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Introduction
Brazilian Portuguese (BP) cadê que

BP has a structure that involves the combination of an interrogative and a complementizer, but indicates disapproval and rejection.

(1) a. Cadê que o João foi ao jogo!
   where that the João go.PST.3SG to-the game
   ‘Like hell João went to the game!’

This differs from another, more common use of Cadê…? meaning ‘Where is…?’

b. Cadê o João?
   where the João
   ‘Where’s João?’
Brazilian Portuguese (BP) cadê que

(1) a. Cadê que o João foi ao jogo!
   where that the João go.PST.3SG to-the game
   ‘Like hell João went to the game!’

We will examine the properties of this structure, with explicit comparisons to the syntactic account of Cadê..? in Gravely & Gupton (forthcoming).

Subsequently, we will:

1) show that it syntactically codifies metalinguistic negation, and
2) propose a base-generated, left-peripheral analysis for cadê que.
Brazilian Portuguese (BP) cadê que

Our proposal is similar to what others have claimed for MN (e.g. Martins 2014), thus contributing to the literature on clause-typing of other base-generated elements in the left periphery (Etxepare 2008, 2010; Aelbrecht et al. 2012; Hill 2012; a.o.).

This analysis sheds further light on the fine articulation of the left periphery (e.g. Rizzi 1997, 2013), its interface-related properties, and how discourse-pragmatic features like MN may be encoded within the syntax of the expanded CP-realm.
Previous research
The interrogative cadê was reanalyzed from the interrogative phrase O que é de…? (cf. Silva da Menon 2014)

In its present-day use, cadê may select an overt DP of varying types: Singular definite DP (2a), plural definite DP (2b), or indefinite DP (2c)

(2) a. Cadê a mãe?
    where the mother
    ‘Where is mom?’

b. Cadê os meninos?
    where the boys
    ‘Where are the boys?’

c. Cadê um desses aqui?
    where one of those here
    ‘Where is one of those here?’
Gravely & Gupton (forthcoming): BP cadê

- Cadê also appears with Quantified DPs (3a) and strong pronouns (3b) with nominative Case, thus ruling out (object) clitic pronouns (3c):

(3) a. Cadê cada maldito que disse que
   where each damn COMP say.PST.3SG COMP
   o Everton não pega pênalti?
   the Everton NEG hit.PRS.3SG penalty
   ‘Where is every damn (person) that said Everton doesn’t make penalties?’

b. Cadê ele?
   where he
   ‘Where is he?’

c. *Cadê-te? / (ok) Cadê tu?
   where-CL2.SG where you.NOM
   ‘Where are you?’
Topicalization is also found in sentences with *cadê*

The topicalized constituent is often doubled by a personal pronoun that bears the same φ-set (4)

However, it may also stand alone when discourse-linked to a subordinate clause (5)

(4) A desgraça do João, *cadê* ele?
the disgrace of-the João where he
‘That disgraceful João, where is he?’

(5) Quando acho que to engordando, *cadê*?
when find.PRS.1SG COMP be.PRS.1SG fatten.PROG where
‘When I notice I’m getting fat, where is it (=the fat)’
Gravely & Gupton (forthcoming): BP cadê

- Cadê may also be embedded

(6) Tava procurando o livro mas não sei cadê
be.IMPFV.1SG search-for.PROG the book but NEG know.PRS.1SG where
‘I was looking for the book, but I don’t know where it is.’

- Embedded constructions like (6) suggest that cadê has a null-copular syntax similar to what is found in Semitic languages (7)

(7) Arabic (Benmamoun 2008:1150)
qal bəlli Omar ø f-d-dar
say.PST.2SG COMP Omar ø in-the-house
‘You said that Omar is in the house.’
Gravely & Gupton (forthcoming): BP cadê

• Very importantly, cadê may not be paired with a verb

(8)  a. Cadê (*estão) minhas chaves?  
    where be.PRS.3PL my keys  
    ‘Where are my keys?’
  b. *Cadê vai você?  
    where go.PRS.3SG you  
    Intended: ‘Where are you going?’

• These data suggest that cadê is not a typical wh- interrogative
• Cadê has an obligatorily present-tense reading, so we reject a small-clause approach
• Availability of topicalization suggests that cadê has access to LP functional structure, as opposed to languages like Galician that do not allow topicalization in comparable constructions (Gravely & Gupton 2020)
Gravely & Gupton (forthcoming): BP cadê

Because *cadê* has an obligatory interrogative nature, we assume that it moves to $C^o$ (or Focus$^o$ in an extended, articulated LP) in order to check $[uQ]$

Given its lack of overt agreement morphology, we understand *cadê* to be morphologically defective.

Despite this defective nature, the $v^o$-to-$T^o$-to-$C^o$ movement of morphologically-defective functional material is not uncommon in Romance.

Zanuttini (2017) claims that the Italian presentative *ecco* also undergoes this movement.

This appears to be a point of cross-linguistic microvariation, given subtle similarities to other Romance varieties such as Galician (Gravely & Gupton 2020) and Asturian (Gravely & Gupton 2022).
on BP cadê que

Pragmatically, cadê is a true interrogative that begs an answer (Schwenter, in press), cadê que does not, and instead may be uttered as an objection (9).

(9) Context: You arrive at your gate for a flight when it is announced that your flight has been canceled. The attendant informs you that you will need to buy a new flight and no refunds will be issued.

- Cadê que a gente tem o dinheiro pra outra viagem!
  where COMP the people have.PRS.3SG the money for other trip
  ‘Like hell I have money for another trip!’
The current dataset
Metalinguistic Negation (MN)

“a device for objecting to a previous utterance on any grounds whatever, including the conventional or conversational implicata it potentially induces, its morphology, its style or register, or its phonetic realization.”  
(Horn 1989: 363)

“a reversal, or a denial of a preceding assertion”  
(Farkas & Bruce 2010)
It is context dependent and may not be uttered lacking this context. It must be preceded by an assertion (10a), and the response is a rejection of the preceding assertion:

(10) a. -Que bom que a Maria não teve problemas com o carro!

‘How great that Maria didn’t have any problems with the car!’

-Cadê que a Maria não teve problemas com o carro!

‘Like hell Maria didn’t have problems with the car!’
BP cadê que

It must select a clausal predicate, and may not appear without it (10b). This is notable, given that BP allows null topical objects (i.e. object drop)

(10) b. - A Aline disse que ela se divertiu na festa.
   the Aline say.PST.3SG COMP she se enjoy.PST.3SG in-the party
   ‘Aline said she had a good time at the party’
   - Cadê que *(a Aline apareceu na festa)!
   where COMP the Aline appear.PST.3SG in-the party
   ‘Like hell Aline was at the party!’
The inability to stand alone differs from English MN (11a) in ‘fuck-inversion’ (Sailor 2017) and phrases like *since when*, where the predicate may be elided

(11)  a.  -Apparently John has a new girlfriend.
    -Does he fuck (have a new girlfriend)!

    b.  -Apparently John has a new girlfriend.
    -Since when (does John have a new girlfriend)!
BP cadê que

Also, it may not be used to respond to a question:

(12) -Sabes que a Sandra volta pra Stony Brook?
know.PRS.2SG COMP the Sandra return.PRS.3SG for Stony Brook

‘Did you know Sandra is going back to Stony Brook?’

- #Cadê que a Sandra volta pra Stony Brook!
where COMP the Sandra return.PRS.3SG for Stony Brook

Intended: ‘Like hell Sandra is going back to Stony Brook!’

We assume that this is because of the lack of assertion in questions.
MN in the syntax

Martins (2014): MN in European Portuguese (EP) *agora* encodes objection to a previous utterance (*Cadê que* does not exist in EP)

In her proposal, *agora* appears in Spec, CP, encoding [objection]. For Martins, (13a) involves remnant movement to a TopP higher than CP.

(13) a. O João deu *agora* um carro à Maria!
   the João give.PST.3SG now a car to-the Maria
   ‘Like hell João gave Maria a car!’

   b. \[TopP [ΣP o João deu] [Topº [CP agora [Cº …[vp e João deu um carro à Maria]]]]

   (Martins 2014:653)
The current proposal
The current proposal

• We follow proposals on main-clause base-generated complementizers (e.g. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2020, 2022; Hill 2012, Etxepare 2008, 2010; Sansiñena et al. 2015), proposing that a base-generated MN marker like cadê que should differ from interrogative cadê in that only the former determines a clause type.

• Specifically, we follow Farkas (2010) in claiming that cadê que serves a clause-typing function, encoding a [REVERSAL] to a given responding assertion (RA).
Responding assertions (RAs) in Farkas (2010)

Farkas (2010:102): an RA in any given discourse has four primary outcomes

(14)  
   a. [same, +], (+/+): agreement with a positive utterance  
   b. [same, -], (-/-): agreement with a negative utterance  
   c. [reverse, -], (+, -): disagreement with a positive utterance  
   d. [reverse, +], (-, +): disagreement with a negative utterance

As cadê que serves as inherent negation to any given utterance, we claim that it realizes the discourse functions in (14c, cf. 10b; 14d, cf. 10a).

Building on previous accounts, in particular Martins (2014), we propose that cadê que is base generated in the left periphery, where it introduces a negative operator.
Comparison with other Romance languages

• Highland Ecuadorian Spanish (HES) exhibits a structure that mirrors the properties and syntax outlined above for *cadê que*.
• Similarly to *[cadê]*, *quierde* alone also selects a lone DP and may not combine with a verb (15a).

(15) a. *Quierde* (*están*) los animales?
   where be.PRS.3PL the animals
   ‘Where are the animals?’

When used as a metalinguistic negator, *quierde que* may only select a clause with positive polarity (15b). Also, the verbal predicate may not be elided (15c)

b. *Quierde que* la reforma electoral (*no*) beneficia a todos!`
   where COMP the reform electoral NEG benefit.PRS.3SG DOM all
   ‘Like hell (the) electoral reform benefits everyone!’

c. *Quierde que* la reforma electoral *(beneficia a todos)*!
Comparison with other Romance languages

This state of affairs is unexpected, given that no such limitation exists for other expressions in Spanish like ¿Cómo que…?

(16) ¿Cómo que no (sabes)?

how COMP NEG know.PRS.2SG

‘What do you mean you don’t know?’

This suggests that this restriction is not language-specific to Spanish, we propose that this has to do with the negative concord properties of left-peripheral MN. So, what sort of syntactic model will predict this state of affairs?
Syntactic probes in Deal (2023)

Deal notes similarities between negative concord and *wh*-movement. There are “move one” *wh*-languages (English) and “move all” languages (Bulgarian). Similarly, standard English (SE) has limits on negative concord (17a), while non-standard English (NSE) has no such limit (17b).

(17)  
   a. We have no problem. (SE single negation interpretation)  
   b. We didn’t never have no problem. (NSE single negation interpretation)

Probes have two specifications:

1) an interaction condition (Agreement)  
   INTERACTION: [NEG]

2) a satisfaction condition (what satisfies the probe)  
   SATISFACTION: [-]

A specification of [-] means that a probe is *insatiable*, and will continue probing.
predictions of Deal (2023)

• As we have shown in (10a), cadê que in BP may take a TP-sized clausal complement containing overt negation

• This equates the probe specification to that of Non-standard English (17b)

• On the other hand, the operator introduced by quiere que in HES may only agree with one [NEG] feature, that which serves as metalinguistic negation
  • i.e., the probe may not agree with more than one [NEG] feature

• This is what we find in Standard English (17a)
Syntactic probes in Deal (2023)

Brazilian Portuguese

(18)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{INTERACTION: [NEG]} \\
\text{SATISFACTION: [-]}
\end{array}
\]

The specification of the probe in (18) allows it to continue probing after agreeing with the first [NEG] feature in its search space, which predicts that clauses with overt negation may be licensed.
Syntactic probes in Deal (2023)

Highland Ecuadorian Spanish

If quierde que introduces an operator with the above satisfaction condition, it cannot continue probing once satisfied (with MN), thus ruling out additional negation beyond MN.
Taking stock

• In light of the fact that BP *Cadê que* does not behave like interrogative *Cadê…?*, we have proposed an analysis by which *Cadê que* is base-generated in the left-periphery, encoding [REVERSAL] relative to an assertion in the preceding discourse context, following Farkas (2010).

• We have attempted to explain the curious asymmetry between BP and HES by invoking Deal’s (2023) analysis of probe interaction and satisfaction conditions, which is independently motivated.

• The analysis proposed sheds further light on the fine articulation of the left periphery (e.g. Rizzi 1997, 2013), its interface-related properties, and how discourse-pragmatic features like MN may be encoded within the syntax of the expanded CP-realm.
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