1. Introduction

Optative sentences are main clauses that express a vivid wish, hope, or desire without using a verb of wish, hope, or desire. They express the speaker’s desire about an actual or future situation, but they also are able to express a desire about a past situation and convey a contra-factual reading. They are prosodically marked by exaggerated acoustic intensity (wide ranging peaks and troughs) and orthographically indicated by exclamation marks «¡!». This property makes optatives look like exclamative sentences, but this is not the only common point between both kinds of clauses, since optatives and exclamatives are two varieties of non-declarative speech acts.

Exclamatives have aroused the interest of linguists in the past ten years, but the study of optatives from a formal view is recent. This chapter is devoted to presenting an analysis of Spanish optatives with two main objectives: one is to describe and explain the syntactic and semantic properties of Spanish optatives; the other one is to determine which properties optatives share with exclamatives and what exactly sets them apart.

This investigation has benefited from grant FFI2012-34974 from the Spanish Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad.
There is a large variety of optative sentences in Spanish. I will focus on the three types that are fully productive: (1) optatives introduced by *ojalá*, (2) optatives introduced by conjunctions such as *que* 'that' and *si* 'if,' and (3) optatives introduced by the wh-word *quién* 'who':

(1) ¡Ojalá haya paz entre los hombres!
   OJALÁ have_subj peace among the men
   ‘Let there be peace among men!’

(2) a. ¡Que la suerte te acompañe!
   that the luck you_ac accompanies_subj
   ‘May luck be with you!’

b. ¡Si hubierais encontrado un trabajo!
   if you.had_subj found a job!
   ‘If only you had found a job!’

(3) ¡Quién fuera millonario!
   Who were_subj millionaire
   ‘If only I were a millionaire!’

I will start by analyzing the optatives exemplified in (1) and (2). I will show that these are main sentences with a complex left periphery and will propose an analysis that combines two main ideas. First optatives contain a generalized

1. Sentences with a subjunctive verb such as the ones in (i)–(iv) are considered volitives or desideratives by grammarians:

   (i) ¡Pleitos tengas y los ganes!
      lawsuits you_have_subj and them_ac you.gain_subj
      ‘If you have lawsuits, I hope you win them!’

   (ii) ¡Dios te bendiga!
      God you_ac bless
      ‘God bless you!’

   (iii) Sea el conjunto de los números naturales.
      is_subj the set of the numbers natural
      ‘Let X be the set of natural numbers.’

   (iv) Agítese antes de usar.
      stir_subj--it_refl before of using
      ‘Stir before using.’

These sentences fall beyond the scope of this chapter. Optatives in (i) and (ii) are formulas or semi-lexicalized expressions whose syntactic pattern is not fully productive (cf. Porto Dapena 1991, 77). The more productive patterns—that is “jussives” of (iii) and “exhortatives” of (iv)—usually lack exclamatory force and fall somewhere in between proper optatives and imperatives (Merin & Nicolaeva, 2008, p. 50).
The two main properties of optative sentences in (1) and (2) are the obligatory presence of lexical material in the left periphery—the conjunctions que and si or the expression ojalá—and the obligatory subjunctive morphology in the verb. I will propose that the optative meaning is the result of the compositional contribution of these two elements. Optatives project a MoodP with an uninterpretable “anti-factive” feature associated with the morphological subjunctive mood; in addition, they contain an EX-operator in ForceP, which is responsible for the exclamatory force of the sentence, as well as for the desirability effect. The different ways in which the uninterpretable feature in mood is checked give rise to the different realizations of C like que, si, or ojalá. In this section, I will develop my proposal about the left periphery of optative sentences. The contribution of mood to the meaning of the sentences will be analyzed in greater detail in section 3.

2.1. QUE-OPTATIVES AND SI-OPTATIVES

Spanish optatives may be introduced by a complementizer in two different forms: the conjunction que ‘that,’ as in (4a), and the conjunction si ‘if,’ optionally followed by the adverbial expression al menos ‘at least,’ as in (4b). In both cases, the conjunction is obligatory:
Optative Exclamatives in Spanish

Optative exclamatives in (4) differ from polar exclamatives in (5) both in semantic and syntactic properties. As it is well-known, exclamatives express the speaker’s surprise about the fact denoted by the proposition. They may be introduced by a conjunction, but this particle is usually absent:

\[(4) \quad a. \quad ¡Que la suerte te acompañe!\]
\[\text{that the luck you accompanies} \]
\[\text{‘May luck be with you!’}\]
\[b. \quad ¡Si al menos hubieses estado allí!\]
\[\text{If at least you had been there}\]
\[\text{‘If only you had been there!’}\]

Optatives differ from polar exclamatives in (5) both in semantic and syntactic properties. As it is well-known, exclamatives express the speaker’s surprise about the fact denoted by the proposition. They may be introduced by a conjunction, but this particle is usually absent:

\[(5) \quad a. \quad ¡(Que) la suerte te acompaña!\]
\[\text{that the luck you accompanies}\]
\[\text{‘I am surprised that you are lucky!’}\]
\[b. \quad ¡(Si) estás aquí!\]
\[\text{if you are here}\]
\[\text{‘Oh, you are here!’}\]

Optative sentences look like embedded or subordinated clauses in that they are introduced by a subordinating conjunction, but they both occur without an overt matrix clause. This phenomenon is known as “insubordination” (Evans, 2007) and has been explained through a process of reconstruction of the omitted clause. This analysis, called the D(eletion)-hypothesis, defends the presence of an abstract or elided embedding verb. For Spanish, Spaulding (1934), Bustos Kleiman (1974), Rivero (1977), and Porto Dapena (1991) argue that these sentences are only apparently main clauses. In fact, they argue that they are really subordinated clauses that depend on a silent main verb selecting the subjunctive mood in the embedded clause. An alternative analysis, the I(ndependence)-hypothesis (Grosz, 2011), does not involve deletion of the matrix clause. I will defend the latter hypothesis and will argue that optatives are constituents of the category CP.

According to the D-hypothesis, Spanish que-optatives result from the ellipsis of an attitude predicate such as querer ‘want,’ desear ‘desire,’ or esperar ‘hope.’ This analysis presents, at least, two empirical problems. Firstly, it predicts that the optative sentence in (6a), whose subject is first-person singular, would derive from the ungrammatical sentence in (6b), since volition verbs, as other verbs selecting the subjunctive mood, display an “obviation effect” that prevents subjunctive complements if the matrix and the subordinating
subjects are co-referent. The D-analysis predicts that the optative must take the form in (6c); this sentence is grammatical, but its meaning is not optative (cf. Grohmann & Etxeparre, 2003):

(6) a. ¡Que yo gane el premio!
   That I \( \text{win}_{\text{subj}} \) the prize
   ‘If only I won the prize!’

b. *Quiero que yo gane el premio.
   I want that I \( \text{win}_{\text{subj}} \) the prize
   ‘I want to win the prize!’

c. ¡Ganar yo el premio! Eso sería fantástico.
   \( \text{Win}_{\text{inf}} \) I the prize that would be fantastic
   ‘Me win the prize?! That would be fantastic.’

Secondly, the subjunctive verb in \( \text{que} \)-optatives must be in present or present perfect tense (7a); other tense forms (like past and pluperfect) make the sentence ungrammatical, as shown in (7b). However, nothing prevents these verbal forms from occurring in a subordinate clause depending on a volition matrix verb, as shown in (7c). The D-hypothesis wrongly predicts that (7b) should be grammatical, unless a specific condition on tenses restricts the ellipsis of the matrix predicate. As it obvious, such a condition would not be far from being an ad hoc stipulation:

(7) a. ¡Que \{llege/e haya llegado\} ya María!
   That \{\text{arrives}_{\text{subj}}/\text{has}_{\text{subj}} \text{arrived}\} yet M.
   ‘I want María to arrive!’

b. *¡Que \{llegase/hubiese llegado\} ya María!
   That \text{arrived}_{\text{subj}}/\text{had}_{\text{subj}} \text{arrived} yet M.
   ‘I wish that María \{arrived/had arrived\} \{already/by now\}.’

c. Yo quería que \{llegase/hubiese llegado\} ya María.
   I wanted that \text{arrived}_{\text{subj}}/\text{had}_{\text{subj}} \text{arrived} yet M.
   ‘I wished that María \{arrived/had arrived\} \{already/by now\}.’

The D-hypothesis has been proposed for \( \text{si} \)-optatives in some other languages as well. Biezma (2011a, 2011b) considers English \( \text{if} \)-optatives as truly conditional sentences that differ from non-optative conditionals in the nature of the matrix clause. According to her, \( \text{if} \)-optatives include an elided matrix clause (the “consequent”, in Biezma’s terms). The elision of the matrix clause is possible because \( \text{if} \)-optatives have reverse topicality; that is, the
if-clause is the focus and the main clause is the topic. According to Biezma’s proposal, the schematic representation of the information structure of an if-optative would be the following (the example is hers):

(8)  a. How would I have brought it about that I played in the NBA?
    b. If only I had been taller, I would have played in the NBA!

In order to derive the intuition of what is desired in the implied consequent, Biezma (2011a) argues that desirability arises in those contexts in which optative conditionals provide answers to a question of how to bring about some salient consequent. In her proposal, the “mention-some” nature of optatives is due to the presence of “only,” which marks the modified statement as the strongest answer to the immediate question under discussion.

I will show that the D-hypothesis cannot be applied to Spanish si-optatives. In fact, Spanish provides a strong argument against the hypothesis, as Spanish conditionals admit both an indicative (9a) and a subjunctive verb (9b), but optatives require a subjunctive verb:

(9)  a. Si tengo dinero, compraré un coche nuevo.
    if I .have ind money I.will.buy a car new
    ‘If I have some money, I will buy a new car.’
    b. Si tuviera dinero, compararía un coche nuevo.
    if I .had subj money I.would.buy a car new
    ‘If I had some money, I would buy a new car.’

In the spirit of Biezma’s (2011a) analysis, the elision of the matrix clause in (9a) would correctly derive a si-optative with the verb in the indicative mood under two conditions: a) the utterance is in a context that favors the inverse informative structure, and b) a scalar adverb marks the statement as the strongest answer to the preceding question. Although both conditions are satisfied in (10), the elision of the matrix clause does not produce an optative sentence. The answer in b cannot receive an optative reading and is not interpretable; it could be grammatical if interpreted as a cut off utterance with conditional meaning and suspended intonation, as in (10c):

(10) a. ‒¿Comprarás un coche nuevo?
    ‘Will you buy a new car?’
    b. ‒¡Si al menos tengo dinero!
    if at least I .have ind money
I have provided empirical arguments that allow us to reject a D-analysis and support, instead, the I-analysis. This implies that Spanish optative sentences are main sentences of the category CP, introduced by a conjunction que ‘that’ and si ‘if,’ and displaying a complex left periphery.

2.2. THE OPERATOR EX AND THE STRUCTURE OF THE LEFT PERIPHERY

In this section I will propose that the left periphery of optative sentences consists of an EX-operator that selects an overt conjunction in C and is responsible for their semantic and syntactic properties. The idea that exclamative sentences have an Exclamative operator was proposed by Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996, 2001), and it has been implemented in various forms in the studies of Castroviejo (2006) for Catalan, Jónsson (2010) for Icelandic, and Grosz (2011) for German, among others. Following Grosz (2011), I will extend the EX-operator analysis to optatives and will argue that optatives contain a generalized exclamation operator EX expressing an emotion toward the status of the modified proposition on a contextually provided scale; the optative reading arises if the context provides a scale of the speaker’s preferences.

Being expressive speech acts, both exclamatives and optatives differ from declaratives, which are descriptive utterances. Expressive utterances reveal emotional or affective reactions that constitute over manifestations of emotional or affective behavior. On the contrary, descriptive statements are truth functional propositions bound to be true or false. Expressive utterances are either felicitous or infelicitous in a given context, but they cannot be true or false. They cannot be denied or confirmed either, in the same way in that an assertion can. The examples in (11) show that the listener may react to an optative utterance expressing his agreement, as in the b answer, but he or she might not confirm the truth value of the expressive utterance. As a consequence, the c answer is not adequate:

(11) a. ¡Que venga Pepe!
   ‘If only Pepe came!’
   b. Yo también lo deseo.
   ‘Yes, I wish so too.’
Interestingly, declarative statements with a verb of desire can be denied or confirmed by the listener, as the examples in (12) clearly prove. This supports the idea that they are declarative sentences, but not expressive utterances. The different behavior of optative and declarative sentences with verbs of desire provides an additional argument against a D-analysis for optatives:

(12) a. Yo deseo que venga Pepe.
   ‘I want Pepe to come.’
   b. Es {verdad/falso} que tú deseas eso.
   ‘It is {true/false} that you want that.’

The fact that optative utterances are inherently emotive and evaluative is confirmed by the observation that the perceived emotion/evaluation cannot be easily cancelled. The unexpected inference conveyed by exclamatives cannot be cancelled, as the examples in (13) show; similarly, the implication of desirability (attributed to the speaker) cannot be cancelled in optatives either, as can be seen in (14):

(13) a. Me sorprende que haya venido Pepe, aunque en el fondo me lo esperaba.
   ‘I am surprised that Pepe has come, although deep down I expected it.’
   b. #¡Ha venido Pepe, aunque en el fondo me lo esperaba!
   ‘Pepe has come, although deep down I expected it!’

(14) a. Deseo que sea despedido, aunque eso no importa mucho.
   ‘I wish he was fired, although it does not matter much.’
   b. #¡Ojalá sea despedido, aunque eso no importa mucho!
   ‘If only he was fired! Although that does not matter much.’

The expressive nature of exclamatives and optatives is due to the presence of an EX operator that combines with a truth conditional statement (i.e., a proposition) and turns it into a felicity-conditional expression of an emotion. Both in exclamatives and optatives, the emotion is connected to a scale, since EX takes a scalar argument and quantifies over scalar alternatives. I take the formulations below from Grosz (2011):
(15) a. An utterance of EX(ø) conveys that the speaker at the point of utterance has an emotion \( \epsilon \) (or at least an evaluative attitude \( \epsilon \)) toward \( \emptyset \). By uttering an utterance of EX(ø), the speaker intends to express an emotion \( \epsilon \), rather than describe \( \epsilon \).

b. EX: For any scale \( S \) and proposition \( p \), interpreted in relation to a context \( c \) and assignment function \( g \), an utterance \( EX(S)(p) \) is felicitous if:

\[
\forall q [\text{threshold}(c) > S q \rightarrow p > S q]
\]

That is to say: EX expresses an emotion that captures the fact that \( p \) is higher on a (speaker-related) scale \( S \) than all contextually relevant alternatives \( q \) below a contextual threshold, where \text{threshold}(c) is a function from a context into a set of worlds/a proposition that counts as high with respect to a relevant scale \( S \). If \( S \) refers to a scale that models the speaker's surprise, we get an exclamative reading. If \( S \) refers to a scale that models the speaker's preferences (i.e., a bouletic scale), we get an optative reading.

This account is consistent with the idea that desirability is the result of the comparison of a proposition and salient alternatives. Villalta (2007, 2008) discusses Heim's (1992) analysis of desire as a polar comparison of a proposition and its opposite. She concludes that desirability involves a comparison of a situation such that a proposition \( p \) is more preferable to the speaker than all contextually salient alternatives. Villalta's view provides an explanation for the fact that we can wish something that is not optimal. The desired situation is not necessarily the best possible case, but it is a case desirable enough as to be satisfactory in some relevant sense. This is why someone may utter a sentence like (16) considering that his or her actual job forces him or her to work 60 hours a week:

(16) ¡Ojalá tuviera que trabajar cuarenta horas a la semana!

'If only I only had to work 40 hours a week!'

Associating the expressive interpretation of a sentence with an exclamatory operator entails that there has to be a syntactic projection hosting this constituent expressing force. In line with the cartographic approach that takes CPs to involve a fine-grained structure encoding topic, focus, and force constituents, I will assume that EX is syntactically merged in the specifier of ForceP (Rizzi, 1997; Gutiérrez-Rexach, 2001). I will propose that an overt conjunction que ‘that’ or si ‘if’ merges to satisfy the mood feature entailed in optative sentences. C has an interpretable feature that attracts the uninterpretable feature [mood], in MoodP, associated with subjunctive morphology.
The fact that exclamatives do not necessarily contain an overt conjunction reflects the absence of a parallel uninterpretable feature in MoodP, since the verb displays indicative morphology.
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The role of MoodP on the semantic properties of optatives will be pursued in section 3. In the following section, I will propose that the analysis in (17) can be extended to Spanish ojalá-optatives.

2.3. OJALÁ (QUE)-OPTATIVES

The most common exclamative sentences with optative meaning in Spanish are introduced by the word ojalá, for which English ‘I wish’ is just an approximate translation. Ojalá-optative sentences admit an optional que, as shown in (18):

(18) ¡Ojalá (que) tu vida sea larga y feliz!

ojalá that your life is subj long and happy

‘I wish you a long and happy life!’

The grammatical categorization of ojalá is a controversial issue. I will consider it to be a modal adverb, such as quizás ‘maybe’ or acaso ‘perhaps.’ All these particles show a very similar distribution, and all have the capacity to select a verb in the subjunctive mood.2 Like modal adverbs, ojalá can be used

---

2. I agree with Alonso-Cortés (2011, p. 27) that ojalá is not an interjection because it has a constant meaning, whereas interjections can convey different pragmatically dependent senses. However, Alonso-Cortés (2011, p. 26) considers ojalá not to be an adverb because it cannot be coordinated with another adverb (‘Ojalá y seguramente ojalá and sure’) and because it does not admit quantifiers (cf. *Muy ojalá que Juan venga ‘Very ojalá that Juan comes’). In my opinion, the ungrammaticality of the coordinate phrase above can be due to a semantic incompatibility (a similar incompatibility arises in ‘seguramente y probablemente ‘sure and probably’).
as an answer (19a) and is able to occupy incidental positions in the middle or the end of the sequence (19b, 19c):

(19) a. -¿Terminarás tu trabajo a tiempo?
     you will finish your work at time
     ‘Will you finish your work on time?’
     -{Ojalá/quizás}
     {ojalá/maybe}
     ‘[I hope/maybe]’
b. Mañana todo habrá acabado, {ojalá/quizás}.
     Tomorrow everything will have finished, ojalá maybe
     ‘Everything will be done tomorrow, I hope/perhaps.’
c. Todos nuestros problemas se resolverán, {ojalá/quizás}, muy pronto.
     All our problems will be solved ojalá/ maybe very soon
     ‘Our problems will, [I hope/perhaps], soon be solved.’

As with other modal adverbs, ojalá selects for a verb in a subjunctive mood under a government relation; the subjunctive is not possible if ojalá does not c-command the verb:

(20) a. Ojalá {*llegas/ llegues} a tiempo.
     ojalá {you.arrive_ind/you.arrive_subj} on time
     ‘I hope you arrive on time.’
b. {Llegarás/ *llegues} a tiempo, ojalá.
     you.will.arrive_ind/you.arrive_subj on time, ojalá
     ‘You will arrive on time, I hope.’

I will propose that ojalá-optatives contain an EX operator in the same way as optatives with que and si. However, the adverb ojalá merges in the position of the specifier of MoodP and checks the uninterpretable feature of mood in situ. Afterward, it is displaced to Force in order to check the exclamatory feature of EX. As such, ojalá-optatives do not involve the obligatory realization of C as the conjunctions que/si. Movement of ojalá to Force guarantees

On the other hand, gradability is not a necessary property of all adverbs. I conclude, therefore, that his arguments against ojalá as an adverb are not sound.
the realization of overt adequate lexical material in the CP layer under ForceP. The structure of an ojalá-optative without que would be as follows:

\[(21) \text{[ForceP EX ojalá [MoodP ojalá [Mood [u-mood]]]]}\]

Optional que after ojalá is homonymous with the conjunction que of que-optatives, but they differ both in their optionality and in their relation with the morphological mood of the verb. The que heading que-optatives is obligatory. As we will see below, this complementizer has an effect on the tense and the mood of the predicate, since it selects a verb in present or present perfect, but rejects past or pluperfect (22):

\[(22) ¡Que [lleve/haya llegado/ *llegara/ *hubiera llegado]!
That s/he.arrives_{subj} he.has_{subj} arrived he.arrived_{subj} he.had_{subj} arrived
‘I wish he {had arrived}!’\]

Contrarily, the que after ojalá is optional, and, thus, it cannot be considered responsible for the mood features of the verb. In addition, the presence of the optional que seems to be unconstrained by the tense of the verb. Demonte and Fernández Soriano (2009) suppose that que is not possible with a pluperfect, but the truth is that all the combinations of subjunctive tenses with ojalá que are documented: not only present tense (as in [18] above), but also perfect (23a), past (23b), and pluperfect (23c):

\[(23) a. ¡Ojalá que haya secado mi chompa!
ojalá that had_{subj} dried my jersey
‘If only my jersey had dried out!’
(C. Vega, Ipacankure, Perú, CREA)
b. ¡Ojalá que estuviera dormido!
ojalá that s/he.were_{subj} asleep
‘If only he was asleep!’
(J. A. Lira, Medicina andina, Perú, CREA)
c. ¡Ojalá que nunca hubiera crecido, ni conocido a Pedro!
ojalá that never s/he.had_{subj} grown nor known to Pedro
‘If only he had never grown up, nor known Pedro!’
(L. Esquivel, Como agua para chocolate, México, CREA)\]
In order to explain the special behavior of both *que*’s, I will propose that the *que* following *ojalá* is related to the *que* that optionally follows some focused elements in exclamative sentences, such as the ones exemplified in (24):

(24) a. ¡Qué guapa (que) es María!
   what pretty that is María
   ‘How pretty Mary is!’

   b. ¡Bien (que) me habías engañado!
   well that me you had cheated
   ‘You sure cheated me!’

I will assume, following Gutiérrez-Rexach (2008), that the optional presence of *que* is related to the activation of the focus layer in C. This explains that the difference between *ojalá*-optatives and *ojalá que*-optatives lies in the focal or emphatic import of the latter. Consequently, the analysis of an *ojalá que*-optative would be as follows: 3

(25) $\left[ \text{ForceP} \text{ EX} \text{ ojalá} \left[ \text{FocusP} \left[ \text{Focus que} \left[ \text{MoodP ojalá} \left[ \text{i-mood} \text{ Mood} \left[ \text{u-mood} \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right]$}

According to this proposal, *ojalá*-optatives contain an EX-operator in the same way as *que*-optatives and *si*-optatives; the operator shifts the propositional content of the utterance into the expressive domain. This analysis differs from Grosz (2011, pp. 185–190), who supposes that *ojalá*-optatives belong to a special kind of optatives, *adv*-optatives. This variety is supposed to contain an idiosyncratic speech act adverbial, but not an EX-operator. Grosz’s main argument is that *ojalá*-optatives are embeddable, whereas EX-optatives are not. The following examples, adapted from Grosz (2011, p. 186), show that a quantifier is able to bind to an *ojalá*-optative from a super-ordinated clause (26a). Wh-movement is possible as well from within an embedded *ojalá*-clause (26b):

(26) a. Cada bruja dice que ojalá su escoba estuviera aquí.
   each witch says that *ojalá* her broom were here
   ‘Each of the witches says that she wished her broom were here.’

---

3. Considering that the optional *que* in *ojalá*-optatives is the same focus-related element that optionally occurs in exclamatives supports Gutiérrez-Rexach’s (2008) observation that *que* is not the overt realization of factivity, contrary to the proposal by Zanuttini and Portner (2003).
b. ¿Qué dijo Juan que ojalá hubieras comprado?
   ‘What did Juan say that he wished you had bought?’

However, as Grosz (2011) notes himself, ojalá-optatives are problematic under a verb of speech other than decir ‘to say,’ as well as ungrammatical under a wish verb (27a). To these arguments, one may add that they cannot depend on a predicate of desire, as shown in (27b):

\[
(27) \quad \text{a. Cada bruja\{dice/piensa/insiste en/espera/desea/\*quiere\}} \quad \text{each witch says thinks insists on espera/hopes wants}
\]
\[
\quad \text{que ojalá su escoba estuviera aquí.} \quad \text{that ojalá her broom were here}
\]
\[
\quad \text{‘Each witch says that ojalá her broom is here.’}
\]
\[
\text{b. *Es deseable que ojalá todas las escobas estuvieran aquí.}
\]
\[
\quad \text{It is desirable that ojalá all the brooms were here}
\]
\[
\quad \text{‘One would desire all brooms to be here.’}
\]

On the other hand, ojalá que-optatives are not embeddable, as the example in (28a) shows; extraction is not possible in (28b), either:

\[
(28) \quad \text{a. *Cada bruja dice que ojalá que su escoba estuviera aquí.}
\]
\[
\quad \text{each witch says that ojalá her broom were here}
\]
\[
\quad \text{‘Each of the witches says that she wished her broom were here.’}
\]
\[
\text{b. *¿Qué dijo Juan que ojalá que hubieras comprado?}
\]
\[
\quad \text{What said Juan that ojalá you had bought}
\]
\[
\quad \text{‘What did Juan say that he wished you had bought?’}
\]

More arguments may be found; if ojalá-optatives were embeddable, the sentence in (29) would be expected to be grammatical with the meaning “each of the witches says that she does not desire that her broom were here,” but this is not the case:

\[
(29) \quad \text{*Cada bruja niega que ojalá su escoba estuviera aquí.}
\]
\[
\quad \text{each witch denies that ojalá her broom were here}
\]
\[
\quad \text{‘Each of the witches denies that her broom was here.’}
\]

---
4. The English translation in (27b) expresses the expected but not available reading of the Spanish example. This is also the case for examples (28) and (29) below.
Finally, Grosz (2011) argues that volitional adverbs operate on the propositional level. This means that, when ojalá is embedded, the wish expressed does not seem to be a wish on the part of the speaker, but rather a wish on the part of the person referred to by the matrix subject. Nevertheless, this is not all true, since ojalá is able to refer to the speaker’s desire in the embedded context as well. The example in (30) shows that ojalá refers to the speaker’s desire if it is inside a relative clause because the only available reading of the utterance is the one in (30b):

(30) María escribió un libro que ojalá no hubiera escrito.
M. wrote a book that ojalá not she.had subj written
a. ‘Mary wrote a book and she wishes she had never written it.’
b. ‘Mary wrote a book and the speaker wishes that she had never written it.’

To summarize, the data above suggest that the fact that ojalá is able to modify an embedded sentence cannot be considered a conclusive argument against analyzing ojalá-optatives as root sentences with an EX-operator. It is necessary to investigate which kind of embedded sentences allows ojalá to occur. At a glance, it seems that only restrictive relative clauses and clauses depending on speech verbs do so. In any case, I have to leave this issue open for space limitations. I will confine myself to arguing that in these cases ojalá merges in the specifier of a MoodP, but the numeration does not have an EX-operator and it remains in situ. As opposed to this, there are empirical arguments for considering that in main sentences, ojalá merges in the specifier of MoodP and moves to the ForceP inside a complex left periphery; if the focus layer of this complex left periphery is activated, Focus merges as an optional que.

3. Mood and Tense in Optatives

The use of subjunctive morphology in optative sentences is related to two semantic features. On one hand, the grammatical role of mood is to overtly mark the sort of model in which a proposition must be interpreted (Giannakidou, 1997; Quer, 1998). The operator EX forces the proposition to be evaluated according to a scale. If the scale models the speaker’s preferences (i.e., a bouletic scale), we get an optative reading. If the scale models the speaker’s surprise (i.e., an inverse prior likelihood scale), we get an
exclamative reading. Optative and exclamative sentences clearly illustrate that the shift from subjunctive mood to indicative mood signals a shift in the model of evaluation for the proposition.

On the other hand, I propose that the subjunctive is related to the semantic feature of anti-factivity. It is widely assumed that exclamative sentences involve a factive feature, which explains that the proposition denotes a fact (see Zanuttini & Portner, 2003, and the references therein). I will show that optatives are characterized by the semantic property of anti-factivity, in the sense that they express a desire about an event that cannot be interpreted as a fact. This property goes beyond the intuitive idea that people usually desire something that is not actually happening. This is proven by the contrast between optative and declarative sentences with a verb of desire. Descriptive sentences containing these predicates are compatible with a context in which the factual nature of the desire is expressed. This happens in the examples in (31):

(31) a. Yo quiero que tú seas el jefe y por eso lo eres.
    I want that you is the boss and by that it you are
    ‘I want you to be the boss, and that is why you are.’

b. Esperaba que hubiera venido Pepe, como de hecho ha venido
    I.hoped that had come Pepe as of fact he has come
    ‘I was hoping Pepe had come, as he in fact did.’

c. Deseo que me ames, y soy feliz porque sé que me amas.
    I.wish that me you love and I am happy because I know that me you love
    ‘I want you to love me, and I am happy because I know you love me.’

Contrarily, optative sentences are anomalous in a context in which the factual nature of the desire is entailed:

(32) a. ¡Ojalá tú seas el jefe! #Y por eso lo eres.
    ¡OJALÁ you is the boss and by that it you are
    ‘If only you were the boss! And that is why you are.’

b. ¡Que haya venido Pepe . . . , como de hecho ha venido!
    That has come Pepe, as of fact he has come
    ‘If only Pepe had come, as he in fact did.’
I propose that the anti-factivity feature of optatives merges as an uninterpretable feature in MoodP. This feature is checked in two different ways: it can be checked by an interpretable feature mood in C (in this case, C merges as an overt conjunction que/si), or by spec-head agreement with the lexical adverb ojalá. I will show that the way in which this feature is checked has syntactic and semantic consequences.

The Spanish paradigm of subjunctive mood consists of four tenses: present (ame ‘I love’), past (amara/amase ‘I loved’), (present)-perfect (haya amado ‘I have loved’), and pluperfect (hubiera/hubiese amado ‘I had loved’). The data presented so far show that both que-optatives and si-optatives require verbs with certain tense features: the verb in que-optatives may display present or perfect morphology, but not past or pluperfect (cf. [22] repeated in [33a]); the verb in si-optatives is in the past or pluperfect tense, but it rejects present and perfect, as shown in (33b).

(33) a. ¡Que ella llegue/ haya llegado/*llegara/* hubiera llegado} ya!
That she arrives has arrived arrived had arrived
yet
‘I wish she {had arrived} {already/by now}.’

b. ¡Si al menos yo {*sea/ *haya sido/ fuera/ hubiera sido} millonario!
If at least I am have been been a millionaire
‘If only I {were/had been} a millionaire!’

Ojalá-optatives don’t have tense restrictions, as shown in the examples in (23) above. Table 1 summarizes the tense restrictions of optative sentences. The table shows that there is a relationship between the way mood is checked and the restrictions on the tense of the subjunctive verb. When checking takes place in C, it has consequences on the lexical realization in C. In the
following, I will show that this is due to the semantic specification of the feature of anti-factivity.

Grammarians have noted that tense features in optative sentences are not exclusively related to temporal anchoring, but also to the interpretation of the event as a feasible or unfeasible desire (cf. Bello, 1847/1964, § 692; Gili Gaya, 1961, § 40; Ridruejo, 1983; among others). When combined with present tense, the desired situation is a present stage or a future event (34a); when combined with a present perfect tense, the desired situation consists of the present or future results of an event, which can be accomplished at any time (34b). In both cases, the desire is supposed to be feasible. The sentences in (34) express a feasible desire, that is, an eventuality that is not real but is compatible with the actual state of things.

(34) a. ¡Ojalá llueva {ayer/ hoy/ mañana}!
   ojalá it.rains_{subj} yesterday/today/tomorrow
   ‘I wish it would rain {today/tomorrow}!’

b. ¡Ojalá haya terminado la huelga {ayer/ hoy/ mañana}!
   ojalá has_{subj} finished the strike yesterday/today/tomorrow
   ‘I hope the strike will be finished {today/tomorrow}!’

When combined with a past tense, optatives express that the desired situation is simultaneous or subsequent to the time of the utterance (35a). When combined with the pluperfect, the desired situation described by optatives consists on the present or future results of an event, which can be accomplished at any time (35b). In both cases, optatives express a non-feasible or impossible desire, that is, an eventuality that is not real and is not compatible with the actual state of things:
(35) a. ¡Ojalá estuviera lloviendo {ahora/mañana}!
   ‘If only it was raining {right now/tomorrow}!’

b. ¡Ojalá hubiese terminado {ya/mañana} el artículo!
   ‘If only I had finished my paper {yet/tomorrow}!’

Only the pluperfect can anchor the desired situation in the past. In that case, both the aoristic (36a) and resultative/perfect reading (36b) are possible for the pluperfect:

(36) a. ¡Ojalá su esposa hubiera ido ayer a la fiesta!
   ‘If only his wife had gone yesterday to the party’

b. ¡Ojalá hubiera terminado el trabajo ayer!
   ‘If only I had finished my paper yesterday!’

The temporal anchoring of the pluperfect provides the contra-factual reading. The sentences in (35) and (36) express a non-feasible or impossible desire, that is, an eventuality that is not real and is not compatible with the actual state of things (Ridruejo, 1999, p. 3217; Rojo, 1974; Rojo & Veiga, 1999, pp. 2918–2919).

Table 2 sums up all the possible interpretations of the subjunctive tenses in optative sentences. In all these cases, the subjunctive refers to an anti-factive situation. The combination of the morphological tense of the verb and the temporal anchoring of the non-factual event gives rise to two different readings related to the speaker’s attitude. Optatives with a present or present perfect tense are interpreted as feasible desires, which is consistent with Laca’s (2010, p. 198) idea that “the present is a deictic tense, always anchored with regard to Utt-time.” Optatives with a past or pluperfect tense are interpreted as non-feasible desires, as contra-factivity is a special case of non-feasibility. Tense selection is, then, associated with the modal base to which the proposition is evaluated: optatives with present and perfect tense provide a non-realistic modal base (Iatridou 2000), that is, a non-unitary domain of words of evaluation including the real world ($w_0$); on the other hand, optatives with past and pluperfect provide a non-realistic modal base, which excludes the real world. This explains that only optatives with a past tense are compatible with a contra-factual reading, as example (37) shows:
Finally, it is important to recall that the merging of C in optatives is related to the interpretation of the anti-factive feature of mood. C merges as *que* if the anti-factive feature has a “feasible” reading, since this conjunction is only allowed with present and perfect tenses. On the other hand, C merges as *si* if the anti-factive feature has a contra-factive or non-feasible reading, since *si* is only compatible with preterite and pluperfect tenses. The fact that *ojalá*-optatives are compatible with all tenses supports the idea that the adverb can lexically check the anti-factive feature of mood without resorting to C.

**4. Wh-Words in Optative Sentences**

In previous sections, it has been shown that exclamatives and optatives have some common properties: they are expressive sentences without a truth value that express the speaker’s emotion about a proposition, and they contain an EX-operator that selects a scalar argument and quantifies over scalar alternatives. However, they differ in the type of scale involved (a preference scale for optatives but an inverse prior likelihood scale for exclamatives). They differ as well in the factual nature of the proposition (which is factual
for exclamatives but anti-factual for optatives). In this section, I will show that they also differ in the possibility of containing a wh-word.

4.1. WH-OPTATIVES DO NOT EXIST . . .

It is known that predicates of desire, wish, or hope cannot take wh-sentences as arguments, as shown in (38):

(38) a. *I hope who comes.
    b. *She wishes where he goes on holidays.
    c. *It is desirable when he lives.

As expected, wh-optatives are not possible, either. The subjunctive morphology excludes an exclamative reading in the Spanish examples in (39), so that, only the optative reading is available. But even so, the sentences in (39) are ungrammatical. The English translation expresses the expected, but not available, reading of the Spanish examples:

(39) a. *¡Dónde esté yo ahora!
    ‘If only I were in such a place now!’
    b. *¡Cuán interesante haya sido el artículo que he escrito!
    ‘If only the paper I wrote were very interesting!’
    c. *¡Cuántos países visitase durante mis vacaciones!
    ‘If only I visited many countries during my holidays!’

Wh-exclamatives are, instead, perfectly grammatical:

(40) a. ¡Dónde estoy yo ahora!
    ‘It is amazing where I am now!’
    b. ¡Cuán interesante ha sido el artículo que he escrito!
    ‘How interesting the paper I have written is!’

5. To the best of my knowledge, sentences with this pattern are ungrammatical in German and English and other Romance languages as well.
c. ¡Cuántos países visité durante mis vacaciones!
   How many countries I visited during my holidays
   ‘How many countries I have visited during my holidays!’

I propose that the ungrammaticality of the examples in (38) and (39) is due to the intensional anchoring of the proposition involved in optatives. Assuming that propositions are anchored to worlds, and worlds are anchored to individuals, I consider that both exclamatives and optatives are modalized propositions anchored to the speaker’s world. As we have seen above, EX contributes the speaker’s emotion about a proposition, so that the world in which the proposition must be evaluated is a world, or set of worlds, introduced by the speaker.

Optatives and exclamatives differ, however, with regards to this world or set of worlds. Since EX in optatives is associated with the world the speaker considers desirable, it naturally follows that optative-EX is a “strong intensional operator”—in McCawley’s (1981) terms. It introduces a set of worlds that the speaker takes to be possible alternatives to his or her real world. The content of the proposition is anchored in each one of these worlds, and the proposition is true in them. As expected, the optative EX operator is non-veridical. As other strong intensional predicates do, it does not guarantee the truth of the proposition in the embedded model (see Giannakidou, 1995; Quer, 1998).

As opposed to optative operators, EX in exclamatives is a “weak intensional operator” and introduces a single world in the context where the proposition is true. This explains that the proposition under the exclamative EX operator is not only a veridical proposition, but it actually denotes a fact. According to this, EX in exclamatives is a veridical operator because the truth of its complements is implied or entailed in the model it introduces.

Going back to the examples in (39)–(40), I assume that a wh-clause denotes basically a set of propositions \( p \) true in the world \( w \). That means that clauses with a wh-word denote the set of all possible true propositions of the form \( p(x) \), \( x \) being all the possible values for the wh-variable in the world of evaluation. According to this, wh-words are grammatical under the scope of an exclamative EX-operator because the proposition is evaluated in a single world that coincides with the world of the speaker’s knowledge. The proposition is, then, veridical. The exclamative reading involves the presupposition

---

6. This is the classic analysis of Hamblin (1973) and Karttunen (1977) for interrogatives, which Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996), Abels (2004), D’Avis (2002), and Zanuttini and Portner (2003), among others, extend to exclamatives.
that the wh-variable instantiates. As a consequence, it has a single value that is known by the speaker.7

To the contrary, wh-words are ungrammatical under the scope of an optative EX-operator because the proposition is evaluated in a set of worlds that coincides with the desires and wishes of the speaker. The denotation of the wh-optative would be the set of all possible true propositions \( p(x) \), where \( x \) is the wh-variable. Nevertheless, since the proposition is under the scope of a non-veridical operator, it is not possible to guarantee the truth of the proposition, what makes the utterance uninterpretable.

4.2. . . . EXCEPT FOR SPANISH QUIÉN-OPTATIVES

Contrary to what we would expect, Spanish wh-optatives with the pronoun quién ‘who’ are grammatical. They are, actually, an extremely common productive pattern of optative sentences in both Spanish and other Ibero-Romance languages (see Sánchez López, 2016). Let me enumerate their most relevant syntactic and semantic properties.

Quién is a pronoun that is marked with singular and third-person features [+human], which the verb displays in subject-verb agreement.8 Somehow paradoxically, quién-optatives express the speaker’s desire, that is, they are interpreted as having a first-person singular, as shown in the gloss of (3), which I repeat here as (41):

\[
(41) \text{¡Quién fuera millonario!}
\]

‘If only I were a millionaire!’

Quién must be the subject of the sentence. The sentence becomes ungrammatical (the optative reading being available) if quién is a direct

7. This is consistent with the factive content of exclamatives and also with the scalar interpretation of the proposition, since only one of all the possible values of \( x \) can satisfy the condition of being the highest in an inverse prior likelihood scale that models the speaker’s surprise.

8. In the preterit subjunctive, first and third persons are homonymous. However, the agreement with a reflexive pronoun clearly shows that the verb in quién-optatives has third-person features:

\[
(i) \text{¡Quién pudiera ir \{se/ *me\} al Caribe!}
\]

‘If only I were able to travel to the Caribbean sea!’
object (42a) or a prepositional complement (42b). The English glosses express the expected but impossible meaning of the utterance:9

(42) a. *¡A quién amara él!
   To whom loved\textsubscript{subj} he
   ‘If only he loved me!’

   b. *¡Para quién hubieses trabajado en esa empresa!
   For whom you.had\textsubscript{subj} worked in that company
   ‘If only you had worked for me in that company!’

The interpretation of quién as a first-person singular, despite its morphological features, can be overtly explicit in context. In the following examples, the first person merges in the verb of the relative clause:

(43) a. ¡Quién tuviera el ansia de aventura que tuve siempre!
   Who had\textsubscript{subj} the yearning of adventure that I.had ever
   ‘If only I had the yearning for adventure that I always had!’
   (J. Martín Recuerda, El engañao, España, 1981)

   b. Quién hubiera podido comprarlos con el dinero que gané bailándole a los franceses en las tabernas de Cádiz.
   who had\textsubscript{subj} been-able buying-them\textsubscript{ac} with the money that I.earned dancing-him\textsubscript{dat} to the Frenchmen in the taverns of Cádiz
   ‘If only I was able to buy them with the money I earned dancing in the Cadiz taverns for the Frenchmen!’ (J. Martín Recuerda, Las arrecogías, España, 1988)

The verb in quién-optatives must be in the subjunctive mood. Present and perfect tenses are not possible. The past has a “non-feasible” reading (43a), and the pluperfect, as expected, has a contra-factual reading (43b).

I will now explain how quién-optatives escape from the general restriction of wh-optatives. Considering the ungrammaticality of the examples in (38) and (39) above, the grammaticality of (41) is quite surprising. The EX-operator ought to make the proposition “to be a millionaire(x)” (where x is the wh-variable associated with quién ‘who’) true in the set of worlds

---

9. These sentences would be ungrammatical if quién ‘who’ refers to another person than the speaker as well.
compatible with the speaker’s desire. But it is not possible to know whether this proposition is true in all these possible worlds, since the value of the wh-variable is not instantiated. In other words, the speaker cannot express an emotion about a proposition that contains a variable whose value is expected to be different in each of the worlds compatible with his desire.

The only way to save the derivation of a wh-optative would be to interpret the wh-variable as having a constant value instantiated by some special mechanism. I will argue that this is exactly what happens in quién-optatives. Since EX is necessarily associated with the speaker’s emotion, I propose that it contains a first-person feature that guarantees that exclamatives and optatives do not express the surprise or the desire of another person other than the speaker. EX enters the derivation with an interpretable first-person feature, yielding an expressive utterance that conveys the speaker’s emotion about a proposition. I assume that the features of third-person and singular quién ‘who’ are uninterpretable (that is, they are default values for person and number), acquiring a value by agreement with INFL. Being a quantifier, quién ‘who’ is associated with a covert partitive phrase, which provides their quantification domain. This partitive phrase may acquire a person feature in the course of the derivation, via binding. I propose that EX binds the partitive complement of quién. By so doing, it restricts the quantifier domain to the set of individuals with the features [+human] [person:first], as shown in (44):

10. Similarly, Zanuttini, Pak, and Portner (2012) propose that jussive, hortative, and imperative sentences contain a jussive operator with second-person features. This is necessary to explain the mandatory reference to the addressee in these sentences.
My analysis ensures that a relation is established between the EX-operator and the subject, as opposed to some other argument. The examples in (41) crash because of the presence of a potential binder for quién (i.e., the subject or another argument). The binding of the partitive complement of quién ‘who’ by EX restricts the quantifier domain to the individuals with the feature [person:1], that is, the speaker. This saves the derivation of the wh-optatives because the proposition under the EX-operator contains a variable whose value is constant in all the possible worlds compatible with the speaker’s desire. The sentence in (40), thus, is interpretable and expresses the speaker’s emotion about the proposition “to be a millionaire(x) where x is the speaker.”

5. Conclusion

Optatives are main sentences with a complex left periphery. As exclamative sentences, optatives have an EX-operator in ForceP. EX makes the sentence expressive, and it conveys the speaker’s emotion about the content of a proposition. The composition of an exclamative or an optative meaning is made up from several ingredients that are responsible for the differences between optatives and exclamatives. In optatives, EX quantifies over scalar alternatives in reference to a bouletic scale that models the speaker’s preferences. The proposition has an anti-factual feature that is encoded in a mood head whose content determines both morphological mood (subjunctive) and the expressions that overtly surface in the position of force. The uninterpretable feature in mood can be checked lexically by agreement with the adverb ojalá, so that all the possible readings for anti-factuality are available. Ojalá can move to ForceP and no conjunction is required; the sequence ojalá que is the result of the merge of an optional que ‘that’ in the focus head. Finally, I have proposed that the operator EX has strong intensional properties in optatives that are responsible for the ungrammaticality of wh-optatives. Contrary to what is expected, Spanish quién-optatives are possible because the identification of the first-person feature in EX with the wh-variable of quién makes the sentence interpretable.