

An expressives analysis of exclamatives in Spanish

María Biezma, University of Massachusetts at Amherst

Introduction: Spanish speakers characterize sentences like (1a/b) as exclamatives:

- (1) a. ¡ QUE viene Juan! / b. ¡ QUE comas la sopa!
QUE comes Juan QUE eat.2.sg.Subj the soup
'Juan comes!!!' 'Eat the soup!!!' (extremely emphatic = '!!!' from now on)

Intuitively, exclamatives are sentences that express the speaker's state of "surprise", the "unexpectedness" of something or its location at an "extreme degree" with respect to an evaluative scale. (1a/b) fit this pattern: If two burglars are going through the papers on Juan's desk and they suddenly hear the front door, one of them could utter (1a) to express his surprise about Juan's unexpected arrival. If a mother is talking to a child who refuses to obey her requests that he eat the soup, the utterance of (1b) expresses an extremely emphasized order, arising from the mother's degree of annoyance. However, recent theories of exclamatives (c.f. [8], a.o.) do not include sentences like (1a/b). In this paper I show that the sentences in (1) are exclamatives, and not just declaratives used with exclamative intonation. I also show that the crucial difference with declaratives is QUE: QUE in (1) is different from the regular Spanish complementizer que ('that'). I propose an analysis in which QUE is an expressive ([4]) and show that all the properties attributed to exclamatives can be derived from it.

Identifying exclamatives: Several standard tests have been established in the literature to identify exclamatives ([1], [2], [8] a.o.) and (1a/b) satisfy them. **(i) Factivity:** Exclamatives are factive, i.e., the propositional content of exclamatives is presupposed to be true. This is usually determined by the impossibility of embedding exclamatives only under factive predicates ('know', 'realize'), but this test is not applicable to the sentences in (1) because they are not embeddable. However, factivity can be established by applying other strategies ([7]), like showing the incompatibility of factive sentences with states of ignorance, (2): a state of ignorance is incompatible with the presuppositions carried by the factive sentence.

- (2) a. ¡ QUE viene Juan! # Si es que viene. / b. ¡ QUE comas la sopa! # Si es que la comes.
'Juan comes!!! # If he comes at all.' / 'Eat your soup!!! # If you eat it at all.'

(ii) Scalar implicature: According to [8], exclamatives introduce a scalar implicature to the effect that the proposition they denote lies at the end of a some contextually given scale. In [8] scalar implicatures are treated as an effect arising from the comparison between two domains: the domain salient in the context of utterance and the larger domain salient once the sentence has been uttered. According to [8], (1a/b) would be 'yes/no exclamatives': they do not have an overt wh-operator or obvious scale. These exclamatives widen the domain of events under discussion. Before the utterance of (1a/b), the set of events under discussion does not include an event of Juan coming or of the child eating the soup, respectively. The exclamatives widen the domains to include such events. **(iii) Question/Answer pairs:** Exclamatives do not introduce questions in the discourse. The utterances of (1a/b) in the scenario discussed above cannot be followed by (3a) or (3b) respectively.

- (3) a. # ¿A qué hora? / b. # ¿De pescado ?
'# 'At what time?' / '# 'Fish soup?'

Previous proposals: Many attempts to account for exclamatives take as a starting point [8]'s analysis. Their claim is that exclamatives contain a wh operator-variable structure and an abstract morpheme FACT in the CP domain. However, the sentences in (1) are exclamatives

without an overt or covert wh-operator (the possibility of exclamatives without wh-operators has already been pointed out for Catalan by [7]). Previous analyses have also implemented a domain widening view of exclamatives, appealing to a context change operator, R_{widening} . However, [5] claims that there is no need for a special exclamative syntax or semantics, and points out problems with R_{widening} .

The analysis: QUE in (1) is responsible for the exclamative interpretation: sentences without QUE do not encode the same extreme degree of surprise or emphasis. **(i) QUE is not a regular complementizer:** [3], a.o., treats QUE in (1b) as the standard complementizer preceding embedded clauses that we find in (4a). In (1), the main clause is considered to be elided. However, the strength of (1b) is not reproduced by uttering (4a). Indeed, it is the addition of QUE, (4b), that promotes (4a) to a nonrefusable order by expressing the speaker's annoyance.

(4) a. Ordeno que comas la sopa / b. ¡QUE ordeno que comas la sopa!
 'I order that you eat the soup' / 'I order that you eat the soup!!!'

Embedded clauses as in (4a) can overtly express the agent of the predicate, (5a), but that is not possible in (1), showing that QUE is not the regular complementizer in (4a)

(5) a. Ordeno que tú comas la sopa / b. *¡QUE tú comas la sopa!
 'I order that you eat the soup.'

(ii) QUE is an expressive: The presence of QUE is revealing of the perspective from which the utterance is made. (1a) tells us that the speaker is on edge because of the arrival of Juan, and (1b) that the parent is extremely annoyed by her child's disobedience. The utterance of (1) alters the context making an impact about how current and future utterances are perceived. QUE is responsible for this shift, and the proposal is that QUE is an expressive ([4]), it fulfills the characteristics attributed to expressives: **(a) independence:** it contributes to a dimension of meaning separate from the original one: it is not the regular complementizer in (4a); **(b) nondisplaceability:** it expresses something of the utterance situation: in (1) it expresses that the speaker is on edge; **(c) perspective dependence:** the expressive content in (1) is evaluated from the speaker's perspective (it is the speaker who is on edge in (1)); **(d) descriptive ineffability:** speakers are never fully satisfied when they paraphrase expressive content using not expressive terms; **(e) immediacy:** its utterance achieves its intended act simply by being uttered; **(f) repeatability:** repetitions leads to strengthening. When uttering (6) the speaker is getting progressively anxious.

(6) ¡QUE viene Juan! ¡QUE ya llega! ¡QUE viene!
 'Juan comes!!! Juan is getting here!!! He comes!!!'

To account for expressive, [4] introduces expressives indices, c_e as part of the context, c . Expressive indices are triples, $\langle a \ I \ b \rangle$ ('a is at expressive level I for b'), where $I \in [-1, 1]$ (an interval). In the case of (1), b belongs to the domain of events. Expressives alter c_e laying out a new context, c' , that differs from the former with respect to an expressive index: $c \approx \overset{1}{c} c'$ ($c_1 =$ judge in c). The role of QUE as an expressive is to change the expressive level of the previous context. The appeal to expressive indices predicts that QUE cannot be embedded, and that it will give rise to an exclamative interpretation.

References: [1] Elliott (1974) Towards a grammar of exclamation. [2] Grimshaw (1979) Complement selection and the lexicon. [3] Han (2000) The structure and interpretation of imperatives [4] Potts (2007) [a] The expressive dimension. [b] Expressive dimensions: quality and expressability. [5] Sæbø (2005) The logical basis of exclamatives. [6] Traugott (2004) Exaptation and grammaticalization. [7] Villalba (2001) An exceptional exclamative sentence type in Romance. [8] Zanuttini & Portner (2003) Exclamative clauses: at the syntax semantics interface.