

Chapter Title: Spanish Exclamatives in Perspective: A Survey of Properties, Classes, and Current Theoretical Issues

Chapter Author(s): Ignacio Bosque

Book Title: Advances in the Analysis of Spanish Exclamatives

Book Editor(s): Ignacio Bosque

Published by: Ohio State University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1wn0qzm.3>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



This content is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.



Ohio State University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Advances in the Analysis of Spanish Exclamatives*

JSTOR

1

Spanish Exclamatives in Perspective

A Survey of Properties, Classes, and Current Theoretical Issues

Ignacio Bosque

1. Introduction

Exclamative constructions are the result of the rather intricate (and not fully understood) crossing of several syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic variables. Even so, substantial progress in all of these factors has been achieved in recent years, both from theoretical linguistics and the specific grammar of Romance languages. A large number of recent theoretical studies, most of them mentioned below, constitute substantial contributions to our understanding of the semantic import of the grammatical ingredients of these peculiar constructions. Results of this abundant research touch on the projections that articulate their syntax, the specific processes of variable binding in structures of degree quantification, the interpretation of mirative and evidential particles, the behavior of exclamatives in negative and subordinate contexts, and the grammatical consequences of the very significant differences between interrogative and exclamative patterns, among others.

I would have liked to express my deep gratitude to Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach for inviting me to participate in this series. I am also very grateful to Cristina Sánchez López and two anonymous reviewers for their comments on a previous version of this chapter. This research has been partially supported by grant UCM-930590 from the Complutense University, Madrid.

The specific ways in which these theoretical issues are relevant for the grammar of Romance languages have been analyzed with much detail in recent years. Main contributions include research on French (Gérard, 1980; Bacha, 2000; Rys, 2006; Beyssade & Marandin, 2006; Marandin, 2008, 2010; Burnett, 2009; Kellert, 2010), Portuguese (Bastos-Gee, 2011), Catalan (Castroviejo, 2006, 2007, 2008a, 2008b; Villalba, 2001, 2003, 2004, 2008b), and Italian (Benincà, 1995, 1996; Zanuttini & Portner, 2000, 2003; Porter & Zanuttini, 2000, 2005; Munaro, 2003, 2005, 2006; Benincà & Munaro, 2010; Zanuttini et al., 2012), among other languages. As regards Spanish, main references are mentioned and discussed in this overview and the rest of the book. General presentations of exclamative structures in current theoretical grammar include Michaelis (2001), Heycock (2006), and Villalba (2008b).

This book on Spanish exclamatives intends to constitute a contribution to Romance linguistics, as well as a general picture of settled, new, and pending issues in this important, as well as traditionally neglected, domain of grammar. The necessary comparison of exclamative structures (either present, absent, or lost) in the Romance languages family is yet to be done. The present overview aims to be a guide into the intricate jungle of exclamative patterns in Spanish. It is also meant to be a threshold to welcome the reader to the main theoretical issues and controversies standing out of the considerable existing current literature on this topic.

2. Exclamatives as Speech Acts

Exclamatives are speech acts, and they are addressed as such in classical typologies of utterances. For example, Searle (1976, 1979) distinguishes assertive, directive, commissive, declarative, and expressive speech acts and subdivides the latter into exclamatives and optatives (for developments and refinements, see also Sadock & Zwicky, 1985; Zaefferer, 2001; Abels, 2005; and Boisvert & Ludwig, 2006). Being speech acts, exclamative utterances have illocutionary force, lack truth values, and are exclusively attributed to the speaker, even if—as happens in questions—they lose these features when embedded (§ 6.5.).

Whereas promises or commands are addressed to a hearer, exclamatives do not require one, unless reinterpreted as rhetorical questions or commands. There is little doubt that the speech act that exclamatives perform constitutes the manifestation of an emotional reaction of the speaker. In fact, in the literature it is often assumed that the key notion behind exclamatives

is the speaker's surprise (Elliott, 1971, 1974; Castroviejo, 2006; Rett, 2007, 2009, 2011; Andueza, 2011; and many others). This concept is both accurate in many cases and too restrictive in others. The reason is that surprise is bound to counterexpectation, and this requirement is not always fulfilled in exclamatives. If I get up and open my window, I may utter (1):

- (1) ¡Qué bonita mañana!
 'What a beautiful morning!'

This utterance may be fully felicitous in complete absence of any previous (explicit or implicit) bad weather forecast on my part. One may say that the emotional reaction expressed by (1) is complacency and also that other exclamative utterances express disappointment, frustration, excitement, surprise, enthusiasm, or amazement, among other subtle notions. Such a large list of possible emotional reactions, together with a similarly extended paradigm of grammatical structures able to express them, have lead specialists to raise the natural question whether exclamatives are a unified speech type, or rather constitute one or several varieties of a more comprehensive one, sometimes called "expressive." See Abels (2005), Allan (2006), Potts (2007), Merin and Nikolaeva (2008), Schlenker (2007), and Castroviejo (2008a) on this issue.

Whether or not this reduction is possible, it must be stressed that, according to Zanuttini and Portner's (2003) influential analysis, surprise and similar concepts are somehow derived notions in the grammar of exclamatives, in fact a consequence of what they call "widening" processes. These authors argue that by using an exclamative sentence such as, say, *How X she is!* (X being a qualifying adjective), the speaker implies that the extent in which X is predicated exceeds or outranks the range of possibilities under consideration. In their analyses, a fundamental property of wh-exclamatives is the fact that they widen or enlarge the domain of quantification for the wh-operator,¹ and this operation gives rise to the set of alternative propositions denoted by the sentence. Being extreme, values expressed by degree quantifiers in exclamatives are associated with typical entailment monotonicity processes (Castroviejo, 2008b).

The contrast between questions and exclamations is rather sharp, as regards this essential aspect of their meaning: whereas wh-words in questions pick up one alternative in an implicit set, as *cómo* 'how' does in

1. Following a standard convention, in this chapter I will use the term wh- (wh-operator, wh-exclamatives, wh-words) for Spanish instead of *qu-*, *cu-* or *q-*.

(2a), their exclamative counterparts, as *cómo* in (2b), behave in a rather different way:

- (2) a. ¿Cómo canta María?
 ‘How does M. sing?’
 b. ¡Cómo canta María!
 ‘How M. sings!’

In fact, exclamative *cómo*—a different word from its interrogative counterpart in French and other languages—refers to an implicit set of non-standard ways of singing (see § 6.1 for a more precise characterization). Since the denotation of exclamative wh-phrases involves a widening process, the characteristic form of the illocutionary force associated with them must be crucially related to this particular sort of variable binding and domain denotation. Chernilovskaya and Nouwen (2012) argue that widening—a notion usually applied to the semantics or free-choice indefinites (Kandom & Ladman, 1993)—is not exactly the relevant concept to be grasped in exclamatives, and they suggest noteworthiness, a notion related to saliency, prominence, and similar concepts, as a better candidate (on this issue, see also Brown, 2008). In any case, the fact that only extreme values in implicit scales are implied by wh-exclamatives, so that intermediate extents are disregarded, has been repeatedly pointed out in the literature as a defining feature of these utterances (see Elliott, 1971, 1974; Milner, 1978; Gérard, 1980; and Rett, 2008, 2009; among many others).

The speaker’s emotional reaction is, thus, related to the non-standard set of extreme values associated with the domain of wh-words, but these two notions must be kept apart. The main reason to do so is the fact that the choice of the emotion expressed in exclamative wh-utterances is mostly a pragmatic issue, whereas the quantification domain obtained for wh-expressions may be either overt (as in the «How + adjective» pattern²) or calculated from a restricted set, as in (2b). That is, the ways of singing to which some emotional reaction is addressed in (2b) are placed at the

2. Notice that adjectives in so-called “closed scales” (Kennedy & McNally, 2005a) are gradable, as in *lleno* ‘full’ (cf. *muy lleno*, *llenísimo* ‘quite full’), even if the highest extent of the relevant property seems to be interpreted on the subject’s extension: “full in all their parts.” These adjectives allow for adversative tags such as . . . *pero no del todo* ‘. . . but not quite,’ disallowed by other gradable adjectives (*interesante* ‘interesting,’ *caro* ‘expensive,’ etc.). On the interpretation of wh-APs such as *qué lleno*, see Castroviejo (2006) and Villalba (this volume). González Rodríguez (this volume) argues that adverbs such *extremadamente* ‘extremely’ close Kennedy and McNally’s (2005a) open scales.

opposite extremes of an implicit scale built of pragmatic information: either beautifully, marvelously, etc., or awfully, out of tune, etc. This set of extreme values may be extended to ¡*Qué* + *N!* ‘What a *N*’ exclamatives (§ 4.1). Some contextual factors, such as those pointed out by Potts and Schwarz (2008), might help one decide on the correct polarity of the extreme values involved.

Closer looks at different types of exclamatives (particularly those built of a series of non *wh*-exclamative particles) show that their syntactic structures may be associated with particular meanings and intentions in much more specific ways. For example, quantificational expressions, such as *vaya si* ‘sure, definitely’ in (3a) are not compatible with low degrees. Similarly, by using *mira* in (3b) the speaker expresses that he or she considers a certain fact to be both surprising and inadequate; the grammatical structure of (3c) is inextricably linked to the expression of some disappointment, etc.

- (3) a. ¡Vaya si me gusta!
 ‘I sure like it.’
 b. ¡Mira que haber dejado tu empleo! (from Sánchez López, 2014b)
 ‘I can’t believe you’ve left your job.’
 c. ¡Y pensar que te creí!
 ‘And to think I believed you!’

Many other similar cases exist, and some of them have been addressed in detail in the large descriptive literature on Spanish exclamatives (González Calvo, 1984–88, 1998; Carbonero Cano, 1990; Alonso-Cortés, 1999a, 1990b; Casas, 2005; Vigara Tauste, 2005; etc.). See also the literature referred to in § 5.2.

Two modal notions developed recently have important consequences for the analysis of exclamative utterances: mirativity and evidentiality. The first (DeLancey, 2001; Aikhenvald, 2012; on Spanish, see Sánchez López, 2014a, 2014b; Olbertz, 2009, 2012; and Torres Bustamante, 2013) refers to the novelty of the propositional contents and the emotional reaction that unawareness, surprise, or lack of information causes in the speaker. Sánchez López (2014b) argues that exclamatives headed by Sp. *mira* involve mirative information—see also Ocampo (2009) and Gutiérrez-Rexach and Andueza (this volume) on this issue. Other potential candidates include *cuidado* (*que*) and *vaya* (*que*) (both, ‘sure, no doubt’). See Casas (2005), Sancho Cremades (2008), and Tirado (2013, 2015a, 2015b) on these exclamative particles.

Evidentiality (Plungian, 2001; Aikhenvald, 2004) is a different notion, although not entirely unrelated to mirativity, as argued by Lazard (1999,

2001) and Rett and Murray (2013). It concerns the source of the information and specifically whether it is direct or indirect (that is, obtained through witness experience, hearsay, etc.), as well as whether or not it is taken to be reliable or established. Rodríguez Ramalle (2008a, 2008b) and Demonte and Soriano (2014) argue that the non-subordinated *que* in expressions such as *¡Que ha dimitido el decano!* ‘Hey, the dean has just resigned!’ is an evidential particle, then signaling the reported status of the propositional content of the sentence. I will return to this in § 5.3.

The emotional nature of expressive speech acts has some other grammatical consequences. Emotive predicates are factive (Kiparsky & Kiparsky, 1970; Giannakidou, 2006; De Cuba, 2007; and many more). Since exclamative sentences express an emotive reaction, the natural question is whether or not exclamatives are factives as well. Most answers are affirmative: Elliott (1971, 1974), Grimshaw (1979), Michaelis (2001), and Michaelis and Lambrecht (1996). Even so, some indications suggest that the notion “factivity” might be understood in a somehow extended sense in these cases. First of all, there is little doubt that indirect exclamatives (§ 6.5), such as (4a), presuppose the truth of their complement:

- (4) a. Es sorprendente lo bien que se porta el niño.
 ‘It’s amazing how well the child behaves himself.’
 b. ¡Qué listo es Juan!
 ‘How smart Juan is!’

But notice that a similar conclusion would be obtained from a non-exclamative complement clause of the same predicate. Factivity is not so straightforward as regards main clause exclamatives. Sentence (4b) reflects some belief of the speaker (namely, “Juan is very smart”), which can be refuted by the hearer (as argued by Rett, 2008; Abels, 2010), a situation not expected in factive patterns. Villalba (this volume) shows that speakers tend to interpret that refusal as a rejection of the property itself, rather than its high degree.

Beysade (2009) claims that standard tests on factivity are not applicable to main exclamatives, which—she argues—are not presupposition triggers, but rather expressive speech acts whose content is speaker-only oriented. In a similar vein, notice that interjective expressions manifest a speaker’s emotions (then, personal reactions toward true state of affairs), but this does not imply that they are factive constructions. Zanuttini and Portner (2003) suggested that the relationship between wh-exclamatives and their

propositional contents is not presupposition, but conventionally implicature. Villalba (this volume) argues that it is neither, but one of projective meaning, in Tonhauser et al.'s (2013) sense.

3. A Classification of Exclamative Expressions in Spanish

The very existence of quite a number of general descriptions of Spanish exclamatives (González Calvo, 1984–88, 1998, 2001; Alonso-Cortés, 1999a, 1999b; Casas, 2005; RAE-ASALE, 2009, § 42.13–16; and Villalba, 2016, among others) does not imply that it is easy, or even possible, to come up with a classification of exclamatives able to be generally accepted. We may classify exclamative expressions on the basis of two factors: (1) their grammatical structure and (2) whether or not this structure is exclusively exclamative. According to the former, an expression may be signaled as exclamative by some lexical and/or syntactic clue (“primary exclamatives”); in the latter group, only intonation and the proper interpretation of the exclamative illocutionary force associated with it are the linguistic markers of exclamative import (“secondary exclamatives”). The following groups are obtained by applying these criteria:

(5) A classification of Spanish exclamative expressions

	Primary	Secondary
Lexical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interjections • Phrasal and sentential idioms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocatives?
Phrasal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interjective phrases • Wh-phrasal exclamatives • DPs with other exclamative particles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imprecatives (insults, compliments, etc.) • Intonation-only exclamative phrases
Sentential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wh-exclamative sentences and definite determiner exclamatives • Focal exclamatives • Polarity exclamatives • Matrix complementizer exclamatives • Binomial exclamatives • Suspended exclamatives • Optative exclamatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intonation-only exclamative sentences (= Declarative exclamatives)

Exclamative intonation, which applies to all types in (5), is often characterized by a number of features: hyperarticulation, increasing intensity and

quantity in stressed syllables (in polysyllabic expressions), changes in individual tonal range (more specifically, movement of the general range of pitch over or below standard levels), and a perceptible acceleration or retardation of “tempo.” For a technical description of Spanish exclamative intonation patterns in ToBi parameters, see Prieto and Roseano (2010). A more traditional, but still quite accurate, account in a number of respects is Navarro Tomás (1918).

Interjections, not addressed in this book, are lexical units associated with a number of (fixed but often fuzzy) emotional reactions: *¡vaya!* ‘what a . . . , oh,’ *¡toma ya!* ‘wow,’ *¡ni modo!* ‘no way.’ General descriptions of Spanish interjections include Sánchez Royo (1976), Almela Pérez (1982), Alonso-Cortés (1999a, 1999b), Montes (1999), Torres Sánchez (2000), López Bobo (2002), Edeso (2009), and RAE-ASALE (2009, ch. 32), among others.

Phrasal and sentential idioms are in the lexical group in (5) because they are expected to be in the lexicon, even if some of them allow for morphological variants. Phrasal idioms are expressions such as *¡La madre que {me/te/lo/la . . . } parió!* ‘By the mother who bore {me/you/him/her}.’ Examples of sentential idioms include *¡Qué le {voy/vas/vamos} a hacer!* ‘What can {I/you/we} do!’ or *¡(No) {faltaría/faltaba} más!* ‘By all means, of course.’

Primary phrasal exclamatives are divided into three groups in (5). The first one corresponds to interjective phrases, that is, phrases headed by interjections (RAE-ASALE, 2009, § 32.8; Alonso-Cortés, 1999a; Rodríguez Ramalle, 2007b), as in *¡Vaya con el muchacho!* ‘What a (disgusting) boy!’; *¡Ay de la que se retrase!* ‘Woe unto the woman who is late!’; *¡Bien por el equipo!* ‘Good for our team!’ The second group is that of wh-phrasal exclamatives (§ 4.1), as in *¡Qué calor!* ‘It’s so hot!’; *¡Qué bonito!* ‘How nice!’; *¡Qué deprisa!* ‘How fast!’ The third group includes other exclamative particles (§ 4.2), as in *¡Menudo lío!* ‘What a mess!’; *¡Vaya día!* ‘What a day!’; or *¡Valiente tontería!* ‘What nonsense!’

Grammatical expressions with exclamative intonation and no other identifying syntactic structure are called “intonation-only exclamatives” in (5) and may be phrasal or sentential. The former are expressions such as *¡Las tostadas!* ‘The toast!’; *¡Muy interesante!* ‘Quite interesting!’; or *¡Bien dicho!* ‘Well said!’ Some might be reduced to other groups. For example, exclamative APs such as *¡Muy interesante!* can be a variant of binomial (that is, predicate-subject) exclamatives, such as *¡Muy interesante, este libro!* ‘Quite interesting, this book!’ addressed in § 5.4. Other items in this class include emphatic answers or replies, fragments, etc.

Intonational-only exclamative sentences, sometimes called *declarative exclamatives*, may be easily exemplified: *¡Se están quemando las tostadas!* ‘The toasts are burning!’; *¡Tienes razón!* ‘You are right!’; or *¡La respuesta estaba ahí mismo!* ‘The answer was right there!’ Notice that the lack of a grammatical marker (distinct from intonation) that signals these expressions as exclamative does not dismiss the need to analyze the specific import of their illocutionary force. In fact, this import lies in the process of assigning the propositions they contain to the extremes of implicit pragmatic scales of standardness, expectation, relevance, or plausibility. From this point of view, it is not extreme degrees that are valued, but extreme states of affairs. On this perspective, see Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996, 1998, 2008), Rett (2008), and Andueza and Gutiérrez-Rexach (2011).

But exclamative intonation and its correlates in exclamative force are not a default option for all assertions. When they are not, the natural question is which specific propositional contents are, and are not, suitable to be freely converted into secondary exclamative utterances. Modal information is one of the possible restricting factors. Notice that the utterance in (6a) is a good candidate to be an impossible secondary exclamative sentence (that is, an intonational-only exclamative); (6b) might be one as well, but (6c) is not:

- (6) a. *¡Estás equivocado probablemente!
 Most probably, you are wrong!
 b. ??¡Tal vez estés equivocado!
 Maybe you are wrong!
 c. ¡Puedes equivocarte!
 You may be wrong!

Possible constraints on secondary exclamatives are worth exploring, but they will not be considered here.

It is not obvious that lexical exclamatives exist (that is, non-phrasal lexical items giving rise to exclamative speech acts through intonation patterns only), but perhaps vocatives and empathic one-word answers might fit here. As regards secondary phrasal exclamatives, they include imprecatives, which, according to Sadock and Zwicky (1985), constitute a specific type of speech act. Imprecatives are exclamative expressions only indirectly, since they require addressees, as imperatives do, but unlike imperatives, they do not expect answers. On their relationship with exclamative utterances, see Alonso-Cortés (1999a, 1999b).

The main difficulty in classifying primary sentential exclaimatives is the fact the structural considerations and semantic import may unavoidably overlap in some groups (as in matrix complementizer exclaimatives and optative exclaimatives). The tentative classification in (5) is as follows:

- a) Wh-sentential exclaimatives (§ 5.1) are sentences built with phrasal wh-exclaimatives, as in *¡Qué calor hace hoy!* ‘How hot it is today!’ Extreme degree exclaimatives with definite articles, as in *¡Lo fuertes que son!* ‘How strong they are!’ (§ 5.1.2), may be associated with this group as well.
- b) Focal exclaimatives involve focus movement of a phrase to a left peripheral position. Focus preposing is not necessarily bound to exclaimative intonation, since not all sentences involving this process are necessarily exclaimative (e.g., *De algo hay que vivir* ‘One has to make a living’). Focal exclaimatives with overt complementizers, as in *¡Buenos bocadillos que te comías tú!* ‘You used to eat so many wonderful sandwiches!’, are no doubt primary, but those without them, as in *¡En buen lío (??que) me he metido!* ‘What a mess I got myself into!’, might be secondary. See § 5.2 below.
- c) “Polarity exclaimatives” is the term that Batllori and Hernanz (2013) apply to exclaimative utterances built out of emphatic particles such as *bien* ‘well’ or *sí* ‘for sure, no doubt’, which display some quantificational properties, as shown in § 5.2.
- d) Matrix complementizer exclaimatives are headed by *que* ‘that’ or unstressed *si* ‘if’. Both are functional heads, but they give rise to quite different meaning depending on verbal mood. See § 5.3.
- e) Binomial exclaimatives are predicative sentences with no copula, as in *¡Muy bueno, tu artículo de ayer en el periódico!* ‘Quite good, your article in yesterday’s newspaper.’ They may be divided into several subclasses, as shown in § 5.4.
- f) Suspended exclaimatives (§ 5.5) exhibit a rising final intonation, quite close to that of consecutive sentences with omitted codas, as in *¡Estoy tan cansado . . . !* ‘I am so tired . . . !’ or *¡Tienes unas cosas . . . !* ‘You come up with such ideas . . . !’
- g) Optative or desiderative exclaimatives (§ 5.6) express the speaker’s desire, as in *¡Quién fuera rico!* ‘Whish I were a rich man!’

This list is by no means exhaustive. Other exclaimative types include those headed by *con* ‘with’ or *conque* ‘so that’, as in *¡Conque no quieres comer!*

‘So, you don’t want to eat!’ as well as infinitival exclamatives such as *¡Tener que aguantar yo esto!* ‘I can’t believe I have to put up with this!’ among others. On infinitival exclamatives, see Herrero (1991) and Grohmann and Etxeparre (2003).

Even if we take the basic tenets of the classification in (5) to be on the right track, a number of objective factors make it difficult to trace a sharp boundary between primary and secondary exclamatives in some cases:

- 1) Predicates lexically denoting extreme values, sometimes called *elatives*, cannot be dissociated from the emotional content expressed by exclamations—hence, some evaluation of the speaker—as in *Mary is marvelous*. This is a natural consequence of the fact that extreme degree values of properties are associated with exclamative illocutionary force (Zanuttini & Portner, 2003; Rett, 2008). In fact, the speaker’s involvement in those judgements is much stronger than the one we may attest in other predications, as in *Mary is a chemical engineer*. Morphological elatives may be marked by prefixes in Spanish (*re-*, *requete-*, *super-*, *archi-*, *hiper-*) or suffixes (*-ísimo*, *-érrimo*); they are subject to dialectal variation (Masullo, this volume) and belong to various word classes. Spanish elatives are described in detail in González Calvo (1984–88), Arce Castillo (1999), Vigara Tauste (2005, ch. 3), and Casas (2005), among others. They share a number of properties with exclamatives, as Masullo (1999, 2003, 2012, this volume) and González Rodríguez (2006, 2008, 2009, 2010) have very explicitly argued. But even so, elatives are not illocutionary expressions, even less so root constructions. They also bear a close relationship with so-called *qualifying nouns* (Milner, 1978; Gandon, 1988), which are typical of predicative nominal structures, such as *El imbécil de Juan* ‘That idiot, Juan.’ In fact, this pattern is one option for wh-phrasal exclamatives, as in *¡Qué maravilla de película!* ‘What a marvelous film!’
- 2) Exaggerations are also typically associated with exclamative patterns, as in *Te lo he dicho mil veces* ‘I’ve told you that a thousand times.’ Some ironic statements, as in *Me voy a preocupar yo por eso . . .* ‘I do not intend to worry about that’ and emphatic comparisons, such as *Vives como un rajá* ‘You live like a rajah,’ also bare a close relationship with exclamations. All these expressions introduce personal statements resulting from subjective assessments that present states of affairs as non-actual or non-standard,

often as resources to convey humor. In any case, they do not quite assimilate to the specific grammatical type of exclamatives.

- 3) The close relationship between rhetorical questions and exclamations has been pointed out on many occasions. As Spanish grammar is concerned, see Gutiérrez-Rexach (1998), Escandell-Vidal (1984, 1999), Casas (2005), and Andueza (2011) on the difficulties of telling them apart in a number of cases. Nevertheless, grammatical factors still make the distinction possible, as I will discuss in the pages to follow.

4. Phrasal Exclamatives

4.1. WH-PHRASAL EXCLAMATIVES

The main characteristics of wh-exclamative words in Spanish have been analyzed in both the synchronic and the diachronic literature. The most detailed descriptions are found in Casas (2005), Octavio de Toledo and Sánchez López (2009, 2010), and RAE-ASALE (2009, ch. 22). See also Bosque (1984a, 1984b) and Andueza (2011). Since it would be out of the question to cover such a huge amount of information here, I will merely attempt to clarify the general picture as regards some fundamental conceptual issues. First of all, wh-exclamative phrases may be quantitative or qualitative, the former being degree or amount exclamatives:

- (7) Quantitative wh-exclamative phrases
- a. ¡Qué caro! [Degree]
'How expensive!'
 - b. ¡Cuán lejos! [Degree]
'How far!'
 - c. ¡Cuántos coches! [Amount]
'How many cars!'
 - d. ¡Cuánto calor! [Amount]
'So much heat!; It's so hot!'
 - e. ¡Cuánto trabajas! [Amount]
'How hard you work!'
- (8) Qualitative wh-exclamative phrases
- a. ¡Qué casa! [Type]
'What a house!'

- b. ¡Qué fruta! [Type]
 ‘What a (piece of) fruit!’

The term *degree exclamatives* is sometimes applied to all types in (7) and (8), which suggests an (perhaps deliberate) extended interpretation of the notion of “degree.” Indeed, *qué* and *cuán* (the latter, an apocopate variant of *cuánto* restricted to a very formal literary style) form degree phrases with adjectives and adverbs. The phrases in (7a, b) express the extreme extent of some property, but notice that no property is graded in (7c). This phrase denotes the speaker’s emotional reaction toward the fact that the number of cars in a certain place exceeds the average. In a broader sense, (7c) implies that the amount is high or excessive, therefore reaching a high level in a scale of possible implicit amounts. But this does not exactly mean that *cuántos* ‘how many’ denotes degree, nor does it imply that “amount” and “degree” are interchangeable concepts.

As regards qualitative wh-phrases, possible interpretations of the notion of degree depend on their grammatical analysis, as we will see in a minute. The DP in (8a) expresses the fact that a certain house is unique because of some remarkable properties, which somehow make it singular or special.

There is little doubt that quantitative DPs such as (7c) involve at least two components, both of which are overt in English (“how” and “many”): one corresponds to the wh-operator, and another one represents a measure projection. Interestingly, both are overt in Spanish if the utterance is about some small amount, as in *¡Qué pocos coches!* ‘How few cars!’ and both might be overt as well in medieval Spanish, as pointed out by Octavio de Toledo and Sánchez López (2009, p. 1014), as in *¡Qué muchas avellanas!* ‘How many hazelnuts!’ (Juan Ruiz, *Libro de Buen Amor*, CORDE). Even so, many more examples of this pattern are attested to in interrogatives than in exclamative sentences. For example, Eng. *how many/much* corresponds to Italian *ché tanto* in exclamatives (Zanuttini & Portner, 2003), a pattern also occasionally attested to in American Spanish texts (Octavio de Toledo & Sánchez López, 2009, p. 1026).

Quantitative exclamative wh-DPs are headed by *cuánto* (or its morphological variants) or by *qué de* (lit. “what of”), with no interrogative counterpart, both followed by mass or plural nouns. As an adverb, *cuánto* ‘how much/many’ is decomposed as *qué mucho* in some medieval texts: *¡Qué mucho pesas!* ‘How much you weigh!’ (Juan Ruiz, *Libro de Buen Amor*, CORDE), a pattern still present in some varieties of Caribbean Spanish (RAE-ASALE, 2009, § 22.14r), together with *qué tanto*:

- (9) a. ¡Qué tanto ha cambiado eso! ‘How very much all this has changed!’ (Oral Corpus, Venezuela, CREA).
 b. ¡Qué tanto sabía Nicanor! ‘¡How very many things Nicanor used to know!’ (T. Carrasquilla, *Hace tiempo*, CORDE).

“*Qué tan + Adj/Adv.*” is the standard pattern for wh-degree questions in present-day American Spanish. This does not hold for exclamatives, which are formed as in (7a), but it did in medieval Spanish, as attested by Octavio de Toledo and Sánchez López (2009, p. 1019). It must be pointed out that *qué* in (7a) is not a degree modifier, since, as opposed to *muy* ‘very’, it allows for interposed adverbs, such as *increíblemente* or *extraordinariamente*, as well as high degree adjectives (*qué carísimo ~ *muy carísimo* ‘How expensive’). As in the case of nominals, *mucho* or *muy* do not appear in this position nowadays, but they did in Old Spanish:

- (10) Muy repetido es entre todos . . . cuán muy nutritivo es el vino a los que le beben.
 ‘It is much repeated among people how nutritious wine is for those who drink it.’
 (J. de Pineda [1585], CORDE)

According to Sáez (this volume; see also Corver, 1997), the *muy-tan* alternation might be a mirage: if a degree projection (as Eng. *so*) takes an orientational measure complement, as in Eng. *very* in *so very happy*, these two grammatical components might not necessarily be in the same paradigm. Even so, notice that some explanation should be given for the absence of the “*qué tan mucho/muy*” pattern in all time periods and dialects.

Acknowledging that more research is needed to account for the strong asymmetry between interrogative and exclamative patterns on both a historical and geographical basis, there is enough evidence to conclude that at least a measure projection separates the wh-degree word for quantitative adverbs, adjectives, and nominals in the lexical structure, whether or not it is visible in overt syntax.

Let us turn to qualitative wh-phrases now, such as those in (8). Interestingly, *qué* does not agree with N, which may be plural (even overtly quantified), in this pattern:

- (11) ¡Qué (tres) casas!
 ‘Check out those (three) houses!’

The relationship between qualitative and quantitative exclamative DPs is intriguing for both lexical and semantic reasons. The interpretation of mass nouns in Spanish *wh*-exclamative DPs is subject to some lexical restrictions. As seen in (8), N in the “*Qué-N*” pattern can be count or mass. In Bosque (1984a, 1984b) it is observed that *qué* exclamative DPs apparently give rise to quantitative readings with some mass nouns, but not with others:

- (12) a. ¡Qué dolor! ‘What a pain!’ = ¡Cuánto dolor! ‘How much pain!’
 b. ¡Qué fruta! ‘What fruit!’ ≠ ¡Cuánta fruta! ‘How much fruit!’

In the group with *dolor* we find *suerte* ‘luck,’ *calor* ‘heat,’ and *fuerza* ‘strength’; in the group with *fruta* one might place *arroz* ‘rice,’ *locura* ‘madness,’ or *verdad* ‘truth.’ It is suggested that the key factor in these two lexical classes is whether or not mass nouns quantifiers allow for paraphrases with size adjectives; that is, *mucho dolor* = *dolor grande* ‘much pain = a big pain.’ See also Marandin (2008, 2010) on other aspects of this relationship. Notice that an explanation of the pattern in (12a) along these lines does not necessarily imply that *qué dolor* receives a quantitative reading, but rather that qualitative readings in these cases (as in *severe pain*) cannot be sharply distinguished from quantitative interpretations (as in *much pain*). An argument in support of this conclusion³ comes from the fact that paraphrases with «*Qué de N*», restrictive to quantitative readings, are rejected in the pattern in (12a), but allowed in that of (12b). This implies that the qualitative reading can then be preserved in (12a) if the extreme values applicable to the noun denotation are expressed through seize adjectives, since these adjectives are used to grade intensity, not just size.⁴ The fact that the equivalences in (12a) do not hold for questions may be seen as a simple consequence of the fact that widening processes do not hold for them either.

How are then qualitative exclamative *wh*-DPs, such as (8a), to be grammatically analyzed? Here are some possibilities:

- (13) a. We may suppose that *qué* is an inherently qualitative determiner. Octavio de Toledo and Sánchez López (2009) remark that Lat. *quantus* could be used in this way, as in *Quantus homo* ‘What a man!’ In this exclamative NP, *quantus* does not quantify

3. Thanks to C. Sánchez López for pointing it out to me (personal communication).

4. An independent question, not addressed here, is when exactly are “*qué-N*” exclamatives allowed to receive polarized interpretations. Notice that (8a) is about a wonderful or an awful house, and (8b) is about juicy or rotten fruit, but (12a) is not about some mild pain, nor is *qué injusticia* (in the b group) about some minor injustice.

homo, but qualifies it, then highlighting a number of implicit non-standard properties that therefore make someone outstanding as a singular individual. Exclamative *cuál* ‘which’ had this very meaning in Old Spanish (RAE-ASALE, § 22.14h).

- b. We may interpret a silent qualitative determiner. In present-day Peruvian Spanish, (8a) alternates with *¡Qué tal casa!* (lit. “what such house”), a variant also registered in Old Spanish (RAE-ASALE, 2009, § 22.14v; Octavio de Toledo & Sánchez López, 2009). The qualitative determiner *tal* ‘such’ is, then, parallel to the quantitative *tan* ‘so much.’
- c. We may suppose that the qualitative interpretation is obtained through a silent measure coda with *tan* ‘so much’ or *más* ‘more,’ plus an elative adjective that is contextually determined, since (8a) is equivalent to *¡Qué casa {tan/más} + ADJ!*

Notice that option (13a) places the proper interpretation of the wh-word in the lexicon, whereas the two other analyses locate it in the syntax. Option (13b), suggested in Octavio de Toledo and Sánchez López (2009), is particularly interesting. It somehow reproduces Zanuttini and Portner’s (2003) idea that a hidden high degree modifier is present (in fact, optional) in exclamative sentences such as *How (very) long this bridge is!*, an option not available for interrogatives (**How very long this bridge is?*). An additional indirect argument for (13b) is the free omission of *tal* in present-day standard wh-qualitative questions in Spanish, as in *¿Qué (tal) tiempo hace?* ‘How’s the weather?’

Sáez’s (this volume) analysis of (8a) is as follows

(14) [_{DEGP} Qué [_{DEG°} e] [_{ORP} Ø [casa]]]

In (14), *qué* occupies the specifier of a Degree projection headed by *e*. This is Zanuttini and Porter’s (2003) exclamative operator, that is, the operator that these authors associate with the specific illocutionary force of exclamatives. Ø in (14) is a measure quantifier oriented in polar opposite directions, such as those implied by *mucho* ‘much’ vs. *poco* ‘little.’

Notice that the lexical solution in (13a) might be reduced to (13b)—or some variety of it—if we suppose that all that makes them different is whether the information corresponding to the wh- and the qualitative (measure) projections is separated in the syntax or conflated in the lexicon.⁵

5. In any case, identification of the relevant non-standard required properties of qualified nouns is not a straightforward matter. One might guess that these properties include exoticism

As for solution (13c), which does not necessarily imply an unrecoverable ellipsis, it provides a good paraphrase of these expressions, as Anscombe (2013) argued for French. In RAE-ASALE (2009, § 42.13l) it is suggested that *¡Qué vestido tan bonito!* and *¡Qué bonito vestido!* (both ‘What a nice dress!’) are derivationally related, since the latter might contain a \emptyset variant of *tan* ‘such.’ There is another interesting contact point between (13b) and (13c). As Sáez (this volume) argues, the measure complement in (15a) is headed by a false comparative. In fact, quantificational degree words such as *tan* ‘such’ and *más* ‘more’ may be omitted here, with a certain range of historical and dialectal variation:

- (15) a. *¡Qué obra {tan/más} maravillosa!* [Standard Spanish]
 ‘What a marvelous work!’
 b. *¡Qué obra maravillosa!* [Classical Spanish; also many varieties of American Spanish and present-day European literary Spanish]
 ‘What a marvelous work!’
 c. **¡Qué {tan/más} maravillosa obra!* [All dialects]
 ‘What a marvelous work!’
 d. *¡Qué maravillosa obra!* [Standard Spanish]
 ‘What a marvelous work!’

Numerous examples of the pattern in (15b) with relative adjectives, such as *¡Qué sitio deprimente!* ‘What a depressing place’ or *¡Qué idea absurda!* ‘What an absurd idea!’, are attested in RAE-ASALE (2009, § 22.13w), Carbonero Cano (1990), and Casas (2005), among others. Non-relative adjectives (as in *¡Qué cosa rara!* ‘What a strange thing’) are less common in this pattern, but also possible in certain geographical varieties.

Sáez (this volume) argues that *más* receives no interpretation in (15a) and behaves as a last-resort item inserted in order to support ϵ (the exclamative operator). According to this analysis, the DP with *más/tan* cannot be

for countries in (ia), but the verbal predicate is a crucial deciding factor, since exoticism is not the required property in (ib):

- (i) a. *¡Qué países visitas en vacaciones!*
 ‘What countries you usually visit on vacation!’
 b. *¡Qué países se endeudan en estos tiempos!*
 ‘What countries get into debt nowadays!’

Arguably, “non-standardness” is all the grammar needs to build qualitative wh-phrases, so that its specific realization will depend on pragmatic variables relative to world knowledge. See Zanuttini and Portner (2003) and Rett (2008, 2009) on these issues.

preposed, since ϵ is properly identified by its overt specifier *qué*. On the possibility that the *wh*-word may be null in some qualitative *wh*-exclamative DPs, as in *¡Cosa más rara!* ‘What a strange thing!’ see Alonso-Cortés (1999b, p. 54).

4.2. OTHER PHRASAL EXCLAMATIVES

DP phrasal exclamatives may be headed by *vaya* ‘what a’ with no inflection, as well as a number of grammaticalized but fully inflected qualifying adjectives acting as exclamative determiners: *menudo* (lit. ‘small’), *valiente* (lit. ‘courageous’), *bonito* (lit. ‘nice’), etc. For a longer list, see Casas (2005, pp. 148ff.), who calls them *ironic adjectives*.

- (16) a. *¡Vaya casa!*
 ‘What a house!’
 b. *¡Menudo chasco!*
 ‘What a big disappointment!’
 c. *¡Valiente mequetrefe!*
 ‘S/he is such a pipsqueak!’

These exclamative words behave as qualifying determiners (such as Lat. *quantus* or Old Spanish *cuál*), rather than quantifiers. In fact, *vaya* does not quantify over houses in (16a), just as Eng. *what* does not do so in its English counterpart. As we have seen, qualifiers may indirectly be seen as degree words, insofar as they call for the highest or the lowest values of properties in implicit scales. The phrases in (16) are root exclamatives (§ 5.2). The fact that they reject subordination is an argument against the idea that these determiners are *wh*-items:

- (17) a. *¡Vaya lata es eso!*
 ‘What a nuisance that is!’
 b. **Sé muy bien vaya lata es eso.*
 ‘I know quite well what a nuisance that is.’

The syntactic projections of the exclamative words in (16) do not quite coincide. Only *vaya* optionally allows for indefinite NPs, as in *Vaya (una) casa* ‘What a house.’ Sáez (this volume) argues that *a/una* occupies the place of the exclamative operator ϵ in these expressions. *Vaya* precedes nouns, but in the Spanish of Asturias and León (northern Spain) it allows for adjectives

(¡*Vaya caro!* ‘How expensive!’) and adverbs (¡*Vaya despacio!* ‘How slowly!’). It does not inflect, but it allows for plural nominals, as the adjectives in (16) do. It differs from them in admitting interposed adjectives, a property shared by *wh*-words (Tirado, 2013, 2015a, 2015b):

- (18) ¡{*Vaya*/**Menuda*} *curiosa coincidencia!*
 ‘What a curious coincidence!’

On the behavior of these phrases in exclamative sentences, see § 5.2. On the grammaticalization of *vaya* (a subjunctive form of the verb *ir* ‘go’), see Octavio de Toledo (2001–2002) and Tirado (2015b). On other properties of the exclamative words in (16), and the paradigm they constitute, see Sancho Cremades (2001–2002, 2008), Casas (2005), Rodríguez Ramalle (2008a, 2008b, 2011), Escandell-Vidal and Leonetti (2014), Tirado (2013, 2015a, 2015b), and Gutiérrez-Rexach and Andueza (this volume).

5. Sentential Exclamatives

5.1. WH-EXCLAMATIVES AND RELATED STRUCTURES

5.1.1. *Wh-Exclamatives*

Wh-sentential exclamatives are exclamative sentences built with *wh*-words and phrases moved at the specifier of some position at the left periphery. As opposed to English *wh*-exclamatives, their Spanish counterparts require *V*-preposing, a property shared by focus fronting. A well-known characteristic of root Spanish *wh*-exclamatives, rejected by their interrogative counterparts, is the fact that they apparently display doubly filled COMPs on an optional basis, as in (19):

- (19) a. ¡Qué bien (que) canta María!
 ‘How well M. sings!’
 b. ¡Qué raro (que) eres!
 ‘How strange you are!’

There is no disagreement on the fact that (19) involves *wh*-movement, but no consensus exists on the specific projection targeted by the *wh*-phrase in these structures. The main alternatives are presented in (20):

- (20) a. The *wh*-phrase moves to Spec/CP: Bosque (1984a), Brucart (1994), and Masullo (2012); also Castroviejo (2006, 2007) for the Catalan counterparts of (19).
 b. The *wh*-phrase moves to Spec/FocusP: Hernanz (2006) and Hernanz and Rigau (2006).
 c. The *wh*-phrase moves to Spec/CP₁, a low CP under CP₂: Zanuttini and Portner (2003) for Italian.
 d. *Wh*-phrases are split, as in Kayne's (1994) analysis of relatives: Gutiérrez-Rexach (2008).

The analysis in (20d) requires some clarification. Gutiérrez-Rexach extends Kayne's (1994) anti-symmetric analysis of relatives to exclamatives. This means that *qué bien* 'how well' or *qué raro* 'how strange' are not syntactic constituents in (19). Just as a D° head selects for a CP in Kayne's well-known analysis of relatives and the internal NP is the operator that moves out of IP and reaches Spec/CP, *bien* and *raro* are moved from their propositional constituent, so that *wh*-phrases split along the derivation. The four options in (20) are depicted in (21):

- (21) a. [_{CP} [_{WH-DEGP} *qué bien*] [_{C'} [_{C°} *que* [_{IP} *canta María* [_{WH-DEGP} *e . . .*]]]]]
 b. [_{FOCUSP} [_{WH-DEGP} *qué bien*] [_{FOC'} [_{FOC°} *que* [_{FINP} *canta María* [_{WH-DEGP} *e . . .*]]]]]
 c. [_{CP₂} [_{WH-DEGP} *qué bien*] [_{C'} [_{C°} [_{CP₁} [_{C'} [_{C°} *que* [_{IP} *canta María* [_{WH-DEGP} *e . . .*]]]]]]]]]
 d. [_{FORCEP} [_{WH-DEGP} *qué_i*] [_{FORCE'} [_{FOCUSP/DEGP°} [_{e_i}] *bien*] [_{TOPICP'} *que* *canta María* [_{WH-ADVP} *e . . .*]]]]]

In none of these structures does a syntactic relation hold between the *wh*-phrase and the indicative mood of the verb. Bosque (1984a) compares (19a) with its subjunctive counterpart, *¡Qué bien que cante María!* 'How nice (that) M. is singing!', and argues that the interpretive difference follows from the predicative or binomial structure (§ 5.4) of the latter, since predicates select the mood of their sentential arguments. See Casas (2004, 2005) on other aspects of the optionality of *que* in (20).

In all the exclamatives above some *wh*-phrase moves as a whole, with the exception of (20d), where *qué bien* still has to be considered a constituent in regard to coordination processes. Apparently, the possibility exists that *wh*-exclamative phrases are overtly split in syntax. This might happen when the *wh*-word preposes, leaving the rest of the phrase behind. But some

doubts persist on the existence of this splitting process. First of all, two main varieties of these (apparently split) *wh*-exclamatives may be recognized. Both involve *cómo* ‘how much’ and adjectives and adverbs. The first pattern is illustrated in (22):

- (22) a. ¡Cómo eres bella!
 ‘How beautiful you are!’
 b. ¡Cómo es grande mi pueblo! (M. Viezzer [Bolivia, 1977], CREA)
 ‘How big my town is!’
 c. ¡Oh, cómo canta bien y sabe bien italiano! (J. de Pasamonte
 [1605], CORDE)
 ‘How well s/he sings and knows Italian!’

The type in (22), widespread in Old Spanish, is still alive in some literary variants of American Spanish. See Octavio de Toledo and Sánchez López (2009) for examples, as well as for other comments on the history of this pattern. This is the unmarked form in present-day French (*Comme tu est belle!*) and Italian (*Come sei bella!*).

The second pattern is standard in European Spanish and less common in present-day American Spanish:

- (23) a. ¡Cómo eres de bella!
 ‘How beautiful you are!’
 b. ¡Cómo canta de bien!
 ‘How well s/he sings!’

Although it is tempting to see (22) as extraposed *wh*-exclamatives (more specifically, as instances of a *wh*-word moved out of an AP), the fact that *cómo* ‘how’ is not a *wh*-degree word for APs (**¡Cómo bella eres!* ‘How beautiful you are!’) is an argument against this option. This analysis could be applied to old variants of (22) with *cuánto*, instead of *cómo*, as in (24):

- (24) *Quánto fue engañado aquel hombre* (J. de Ortega [1512], CORDE)
 ‘How deceived that man was!’

In Bosque (1984a, 1984b) it is suggested that *wh*-exclamative words in (22) might be VP adjuncts instead of degree modifiers inside APs. VP adjuncts of this sort in present-day Spanish include *hasta qué punto* ‘to what extent.’ Interestingly, *mucho* ‘much’ was freely focalized in Old Spanish in similar

contexts, as in (25a), and still is in some varieties of oral speech, mostly with ironic interpretations, as in (25b):

- (25) a. Mucho es desseado de aquella que lo ha menester (Anonymous [1522], CORDE)
 ‘He is very much desired by she who needs him’
 b. ¡Mucho estás tú en crisis!⁶
 ‘No doubt you are in a deep crisis, for sure!’

To all this one may add that cases are found of focalized *mucho* displaying a lack of nominal agreement in Old Spanish: if (26) were an instance of focal movement out of an NP, the feminine *mucha* would be expected.

- (26) Mucho es marauilla (Anonymous [1470], CORDE)
 ‘This is most wonderful.’

5.1.2. Definite Article Degree Exclamatives

It has been traditionally recognized that there is a close link between wh-sentential exclamatives and “definite article degree exclamatives” (DADEs), sometimes also called “degree relatives” and “exclamatives with emphatic articles.” These are exclamatives headed by a definite determiner followed by a projection denoting degree or amount. DADEs may vary according to the categorial features of the degree projection they host, which may optionally admit modifiers. Possible hosted categories are nouns (27a), adjectives (27b), adverbs (27c), and prepositions (27d):

- (27) a. ¡Los (incontables) sitios que ha visitado este hombre!
 ‘The (innumerable) places that this man has visited!’
 b. ¡Lo (muy) inteligente que es María!
 ‘How very clever M. is!’
 c. ¡Lo (increíblemente) rápido que va este coche!
 ‘How (incredibly) fast this car runs!’
 d. Vergüenza por lo tan para poco que hemos sido (*El Diario.es* 02/06/2014)
 ‘We should be ashamed of how unimportant we have been!’

6. Quoted from <http://www.spaniards.es/foros/2009/04/14/oslo-nos-espera-un-sitio-donde-dormir-help>

As seen in (27a), the definite article agrees with the noun; for all other cases, the neuter article *lo* is picked up. The possibility exists that the neuter determiner *lo* alone covers the degree information provided by the quantified phrase as a whole, since neuter pronouns may be arguments and adjuncts:

- (28) a. ¡Lo que me ha dicho!
 ‘The things s/he has said to me!’
 b. ¡Lo que es María!
 ‘What a person M. is!’
 c. ¡Lo que corre este coche!
 ‘How fast this car runs!’

It is important to keep in mind that some high or extreme value must necessarily be interpreted in (27) and (28), even if optional modifiers are absent. There is, thus, no appreciable difference between the two variants in (29):

- (29) No sabes lo (mucho) que te lo agradezco.
 ‘You can’t imagine how much I appreciate this.’

The main properties of DADEs are pointed out in most general descriptions of Spanish exclamatives (Alonso-Cortés, 1999a, 1999b; RAE-ASALE, 2009, § 42.16; see also Casas, 2005; González Calvo, 1984–1988), as well as in the previous grammatical tradition summarized therein. Root DADEs are only exclamative, but their subordinate counterparts may be propositional complements selected by predicates taking indirect questions (as in [30a], not addressed here), or indirect exclamatives, as in (30b). They are rejected by predicates that select for neither one, as in (30c):⁷

- (30) a. Eso depende de lo bien que se porte.
 ‘That depends on how well s/he behaves.’
 b. Es curioso lo bien que se porta.
 ‘It is curious how well s/he behaves.’
 c. *Creo lo bien que se porta.
 ‘I believe how well s/he behaves.’

7. Factive non-wh-readings are also possible, but they will not be considered here:

- (i) De {lo que bien que trabaja/*qué bien trabaja} se deduce que la contratarán enseguida.
 ‘One may deduce that she will be hired soon from the fact that she works so well’

DADEs do not exactly contain *wh*-phrases, but some A' degree operator on extreme degrees/amounts must be an essential part of their syntactic structure, as argued by Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996, 1999, 2001, 2008). In fact, this operator licenses parasitic gaps, as Torrego (1988) observed:

- (31) ¡Los libros que ha devuelto sin haber leído!
 'How many books s/he has returned without reading!'

The interpretation of DADEs is subject to categorial variables. DADEs built out of count nouns receive qualitative readings, as in (32a). DADEs built out of mass and plural nouns are ambiguous between qualitative and quantitative interpretations. That is, (32b) is about some noteworthy brand or variety of champagne, or rather about some extremely high amount of champagne:

- (32) a. ¡La noche que he pasado!
 'What a rough night I've had!'
 b. ¡El champán que bebe Juan!
 'The champagne that J. (usually) drinks!'

On this ambiguity see Grosu and Landman (1998), Neelman et al. (2004), and Szczegielniak (2012). The variant with "*la de +N*" selects for quantitative readings only. According to Torrego (1988), other quantitative readings require verb internal complements, that is, those of transitive or unaccusative verbs. Consequently, only the qualitative reading (i.e., the one referring to people of a certain kind) is available in (33), with a subject DP:

- (33) ¡La gente que te preocupa!
 'The people that worry you!'

One must add that the distinction between qualitative and quantitative readings of nominal DADEs may simply be impossible to draw in certain cases, namely whenever extreme properties of nominals are contextually interpreted in relation to high amounts, as happens in (34a). The difficulty to tell the interpretation of *cómo* 'how' and *cuánto* 'how much' exclamatives apart in certain cases provides a similar situation, as noted in § 6.1, below. Similar factors exclude qualitative readings, and favor quantitative ones, in a number of DADEs involving abstract mass nouns, as *razón* 'reason' in (34b):

- (34) a. No me explico el frío que hace.
 'I can't explain why it's so cold.'

- b. ¡La razón que tenía mi abuela!
 ‘How right my grandmother was!’

As regards the syntactic analysis of DADEs, most proposals attempt to relate them to the patterns in (20), even if C° must be always overt in DADEs, as opposed to *wh*-exclamatives. Brucart (1994, p. 155) and Masullo (2012) suggest a variety of (21a) in which *lo fuertes* in (35) is placed at Spec/CP.

- (35) ¡Lo fuertes que son!
 ‘How strong they are!’

Zanutini and Portner’s (2003) analysis of the Paduan equivalent of (35) is like (21c), except for the fact that an operator, FACT, heads CP₁. Gutiérrez-Rexach (2008) extends the structure in (21d) to DADEs, so that *lo* and *fuertes* are separated in different projections, the former being placed at ForceP. Other extensions of Kayne’s (1994) anti-symmetric analysis of relatives to DADEs include Grosu and Landman (1998) and Kaneko (2008), the latter for French.

5.2. FOCAL AND POLARITY EXCLAMATIVES

We saw that, strictly speaking, focus movement is not bound to primary exclamatives. In fact, it is possible inside relative clauses, as in (36a), which (arguably) involve no ForceP (but see [58] below). Focus preposing may also be a cyclic movement, as in (36b), as opposed to exclamative *wh*-preposing (§ 6.4), and it does not have to be associated with degree quantification, as shown in (36c):

- (36) a. Un libro que a mucha gente habría hecho pensar.
 ‘A book that would have made many people think.’
 b. Un poco más de paciencia me parece a mí que necesitas tú.
 ‘A bit of patience is what it seems to me you need.’
 c. Este elijo.
 ‘I choose this one.’

But other factors make focalized exclamatives behave as primary exclamatives, according to the classification in (5). First, quantifiers such as *mucho* ‘much’ or *poco* ‘little,’ together with exclamative adjectives such as those in (16), give rise to rhetorical and ironic readings that cannot be reduce to simple cases of focus preposing:

- (37) a. ¡Mucho te interesa a ti la sintaxis!
 ‘You are not very into syntax, are you?’
 b. ¡Menudo explorador estás tú hecho!
 ‘You look like such a good explorer!’

Many more examples of this pattern are provided in Casas (2005), Hernanz (2001, 2006), and Andueza (2011). These are rhetorical exclamatives because they introduce evaluations almost exactly opposed to the ones they express. One way to account for this fact, following Andueza (2011) and Andueza and Gutiérrez-Rexach (2011), is to suppose that reversed interpretations associated with irony are triggered by a negative operator with scope over the degree phrase. From a different perspective, Escandell Vidal and Leonetti (2014) associate these effects to those of the so-called *verum focus*. In their view, rhetorical exclamatives crucially hinge on the magnifying effect of emphasis, more specifically the hyperbolic meaning triggered by the propositional scope of *verum focus*. Interestingly, ironic interpretations in standard wh-exclamatives may be subject to some calculus, as in ¡*Qué oportuno ha sido tu comentario!* ‘How timely your comment was!’ so that the speaker’s intended inference might fail or be missed.

There is also a close link between rhetorical exclamatives, as those in (37), and the “doubly filled COMP effects” characteristic of wh-exclamatives, as in the ones we saw in (19). As in that pattern, overt C° may be optionally present with preposed exclamative adjectives, as well as phrases built out of *bueno* ‘good,’ *bien* ‘well,’ *mucho* ‘much,’ *poco* ‘little,’ and similar degree expressions:

- (38) a. ¡Menudo sinvergüenza (que) está hecho!
 ‘What a crook he is!’
 b. ¡Poco (que) te gusta a ti el chocolate!
 ‘No doubt you like chocolate!’
 c. ¡En buenos líos (que) me metes!
 ‘You always get into such a big trouble!’
 d. ¡Vaya cosas (que) dices!
 ‘What absurd things you say!’

Hernanz and Rigau (2006) locate these instances of *que* as heads of a FocusP. Notice that this projection cannot be identified with the one typically associated with focus movement, since the latter requires C° to be empty:

- (39) a. ¡Eso mismo (*que) pienso yo!
 ‘That’s exactly what I think!’
 b. ¡Un buen helado (*que) me tomaría yo ahora!
 ‘I could go for a good ice-cream now.’

As opposed to the patterns in (38)–(39), C° must be overt in two exclamative types:

- 1) Evidential exclamatives.
- 2) Emphatic polarity exclamatives.

Evidential exclamatives are constructed with modal adverbs and adjectives. See Rodríguez Ramalle (2008a, 2008b, 2008c, 2011), Andueza (2011), and Andueza and Gutiérrez-Rexach (2011):

- (40) a. ¡Naturalmente que tienes razón!
 ‘Of course you are right!’
 b. ¡Claro que ella lo sabía!
 ‘Of course she knew!’

This exclamative type is somehow paradoxical: on the one hand, it cannot be reduced to a binomial exclamative (§ 5.4.), as Rodríguez Ramalle has convincingly argued. On the other hand, evidential words in (40) seem to be predicates of propositional arguments. In fact, Andueza and Gutiérrez-Rexach (2011) argued that evidential exclamatives crucially hinge on the idea that the speaker explicitly rejects possible doubts of their propositional content. As regards their syntactic analysis, perhaps the predicative relation may be established within a low small clause, before the evidential items reach ForceP—the place where Hernanz and Rigau (2006) locate them.

“Emphatic polarity exclamatives” is the label that Batllori and Hernanz (2009, 2013) give to exclamatives formed with a left peripheral emphatic particle, such as *sí* ‘yes’ and *bien* ‘well’ (see also Hernanz, 2007).

- (41) a. ¡Sí que tiene María prisa!
 ‘M. sure is in a hurry!’
 b. ¡Bien que te has divertido!
 ‘No doubt, you’ve had fun!’

Some emphatic particles allow for focal interpretations when associated with IP or VP in Spanish. For example, *sí* behaves as a contrastive focus marker (Martínez Álvarez, 1997; González Rodríguez, 2007b, 2009), and *bien* is a manner adverb.

Exclamatives in 2) require V-preposing, as all focus movement structures do in Spanish, and they are not compatible with negation, whether expletive or not (§ 6.6), or subordination (6.5). Crucially, emphatic polarity exclamatives are also subject to the effect that RAE-ASALE (2009, § 42.15ñ-p) calls *cuantificación a distancia* ‘quantification at a distance’ (QD). This refers to the fact that degree expressions contained in emphatic polarity exclamatives reject *in situ* quantifiers, since the initial emphatic particle (or maybe the null operator in its specifier) provide that information.

- (42) a. ¡Sí que tiene María (*mucho) prisa!
 ‘Of course M. is in a real hurry!’
 b. ¡Bien que te has divertido (*bastante)!
 ‘You have sure had a real good time!’

QD effects may be captured either by overt movement of these emphatic particles from low degree projections (which amounts to taking them as proper degree quantifiers) or by associating them with operators binding degree variables at some distance in local environments. Battlori and Hernanz (2013) argue that, besides focus, force, and degree projections, a polarity projection must be involved in these cases, arguably below focus phrase.⁸

8. In any case, there is no consensus on what exclamative particles compose this paradigm. *Ya* seems to be a good candidate, but it does not exhibit QD effects, as shown in (ia). *Vaya* is another potential candidate. It is subject to these effects (as observed in RAE-ASALE, 2009, § 42.15ñ), but it is also compatible with expletive negation, as in (ib):

- (i) a. ¡Ya quisiera yo ser muy rico!
 ‘No doubt I’d like to be very rich!’
 b. ¡Vaya que no has tenido suerte!
 ‘You sure have been lucky!’
 c. ¡Mira que Juan es tonto!
 ‘J. is so dumb!’

Mira displays QD effects and does not reject expletive negation, but it does not require V- preposing, perhaps because it is not an emphatic particle but a mirative one (Sánchez López, 2014b; see also Ocampo, 2009; Gutiérrez-Rexach & Andueza, this volume).

5.3. MATRIX COMPLEMENTIZER EXCLAMATIVES

A large number of papers, written from various formal and functional perspectives, address non-wh matrix exclamatives headed by the complementizers *que* ‘that’ and unstressed *si* ‘that, if’ in Spanish (not to be confused with stressed *sí*). Matrix complementizer exclamatives (MCE, hereafter) may fit within so-called *embedded root phenomena* (Heycock, 2006) or *insubordination structures* (Evans, 2007). These cover particular interpretations of subordinate sentences when used in main contexts. Some specific connection of the head complementizer with the appropriate Force or Mood projections seems to be necessary, since these sentences may express reports, quotations, evaluations, and replies in rather subtle ways, as well as some forms of degree quantification in a restricted number of cases.

Non-exclamative sentences headed by matrix C will not be addressed here. The simplest formal classification of MCEs is as follows (a “*que + si*” option might be added, but it will not be considered here, since it seems to be compositional):

- (43) a. *Que* + indicative.
 b. *Que* + subjunctive.
 c. *Si* + indicative.
 d. *Si* + subjunctive.

Type (43a) corresponds to sentences such as (44), often called “reportative” or “quotative” (Etxepare, 2007, 2008, 2010):

- (44) ¡Que son las diez!
 ‘Hey, it’s ten o’clock already!’

Even so, these general meanings allow for a wide range of related interpretations, going from mere notification to reminding or warning. Reportative *que* is considered to be an evidential marker in Rodríguez Ramalle (2008a, 2008b) and Demonte and Soriano (2013). The latter authors argue that the pattern in (43a) may correspond to either an echoic structure or a quotative one, with a number of syntactic differences. Porroche (1998a, 1998b) argues that it has also an argumentative value, since it may be used by the speaker in order to emphasize the contextual relevance of the exclamative’s propositional content, not necessarily its novelty, as in (45a):

- (45) a. ¡Que ha venido Marta!
 ‘Martha is finally here!’
 b. Vamos, que no quieres venir.
 ‘So, it’s just that you don’t want to come.’

Gras (2013, 2016) suggests that (45b) exhibits a “connective interpretation,” which might be considered a variety of the quotative reading in which the speaker introduces a personal reformulation of a preceding discourse. On these and other aspects on the pattern in (43a) see also Pons (2003), Casas (2005), Biezma (2007), and Rodríguez Ramalle (2007a, 2011).

The MCE type in (43b) allows for four variants: (1) an evaluative one, with rising final intonation, as in (46a); (2) a quotative or echoic reading, reporting someone else’s instructions or commands, as in (46b); (3) an optative or desiderative interpretation, as in (46c); and (4) a directive reading, as in (46d):

- (46) a. ¡Que tenga yo que aguantar esto!
 ‘I can’t believe I have to put up with this!’
 b. ¡Que no tardes!
 ‘(Remember,) Don’t you be late!’
 c. ¡Que te diviertas!
 ‘Have a good time!’
 d. ¡Que pasen!
 ‘Let them come in!’

Compound tenses are allowed in the first three types. As pointed out by Sánchez López (2015a, 2015b) only the type in (46a) is factive, since it expresses the speaker’s feeling (almost always negative) on a present or past attested fact. Although desirable on theoretical grounds, it is hard to subsume (46c) and (46d) into a single optative interpretation. On this issue and some other aspects of the readings distinguished in (46), see Dumitrescu (1998), Garrido Medina (1999), Sansiñena, Cornillie, and De Smet (2013), and Sansiñena, De Smet, and Cornillie (2015). Sánchez López (this volume) argues that hypotheses that postulate a hidden main predicate of propositional attitude face a number of difficulties to overcome.

Type (43c) may be subdivided in two varieties. The first one is exemplified in (47):

- (47) a. ¡Si estoy callado!
 ‘But I am quiet!’

- b. ¡Si es una maravilla!
 ‘But this is awesome!’

This variety introduces a justification in a reply or a possible (counter) argumentative reinforcement of the speaker’s position (Contreras, 1960; Porroche, 1998a, 1998b; Schwenter, 1996, 1999, 2012; Montolío, 1999a, 1999b). Sánchez López (2015a, 2015b) argues that it may involve scalarity as well, since by uttering (47b) the speaker rejects all possible alternatives located below some implicit point. This suggests an extension of Zanuttini and Portner’s (2003) widening process to situations (somehow as in the *declarative exclamatives* above), even if the sentence contains no *wh*-word.

The second variety of the pattern in (43c) involves QD, interpreted as explained above:

- (48) a. ¡Si será Juan tonto!
 ‘J. is so dumb!’
 b. ¡Si habrá escrito libros este hombre!
 ‘He’s sure written tons of books!’

That is, adjectives in this pattern reject overt degree modifiers (* . . . *muy tonto!*, in [48a]), and nominals must be bare (* . . . *muchos libros* in [48b]). Hernanz (2012) argues that in these sentences a null operator acting as a specifier of a FocusP headed by *si* binds a null degree or amount quantifier in its base position. Another feature, which she calls *irrealis*, is argued to be located in ForceP in order to provide the modal information (epistemic future or conditional) encoded in the verb’s inflexional morphology:

- (49) [_{FORCEP} [+irrealis] Op_i . . . [_{FOCUSP} Op_j *si* [_{FINP} Juan será_i [_{DEG} [e_j tonto]]]]]

One may add that the degree features associated with the null operator binding the degree variable seem to be shared by *tan(to)* ‘so much,’ since they are able to trigger consecutive degree complements headed by *que* ‘that,’ as in (50a). Grande Rodríguez and Grande Alija (2004) argue that *wh*-exclamatives have this very property, as in their example (50b):

- (50) a. ¡Si será Juan tonto que no se da cuenta de que le están tomando el pelo!
 ‘Juan must be so dumb to not realize that people are pulling his leg!’

- b. ¡Qué bien lo haría, que hasta le dieron un premio!
 ‘S/he did it so well that s/he was even given a prize!’

Finally, type (43d) is an optative pattern (therefore, it may be placed in group 5.6 as well), restricted to imperfect or pluperfect of the subjunctive mood. These are sometimes called “conditional exclamatives”:

- (51) ¡Si yo fuera rico!
 ‘If I were a rich man!’

Biezma (2011a, 2011b) argues that the structure in (51) is conditional, even if it contains no overt apodosis, a fact that strongly associates this pattern with that of suspended exclamatives (§ 5.6). In any case, conditional exclamatives do not fit in the pattern in (43c), as Sánchez López (this volume) argues, which introduces an asymmetry triggered by mood inflections.

Conditional exclamatives are also characterized in some languages by admitting the modifier *ONLY* in a non-restrictive interpretation (Rifkin, 2000), as in Eng. *If I only had time*. Spanish prefers *tan solo* (lit. “so much only”) in these contexts. Grosz (2011) argues that *only* locates the prepositional content in the lowest point of a supposed set of possible wishes; as a consequence, these become exclamative conditionals of minimum requirement. Interestingly, Sp. *tan solo* alternates with *al menos* ‘at least’ and (*tan*) *siquiera* ‘if . . . even’ in this pattern.

Since both *que* and *si* may give rise to optative interpretations in subjunctive MCEs, the natural question is how to tell them apart. Sánchez López (2015a, 2015b, this volume) argues that optative *que* expresses a feasible desire, therefore an eventuality that is not real but is compatible with the actual state of things; optative *si*, on the contrary, introduces a non-feasible or impossible desire. From a formal point of view, she argues (this volume) that both *que* and *si* are heads of a ForceP projection (whose specifier bears the exclamative operator) taking a subjunctive modal head.

5.4. BINOMIAL EXCLAMATIVES

Binomial exclamatives (BEs) may also be called “two-membered” (Sp. *bimembres*). They are further called “verbless clauses,” as in Gutiérrez-Rexach and González-Rivera (2013, 2014) or Munaro (2006). BEs are predicational

exclamatives containing a subject and a predicate. They may be subdivided into various groups, illustrated in (52):

- (52) a. ¡Un poco aburrido, tu amigo!
 ‘A little boring, this friend of yours!’
 b. ¡A la horca con ellos!
 ‘Send them to the gallows!’
 c. ¡Las patatas, que se queman!
 ‘The potatoes! They’re burning!’
 d. ¡Las maletas, junto al sofá!
 ‘The suitcases next to the sofa!’

As can be seen in (52), predicates precede subjects in types (52a) to (52c), but follow them in the rest. Type (52a) is the most studied of all BEs. As regards Spanish, see Bosque (1984a), Carbonero Cano (1990), Alonso-Cortés (1999a, 1999b), Hernanz and Suñer (1999), Casas (2005), González-Rivera (2011), and Gutiérrez-Rexach and González-Rivera (2013, 2014). On Italian, see Munaro (2006) and Benincà (1995); on French, see Henry (1953/1977), Vinet (1991), and Obenauer (1994); on Portuguese, see Sibaldo (2013).

Predicates in BEs of the type in (52a) may contain qualifying adjectives, indefinites DPs and *wh*-APs, as well as DPs built out of relatives and evaluative nouns, in Milner’s (1978) sense, such as *desastre* ‘disaster’ or *maravilla* ‘wonder.’ Some PPs are also possible predicates in this pattern, as in *De no perdérsela, esta película* ‘A must, that film!’ (Munaro, 2006). All of them must be individual level predicates. The possible subjects of these BEs are DPs (whether *wh*- or not) and CPs, including infinitivals, as in *¡Qué bien poder hablar de ello!* ‘How nice, to be able to talk about that!’⁹

The predication expressed in BEs of the type in (52a) involves a deictic interpretation bound to present time. As regards the syntactic analysis of these sentences, Sibaldo (2013) argues for Portuguese that they are root TP

9. Focal exclamatives bear a relationship to binomial exclamatives, but they are different structures. As indicated above, mood selection (subjunctive in [ib]) is crucial in binomial exclamatives with sentential subjects:

- (i) a. ¡Muy bien que hiciste! [FOCAL EXCLAMATIVE]
 ‘You sure did well!’
 b. ¡Muy bien, que hagas la compra! [BINOMIAL EXCLAMATIVE]
 ‘It’s great you are able to do the shopping!’

Evidential exclamatives are also related to BEs, as pointed out after (40).

phrases that behave as free small clauses. Gutiérrez-Rexach and González-Rivera (2013, 2014) claim that preposing of the predicate is triggered by a strong affective feature, which is checked at a focus projection.¹⁰

Example (52b) illustrates a discontinuous *a . . . con . . .* ‘to . . . with . . .’ optative reading. It is made up of a goal predicative PP (Hernanz & Suñer, 1999, p. 557) and a PP containing the predicational subject denoting the entity that the speaker wants to end up in some particular place.

Type (52c) corresponds to so-called “tetic exclamatives” (Kaneko, 2008, and references therein). These exclamatives express a non-standard (i.e., remarkable, unexpected, or worth noticing) present situation by associating a definite subject and a sentential predicate. This subject-predicate association is similar to the one found in so-called “pseudo-relatives,” as in *Lo vi que huía* ‘I saw him running away.’

Type (52d) resembles optative exclamatives (§ 5.6), since it introduces a location in which someone or something must be located according to the speaker’s orders.

5.5. SUSPENDED EXCLAMATIVES

Suspended exclamatives (SEs) exhibit final rising intonation. Some of them look like comparative and consecutive sentences lacking *que*-codas. Casas (2005, 2006) calls them *exclamativas truncadas* ‘truncated exclamatives,’ and Masullo (2012, this volume) names them “covert exclamatives.” SEs include *in situ* exclamative phrases built of five possible degree words: *tan(to)* ‘so much/many,’ *tal* ‘so much,’ *un(o)* ‘a,’ *cada* ‘each,’ and *más* ‘more.’ Here are some examples:

- (53) a. ¡Eres {tan/más} tonto . . . !
 ‘You are so dumb . . . !’
 b. ¡Había tal barullo . . . !
 ‘There was such a racket . . . !’
 c. ¡Juan dice unas tonterías . . . !
 ‘J. says such nonsense . . . !’

10. Apparently, sentences such as *¡Maldita la gracia que me hace salir ahora de casa!* ‘It’s no fun to have to go out now!’ belong to this pattern, but, strangely enough, the adjective *maldito* ‘curse’ seems to be able to precede a DP headed by an article, as in [. . .] *nadie se iba a enterar de maldita la cosa* (J. Sanchís Sinisterra, *Lope de Aguirre, traidor*, CREA). Perhaps this structure involves a syntactic amalgam, in Lakoff’s (1974) sense.

- d. ¡Se ve por ahí cada cosa . . . !
 ‘One sees so many weird things out there . . . !’

A null sixth degree quantifier may be added to these five options, according to Di Tullio (2004) and Masullo (this volume). In this variant, *de* precedes APs, DPs, and AdvPs and blocks any other possible overt quantifier:

- (54) a. ¡Llegó de (*muy) cansado . . . !
 ‘S/he arrived so very tired . . . !’
 b. ¡Sabe de (*tantas) cosas . . . !
 ‘S/he knows so many things . . . !’

Di Tullio (2004) suggests that a null quantifier immediately precedes the *de* PP in these cases and also that the immobilized indefinite article *una* (as in ¡Leyó *una de libros* . . . ! ‘S/he read so many books . . . !’) might occupy its place. Masullo (this volume) argues that the null quantifier or extreme degree, which takes *de* PPs as complements, is bound by an operator at the higher FocusP. He further shows that this binding process is subject to islands effects.

Even if consecutive *que*-codas are licensed in all these variants, as they are in (50), Casas (2005, pp. 72ff., pp. 109ff) and Di Tullio (2004) argue that SEs do not reduce to equality comparatives or consecutive structures. SEs exhibit other interesting properties. Krueger (1960) constitutes an in-depth description of Spanish and Catalan SEs from both diachronic and synchronic perspectives. See also Alonso-Cortés (1999a, § 62.2).

5.6. OPTATIVE EXCLAMATIVES

Optative sentences are a group of exclamatives that express vivid desires, then propositional attitudes on non-veridical or non-attested situations. Most refer to present or past states of affairs, the latter through compound tenses. Propositions denoting the situations being desired are not necessarily extreme (unlike the degree values associated with most exclamative sentences), but they are salient, prominent, or non-standard in the speaker’s personal view. Spanish optatives may be subdivided into three groups (Sánchez López, this volume):

- (55) a. Optatives with *quién* ‘who’
 b. Optatives with initial particles.
 c. Verb initial optatives.

Quién optatives (55a) are constructed with an imperfect or subjunctive pluperfect. As Sánchez López (2014a, this volume) remarks, *quién* agrees with the verb in 3rd person features, but the sentence necessarily encodes a desire of the speaker on a counterfactive situation:

- (56) a. ¡*Quién* fuera millonario!
 ‘Wish I were a millionaire!’
 b. ¡*Quién* hubiera estado allí!
 ‘Who would’ve been there!’

In her analysis, first-person features are linked to the intensional operator (after Grosz, 2011) expressing illocutionary force, whereas third-person features are provided by *quién* and reflected by the verb. Grosz (2011) argues that these optative utterances incorporate a mood head responsible for their counterfactive reading, as well as (arguably) their inflectional mood in some languages.

The initial optative particles to which (55b) refers are marked in italics in the examples in (57):

- (57) a. ¡*Si* yo fuera rico!
 ‘If I were a rich man.’
 b. ¡*Que* tengas suerte!
 ‘Luck be with you!’
 c. ¡*Así* se muera!
 ‘May s/he drop dead!’
 d. ¡*Ojalá* (que) termine pronto la crisis!
 ‘Wish the crisis would end soon!’

We have already seen the patterns in (57a) (= [43d]) and (57b) (= [43b]). *Así* ‘May, I wish’ is mostly restricted to curses; it forces V-preposing, unlike the other items in (57). *Ojalá* ‘I wish’ has the interesting property of being able to appear in subordinate clauses (RAE-ASALE, § 32.5q; Alonso-Cortés, 2011), as in (58a). Although *ojalá* may be an interjection in other contexts, it seems to be a modal adverb when heading an optative utterance (Alonso-Cortés, 2011; Sánchez López, this volume), but also when used in answers or replies. It is controversial whether illocutionary force holds in subordinate clauses, but examples such (58b) suggest that it might do so in certain cases:

- (58) a. Una película que ojalá te guste
 ‘A film that I hope you like.’
 b. El libro que te prometo leer.
 ‘The book that I promise you to read.’

As other optatives, the ones in (55b) are not counterfactive, unless constructed in subjunctive imperfect or pluperfect. The speaker who says *¡Ojalá haya aprobado!* ‘I hope I’ve passed’ is not presupposing that s/he has failed, but only expressing a vivid desire for this situation not to be true. In Sánchez López’s analysis (this volume), *ojalá* is moved to Spec/ForceP from a modal head. The optional complementizer that it allows for, as seen in (57d), is similar to those examined in (19) or (38).

Verb initial optatives (55c) present at least two varieties. In the first one, counterfactive pluperfects are used in recriminations, as in (59a), or in comments or remarks on missed opportunities, as in (59b):

- (59) a. *¡Te hubieras fijado!* [American Spanish]
 ‘You should have paid attention!’
 b. *¡Te hubieras divertido!*
 ‘You would’ve had fun!’
 c. *¡Haberte fijado!*
 ‘You should have paid attention!’

A variant of (59a) containing infinitive compound tenses, as in (59c), was argued to be an imperative in Bosque (1980b). This analysis was supported and developed by Vicente (2010) and Van Olmen (2014), and criticized by Biezma (2008, 2010), who takes all the patterns in (59) to be variants of *si* conditional counterfactuals. Counterfactive optatives with compound tenses allow for the pattern in (59a) as well, as in *¡Que se hubiera fijado!* ‘S/he should have paid attention!’

The second variety of (55c) corresponds to so-called “jussive mood,” also called “optative subjunctive” in the Spanish grammatical tradition after Bello (1847/1964).

- (60) a. *¡Tenga usted un buen día!*
 ‘Have a nice day!’
 b. *¡Haya paz!*
 ‘Let there be peace!’

- b. Supóngase una situación en la que . . .
 ‘Let us suppose a situation in which . . .’

On the grammatical properties of this pattern, see Sánchez López (this volume) and references therein.

6. Are Exclamatives Defective Structures? Syntactic and Semantic Constraints on Exclamatives

A number of constraints suggest that exclamative sentences are defective constructions. These constraints certainly exist, but they may be proven to be natural results of the defining characteristics of these utterances; namely, the denotation of extreme degrees, the widening process that *wh*-exclamative variables are subject to, the specific illocutionary force required by root exclamatives, and (arguably) factivity. The crossing of these features with the grammatical requirement of some syntactic structures, such as clefts, negative islands, and multiple questions, provides a plausible explanation for most of the restrictions found. Here is a sketchy presentation of the ways in which this interaction might take place.

6.1. FEWER EXCLAMATIVE *WH*-WORDS IN A DIFFERENT DISTRIBUTION

Most *wh*-interrogative words have exclamative counterparts. Exceptions include *quién* ‘who,’ *cuándo* ‘when,’ and *por qué* ‘why.’ According to Castroviejo (2006), Rett (2008), Andueza (2011), and Andueza and Gutiérrez-Rexach (2010, 2011), *wh*-exclamative operators are associated with degree variables, and these *wh*-words provide none. As a consequence, (61b) cannot be a legitimate *wh*-exclamation in which the speaker expresses his or her amazement at the hearer’s weird mealtimes. On the non-existence of this pattern, see also Casas (2005, pp. 71ff.):

- (61) a. ¡Cuánto comes!
 ‘How much you eat!’
 b. *¡Cuándo comes!
 ‘When you eat!’
 c. ¡A qué horas comes!
 ‘How strange your mealtimes are!’

- d. *¡Quién es Juan! [rhetorical question reading disregarded]
 ‘Who is J.’

Notice that (61c) represents no exception, since *qué horas* is a qualitative DP, not a *wh*-adverb. One may find apparent exceptions to this generalization and also some (arguably) true ones. Apparent exceptions include rhetorical questions, often written between exclamative orthographic symbols. In this particular reading, (61d) is grammatical, as indicated, and so are the sentences in (62):

- (62) a. ¡Quién me iba a decir a mí que estaría hoy aquí!
 ‘Who could have told me that I would be here today!’
 b. ¡Por qué no te callas!
 ‘Why don’t you shut up!’
 c. ¡Adónde vamos a llegar!
 ‘How far are we going with this?’

See Castroviejo (2006) for similar examples. These rhetorical questions lack an intended answer, but they do not become exclamative utterances as a consequence of this (Escandell-Vidal, 1984, 1989; Gutiérrez-Rexach, 1998; Alonso-Cortés, 1999a, 1999b). Other possible apparent exceptions include optatives, fully compatible with *quién*, as seen in (56). This might follow from the fact that the subject *quién* in counterfactual optatives is exceptionally licensed through the person features provided by an exclamative operator, according to Sánchez López (2014a, 2016, this volume).

True exceptions include sentences such as (63). For similar examples, see Michaelis and Lambrecht (1996), Michaelis (2001), Casas (2005, p. 71), and Sánchez López (2014a).

- (63) a. Pero ¡quién viene a verme!
 ‘But look who’s coming to see me!’
 b. Es curioso quién protesta ahora.
 ‘It’s funny who is complaining now!’

Notice that if no *wh*-indirect exclamative is present in (63b), there is no place for this structure in the grammar, since this sentence contains no indirect question. In any case, the potential exclusion of *quién/ quiénes* ‘who’ from the paradigm of exclamatives needs some clarification, since paraphrases of these items with nouns such as *personas* ‘persons,’ *individuos* ‘individuals,’

or *gente* ‘people’ constitute possible wh-exclamative phrases. One may argue that this paradox is similar to the contrast in (61b–61c). It relies on the fact that interrogative *quién* or *qué gente* attempt to identify a variable in a certain context, whereas their exclamative counterparts search for no one. Qualitative exclamative wh-phrases such as *qué individuos* or *qué gente* provide a set of implicit non-standard properties for those nouns. The range of the variable bound by *quién* is “person,” but this sublexical information is (apparently) not accessible for the syntax (maybe for reasons related to lexical integrity), and no set of extreme properties is built for exclamative *quién*.

But another option exists. We may also suppose that individuals may be ranked in scales according to contextually salient properties (on this view, see Michaelis & Lambrecht, 1996; Michaelis, 2001; Sánchez Lopez, 2014a). This option provides a place for (63b), since *quién* is allowed in the paradigm of wh-exclamatives. It must be restricted, in any case, and may be parametrized, since, as Nouwen and Chernilovskaya (2013) show, remarkable differences among languages exist as regards these uses.

Lexical restrictions extend to other wh-exclamative words. The wh-adverb *cuánto* ‘how much/many’ is the only wh-word that admits the superlative suffix *-ísimo* (*cuantísimo* ‘how very much’), again restricted to exclamatives (a fact that nicely fits in Zanuttini and Portner’s widening theory). It is also the only bare wh-exclamative accepting the doubly filled COMP analyzed in § 5.1.1:

- (64) a. ¡Cómo (*que) canta!
 ‘How s/he sings!
 b. ¡Cuánto (que) trabaja!
 ‘How much s/he works!

The contrasts between exclamative *cómo* and *cuánto* may be addressed from various perspectives. Rett (2009) argues that *how* questions may ask about either manner or evaluation, as in *How does Buck ride his horse?* Manner-*how* roughly means “in what specific manner,” and evaluation-*how* equals “how well.” On the contrary, exclamative-*how* only allows for the second reading. See also Wiese (2003) and Gutiérrez-Rexach and Andueza (this volume) on this difference.

We might add that “how” and “how much” exclamatives do not seem to be able to differentiate these two interpretations in some situations: if extreme manners of doing something exist, then the pragmatic scales relevant to identify them may not be distinguished from the values provided by adverbs denoting highest or lowest grades for event evaluation according

to properness or standardness. In Bosque (1984a, 1984b) it is observed that *cómo* ‘how’ and *cuánto* ‘how much’ may be interchangeable in some exclamatives, whether direct or indirect, but not in interrogatives:

- (65) a. ¡{Cómo/cuánto} te gusta el arroz! [*synonymous*]
 ‘How much you like rice!’
 b. ¿{Cómo/cuánto} te gusta el arroz? [*non-synonymous*]
 ‘{How/How much} do you like rice?’

It is suggested there that root exclamations about manners, such as *¡Qué manera de llover!* ‘What a way to rain!’ come close to exclamations about amounts or degrees. The pattern in (65a) is mainly restricted to change of state and psychological verbs (see Rodríguez Espiñeira, 1996, § 4r for corpus examples), as well as measure verbs (*costar* ‘cost’, *pesar* ‘weight’, *durar* ‘last’), even if *medir* ‘measure’ is an exception.

Wh-APs exclamatives with *qué* are restricted as well. Besides lacking counterparts in questions, they are rejected in “P + Adj” PPs functioning as secondary predicates in exclamative wh-phrases, as Casas (2005, p. 54) observed:

- (66) a. Lo tienen por muy tonto.
 ‘They consider him rather dumb.’
 b. *¡Por qué tonto lo tienen!
 ‘How dumb he is considered!’
- (67) a. Pasaba por sumamente lista.
 ‘She passed for a very smart girl.’
 b. *¡Por qué lista pasaba!
 ‘How smart for a girl she was taken to be!’

6.2. NO CLEFTS

This constraint is not attested in the literature: wh-interrogative phrases may be clefted, but their exclamative counterparts may not:

- (68) a. ¿Qué piso es el que te has comprado?
 ‘Which apartment is the one you’ve bought?’
 b. *¡Qué piso es el que te has comprado!
 ‘*Which apartment is the one you’ve bought!’

Potential counterexamples may be interpreted as rhetorical questions, therefore not real exceptions:

- (69) ¡Qué es lo que has hecho!
‘What have you done!’

One might be tempted to argue that the asymmetry in (68) is related to the illocutionary properties of questions, but this is not correct, since (68a) might be embedded under, say, *Sé muy bien . . .* ‘I know quite well . . .’ The key to the asymmetry in (68) should rather be found in the crash of the two different tasks that the *wh*-phrase must simultaneously perform in the exclamative cleft sentence. It must (1) pick up an item from a set of alternatives, as all foci do in clefts (Krifka, 2007; and much related work), and (2) be placed within an enlarged or widened interval (Zanutini & Portner, 2003) characterized by some implicit standard scale.

One of these two tasks will be unaccomplished in (68b). Since the variables to be bound are quite different, in either of these two processes there will be an operator unable to properly bind its variable. Notice that there are two *wh*-operators in (68a): one is provided by the free relative, and the other one corresponds to the focal *wh*-DP *qué piso*. We may safely argue that the first one does not play any role in the asymmetry in (68). An argument in support of this conclusion is the fact that so-called “*que-galicado*” sentences, present in most varieties of American Spanish (Brucart, 1994; Di Tullio & Kailuweit, 2012), lack free relatives. Interestingly, they reject *wh*-exclamatives as well. Foci are preposed in these structures approximately as they are in clefts, and identification of a variable in a set of alternatives is identical in them as well:

- (70) a. ¿Cuánta plata fue que se robó? [American Spanish]
‘How much money did s/he steal?’
b. *¿Cuánta plata fue que se robó! [All dialects]
‘How much money s/he stole!’

6.3. NO *IN SITU* NOR MULTIPLE *WH*-EXCLAMATIVES

Unlike their interrogative counterparts, exclamatives cannot be multiple:

- (71) a. ¿Qué libros has enviado a qué clientes?
‘Which books did you send to which clients?’

- b. *¡Qué libros has enviado a qué clientes!
 ‘*Which books you sent to which clients!’

A natural account of this asymmetry relies on the fact that operator-variable pairs may be satisfied in answers (RAE-ASALE, 2009, § 22.2h), but no answers are required (or even possible) in exclamatives. The non-existence of *in situ* exclamatives is also related to the absence of dialogues in which variables could be bound. In fact, the dialogue in (72), quoted from RAE-ASALE (2009, § 22.2h), provides a potential counterexample, since it includes an exclamative sentence in an answer:

- (72) —¿Sabes que Pascual se ha comprado tres pisos en tres ciudades?
 ‘¡Did you happen to know that P. has bought three apartments in three towns?’
 —Sí, ¡y qué pisos en qué ciudades!
 Lit. ‘Yes, and what apartments in what towns!’

On the other hand, the fact that multiple exclamatives are possible in Japanese (Ono, 2004) suggests that their anomaly does not stand on a fundamental semantic conflict.

6.4. NO CYCLICITY

Villalba (2008b, 2016) observes that cyclic movement of *wh*-interrogative phrases is rejected. Here is a simple contrast:

- (73) a. ¿Qué estupideces te han dicho que escribe hoy Juan en la prensa?
 ‘What silly things did they tell you that J. has written in today’s paper?’
 b. ¡Qué estupideces (*te han dicho que) escribe hoy Juan en la prensa!
 ‘What silly things (*they tell you) that J. has written in today’s paper!’

Few explanations of this asymmetry are given in the literature. I suggest that it is probably related to the fact that so-called “bridge verbs” have been repeatedly associated with parenthetical expressions (Dehé & Kavalova, 2007; Schneider, Glikman, & Avanzi, 2015 and references therein), and parentheticals are incompatible with exclamatives:

- (74) a. ¿Cuántos coches, según los cálculos, caben aquí?
 ‘How many cars, according to calculations, could fit in here?’
 b. *¿Cuántos coches, según los cálculos, caben aquí!
 ‘*How many cars, according to calculations, could fit in here!’

In any case, some potential counterexamples of this constraint may be found. Many native speakers accept (75a), with a *wh*-AP preposed through cyclic movement. As regards (75b), it is from a literary translation:

- (75) a. ¡Qué contenta dice tu madre que está la niña con su regalo!
 Lit. ‘How happy your mother says the girl is with her gift!’
 b. ¡[. . .] qué tarde parece que has visto lo acertado!
 ‘How late it seems you have seen the right thing!’ (From
 Sophocles, *Antígona*, translation into Spanish, Google Books)

6.5. RESTRICTIONS ON EMBEDDING

Whereas predicates taking indirect questions are numerous, and belong to many semantic classes (nine in the typology in RAE-ASALE, 2009, § 43.7j for Spanish), those taking indirect exclamatives are much more restricted (Bosque, 1984a; Alonso-Cortés, 1999a, pp. 401ff.). They include some verbs of speech, a few perception verbs that also take indirect questions, such as *ver* ‘find out,’ *mostrar* ‘show,’ or *revelar* ‘reveal,’ and a larger number of emotional factives. Non-factive emotional predicates, as *temer* ‘fear,’ are excluded (Gutiérrez-Rexach & Andueza, this volume). Here are some clear examples of indirect exclamatives in Spanish (DADEs are included, as advanced in [30]):

- (76) a. Ya veo cuánta gente está de acuerdo contigo.
 ‘I can see how many people agree with you.’
 b. Es sorprendente lo fuertes que son.
 ‘It is surprising how strong they are.’
 c. Es una vergüenza cómo tratan aquí a la gente.
 ‘It is shame how people are treated here.’

A much-studied issue, as regards similar lists of predicates, is the fact that those related to emotional notions are rejected in embedded questions. Apparent counterexamples may be reduced to fixed or lexicalized expressions and semi-idioms. This rejection is related to the incompatibility of factive predicates with an open variable that must be identified in *wh*-questions.

On this topic, see Abels (2004, 2007), Sæbø (2010), Chernilovskaya (2010, 2011), Andueza and Gutiérrez-Rexach (2012), and Gutiérrez-Rexach and Andueza (2016, this volume).

It is not obvious whether or not total (i.e., non-wh) embedded exclamatives exist. Apparently, they do not:

- (77) Es curioso {cómo/*si} se las arregla para salirse con la suya.
‘It is amazing {how/whether} s/he manages to get away with it.’

But a few potential counterexamples exist, as argued by Girón (2014). They include sentences such as (78):

- (78) a. Ahora verás si aprovecha. (Cervantes, *Quijote*; from Girón, 2014, p. 46)
‘You will now see what it’s good for.’
b. Dígame usted si no tengo razón.
‘You will now see what it’s good for.’
c. Figúrate tú si será grande la casa.
‘Just imagine how big the house must be.’

Example (78a) is unclear, since it allows for a disjunctive . . . *o no* (‘. . . or not’) coda, and disjunctive codas are incompatible with exclamatives as a natural consequence of the illocutionary nature of exclamative speech acts. Other potential counterexamples suggested by Girón, such as those headed by *mira* or *fíjate*, are dubious as well, since these expressions seem to behave as mirative particles (Sánchez López, 2014b) rather than transitive verbs (in fact, *fijarse* is an intransitive verb: *Fíjate si corre este coche* ‘See how much this car runs’ > **Fíjatelo* ‘See it’). In a similar vein, the fact that *no sabes* ‘you can’t imagine’ allows for indirect exclamatives does not contradict the fact that *saber* rejects them. Nevertheless, Girón is right in arguing that a number of predicates taking indirect exclamatives may historically come from grammaticalization processes on perception verbs.¹¹

Indirect exclamatives are also defective in that they reject infinitives:

- (79) Es {misterioso/*sorprendente} cómo encontrarlo.
‘It is {mysterious/amazing} how to find him/it.’

11. Interestingly, QD effects apply in (78), which suggests that a degree operator similar to Hernanz’s (2012) might be at work. See Gutiérrez-Rexach and Andueza (this volume) on other aspects of the relationship between perception and emotive verbs as regards indirect exclamatives.

This may be derived from the fact that *wh*-infinitive questions are always prospective. If a null modal head is responsible for their presence in questions, whether main or subordinate (RAE-ASALE, 2009, § 43.7w), it follows that it will be unavailable for exclamatives.

Other grammatical restrictions on embedded exclamatives exist. Gutiérrez-Rexach and Andueza (this volume) show that qualitative exclamatives cannot be embedded. One of the relevant conditions they fail to meet, according to their analysis, is the inability of the subordinate sentence to maintain the capacity of illocutionary operators as licensers of grounded knowledge:

- (80) a. ¡Qué dibujos hace María!
 ‘What amazing drawings M. does!’
 b. *Es increíble qué dibujos hace María.
 ‘It’s incredible what amazing drawings M. does.’

Other constraints on indirect exclamatives are related to mood. Factive emotive predicates select for the subjunctive mood, but embedded exclamatives (whether DADEs or not) are exceptions:

- (81) a. Me sorprende que {*son/sean} tan fuertes.
 ‘It amazes me that they are so strong.’
 b. Me sorprende lo fuertes que {son/*sean}.
 ‘It amazes me how strong they are.’
 c. Me sorprende cómo {son/*sean} de fuertes.
 ‘It amazes me how strong they are.’

The relationship between (81b) and (81c) may be interpreted as an argument in favor of the *wh*-nature of the null operators in DADEs (Gutiérrez-Rexach, 1999, 2001, 2008). But notice that the reduction of (81b) to (81c) does not quite explain the anomaly of the subjunctive in the latter, since indirect questions allow for this pattern with some verbs (e.g., *depender* ‘depend’; see Bosque, 2012).

In spite of these and some other asymmetries,¹² exclamatives and interrogatives are alike in a number of respects, as pointed out in the literature

12. Bosque (1984a) argues that indirect exclamatives are rejected in nominal and adjectival complements (**La vergüenza de cómo tratan aquí a la gente* ‘The shame of how people are treated here’), but Casas (2005, p. 42) quotes some potential counterexamples in literary texts, such as [. . .] *la noticia de cuán pronto había pacificado la ciudad* [. . .] *llegó pronto a Fernando* ‘News

(D'Avis, 2002; Gutierrez-Rexach, 1996; Abels, 2004, 2005; Groenendijk & Stokhof, 1982; among others). For example, concealed exclamations (CEs) (see Grimshaw, 1979; Schwager, 2009; Portner & Zanuttini, 2005; Gutiérrez-Rexach & Andueza, this volume) parallel concealed questions (CQs). The former are DP complements, interpreted as CPs, which receive the extreme value interpretation characteristic of indirect exclamatives. That is, no extreme height is explicitly attributed to a building in (82):

(82) It's amazing the height of that building.

(82) contains no subordinate clause, but the DP in that sentence (a CE) is approximately interpreted as “how tall that building is.”

But even if some consensus exists on the idea that CEs denote kinds or individual types, as CQs do, the process necessary to obtain their exact meaning is not so obvious. There is no doubt that (83a), with a CQ, means “I didn't know what his/her profession was.”

- (83) a. Yo no sabía su profesión.
 'I did not know his/her profession.'
 b. Me extrañó su profesión.
 'I was weirded out by his/her profession.'

In a parallel way, one might argue that (83b), with a CE, means “It surprised me how-x (x = an extreme property pragmatically accurate for professions) his profession was,” but a simpler paraphrase, involving internal predication in a complement of the noun “fact,” might be more accurate: “The fact that his/her profession was the one it was surprised me.” Notice that no extreme degree is exactly predicated of a profession in (83b). If this is on the right track, at least some CEs may diverge from their interrogative counterparts in more fundamental respects.

6.6. RESTRICTIONS ON NEGATION

Negation in exclamative sentences may be interpretable (i-neg) or uninterpretable (u-neg), the latter often called “expletive.” If neither option is

about how rapidly s/he had pacified the town soon arrived to F' (M. Fernández Álvarez, *Isabel la Católica*).

possible, negation is excluded (e-neg), and an ungrammatical sentence is obtained. Here are the three possibilities:

- (84) a. ¡Cuántas cosas importantes no ha dicho el orador! (I-NEG)
 ‘How many important things the speaker has not said!’
 b. ¡Cuántos recuerdos no le vendrían a la cabeza! (U-NEG)
 ‘How many memories would come to his/her head!’
 c. ¡Qué fuerte (*no) es María! (E-NEG)
 ‘How strong M. is (*not)!’

Villalba (2004) argues that e-neg results from the negation’s incapability of taking scope over the degree operator, as a consequence of exclamatives’s being factive structures. The interpretation of (84c) is meaningless, since it implies that “there is no degree *d*, such that *d* is maximal in the scale of strength and such that María is strong to degree *d*.” Since potential arguments against the factivity of root exclamatives exist (§ 2), an alternative might be worked out that does not crucially depend on that notion. In fact, Espinal’s (1997, 2000) analysis of e-neg in exclamatives is grounded on specificity rather than factivity. Notice that there is a relationship between e-neg in exclamatives and typical effects of so-called “negative islands” (Abrusán 2014, ch. 3 and references therein). The anomaly of sentences such as **How much does John not weigh?* is repaired if the QP is able to become specific by denoting a particular amount or degree recoverable from context, as in *How much did John not weigh and how much should he have weighed?* But this resource is unavailable for exclamatives, just as it is for clefts or multiple exclamatives, since there is no possible variable to be contextually identified in either of these constructions. As expected, specific amount wh-exclamatives provide i-neg contexts, as in (84a). The fact that qualitative wh-DPs reduce to sets of extreme properties (§ 4.1) explains e-neg in (85):

- (85) *¡Qué coche no tiene Juan!
 ‘*What a car J. does not have!’

González Rodríguez (2007a, 2008, 2009) claims that relatives are positive polarity items not licensed via movement to functional projections (in this volume she extends this treatment to adverbs such as *extremadamente* ‘extremely’). She argues that e-neg effects are derived from the relative’s

inability to be interpreted under the scope of negation as a consequence of their upper endpoint orientation.

Other phrases, not conditioned by this restriction, are compatible with *i-neg* contexts in *wh*-exclamatives. Masullo (2012) relates the *e-neg* in (84c) to the unavailability of low scope (that is, internal or non-clausal predicate-bound) negation of relatives, as in *El cine no está carísimo* ‘The movies is not extremely expensive,’ as well as their incompatibility with imperatives and other speech acts (on related phenomena, see also Bosque, 2001, 2002; González Rodríguez, 2006, this volume). A potential problem of Masullo’s (2012) analysis of *e-neg* in these expressions (in which relatives must locally move to the specifier of a Focus projection to check an exclamative feature) might be its excessive power, since it predicts no relatives in relative clauses, DP sentential complements, and other syntactic islands.

There is no consensus on whether or not other *e-neg* effects in exclamatives must be excluded as a result of scope relations. For example, the question remains whether or not factivity is the key factor accounting for *e-neg* in predicates selecting for embedded exclamatives—first observed by Elliott (1974) for English—as in (86):

- (86) (*No) es curioso cómo se las arregla para salir adelante (E-NEG)
‘It is (*not) curious how s/he manages to get by.’

The issue may, again, be addressed from either a syntactic or a semantic perspective. According to the former, one might say that a *wh*-phrase denoting an extreme value cannot be interpreted under the scope of a modal operator. According to the latter—adopted by Villalba (2004) and Octavio de Toledo and Sánchez López (2009)—(86) is meaningless if *no* is included (metalinguistic negation being disregarded) because the main clause explicitly denies the strangeness or non-standardness of some presupposed extreme value on manners, denoted in the embedded clause. Other, somehow intermediate, approaches exist. According to Zanuttini and Portner (2003), the phenomenon in (86) results from negation preventing the necessary widening process in the subordinate clause. Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) regards (86) as a selectional problem, since negation would exclude the negative matrix predicate from the class of factive emotives.

Let us briefly consider *u-neg* in exclamatives now. *U-neg* is triggered by (epistemic) conditional inflection, as in (84b), or epistemic futures, as in

(87), which constitute a subset of intensional or non-veridical environments—in Giannakidou's (1998) sense:

- (87) ¡Que de excusas no habrás buscado para evitar hacer los deberes!
 'How many excuses you sure have looked for to avoid doing your homework!'

Other potential intensional candidates, such as imperatives, questions, or "if" conditionals, display incompatibilities with exclamatives related to illocutionary force.¹³

Negation in rhetorical exclamatives allows for some varieties. The type in (88a) may be considered i-neg, rather than u-neg, since ironic effects in these cases mostly result from a calculation process that depends on contextual factors (Escandell-Vidal & Leonetti, 2014):

- (88) a. ¡No corre este tío ni nada!
 'This guy sure runs fast!'
 b. ¡Poco te gusta comer! (from Andueza & Gutiérrez-Rexach, 2010, p. 21)
 'How little you like eating!'

Antonymic readings or some quantifiers, as in (88b), are derived from a covert negative element with narrow scope over a degree phrase in Andueza and Gutierrez-Rexach (2010).¹⁴

13. Apparently, y/n questions are able to induce u-neg, as opposed to non-wh-exclamatives:

- (i) a. ¿No tendrás cambio de 50 euros? (u-neg)
 'Could you change a 50 euro bill for me?'
 b. ¡No tendrás cambio de 50 euros! (i-neg)
 'You will end up with no change for 50 euro bills!'

But this asymmetry may lie in the role of negation in polite rhetorical questions (see RAE-ASALE, 2009, § 43.10k), implying that (ia) is not a proper instance of u-neg. As for u-neg in *vaya si* exclamative structures, as in (ii), it does not require intensional contexts. As Tirado (2015a) argues, this type of u-neg is restricted to contexts of rebuttal:

- (ii) A esa gente, vaya si no les gusta. (R. Rey, *Lo que soñó Sebastián*, CREA)
 'These people, of course they like it.'

14. The negative interpretation of *qué* in some wh-exclamatives, as in ¡*Qué va a venir ese!* 'No doubt he will not come!'—Di Tullio's (2008) example—is most probably rhetorical as well. In fact, *qué* might be a reduction of *para qué* in these constructions. See also Rojas (1985) on very similar patterns.

7. This Volume

All authors invited to this compilation have previously published several pieces on Spanish exclamative constructions from some theoretical point of view. Most of the fundamental issues addressed in this overview are dealt with in the coming chapters: exclamative operators, both *wh*- and degree, are discussed in all of them, and so is the specific nature of illocutionary force in exclamative utterances. Special attention is given to exclamatives in negative (chapters 4, 5, and 6) and embedded (chapter 7) contexts, but also to factivity (chapter 5), relative items (chapters 4 and 6), and optatives (chapter 3).

In chapter 2, “*Más*-Support,” Luis Sáez argues that the semantic composition of Sp. non-comparative *más* (as in *¡Qué libro más curioso!* ‘What a curious book!’) is partially similar to that of Zanuttini and Portner’s (2003) null exclamative operator. He argues that this false comparative quantifier is licensed by this operator. In a process similar to *do*-support for T° or *that/for*-support for C°, *más* is interpreted as a support item, inserted in order to satisfy the affixal requirements of an abstract morpheme.

Chapter 3, by Cristina Sánchez López, is entitled “Optative Exclamatives in Spanish.” Sánchez López deals with exclamatives that express the speaker’s desires toward some state of affairs. These structures, always displaying subjunctive morphology, combine two factors. One, she argues, is a generalized exclamative operator EXC—as in Gutiérrez Rexach (2001) analysis—related to the emotion toward the status of the modified proposition on a contextually provided scale. The other factor is a mood head (encoding factuality, counterfactuality, and other similar values), that determines tense and mood, as well as the content of the C° initial head.

In chapter 4, entitled “Exclamatives in (Argentinian) Spanish and Their Next of Kin,” Pascual J. Masullo analyzes the relationship between a series of covert exclamatives (CEs)—that is, exclamative sentences containing no overt *wh*-word—with overt *wh*-exclamatives (OEs). Showing they are subject to similar constraints, he argues that, while CEs contain an empty operator binding an extreme degree expression *in situ*, in OEs the *wh*-word conflates both the operator and extreme degree feature at once. He also analyzes new relatives in Argentinian Spanish in detail, arguing that, although associated with an extreme degree feature, they need not to be used in exclamative patterns.

In chapter 5, “At-Issue Material in Spanish Degree Exclamatives: An Experimental Study,” Xavier Villalba deals with the notion of high degree in exclamative sentences, and specifically the question whether it should be

analyzed as a presupposition (Gutiérrez-Rexach, 1999) or as a conventional implicature (Zanuttini & Portner, 2003). He carries out two experiments and he concludes that when speakers react negatively to *wh*-exclamatives, they tend to cancel the ascription of the relevant property rather than the high degree to which it is attributed. He argues that the relationship between *wh*-exclamatives and their propositional contents fits within the notion of projective meaning, as understood in Tonhauser, Beaver, Roberts, and Simons (2013), more properly than within that of presupposed knowledge.

Raquel González Rodríguez deals with the grammatical differences between exclamative *wh*-phrases and extreme degree modifiers in Spanish in chapter 6, “Exclamative Sentences and Extreme Degree Quantification.” She points out a number of differences between *wh*-exclamative phrases and elatives, in spite of the fact that both are polarity items. These differences are related to their (in)compatibility with downward-entailing and anti-morphic operators. She argues that adverbs denoting extreme degree, as in *extremadamente* ‘extremely,’ close open scales, in Kennedy and McNally’s (2005a) sense, and suggests a link between exclamative *wh*-phrases and modal adverbs denoting surprise.

In chapter 7, entitled “Embedded Exclamatives and the Ingredients of Grounded Belief,” Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach and Patricia Andueza analyze the semantic properties of predicate-taking embedded exclamatives and argue that they are factive-emotive because they select for facts. They also claim that the meaning of main clause and embedded exclamatives does not change, and that evidential predicates can embed exclamatives expressions. Grounded belief is argued to be an underlying factor for several classes of embedded exclamatives, although other elements, such as factivity, degree reference, or evidential content, also play a crucial role in them.