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General Preface

The theoretical focus of this series is on the interfaces between subcomponents of the human grammatical system and the closely related area of the interfaces between the different subdisciplines of linguistics. The notion of ‘interface’ has become central in grammatical theory (for instance, in Chomsky’s Minimalist Program) and in linguistic practice: work on the interfaces between syntax and semantics, syntax and morphology, phonology and phonetics, etc. has led to a deeper understanding of particular linguistic phenomena and of the architecture of the linguistic component of the mind/brain.

The series covers interfaces between core components of grammar, including syntax/morphology, syntax/semantics, syntax/phonology, syntax/pragmatics, morphology/phonology, phonology/phonetics, phonetics/speech processing, semantics/pragmatics, and intonation/discourse structure, as well as issues in the way that the systems of grammar involving these interface areas are acquired and deployed in use (including language acquisition, language dysfunction, and language processing). It demonstrates, we hope, that proper understandings of particular linguistic phenomena, languages, language groups, or inter-language variations all require reference to interfaces.

The series is open to work by linguists of all theoretical persuasions and schools of thought. A main requirement is that authors should write so as to be understood by colleagues in related subfields of linguistics and by scholars in cognate disciplines.

Much recent work in syntactic theory has sought to incorporate relevant aspects of the speech-act into the grammar of sentences, arguing that the higher domains of functional structure in the clause encode aspects of the utterance, such as properties of the speaker, addressee, and pragmatic aspects of the discourse. This previous work has used ideas developed in the Cartographic approach to syntax, enriching the differentiation of the left periphery of clause structure. In the current volume, Corr extends the empirical evidence for syntacticizing these properties of utterances, but takes a new direction, arguing for a clausal topology where a syntactic head U, available in the root clause, functions to connect the internal content of clauses to the external world
(following Hinzen’s un-Cartesian approach to grammar), thereby updating the conversation. This general idea is shown to play out in the syntax of vocatives and interjections as well as in the relationship between verb height in Romance varieties and the availability of the different readings of illocutionary complementizers. Overall, the book makes the argument that the link between grammar and conversational action in the world is crucially syntactic.

David Adger
Hagit Borer
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DOM  differential object marking (or marker)
DomSp.  Dominican Spanish
DP  determiner phrase
DSG  Diálogos de Sao Gregório (anon., 14th or early 15th century)
Eiv.  Eivissenc (dialect of Balearic Catalan spoken on Ibiza)
Eon.  Eonavian (dialect group transitional between Galician and Asturian, spoken at the Galician-Asturian border in northwestern Spain)
EuPt.  European Portuguese
EuSp.  European Spanish
ExclIP  exclamative phrase
EXPL  expletive
Ext.  Extremaduran (dialect group of Extremadura, central western Spain)
F  feminine
FIN  finite
Flm.  Fluminense (Brazilian Portuguese spoken in Rio de Janeiro)
Foc(P)  focus (phrase)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>functional projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSI</td>
<td><em>Fiori e vita di filosi e d’altri savi e d’imperadori</em> (anon., 13th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gad.</td>
<td>Gaditano (dialect of Spanish of city of Cádiz, Andalusia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCU</td>
<td><em>La Gran Conquista de Ultramar</em> (anon., late 13th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.Est.</td>
<td><em>General Estoria</em> (attributed to Alfonso X, late 13th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gko.</td>
<td>Griko (Greek contact variety with Salentino, southern Italy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glc.</td>
<td>Galician (Ibero-Romance language of northwestern Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gsc.</td>
<td>Gascon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-</td>
<td>high phrasal accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H*</td>
<td>high pitch accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H*+L / H+*L</td>
<td>falling complex pitch accent (stressed syllable aligned with high/low pitch accent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H%</td>
<td>high boundary tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hkt.</td>
<td>Ḥaketiya (western Judeo-Spanish dialect historically spoken in Morocco)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTop</td>
<td>hanging topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HypP</td>
<td>hypothetical phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IbR.</td>
<td>Ibero-Romance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFoc</td>
<td>informational focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFP</td>
<td>Illocutionary Force Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFVP</td>
<td>Illocutionary Force Verb Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEFQ</td>
<td>indefinite quantifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I(nfl)P</td>
<td>inflectional phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IntP</td>
<td>interrogative phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRo.</td>
<td>Istro-Romanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jdz.</td>
<td>Judezmo (eastern Judeo-Spanish dialects historically spoken in the former Ottoman empire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-</td>
<td>low phrasal accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L*</td>
<td>low pitch accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L*+H / L+*H</td>
<td>falling complex pitch accent (stressed syllable aligned with low/high pitch accent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lad.</td>
<td>Ladino (Judeo-Spanish Hebrew calque)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAmSp.</td>
<td>Latin American Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LdE</td>
<td><em>Libro de los estados</em> (don Juan Manuel, early 14th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LdF</td>
<td><em>Llibre dels feyts</em> (Jaume I of Aragon, 13th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo.</td>
<td>Leonese (dialect group of northwestern Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lgd.</td>
<td>Langdocien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lis.</td>
<td>European Portuguese spoken in Lisbon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lit. literally
LLat. Late Latin
M masculine
Mad. Madrileño (Spanish)
Mdr. Madeirense (variety of Portuguese spoken on Madeira)
Med medieval
Men. Menorcan (Catalan)
Met. Metamorphoses
Mex. Mexican (Spanish)
Mil. Milanese
Mil. Miles Gloriosus
Mir. Mirandese (dialect of Astur-Leonese spoken in Miranda do Douro, northeastern Portugal)
Mlg. Malagueño (dialect of Spanish of city of Málaga, Andalusia)
Mod modern
ms. manuscript
N (i) north(ern); (ii) noun
NEG (marker of) negation
NOM nominative
Nov. Il Novellino (anon., 13th century)
NP noun phrase
NPt. Portuguese spoken in northern Portugal
NSp. Spanish spoken in northern Spain
O old
Obj object
Ov. P. Ouidius (Ovid) Naso (43 BCE – CE ?17)
P preposition
Pal. Palermitano (northwestern Sicilian dialect of city of Palermo, extreme south of Italy)
Paillé. Paillé (dialect of Astur-Leonese spoken in El Bierzo, northwest León province, Spain)
PART partitive
Pau. Paulista (Brazilian Portuguese spoken in the state of São Paulo)
PCG Primera Cronica General de España / Estoria de España (Alfonso X, late 13th century)
Per. Aeth. Peregrinatio Aetheriae (late 4th century)
Pign. Pignolese (Gallo-Italic dialect spoken in Pignola, in the province of Basilicata, southern Italy)
PL plural
Pl. T. Maccius Plautus (d. 184 BCE)
Plup pluperfect
Pont. Epistulae ex Ponto
PP prepositional phrase
ps presented set
Pst past
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pt.</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTT</td>
<td>presentative QUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question particle/marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUE</td>
<td>illocutionary (matrix) complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RaeR.</td>
<td>Raeto-Romance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reb.</td>
<td>western Ibero-Romance dialect spoken in county of El Rebollal (El Rebollar), Salamanca province, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recomp</td>
<td>recombination QUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refl.</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reg.</td>
<td>regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>raddoppiamento fonosintattico (phonosyntactic gemination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rib.</td>
<td>Ribagorçan (Catalan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rnr.</td>
<td>Rionorés (Leonese dialect spoken in Rio de Onor, Portugal, at the Portugal-Spain border)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro.</td>
<td>Romanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal.</td>
<td>Leonese spoken in Salamanca province, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>Speech Act Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sbjv</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send.</td>
<td>Sendinés (subdialect of Mirandese, spoken in the south of the Miranda do Douro municipality, Portugal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>(i) tense (position); (ii) address form used to those of lower social status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag</td>
<td>tag particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>the finite declarative complementizer, orthographically ‘that’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMT</td>
<td>Topological Mapping Theorem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tol.</td>
<td>Spanish spoken in city and/or province of Toledo, central Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top(P)</td>
<td>topic (phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trin.</td>
<td>Trinummus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trp.</td>
<td>Trapanese (western Sicilian dialect spoken in the city of Trapani and the surrounding region)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP</td>
<td>utterance/update phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UruSp.</td>
<td>Uruguayan Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>(i) verb; (ii) address form used to those of higher social status (or to indicate distance or solidarity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>verb second (syntax)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VeV</td>
<td><em>Il Libro de’ Vizi e delle Virtudi</em> (Bono Giamboni, 13th century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc</td>
<td>(i) vocative marking; (ii) vocative-modifying particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>verb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>west(ern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>unspecified head element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XP</td>
<td>unspecified phrasal category</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction

1.1 How to ‘do things’ with grammar

What should the grammar codify? In this book, I address this question by examining how speakers of Ibero-Romance ‘do things’ with conversational units of language, paying particular attention to what they do with utterance-oriented elements such as vocatives, interjections, and particles (1a–b), and to what they do with *illocutionary complementizers*, the name I give to items attested cross-linguistically which look like, but do not behave like, subordinators (2a–c):

(1) a. *Cudiato*, que fa temporal! (Ara.)
   careful that make.3sg storm
   ‘Be careful, there’s a storm!’

   b. *Mi’, Pasquà*, dissabte mos tenim de reunir (Alg.)
   utt Pasqual Saturday us=have.1PL of meet.up.INF
   ‘Look, Pasqual, we have to meet up on Saturday.’

(2) a. *Ai que o meu coraçãozinho não aguenta!* (Pt.)
   intj that the my heart.dim not bear.3sg
   ‘Oh, [that] my little heart can’t stand it!’

   b. A: ¿Qué se teme más en el campo? (NSp.)
   ‘What are people most afraid of in the countryside?’

   B: ¿Cómo?
   ‘Pardon?’

   A: ¿Que a qué se teme más en el campo?
   that of what refl=fear.3sg most in the countryside
   ‘[I asked] what are people most afraid of in the countryside.’

   c. Si tiens campos trabaja-los, *que yo no*
   if have.2SG fields work.IMP=them that I not
   t’en trabajaré garra (Ara.)
   you=PART=work.FUT.1SG at.all
   ‘If you have fields, work them, [that] I’m not going to work them for you.’
This book asks what happens when utterance-oriented elements ‘external’ to the sentential syntax exhibit grammatical behaviours in relation to that sentence (1a–b), and, conversely, what happens when exclusively grammatical items—specifically, the Romance finite subordinating complementizer *que* ‘that’—come to be used as conversational signposts (2a–c), in which role they no longer perform their canonical function (viz. subordination). I argue that neither the illocutionary contributions nor the grammatical behaviours of such elements are coincidental, but that, in each case, they lexicalize form–function mappings affiliated to a grammar of the utterance.

Empirically, this book seeks to account for the availability and behaviour of utterance-oriented elements across Ibero-Romance varieties standard and non-standard, contextualized within the wider Romance synchronic and historical context and the language group’s Latin ancestry. Theoretically, I take the behaviour of Ibero-Romance conversation-oriented units of language as a window into the indexical nature of language, arguing that these items provide insight into how language-as-grammar participates in world-building. In so doing, the present study brings together the recent flurry of work seeking to incorporate aspects of the context of the utterance into the syntax, a line of enquiry broadly founded on empirical considerations, with the pursuit of explanatory adequacy on conceptual terms, viz. the philosophical arguments for the organization of grammar as not merely expressing, but *yielding*, our (species-specific) mode of thought.

The theoretical focus of this book, then, is on the possibility of the formal representation of *utterance* information, situating its research questions in the context of a wider programme in linguistic theory which seeks to model how form relates to interpretation at the grammar–discourse interface. Building on recent work which has begun to map out the syntactic encoding of utterance participants and context at the height of the structural architecture (Speas & Tenny 2003; Sigurðsson 2004, 2010, 2014; Hill 2007, 2014; Giorgi 2010, 2014, 2018; Haegeman 2014; Wiltschko 2015, 2021; Portner et al. 2019, i.a.), this study makes the case that the grammar plays a larger role than is typically recognized in constructing the universe of discourse, and that a radical rethinking of how we conceptualize the grammatical architecture is required in order to capture the intuition that language users ‘do things’ with utterance information and the units of language through which it is codified.

In turn, I argue that a grammar for the utterance is not only empirically necessary, but is entirely compatible with a long philosophical tradition—and the project for a universal grammar (Arnauld & Lancelot 1660/1676/1966; Chomsky 1966; Hinzen & Sheehan 2013; Mendivil-Giró 2018)—which holds
that language is a system of thought. Specifically, I align myself with the ‘un-Cartesian’ programme of research pursued by Wolfram Hinzen and his associates, whereby the mind is (necessarily) grammatical, insofar as the human ability to refer—i.e. to build a bridge between our inner world and the extensional world—is mediated through the architecture of grammar, such that reference itself is configurational, a product of grammatical structure-building.\(^1\)

In accordance with the aforementioned line of enquiry known variously as the syntax of ‘speech acts’ (Speas & Tenny 2003), ‘discourse’ (Haegeman & Hill 2013), and ‘interaction’ (Wiltschko 2017a), this book argues the case for the expansion of the functional architecture to encompass utterance information within the nominal and clausal left periphery in and beyond Romance. Whilst it shares with existing research the impetus to challenge the traditional notion that grammar—and its largest unit of analysis, viz. the sentence—should exclude the dynamic and interpretative aspects of linguistically codified human communication, the present study distinguishes itself from other work in this area by its pursuit of explanatory adequacy through the proposal for an ‘un-Cartesian’ formalization of the intuition that language users ‘do things’ not with words, but with grammar (Austin 1962; Searle 1969:15).\(^2\)

Drawing on a comparative examination of the empirical patterns of Ibero-Romance utterance-oriented elements, and, especially, illocutionary complementizers, I propose a conceptual rethinking of how we model the grammar–discourse interface in terms of a ‘topological’ grammar of


\(^2\) Since this book was conceived and written (mostly in the summer of 2019), I have become aware of Martina Wiltschko’s latest model of the grammar of interaction, which, like the present study (and unlike our respective earlier forays, cited herein, into the grammar–discourse interface), synthesizes insight from Wolfram Hinzen’s programme of research on the relation between language and thought. My preliminary reading of her work suggests a number of divergences in approach and conceptualization between our respective proposals. Most saliently, Wiltschko’s model uses her universal spine framework, whereas mine is a hybrid between a cartographic/topological functional structure. Another divergence is that her work seems to draw a key distinction between a grammar of (propositional) ‘truth’ and the grammar of use-conditional interaction, where these are integrated into the clausal grammar by allocating each component distinct domains within her clausal spine. My work, by contrast, envisages these domains as part of the same referential grammar, where ‘use-conditional’ content is, at least in part, a more general fallout of non-phasal structure-building. Nonetheless, that our programmes of research have independently arrived at similar conclusions can only serve to underscore the theoretical potential of the present line of enquiry pursued here. Whilst integration of Martina Wiltschko’s latest work into the present publication is not possible, I nonetheless wish to highlight the strong claim made by Wiltschko in an unpublished squib (cited here as Wiltschko 2020), which proposes that (what in my terms would be) a grammar for the utterance is the null hypothesis, and therefore that the burden of proof lies not with those of us who argue for the integration of utterance information into the grammatical architecture, but with its detractors.
reference (Longobardi 2005; Sheehan & Hinzen 2011; Hinzen & Sheehan 2013) where an increase in syntactic structure co-varies with an increase in semantic reference. Taking as my point of departure the empirical observation that conversation-oriented units of language are referentially ‘strong’, I contend that the hypothesis that grammatical complexity co-varies with referential strength predicts that utterance-oriented items should be grammatically complex constituents in line with their referential function. I claim that this prediction is borne out in Ibero-Romance.

To that end, the three chapters of Part I take the conceptual foundations of the un-Cartesian grammar of reference to make the case for a grammar of the utterance in the nominal and clausal domains, arguing that an extension of the structural architecture to encompass utterance information is necessary, and, moreover, in keeping with the tenets of formal syntactic enterprise. In Part II, I use these insights to elaborate a principled explanation of the behaviour and cross-linguistic availability of each of the three Ibero-Romance illocutionary complementizers under investigation in the present study.

1.2 Theoretical considerations

In the initial study on Ibero-Romance illocutionary complementizers (Corr 2017) from which this monograph grew, I adopted a broadly speaking ‘cartographic’ approach (Cinque 1999, 2002; Rizzi 2004a, 2004b; Belletti 2004) in representing the structural architecture of the clause, a framework which, in its strongest formulation, assumes an idealized one-to-one mapping between interpretation and syntactic representation, wherein each semantico-pragmatic unit of meaning is encoded via a dedicated, non-recursive functional projection. My adoption of a cartographic approach was motivated primarily by the practical: extensive investigation into and within this framework offered a principled approach to mapping out the syntax of illocutionary complementizers, enabling conceptual insight into its formal mechanisms without compromising empirical adequacy.

In addition to expanding the empirical coverage of my work on utterance grammar, the present study represents a theoretical departure from Corr (2017), insofar as the fundamental concerns of this book are radically re-centred in relation to my earlier work. In the bid for explanatory adequacy on conceptual terms, this book recasts the theoretical framing of the grammatical facts of Ibero-Romance through the un-Cartesian programme of research.
Thus, whilst the cartographic influence pervades the present work, the theoretical formalization of my endeavours is instead couched within the TOPOLOGICAL MAPPING THEOREM (Longobardi 1994, 2005; Sheehan & Hinzen 2011; Hinzen & Sheehan 2013; Martín & Hinzen 2014). The Topological Mapping Theorem, abbreviated to TMT throughout the present work, offers a framework in which words gain reference through insertion into the grammatical structure in line with a basic configurational template composed of a descriptive INTERIOR and a grammatical EDGE, where expansion and movement into the edge correlate with an increase of referential strength:

\[(\text{EDGE} [\text{INTERIOR}])\]

The TMT thesis that grammatical structure co-varies with referential structure proposes a mechanism of grammar-based reference which ‘systematically establish[es] relations of relative distance between the object of reference and the immediate features of the speech context’ (Sheehan & Hinzen 2011:2).

Like the cartographic enterprise, the TMT is concerned with the relationship between grammatical architecture and meaning, although the strong thesis of the TMT postulates an even tighter relationship between structure and meaning than the already restrictive form–function mapping of the cartographic approach. These frameworks also offer compatibility in terms of their fine-grained approach to the mapping of interpretation in the functional structure, and in their utilization of natural language data to empirically substantiate, as well as to refine, their theoretical hypotheses. Indeed, the cartographic decomposition of the structural architecture will prove crucial at various points in revising and extending the TMT’s configurational mapping in order to adequately capture the empirical facts of (Ibero-)Romance utterance grammar.

By undertaking a syntactic reinterpretation of certain semantic concepts, this book diverges from mainstream approaches to formal syntax, including the cartographic programme. Some provisos are therefore in order. My engagement with issues and theories of semantic reference does not represent an attempt to wade into debates in the fields of semantics, philosophy of language, or mind. I also permit myself to diverge from theoretical tenets at other points; in Chapter 8, for example, I indulge in some blue-sky thinking, exploring the hypothesis that the grammar could interface with the sensorimotor system in a fuller sense, to include not only prosody but, more controversially, gesture.

By following these lines of enquiry and venturing beyond conventional disciplinary boundaries, I seek to synthesize insight from seemingly disparate modes of thinking in the pursuit of understanding utterance grammar rather
than proving the assumptions of a particular theoretical or disciplinary framework (nor do I seek to enter into debates outside my disciplinary purview or expertise in which I have no stake). A consequence of this approach is that some areas of analysis are more schematic—and occasionally speculative—than others. In particular, the broad perspective on Romance utterance grammar in Part I contrasts with the narrower focus of Part II’s case studies on specific illocutionary complementizer constructions. The reader should therefore be aware that certain discussions of the application of the grammar of reference to the Ibero-Romance data are more programmatic in nature, and that the organization of the book leads to divergences in this respect.

1.3 Overview of the book

The present study is divided into two Parts. Chapters 1 and 2 serve as an extended introduction to the book. Chapter 2 outlines the theoretical background to, and conceptual case for, a topological recasting of the grammatical structure in Romance and beyond in order to model aspects of the pragmatic dimension of language. Part I examines the grammar of the utterance in Romance, with a focus on the nominal and clausal left peripheries in Ibero-Romance and the conversation-oriented elements that typically occupy the leftmost positions of the utterance. Part II studies how the clausal grammar creates meaning by undertaking an in-depth investigation of the three types of Ibero-Romance illocutionary complementizer construction illustrated at the start of this chapter. Concluding the study, Chapter 9 summarizes the book’s principal contributions and examines the theoretical implications arising from its proposal for an ‘un-Cartesian’ formalization of the intuition that speakers of Ibero-Romance can ‘do things’ with grammar.

1.3.1 Overview of Part I

The three chapters of Part I examine a range of utterance-oriented elements whose empirical properties give rise to the perception that such items are ‘realized together with the clause without really belonging to it’ (Giorgi 2018:168). Such items thus appear to be outside the domain of the sentence (for which, read CP) in terms of their pragmatic interpretation, peripheral distribution, and prosody, and which, on conventional assumptions, are ‘not
easily accountable in terms of clause-internal rules of sentence grammar’ (Wiltschko & Heim 2014:3). These utterance-oriented elements are crucial to the initiation, termination, and, especially, maintenance of dialogue between discourse participants (cf. Haegeman & Hill 2013 on ‘conversational pragmatics’). However, their interpretation on traditional accounts is captured as contextually derived rather than syntactically computed. More broadly, their empirical behaviours are typically characterized in terms of ‘deviance’ and/or ‘deficiency’ in relation to their unambiguously syntactic counterparts elsewhere in the linguistic system. Yet, the successful deployment of utterance-oriented elements is, like other areas of grammar, part of a native speaker’s high-level yet unconscious competence in their language, as evidenced by the possibility of using utterance-oriented items infelicitously.

The first two chapters of Part I examine the grammatical behaviours of vocatives (Chapter 3), interjections, and particles (Chapter 4), making the case that these items participate in principled, systematic behaviours at the interface between grammar and the extensional world. It is proposed that the ostensive-deictic referential properties of Ibero-Romance utterance-oriented constituents are systematically configured by the architecture of grammar, lending support to the proposal that reference is finely tracked through the phasal template. Building on this insight, these chapters recast the internal architecture of such conversation-oriented units in terms of grammatical reference, arguing that, under TMT principles, we should expect these elements to be grammatically complex constituents, and that this prediction is indeed borne out in the empirical behaviours of Romance utterance-oriented units of language.

Chapter 5 concludes Part I by revisiting the relation of utterance-oriented units to the sentence with which they are associated. It puts forward the proposal that dynamic conversational moves can be captured under a phasal approach to the clausal structure, using insight from the grammar of reference to reframe utterances as a grammatical ‘fact’. On this approach, utterances are dynamic communicative acts whose structure and referential potential are configured by the clausal architecture; specifically, they constitute the combined outcome of phasal and non-phasal structure-building in the clausal domain. In so doing, this chapter formalizes the distinction made in this book between the CP, which does things with propositions, viz. packages them as different types of knowledge, and an Utterance (or ‘Update’) Phrase (UP), which does things with clauses, viz. repackages the knowledge they contain for consideration in the external world.
1.3.2 Overview of Part II

The point of departure of Part II is the observation that the complementizer (Rosenbaum 1967; Bresnan 1970) in Ibero-Romance does not always function as a complementizer, i.e. as a subordinator that heads a complement clause. The canonical function of the complementizer as a subordinator is illustrated in (4), where the obligatory presence versus absence of the finite Romance complementizer _que_ ‘thət’ (< Lat. *quid*) marks the distinction between an embedded (4a) and matrix (4b) indicative declarative clause:

(4) a. Dixiérunñus *(que) yiera meyor cumezar cun tell.pst.3pl=us that be.impf.3sg better begin.inf with algo senciello (Cabr.)
   ‘They told us thət it was better to begin with something simple.’

b. (*Que) yiera meyor cumezar cun algo that be.impf.3sg better begin.inf with algo senciello simple
   ‘(*Thət) it was better to begin with something simple.’

The morphological marking on the complementizer in (4a-b) identifies the embedded sentence’s clause type (compare, e.g., Romance _si/se_ for an interrogative clause) and finiteness (e.g. Romance _de/di_ indicates a non-finite clause). In Romance, zero morphological marking in the complementizer position (as in 4b) is typically assumed to provide an overt signal that the clause is a matrix declarative (cf. Roberts 2004).

One of the more conspicuous properties characterizing the colloquial grammar of the Ibero-Romance language family, particularly varieties located in the Iberian Peninsula, is the ample use of the Romance complementizer _que_ ‘thət’, as we saw in (2a–c), to introduce non-embedded matrix clauses. To that end, Part II undertakes three case studies into Ibero-Romance matrix ‘illocutionary’ complementizers, where the complementizer in each instance makes a distinct contribution to the build of discourse: the expression of speaker affect with _affective que_ (2a); the metalinguistic negotiation of the universe of discourse with _presentative que_ (2b); and the dynamic construction of discourse cohesion across utterances with _dialogic que_ (2c). These complementizers are henceforth collectively referred to as illocutionary _QUE_, to
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3 Gascony Occitan, including some of its Aranese sister dialects (Carrera 2007), is a notable exception.
distinguish these uses from the well-established role of que as the Romance (finite) subordinating complementizer.

The chief task of Part II is to determine if and how the interpretative differences between the Ibero-Romance illocutionary complementizers under investigation here manifest themselves in the clausal structure. Each chapter unpacks in detail the interpretative contribution and grammatical properties of each illocutionary complementizer. I show that, in terms of their grammatical behaviour, not all illocutionary complementizers pattern alike. Moreover, I follow up on an earlier hunch in Corr (2017) that verb height correlates inversely with the availability of Romance illocutionary complementizers. Drawing on the extension of the TMT to the clausal template in Sheehan & Hinzen (2011), I recast this ‘verb height’ hypothesis in terms of the grammar of reference.

A key insight in Sheehan & Hinzen (2011) is that clausal reference is configurationally mapped in the CP, where V-to-C movement is the mechanism responsible for yielding extensional truth in declarative matrix CPs (producing a ‘rigid’ interpretation analogous to the ‘rigidity’ of proper names, cf. Kripke 1971), and where complementizer insertion blocks such movement and its associated extensional semantics. In Chapters 6–8, I make the case that Ibero-Romance illocutionary complementizers yield maximally expanded ‘root’ CPs without necessarily constituting assertions. In these cases, the insertion of the complementizer at the height of the cartographic ‘split’ CP signals maximal expansion of the clausal structure, whereas the assignation of a truth value occurs at the lower end of the split CP.

Chapter 6 proposes that affective que constructions are configured with the referential potential of a truth-denoting deictic act—realized through c/overt V-to-Fin movement—whilst additionally providing instruction on how that clause should be interpreted in the external world, viz. through an affective lens. Chapter 7’s examination of presentative que, used to report second-hand speech in matrix environments, shows that speakers can put forth (Portner 2006) truth-conditional content into the extensional world without having to assert it. It is argued that, in clauses which present their (scope) proposition, the verb remains below C, but that these structures also yield a semantically and syntactically separate evidential proposition assigned at the ‘root’. The availability of presentative que across (Ibero-)Romance inversely correlates with the height of verb movement, such that varieties with a higher landing site cannot put forward a proposition without also asserting—through compulsory V-to-Fin movement—the truth of that set of affairs. Chapter 8 proposes that complementizer insertion in dialogic que constructions
(which build textual coherence by rendering explicit perceived connections across dialogue) enables the speaker to implement an act of grammatically configured ostension beyond the utterance it introduces, whilst V-to-Topic movement in these constructions not only licenses the configurational assertion of propositional truth, but explains the robust availability of the dialogic complementizer across the Romance family.

In this way, the analysis put forward in Part II proposes to unpack truth ascription into two structural correlates, and lends credence to the intuition that the CP does things with propositions whereas the UP does things with clauses. Whilst it is verb movement that determines the truth of the proposition itself, the final landing site of a verb in a given construction is understood to be topologically differentiated at the nanoparametric level according to the referential force required for that context. On my account, it is the combination of verb movement, or lack thereof, to varying positions in the split CP plus the complementizer insertion that yields the various interpretative nuances of illocutionary complementizer expressions. Conversely, it is verb movement itself which accounts for the cross-linguistic availability of illocutionary complementizers across Romance.

1.4 Empirical considerations

1.4.1 Utterance syntax in the cross-linguistic context

The exploration of utterance syntax is often associated with typologically ‘distant’ languages: Basque, Japanese (Miyagawa 2012, 2017), Blackfoot, Halkomen Salish (Ritter & Wiltschko 2009), dialectal Arabic (Akkuş & Hill 2018), Tibeto-Burman (Zu 2018), Korean (Ceong 2019), and Finnish (Hollingsworth 2019). In some cases, the motivation for this investigative focus is founded on the assumption that these languages provide evidence of the encoding of the utterance and its context in ‘specific grammatical ways that English and other well-researched languages do not employ’, reinforcing the impression that ‘the familiar languages of Western Europe are overshadowed once again by the complexities of systems found elsewhere in the world’ (Zu 2018:6).

It is true that these languages exhibit discourse-oriented phenomena that are seldom, if ever, attested in the Eurocentric canon of well-researched
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4 See also Wiltschko & Heim (2016) on Canadian English particles.
languages: such ‘rigidly root’ (Haegeman & Miyagawa 2016) phenomena include speaker-oriented (5a) and addressee-oriented (5b) non-argumental verbal agreement; logophoric pronouns (6), and logophoric complementizers (7a–b):

(5) a. Sam-ga {warat-ta / o-warai-ninat-ta /}
    Sam-NOM laugh-PAST SUBJ,HON-laugh-SUBJ,HON-PAST
    warai-yagat-ta}. (Japanese)
    laugh-ANTI,HON-PAST
    ‘Sam {laughed / laughed [speaker deferential to addressee] / laughed
    [speaker impolite]’

b. Pettek lan egin {dik /}
    Peter.ERG work.ABS do.PRF AUX-3SG.ABS-2SG.COLLOQ.M-3SG.ERG
    din /
    AUX-3SG.ABS-2SG.COLLOQ.F-3SG.ERG
    dizü}. (Basque)
    AUX-3SG.ABS-2SG.FORMAL-3SG.ERG
    ‘Peter {worked [male familiar addressee] / [female familiar addressee]/
    [formal/higher status addressee]}’

(6) Kofi be {e-dzo / yè-dzo } (Ewe, Niger-Congo)
    Kofi say 3SG-leave LOG-leave
    ‘Kofi said {s/he, i/j / he, i/*j} left’

(7) a. ko-ɑ-mwaa θɑ-le
    ko-ɔ-ruuja tuya amut (Kipsigis, Nilotic)
    pst-1SG-say 1SG-COMP pst-3-sleep cows yesterday
    ‘I said that.1SG the cows slept yesterday.’
    (Diercks & Rao 2017:2)

b. ko-ɑ-yas kobun Kiproono {ko/e/*ɑ-je}
    ko-ɔ-ruuja
    pst-1SG-hear through Kiproono that/1SG-COMP pst-3-sleep
    tuya amut cows yesterday
    ‘I heard through Kiproono {that/*that.1SG} the cows slept yesterday.’
    (ibid.:10)

The description and analysis of such phenomena is indeed necessary lest, as Miyagawa (2017:xiii) warns, ‘the predominance of linguistic data spoken by [Western linguists] distort our conception of what the universal system looks like’. Nevertheless, the empirical focus of this book is the Iberian branch of the Romance language group, a prime example of a familiar language family of Western Europe that has already been thoroughly scrutinized.
Why? I argue the Ibero-Romance data provide compelling evidence that utterance phenomena can be found in a language family with which the research community is (at least superficially) familiar and whose comparative contribution as yet is untapped. In the case of utterance grammar, focusing on ‘unfamiliar’ languages for our evidence not only obscures a wealth of data on our proverbial doorstep, but paradoxically risks playing into Orientalist tropes about the ‘exotic’ nature of non-European languages’ linguistic systems that is, in the present case, unwarranted by fact.

To that end, a principal aim of this volume is to provide extensive novel data (including from numerous non-standard varieties) that I have collected from across the Ibero-Romance family, and to take advantage of the rich documentation of complementizer systems across Romance, for the exploration of this relatively understudied area of syntactic theory. In this sense, I take the view that, as Ledgeway (2012:6) puts it, ‘the perennially fertile and still under-utilized testing ground of the Romance languages has a central role to play in challenging linguistic orthodoxies and shaping and informing new ideas and perspectives about language change, structure, and variation’. In so doing, this book offers for the first time a detailed, comparative monographic study of Ibero-Romance morphosyntax and its diatopic, diastrastic, diamesic, and, to a lesser extent, diachronic variation from a formal perspective. Readers of a more theoretical orientation should therefore be aware that, in this respect, the book takes inspiration from the rich philological tradition of Romance scholarship, such that the inclusion of a wealth of empirical data in the present study is a deliberate decision to document and systematize a historically neglected, yet empirically abundant, area of the descriptive grammar of Romance.

1.4.2 Methodological clarifications

In this book, I take the term ‘Ibero-Romance’ to refer to those languages and dialects which descend from the Latin as originally spoken in the Iberian Peninsula. I subdivide Ibero-Romance into three further branches following Peninsular geography and its traditionally associated isoglosses: West Ibero-Romance corresponds to Galician-Portuguese and Astur-Leonese varieties; Central Ibero-Romance to Spanish varieties; and East Ibero-Romance to Occitano-Romance varieties. For present purposes, the cut-off between Ibero-Romance and Gallo-Romance follows national boundaries: thus Aranese is considered an Ibero-Romance variety, whereas Gascon is Gallo-Romance.
1.4 Empirical Considerations

Whilst arbitrary—Aranese is typically classed as a subdialect of Pyrenean Gascon (Occitan)—I hold that, since its linguistic classification is not clear-cut, it is preferable to recognize Aranese as an Iberian language that exists on an interstitial point of dialect continuum between two major branches of the Romance family, than exclude it on a similarly arbitrary notion that it should be classified as Gallo-Romance (a branch whose European geography extends as far as Belgium, Switzerland, and Italy). Nonetheless, contact with Catalan and Spanish gives Aranese varieties a more ‘Iberian’ flavour than their Gallic sister dialects, providing empirical justification for my classification of Aranese as an Ibero-Romance variety. The identification of Ibero-Romance, however, does not respect national boundaries as above described in the case of the România nova.

In order to represent the Ibero-Romance family in as wide yet as coherent and manageable a perspective as possible, this book focuses on present-day varieties spoken in and around the Peninsula, viz. European Portuguese, Galician, Spanish, Catalan, and a number of non-standard varieties, though non-Peninsular varieties are not excluded from the discussion. Informally, it is observed that the use of illocutionary que is characteristic of Peninsular Ibero-Romance more than it is of Spanish-American varieties and Portuguese-speaking Africa, which does not justify, but partially serves to explicate, their sidelining here. Nor does my discussion fully take into account language contact or sociolinguistic factors more generally, despite bilingualism and diglossia being the norm in much of the Peninsula, especially in the case of speakers of non-standardized varieties, whose linguistic systems frequently show L2 effects particularly in the younger generations and amongst so-called new speakers. These omissions from the present work nonetheless provide clear avenues of investigation for future research.

The data used in this book come from a variety of sources. The majority of my examples are either attested data that I have sourced myself, or elicited data from Ibero-Romance speaker consultants, collected either in person or via online surveys. The attested data have been taken predominantly from publicly available online material, in particular social media, which, given the informal, oral register of illocutionary que constructions, I found to be an especially fruitful source insofar as the language employed by users of social media is the written form that most closely approximates how language users express themselves in unguarded, spoken social exchanges. Indeed, although I have characterized illocutionary complementizers as a spoken language phenomenon, the empirical focus of this volume might be more appropriately characterized as a conversational phenomenon—whether such dialogue is
written or spoken—since the colloquial nature of social media is increasingly blurring the distinction, at least in certain registers/contexts, between written and spoken discourses.

The internet also permitted contact with numerous speakers of non-standard(ized) languages who otherwise would have been difficult to locate and access. My other, most commonly consulted sources for attested data were corpora, traditional media (including television), literature, and reference grammars. The results from the attested data collection stage were then examined and tested by close consultation with a smaller number of speakers. Given the difficulties of remote data collection, the more fine-grained analyses and comparative observations are based on languages for which I could more confidently verify my findings, which were inevitably the Ibero-Romance languages with larger numbers of speakers (i.e. Spanish, Catalan, Galician, and European Portuguese). In the text, examples appearing without citation are those from the corpus I have built, as above described.

1.4.3 Nomenclature

Where known, I use the preferred nomenclature as stated by the speaker in question, or, in the case of data taken from existing research, the name of the variety given in the literature unless it can be substituted for a suitable endonym without introducing inaccuracy in the characterization of the data or their source. When unknown, I use the most fine-grained nomenclature possible, giving the autonyms or commonly accepted dialect names (if suitable, in English translation, e.g. Extremaduran for estremeñu, the group of Western Ibero-Romance dialects spoken in Extremadura), or a more generic label with a descriptor of the geographic region (e.g. European Spanish). For lesser-known varieties, (minimal) background information is provided to the reader in the abbreviations section. This may result at times in different labels for what is ostensibly the same variety, especially those associated with linguistic or political boundaries or language contact.
2

A grammar for the utterance

2.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the conceptual case for a radical rethinking of the grammatical architecture in Romance and beyond in order to capture the intuition that speakers can ‘do things’ with utterance information, specifically, via the topological organization of grammatical structure.

Through critical examination of the modelling of speech acts within pragmatics and philosophy of language (§2.2) and developments in clause structure within syntactic theory (§2.3), this chapter examines how different theories have modelled the mapping of form to function at the level of the utterance, and how these insights have informed recent work in formal syntactic theory. Building on recent work on the syntacticization of discourse (§2.4), I will argue that, following the decomposition of the Complementizer Phrase (Chomsky 1986) into a hierarchy of increasingly fine-grained, discourse-oriented projections (Rizzi 1997 et seq.), the incorporation of utterance information is the logical next step in a succession of theoretical revisions to the clausal left-edge. At the same time, by matching the single-sentence limit of syntactic analysis, the modelling of complex illocutionary force as speech acts within a single, dynamic conversational move (Beyssade & Marandin 2006a, 2006b) has resulted in compatibility with syntactic frameworks.

The chapter ends by laying out the theoretical ‘un-Cartesian’ principles of the Topological Mapping Theory pursued in the study (§2.5), the insights and predictions of which, I propose, lay the foundations for a grammar of the utterance. In so doing, this chapter defends a conceptual shift to a so-called grammar of reference, wherein the mind is (necessarily) grammatical, in modelling aspects of the pragmatic dimension of language.

2.2 Mapping form to function

In seeking to understand if, and how, the utterance is manifested in grammatical structure, my research questions are set within a wider practical, and
ultimately philosophical, line of enquiry in linguistic theory which seeks to model how form relates to interpretation at the level of the sentence. Conventionally, we distinguish the morphosyntactic notion of clause type—a sentence’s formal or grammatical structure, captured through syntax—and illocutionary force, the sentence’s communicative function, which falls within the purview of pragmatics. Following the view from speech act theory that language is fundamentally a medium for action (§2.2.1), a speech act, or illocutionary act, is the communicative action effected through the production of an utterance, and the illocutionary force of an utterance is the communicative function attached to that expression. Note that, in this book, I adopt the terminology of speech act, and, as defined in §2.3.1, utterance, but in neither case should my usage of these terms be taken to refer to spoken modalities only.

A coincidence between clause type and illocutionary force has been observed since antiquity (Allan 2006:2), leading, at times, to their conceptual conflation, especially in formal syntactic theory. This is unsurprising given that, in general, syntactic approaches assume a mapping between form and interpretation (e.g. Sadock 1974; Levinson 1983), and in that direction. However, a straightforward mapping between the two is complicated by various empirical factors:

i) a single (morphosyntactic) clause type can correspond to multiple speech acts:

(1) ¿Tienes fuego? (Sp.)
’Do you have a light?’

a. Information-seeking question: ‘Do you have a lighter in your possession?’

b. Implicit request: ‘Can you lend me your lighter?’

c. Implicit command: ‘Lend me your lighter.’

ii) a single speech act can have multiple morphosyntactic realizations:

(2) a. Debes devolverme o libro mañá. (Glc.)
must.2sg give.back.inf=me the book tomorrow
’You must give me the book back tomorrow.’

b. {Devólveme / que me devolvas} o libro
give.back.imp.2sg=me comp me=give.sbjv.2sg the book
mañá!
tomorrow
’Give me back the book tomorrow!’
c. Mañá devólvesme o libro.
   Tomorrow give.back.2SG=me the book
   ‘Tomorrow you’ll give me back the book.’

iii) a single utterance may perform more than one type of illocutionary function simultaneously, or involve more than one clause type:

(3) a. Y aquí nu se ofendi nañi, ¿nordá? (Can.)
   ‘And no one’s offended around here, right?’
b. Quédate un rato más y te prometo que valdrá la pena (EuSp.)
   ‘Stay a little longer and I promise you it’ll be worth it’
c. Luna, aide, skapando la lavor i mus vamos. (Jdz.)
   ‘Luna, c’mon, finish.ger your work and let’s go’
d. Que jogas mal, ou já abías isso? (EuPt.)
   ‘You play badly, or did you know that already?’

iv) illocutionary modifiers (e.g. discourse particles) do not map isomorphically to clause type, but correspond instead to a sentence’s illocutionary force:

(4) a. Vinga, ara em tocarà bloquejar trolls! (Cat.)
   ‘C’mon/right, now it’s my turn to block trolls!’
b. #Vinga, {m’ha picat una abella/quina por}!
   ‘C’mon, a bee has stung me/how scary!’ (Hernanz 2008 [2002]:1012)
c. Vinga, anima’t!
   ‘C’mon, join in!’
d. Vinga, ja teniu les màscara anti-gas?
   ‘Right, have you got the gas masks?’

v) speech acts are not limited to the canonical sentence centred around a predicate and subject, and many do not have a specific clause type correlate at all:

(5) a. A que non adiviñas de quen van ser? (Glc.)
   ptc thød not guess.2SG of who go.3PL be.INF
   ‘I bet you can’t guess who they’re going to be’
b. Coime, que faen con nós lo que quieren. (Ast.)
   intj thød do.3PL with us that which want.3PL
   ‘Bloody hell, they just do what they want with us’
c. A: Nu-îşâ? (IRo.)  
   ‘Isn’t it like that?’
B:   Ba, că şa-î!  
   ptc thot thus=be.3sg
   ‘You are wrong, it is like that.’ (Saramandu et al. 2011:55)

In mapping form to function at the level of the sentence, the foregoing empirical observations provide persuasive evidence that illocutionary force can be decoupled from clause type; that speech acts are distinct from (syntactic) sentences; and that the range of (possible) illocutionary forces outnumbers the taxonomy of possible sentence types. Yet, a strong intuition persists that some sentences have a ‘basic’ meaning (i.e. direct speech acts, where clause type and illocutionary force align), even if they can be used with other interpretations (i.e. indirect speech acts, where clause type and illocutionary force diverge).¹

2.2.1 The view from speech act theory

Speech act theory has responded to these empirical issues by developing an account of utterance-level meaning independent from structural considerations. Speech acts have been variously defined as constituting performative utterances (Austin 1962); communicative actions (Frege 1879; Stenius 1967); moves in a language game (Wittgenstein 1958); ‘paraphrased performatives’ (Lewis 1970); and index-changing devices (Szabolcsi 1982; Krifka 2014).² The core insight of speech act theory is that language is fundamentally a medium for action (even if the surface form fails to differentiate the meanings of these actions, or conceals their performative nature altogether). Its explanandum is how utterances, composed of the same morphosyntactic form and its associated lexico-conceptual content, can have a range of illocutionary meanings; that is, can constitute different speech acts. By way of example, consider the myriad illocutionary values of the three word Spanish utterance in Table 2.1 (viz. [‘be.βe la li.mo. na.ða], where p = ‘drink the lemonade’), which—in the absence of any other contextual cues—are codified in spoken registers through prosody alone.

In speech act theory, it is through the articulation of their utterances that speakers execute actions that change the world. This is evidenced most

¹ Note that ‘basic’ should not be confused with ‘most frequent’.
² See also, amongst others, Bühler (1934); Austin (1970); Searle (1969, 1975); Vanderveken (1990); Recanati (2013); Kissine (2013). For recent critical overviews, see Levinson (2017); Fogal et al. (2018); Harris et al. (2018); Green (2020).
Table 2.1 Possible intonational contours and corresponding communicative functions for Sp. *bebe la limonada* (Hualde & Prieto 2015:389)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bebe</th>
<th>la limonada</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L+&lt;H*</td>
<td>L+H* L%</td>
<td>(s/he drinks the lemonade’) or command (‘drink the lemonade!’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L+&lt;H*</td>
<td>L* L%</td>
<td>Statement/command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L+H* L-</td>
<td>L* L%</td>
<td>Statement/command with emphasis on first word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L+&lt;H* H-</td>
<td>L+H* L%</td>
<td>Statement/command with emphasis on second word. First word is topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L+&lt;H*</td>
<td>L+H* L! H%</td>
<td>Statement of the obvious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L*+H</td>
<td>L* H%</td>
<td>Information-seeking question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L+&lt;H*</td>
<td>L+H* HL%</td>
<td>Confirmation question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L+&lt;H*</td>
<td>L+¡H* L%</td>
<td>Echo question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L+H*</td>
<td>H* H%</td>
<td>Quiz question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L+&lt;H*</td>
<td>H+L* L%</td>
<td>Insistent explanation/request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

explicitly in performative predicates (‘I name this ship the Queen Elizabeth’), where the sentence does not merely describe a state of affairs but creates a new set of circumstances. The speaker, by the act of uttering the sentence, updates the world from, in this case, a state in which the ship is unnamed to one in which there is a ship, the one which the speaker has named, which is now called the Queen Elizabeth. Austin’s theory pursues the hypothesis that there is a performance—i.e. an action executed—underlying every sentence, whether or not a given utterance involves an explicit world-changing predicate (e.g. ‘promise’, ‘congratulate’, ‘conclude’, ‘pronounce man and wife’).

Whereas Austin’s work focused on the *conventionalized* nature of speech acts, other traditional approaches (e.g. Grice 1957, 1968, 1969; Strawson 1964; Searle 1969; Bach & Harnish 1979) understood speech acts in terms of a speaker’s communicative goals or *intentions*, such that an assertion constitutes an act through which a speaker announces (i) their belief in a proposition $p$, and (ii) their desire/intention for the addressee to adopt that belief in $p$. The insight that speakers attempt to change propositional attitudes between discourse participants is updated in more recent proposals that adopt a dynamic approach to the encoding of communicative functions. On such approaches,
which have proven especially popular amongst advocates of the syntacticization of the speech event (§2.4), the intuition is that speech acts, and the illocutionary forces which characterize—or constitute—them, involve updates to the utterance participants’ shared context or common ground, originally conceived (and today maintained in addressee-directed theories such as Harris 2019) as acts which intend to change shared propositional attitudes between interlocutors. In dynamic models of illocutionary force (cf. Heim 1982), propositions are put forward as proposals for changing the common ground; and speech acts are conversational moves—often conceived as social commitments—to be kept track of via a (mental) ‘scoreboard’ (Lewis 1979; see Portner 2018 for a recent overview).

Thus an assertion is equivalent to the speaker putting a proposition ‘on the table’ for consideration by the addressee, the communicative goal of which is not achieved until the addressee gives an indication that they accept that proposition as true (cf. Clark & Schaefer’s 1989 two-part model in terms of a ‘presentation’ and subsequent ‘acceptance’ phase). However, as Krifka (2014) points out, an assertion can still be successful whether or not the addressee accepts its proposition as true (whence the appeal of intentional theories of speech acts, which, although dependent on the speaker–addressee opposition, centralize the speaker whilst requiring nothing on the part of the addressee):

(6) Believe it or not, I never cheated on you.  

(Krifka 2014:65)

Of particular relevance to the present discussion, since it constitutes the framework for the ‘conversational layer’ (akin to my UP) of Wiltschko’s (2014, 2021) clausal spine, is the work of Beyssade & Marandin (2006a, 2006b). These authors propose a model of illocutionary force based on utterance participants and the set of shared commitments they bring to—and update through the course of—a conversation. On their account, the illocutionary force of an utterance is a conversational move composed of two types of conversational update: a proposal by the speaker to change the common ground, plus an appeal to the addressee to do the same. When these two types of conversational update—the speaker’s commitment plus the ‘call on addressee’, in Beyssade &

---

3 The expression ‘common ground’, viz. the set of knowledge and assumptions shared between discourse participants, is attributed to Paul Grice in Stalnaker (2002:701), although it is largely associated with the latter’s work; cf. e.g. Stalnaker (1973, 1974, 1978, 2002); also, Karttunen (1974).

4 MacFarlane (2011); Geurts (2019); Krifka (2019).

5 Beyssade & Marandin (2006a, 2006b); Farkas & Bruce (2010); MacFarlane (2011); Ginzburg (2012, 2016); Krifka (2014); Malamud & Stephenson (2015).

6 Strictly speaking, their dynamic model of illocutionary force involves an attempted update to the set of shared commitments by the speaker, and a simultaneous request by the speaker that the addressee also commits, or otherwise ratifies or responds to, the speaker’s attempted update.