

**Modality markers in Gascon,
between grammar and stylistic variation¹**

Jordi Suïls Subirà & Salomé Ribes
Universitat de Lleida

0. Introduction

In this paper we would like to describe some aspects regarding the so-called enunciative particles of Gascon dialect, in the south-western area of Occitan (for a general characterization including a linguistic commentary of several texts, see Bec, 1973). Specifically, after a general description of the function of these particles depending on their distribution and interpretation, the paper aims to consider if it is appropriate to site evidentiality as a functional justification to explain those data. However, to the extent that there is a commonality or continuity of certain facts, it is wise to consider a common perspective between Gascony Occitan and Catalan, and specifically in some cases, between south-eastern Gascon and certain varieties of north-western Catalan.

The main theory is that, as a result of an evolutionary course which has led Gascon to fix some sentence positions occupied by the so-called enunciative particles, this dialect has established a range of contrasts between particles that have been completely or partially grammaticalized. Generally, these contrasts are displayed in preverbal position, and those particles concerned are the so-called enunciatives *que* and *e* and the particles of adverbial origin *be* and *ja*. The fact that elements of an adverbial nature come into play is completely logical, bearing in mind their structural mobility. Nonetheless, this article will also consider the case of the particle *se*, which is located on the left periphery of the sentence, even when preceding *wh*- elements in embedded interrogative clauses. In all these cases it will be possible to observe grammaticalization phenomena in which, to the extent that there is a contrast between completely grammaticalised elements appearing by default and others that are optional, it is possible to observe efficiency in the expression of modality nuances.

This contribution is set out as an annotation to previous works to which we want to refer, and especially to Pusch's description (2002; 2007), which opens the possibility of explaining the facts from the viewpoint of sentence modality and especially evidentiality. In those same texts there is a large amount of references to works which had previously dealt with Gascon enunciative particles from different perspectives; although, in this case, for basic descriptions we refer the reader to Rohlfs and Field. In a diachronic and language-contact view, Haase has described the Gascon particle *que* as parallel to basque *ba*, suggesting therefore a possible substrate or adstrate origin. For an interesting update on what is known about this enunciative *que*, including additional data from a sociolinguistic perspective, we refer the reader to Marcus.

¹ The contents of this paper are part of the research activity carried out within the Oficina de Llengua i Literatura de Ponent i del Pirineu, at the University of Lleida, which has dialectal variation and linguistic relations between Occitan and Catalan throughout the Pyrenees as one of its main research fields. We must thank an anonymous reviewer for providing us some additional references about Gascon enunciative particles; we are also indebted to Gemma Rigau for reading a first version of this text and pointing out some interesting aspects in a comparative Occitan-Catalan perspective about *plan/pla* and other focusing or emphatic particles.

1. Adverbs and sentence modality

Sentence modality is usually subdivided into a few basic types regarding the communicative act, usually declarative, interrogative and imperative. Beyond these basic modalities, one can discuss attitudinal modalities, which are related to the speaker's attitude or subjective perception. The indication of sentence and attitudinal modality can adopt syntactically-coded means or not: the three basic modalities are often reflected in structural terms (word order, intonation, presence of lexical markers); attitudinal modalities can be grammatically marked but can also derive from lexical means as the presence of auxiliaries (Cornillie) and others. An example of this is the distinction between deontic and epistemic modality, which is related to the presence of modal verbs in declarative sentences. Another is adverbs which contribute an explicit modality indication: in Catalan, Payrató (1191) describes the role of adverbs like *necessàriament*, *efectivament*, *probablement*... which contribute this appreciatory component. This type is obviously not exclusive to Catalan or Romance Languages.

Adverbs are characterised by their intrasentential mobility, so that, depending on the place they occupy (inside the verb phrase, in a high position of it, or at the left periphery of the sentence), they lead to substantially different interpretations. These differences can be exemplified by adverbs indicating circumstances about time:

- (1) a. el director inspeccionarà el centre avui
the director is going to inspect the center *today*
- b. el director avui inspeccionarà el centre
the director *today* is going to inspect the center
- c. avui el director inspeccionarà el centre
today the director is going to inspect the center

In each case, temporality is limited in a very different way: “when will the director inspect the centre?” / “what is going to do the director today?” / “what will happen today?” Syntactically, it could be understood that while the adverb *avui* is inside the VP in example (1a), (1b) and (1c) show a topic displacement to the left (“el director avui” and “avui” respectively).

The case of an adverb like *només* (called a “focal quantifier” -Brucart & Rigau, 1581-) is different, because it can be associated with a noun phrase as in (a), but also with a verb phrase as in (b), without there being any need to think about focusing structures (which is the case of (c)):

- (2) a. el director inspeccionarà només el centre
the director is going to inspect *only* the center
- b. el director només inspeccionarà el centre
the director is *only* going to inspect the center
- c. només el director inspeccionarà el centre
only the director is going to inspect the center

In an even more restricted case, the negation usually occupies a preverbal position:

- (3) el director no inspeccionarà el centre
the director is *not* going to inspect the center

The mobility and internal diversity of adverbs has contributed to some becoming specialised in positions from where the sentence can be modified regarding attitudinal modality. For example, in Catalan the adverb *prou* can quantify a NP or internally complement a VP:

- (4) ja hi ha prou paper
there is *already* enough paper
- (5) encara no treballes prou
you are not working *enough* yet

However, it can be moved to higher, peripheral position where, beyond a simple focusing operation, there is a substantial modification in terms of modality:

- (6) prou que treballes
you are *really* working

Similarly, in Gascon Occitan the form *plan*, which can be interpreted in Catalan as either *bé* or *prou*, depending on its position gives rise to different interpretations:

- (7) a. quan èra joen i anaua plan
when I was young I used to go *often* there
- b. quan èra joen plan que i anaua
when I was young I *really* used to go there
- (8) a. ara que va plan
now it goes *well*
- b. ara plan que va
now it *really* goes

In cases like this, the adverb asserts the verb's action when it is within the VP, while it is just a sentence enhancement when it is moved to a focus position. It is impossible not to see a certain degree of grammaticalization in this second case, because the adverb loses part of its semantic content and lexical character upon assuming this position, to become a sentence modality marker. This process is visible when *plan* assumes the role of just an affirmation (in example (9), used ironically as an affirmation that denies):

- (9) a. aqueth se vò morir...
that one is going to die...
- b. ò ben, que ja ei guarit, plan!²

² This specific example is contributed by Coromines (1990, 213) in his text about Aranese Gascon. Rigau (2005; 2012) contributes an interesting description of the particle *pla* in north-eastern Catalan (Pla de l'Estany area); this particle shows a great similarity to the Occitan *plan* -including the possibility of a

oh, good, he's already well, *sure!*

Both in Catalan *prou* and Occitan *plan* it is possible to see the contrast between a complement about what the verb asserts and a modality complement of the assertion. When the adverb is within the VP as in (7a), it indicates a certain degree of frequency about “anar-hi”, while when it occupies a focal position as in (7b) it reinforces the certainty of the assertion. This contrast is more evident with an adverb like *bé* in Catalan:

- (10) a. vas escoltar bé el que et va dir
you listened *well* what s/he said
- b. bé vas escoltar el que et va dir
you *really did* listen what s/he said

In (10b), *bé* is in preverbal position, which in general terms is the same place where a negation as *no* would be placed. Furthermore, in this example, the adverb warns about a circumstance (described by the verb). In contrast with *prou*, *bé* is in this case a modality marker (let us call it declarative for now) that warns the interlocutor about a fact which has a direct impact on how he or she interprets the circumstances (and requires him or her to interpret it or to act consistently).³ There are identical examples, with an identical interpretative contrast, in Gascon ((11b) is parallel to (10b)):

- (11) a. qu'escotès ben çò que diguec
you listened *well* what s/he said
- b. b'escotès çò que diguec
you *really did* listen what s/he said

In what follows we would like to deal with various phenomena of grammaticalization in Gascon, regarding the so-called enunciatives, as sentence markers and, in short, as modifiers of the type of interpretation to be given to the sentence. Since these sentence markers occur systematically in the varieties here discussed, they have contributed to optionally incorporate lexical elements that complete a set of various types of assertion, negation, interrogation or doubt, a discursive range that also displays its efficiency in written communication.

2. Gascon enunciatives

Several works stress at least the contrast between declarative affirmative, declarative negative and interrogative modality in Gascon. Affirmative declarative sentences contain a *que* known as an enunciative in most of the central and southern Gascon varieties. This phenomenon is especially frequent in Béarnese and Bigordan Gascon (the regions around Pau and Tarba, respectively, at the higher basins of Gave de Pau and Ador rivers); also in literary Gascon since the eighteenth century, and especially in contemporary Gascon literature.

negative value as in (9)-, although some specificities could also be noted, which suggests an interesting issue in a compared perspective Occitan-Catalan.

³ A description of the functioning of different emphatic particles in Catalan and Castilian, as for exemple Cat. *bé*/Cast. *bién*, can be found in Batllori & Hernanz.

Rohlf's description (205) of Gascon enunciatives centres around four particles: *que*, *e*, *be* and *ja*. The author does not consider it entirely appropriate to include them all within the same denomination -neither does he seem to agree with the denomination "énonciative"-; he notes that "chacune des particules examinées ici, remplit des fonctions spéciales et que leur origine est due à des conditions très différentes. Ce que ces particules ont de commun, c'est qu'elles énoncent ou expriment une nuance subjective qui donne à l'énonciation verbale une valeur d'insistance ou de vivacité. Mais, tandis que *be*, *ja* et *e* ont gardé cette expresivité, l'emploi de *que* s'est grammaticalisé, en devenant un signe purement morphologique."

Rohlf's explanation is an example of different theories about the origin of the enunciative *que* in terms of internal evolution. He attributes it to a context associated with adverbs or other equivalent locutions in a preceding position, like in the French examples of the type *bien sûr que je viens / c'est que je viens*, where the adverb or the introductory locution would have been optional in the end: (*bien sûr*) *que je viens / (c'est) que je viens*. In affinity with this, it is possible to find some cases in ancient language (*Toza, que deshonratz es qui ama desamatz*) or in neighbouring languages, like Aragonese (*Qué es esto? Que el banco se ha estrechao*) or Spanish (*pues no son gatos, que son duendes*), and even in Catalan (*Per què plorats? -Sényer, mon fill que s'es nafratz*).

However, not all the examples that contain an introductory *que* can be interpreted as possible precedents; the specific syntactical context of the Gascon enunciative *que* should be taken into account: this is always placed at the beginning of the VP, in a way that any other sentence component outside the phrase, such as the Subject or emphasised elements, occupies a preceding position (except if it's displaced to the right periphery):

- (12) a. jo que canti tostemp
I <E: que> sing always ("I'm always singing")
- b. tostemp que canti
(I) always <E: que> sing ("I'm always singing")
- c. lo director qu'arriba
the director <E: que> arrives ("the director arrives")
- d. qu'arriba lo director
<E: que> arrives the director ("the director arrives")

This position can account for the type of expression that led to the generalization and grammaticalization of the enunciative *que*. Of those Castilian and Catalan forms contributed by Rohlf (207), some manifest this syntactic type. This is the case of medieval Castilian fragments, of a popular origin, like:

- (13) el señor estando en esto, Murradillo que asomaba
(as) the sir (was) beeing in this, Murradillo <E: que> showed up

This is also the case of the Catalan example given above (*mon fill que s'es nafratz*). If this is a type of structure already present in old Catalan and Castilian phases, we can think it had to be found also in spoken ancient Gascon, even though medieval texts usually avoid markedly Gascon traits (following Baldinger). The case of current Catalan

is similar, where the spoken language still shows signs (although it is most probably a recessive trait) of structures with *que* as a mark of expressiveness that is infrequent in written language:

- (14) a. i tu que et pensaves que no hi era!
and you *that* thought that I was not there (“and you guessed I was not there!”)
- b. jo que baixo i me’l trobo a la porta...
I *that* come down and him-find at the door (“suddenly I came down and found him at the door”)

Let us just indicate that, as constructions with an explicitly subjective content, they are the opposite of their equivalents without the *que* marker. A logical consequence is that, while the sentences in (14) require the presence of an explicit subject, those in (15) do not:

- (15) a. i et pensaves que no hi era!
and (you) yourself-thought that (I) not there was (“and you guessed I was not there!”)
- b. baixo i me’l trobo a la porta...
(I) come down and myself-him-find at the door (“suddenly I came down and found him at the door”)

This contrast suggests that Catalan sentences with *que* are cleft structures similar to those proposed by Pusch (2002; 2007) in order to explain the origin of the Gascon enunciative *que*, where the subject is emphasised as a resource to attain expressiveness; this is why the sentences without overt subject of (15) do not allow *que* as those in (14). Moreover, again with an emphatic value, other structures introduced by *que* are due to the presence of an explicit negation or assertion that contradict a preceding assertion or negation respectively:

- (16) a. que no ho vull!
that (I) don’t want it
- b. que sí que ho puc fer!
that yes that (I) it can do (“yes, I really can do it”)

In Gascon there would have been a process of grammaticalization which led this marker to lose expressiveness and gain a purely declarative value.⁴ This is why

⁴ What we have exposed until here is not inconsistent with the explanation suggested by Haase among others, and assumed by Marcus, in the sense that a situation of language contact or substrate between Basque and protoromance in Gascony could have been the trigger to the generalisation of this enunciative *que* as a declarative marker. Marcus (92) has illustrated different similarities between Gascon and Basque concerning the contexts of Gascon *que* and different modality markers in Basque. The Basque emphatic form *ba* is one of them as, for instance, a preverbal marker in existential constructions (examples taken by Marcus from Hualde & de Urbina) :

- (a) Hemen euskaldunak dira.
here Basque.DET.PL are
‘Here, people are Basque.’

sentences like those in (17) do not have any particular expressive value and in most Gascon varieties would be simply ruled out when lacking the enunciative *que*:

- (17) a. *que parli de nosauts* / **parli de nosauts*
 (I) <E: *que*> talk about us / (I) talk about us
- b. *que voi vier* / **voi vier*
 (I) <E: *que*> want to come / (I) want to come

Note that in this type of sentences the presence of an explicit subject is no longer mandatory, that is, they are no longer cleft structures. Another result of grammaticalization is that the enunciative appears in complementary distribution with negation: as both occupy the same syntactic position, the presence of one excludes the other:

- (18) *que voi vier* / *non voi pas vier*
 (I) <E: *que*> want to come (I want to come) / (I) not want to come (“I don’t want to come”)

In fact Bouzet (66), in his description of Béarnese Gascon, treated the negative adverb *non* as an enunciative particle along with *que*. This is because the Béarnese negation, which would canonically have a double form *non (/ne)+V+pas*, according to Bouzet’s description behaves differently and is reduced to a preverbal *non* in certain cases: if the negative form is an imperative (19a); if the sentence is introduced by a conjunction (19b) or adverb of doubt (19c); or if there is another negative particle linked to the verb (19d-e):

- (19) a. *non te n’anes*
 not *pron.* (*yourself*)-*pron.* (*genitive*)-go [imperative]
 (“don’t go”)
- b. *que caleré que non la rencontrèsses*

-
- (b) Hemen euskaldunak **badira**.
 here Basque.DET.PL ba. are
 ‘Here, there are Basque people.’

And also in subordinate clauses, but not if they are, for example, interrogatives or relatives introduced by the complementizer *-en*:

- (a) **Ba**-datozela uste dut.
 ba- come.that think AUX
 ‘I think that they do come.’
- (b) ***ba**-datorren gizona
 ba- comes.COMP man
 ‘the man who does come’

Our aim here is to sketch the role of the enunciative *que* in terms of structure, not in a diachronic framework. Some similarities between Gascon and Castilian or Catalan seem to be in accordance with a theory of internal origin, but if some authors have claimed in favour of a substrate origin is because of the extreme particularity of this trait, not only compared with the neighbouring languages but even considered in a wide Romance context.

(it) <E: que> is necessary [conditional] that not her-find [2p sg. imperfect subjunctive]

(“it would be necessary that you wouldn’t find her”)

c. lhèu non l’avetz trobat

perhaps (you) not him/her-have [2p. pl. pres.] found

(“perhaps you haven’t found him/her”)

d. arrés non m’an dit aquò

nobody not me-have [3p. pl. pres.] told that

(“nobody told me that”)

e. lo praube òmi non minjava arren

the poor man not ate nothing

(“the poor man didn’t eat anything”)

Moreover, it is possible for *que* and *non* to appear together in some cases, although this excludes the post-verbal *pas*:

(20) qu’ac sap, mès que non ac vòu díser

(s/he) <E: que> it-knows, but (he/she) not it-want to say

(“s/he knows it but he/she doesn’t want to say it”)

According to Romieu & Bianchi (133), it is only possible to find complete negative structures preceded by an enunciative *que* in a clearly emphatic context like:

(21) que non comprenes jamei arren!

(you) <E: que> not understand never nothing

(“you don’t never understand anything”)

Some dialectological details are also relevant: it is understood that Béarnese and Bigordan constitute the area where the use of enunciatives is clearly systematic. It has been observed that south-eastern Gascon dialects (which can be understood to be peripheral) show *que non* in plain negative declaratives without being marked as emphatic utterances. Rohlf’s (208) again offers some examples of the areas of Barèges and Aura, halfway between Bigorre and Coserans or, in other words, between the basin of Gave de Pau and that of Garona:

(22) a. ué que non plòi

today (it) <E: que> not rains

(“it isn’t raining today”)

b. que non a dromit pro e que plora

(s/he) <E: que> not has slept enough and (s/he) is crying

(“s/he didn’t slept enough and (therefore) s/he is crying”)

Massourre (337), in a study dedicated to the Luz, Barèges and Gavarnia valleys, does not indicate any differences in the use of enunciatives, regarding the description given for Béarnese/Bigordan, and the texts he contributes in appendix do not seem to contradict this. As we will remark in the conclusions, the geographical dimension of the

use of enunciatives has not received enough attention and would be of interest in an explicative perspective.

If the enunciative *que* shows a complementary distribution with *non* as positive/negative declaratives, it is also in complementary distribution regarding the introducer *e*, which can have several values. It is again in Béarnese and Bigordan where this distribution is found systematically, as described by Rohlfs (210). In contexts where the VP is part of an embedded clause, *e* seems to take on the role that corresponds to the enunciative *que*:

- (23) quan lo caperan e demandava aus nòvis...⁵
when the priest <E: e> asked the newlyweds...

Similarly, it appears with speech-act verbs, in a metadiscourse insert:

- (24) hàcies tant de faiçons, e hè la mair
(you) make (not) so many gestures, <E: e> said the mother
("don't you make so many gestures, said the mother")

Although it mainly appears as an independent marker of interrogative modality, in yes/no questions:

- (25) a. e te'n vas?
<E: e> (you) *pron.* (*yourself*) *pron.* (*genitive*) go?
("are you going?")
- b. e sortirés, se non ploieva?
<E: e> would go out (you), if not (it) was raining?
("would you go out if it were not raining?")⁶

Therefore, in this case it is possible to speak of a complementary distribution between this interrogative marker and the interrogative pronouns or adverbs introducing partial interrogatives.

It is also possible to find it as a desiderative marker, equivalent to a conditional:

- (26) e hèsse beròi doman!
<E: e> were (it) sunny tomorrow!
("I wish it were sunny tomorrow!")

Or in strictly conditional contexts:

⁵ However, it should be noted that there are cases where *que* occupies also this position:

qu'èra plan pro, si disè, que los auts que n'avossen (Palay, 1974b, 54)
("it was enough, he said, that the others had their share (of troubles)")

⁶ We can see a parallel here with the interrogative marker *que* in Catalan; in fact, according to what Rohlfs (208) states, it is possible to find *que* as an interrogative marker in Gascon:

que vatz tà Pau? (=e vatz tà Pau?) ("do you go to Pau?")

- (27) la mair e volosse passejar la neneta, Víctor qu'atelava la soa vuetura, la dauna e debossa crubar paperons a la banca, Víctor qu'èra de viatge
 the mother <E: e> wanted to walk the child, Víctor <E: que> arranged his car, the lady <E: e> had to get some money at the bank, Víctor <E: que> was in travel
 (“if the mother wanted to walk the child, then Víctor had to arrange his car; if the lady had to get some money from the bank, then Víctor had to go there”)

Although geographical variation would offer different solutions, especially Bearnese and Bigordan display a system of modality markers that ensures every sentence is conveniently assigned a suitable interpretation regarding basic modality: assertion, negation, interrogation, wish and condition. Therefore, there is a preverbal position where modality marking is made explicit. Assertion and negation, where only the objective appreciation is expressed, respectively take *que* and *non* as markers, while the interrogative, in the absence of *wh*- pronouns, is generally introduced by *e*, which also appears in sentences with a conditional or desiderative value, that is, in contexts where subjectivity is morphologically overt.

The inventory of markers still comprises other forms. The interrogative *si*, which in Gascon often takes the form *se*, is found throughout Romance-speaking areas, although in our case it manifests particularities that should be observed. As an introducer of indirect interrogative sentences, it initially displays the typical characteristics of Romance varieties:

- (28) que volerí saber *si* l'as parlat
 (I) <E: que> would like to know *if* (you) have spoken to her/him
 (“I would like to know if you have spoken to her/him”)

Rohlf's (203) (and the same could be said for Coromines 1990) dealt with this particle as a conditional conjunction, although he devoted little space to it. However, he did indicate two facts which are of interest in the present study: firstly, the form *se* appears as an introducer of direct questions, in the sense that in some dialects it is capable of changing its status and clearly become an enunciative particle with an interrogative value:

- (29) a. se te'n vas?
 <E: se> pron. (yourself)-pron. (genitive)-go (you)?
 (“are you going out?”)
- b. se cres que tórnne viàs?
 <E: se> believe (you) that s/he will come back soon?
 (“do you think s/he is coming back soon?”)

In sentences like (29) *se* takes on the role that had been attributed to the interrogative marker *e*, without authors noticing any semantic difference between one and the other. Without more detailed data, it seems that both enunciatives can head an interrogative, even though *se* seems to be used less frequently if we must judge by the importance given to it in descriptions (Romieu & Bianchi do not mention it) and what we can deduce from the texts. It is found linked to conditional contexts, like in the Bearnese and Baregese forms:

- (30) a. *se gessirés, se non ploiossa?*
 <E: *se*> would (you) go out if (it) not rained?
 (“would you go out if it wasn’t raining?”)
- b. *se voleré vier-se’n dab jo? Se la me hèi seguir, companha de desòu?* (Lavit, 36)
 <E: *se*> would (s/he) like to come-pron. (refl.)-pron. (genitive) with me? <E: *se*>
 pron. (her)-pron. (myself)-take (I) with me, my companion of sorrow?
 (“Would she like to come with me? Shall I take her with me, my companion of sorrow?”)
- c. *se voloris aquerò?* Lo dishó eth serpent (Boisgontier & Darrigrand, 121)
 <E: *se*> would (you) want that? *pron.* (her)-said the snake
 (“would you like that? Said her the snake”)

All these cases seem to indicate that the presence of *se* as an interrogative introducer, and not as a conjunction, is the result of an elision (or, in other words, an implicit presence) of an epistemic expression that would have the form “non sabi pas” (I don’t know). As an enunciative, *se* is a modality marker which implicitly contains the value of doubt, and confers an interrogative/exhortative interpretation to a sentence with declarative intonation:

- (31) *se t’arrasavas mentre de qui boti la taula. Que vam disnar davant la television* (Lavit, 120)
 <E: *se*> *pron.* (yourself)-shaved while that (I) arrange the table. (we) <E: *que*>
 are going to have lunch in front of the television
 (“what if you shave yourself as I arrange the table? We are going to have lunch in front of the television”)

Therefore, it is possible to observe how the several enunciatives become simultaneously specialised and partially overlapped, if *se* is included amongst them: *que* takes on a declarative, predominantly affirmative value in complementary distribution with *non*, appearing together in exceptional cases and especially in an emphatic context. In some cases, *que* can also be an introducer of total interrogatives (see note 3). The enunciative *e* is mainly an interrogative marker, although it can take the place of *que* when found within an embedded clause. Finally, *se* is basically an introducer of total interrogatives when it behaves as an enunciative particle. Therefore, there is a certain declarative-interrogative polarity between *que* and *e*, where *e* can take values of *que* in some structural contexts, and *se* can converge with *e* occasionally as an interrogative marker. This description makes us think that the incorporation of *se* to the range of enunciative particles is due to its acquisition of an epistemic value of doubt in contrast with the general interrogative model with generic marker *e* (we will develop this in section 3).

It should be added to this inventory that there is an entire set of sentences that seem to lack enunciative. Following Pusch (2002), it is possible to speak of a zero enunciative in the case of imperative sentences:⁷

⁷ To which the case of infinitive sentences that appear unbound should be added:

- (32) entra, ce'm tornè. Que vam minjar amassa... (Gonzalès, 36)
 <E: ø>come in, *pron.* (me)-said (she). (we) <E: que> are having lunch together
 (“come in, said she to me. We are having lunch together”)

3. The extension of the interrogative marker *se*.

We can complete the description of the structural contexts of *se* through a wider set of indirect interrogatives. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the writer and dialectologist Bernat Sarrieu highlighted the presence of a “*se explétif*” (Sarrieu 1908, 92) in sentences of the following style:

- (33) a. tanben, que sabi se quin vos cau tocar a cadun (Sarrieu 1914, 14)
 (I) also <E: que> know <Expl.: se> how *pron.* (to you)-(it) is necessary to touch every one of you
 (“I also know how I must touch every one of you”)
- b. òc-mair-òc, jamès, aban qu'au visa,
 that's true, never, before that (I) him-saw
 non sabia pas se qué ère un òme, n'un eròs! (Sarrieu 1908, 26)
 not (I) knew <Expl.: se> what was a man, nor a hero!
 (“I really never knew, before I saw him, what was a man or a hero!”)

This marker is not mandatory and, to the extent that it introduces an interrogative, it does not seem to contribute relevant information to a subordinate clause that already contains a *wh*- pronoun (*quin*, or *qué*, or any other). In central Pyrenean dialects (singularly, south-eastern Gascon and south-western Languedocian dialects, and the neighbouring Ribagorçan and Pallarese dialects of Catalan), this type of structure is quite common.⁸ In the Ribagorçan dialect there are sentences like the following:

- (34) a. Demana'ls se què volen.
 ask them <Expl.: se> what (they) want
 (“ask them what they want”)
- b. No recordo se quan ho va dir.
 not (I) remember <Expl.: se> when (s/he) it-said
 (“I do not remember when s/he said it”)

In south-eastern Gascon, like in Aranese:

- (35) a. Demana-les se qué vòlen.
 ask them <Expl.: se> what (they) want

ara mèma plaça que l'è trobat. E tostemp sondar, hurgar e huretar, coma eth bolanger en horn.
 (Sarrieu 1914, 20)
 (“I found him at the same place. And always searching, digging, scratching, as the baker in the oven”)

ha'm aquò a jo! Jo qui n'èi pas jamei barrat la pòrta a çò qui viu e muda! (Lapassada, 95)
 (“to do this to me! To me who never closed the door to anyone who passed by”)

⁸ Rigau & Suïls address these structures from the viewpoint of the structure of the left periphery of the sentence. A few details on geographical distribution can be found in Suïls *et alii*.

(“ask them what they want”)

b. Non compren cap se per qué i vòlen parlar.

(s/he) not understand <Expl.: se> why (they) her/him/them-want to-speak
 (“s/he doesn’t understand why they want to speak with her/him/them”)

The same happens with infinitive subordinate clauses introduced by *wh-* that in standard Catalan and general Occitan are not preceded by *se*:

(36) a. No sé què fer (standard Catalan)

(I) not know what to-do
 (“I do not know what to do”)

b. Sai pas qué faire (general Occitan)

(I) know neg. what to-do
 (“I do not know what to do”)

c. No sé cap se què fer (Ribagorçan and Pallarese Catalan)

(I) not know neg. <Expl.: se> what to-do
 (“I do not know what to do”)

d. Non sai cap se qué hèr (south-eastern Gascon)

(I) not know neg. <Expl.: se> what to-do
 (“I do not know what to do”)

It is possible to interpret this *se* introducing embedded indirect and partial interrogatives as an extension of *se* to any interrogative context; hence it also being found as an introducer of polarity interrogatives, in a context where it is equivalent to the generic marker *e*. The Catalan dialects where *se* precedes interrogative pronouns also show interrogatives like those in (37), which recall (especially in the case of (37b)) the Gascon ones seen in (30):

(37) a. Se a on deu ser, aquell home?

<Expl.: se> at where might be, that man
 (“Where might that man be?”)

b. Se deu ser veritat que hi anirem?

<Expl.: se> (it) might be truth that cl. (we) will-go
 (“Is it true that we will go there?”)

However, in Gascon, although *se* can occupy *e*’s contexts (in polarity interrogatives), the opposite does not occur, so *e* cannot precede *wh-* interrogatives:

(38) a. Se d’a on vien aqueras gojatas?

<Expl.: se> from where come those girls
 (“Where do those girls come from?”)

b. *E d’a on vien aqueras gojatas?

<Expl.: e> from where come those girls
 (“Where do those girls come from?”)

Se is also present in embedded exclamative clauses, as shown in the Pallarese example in (39a) from Coromines (1976, 67) and in the Aranese example in (39b):

- (39) a. Vet aquí se com ho fan.
look here <Expl.: se> how it (they) do
("look how they do it")
- b. Guarda se com ac hèn!
look <Expl.: se> how it (they) do
("Look how they do it")

Several Romance philologists draw attention to the interrogative particle *se*, but they do not agree on its syntactic category. We have referred to the Occitan dialectologist Sarrieu (1908) as the first to observe this particle as a spare or expletive element. Rohlf's (203) included *se* among what he called "enunciative elements." He considers *se* a conjunction which introduces indirect yes/no questions, and which is expletively used in some Occitan dialects (see Rigau & Suïls). Alibèrt defined the particle *se* used before interrogative *wh*- phrases as an adverb. Coromines, who described this particle in Pallarese and Ribagorçan Catalan (see Coromines 1976), and in Aranese Occitan (see Coromines 1990), does not assign to it a specific syntactic category and includes it on the section dedicated to the conditional conjunction.

With little basis, Coromines interprets that this *se* in indirect partial interrogatives comes from an old pronoun of the *çò* or *ce* type. What enables him to state this is the apparent equivalence between sentences that clearly contain a pronoun (*çò* in (40a)) and others with *se*:

- (40) a. non sabem çò que ditz
(we) not know it-what s/he says
("we don't know what s/he says")
- b. non sabem se qué ditz
(we) not know <Expl.: se> what s/he says
("we don't know what s/he says")

The differences between the two contexts, though, are so big that they barely allow this hypothesis to be defended: firstly, in cases like (40a) *çò* is stressed whereas *que* is unstressed, and in cases like (40b) *se* is unstressed whereas the adjacent *wh*- is stressed; secondly, this adjacent *wh*- can display adverbial value, which would hardly be coherent with a nominal antecedent such as *çò*:

- (41) a. *non sabem çò quan vierà
(we) not know it-when s/he is coming
("we don't know when is s/he coming")
- b. non sabem se quan vierà
(we) not know <Expl.: se> when s/he is coming
("we don't know when is s/he coming")

What we aim to convey is that this *se* has become set as a modality marker, based on common contexts where it introduces indirect interrogatives without *qu-*. Its spread towards new contexts would be precisely related with modality contrasts. The contrast between this pair of sentences highlights the difference between *se qué* and *çò que*:

- (42) a. ja vos ac diderè jo, çò que vòlen
yet to you-it-will say I, it that (they) want
("I will say you what they want")
- b. ja vos ac diderè jo, se qué vòlen
yet to you-it-will say I, <Expl.: se> what (they) want
("I will say you what they want")

While the first example emphasises a pronoun that represents an entity unknown to the interlocutor (I will tell you what it is), the second highlights exactly the fact that the interlocutor does not know what it is about (I will resolve your query).⁹

Although in the case of the Occitan dialects it is difficult to contrast these interpretations, being a trait with such a limited geographical extension¹⁰, in the Catalan dialects that show this syntactic trait it is possible to observe interpretative difference like that which, at least in Ribagorçan, is found between (43) and (44):

- (43) sabeu quan vindran? Quan puguen!
do (you) know when will-they come? When they can
("don't you know when will they come? As soon as they can")
- (44) sabeu se quan vindran? (*Quan puguen!)
do (you) know <Expl.: se> when will-they come? When they can
("don't you know when will they come? As soon as they can")

The first sentence indicates that whoever is asking the questions doesn't necessarily ignore the answer (this is why she or he can enunciate it as a rhetorical question before answering it themselves), while the second one is a true request for information unknown to the speaker.

Although subtle, the interpretative contrast exemplified highlights that in some Pyrenean varieties of Catalan and Occitan, indirect interrogatives have an additional

⁹ The contrast between these two examples also explains the different nature of *çò que* and *se qu-*:

*non sabem çò que dider
non sabem se qué dider ("we don't know what to say")

*çò que hèr en un cas atau ei de mau decidir
se qué hèr en un cas atau ei de mau decidir ("what to do in such a case is difficult to decide")

For reasons that do not pertain here, a syntactical environment formed by an infinitive does not accept the pronoun *çò*, acting as the direct complement of that infinitive and moved out of the embedded sentence. In any case, it is evident that *se* is not a pronoun but a marker associated to *qué*.

¹⁰ By geographical we mean also demographical extension. We have been able to verify the difficulty of obtaining enough reliable data for Aranese, where the influence of Catalan and Castilian, in very specific socio-demographical conditions, has been significant. Meanwhile, the neighbouring Occitan dialects are living in an almost residual situation regarding French. However, a survey about this and other dialectal aspects is still possible.

marker *se* that expresses the speaker's implication, in the sense that it emphasises a doubt value besides the strictly interrogative value expressed by the *wh*-pronoun. On the other hand, the presence of *se* emphasises the epistemic value of doubt, implicit in indirect questions and explicitly stated in subordinate clauses complementing epistemic verbs like (40b) or other where the epistemic value is obtained compositionally, like in (39).

4. A return to adverbs: the so-called enunciative *be* and *ja*

The forms *be* and *ja*, strictly speaking lexical adverbs, have also traditionally been considered enunciatives in Gascon grammar, which is justified by the fact that they occupy the same position as the enunciative *que*:

- (45) a. qu'ei flaca
<E: que> is (she) weak
("she is weak")
- b. b'ei flaca
<E: be> is (she) weak
("she is really weak")
- c. ja n'ei, de flaca
<E: ja> is (she) weak
("she is really quite weak")

There are not any sequences where any two of these particles appear together, and they are all used in complementary distribution with negation. Specifically, *be* and *ja* are never found preceding the negation (regarding *ja*, additional details are given below on this aspect), in contrast with the exceptional cases of *que non* seen in (20) and (21). This is possibly related to *be* and *ja*'s expressively affirmative meaning, in contrast with the more neutral, purely declarative role of *que*.

Another notable circumstance is that, as enunciatives, *be* and *ja* are the result of the incorporation of adverbial forms *BENE* and *JAM*, which can be found inside the VP:

- (46) a. Pèir que minja ben
Pèir <E: que> eats well
("Pèir eats well")
- b. Pèir qu'ei arribat ja¹¹
Pèir <E: que> is arrived already
("Pèir is already arrived")

As a consequence of its modal value, upon occupying the preverbal position, the adverb *ben* automatically loses most of its lexical content and adopts a new role, which

¹¹ This adverb often takes the form *dejà*:

qu'ei arribat dejà ("he <E: que> is arrived already": "he is already here")

To the extent that, in reference works such as Romieu & Bianchi, Rohlfs, Hourcade or Palay (1974a), *ja* is only considered within the enunciative category.

modifies the modality of the entire clause, as seen in the Catalan examples in (10) and their corresponding Gascon ones in (11):

- (47) Pèir que minja ben > Pèir be minja¹²
 (“Pèir eats well” > “Pèir does really eat”)

The case of *ja* is slightly different. Although it is also a case where an adverb has been incorporated into the enunciative category, due to its temporal value, it is also possible to find it with this same temporal value in front of the verbal phrase, being compatible then with negation:

- (48) a. eths qu’ac saben ja
 they <E: que> it-know already
 (“they already know it”)
- b. eths ja non ac saben pas
 they already not-it-know
 (“they don’t already know it”)

In this sense the following clause is ambiguous:

- (49) ja sabem çò que cau hèr
 already/<E: ja> (we) know it-that must be done
 (“we already know what must be done”)

That is, it can represent an achievement in temporary terms or emphasise a state of affairs (we have sufficient knowledge about what has to be done).

We will first consider the case of *be*. If we recall two of the examples from (45):

- (50) a. qu’ei flaca
 <E: que> is (she) weak
 (“she is weak”)
- b. b’ei flaca
 <E: be> is (she) weak
 (“she is really weak”)

There is an apparent contrast in the interpretation of the sequences introduced by *que* and *be*: while the first one is just an objective declaration, and not necessarily appreciatory, the second one seems to denote a much more explicit commitment by the speaker, in the sense that it establishes a remarkable degree for the adjective in attributive function. Rohlfs (208) states that “au lieu de *que* une phrase affirmative en béarnais peut être introduite aussi bien par *be* (<bene>).” Therefore, he interprets this marker as neutral, equivalent to *que*, which would have become fixed after an evolutionary phase when it would have assumed an enunciative value of insistent assertion: “...en tant que *be i aneram* ‘nous irons’ tout d’abord a dû exprimer ‘nous

¹² In preverbal position, *ben* loses *-n*. This is orally visible in varieties where this *-n* would be pronounced (thus giving a contrast *ben/be*), like in south-eastern Gascon, but not in the varieties in which every *-n* has been systematically silenced.

irons bien', 'certainement nous irons (n'est-ce pas?)', c'est-à-dire une affirmation contre une sorte de doute ou d'hésitation..." Actually, that old connotation is still present in the use of *be*: Romieu & Bianchi (133) state that "au lòc de l'enonciatiu *que* (...), los enonciatius *ja e be* pòden estar l'equivalent deu francés 'n'est-ce pas?', de l'italian '(è) vero?' o de l'anglés 'isn't it?' / 'won't it?'..."; and then *be soparàs dab nosauts?* is interpreted as 'you'll have supper with us, won't you?'.¹³

Therefore, those propositions marked by *be* especially contrast with those marked by *que*; being forms with an affirmative value in both cases, *be* is far from being a completely neutral assertion:

- (51) a. qu'ac sabes díder
<E: que> it (you) know to say
("you know how to say it")
- b. b'ac sabes díder
<E: be> it (you) know to say
("you really know how to say it")

(51a) is a simple statement, nothing more than a declaration; while in (51b) one undoubtedly observes that somebody knows what to say perhaps in contrast with an opposing presupposition or circumstance. The casuistry that thus unfolds is quite varied depending on the discursive contexts. An example could be the three possibilities shown below:

- (52) a. b'ac sabes díder, qu'ei vertat
<E: be> it (you) know to say, E: *que* is true
("you really know how to say it, that's true")
- b. b'ac sabes díder, e que no'c semblava cap
<E: be> it (you) know to say, and E: *que* not it seemed
("you really know how to say it, and you didn't seem to")
- c. b'ei pèc, aqueth
(he) <E: be> is foolish, that-one
("that one is really foolish")

In (52a) one verifies an event and *be* takes on a confirming value of the evidence based on a presupposition. In a language lacking a system of enunciatives like those described, it would be necessary to use explicit lexical forms:

¹³ In fact, although Palay (1974a) classifies *be* as an adverb, he contributes a series of examples where it is clearly an enunciative in Rohlfs' terms, even when used as an interrogative:

be i aneram ("we <E: be: *certainly*> will go there")

b'at vòs? ("<E: be> want-it you?": "Do you want it")

Far from considering it a neutral enunciative, he awards it the French translation "bien, convenablement".

- (53) certament ho saps dir / sí que ho saps dir
 really it (you) know to say
 (“you really know how to say it”)

In (52b) the statement occurs against opposing evidences, and then *be* highlights the contrast, in a similar way to *tanmateix* in Catalan:

- (54) tanmateix ho saps dir
 really it (you) know to say
 (“you really know how to say it”)

In (52c) *be* is used as an emphatic marker, with a consecutive value related to previous evidence. In Catalan, *bé* or *mira que* would have a similar value:

- (55) bé n'és, de ruc, aquell
 <E: be> *pron.* (genitive)-is, of-stupid, that-one
 (“that one is really stupid”)
- (56) mira que n'és, de ruc, aquell
 look (imperative) that *pron.* (genitive)-is, of-stupid, that-one
 (“you see, that one is really stupid”)

The interpretative contrast between the enunciatives *que* and *be* is also visible regarding the predictive and deontic values, where *que* is appropriate in the first and second, while *be* does not always fit within a predictive interpretation.

In Occitan, and therefore in Gascon too, the verbs *auer de* and *caler* can both have a deontic value, while only the first can exhibit a predictive value:

- (57) a. qu'/b'a d'arribar aué
 (s/he) <E: que/be> has to come today
 (“s/he (really) has to come today”)
- b. que/be cau qu'arribar aué
 <E: que/be> is necessary that (s/he) come (pres. subjunctive) today
 (“It is (really) necessary for s/he to come today”)

These two examples can be perfectly equivalent, in the sense that one and the other can be interpreted as the expression of an obligation or need to arrive today based on an aim. With a complement expressing purpose, the equivalency in the enunciatives is maintained:

- (58) a. qu'/b'a de plòir entà que i aja èrba
 (it) <E: que/be> must (obligation) rain for-that there-would be grass
 (“it must rain for the grass to grow”)
- b. que/be cau que plòiga entà que i aja èrba
 (it) <E: que/be> must (need) rain for-that there-would be grass
 (“it must rain for the grass to grow”)

However, it is only possible to interpret the first as a logical prediction, if based on a previous circumstance:

- (59) a. qu'/b'a de plòir pr'amor qu'ei embromat¹⁴
 (it) <E: que/be> must (obligation) rain because (it) is cloudy
 ("it must rain because it is cloudy")
- b. *que/*be cau que plòiga pr'amor qu'ei embromat
 (it) <E: que/be> must (need) rain because (it) is cloudy
 ("it must rain because it is cloudy")

In contrast, the verb *caler* adapts to a semantic environment where what is being expressed is not a logical consequence but a need depending on previous circumstances:

- (60) a. qu'/b'a de plòir pr'amor qu'ei tot sec
 (it) <E: que/be> must (obligation) rain because (it) is all dry
 ("it must rain because it is all dry")
- b. que/be cau que plòiga pr'amor qu'ei tot sec
 (it) <E: que/be> must (need) rain because (it) is cloudy
 ("it must rain because it is cloudy")

Therefore, the verb *caler* cannot express a prediction, although *auer de can*. However, this verb does not accept the enunciative *be* if the prediction indicates a degree of total certainty:

- (61) a. ?b'a d'arribar a sèt oras deht ser
 (s/he) <E: be> must (obligation) arrive at seven o'clock of the evening
 ("s/he must arrive at seven o'clock in the evening")
- b. be cau qu'arribe a sèt oras deht ser
 (s/he) <E: be> must (need) arrive at seven o'clock of the evening
 ("s/he must arrive at seven o'clock in the evening")

The difference between one case and the other, as far as this paper is concerned, is that *auer de* expresses a prediction and *caler*, a need. The second one contains the speaker's appreciative component, while the first may not contain it. If it is a prediction

¹⁴ The verb *déver* in Gascon, like in general Occitan, is presented as strictly deontic in grammatical descriptions, but it should be noted that, at least in Gascon, and in a similar way to Catalan (according to Sentí), it is mainly found in expressions with an epistemic value:

– que déu estar tornat d'Auloron.
 – los estrangèrs, e son tanben a l'aubèrja?
 – òc, que i deven estar e lhèu per tot lo vrespau (Gastellú-Sabalòt, 114)
 ("– he must be back from Auloron. / – and the strangers, are they also in the house? / – yes, they must be there")

brave Pastor, que déus saber t'on ei partida la toa dauna. Cèrca, Pastor, cèrca, nosauts que't vam seguir (Gastellú-Sabalòt, 129)
 ("good Pastor, you must know where is your mistress gone. Go for her, search, we will follow you")

based on an interpretation of the circumstances, then the subjective component becomes evident:

- (62) b'a d'estar ací a sèt oras pr'amor qu'a dit que's vòu trobar damb eth president
 (s/he) <E: be> *must (obligation) be here at seven o'clock because (s/he) has said that (s/he) wants to meet the president*
 ("s/he must be here at seven o'clock as s/he said s/he wants to meet the president")

By observing this set of examples, it is possible to extract that *be* simply implies an appreciative connotation; this is why it better accepts a patent degree of indeterminacy:

- (63) a. ?b'a d'arribar a sèt oras
 (s/he) <E: be> must arrive at seven o'clock
 ("s/he really must arrive at seven o'clock")
- b. ?b'a d'arribar abans de sèt oras
 (s/he) <E: be> must arrive before seven o'clock
 ("s/he really must arrive before seven o'clock")
- c. b'a d'arribar lèu
 (s/he) <E: be> must arrive soon
 ("s/he really must arrive soon")
- (64) a. ?be hè 5 centimètres de larg
 (it) <E: be> does 5 cm of-wide
 ("it is really 5 cm wide")
- b. ?be hè mès de 5 centimètres de larg
 (it) <E: be> does more of 5 cm of wide
 ("it is really more than 5 cm wide")
- c. b'ei larg
 (it) <E: be> is wide
 ("it is really wide")

Nonetheless, if an apparently absolute assertion is not given as a simple statement, but inserted in a context where, for instance, someone asked previously for a measurement of 5 cm, then *be* is admissible as an enunciative:

- (65) a. qu'ei un espaci de 5 cm, aqueth, alavetz non sai cap s'aquera pèça e va estar pro larga.
 (it) <E: que> is a space of 5 cm, that one, then (I) not know if that piece <E: e> is going to be wide enough
 ("it is a space of 5 cm, that one, so I don't know if that piece is going to be wide enough")
- b. òc, plan solide, be hè 5 cm, aquera.
 yes, quite sure, (it) <E: be> does 5 cm, that one
 ("yes, sure, that one is 5 cm wide")

This highlights that the enunciative *be*, in contrast with *que*, truly indicates the speaker's commitment in the sense that he or she expresses an appreciation about what he or she has stated. Such an appreciation is in terms of adaptation to patent circumstances. For this reason, in literary texts it is often inserted in sequences where a series of circumstances are presented to which the assertion fits logically:

- (66) Sarah que'm hiquè las mans suus uelhs, mes que'us vedoi parièr! B'èra estranh!
(Javaloyès, 151)
Sarah <E: que> me-put the hands over the eyes, but (I) <E: que> them-saw anyway! (it) <E: be> was strange!
("Sarah covered my eyes with her hands, but I saw them anyway! It was really strange!")

In a short story by Albèrt Peyroutet, the narrator emerges amidst a scene where mother and daughter are observing a kitten the girl has gathered from the street:

- (67) Que'm llevèi de taula e que'u vedoi, magròt, mus-prim (...):
(I) <E: que> *stood up-myself from the table and* (I) <E: que> *saw-it, weak, slim*

– b'ei hèra lèd aqueth gat, ce hèi.
(it) <E: be> is quite ugly that cat, I did

– tà jo qu'ei ua gata, ce digó la hemna. (Peyroutet, 51)
for me that (it) is a she-cat, said the wife
("I stood up from the table and I saw it, weak, slim (...):
– that cat is really ugly, I said
– I guess it is a female, said my wife")

The assertion contrasts with the women's piteous attitude, adapting in contrast to the deplorable aspect of the animal.

If, in general, declarative clauses can be introduced without necessarily being the result of any shared or contrasted information, the enunciative *be* will hardly be found with epistemic verbs. Even when it clearly expresses subjectivity, it does so in categorical terms:

- (68) Que m'a vist. Na Pèirauba que s'aprèssa de jo e que'm potoa, tres còps, lhèu mei... Be sent bon, qu'ei jansemin, òc qu'ei jansemin ce'm sembla... B'ei beròia! Vivant, avossi cinc ans de mei... (Javaloyès, 51)

(she) <E: que> me-has seen. Ms. Pèirauba <E: que> comes close to me and (she) <E: que> me-kisses, three times, maybe more... she <E: be> smells good, (it) <E: que> is jasmine, yes (it) <E: que> is jasmine I guess... (she) <E: be> is nice! My god, (if) (I) were five years old of-more

("She has seen me. Ms. Pèirauba approaches and kisses me, three times, maybe more... She smells good, it's jasmine, yes it's jasmine I guess... She is really nice! My god, if only I were just five more years old")

This is noticeable when comparing a sentence that contains the verb *semblar* with another where the same verb is pronominal:

- (69) a. que sembla joen, aqueth gojat
 (he) <E: que> seems young, that fellow
 (“that fellow seems young”)
- b. que’m sembla joen, aqueth gojat
 (he) <E: que> to me-seems young, that fellow
 (“that fellow seems young to me”)

The non-pronominal form responds to an objective statement, based on evidence, while the pronominal form, due to the specification of the verb’s indirect object (to me), stands out due to its epistemic nature, because it communicates an opinion, not a perception. Although both of them accept the declarative enunciative *que*, the second one does not accept the enunciative *be*:

- (70) a. be sembla joen, aqueth gojat
 (he) <E: be> seems young, that fellow
 (“that fellow seems really young”)
- b. ?be’m sembla joen, aqueth gojat
 (he) <E: que> to me-seems young, that fellow
 (“that fellow seems really young to me”)

Bearing in mind that the enunciative *be* connects the statement with an observation about the circumstances, it becomes obvious that, out of context, both sentences are slightly unreal. However, although (70a) can be used to start a discussion about the event (based on evidence, I say that someone seems young), (70b) can only emphasise the perception in itself, in accordance with what has been stated: I can say that I think the same about an observed or asserted circumstance, and that I am highlighting this agreement, and not so much what has been observed about the object, like in:

- (71) – ... que’u tròbi joen
 (I) <E: que> him-find young
- òc, be’m sembla joen, a jo tanben, mès...
 yes, <E: be> to me-seems young, too, but...
 (“- I find he is young
 –yes, I really find he is young too, but...”)

This enunciative displays all of its values during the interaction. Then it becomes noticeable that, to the extent that it connects a statement with some supporting facts, it often leads to an adversative or concessive interpretation. In (72) the first *be* establishes a logical relationship between events, while the second outlines a contradiction between circumstances:

- (72) – qué te’n sembla a tu de l’idea deu noste Andrèu?
 what to you-of it-seems to you the idea of our Andrèu?

– hé! mès... arren! B'èra temps que's decidèsse puishque volè perseguir... E a tu?

well! but... nothing! (it) <E: be> was time that (he) himself-decide to because (he) wanted to go on... And to you?

– mon amic, lo gojat qu'ei joen. Be sabes plan que s'a tirat lo plan de s'establir per Tolosa?

my friend, the boy <E: que> is young. (you) <E: be> know that (he) planed to establish arround Toulouse

(Palay 1974b, 57-58)

(“– What do you think about the idea of our Andréu?

– Well! Nothing! But it was time for him to take a decision as he wanted to go on... And you?

– My friend, he is young. You really know that he planed to establish arround Toulouse”)

In a sense that *be* is used to support contrasted reasoning based on evidence or logic:

(73) – ... ne hè pas un bon pair qui vòu.
not anyone who wants can be a good father.

– vòs-te carar! si s'esclamèn en arríder los dus frairs.
oh, shut up! shouted laughing the two brothers.

– be n'i a hèras qui son bons pairs de familha e qui no't valen pas, si horní l'Andréu.

<E: be: *certainly*> there are lots who are good family fathers and who are not worth it, added Andréu.

(Palay 1974b, 39-40)

(74) – que n'as mentit e arrementit! Que coneishes hèra plan a Sophie! Que'vs vedetz a continuar!

you <E: que> lied me every time! You <E: que> know Sophie very well! You <E: que> are dating together!

– e quin sabes aquò?, ce hè, estonada, briga genada.

<E: e> how do you know that? said her, surprised, but not bothered.

– be cau que justificiqui la mia soutada de foncionari...

I <E: be: *certainly*> must justify my salary as a civil servant...

(Gonzalès 1998, 40)

The same occurs in the following example, where *totun* ('however') highlights the contradiction:

(75) – en tot cas, si he, si jamei e's desaviava, tu e jo qu'èm aqui per un còp, vertat?
anyway, he said, if one day he loses the right path, you and me are here to help him, aren't we?

– ò! be-sè!... Be cau esperar, totun, que non nse darà pas nat moca-nas...
 oh! sure!... But one <E: be> must hope, anyway, that he won't give us reasons to
 be worried.
 (Palay 1974b, 59-60)

The adversative connotation becomes visible in a fragment where the resuming of a previous discussion about the role of sons in a society that privileges the heir, one of them puts a question to his father to make him appreciate a contradiction between tradition and personal situation:

(76) – be voletz avoar, si disè lo gojat, qu'èm tots los vòstes hilhs, los capdèths com
 l'ainat! B'èm
 you <E: be> will agree, said the fellow, that we all are sons of you, the eldest as
 the others! We <E: be> are
 tots vaduts parièr, nuds mèu medish sang e plens de la medisha vita? all born
 equals, nude but from the same blood and full of the same life!

Davant Diu b'èm egals?
 Before God we <E: be> are all the same!

– ... ua família tà estar çò qui deù èster, qu'a besonh d'un cap-maison...
 ... a family, in order to be what it has to be, <E: que> must have a head of
 household ...
 (Palay 1974b, 30)

Or in Camelat's verses, where Gaston Febus indicates a contradiction between what the events suggested and the actual situation:

(77) Ò blanga Dauna, dauna aimada, ont t'escones?
 Be t'èi vista, com de la frinèsta espiavi,
 per adès! Ont ès donc partida (...)?
 bé'm digós: a doman! E dongas, non truca
 aqueth doman tà nos?
 (Camelat 2000, 77)
 ("oh you white Lady, beloved lady, where are you hidden? / I <E: be> have seen
 you, as I looked from the window, / a moment ago! Where are you gone (...)? /
 You <E: be> said me: see you tomorrow! And so, wasn't it / for both us, that
 tomorrow?")

The role of *ja* is similar to that of *be* in some aspects. This enunciative emphasises more explicitly the speaker's valuation of what is being said. Let us contrast three possibilities:

(78) a. se't cau trabalhar ueit oras,... que't pòdes preparar
 b. be't pòdes preparar
 c. ja't pòdes preparar
 ("If you must work for eight hours... you <E: (a) que/ (b) be/ (c) ja> better get
 prepared")

The first option, a neutral *que* enunciative, establishes a consecutive relationship indicated by the conditional conjunction *se* heading; the *be* marker emphasises this relationship by introducing a subjective component, in the sense that having to work eight hours is enough for one to make provisions, like become mentally prepared. *Ja* is used in a similar sense to *be*, although it emphasises the valuation even more and, as a result of its temporary connotation, it even implies a sense of urgency. This contrast becomes apparent in expressions with a deontic component:

- (79) a. ... be cau que't prepares
 ... you <E: be: *certainly*> must be prepared
- b. ... ja cau que't prepares
 ... you <E: ja: *really*> must be prepared

Therefore, there is a gradation that just encompasses a statement (*que*), a subjective valuation depending on the circumstances (*be*, *ja*) and, finally, a certain degree of emphasis, which can be understood as an exhortation towards the interlocutor (*ja*). In contexts like (80), *que* and *be* are also possible:¹⁵

- (80) a. e dejà, en prumèras, ja m'estonavi d'aver tostemp la hemnòta en çò deu vesin
 (Camelat 1971, 90)
 and yet, from the beginning, I <E: ja: *really*> was surprised of having my wife in my neighbours house
- b. e, ce digoi, ja sabetz que me'n vau pausar en çò d'Escura-Mesples! (Camelat 1971, 62)
 and, I said, you <E: ja: *really*> know I am going to rest to Escura-Mesples' home!
- c. puishqu'at vòs, ja vas véder, non t'i cambiarèi ne un díser ne ua hèita
 (Camelat 1971, 82)
 if you want, you <E: ja: *really*> will see, I'm not hiding any detail in my explanation
- d. ja s'at viraràn, se Diu los balha santat, los cantons de las casas que son solides. (Camelat 1971, 168)

¹⁵ Palay (1974a) refers to an enunciative *ja* (*ja*) and also an exclamative *ja* which appears alone, as an interjection, which seems to be used to indicate to the interlocutor that s/he has no need to give further explanations, be it because the speaker agrees or completely the opposite:

–... voletz-ve pariar que me'n hèi tres cents liuras?
 (“would you believe that I sold it for three hundred pounds?”)

– ja, ja! Òmi de lo bon Diu, e non s'i pòt parlar, si'm he autanlèu, nat besonh d'enqueri'vs, be'vs èi dit que la bèstia que'm plasè. (Camelat, 1971, 150)
 (“(JA, JA: *ok, ok*)! My good friend, no need to discuss, said, neither to a ask, I (*BE: really*) have said you that I like that animal”)

Although this is an interesting case, it is rarely found in texts and it does not seem entirely relevant to our exposition.

they <E: ja: *really*> will arrange themselves, if God gives them health, the walls of the house are strong

(80a) seems to have a temporal meaning, although it soon becomes apparent that *dejà* is the form which specifies the time lapse associated with *en prumèras*. Therefore, this *ja* retains the temporal connotation that emphasises the event, *m'estonavi*, as if referring to the moment when it occurs. In this sense, one uses *ja* to emphasise a finished state of things or one that is projected towards the future, like the knowledge about a specific circumstance, as exemplified in (80b-c). If linked to a verb in future (80d), it is generally used to express certainty (sometimes with a slight lack of concern) about what will happen.

Hourcade (43) states that *ja* “est beaucoup moins utilisé que le “que” mais elle peut le remplacer: elle ajoute, alors, une nuance d’insistance, de renforcement.” Consistent with this reinforcing nature, other elements usually accompany the clause, like an ascending intonation which requires a focusing structure or duplication like in (81):

- (81) a. ja n’ei, de flaca
she <E: ja> [*pron. (genitive: ne)*]_i-is, [of weak]_i: “she is really weak”
- b. ja’t sabè, ja
he <E: ja> *pron. (acusative: at)*-did know it, <E: ja>: “he really knew it, sure”

Hitherto, *ja* can be exchanged both with *que* and *be*, as we show in (82), respectively regarding the examples in (80):

- (82) a. ... que/be m’estonavi...
It <E: que/be> surprised me: “it (certainly) surprised me”
- b. ... que/be sabetz...
you <E: que/be> know...: “you (certainly) know...”
- c. ... que/be vas véder...
you <E: que/be> will see...: “you (certainly) will see...”
- d. ... que/be s’at viraràn...
they <E: que/be> will arrange themselves...: “they will (certainly) arrange themselves ...”

Obviously, the substitution is possible as regards syntactical position, but not in terms of interpretation. However, it should be noted that not all contexts with *be* and *ja* are equivalent. If we recall the examples (74)-(76), where *be* was used to emphasise a contradiction between reality and expectations, it is possible to notice that *ja* would not be admissible (on the contrary, *que* could always be used):

- (83) – que n’as mentit e arrementit! Que coneishes hèra plan a Sophie! Que’vs vedetz a continuar!
you <E: que> lied me every time! You <E: que> know Sophie very well! You <E: que> are dating together!
- e quin sables aquò?, ce hè, estonada, briga genada.

<E: e> how do you know that? said her, surprised, but not bothered.

– be/*ja cau que justificiqui la mia soutada de funcionari...

I <E: be: *certainly* / *ja: *really*> must justify my salary as a civil servant...

- (84) – en tot cas, si he, si jamei e’s desaviava, tu e jo qu’èm aqui per un còp, vertat? anyway, he said, if one day he loses the right way, you and me are here to help him, aren’t we?

– ò! be-sè!... Be/*ja cau esperar, totun, que non nse darà pas nat moca-nas...

oh! sure!... But we <E: be: *certainly* / *ja: *really*> must hope he is not going to do so.

- (85) – be/*ja voletz avoar, si disè lo gojat, qu’èm tots los vòstes hilhs, los capdèths com l’ainat!

you <E: be: *certainly* / *ja: *really*> will agree, said the fellow, that we all are sons of you, the eldest as the others!

B’/*ja èm tots vaduts parièr, nuds mèu medish sang e plens de la medisha vita?

We <E: be: *certainly* / *ja: *really*> are all born equals, nude but from the same blood and full of the same life!

Davant Diu b’/*ja èm egals?

Before God we <E: be: *certainly* / *ja: *really*> are all the same!

– ... ua familia tà estar çò qui dèu èster, qu’a besonh d’un cap-maison...

...a family, in order to be what it has to be, <E: que> must have a head of household...

We do not think that this difference in the likelihood of *be* and *ja* is due to the type of verb the enunciatives are associated with in each case. The enunciative *be* emphasises a state of affairs independently to the temporal relationship between sentences; this is why it is found in adversative reasoning, while *ja* is linked to contexts with a connotation of accomplishment or projection into the future.

The different performance of each enunciative has the consequence of stylistic differences between authors, which are also related to several possibilities in spoken language. In authors from the first third of the twentieth century it is already possible to find remarkable differences, which are not always explicable as due to geographical origin. At the beginning of the twentieth century, Miquèu Camelat tends to greatly use the entire repertoire of enunciatives; not only using the enunciatives *que*, *e* and *se* with sufficient systematicity, and in a variety of contexts, but frequently using *be*, even in poetical texts, with the unquestionable aim of incorporating oral resources into literary practise. This author also used *ja* as an enunciative, as can be seen in the examples of (80). Palay, his contemporary, proceeded in a similar manner, although he rarely used the enunciative *ja*, and Gastellú-Sabalòt is even more moderate. This variation could be moved to authors of the present time like Javaloyès, Gonzalès and Peyroutet, even though in general the enunciative *ja* is very rare.

5. Conclusions

The process presented here shows that Gascon Occitan offers clear examples of grammaticalization of particles that perform as modality markers. Firstly, there is an inventory of particles of mandatory use: *que*, *e*, *non*, which respectively indicate affirmative declarative sentences, total interrogatives and negative declarations. The inclusion of *non* in this inventory can be justified because it is in complementary distribution with the other two, that is all three occupy the same syntactic position. As stated, it is also possible to include a zero marker associated to imperative and unbound infinitive sentences.

There does not seem to be place to consider that these particles perform modality marking beyond the main types (declarative, interrogative, imperative), to the extent that any sentence obligatorily requires one or another particle without there being any evidence, beyond grammatical fixation, of an expression modulated by the speaker's commitment. For example, any assertion bears a declarative *que* marker and secondary nuances are assumed by the verb morphology (as shown in Squartini). However, it seems necessary to observe peripheral varieties of Gascon where *que/e* are not obligatory enunciatives, or, in diachronic terms, to observe if possible the behaviour of these enunciatives when they did not yet appear systematically, at least in written language.

Se has been added to these particles. It can alternate with *e* as an interrogative marker in total interrogatives, but displays a wide variety of nuances. Initially, as an extension of interrogative uses, it seems to be able to function as an introducer half way between doubt and exhortation. In this case a certain subjective implication is expressed: example (31) does not accept an interrogative *e* or a declarative *que*, but rather expresses the speaker's opinion about what the interlocutor should do.

Regarding *se* this paper has shown examples of embedded wh- indirect interrogative clauses introduced by this particle. The dialectal varieties where this phenomenon occurs do not bear it as a mandatory marker in this type of context, even though it seems to have notable systematicity in some texts like those of Sarrieu. In specific contexts, whether it appears or not generates a contrast between knowledge and ignorance by the speaker, in the sense that the presence of *se* invariably indicates a connotation of doubt regarding the wh- reference. Therefore, in Catalan dialects there are structures like those in (37a), direct wh- interrogatives, and especially (37b), direct interrogatives without wh- that contain an epistemic modal expressing doubt. Pragmatically speaking, the latter connote an interrogative interpretation, although they are strictly structures where the speaker manifests his or her query through the combination of *se* and the modal *deure*.

This digression on the contexts of *se* undoubtedly goes a little beyond the general table that defines the classical distribution of the so-called Gascon enunciatives. If Gascon grammatical tradition includes this particle in that general table, without doubt it is due to the fact that it concurs with *e* in the marking of interrogative modality. However, it is evident that in syntactic terms, if it is observed in all its contexts, it occupies a very different position to all the other enunciatives: while these are placed leftmost into the VP, *se* is placed just before wh- or, in the absence of wh-, in a higher position of the sentence where it cannot be preceded by the subject (as described in Rigau & Suïls).

The particles *be* and *ja* also have often been included among enunciatives, as show they the same typical characteristics: they are placed in preverbal position and additionally display complementary distribution among themselves and regarding *que*, *e* and *non*. These forms have also followed a process of grammaticalization although, like

with *se*, this process has not completely erased their original connotation (as the adverbs they originally were), in a way that in this case they also continue to display performance in expressing evidentiality. As exposed, *be* generally expresses an adaptation between events and a person's perception, often by emphasising a contradiction between intentions and evidence, thus it can be used in interpretations with adversative connotation. The case of *ja* is similar, although in a lesser sense, probably because it retains part of its temporal meaning, and contributes a perfective or accomplishment component which limits its contexts compared with *be*.

At this stage, we can pose the same question as Pusch (2007): is there evidence of evidentiality in Gascon? In our opinion, to the extent that enunciatives like *que/e* are mandatory in declarative sentences, they are simply declarative modality markers that do not display any optionality that leads us to think of any degree of modulation linked to the speaker's conscious commitment. A different case is when we look at the contexts of *se*, which can just be an interrogative marker like *e* but can also be used in structures of an epistemic nature, and express doubt or a modality somewhere between interrogative and exhortative. It is possible to note here that the nuances contributed by *se* come into play during the interaction between speaker and interlocutor. They essentially belong to orality and this, on the one hand, can explain their late appearance in texts and, on the other, highlights that in essence it is a marker linked to the play of contrasts between speakers and external evidence.

This is even truer in the case of *be* (and *ja*): as indicated, if in any case it is possible to state that there is proof of evidentiality it is here. Since *be* appears quite frequently in texts, it is possible to think of a certain degree of grammaticalization, and therefore, of grammatical codification of the opposition between assertiveness (essentially represented by *que*) and evidentiality (mainly represented by *be*).

There have been varied and numerous approaches to the Gascon system of enunciatives. However, we believe it is necessary to delve deeper into a diachronic analysis like that initiated by Pusch (2002; 2007). It would be possible to add a wider geographic perspective, in a way that synchronic and diachronic varieties depicting variations in the distribution of the different enunciatives would be contemplated. For example, writers hailing from Landes (along the Atlantic coast) like Manciet or Morà are not constricted by the "norm" that determines every declarative sentence should be introduced by *que*:

Que truquèn estranjament. Qui donc arromagava atau? E la pòrta s'aubrí. Manquèm de se n'arríder. Que vim lo Matiu, briac, lo peu blanc hòrt long e boclat, dab lo pau a la man. Nes saludè ençà, nes saludè enlà, que nes parlè deus cans deu Rei, que los avè trobats en camin. "Atz los uelhs roges", ce dishó après aus carbons. Que me demandavi se hadè pas deu briac, tament tant. (Manciet, 78-79).

("Someone knocked in a strange way. Who did come bothering like that? And the door opened. We almost laughed. We <E: que> saw Matiu, drunk, with his white and wavy hair, with the stick in his hand. He saluted us here, he saluted us there, he talked us about the dogs of the King that he had encountered as he went along the path. "You have red eyes", said to the ashes. I <E: que> was wandering if he pretended to be drunk, in so doing.")

Mès cerquè tostemps labàs, un espiar. Totara, un espiar? Vedó pas sonque ua hemna tombar labàs. L'imatge lo burlè, baishè lo cap. Que's sentí vergonhós e

shètz hòrças. Que's perdonarè jamès de'us dishar tots atau dens lo malur. (Morà, 48).

(*"But he searched always there, a gaze. Now, a gaze? He saw nothing but a woman falling down. The picture laughed of him, he looked down. He <E: que> felt ashamed and weak. He <E: que> would never forgive himself of leaving them all into the sorrow."*)

It does not seem easy to determine the motivation behind the occurrence of the enunciative, or its absence, in the previous fragments; possibly it is due to a search for expressiveness, emphasising specific sentences in a game between the centre and periphery of the discursive composition, more than to a bi-univocal marking between enunciative and sentence modality.

Like geographical perspective, diachronic perspective also has a lot to contribute. The brief but interesting anthology of Gascon texts presented more than a century ago by Lespy is already a good sample that suggests different periods of enunciative fixing (at least in literary language). Therefore, for example, in Despouirins, the author who in the eighteenth century poetised the landscape and the oral tradition of the Aspa Valley, the use of *que* is relatively infrequent compared with that of modern Gascon, while *be* had a presence similar to that shown today:

Deu bèth tropèth de mas anescas,
 aquera be'n èra la flor;
 los qui vedèn sas lans tan frescas,
 gridavan: "Ah l'urós pastor!"
 Ara, jo l'èi perguda!
 Tant mau me'n saberà;
 si lèu non m'ei renduda,
 be'n serèi mòrt doman! (Ciprian Despouirins: "L'anesqueta perguda".
 Vignancour).

(*"From the flock of my lambs, / that one <E: be: certainly> was the flower; / those who saw her fresh wools, / shouted. "oh you happy shepard!" / Now I lost her! / and I will be so sad; / if I don't get her back soon, / I <E: be: certainly> will be dead tomorrow!"*)

In fact, as stated by Marcus, the enunciative *que* has not only become systematic as a declarative modality marker in the south-western area of Gascon, but there is also evidence that its territorial scope is becoming wider, and our perception is that the first circumstance has an important role in favour of the second, as that *que* stands for a visible "gasconity" marker. Considered diachronically and in terms of sentence modality, the contrast between *que* and other enunciatives as *be* or *ja* suggests a case of structural reordering that tends to keep the expressive value of the opposition marked/unmarked throughout a process of grammaticalization, and the expression of evidentiality seems to be a central notion for which markedness is relevant here.

Works cited

- Alibèrt, L. *Dictionnaire Occitan-Français selon les parles languedociens*. Nîmes: IEO, 1966.
- Baldinger, K. "Die hyperkorrekten Formen als Konsequenz der Scripta im Altgasconischen." In *Romanica. Festschrift für Gerhardt Rohlfs*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1958. 57-75.
- Batllori, M. & M. L. Hernanz. "Emphatic Particles in Spanish and Catalan." In *Lingua* 128 (2013): 9-30.
- Bec, P. *Manuel pratique d'occitan moderne*. Paris: Picard, 1973.
- Boisgontier, J. & R. Darrigrand. *Condes deus monts e de las arribèras*. Ortès: Per Noste (IEO), 1978.
- Bouzet, J. *Manuel de grammaire béarnaise*. Billière: Escole Gastoû Febus, 1975 [1928].
- Brucart, J. M. & G. Rigau. "La quantificació." In J. Solà, M.-R. Lloret, J. Mascaró & M. Pérez-Saldanya eds. *Gramàtica del Català Contemporani*. Barcelona: Empúries, 2002. 1517-1589.
- Camelat, M. *Bite-bitante*. Billère: Escole Gastoû Febus, 1971.
- . *Gaston Febus*. Biarritz/Pau: Atlantica/Institut Occitan, 2000 [1914].
- Cornillie, B. *Evidentiality and epistemic modality in spanish (semi-)auxiliaries: a cognitive-functional approach*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2007.
- Coromines, J. "El parlar de Cardós i Vall Ferrera." In *Entre dos llenguatges*. Barcelona: Curial, 1976. Vol. II: 29-67.
- . *El parlar de la Vall d'Aran. Gramàtica, diccionari i estudis lexicals sobre el gascò*. Barcelona: Curial, 1990.
- Field, Th. T. "Speech act markers in modern Gascon." In L. D. King & C. A. Maley eds., *Selected papers from the XIIIth LSRL*. Benjamins: Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1985. 77-97.
- Gastellú-Sabalòt, J. *Margalida, la hilha deu praube*. Ortès: Per Noste (IEO), 1981.
- Gonzalès, E. *Lo melic de Silvia Chasaus*. Ortès: Per Noste (IEO), 1981.
- . *Isabèu de la Valea*. Pau: Reclams, 2000.
- Hourcade, A. *Grammaire Béarnaise*. Pau: Los Caminaires, 1986.
- Javaloyès, S. *L'òra de partir*. Pau: Reclams, 2002 [1997].
- Lapassada, R. *Sonque un arrider amistós*. Ortès: Institut d'Estudis Occitans, 1975.
- Lavit, J.-L. *Hont blanca*. Castras: Institut d'Estudis Occitans, 2000.
- Lespy, V. *Grammaire béarnaise*. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1880.
- Manciet, B. *Lo gojat de noveme*. Pau: Reclams, 1995.
- Massourre, J.-L. *Le Gascon haut-pyrénéen (vallées de Luz, de Barèges et de Gavarnie)*. Villeneuve-sur-Lot: Ego, 2003.
- Morà, P. *Garbais burlentas*. Ortès: Per Noste (IEO), 1979.
- Palay, S. *Dictionnaire du Béarnais et du Gascon modernes (bassin aquitain)*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1974a.
- . *Los tres gojats de Bordavielha*. Pau: Per Noste (IEO), 1974b.
- Payrató, L. "L'enunciació i la modalitat oracional." In J. Solà, M.-R. Lloret, J. Mascaró & M. Pérez-Saldanya eds. *Gramàtica del Català Contemporani*. Barcelona: Empúries, 2002. 1149-1220.
- Peyroutet, A. *Miratges*. Pau: Reclams, 1996.
- Pusch, C. "Preverbal modal particles in Gascony Occitan." In T. van der Wouden, A. Foolen & P. van de Craue eds. *Particles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002. 105-118.

- . "Is there evidence for evidentiality in Gascony Occitan?" *Rivista di Linguistica* 19, 1 (2007): 91-108.
- Rohlf, G. *Le Gascon. Études de philologie pyrénéenne*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1977 [1935].
- Rigau, G. & J. Suïls, "Microvariation in Catalan and Occitan complementizers: the so-called expletive *se*." *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 9 (2010): 151-165.
- Romieu, M. & A. Bianchi. *Gramatica de l'occitan gascon contemporanèu*. Pessac: Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux, 2005.
- Sentí, A. "La perífrasi *deure+Inf* en el català preliterari. Gènesi i evolució d'una perífrasi romànica en el seu context lingüístic." In *Actes del XV Col·loqui de l'Associació Internacional de Llengua i Literatura Catalanes*. Barcelona: Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat 2010. Vol. I: 107-124.
- Squartini, M. "The internal structure of evidentiality in Romance." *Studies in Language* 25, 2 (2001): 297-334.
- Suïls, J., R. Sistac & G. Rigau. "Pour une étude intégrée des variétés romanes des Pyrénées: L'approche de Gerhardt Rohlf à la lumière de nouvelles données." In *L'apport de Gerhardt Rohlf à la connaissance des langues pyrénéennes: parentés, disparités. Actes du Colloque*. Oloron Sainte-Marie: ICN, 2007. 55-83.
- Vignancour, E. *Poésies Béarnaises*. Pau: Vignancour, 1828.