Degree Restrictions in Spanish Exclamatives

Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach and Patricia Andueza
The Ohio State University and University of Evansville

1. Introduction

The semantics of *wh*-exclamatives has been traditionally derived from the semantics of *wh*-questions (Zanuttini & Portner's 2003, Gutiérrez-Rexach 1996). Nevertheless, several authors (Villalba 2003, Castroviejo 2006, Rett 2008) have emphasized certain important properties of exclamative constructions relating them to degree expressions. This would amount to making exclamatives equivalent to expressions of high degree. In this paper we present evidence from Spanish with two goals: (i) to characterize a more refined and complex classification of exclamatives and, (ii) to defend a unified approach that would explain the restrictions on exclamative constructions.

2. The denotation of exclamatives

The main ingredient distinguishing exclamatives from other types of sentences is their illocutionary force: declarative sentences denote truth values; interrogative sentences denote questions; imperatives denote commands; and exclamatives denote "exclamations". For the utterance of an exclamative to be expressively correct, its content must be salient and the speaker must hold a particular propositional attitude toward it. When uttering an exclamative sentence, a speaker expresses an emotive attitude toward the content of his utterance. The emotive attitude could be triggered by a degree property (1)-(2) or by a fact (3)-(4) that exceeds the contextualized speaker's expectations. A speaker may express wonder, admiration, amazement or criticism, among other emotive attitudes:

(1) ¡Qué inteligente es Pepito!
'How smart Pepito is!'
(2) ¡Cuanto bebe Pepe!
'Pepito is such a drinker!'
(3) ¡Vaya por Dios, se cayó!
'Oh My God, he fell!'
(4) ¡Has venido!
'You came!'

Besides their illocutionary force, there are two properties which have been treated as the hallmark of exclamatives: factivity (Elliot 1974; Grimshaw 1979) and extreme degree (Gutiérrez-Rexach 1996; Zanuttini & Portner 2000, 2003). We understand that exclamatives are factive because the propositional content of exclamatives is presupposed, and they express a 'extreme degree' because the degree of the adjectival property/fact is maximal. For instance, when a speaker utters an exclamative such as (5), s/he presupposes that Juan is tall and expresses an emotive attitude toward the high degree of Juan's height, which is beyond her/his expectations:

(5) ¡Qué alto es Juan!
'How tall Juan is!'

Factivity is a concept that has been applied in different ways in the literature. The basic notion is characterized by Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1970): "[a factive operator] presupposes that the embedded clause expresses a true proposition, and makes some assertion about the proposition." Elliot (1974) and Grimshaw (1979) have argued in favor of the independent status of exclamatives both

© 2011 Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach and Patricia Andueza. Selected Proceedings of the 13th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium, ed. Luis A. Ortiz-López, 286-295. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

syntactically and semantically, isolating a class of predicates (emotives) that select exclamatives. They claim that exclamatives are factive, and therefore they can be embedded by factive predicates. This explains why an exclamative can be embedded by predicates such as *amazing, surprising, unbelievable, significant, important, relevant, fantastic, alarming, awful, terrible, tragic*, etc. but not by non-factive predicates such as *ask* or *wonder*. In these latter cases the complement is not an exclamative but a question*:*

(6) It's amazing how tall John is
(7) I'm surprised at how fast John can run
(8) Fred will ask how tall John is
(9) Fred is wondering how fast John can run

With respect to the property of 'extreme degree', Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) points out that we can interpret an exclamative like (5) as follows: 'The speaker expresses his/her attitude (amazement, admiration, surprise…) toward the fact that Juan is *d*-tall and the degree of Juan's tallness is greater than any other degree in the scale of tallness given her/his expectations'. In other words, this scale is determined by the speaker's expectations. There would be no reason to utter this exclamative in a situation in which the speaker learns that Juan is as tall as he expected or less than he expected. This component is what explains that adverbs such as *reasonably* are not allowed in contexts where the relevant degree exceeds the relevant level of expectation:

(10) * It is amazing how slightly/ fairly/ reasonable long he can stay under water

As far as we know, the literature on exclamatives has mostly focused on *wh*-exclamatives. Nevertheless, exclamatives are not uniform. There are several types of exclamatives with important differences in their syntactic and semantic characteristics, as we will see in the next section. Our purpose is to show that some of them cannot be interpreted as degree constructions, but rather they entail a propositional content.

3. Types of exclamatives

3.1. Wh-exclamatives

In these exclamatives, the *wh*-phrase moves to the left periphery of the sentence. In addition to the factive operator mentioned above, it has been claimed that there is a *wh*-operator. There are different hypotheses about how this operator is interpreted: It has been viewed as a function on propositions (Zanuttini & Portner 2003, Gutiérrez-Rexach 1996); or as a function on degrees (Castroviejo 2006, Rett 2008). The *wh*-phrase can be headed by a noun phrase (11), an adjectival phrase (12) or an adverbial phrase (13):

(11) ¡Qué cosas dice Juan!
'The things that Juan says'
(12) ¡Qué divertido es Juan!
'What a load of fun Juan is!'
(13) ¡Qué bien habla Juan!
'What a good speaker Juan is!'

3.2. Nominal exclamatives

These comprise the class of relative clauses introduced by definite determiners. They may have exclamatory force with a degree reading when occurring as root elements:

(14) ¡Lo alto que es tu hermano!
'How tall your brother is!'

(15) ¡Las cervezas que bebe!
'The number of beers he is able to drink!'

In the case of (14), the raised adjective is in a focus position pied-piped by the neuter determiner and, in the case of (15), raising is triggered by the definite determiner (Gutiérrez-Rexach 2001).

3.3. Evidential exclamatives

There are exclamatives introduced by evidential adjectives whose reading is clearly propositional. In (16) and (17) the relevant alternatives are not based on degrees or kinds, but on propositions:

(16) ¡Claro que te lo voy a dar!
'Of course, I will give it to you!'
(17) ¡Evidentemente que te voy a devolver el libro!
'Evidently, I will give the book back to you!'

For instance, in (16) the speaker asserts that it is evident that he is going to give the relevant object to the addressee and, by uttering this exclamative sentence, he also expresses a contextually determined emotive attitude toward this assertion. Sentence (17) can be uttered in a situation in which the addressee has expressed his doubts about getting the book back and, by uttering this exclamative, the speaker expresses his surprise or resentment toward the fact that the addressee does not trust him.

3.4. Declarative sentences

Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) claims that the following declarative sentences can be considered genuine exclamative expressions from a prosodic and illocutionary point of view:

(18) ¡Juan se lo ha comido todo!
'Juan ate everything!'
(19) ¡Juan es muy divertido!
'Juan is so funny!'

The above exanples exhibit the characteristic intonational contour of exclamatives and, by uttering them, a speaker expresses an emotive attitude toward the content of the utterance: in the case of (18) toward the fact that Juan has eaten everything; (19) is interpreted as 'Juan is an instance of the kind of funny man I am referring to'. We argue below that the content of these exclamatives is not about degrees but about propositions. We claim that these four structural types of exclamatives can be merged into two different semantic groups: (i) exclamatives whose content is a degree property, such as *wh*-exclamatives or nominal exclamatives; and (ii) exclamatives whose content is propositional, such as exclamatives with a declarative structure and exclamatives introduced by an evidential expression. Following Rett (2008), we assume that these two groups of exclamatives have partially different properties. The content of the exclamatives in the first group must be about a degree that exceeds a relevant standard (Castroviejo 2006). The exclamatives in the second group are expressively correct when their content is salient in discourse and the speaker finds it surprising in a certain way.

In the remainder of the paper, we will discuss the differential properties of these two classes and we will propose an account that explains such differences within a unified view.

4. Exclamatives as degree constructions

As Grimshaw (1979) pointed out, exclamatives differ from questions (20) and assertions in the fact that they cannot be answered (21) or used as answers (23 B1):

(20) A: How tall is John?
B: 2.20 meters

(21) A: How tall is John!
B: # 2.10 meters
(22) A: How tall is John?
(23) B1: # How tall he is!
B2: He's very tall

Although a *wh*-exclamative is a *wh*-construction, it differs from a question with respect to its discourse function: whereas (20) can be used to request information, (21) obviously cannot. On the other hand, degree exclamatives cannot update the common ground like assertions do. This is why (23B1) cannot constitute an answer to question (22).

Under the degree analysis, the *wh*-operator present in *wh*-exclamatives is associated with a degree variable, so it can be properly characterized as a degree operator (Gutiérrez-Rexach 1999). According to Creswell (1976), predicates denoting properties express relations between individuals and degrees, in other words, sets of individuals defined with respect to a degree. In exclamative sentences, there is reference to a degree that comes from applying the gradable property (G) to an individual (x) (reference degree); and there is also a degree which is taken from context as a standard (standard degree). The reference degree has to be higher than the standard degree in the relevant scale; it cannot be equal, since this would indicate that the reference degree is average; it cannot be less than the standard degree either.

In (24) the standard level of intelligence (standard degree) is established by a speaker's-dependent criterion, namely the speaker's expectations (Gutierrez Rexach, 1997), and Juan's intelligence (reference degree) is located in a point higher than the standard one in the relevant scale of intelligence:

(24) ¡Qué inteligente es Juan!
'How intelligent Juan is!'

The nature of the operator as a degree operator allows for a straightforward explanation of several restrictions. First, only the following *wh*-words can occur in an exclamative construction:

(25) *Qué*: ¡Qué exagerados que son tus padres!
'How so over the top your parents are!'
(26) *Cómo*: ¡Cómo son de exagerados tus padres!
(27) *Cuánto*: ¡Cuánto corre aquel coche!
'How fast that car runs!'
(28) *Cuánto/a/os/as + N:* ¡Cuántas tonterías tengo que oír al cabo del día!
'The nonsense I have listened to at the end of the day!'

On the other hand, non-degree *wh*-words, such as *cuándo, quién, dónde* and *por qué* are not allowed in Spanish exclamatives:

(29) *¡Cuándo compra Juan!
'*When Juan buys!'
(30) *¡Quién compra estas cosas!
'*Who buys these things!'
(31) *¡Por qué compra Juan!
'*Why John buys!'

In general, only gradable adjectives or adverbs are licensed in this kind of sentences. The origin of this restriction comes from the fact that the presence of a degree operator with propositional scope requires the presence of a degree variable, contributed by a gradable predicate, in order to satisfy its binding requirements. For instance, *inteligente* is gradable and therefore we can say of Juan that he is tall to degree *d*. Relational adjectives, such as *bípedo* or *nuclear*, cannot contribute a degree variable

for the *wh*-operator to bind. Thus, this operator quantifies vacuously and the resulting sentence is ungrammatical:

(32) ¡Qué inteligente es Juan!
'How intelligent Juan is!'
(33) *¡Qué bípedo eres!
'*How biped he is!'
(34) *¡Qué nuclear es la central!
'*How nuclear the plant is!'
(35) ¡Qué maravillosa película!
'What a wonderful movie!'
(36) ¡Qué inteligente eres!
'How intelligent you are!'

Castroviejo (2006) points out that relational adjectives are not acceptable in other degree constructions, such as comparatives and result clauses, as can be observed in (37) and (38):

(37) *Ana es más mortal que Pepe
'*Ana is more mortal tan Pepe'
(38) *Ana es tan mortal que todo el mundo se da cuenta
'*Ana is so mortal that everyone notices'

The raised adjective in exclamative sentences has to move to the specifier of the Complementizer Phrase (CP) to check [+degree]. According to Gutierrez Rexach (2001), the necessity that the degree feature be checked in the C-phrase of the syntactic derivation is probably conditioned by semantic reasons. The degree argument of the adjective is existentially quantified and has wide scope over other operators and quantifiers in the clause. However, sometimes the degree phrase that contains the degree operator and the gradable adjective is not spelled out. For example, the two examples in (39) may receive the same interpretation:

(39) a. ¡Qué hombre tan/ más/increíblemente guapo/inteligente/estúpido!
'What an incredibly handsome/intelligent/stupid man'
b. ¡Qué hombre!
'What a man!'

We have claimed that nominal exclamatives denote a degree property. This type of exclamatives are used in the following examples to express surprise at the number of things that Juan told us (40), the number of beers that Juan drunk (41), or the degree of Juan's tallness (42):

(40) ¡La de cosas que nos contó Juan!
'The (many) things Juan told us!'
(41) ¡Las cervezas que bebe Juan!
'The (many) beers Juan drinks!'
(42) ¡Lo alto que es Juan!
'How tall Juan is!'

According to Torrego (1988), this type of exclamatives receive an amount reading because there is a null operator in the relative clause, introduced by *que*, which moves in LF from an object position to the left periphery of the clause and has scope over the DP. The null operator receives its amount interpretation from its antecedent, the DP. In (40) the amount reading would come from the DP expression *la de cosas* (an elliptical variant of *la cantidad de cosas*). The definite article introducing an exclamative lacks demonstrative or anaphorical content and has a [+wh] feature. The DP behaves as a degree phrase. The interpretation of the DP in (40) and (41) is *la cantidad x de cosas/ cervezas* where *x*

corresponds to ‘a high amount/number’, whereas in the case of (42), the variable *x* denotes a high degree of height.

5. The propositional content of exclamatives

So far we have seen that *wh*-exclamatives and nominal exclamatives pattern alike with respect to the extreme-degree reading. However, as Torrego (1988) points out, nominal or free-relative exclamatives may behave as independent clauses (43b), in contrast with regular relative clauses (44b). We claim that this fact can be explained only if we consider that, in addition to the amount/degree component, these exclamatives have a propositional content:

(43) a. No te imaginas las cosas que nos conto
‘You can’t imagine the things he told us’
b. ¡Las cosas que nos conto!
‘The things he told us!’
(44) a. Nos conto las cosas que le preocupaban
‘He told us the things that were worrying him’
b. *Las cosas que le preocupaban
‘The things that were worrying him’

Furthermore, there are two other types of exclamatives that do not seem to involve any kind of (degree) quantifier either overt or covert, but they are still considered exclamatives: exclamatives based on declarative sentences, and those introduced by evidential expressions:

(45) ¡Has venido a mi fiesta!
‘You came to my party!’
(46) ¡Con que te ha tocado la lotería!
‘So you won the lottery!’
(47) ¡Por supuesto que voy a ir a tu fiesta!
‘Of course, I will go to your party!’
(48) ¡Vaya que voy a ir a tu fiesta!
‘I will absolutely go to your party!’

In (45) the semantic content is the proposition that the addressee has come to the speaker’s party, and the illocutionary force is that the speaker finds the content surprising (or contrary to his/her own expectations); in (46) the speaker is expressing his/her surprise toward the fact that the hearer has won the lottery. On the other hand, (47) and (48) express that the fact that the speaker is going to the party is considered evidentially strong. These two examples can be felicitously uttered in a situation in which it is believed that the speaker is not going to the party, and s/he utters these exclamatives as a reaction against such expectations.

Even if the fact that triggers the exclamative is associated with a gradable predicate, as in (49) and (50), such fact has to be unexpected: firing a great worker in (49), or being able to speak two languages (50) is unexpected, not the high degree of foolishness or amazement at such facts:

(49) ¡Que insensatez despedir a un trabajador así!
‘What foolishness to fire a worker like that one!’
(50) ¡Que maravilloso poder hablar dos idiomas!
‘What a wonderful thing is to be able to speak two languages!’

Contrary to Alonso-Cortés (1999) and Rett (2008), we claim that these types of constructions can be considered exclamatives, since they share important properties with degree exclamatives. They can be embedded by emotive predicates and they are clearly factive. Consider the examples in (51) – (53). For instance, in (51) the fact that the addressee went to the party has to be presupposed, salient in the

context, and also unexpected (i.e. contrary to the speaker's expectations). A similar reasoning applies to (52) and (53).

(51) Es increíble/ sorprendente que hayas venido a la fiesta
'It is incredible/surprising that you came to the party!'
(52) Me sorprende que no vengas a la fiesta
'It surprises me that you are not coming to the party!'
(53) Es increíble/ sorprendente que te haya tocado la lotería
'It is incredible/surprising that you won the lottery!'

However, there are some differences too. The main difference between propositional exclamatives and degree exclamatives relates to their respective presuppositions. Whereas in the latter the content is part of the common ground, that is, it is presupposed by the speaker and the addressee; in the former the content is presupposed only by the speaker, and the addressee has to accommodate the new information. That explains why propositional exclamatives can function as answers to a question:

(54) A: ¿Cómo es Juan?
'How is Juan?'
B1: ¡Es más/increíblemente alto!
'He is so/incredibly tall!'
B2: *¡Qué alto es Juan!
'How tall Juan is!'
(55) A: Entonces, me vas a dar el dinero que te preste hace dos meses?
'So you are giving me back the Money I lent you two months ago?''
B: ¡Claro que te lo voy a dar!
'Of course, I will give it to you!'

In the above scenarios, exclamative sentences update the common ground in two steps. First, the speaker has the intention of restricting the context set of the addressee by answering the question with factual information. Secondly, s/he also updates the common ground by introducing her/his emotional attitude. According to Rett (2008), the reason why non-*wh*-exclamatives whose content is a proposition can constitute the answer to a question is because they convey information about an individual, whereas *wh*-exclamatives with a degree reading lack such capacity and cannot constitute the answer to a question. Rett proposes the following example to illustrate this distinction. Suppose you have heard that Mimi speaks two Romance languages in addition to English. You know that Mimi´s mother is Swiss, so you assume that these two languages are French and Italian. However, you learn that Mimi instead speaks Portuguese and Romanian. Only a propositional exclamation such as (56a) would be felicitous in this context:

(56) a. (Wow) Mimi speaks Portuguese and Romanian!
b. # What languages Mimi speaks!

There are two more differences between degree exclamatives and propositional exclamatives. The latter allow external negation and they can constitute comparative structures, whereas this is not possible with degree exclamatives:

(57) ¡No aprobaste el examen de conducir!
'You did not pass the driving test!'
(58) *¡Que alto no es!
'*How tall he is not!'
(59) ¡Es tan alto como su padre!
'He is as tall as his father!'
(60) *¡Que alto es como su padre!
'How tall he is as his father!'

It has been observed that, when negation occurs in a degree-exclamative sentence, this negative element is expletive (Espinal 1997). It makes no effective contribution to the interpretation of the whole string containing this constituent. The variants of sentence (61) with or without negation have the same meaning:

(61) ¡Cuántas mentiras (no) nos habrá dicho Juan!
'The (many) lies Juan has told us!'

Further evidence that the canonical character of negation seems to be somewhat altered or suspended is the fact that negative polarity items (NPIs) are not licensed in these constructions:

(62) *¡La de tonterías que no habrá dicho nunca!
'*The nonsensical things that he hasn't ever said!'

According to Castroviejo (2006), this is explained by the fact that the degree operator takes scope over negation, and a contradiction ensues. The speaker holds an attitude towards a high degree, but the negative operator makes sure that there is no such high degree:

(63) *¡Qué inteligente no es el presidente!
'*How intelligent the president is not!'

Roughly, it does not make any sense to presuppose the existence of a maximal degree *d* such that the president is not *d*-smart, i.e. there does not exist a maximal degree of 'non-smartness'. Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996), following Elliot (1974), claims that the same scenario obtains with embedded exclamatives, since emotive factives cannot be negated:

(64) It is amazing how very cute he is
(65) *It isn't amazing how very cute he is

Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) argues that a negated emotive predicate does not qualify as properly emotive. In such a situation neither a *that*-clause nor an exclamative can be embedded, which suggests that these negated predicates do not work as factives (as opposed to 'I can't believe', for example). The conclusion to be drawn from these restrictions is that these embedded exclamatives pattern with presupposed *that*-clauses. On the other hand, Zanuttini & Portner (2003) explain the problematic instances of negated emotive predicates as pragmatic mismatches: negating 'amazing' implies that widening cannot occur, something that is incompatible with the widening effect that takes place with embedded exclamatives. Villalba (2003), however, points out that negation, although with a very limited distribution, can appear in exclamative sentences. It can modify the main verb in a *wh*-exclamative when the referent of the NP is salient in the context:

(66) ¡Cuántos libros que no has leído! (pointing at a pile of books)
'The books that he has not read!'

Sentence (66) can be uttered in a situation in which someone is reading books from a large list and refuses to read a majority of this presupposed set. Another scenario in which (66) would be felicitous is when the speaker is looking at the shelves in John's library containing the books that he was supposed to read during the course of his graduate studies, but he did not.

We claim that in the case of propositional exclamatives such as (57), as well as in (66), negation behaves as an external negation operator that moves to ForceP, the locus of illocutionary force. More precisely, in (57) the denial of the fact of not passing the driving exam is contrary to expectations and therefore it is the trigger of the emotive attitude.

With regard to the incompatibility between degree exclamatives and comparatives, Castroviejo (2006) claims that they are incompatible because exclamatives require that the relevant degree has to

be high or extreme on a given scale, and the comparison is not established between two individuals, but rather with a standard degree applied to an individual. On the other hand, propositional exclamatives are compatible with an expression of comparison because what triggers the emotive attitude is not a high degree; for example, in (59) it would be the fact of being as tall as the father referred to.

We have shown that the expression of a high or extreme degree is not a necessary ingredient for an exclamative construction. More concretely, exclamatives always have a propositional content that is viewed as unexpected by the speaker (this is the trigger of the speaker's attitude). The subclass of propositional exclamatives clearly satisfies this requirement, as exemplified in (45)-(48). On the other hand, when uttering a degree exclamative such as (67), a speaker expresses his/her attitude toward the fact that Juan is *d*-tall, so the degree of Juan's height is greater than any other degree in the relevant scale given his expectations:

(67) ¡Qué alto es Juan!
'How tall Juan is!'

Therefore, we conclude that the content of an exclamative construction can be a fact or a property, and the discourse contribution is the speaker's emotional attitude towards it. The difference between what we have called propositional exclamatives and degree exclamatives relies in the trigger of the associated emotional attitude: an unexpected fact, in the case of propositional exclamatives, and the high or extreme degree of a property, in the case of degree exclamatives.

6. Toward a new proposal

Since we have shown that the degree approach is not sufficient to explain the behavior of all exclamative classes in Spanish, the propositional analysis cannot be abandoned, and therefore, contrary to Castroviejo (2006) and Rett (2008), it seems that Zanuttini &Portner's (2000, 2003) analysis can still be considered valid in the sense that propositional exclamatives denote a set of alternatives propositions:

(68) Che roba che I mangia!
(69) [[Che roba che I mangia!]]w ={p:p is true and ∃ *a* [p = 'a is a pepper and he eats a']} =
{eats (he, poblanos), eats (he, serranos), eats (he, jalapenos)}

Zanuttini & Portner base their analysis of exclamatives on a semantic analysis of interrogatives (Groenendijk & Stokhof 1982). They propose that exclamatives like the one above have two domains of quantification: the first one would be the set of individuals denoted by the *wh*-clause in a standard situation; the second one would be a larger domain that would contain not only the expected individuals, but also unusual ones. The presence of a factive operator makes the non-standard alternatives in the quantificational domain presupposed. This widening property is the hallmark of exclamatives, and what makes them different from the clause type which they resemble the most, interrogatives. This is why widening is viewed as the essential component of their sentential force. By assumption, the assignment *g* yields the (narrower) domain D1, and the assignment *g'* yields the (larger) domain D2:

[[S]]*D1* = {eats (he, poblanos), eats (he, serranos), eats (he, jalapenos)}
[[S]] D2 = {eats (he, poblanos), eats (he, serranos), eats (he, jalapenos), eats (he, gueros), eats (he, habaneros)}

The alternatives in these sets are ordered from more standard to less standard (the criterion in the preceding example is the fact that some peppers are hotter than others). In Zanuttini & Portner's proposal 'widening' is the formal correlate of unexpectedness, extreme degree or expression of strong feelings that have been used in the literature. Specifically, 'widening' is a scalar implicature. When a speaker utters an exclamative sentence, the associated proposition lies at the extreme end of a

contextually given scale. They claim that there is an ordering in the quantificational domain, represented by ≺. As a consequence, every item entails the one to its left:

(70) {eats (he, poblanos) ≺ eats (he, serranos) ≺ eats (he, jalapenos) ≺
eats (he, gueros) ≺ eats (he, habaneros)}

We follow their idea that the scalar implicature is derived from a set of propositions ordered with respect to the speaker's expectations in the case of propositional exclamatives. On the other hand, in the case of degree exclamatives, we follow the idea proposed by Gutiérrez-Rexach (1997) that *wh*-words behave as quantifiers and that the scale is formed by degrees. The ordering relation between degrees hinges on the speaker's expectations.

We conclude that there are two different (exclamative) operators in Spanish exclamatives. For propositional exclamatives, the domain of the exclamative operator is a proposition. The emotive predicate takes the proposition, the situation and the speaker as arguments:

(71) ¡Juan ha encontrado mi libro!
'Juan has found my book!'
(72) EXC (a) (w) (λw'[find (w') (b) (J)] (w)) iff
∃P ∈ EMOT [P (w) (find (w) (b) (J)) (a)]

For degree exclamatives, the domain of the exclamative operator is a degree property, and the arguments of the emotive predicate are the degree property, the situation and the speaker:

(73) ¡Qué alto es Juan!
'How talll Juan is!'
(74) EXC (a) (w) (λw' [*id* [tall (w) (j, d)]]) iff
∃P ∈ EMOT [P (w) (λw' [*id* [tall (w) (j, d)] = *id* [tall (w) (j, d)]]) (a)]

References

Alonso-Cortes, Angel (1999) *La exclamación en español. Estudio sintáctico y pragmático*. Madrid: Minerva.

Castroviejo Miró, Elena (2006) *Wh-Exclamatives in Catalan*. PhD diss. Universitat de Barcelona.

Creswell, Max (1976) The semantics of degree. In Partee (ed.), *Montague Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.

Elliot, Dale (1974) Toward a grammar of exclamatives. *Foundations of Language* 11. 231-246.

Espinal, Maria Teresa (1997) Non-negative negation and *wh*-exclamatives. In D. Forget (ed.), *Negation and Polarity*, 75-94. Amsterdam: John Benjamins,

Grimshaw, Jane (1979) Complement selection and the lexicon. *Linguistic Inquiry* 10. 279-326

Groenedijk, Jeroen & Martin Stokhof (1982) Semantic analysis of *wh*-elements. *Linguistics & Phil.* 5. 175-223

Gutiérrez-Rexach, Javier (1996) The semantics of Exclamatives. In Garrett, E. & F. Lee (eds.), *Syntax at Sunset. UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics*, pp.146-162. UCLA. Los Angeles.

—— (1997) The Semantic Basis of NPI Licensing in Questions. *Proceedings SCIL* 8.

—— (1999) Rhetorical Questions, Relevance and Scales. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 11. 139-156.

—— (2001) Spanish exclamatives and the interpretation of the left periphery. In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 1999. Selected papers from 'Going Romance'1999.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1970) Fact. In M. Bierwisch and K.E. Heidolph eds., *Progress in Linguistics*, 143-73. The Hague: Mouton.

Rett, Jessica (2008) A degree account of exclamatives. *Proceedings of SALT* XVII.

Torrego, Esther (1988) Operadores de las exclamativas con articulo determinado. *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 36. 109-122.

Villalba, Xavier (2003) An Exceptional exclamative sentence type in Romance. *Lingua* 113. 713-745.

Zanuttini, Rafaella & Paul Portner (2000) The characterization of exclamatives in Paduan. *Language* 76. 39-81

—— (2003) Exclamative clauses: at the syntax-semantics interface. *Language* 79. 39–81.

Selected Proceedings of the 13th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium

edited by Luis A. Ortiz-López

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2011

Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 13th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium
© 2011 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-442-3 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Gutiérrez-Rexach, Javier and Patricia Andueza. 2011. Degree Restrictions in Spanish Exclamatives. In *Selected Proceedings of the 13th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, ed. Luis A. Ortiz-López, 286-295. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2496.