immediacy to speech event and the ontological nature of the element referred to[3] are necessary for explaining the differences among the diverse discourse functions of insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives.

3.   *Wh*-interrogatives and discourse management

In his approach to the semantics of *wh*-interrogatives, Hamblin (1973) distinguishes between the proposition P of a *wh*-interrogative and a variable X, mostly devoid of meaning, represented by the interrogative pronoun/adverb. Thus, in a *wh*-interrogative such as *What did Merle buy?*, X is represented by *what* and P is 'Merle bought something'. According to Hamblin (1973), the meaning of a *wh*-interrogative is then the set of its possible answers, e.g., {Merle bought a bike; Merle bought a record; Merle bought a plate; ...}. The ingenuity of Hamblin's (1973) analysis resides in that it defines the meaning of a *wh*-interrogative in terms of possibilities. In other words, a *wh*-interrogative represents a realm of possible, but uncertain, continuations in discourse.

Hamblin's (1973) approach reveals that the use of *wh*-interrogatives is fundamentally anchored in discourse. In conversation, speakers constantly explore possible continuations of a given discursive move via inference from the contents of that move. In order for a *wh*-interrogative to be a set of possible propositions, the speaker must have inferred these possible propositions from an earlier statement by the interlocutor. In terms of our example, the speaker might have inferred that 'Merle bought something' from the fact that the interlocutor just said *Today Merle went into town*, which could have triggered questions such as 'Why did she go to town?' or 'What did she do in town?'. The *wh*-interrogative only serves to make this contextually derived question explicit.

Engdahl (2006) proposes to model this fundamental discourse management function of *wh*-interrogatives in terms of the notion of *Question*

---

under Discussion (henceforth QuD, Ginzburg 1996; Roberts 1996; 1998; 2004). In a simplified manner of speaking, a QuD can be defined as the topic that is currently the center of interest in a conversation. The concept of QuD adds to the notion of Common Ground (henceforth CG), i.e. the fact that the speakers in a conversation implicitly agree on – i.e. presuppose – a set of beliefs or propositions, whereas other propositions are not presupposed (Stalnaker 1973; 2002). The notion of QuD adds a dynamic component to this concept of CG, trying to explain how propositions can come to be presupposed, i.e. form part of the CG. In her account of the usage of *wh*-interrogatives, Engdahl (2006: 95) assumes with Stalnaker that each speaker holds in her or his mind a set of propositions that s/he believes to be true. Some of these propositions are part of the CG of the speakers in that (a) both speakers believe these propositions to be true and (b) both speakers believe that they each believe these propositions to be true (cf. also Clark 1996: chapter 4). Each of the speakers also holds a QuD, i.e. a partially ordered set of questions *q* specifying the currently discussable issues. And lastly, there is also a QuD in the CG, i.e. the partially ordered set of questions *q* that both speakers believe they are currently negotiating in discourse.

Now, the mechanism of managing QuD is defined as follows by Engdahl (2006: 94-102, based on Ginzburg's work). As argued above, an utterance by an interlocutor may lead to a question q via inference. When the speaker makes this question q explicit by uttering it as a (*wh-*)interrogative, s/he performs a QuD UPDATE: the question no longer is only part of the speaker's private QuD but now also becomes part of the shared QuD. As such it demands an answer and consequently a QuD DOWNDATE. When the answer is uttered, all questions resolved by the answer are removed from both the shared and the speaker's private QuD. In doing so, the answer becomes shared knowledge and is subsequently presupposed by the interlocutors. In line with Engdahl's operationalization of the notion of QuD, we can consequently assume that the prototypical information-seeking function of *wh*-interrogatives derives from the fact that they are used to perform a QuD UPDATE.

However, there are two potential problems for Engdahl's (2006: 94-102) description of the use of *wh*-interrogatives. First, although the information-seeking function of *wh*-interrogatives is certainly very frequent and prototypical, it is well known that they often also fulfill other functions, such as rhetorical questions (5), challenges (6) or quiz questions (7) (see Fiengo 2009: 77-79, the constructed examples are our own). None of these examples are information-seeking because the speaker already knows the answer ('Never!', 'Just trying out your vintage Martins guitar', 'Aššur'). Consequently, it appears that in order to arrive at a more complete picture of the possible functional range of *wh*-interrogatives, it is necessary to take into account the cognitive status of X, i.e. whether or not the

speaker knows the answer to the "question" (Ehmer and Rosemeyer 2018; Rosemeyer 2018a; b).

(5) When did Trump ever tell the truth?
(6) What the hell are you doing?
(7) [in a lethal trivia quiz] What is the capital of Assyria?

Second, even when a *wh*-interrogative can reasonably be classified as information-seeking, it may differ with respect to the precise effect it has on QuD management. In example (8a), A's question is information-seeking in Engdahl's (2006) sense: A lacks some information, which he requests using the *wh*-interrogative. B's answer can thus be argued to indeed downdate the QuD. In contrast, A's question in (8b) does not aim at the simple filling of an information gap. Rather than making explicit a specific question q associated with something said before, A's question is of a more general kind; it opens up a series of questions associated with a QuD unrelated to the preceding turn. This is evident in B's answer to the first question, which is unbounded in the sense that a one-constituent answer as in (8a) is very difficult to achieve in this context. In Robert's (1996) terms, such topic-changing functions of *wh*-interrogatives ask the "Big Question" *What is the way things are?*.

(8) a.   [*B has gone shopping and shows his new shoes to A, who is thinking about buying the same ones*]
A: Where did you buy the shoes?
B: In the small shop over in the mall.

   b.   [*A and B are colleagues and just met on Monday*]
A: How was your weekend?
B: On Saturday I went to a soccer match and on Sunday I watched TV.

As argued in Rosemeyer (2018b), the difference between information-seeking (8a) and topic-changing (8b) uses of *wh*-interrogatives appears to be correlated with the degree to which the proposition of the *wh*-interrogative is activated or accessible (Dryer 1996). In a context such as (8a), the fact that A bought the shoes has likely been mentioned by A in the previous conversation or in a previous turn in the conversational sequence. Note that A may even be wearing the shoes at the moment of speaking. Consequently, the proposition 'A bought the shoes' is highly active and accessible. In contrast, in (8b) it is very unlikely for the proposition 'B did something on the weekend' to have been mentioned before because it is derived from world knowledge (people typically spend leisure time on the weekend). Consequently, the proposition is not highly active in the moment of A's uttering the interrogative. These observations suggest that in order to correctly predict the

discourse functions of *wh*-interrogatives, Engdahl's model of the use of *wh*-interrogatives has to be complemented by a description of the degree of activation or accessibility of both the proposition P and the asked-for element X of the *wh*-interrogative.

Gras and Sansiñena (2015) argue that when used in discourse-connective functions, non-embedded *que*-constructions express dependency relations in talk-in-interaction and are indexical elements (see Nielsen 2012: 61): they refer to "a relevant piece of contextual information that can be retrieved in a previous utterance or turn, a previous discourse situation, or a proposition being observed or inferable from the speech situation" (Gras and Sansiñena 2015: 510). We hypothesize that insubordinated *que* is also typically used in Spanish *wh*-interrogatives when the interrogative proposition has a high degree of accessibility, leading to discourse functions typically associated with this information-structural constellation.

4.   Data and methodological approach

Our study relies on data from two corpora of spoken informal Spanish conversations. We extracted all instances of insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives from two corpora of spoken Spanish: (a) the *Spanish section of the Integrated Reference Corpora for Spoken Romance Languages* (henceforth C-ORAL ROM, Cresti and Moneglia 2005) and (b) the *Corpus Oral del Lenguaje Adolescente* 'Oral Corpus of Adolescent Language' (henceforth COLA, Jørgensen and Eguía Padilla 2017), by first extracting all interrogative pronouns, determiners and adverbs, and then manually selecting all direct insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives. The C-ORAL ROM Spain contains informal and more formal dialogues, conversations and monologues recorded mostly in Madrid (Spain) between 2000 and 2003. The COLA contains informal conversations among adolescents from Madrid (Spain), Buenos Aires (Argentina) and Santiago de Chile (Chile). Table 2 shows the distribution of the *n*=29 cases of insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives in these data. It demonstrates that (a) the use of insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives is very infrequent (note that Rosemeyer 2018a found a total of 1259 cases of direct *wh*-interrogatives in the Spanish section of the C-ORAL ROM) and (b) the great majority of the cases are from Madrilenian speech, indicating that insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives are much more frequent in this variety than in Argentinian and Chilean Spanish.

Corpus	C-ORAL ROM	COLA		
Dialect	Madrid	Madrid	Buenos Aires	Santiago de Chile
N	15	12	1	1
Corpus size	300,000	500,000	70,000	150,000

Table 2. The distribution of the
n=29 cases of insubordinated wh-interrogatives

In our analysis of these *n*=29 cases of insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives, we focused on the relationship between the discourse functions of these constructions and the formal features that allow these interpretations. We thus distinguished between the basic meaning, i.e. functional potential of insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives, and the situated meanings, i.e. discourse functions that arise in virtue of the combination of this basic meaning and the specific formal contextual parameters (see Linell 2009; Gras and Sansiñena 2015, Fc.).

We identified these formal contextual parameters using tools from interactional linguistics. We transcribed the examples using the GAT 2 transcription model (Selting et al. 2011)[4] and analyzed the position of the *wh*-interrogative in the turn, the turn type in the adjacency pair, and the preference organization with regard to the previous turn, i.e. whether a response is preferred or *unmarked*, or dispreferred or *marked* (Levinson 1983: 333). The interactional activities that the interlocutors can carry out by means of the constructions under study take center stage.

The situated meanings were determined on the basis of three parameters: the type of contextual information that was being retrieved, the co-occurrence with certain linguistic resources, and the discourse position of the *wh*-interrogative in the turn and within the conversational sequence. In doing so, we tackled two research questions: (i) what are the functions of insubordinated *que* in Spanish *wh*-interrogatives?, and (ii) are there differences, if any, in the situated meanings of insubordinated declaratives and *wh*-interrogatives?

---

[4] Due to lack of space we cannot offer a list of transcription conventions here, but they comply with the system for transcribing talk-in-interaction GAT 2 (Selting et al. 2011).

5. A typology of the discourse functions of insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives

A detailed qualitative analysis of these data revealed eight types of situated meanings, which will be presented in this section. For an overview of the quantitative distribution of these situated meanings, see Table 3 in Section 6.

The first type of situated meaning identified was *self-repetition*, which counts as a re-initiation and involves the repetition of the speaker's previous intervention whenever the interlocutor either did not hear the speaker's previous utterance, or just did not take it into account. In (9) speaker A asks a question about an exam and, as speaker B does not answer it, A feels the need to re-introduce it by means of an initial unstressed *que*.

(9) *Examen* (Dialogue between friends, *apud* COLA-M, MALCE2-08B)

```
       01 A: [a   ver  ] TÍO;=
             to   see     dude
             'let's see, dude'
       02 ?  [laughter]
       03 A: =qué tal    el  eXAmen;
             what how   the exam
             'how was the exam?'
       03 B: una   paLAbra      [ (laughter)]
             one   word
             '(let's have) a word'
-->    04 A:                    [que   qué] tAl  el  eXAmen,
                                COMP  what how  the exam
                                'how was the exam?'
```

It is characterized by occurring in turn-initial position and having a rising intonation contour. As Table 1 above shows, this situated meaning is also found with non-embedded declaratives.

Next, we identified the situated meaning of *support of a prior speech act*, which counts as a justification of a previous speech act to point to some evidence that can be observed or inferred from the situational context. This type of intervention prevents further discussion by anticipating a potential objection by the interlocutor. In (10) speaker A makes it clear that denying that his prawn tortilla was exquisite is not an option.

(10)   *Tortilla* (Narrative, *apud* C-ORAL ROM, efammn05)

    01 A: yo   ya   había toʔ terminado de tom-ar mi (.) mi tortilla de
           I   already had   finished   of   take-INF my   my   tortilla of
           'I had already finished eating my tortilla'
    02   (.) de   GAMbas-=
                of   prawns
                'of prawns'
    03   =por cierto (.) exquiSIta;
            by.the.way   exquisite
            '(which was) exquisite, by the way'
    04   (1.0)
--> 05   que para qué vamos   a   neG-AR=lo;
            COMP for   what go.IND.PRS.1PL to   deny-INF=it
            'why should we deny it?'

Support of a prior speech act uses function as increments and occur in non-initial position in a complex or multi-unit turn. They are characterized by a rising intonation contour. This situated meaning has also been observed with non-embedded declaratives (see Table 1 above).

      We encountered the situated meaning of *extended quotative use*[5] whenever the speaker projects textual sequences within a turn by means of a series of non-embedded *que*-clauses. These insubordinated constructions usually report previous speech events. In (11) speaker M is telling a friend that she bumped into Azucena, a common acquaintance, a few days earlier. As M starts reporting what Azucena asked her during that brief encounter, she makes use of interrogative *que*-clauses (see lines 5 to 7). Note that in line 5 M reports an open question, while in lines 6 and 7 she reports yes-no questions.

(11)   *Azucena* (Narrative, *apud* C-ORAL ROM, efamdl34)

    01 M: luego me he   encontra-do ahí   con   la AzuCEna-
           then me have.IND.PRS.1SG meet-PTCP there with the Azucena
           'then I have met with Azucena there'
    02   que iba   con el niño a   compr-ar   un
           who go.IND.PST.IPFV.3SG with the boy to buy-INF   a
           LIbro-
           book

---

[5] Notice that this label corresponds to the situated meaning referred to as *projection of a larger turn* in Gras and Sansiñena (2015, Fc.).

'who was going with the boy to buy a book'

03	y NAda;=
	and nothing
	'and nothing'

04	el	tema	de::	el	tema	del	portAL;=
	the	topic	of	the	topic	of.the	gate
	'the thing with the gate'

--> 05   =que   qué   pasa   aQUÍ:-
     COMP   what   happens   here
     'what's up here'

06	que	si	no	se	hace	NAda:-
	COMP	if	not	REFL	do.IND.PRS.3SG	nothing
	'whether anything is being done'

07	que	si	no	viene	la	muJER:-
	COMP	if	not	come.IND.PRS.3SG	the	woman
	'whether the woman is not coming'

Extended quotative uses occur in non-initial position in the turn and count as increments in multi-unit turns. They are characterized by a rising-falling intonation. As expected, they occur with both declaratives and interrogatives.

Whenever the speaker disputes the validity of a prior intervention by the addressee by, for instance, refusing a request or dismissing a threat, we identify a *challenge*. In (12) speaker A threatens C with the consequences of farting in class, but C does not seem to be worried.

(12) *Pedo* (Dialogue among friends, *apud* COLA-M, malce2-10)

01 A: como   te   tir-es   un !PEdo!- [(laughter)]
       as   you   dump-SBJV.PRS.2SG a   fart
       'if you dare fart'

02 B: [esCUch-a;]
                                                          listen-IMP
                                                          'Listen!'

--> 03 C: que   por qué   NO?
            COMP   why   not
            'why not?'

Challenges prototypically occur in turn-initial position and are dispreferred interventions. They count as response-initiations, given that they react to the previous intervention by the interlocutor and, at the same, demand a response from him/her. They are associated with a rising intonation contour.

We identified the situated meaning of *repeat* or *partial echoing*[6] when the speaker reacts to the previous turn --sometimes with surprise or amazement-- and demands clarification. This use is frequent when the speaker has not been able to understand part of the previous utterance by the interlocutor, as in example (13).

(13)　*Difícil* (Dialogue among friends, *apud* COLA-S, SCCCM4-01)

```
      01 A: yo   pens-é:              que era                  más   diFÍcil;
            I    think-IND.PST.PFV.1SG  that be-IND.PST.IPFV.3SG  more  difficult
            'I thought that it was more difficult'
      02    (3.0)
-->   03 B: que      era              QUÉ?
            COMP     be-IND.PST.IPFV.3SG  what
            'that it was what?'
```

Repeats occur in turn-initial position and, like challenges, they are response-initiations. They are associated with a rising intonation contour.

We use the term '*anticipatory question*' (Escandell-Vidal 1999: 3978; Pons Bordería 2003: 535) to label interventions in which the speaker reacts to an immediately previous turn by confirming s/he understood the question posed and accepting the QuD change. In line 4 of (14) speaker A repeats the question that has been posed previously by B and then moves on to responding within the same turn-intervention.

(14)　*Mucha bronca* (Dialogue among friends, *apud* COLA-M, maore2-01)

```
      01 A: pero  no    me    ech-aron              mucha  BRONca-=
            but   not   me    give-IND.PST.PFV.3PL   much   fight
            'but they didn't scold me much'
      02    pero  BUEno;
            but   well
            'but OK'
      03 B: qué      te    diJEron,
            COMP     you   say.IND.PST.PFV.3PL
            'what did they tell you?'
-->   04 A: eh:: (.) que     qué   me    diJEron;=
                      COMP    what  me    say.IND.PST.PFV.3PL
            'eh... what did they tell me?'
```

---

6 'Echo-questions' have been widely treated in the literature (see Escandell-Vidal 1999 and Porroche Ballesteros 2000, among others).

```
05     = me  diJEron mm-=
       me    say.IND.PST.PFV.3PL
       'they told me'
06     =<<acc>  has              llega-do        TArde;> (laughter)
                have.IND.PRS.2SG  arrive-PTCP     late
       'you are late'
```

An anticipatory question always occurs in turn-initial position of a complex turn. This type of intervention counts as a response-initiation but it is followed by a response by the same speaker. It carries a falling intonation contour.

We identified the situated meaning of *specification of topic change* when a speaker first updates the QuD and then poses a specific question q associated with this new QuD. In lines 2–4 of (15) speaker A introduces the new QuD 'lunch', after which she moves on to posing the actual question, in line 5. The proposition of the interrogative is of high accessibility to the speaker, but of low accessibility to the interlocutor; the fact that B will prepare some food for the lunch has not been discussed in this conversation, but the speaker exploits the indexicality of *que* to signal that the question is based on previous considerations of her own, motivating the topic change. This could be understood as an instance of *reported discourse,*[7] in that it counts as representation of thought (see Nikitina and Spronck 2019).

(15)   *La comida* (Telephone conversation among friends, *apud* C-ORAL ROM, etelef03)

```
01 A: muy   BIEN;=
      very   good
      'very good'
02    =otra   COsa;
      another  thing
      'Another thing'
03 B: [<<assent hm>]
04 A: [que⁸         ]   lo    de    la    coMIda;
       COMP             that  of    the   food
```

---

[7] Spronck and Nikitina (2019: 122) point to the fact that, contrary to 'reported speech', the label 'reported discourse' "allows for other than spoken 'reports' (such as representing of thought or volition)" and that "in many languages the same type of representation applies to considerably more than just expressing speech, and a saying, i.e. an actual speech event need, not be implied by the construction, with meanings of, e.g. 'thinking' and 'wanting' being common as well".
[8] The non-embedded *que*-clause in line 4 is an instance of 'topic reintroduction' (see Gras and Sansiñena, Fc.).

```
            'about lunch'
-->   05    que    [qué        ] vas           a   hacEr  TÚ.
            COMP    what          go.IND.PRS.2SG to  do-INF you
            'what will you do?'
    06 B:              [<<assent hm>]
```

This type of insubordinated interrogative occurs in non-initial position of the turn after a new question is opened up. It prototypically has a falling intonation contour.

      Finally, the situated meaning of *introduction of topic change* was identified whenever the speaker introduces a new QuD that s/he had already contemplated introducing at a previous point in discourse. The indexicality of *que* is also exploited in (16) to signal that the question is based on previous considerations of the speaker, thus motivating the topic introduction. It could also be interpreted as an instance of representation of thought: it is high in QuD change potential, given that the proposition is of high accessibility to the speaker and low accessibility to the interlocutor.

(16) *Mi tío* (Dialogue among friends, *apud* COLA-M, malce2-09)

```
-->  01 A: que     qué  te    iba              a   deC-IR;=
           COMP    what you   go.IND.PST.IPFV.1SG to  say-INF
           'what was I going to say?'
     02    que  mi tío     es            muy  GUApo     eh-=
           that my uncle   be.IND.PRS.3SG very handsome
           'that my uncle is very handsome'
     03    =tiene         así [los   ojos    aZU]le:s-
           have.IND.PRS.3SG so  the   eyes    blue
           'he has such blue eyes'
     04 B:                    [qué   TÍO;      ]
                              what   uncle
                              'which  uncle?'
```

The introduction of topic change occurs in turn-initial position of a complex turn which consists of an initiation and a response by the same speaker. It is often, but not always, associated with a falling intonation contour.[9]

---

[9] Native informants confirmed that a falling contour seems to be preferred, or more prototypically associated with this situated meaning. However, we came across one instance of use with a rising contour, which proves that different contours are, to some extent, accepted. This is in line with previous findings that, at least in Peninsular Spanish, certain insubordinate *que*-clauses can accept any intonation pattern compatible with their functions in discourse (see Elvira-García 2015).

6.   Discussion

The description of the situated meanings of insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives confirms our first hypothesis, namely that these constructions are typically used in contexts in which the interrogative proposition has a high degree of accessibility to the interlocutor. As evident in Table 3, more than half of the tokens in our corpus occur in these contexts. In contrast, Rosemeyer (2018a) found for Madrilenian Spanish that a majority of non-insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives are used in contexts in which the proposition has a low degree of accessibility from the perspective of the interlocutor.

Situated meanings	Accessibility	*n*
Support of a prior speech act	low	2
Extended quotative use	low	6
Specification of topic change	low	3
Introduction of topic change	low	2
Anticipatory questions	high	2
Challenge	high	1
Repeat / partial echoing	high	6
Self-repetition	high	7
TOTAL		29

Table 3. Degree of accessibility per identified situated meanings

This information-structural dimension also has a formal correlate, summarized in Table 4. If we take into account intonation contour, we can identify two main sets of meanings for *que*-prefaced *wh*-interrogatives. The first set is characterized by rising intonation contours and corresponds to anaphoric meanings associated with echoed or reproduced discourse.[10] The second set is characterized by falling intonation contours and corresponds to cataphoric meanings associated with the management of the progression of discourse.

---

[10] Gras and Sansiñena (Fc.) identify a similar set of related meanings of non-embedded indicative *que*-clauses which includes echo, self-repetition, emphatic contrast and topic reintroduction.

Situated meaning	Intonation contour	*n*
Support of a prior speech act	rising	2
Challenge	rising	1
Repeat / partial echoing	rising	6
Self-repetition	rising	7
Extended quotative use	rising + falling	6
Introduction of topic change	falling	2
Specification of topic change	falling	3
Anticipatory questions	falling	2

Table 4. Intonation contour prototypically associated with each situated meaning

As was argued in Section 5, low-accessibility uses of insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives are interesting in that in such contexts, *que* forces an indexical interpretation on a proposition that is discourse-new. Particularly in the topic change functions, the interlocutor has no way of knowing beforehand that the speaker will change the topic using the insubordinated *wh*-interrogative. Consequently, such situated meanings can be characterized as instances of coercion (Pustejovsky and Jezek 2008); by using *que*, the speaker forces the listener to accommodate the presupposition that the question is based on previous considerations by the speaker. *Que* is able to coerce such meaning of indexicality onto these topic change constructions because it is associated with anaphoric construction types in most discourse-connective *que*-constructions. Such rhetorical "abuses" have been identified as crucial for semantic change, in that they can lead to the overall reinterpretation of the construction (Detges and Waltereit 2002; Eckardt 2009), which is why we interpret these uses as innovative.

A further argument for this interpretation comes from the comparison of the types of indexicality of the situated meanings of insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives and declaratives, presented in Table 5. For instance, in the anticipatory question use, an insubordinated *wh*-interrogative is indexical of a previous intervention by a different participant (i.e. a question that is being repeated). There is a clear correlation with the degree of accessibility of the proposition, in that the high-accessibility uses typically depend on something evident from either a previous intervention or the communicative situation, whereas low-accessibility uses only depend on the speaker's intervention or even a thought by the speaker. Consequently, the situated meanings at the top of the

table are more innovative among those meanings available for insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives because, in such uses, *que* is no longer an indexical sign functioning within the conversational sequence or broader conversational discourse, but forces indexicality onto the construction.

Situated meanings	Decl.	Inter.	Indexical of
Introduction of topic change	–	+	a thought by the speaker
Specification of topic change	–	+	a thought by the speaker
Support of a prior speech act	+	+	the speaker's intervention
Extended quotative use	+	+	the speaker's intervention
Anticipatory questions	–	+	the immediately previous intervention
Emphatic contrast	+	–	the immediately previous intervention
Challenge	–	+	the immediately previous intervention
Repeat / partial echoing	–	+	the immediately previous intervention
Self-repetition	+	+	the immediately previous intervention by S
Elaboration	+	–	the immediately previous intervention by S
Topic reintroduction	+	–	a non-immediate previous intervention
Warning	+	–	the situational context

Table 5. Indexicality and situated meanings in
declaratives (see Gras and Sansiñena Fc.) and wh-interrogatives

In addition, Table 5 demonstrates that, in comparison to insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives, insubordinated declaratives can be indexical of a fact not bound to the current discursive situation; for instance, they can be used to reintroduce a topic that was discussed days ago (see, e.g., the insubordinated declarative in line 4 of example 15) or to direct the addressee's attention to stimuli that can be directly observed or inferred from the situational context (Gras and Sansiñena 2015). In contrast, insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives can be indexical of a proposition of low accessibility for the interlocutor, whenever a question is based on previous

considerations of the speaker (see, e.g., the insubordinated *wh*-interrogative in line 1 of example 16). These differences are related to the ontological nature of the elements referred to or reacted to in insubordinated declaratives and *wh*-interrogatives, which we present in Table 6.

Ontological nature	Element referred to or reacted to	Declaratives (Gras and Sansiñena, Fc. (adapted))	Interrogatives
'inner speech'	thought by the speaker		X
verbal output	current or previous intervention	X	X
non-verbal	situational context	X	

Table 6. Ontological nature of elements referred to or reacted to by means of a que-*construction*

7. Summary and conclusion

In this paper, we have described the diverse situated meanings of Spanish insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives in three varieties of Spanish. Our analysis demonstrates that insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives are much more frequent in Madrilenian Spanish than in the varieties from Santiago de Chile and Buenos Aires. Accordingly, a more diverse repertoire of situated meanings is available in the Madrilenian data. Our analysis also reveals that in indicative contexts, *que*-prefaces have the same basic function in *wh*-interrogatives as in declaratives: they typically serve to anchor the utterance indexically. Moreover, the use of insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives is typical for contexts in which (a) the proposition of the interrogative has a high degree of accessibility and (b) anaphoric discourse functions such as self-repetition or challenge are realized. Furthermore, our analysis demonstrates that prosody and, in particular, intonation contour, is to some degree indicative of the distinction between anaphoric and cataphoric discourse functions.

Although insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives appear to be less productive than declaratives (cf. Gras and Sansiñena Fc.), they have developed functions that are not available for declaratives, namely specification of topic change and introduction of topic change. In these uses, the prefaced *que* is no longer indexical of previous discourse because the proposition of the interrogative is new to the

listener. Rather, *que* is used to force the inference by the listener that the speaker had contemplated bringing up this topic beforehand. The change from *information question functions* ('posing a question q derived from the current QuD') to *topic change functions* ('raising a QUD unrelated to the current QuD') can be described as a change from reporting speech (in self-repetition, repeat, challenge, extended quotative use, anticipatory question) to reporting thought (in specification of topic change and introduction of topic change). These innovative uses of insubordinated *wh*-interrogatives appear to be restricted to Madrilenian Spanish, which previous studies characterize as the Spanish dialect in which complement insubordination is more productive in general (Sansiñena 2015).

We hypothesize that the change from reporting discourse to reporting thought can be interpreted as an instance of *subjectification*, defined as the historical process in which "meanings are recruited by the speaker to encode and regulate attitudes and beliefs" (Traugott 2010: 35). Given that in topic change functions the evidence for the interrogative proposition is no longer available to the listener, *que* serves to express the speaker's perspective on the way the discourse is unfolding and is consequently "increasingly based in the SP[eaker]/W[writer]'s subjective belief state or attitude to what is being said and how it is being said" (Traugott 2003: 125). This hypothesis, however, needs to be substantiated by future research.

References

Clark, Herbert H. (1996) *Using language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cresti, Emanuela and Massimo Moneglia, eds, (2005) *C-ORAL-ROM. Integrated reference corpora for spoken Romance languages.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Detges, Ulrich and Richard Waltereit. (2002) Grammaticalization vs. reanalysis: a semantic-pragmatic account of functional change in grammar. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 21(2). 151-195.

Dryer, Matthew S. (1996) Focus, pragmatic presuppositions, and activated propositions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26(4). 475-523.

Eckardt, Regine. (2009) 'APO: Avoid Pragmatic Overload'. In Mosegaard Hansen, May-Britt and Jaqueline Visconti, eds, *Current Trends in Diachronic Semantics and Pragmatics*, 21-41. Bingley: Emerald.

Ehmer, Oliver and Malte Rosemeyer. (2018) When "questions" are not questions. Inferences and conventionalization in Spanish but-prefaced partial interrogatives. *Open Linguistics* 4. 70–100.

Engdahl, Elisabeth. (2006) 'Information packaging in questions'. In Bonami, Olivier and Patricia Cabredo Hofherr, eds, *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics* 6, 93-111. Paris: CSSP.

Elvira-García, Wendy. (2015) La prosodia de las construcciones insubordinadas conectivo-argumentativas del español. Doctoral dissertation, University of Barcelona.

Escandell-Vidal, Victoria. (1999) 'Los encunciados interrogativos. Aspectos semánticos y pragmáticos'. In Bosque, Ignacio and Violeta Demonte, eds, *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 3, 3930-3991. Madrid: Espasa.

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

Fiengo, Robert. (2009) *Asking Questions. Using Meaningful Structure to Imply Ignorance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ginzburg, Jonathan. (1996) 'Interrogatives: questions, facts and dialogue'. In Lappin, Shalom (ed.), *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, 385–422. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Gras, Pedro. (2013) 'Entre la gramática y el discurso: valores conectivos de *que* inicial átono en español'. In Jacob, Daniel and Katja Ploog, eds, *Autour de "que" - el entorno de "que"*, 89-112. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.

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

Gras, Pedro and María Sol Sansiñena. (2017) Exclamatives in the functional typology of insubordination: evidence from complement insubordinate constructions in Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 115. 21-36.

Gras, Pedro and María Sol Sansiñena. (Forthcoming) Discourse structure, constructions and regional variation: non-embedded indicative *que*-clauses in three regional varieties of Spanish.

Hamblin, Charles L. (1973) Questions in Montague English. *Foundations of Language* 10. 41–53.

Jørgensen, Annette Myre and Esperanza Eguía Padilla. (2017) *Proyecto COLA. Corpus Oral de Languaje Adolescente.* http://www.colam.org/ <21-12-2017>.

Levinson, Stephen C. (1983) *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Linell, Per. (2009) *Rethinking Language, Mind and World Dialogically: Interactional and Contextual Theories of Human Sense-Making*. Charlotte, NY: Information Age Publishing.

Pons Bordería, Salvador. (2003) *Que* inicial átono como marca de modalidad. *Estudios de Lingüística* 17. 531-545.

Porroche Ballesteros, Margarita. (2000) Algunos aspectos del uso de *que* en el español conversacional: *que* como introductor de oraciones 'independientes'. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación* (CLAC) 3. 100-116.

Pustejovsky, James and Elisabetta Jezek. (2008) Semantic coercion in language: beyond distributional analysis. *Rivista di Linguistica* 20(1). 181-214.

Roberts, Craige. (1996) 'Information structure in discourse: Towards an integrated formal theory of pragmatics'. In Yoon, Jae Haak and Andreas Kathol, eds, *OSUWPL* Volume 49: *Papers in Semantics*, 91-136. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Department of Linguistics.

Roberts, Craige. (1998) 'Focus, the flow of information, and Universal Grammar'. In Culicover, Peter W. and Louise McNally, eds, *The Limits of Syntax*, 109-160. Malden: Blackwell.

Roberts, Craige. (2004) 'Context in dynamic interpretation'. In Horn, Laurence R. and Gregory Ward, eds, *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, 197-220. Malden: Blackwell.

Rosemeyer, Malte. (2018a) Las funciones discursivas de las interrogativas parciales en castellano. *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 69. 277-314.

Rosemeyer, Malte. (2018b) The pragmatics of Spanish postposed-*wh*-interrogatives. *Folia Linguistica* 52(2). 283-317.

Sansiñena, María Sol. (2015) The multiple functional load of *que*. An interactional approach to insubordinate complement clauses in Spanish. Doctoral dissertation, KU Leuven.

Sansiñena, María Sol, Hendrik De Smet and Bert Cornillie. (2015a) Between subordinate and insubordinate. Paths toward complementizer-initial main clauses. *Journal of Pragmatics* 77. 3-19.

Sansiñena, María Sol, Hendrik De Smet and Bert Cornillie. (2015b) Displaced directives: Subjunctive free-standing que-clauses vs. imperatives in Spanish. *Folia Linguistica* 49(1). 257-285.

Selting, Margret, Peter Auer, Dagmar Barth-Weingarten, Jörg Bergmann, Pia Bergmann, Karin Birkner, Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, Arnulf Deppermann, Peter Gilles, Susanne Günthner, Martin Hartung, Friederike Kern, Christine Mertzlufft, Christian Meyer, Miriam Morek, Frank Oberzaucher, Jörg Peters, Uta Quasthoff, Wilfried Schütte, Anja Stukenbrock and Susanne Uhmann. (2011) A system for transcribing talk-in-interaction: GAT 2. *Gesprächsforschung - Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion* 12. 1-51.

Spronck, Marie-Stephan and Tatiana Nikitina. (2019) Reported speech forms a dedicated syntactic domain. *Linguistic Typology* 23(1). 119-159.

Stalnaker, Robert. (1973) Presuppositions. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 2. 447-457.

Stalnaker, Robert. (2002) Common Ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25. 701-721.

Traugott, Elizabeth. (2003) 'From subjectification to intersubjectification'. In Hickey, Raymond (ed.), *Motives for Language Change*, 124-139. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. (2010) '(Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: A reassessment'. In Davidse, Kristin, Lieven Vandelanotte and Hubert Cuyckens, eds, *Subjectification, intersubjectification and grammaticalization*, 29-74. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter.