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Embedded Exclamatives and the Ingredients of Grounded Belief

Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach and Patricia Andueza

1. Exclamatives and Embedding

A great deal of recent research has focused on the structure and interpretation of Spanish exclamatives (for a relatively recent compilation, cf. Villalba, 2008a). Nevertheless, there has been less emphasis on analyzing the occurrence of exclamatives as embedded expressions and the restrictions associated with embedding such constructions. Theories about embedded exclamatives can be divided into two groups. For some scholars—most prominently Grimshaw (1979), Elliot (1974), Zanuttini and Portner (2003), and Gutiérrez-Rexach (2008)—only emotive predicates have the capability of embedding exclamative constructions. For example, the wh-expression cuánto bebe ‘How much he drinks’ is interpreted with exclamatory content when embedded by an emotive verb or as a question when embedded by a question-selecting verb such as preguntarse ‘wonder.’ Such an expression cannot be embedded by declarative-embedding verbs such as creer ‘believe,’ as shown in (1):
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Advocates of the second theory—Lahiri (1991, 2002), D’Avis (2002), and Abels (2004)—claim that wh-clauses embedded by emotive predicates have to be treated as wh-interrogatives. The issue thus remains as to which elements are critical in order to determine or condition the possibility of embedding and how they relate to the basic properties of exclamative constructions. In this chapter, it will be argued that exclamative sentences not only express a specific type of speech act (with exclamatory force), but also involve *de re* reference in a process that we will be calling “grounding.” Embedding is possible when properties related to this process, mostly related to semantic and pragmatic conditions, are satisfied. Thus, it is shown that several classes of verbs can actually embed exclamatives, most prominently factive emotive predicates. The embedding process can take place only if certain conditions are met. Some of these conditions are also satisfied by other verb classes, such as certain directive predicates, explaining the exclamatory flavor of a variety of related expressive constructions. Thus, from a grammatical point of view, it seems that what is required is the compatibility between certain features of the embedding verb and the embedded exclamative complement.

2. Exclamatives and the Grounding Process

Both traditional grammar approaches and formal analyses—from those emanating from the philosophical tradition developed after speech-act theory to current formal semantic/pragmatic approaches—have concluded that different sentence types can be established according to what has been labeled as *actitud del hablante* ‘speaker’s attitude’ in traditional grammar, a criterion that is currently known as “sentential force” in philosophical and pragmatic terms. Sentence types can thus be classified not only according to standard grammatical or syntactic parameters, but also with respect to semantic and pragmatic criteria. For example, declarative sentences are semantically assumed to denote truth values and be used by speakers to express assertions about facts, beliefs, etc. Interrogative sentences denote questions—modeled,
for example as sets of proposition, as in Karttunen (1977)—and are used to express requests; imperatives denote commands and are used to express orders or instructions. Finally, exclamatives denote “exclamations” and are used by conversation participants to express speaker-based attitudes, mostly with an emotive content, the one that brings about the relevant “exclamation.” More specifically, when uttering an exclamative, a speaker expresses a contextually dependent motive attitude toward the content of his utterance. By uttering (2), the speaker is expressing an emotive attitude (e.g., surprise, amazement, elation) toward the fact that the gift is wonderful (to a point that exceeded his expectations if he had them regarding the object at issue):

(2) ¡Qué regalo tan maravilloso me dio por mi cumpleaños!
   ‘What a wonderful present he gave me for my birthday!’

There are normally one or more linguistic clues that allow the addressee to figure out the relevant emotive content. With respect to (2), the presence of the adjective *maravilloso* indicates that there is an element of surprise and/or counterexpectation in the underlying speaker’s attitude, something that is not necessarily the case with other examples, as pointed out by Bosque (chapter 1; cf. ¡Qué bonita mañana! ‘What a beautiful morning!’). Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) claims that the logical representation of exclamative constructions has as its essential attribute the presence of a force operator, EXC—cf. also Grosz (2011) for an application of this idea to a wider variety of constructions. Semantically, the exclamative operator EXC introduces an emotive property *P* that holds (is true of) an agent (the speaker) and the proposition *p* expressed by the exclamative expression at the utterance world *w* if the speaker holds such an emotive property towards *p* at *w*. In formal terms, the following holds:

(3) EXC (a) (w) (p) iff ƎP_{emot}[P(w)(a)(p)]

Exclamative utterances satisfy all the prerequisites and conditions to be considered genuine speech acts. When uttering an exclamative expression a speaker expresses a very specific illocutionary attitude of an emotive nature and also makes certain commitments, which may be encoded as presuppositions. Consider (4):

(4) ¡Qué alto es Juan!
   ‘How tall Juan is!’
A speaker would utter (4) felicitously in a situation $s$ if and only if he has received new information or assessed all information leading him to an update of his beliefs. This update could thus be new information, if he did not know how tall Juan was, or a revision of his beliefs, if for instance he expected Juan to be shorter. It is the accommodation of this information in the common ground, and the associated updated belief state, that would serve as the proper context for uttering (4). More specifically, a speaker may utter (4) when he realizes that Juan is tall to a degree that exceeds a standard or his expectations about him. For instance, in a situation where the speaker’s expectation is that Juan is 5’8” tall but he learns that in the actual world Juan is much taller than that, then he can felicitously utter (4) to express his surprise at this fact.

The belief state associated with the utterance of an exclamative sentence is a very specific type of belief: grounded belief. A belief is grounded when it is connected in a direct fashion to a fact about an individual in the common ground. For someone to believe that a fact is true he needs to have a $de \ re$ belief about it. In order for this $de \ re$ belief to be possible, a causal connection between the believer and the $de \ re$ element is required as well: $S$ knows $p$ if and only if $S$ believes $p$ $de \ re$ of some fact exemplifying $p$ (cf. Kratzer, 1990). In a situation $s$ where Juan is as tall as expected or less tall than expected, an exclamative such as (4) would express either: (1) a misleading, false proposition, (2) a rhetorical proposition, or (3) a non-informative proposition.

For scenarios (1) and (2) to hold, the speaker has to know the grounding fact, namely that Juan’s height does not exceed standard expectations. He would then deliberately utter (4) to mislead the addressee, possibly with an ulterior purpose, or utter it rhetorically, with the goal of ironically conveying that Juan is short. Scenario (3) would hold if the speaker does not know the grounding fact. In such a case, uttering an exclamatory expression would be at least partially inconsistent with the necessary conditions for such an utterance, so performing such an utterance would be unwarranted. Consider an utterance of (4) in a situation in which Juan is not tall or even actually quite short but the speaker believes him to be tall. Such an utterance would be communicating false information to other participants, although not with a deliberate ulterior purpose necessarily. The speaker would be expressing an

---

1. Andueza and Gutiérrez-Rexach (2011) claim that rhetorical exclamatives differ from standard exclamatives in the fact that the speaker assumes not the truth of the utterance but of its negation. When a speaker utters (4) rhetorically, he knows that Juan’s height has not exceeded his assumptions but pretends that it has. Therefore, the implied meaning of (4) is “How no-tall Juan is!”
emotive attitude toward a proposition that is actually not factual (not true in the world of utterance).

In all the scenarios described in the preceding paragraph, the exclamative utterance would be pragmatically infelicitous (or used rhetorically). In other words, an actual grounded belief is the trigger of the exclamative, but the speaker needs to have certain previous expectations, assumptions, or beliefs about the propositional content of the exclamative or other propositional content related to it, as well as some evidence about the actual grounding fact(s) for an exclamative utterance to be successful.

3. Subordination and Exclamative Content

Reference to degrees has been recently claimed to be essential to determine the content of certain exclamatives, especially those involving the use of wh-expressions (Castroviejo, 2006, 2008a; Rett, 2011). In such cases there are two degrees involved: (1) a reference degree obtained by applying a gradable property to an individual and (2) a standard degree taken from context. There is a scalar implicature associated with the exclamative sentence (Gutiérrez-Rexach, 2001; Zanuttini & Portner, 2000, 2003; Villalba, 2003). The implicature marks a high point in a contextually determined scale, triggering the high-degree reading that is so characteristic of sentences of this type.

(5) ¡Qué alumno tan inteligente es!
‘What a smart student he is!’

The standard level of intelligence (standard degree) is established in (5) by the speaker’s expectations, and the relevant student’s intelligence (reference degree) is located at a point higher than the standard one in the relevant scale of intelligence.

A speaker’s commitments (presuppositions) when uttering an exclamative include having a grounded belief about the fact at issue, involving a degree property in many cases, and also having evidence that this fact is remarkable or unexpected with respect to his assumptions; such evidence would be the basis for the relevant emotive attitude. As was discussed above, if the belief is not properly grounded, the resulting utterance leads to a false, misleading, or non-informative utterance.

The speaker is the only individual who is able to assess de re the propositional content associated with the exclamative. In other words, if the
exclamative is uttered in a conversational exchange context (a dialogue), the
fact that the addressee might know the grounding fact would not constitute
proper grounding for the utterance. The addressee would always assume
that the speaker is expressing an emotive attitude about a fact, not that the
speaker is anticipating the addressee’s knowledge (or lack thereof) about it.

In this respect, exclamatives have been claimed to be factive construc-
tions. Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970) characterize factivity as follows: “[a fac-
tive operator] presupposes that the embedded clause expresses a true prop-
osition, and makes some assertion about the proposition.” Elliot (1974) and
Grimshaw (1979) isolate a class of predicates selecting exclamatives: emo-
tives. These predicates express a subjective assessment about a proposition
rather than mere knowledge about it or its truth value. Factive emotive pred-
icates are emotive predicates presupposing the truth of their complements.
For example, the following predicates are factive emotives: *es importante*
‘it is important,’ *es una locura* ‘it is crazy,’ *es raro* ‘it is odd,’ *es relevante* ‘it is
relevant,’ *lamento* ‘I regret,’ *Me da rabia* ‘I resent,’ etc. There is wide agreement
on the fact that exclamatives are factive (Elliot, 1974; Grimshaw, 1979; Zanut-
tini & Portner, 2003; Gutiérrez-Rexach, 1996). The essential ingredient of
factivity is that the propositional content in the scope of the factive operator
is presupposed. When uttering (6), the speaker presupposes that the relevant
group has been assigned a (long) book:

(6) ¡Qué libro tan largo nos ha puesto como tarea!
‘What a long book we have been assigned!’

Proposition-selecting factive emotive predicates presuppose their com-
plement. For instance, both (7a) and (7b) entail sentence (7c):

(7) a. *Es extraño que esté lloviendo.*
‘It is odd that it is raining.’
b. *No es extraño que esté lloviendo.*
‘It is not odd that it is raining.’

Factive predicates include “significant, odd, tragic, exciting, relevant, matter, count, make sense,
suffice, amuse, bother . . . regret, be aware (of), grasp, comprehend, take into consideration, take
into account, bear in mind, ignore, make clear, mind, forget (about), deplore, resent, care (about),”
etc. Non-factive predicates include expressions such as “likely, sure, possible, true, false, seems,
appear, happen, chance, turn out . . . suppose, assert, allege, assume, claim, charge, maintain,
believe, conclude, conjecture, intimate, deem, fancy, figure . . .”
c. Está lloviendo.  
   ‘It is raining.’

Other predicates can be characterized as non-factive emotives: temer ‘fear,’ desear ‘desire,’ querer ‘want,’ ser vital ‘it is vital,’ etc. (Mindt, 2011). These cannot embed exclamatives. For example, Temo que {estaba/estará} enfadado ‘I fear that he was/will be angry’ does not presuppose {Estaba/estará} enfadado ‘He was/will be angry.’ Elliot (1974) and Grimshaw (1979) claim that complements of a particular semantic type are selected by predicates of the same type, a requirement that Grimshaw dubs “semantic selection” (s-selection), to contrast it with standard categorial or syntactic selection, also called subcategorization. Without entering here on the difficult issue of how to characterize semantic selection or whether such one-to-one correspondence is tenable in all cases, a proposal of this sort would explain why exclamatives are embedded only by factive emotive predicates and not by non-factive predicates such as ignorar ‘not know,’ temer ‘fear,’ preguntar ‘ask,’ or preguntarse ‘wonder,’ as the contrast between (8) and (9) illustrates.

(8) a. Es increíble lo alto que es Pepe.  
   ‘It is amazing how tall Pepe is.’  
   b. Me sorprende lo rápido que corre Pepe.  
   ‘I’m surprised at how fast Pepe can run.’

(9) a. *Temo qué loco está.  
   *‘I fear what a fool he is.’  
   b. Paco se pregunta cómo de alto es Pepe.  
   ‘Fred is wondering how tall Pepe is.’

The embedded complement in (8a) is a genuine exclamative when in root contexts, namely when it occurs unembedded (¡Lo alto que es Pepe! ‘How tall Pepe is!’). As such, it can be embedded by an emotive verb stating the relevant emotive attitude that the grounding fact actually triggers (amazement). The embedded complement in (9a) is also a genuine exclamative, an expression that can only be interpreted as having exclamatory force (¡Qué loco está! ‘What a fool he is!’) and not as any other type of wh-expression (interrogative). A non-factive predicate such as temer ‘fear’ cannot embed this sentential complement because doing so would conflict with the factivity presupposition of the embedded exclamative. Finally, the propositional complement in sentence (9b) only has the non-exclamatory meaning.
Zanuttini and Portner (2003) claim that exclamatives can be embedded by factive emotive predicates because they contain a covert factive morpheme (FACT) hosted in the specifier of the complementizer phrase (CP). This factive morpheme generates a pragmatic effect of “widening.” They propose that exclamatives such as (10) have two domains of quantification:

(10) ¡Qué cosas tan extrañas come Luisa!
    ‘What strange things Luisa eats!’

(11) \( D_1 = \{ \text{eats (she, poblanos), eats (she, serranos), eats (she, jalapeños)} \} \).
    \( D_2 = \{ \text{eats (she, poblanos), eats (she, serranos), eats (she, jalapeños), eats (she, gueros), eats (she, habaneros)} \} \).

The first domain \( (D_1) \) would be the set of individuals denoted by the wh-clause in a standard situation; for example, mild hot peppers in the intended utterance situation corresponding to (10). The second domain \( (D_2) \) would be a larger domain containing not only the expected individuals, but also unusual ones; very hot peppers in (10). The presence of a factive operator makes the non-standard alternatives in this latter quantificational domain presupposed. In sum, the analyses proposed by Elliot (1974), Grimshaw (1979), and Zanuttini and Portner (2003) agree in considering factivity a property of both the predicate and the exclamative clause. Nevertheless, it still not clear how we can restrict the class of exclamative-selecting predicates to just emotive factives.

Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996, 2008) claims that factivity is one of the ingredients of the intensional exclamative operator on propositions (EXC) associated with exclamative sentences. Additionally, a contextually dependent emotive property is predicated on the relevant presupposed proposition. Emotive factives embed exclamatives because they encode the exclamative operator. Root exclamatives can be considered factive because of the presence of a null emotive predicate, associated with the presence of the exclamative operator at the sentential level in the level of representation of logical form (LF), as assumed in generative approaches to natural language syntax. Grosz (2011) proposes a variant of this operator-based theory.

Lahiri (1991, 2002) makes the interesting observation that wh-clauses embedded under predicates of surprise are not interpreted as exclamatives obligatorily. However, he only mentions those wh-clauses that cannot be matrix exclamatives, such as \( \text{quién vino a la fiesta} \) ‘who came to the party’ in (12):
(12) Es sorprendente quién vino a la fiesta.
   ‘It is surprising who came to the party.’

D’Avis (2002) and Abels (2004) claim that the exclamative reading is the result of embedding a wh-interrogative clause under an exclamative/surprise predicate. Different predicates relate to different aspects of the wh-complement. Consider (13):

(13) Me sorprende lo alto que es Pablo.
   ‘It amazes me how tall Pablo is.’

The denotation of this sentence involves two answers \((\text{answer}_1\) and \(\text{answer}_2\)), as proposed in Heim (1994): (1) \(\text{answer}_1\) is the set of worlds making the proposition \(\text{Pablo is } d\text{-tall}\) true, and (2) \(\text{answer}_2\) is the set of worlds where the proposition corresponding to \(\text{answer}_1\) relative to the wh-clause is the same as in the actual world. The agent of an utterance of (13) would know \(\text{answer}_2\) (Pablo is \(d\text{-tall}\)) and most likely did not expect \(\text{answer}_1\) (Pablo is \(d\text{-tall}\)).

To summarize the predictions of the different theories on the embedding issue, the picture is not uniform or clear cut and does not seem to make room for cross-linguistic variation. Grimshaw (1979) and Elliot (1974)’s proposals entail that embedding would be possible as long as semantic selection requirements are satisfied (the complement denotes/presupposes a fact). For Zanuttini and Portner (2003), embedding is associated with widening without any further qualifications. Finally, for Lahiri (1991, 2000, 2002), D’Avis (2002), and Abels (2004), embedding is related to the nature of the wh-complement, namely embedding is allowed as long as the wh-complement has \(\text{answer}_1\) and \(\text{answer}_2\) and the matrix predicate relates these two answers.

### 4. Types of Spanish Exclamatives

In the remainder of the chapter, a semantic analysis of the conditions allowing embedded exclamatives will be proposed. The literature on exclamatives has mostly focused on wh-exclamatives. Nevertheless, exclamatives are not uniform. There are several types of exclamatives in Spanish with important differences in their syntactic and semantic characteristics. We will briefly characterize these types in what follows: ³

³ See Alonso-Cortés (1999b) and Bosque (this volume) for a more detailed description.
4.1. WH-EXCLAMATIVES

Exclamatives of this sort are introduced by certain wh-words, such as qué ‘what’, cuánto ‘how many/much’, and cómo ‘how’, but not por qué ‘why’, para qué ‘what for’, dónde ‘where’, or cuándo ‘when’. The wh-phrase, which occurs in a displaced position in the left periphery of the sentence, can be headed by a noun phrase (14a), an adjectival phrase (14b), or an adverbial phrase (14c):

(14) a. ¡Qué cosas dice Juan!
   ‘The things that Juan says!’
   b. ¡Qué divertido es Juan!
   ‘How funny Juan is!’
   c. ¡Qué bien habla Juan!
   ‘What a good speaker Juan is!’

As was mentioned above, there are two degrees involved in wh-exclamatives: (1) a reference degree obtained by applying a gradable property to an individual and (2) a standard degree taken from context. The availability of such degrees is direct or argumental in adjectives, such as divertido ‘funny’ in (14b), where divertido denotes a relation between individuals and degrees (x is funny to degree d). On the other hand, degree availability is indirect with nouns, such as qué cosas in (14a). Only certain nouns allow the availability of a related degree property. In (14a) such degree might be related to the property of being outlandish or inappropriate (statements are outlandish/inappropriate to degree d).

The scalar implicature associated with the exclamative sentence indicates a high point in a contextually determined scale, triggering the high-degree reading. Consider (15):

(15) ¡Qué inteligente es Juan!
   ‘How intelligent Juan is!’

In (15) the standard level of intelligence (standard degree) is established by the speaker’s assumptions/beliefs (Gutiérrez-Rexach, 1996), and Juan’s intelligence (reference degree) is located in a point higher than the standard one in the relevant height scale. The standard level of intelligence (standard degree) is established by the speaker’s expectations, and Juan’s intelligence (reference degree) is located in a point higher than the standard one in the relevant scale of intelligence.
4.2. DEFINITE AND FREE-RELATIVE EXCLAMATIVES

Free-relative exclamatives or relatives introduced by definite determiners may have exclamatory force with a degree reading when occurring as root elements:

(16) a. ¡Lo alto que es tu hermano!  
    ‘How tall your brother is!’
    b. ¡Las cervezas que bebe!  
    ‘The number of beers s/he drinks!’

In the case of (16a), the adjective displaced to the left periphery of the sentence is in a focus position pied-piped by the neuter determiner. In (16b) noun displacement is triggered by the definite determiner (Gutiérrez-Rexach, 2001).

4.3. EVIDENTIAL EXCLAMATIVES

There are exclamatives introduced by evidential adjectives whose reading is clearly propositional. In (17a) and (17b) the relevant alternatives are not based on degrees or kinds, but on propositions (cf. Andueza & Gutiérrez-Rexach, 2011):

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

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

4.4. 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:
They exhibit the characteristic intonational contour of these types of sentences and, when uttering them, a speaker expresses an emotive attitude toward the content of his utterance. In the case of (18a) the relevant attitude is directed toward the fact that Juan has eaten everything; (18b) is interpreted as “Juan is an instance of the kind of funny man I am referring to.”

The content of exclamatives is thus not only about degrees, but also about propositions. We claim that these four structural types of exclamatives can be merged into two different semantic groups (Andueza & Gutiérrez-Rexach, 2011): (1) exclamatives whose content is a degree property, such as wh-exclamatives or free-relative exclamatives, and (2) exclamatives whose content is propositional, such as exclamatives with a declarative structure and exclamatives introduced by an evidential expression. Following Rett (2009), it can be assumed that these two groups of exclamatives have different requirements. The exclamatives in the first group are expressively correct when their content is about a degree that exceeds the speaker’s assumptions/beliefs. The content of the exclamatives in the second group must be about a fact that contradicts the speaker’s assumptions/beliefs.

5. De Re Ascription and Spanish Exclamatives: A Survey

A problem for contemporary theories of embedding is that predicates do not seem to embed exclamatives uniformly. In other words, not all emotives can do it and, furthermore, not all emotive predicates are able to embed exclamative expressions. Andueza and Gutiérrez-Rexach (2012a, 2012b), analyzing Spanish exclamative constructions, report that there are significant embedding asymmetries with wh-complements in Spanish, as illustrated in the following examples.

(19) a. {Es increíble/Me sorprende} cómo se viste Pepe.
    ‘[It is incredible/It amazes me] how well Pepe dresses.’
   b. Es {increíble/sorprendente} cuánto habla Pepe.
    ‘It is {incredible/amazing} how much Pepe talks.’
c. *{Me sorprende/Es increíble} qué historias cuenta Juan.
   ‘It surprises me/It is incredible} what stories Juan tells.’
d. *Es increíble quiénes vinieron.
   ‘It is incredible who came.’
e. *Es {sorprendente/increíble} qué listo es Juan.
   ‘It surprises me/It is incredible} how smart Juan is.’
f. *Es increíble qué bien cuenta las historias Juan.
   ‘It is incredible who well Juan tells his stories.’

The problem seems to be that factive emotive predicates are able to embed wh-exclamatives but not uniformly. The claim that will be defended in this chapter is that exclamatives can be embedded by emotive predicates only if they can be grounded to a fact about a specific entity (degree). Two semantic conditions have to be satisfied: (1) the complement of the predicate involves reference to a specific degree, and (2) the relationship between the predicate and its complement has to be an expression of de re knowledge.

A test survey was conducted among a population of native Spanish speakers from Spain (Andueza & Gutiérrez-Rexach, 2012a). A group of thirty individuals from northern Spain was selected, all belonging to the same age cohort (35–38 years old) and with similar educational backgrounds (all having a university degree). The survey was conducted during three days using standard testing measures to minimize data bias and errors (order randomization, insertion of fillers, etc.). The most accepted embedded wh-exclamatives in the survey are those headed by cómo ‘how’ (20/30) and cuánto ‘how many’ (27/30):

(20) Es increíble{cómo/cuánto} habla Pepe.
   ‘It is incredible how much Pepe talks.’

4. The group consisted of 20 males and 10 females. The main goal of the study was to investigate a native speaker’s acceptability of the embeddability of different types of exclamatives (wh-constructions, free relatives, etc.) by emotive predicates. Since one of the main proposals of the embedding problem is that interrogatives and exclamatives behave alike in this respect, it seemed desirable to test whether native speakers would accept any type of wh-constructions as complements of emotive predicates even if such constructions do not constitute proper root exclamatives. The participants were presented with a total of 30 short contexts, each one of which was followed by three possible sentences that could be deemed grammatical (or not) in the context provided. Participants were instructed to read carefully the contexts and choose sentences according to grammaticality criteria (perform a grammaticality judgment task). In addition to the experimental items, 10 filler items were included to avoid certain participant bias. Five of the filler items were embedded interrogatives, and five were embedded declaratives.
In the case of cómo ‘how’ and cuánto ‘how much,’ the specific-degree property clearly comes from the wh-word, since these are both degree words. Wh-forms of this sort behave as degree words not only in exclamatives, but also in interrogative sentences:

(21) ¿Cómo es de alto Juan?/¿Cuánto mide Pepe?
    ‘How tall is Juan?’ (‘What is the degree d . . . ?’)

Notice that cómo is not interpreted as a manner adverbial under this construction:

(22) a. Es increíble cómo {habla/come} este tío.
    ‘It is incredible how much this guy {talks/eats}.’ (Not the manner in which he does it.)

b. Me sorprende cómo se viste.
    ‘It is incredible how {bad/well} he dresses.’ (Not the manner in which he does it.)

As the above paraphrases show, the proper interpretation of the above sentences is not one in which cómo is associated with a manner reading. When uttering (22a), a speaker is not surprised at how the individual under consideration eats. Rather, he is surprised at a degree property: the amount he eats (which exceeds a standard or threshold). The degree interpretation is preferred because it immediately makes a degree available, whereas such is not the case for the manner reading, except for certain contexts. For example, uttering (22b) in a situation in which a boy is trying to put his pants on over his head would be associated with a degree based on a manner interpretation (the oddness of dressing oneself in such a fashion). Evidence for de re knowledge ascription comes from the fact that exclamatives such as (23) would be infelicitous in a situation in which the speaker lacks knowledge about the degree under consideration:

(23) ¡{Cómo/cuánto} habla Pepe!
    ‘How much Pepe talks!’

Much lower grammaticality rates are attested in our survey for the following wh-expressions: qué ‘what’ + adv, qué ‘what’ + noun, qué ‘what’ + adj, and “what for.” These are judged as ungrammatical by most speakers (90%).
   ‘It is incredible what pages this book has.’
b. *Es increíble qué agua sale del grifo.
   ‘It is incredible what water comes out of the faucet.’

Some instances improve when there is an obvious degree reading potentially derived from a contextually dependent degree variable in the wh-phrase:

(25) a. ??Es increíble qué listo es Pepe.
   ‘It is incredible how smart Pepe is.’
b. ??Es increíble qué bien dibuja Pepe.
   ‘It is incredible how well Pepe draws.’
c. ??Es increíble qué libros lee Pepe.
   ‘It is incredible which books Pepe reads.’

Certain speakers find complements introduced by para qué, dónde, por qué, or cuándo to be fine when embedded by emotive predicates, although they do not constitute root exclamatives:

(26) a. *¡{Para qué/dónde/por qué/cuándo} trabaja Pepe!
   ‘For {what/where/why/when} Pepe works!’
b. Es increíble {dónde/cuándo} trabaja Pepe. [Ok for many speakers.]
   ‘It is incredible {where/when} Pepe works.’
c. ??Es increíble {por qué/para qué} te pones ese gorro.
   ‘It is incredible why you wear that hat.’
d. Es inaudito con qué desparpajo le robó el bolso.
   ‘It is amazing how bold he was when he stole her purse.’

The wh-words dónde ‘where’ and cuándo ‘when’ introduce measure-based denotations (time, location) facilitating the association with an (extreme) degree: “It is incredible how remote the place where Pepe works is,” “It is incredible how late Pepe works.” Such accommodation is more difficult with rationale/goal clauses, although not impossible: “It is incredible that you wear that hat for such outlandish reasons.” Ignacio Bosque (personal communication) points out that wh-words introduced by a preposition occur quite naturally in certain embedded exclamatives, as in (26d). In these cases, the preposition brings about the required association with a measure
(degrees of boldness in the example), something that would not be available if the wh-word occurred as a non-prepositional argument.5

These deviant results would be the result of an inappropriate embedding not meeting the two necessary semantic requirements for embedding that we have postulated so far. In other words, the reason why many qué-exclamatives cannot be embedded is that the two conditions for embedding described above are not met in general: (1) qué is not intrinsically a degree word, i.e., the quantificational domain of qué-words is a universe of individuals, and (2) qué-words do not presuppose de re attitude attribution. Matrix qué-exclamatives receive their degree reading from the exclamative illocutionary operator. When an exclamative is embedded, this operator is not available. Only when such an operator is contextually available, through an accommodation or similar inferential process, does embedding become possible.

Castroviejo (2006, 2008a) claims that wh-exclamatives in Catalan cannot be embedded by emotive factive predicates in general, with some minor exceptions (27c):

(27) a. Es increíble que alt que ets.
   ‘It’s amazing how tall you are.’

b. *No em puc creure quina feina tan meravellosa que heu fet a Nepal.
   ‘I can’t believe what a wonderful job you did in Nepal’

c. Es increíble como ets d’alt.
   ‘It is incredible how tall you are.’

From this evidence, we can conclude that exclamative expression in Catalan is a root phenomenon. Emotive factives do not embed wh-elements, and the ability to embed exclamatives or to embed expressions of one type or other is not a universal phenomenon, as the contrasting behavior in Spanish clearly shows.

5. Here are two examples in which qué is the term of a preposition and the resulting construction is grammatical when embedded by an emotive factive verb:

(i) a. Es inaudito con qué chulería campan a sus anchas esos facinerosos.
   ‘It is incredible the cocky fashion in which those criminals walk around.’

b. Es una vergüenza con qué facilidad la administración hace uso del dinero de los contribuyentes.
   ‘It is a shame how the government uses the taxpayers’ money.’
6. Non-Sentential Exclamatives in Embedded Contexts

Exclamative constructions belonging to other structural types, fundamentally of a non-sentential nature, can be argued to be subject to similar restrictions as sentential ones if they undergo embedding. Nominal exclamatives will be considered first in this section. Nominal exclamatives are expressions of a nominal nature with the ability to occur as root exclamatives (Portner & Zanuttini, 2005). For example, the nominal exclamatives in (28a) can be embedded, as shown in (28b, 28c):

(28) a. ¡La de libros que lee Juan!/¡Los libros que lee Juan!
   ‘Juan reads so many books!’
   b. Es increíble la de libros que lee Juan.
   ‘It is incredible the amount of books Juan reads.’
   c. ?Es increíble los libros que lee Juan.
   ‘It’s incredible the books Juan reads.’

There is proper degree reference in (28b), given that the non-embedded correlate only has a degree or amount-based reading. An emotive attitude is expressed toward the amount (number) of books read by Juan. On the other hand, in (28c) and in its matrix correlate, there would only be accommodated degree reference. When such a reference is necessary, it is accommodated to prevent a conflict or clash of presuppositions. This is so because free relatives have individual-based denotations, namely, they can be viewed as definite descriptions in disguise (Jacobson, 1995). Consider the following contrast:

(29) a. ?Es increíble lo que dices.
    It’s incredible lo-NEUTER that you-say
    ‘It’s incredible the things you say.’
   b. Me sorprende lo que cuentas.
    Me-CL surprises lo-NEUTER that you-tell
    ‘It surprises me the things you say.’
   c. Averiguó lo que cuentas de él.
    He-found-out lo-NEUTER that you-tell about him
    ‘He found out what you say about him.’

Sentence (29a) is slightly marginal because reference to a degree has to be accommodated from reference to individual propositions (the set of
statements under consideration). What is stated to be incredible is not what the addressee is talking about (statements are not gradable entities), but the outrageous or transgressive nature of its content. This aspect would trigger the contextually appropriate emotive attitude of incredulity. When such emotive attitude characterizes the belief state of a speaker, the required degree ascription becomes rooted to the speaker’s assessment of a grounding fact. On the other hand, embedding under a standard question/statement subordinating verb, such as averiguar ‘find out’ in (29c), requires no accommodation because such verbs do not impose a degree requirement. The embedded complement is not an exclamative.

Embedded complements of factive emotives are normally degree relatives, instantiating the structure “lo + ADJ + sentential expression,” such as the one in (30a), with embedded counterparts as in the ones in (30b, 30c):

(30) a. ¡Lo listo que es Juan!
    ‘How clever Juan is!’
    b. Es increíble lo listo que es Juan.
    ‘It is incredible how clever Juan is.’
    c. Es increíble lo bien que trabaja Juan.
    ‘It is incredible how well Juan works.’

The neuter lo is a neuter degree pronoun in (30a). In general, neuter degree relatives refer to a (maximal) degree (Gutiérrez-Rexach, 1999). This degree would be the maximal degree of cleverness/intelligence that Juan is capable of in example (30a). Thus, proper grounded reference can be established in these constructions and embedding by emotive predicates is allowed, as further illustrated by (30b, 30c).

Concealed exclamatives are DPs without intrinsic exclamative interpretation. They only have it when embedded (Baker, 1968; Elliott, 1974; Grimshaw, 1979; Castroviejo, 2006), as the following examples show. The DP in (31a) lacks an intrinsic exclamatory structure, but can be embedded by an emotive predicate and then have an exclamatory reading (31b).

(31) a. la altura de ese edificio.
    ‘the height of the building.’
b. Es alucinante la altura del edificio.
   ‘It is incredible the height of the building.’

What makes the embedded DP a concealed exclamative is that the emotive predicate relates the emotive attitude to a high degree proposition associated with the content of the relevant DP. In (31b) what is incredible is the (extreme) degree of height of the building under consideration. The relevant degree is associated to the head noun *altura* in (31b), but it can also be a high degree associated with a contextually accommodated property associated with the noun. Such a property would be associated with the individual’s behavior in (32b):

(32) a. su conducta.
   ‘his behavior.’

   b. Es increíble su conducta.
   ‘It is incredible her behavior.’

Concealed exclamatives satisfy the definiteness restriction, i.e., only weak or indefinite-like determiners can occur in the construction: 6

(33) Es increíble {*una/esa} ventana del edificio.
   ‘It is incredible {*a/that} window of the building.’

They all associate with extreme degree and require restrictive modification, indicating the proper contextual environment for the degree assertion. The following examples would be ungrammatical if the restrictive elements between parentheses were omitted:

(34) a. Es increíble los propósitos (tan extraños) (por los que trabaja Juan).
   ‘It is incredible the (strange) purposes Juan works for.’

   b. Es increíble los sitios (tan extravagantes) (en los que trabaja Juan).
   ‘It is incredible the (extravagant) places where Juan works.’

---

6. As pointed out by I. Bosque (personal communication), this property extends to a wide variety of matrix wh-exclamatives:

   (i) ¡Qué alto es {el/*un} niño!
   ‘How tall {the/*a} boy is!’

   The use of the indefinite would go against *de re* reference to a fact/degree.
Portner and Zanuttini (2005) claim that concealed exclamatives have clause-like meaning, following Kayne’s (1994) analysis of relative clauses. According to this account, the definite article indicates factivity. There are potential connections with propositional theories of concealed questions (Nathan, 2006; Frana, 2010), namely, a concealed exclamative can be argued to denote a proposition, making it equivalent to a full-fledged exclamative. Their “exclamative flavor” has also been claimed to be derived from the meaning of the embedding predicate (Castroviejo, 2006). All of these factors would explain their embedding by emotive predicates.

Summarizing, the interplay of structural and contextual factors would explain variability in the possibility of embedding an exclamative construction or in achieving an exclamative interpretation under a verb that normally embeds such a construction (i.e., standard factive emotive predicates). First, the embedded exclamative has to directly express or accommodate a reference to a specific degree. Additionally, a process of ascription of de re belief to such a degree via the embedding predicate has to take place. The extension to other measure-based denotations (time, location, etc.) is possible, as long as there is accommodation of a degree-based grounding fact. Finally, other non-standard or non-propositional exclamative constructions, such as free relatives/nominal/concealed exclamatives, are fine for an embedding process as long as these general conditions are satisfied.

7. Operator Interaction

Embedding by emotive factives is facilitated by the occurrence of certain sentential operators, but the exclamatory interpretation is canceled. For example, the addition of genericity triggers blocks such interpretation. In (35), the adverb of quantification siempre ‘always’ or the verb soler ‘use to’ cancel the exclamatory meaning:

\[(35) \quad \begin{align*}
    a. & \quad ?Es \text{ increíble quién tiene que ocuparse siempre de todo en esta casa.} \\
        & \quad \text{‘It is incredible who has to take care of everything in this household.’} \\
    b. & \quad \text{Le suele parecer {lamentable/increíble/sorprendente} qué alto ponen el volumen en la discoteca.} \\
        & \quad \text{‘He usually finds {appalling/incredible/surprising} how loud the music is at the disco.’}
\end{align*}\]
Generic statements express generalizations over worlds or individuals and have been analyzed as involving reference to kinds (Carlson, 1977). Generic quantification is incompatible with de re reference to actual individuals in the utterance world. If the line of reasoning we are advocating here is correct, this would entail that beliefs about kinds (i.e., generic beliefs) would not necessarily be factually grounded beliefs about the utterance situation/world and would not support exclamatory interpretations. This correctly predicts the readings available for the examples in (35).

Such sentences are reports of expressive attitudes toward a given (generic) proposition, but they do not report exclamatory content (an emotive attitude by a given de re fact in the utterance situation). It is worth noticing that although imperfective tenses are inductors of genericity, tense specification is not sufficient to turn the examples in (19) above and similar ones into grammatical sentences. There seems to be a requirement for an explicit adverbial (siempre) or verbal (soler) inductor.

Several other sentential operators are also able to block an exclamative interpretation. In general, it is not possible to embed exclamatives in questions or under negation. In the following examples it can clearly be seen that the wh-proposition lacks an exclamative interpretation:

\[(36)\]
\[
a. \ ¿No te sorprende qué cosas suele hacer? \\
   ‘Aren’t you surprised by the things he does?’
\]
\[
b. No me sorprende lo que puede hacer. \\
   ‘It does not surprise me what he does.’
\]

The embedding predicate relates to the question-answer meaning, i.e., to the set of individuals under consideration, not to a salient degree property of such individuals. Sentence (36a) expresses the speaker’s usual surprise at the content of the addressee’s assertions. Questions and negation also block attribution of de re knowledge and facilitate answer-like interpretations. When embedding occurs in the scope of an interrogative or negative operator, exhaustive (mention all) readings and non-exhaustive readings (mention some) are allowed. For example, (36b) may be asking for an exhaustive list of the things the individual under discussion does (mention all) or for one or more instances illustrative of a pattern (mention some). These are typical readings associated with interrogative sentences (Groenedijk & Stokhof, 1989), and thus indicate clear departure from an exclamative interpretation. If one is asking about a particular individual or proposition, he cannot have factual knowledge about the same information, which would be incompatible with this type of speech.
act. Thus, the content of the embedded sentences in (36) is closer to a question than to an exclamative: it relates to the individuals satisfying the relevant set expression and does not involve an emotive attitude about a de re entity.

Finally, as pointed out by Bosque (personal communication), degree adverbs with lower reference points or thresholds seem to cancel or interfere with the high degree requirement associated with the emotive predicate, as in Me sorprende (*muy poco) a qué extremos hemos llegado ‘It is (*very little) surprising to me the extent to which we have taken things.’ Facts of this sort, as well as the ones considered in this section, highlight the need for considering the embedding problem as a compositional one, not just as a mere lexical-selection issue.

8. Beyond Emotives

The evidence presented so far indicates that exclamative expressions are only embedded by emotive factive predicates. This is not completely correct from an empirical perspective. Several non-emotive and non-factive predicates are able to embed genuine exclamative expressions. One of the most common predicates used for this purpose is mira ‘look’:

(37) a. ¡Miren ustedes qué cosas dice!
   ‘Look at the things he says!’
 b. ¡Mirad quiénes se presentaron!
   ‘Look who showed up!’

This construction is actually very common, especially in colloquial discourses, as attested by the following corpus examples:

(38) a. ¡Mira qué guapísimo es! (El corpus del español)
   ‘Look at how handsome he is!’
 b. ¡Mira qué bien viene la pregunta! (CREA)
   ‘Look at how appropriate the question is!’
 c. ¡Mira qué perrillo! (CREA)
   ‘Look at that (nice) doggie!’
 d. ¡Mira cuántas chinitas hay! (CREA)
   ‘Look at how many pebbles there are!’
 e. ¡Mira cuánto has hablado! (El corpus del español)
   ‘Look at how much you talked!’
f. Pero, ¡mira cómo beben! (*El corpus del español*)
   ‘Look at how they are drinking!’

g. ¡Y mira dónde estoy ahora! (*El corpus del español*)
   ‘Look at where I am now!’

h. ¡Mira dónde estás y con quién hablas! (*El corpus . . . *)
   ‘Look where you are and who you talk to!’

*Mira* ‘look’ is a directive perception verb. It instructs the addressee to pay attention to a fact. There are other directive perception verbs allowing exclamative embedding, such as *fíjate/fíjaos* (also *fijaros*) ‘pay attention’:

(39) a. ¡Fíjate qué locuras dice!
   ‘Watch out for her nonsense!’

   b. ¡Fíja(r)os cuántos han venido!
   ‘Look at how many came!’

   c. ¡Fíja(r)os qué alto está!
   ‘Look at how tall he is!’

   d. ¡Fíjate dónde ha puesto la ropa!
   ‘Look at where he put his clothes!’

Nevertheless, other directive perception verbs (*oír* ‘hear,’ *escuchar* ‘listen,’ and *atender* ‘pay attention’) cannot embed exclamative expressions. In some cases, they are not able to embed wh-complements in general. The intended construction would be ungrammatical even in a non-exclamatory interpretation, as the following examples illustrate:

(40) a. *¡Oye qué locuras dice!*
   ‘Hear her nonsensical statements!’

   b. *¡Escucha qué alto está!*
   ‘Listen at how tall he is!’

   c. *¡Atended dónde lo he visto!*
   ‘Pay attention to where I have seen him!’

There are several restrictions on the availability of exclamative readings under directive perception verbs. First, only true imperative forms are accepted.7 Suppletive imperative forms, such as the first-person plural pres-

---

7. The distinction between true and suppletive surrogative imperatives is well established in the literature (Joseph & Philippaki Warburton, 1987; Rivero & Terzi, 1995). Morphologically
ent or matrix sentences headed by the complementizer que, do not allow embedded exclamatives, even if they would convey a meaning that would be very close to a genuine exclamative. This point is illustrated by the examples below:

(41) a. *¡Miremos qué guapísimo está!
   ‘Let us look at how very handsome he is!’
b. *¡Vamos a mirar qué alto está!
   ‘We are going to look at how tall he is!’
c. *¡Que miren qué cosas dice!
   ‘You look at the things he says!’

Second, changes in tense specification or the addition of sentential operators such as negation make embedding possible, but only with an interrogative interpretation, not with an exclamative one, as (42) shows.

(42) a. Miraré cómo beben.
   ‘I will look at how they drink.’
b. (No) Me fijé *(en) cuántos han venido.
   ‘I did not pay attention to how many came.’

The data in Andueza and Gutiérrez-Rexach (2012a) corroborate this point. The verbs mira ‘look’ or fíjate ‘watch out’ are found to embed exclamatives more frequently (84%) than standard embedders (such as es increíble ‘it is incredible’). These verbs were also judged by speakers in the survey to be more appropriate than emotives to express unambiguous exclamatory content (76%). It is significant to notice that qué-exclamatives are allowed as complements of these directive predicates, whereas they were only marginal when embedded under emotive factives. Wh-complements headed by qué are even more frequent (55.4%) than those headed by cómo (19.6%) and cuánto (11.3%), also in contrast to the data resulting from embedding by emotive factives. Other wh-exclamatives are also possible, although less common.

We will be calling the subclass of perception verbs with the ability to embed wh-exclamatives directive mirative factives (DMFs), with mira/fíjate true imperatives belong to a distinct verbal paradigm and have imperative force exclusively. On the other hand, suppletive imperatives belong to a morphological paradigm (subjunctives, indicatives, infinitives) and have a variety of additional pragmatic uses.
as the canonical members of this class. Let us explain why. First, they have the property of factivity, as illustrated in (43):

\[(43)\]
\[
a. *¡Mira qué cosas dirá!
   *‘Look at the things he will say!’
b. *¡Mira qué me parece que dijo!
   *‘Look what seems that he said!’
\]

The ungrammaticality of the sentences above can be attributed to the fact that statements about future events are intrinsically not factive, since such events have not occurred yet. Another property of DMFs is that they are lexically mirative. Mirativity conveys information that is new or unexpected to the speaker (De Lancey, 2001; Rigau, 2003), as illustrated in (44):

\[(44)\]
\[
a. Me dio el libro y mira qué tapas tiene.
   ‘He gave me the book and look at its cover!’
b. #Me dio el libro y mira qué ejemplar es.
   ‘He gave me the book and look what copy it is!’
\]

The second conjunct in (44a) adds new or unexpected information triggering the speaker’s attitude of surprise (the book’s cover looks unusual or surprising). On the other hand, the information in the second conjunct in (44b) is analytic or redundant, so it cannot be embedded under mira. Additionally, exclamative constructions with DMFs instantiate actual directivity, i.e., an instruction to perform a cognitive action, such as paying attention, in the utterance situation. The addressee is instructed to consider something in the actual world/time (utterance time or world of evaluation). It is not possible to use expressions of this type to ask the addressee to consider facts or propositions in a near or distant future, for example.

Let us now characterize DMFs in a formal fashion. We say that a proposition \( p \) can be embedded by a DMF predicate if and only if the speaker has \( de re \) knowledge about the fact supporting \( p \) in the actual world and is instructing the speaker to consider \( p \). When exclamatives are embedded by these predicates, the speaker calls the addressee’s attention to a specific \( de re \) proposition. The speaker asks the addressee to ascertain a fact about the specific \( de re \) element triggering the exclamative. Interestingly, there is no degree requirement on the entity referred to. Such an entity (\( de re \)) may be an individual. Consider (45):
(45) ¡Mira quién habla!
   ‘Look who is talking!’

This sentence does not express an emotive attitude toward the degree to which a property holds. Rather, the speaker is instructing the addressee to consider a contextually relevant proposition about a salient individual. The individual referred to (de re) is not the one that the speaker expected to be talking, and this triggers the utterance. If this reasoning is correct, it points out the need to consider mira as a genuine and fully operational DMF operator, not as a mere interjection (RAE-ASALE, 2009; Rodríguez Ramalle, 2008c).

9. Embedding Non-Wh-CPs and Mixed Exclamatives

In the preceding sections, we have considered emotives and their ability to embed wh-expressions denoting exclamatives. Nevertheless, emotive predicates also embed non-wh-propositional complements, as (46) shows:

(46) ¡Es increíble que tenga esa pinta!
   ‘It is incredible that he looks that bad!’

The expressive content of (46) is also exclamatory in nature and the embedding predicate plays a critical role in triggering it. The speaker expresses an emotive attitude (incredulity) toward the embedded proposition. It is thus completely natural for emotive predicates to embed declarative propositional complements. DMFs also embed non-wh-propositions. The expressive content is not necessarily exclamative, i.e., expressing surprise, amazement, etc. In the following examples, it can be seen that DMFs are associated with expressive contents of a somewhat diverse nature, indicated between parentheses in the following examples:

(47) a. ¡Mira que tiene gracia la cosa! [exclamative: anger/regret]
    ‘Look, that’s not amusing at all!’
 b. ¡Mira que te tengo dicho que comas más! [exhortative/optative]
    ‘Look, I’ve repeatedly told you that you should eat more!’
 c. ¡Mira que me voy! [warning]
    ‘Look, I’m leaving!’
d. ¡Mira que te pego! [threat]
   ‘Look, I’m about to hit you!’

Other defective verbal forms that have traditionally been considered
interjections (vaya, anda, venga) embed propositional complements too.
They also have a mixed or more flexible expressive content. In other words,
they are used to express exclamatory content plus other content of an expres-
sive nature, or just this separate expressive content. Consider the following
examples in which exclamative content related to “surprise” is associated
with other expressive elements, such as defiance, refutation, etc.:

(48) a. ¡Vaya {que/sí} se ha comido la sopa! [excl. + incredulity]
    ‘He ate the soup!’
   b. ¡Vaya {que/sí} me voy a ir! [excl. + defiance/threat]
    ‘Of course, I am leaving!’

(49) ¡Anda que no tienes dinero! [excl. + refutative]
   ‘So you didn’t have any money!’

(50) ¡Venga con que no quieres salir! [excl. + emphatic]
   ‘Come on, so you don’t want to leave?’

A sentence such as (48a) would normally be uttered to convey incredulity:
the speaker expected the relevant individual to not like the soup or not eat
it, when in fact he has eaten it. Similarly, sentence (48b) could be uttered to
express defiance or a threat: the speaker would be asserting that he is leaving
no matter what. By uttering (49), a speaker would normally refute a previous
claim by the addressee stating his rather impoverished financial situation or
a similar claim. Sentence (50) would be felicitous, for example, as a reply to a
statement by the addressee indicating that he does not want to go out. Mixed
exclamatives of this sort have several properties of interest for our purposes.
There is no factivity requirement and no de re knowledge requirement with
respect to an entity (degree/individual). In other words, it is possible to have
an exclamative interpretation without the satisfaction of these requirements.
For example, (48b) expresses a plan defying some previous restriction, norm,
or order. The added emotive exclamatory content may be triggered by con-
textual factors; for instance, if someone has just expressed opposition to such
a plan, etc. The exclamative content is introduced by the embedding verb,
encoding the exclamative operator. The speaker expresses a mixed expressive attitude toward a proposition at the utterance time, introducing what we might call an actuality requirement.

Other mixed exclamative expressions include embedders not of a verbal nature. They are adverbial embedders from a categorical perspective (Gutiérrez-Rexach, 2001), such as bien and por supuesto in (51):

(51) a. ¡Bien que te fastidia esto!
   ‘You are really bothered by this!’
   b. ¡Por supuesto que te lo daré!
   ‘Of course I will give it to you!’

It is interesting to compare this occurrence of exclamative embedding bien with emphatic bien (Hernanz, 1999, 2011). The latter is illustrated in (52):

(52) ¡Bien habló el decano ayer!
   ‘Yesterday’s speech by the Dean was great!’

In this sentence the emphatic element bien is not just related to exclamative content but also to the event characterized in the proposition. It would be uttered felicitously when the speaker is conveying that the Dean talked a lot or more than expected. In this respect, this instance of bien is not an “embedder.” It is just an occurrence of an exclamative marker displaced to the left periphery (Gutiérrez-Rexach, 2001).

Optional adverbials also work as indicators of differential mixed expressive content, mostly exclamatory plus optative, desiderative or exhortative as respectively illustrated in (53a), (53b), and (53c). There are also non-adverbial evidentiality markers, such as ¡Cuidado/ojo/claro que . . . !

(53) a. ¡(Por favor) que no vuelva!
   ‘Please, I wish he didn’t come back!’
   b. ¡(Dios mío) que me quede como estoy!
   ‘God, I wish I could stay as I am!’
   c. ¡(Ojalá) que llegue pronto!
   ‘I hope he is here soon!’

These ideas, although still tentative, provide us with a good roadmap for tackling the difficult issue of how to characterize the content of what can be called mixed expressives. These expressive elements can be claimed
to introduce expressive operators, in the same fashion as genuine or non-mixed exclamatives do. This would require us to propose and develop an expansion of what ‘expressivity’ is and how to make an inventory of its ingredients. Formally, a set EXP can be defined as a family of operators: $\text{EXP} = \{EX_1, \ldots, EX_n\}$. The EXP family of operators would generalize the EXC operator (Gutiérrez-Rexach, 1996; Grosz, 2011) and include expressive content in general—cf. also Potts and Roeper (2006), Potts (2005), and Kaplan (1989). For $1 \leq i \leq n$, an utterance of $EX_i(\phi)$, where the proposition $\phi$ is in the scope of the $EX_i$ operator, conveys the following: the speaker at the point of utterance has an emotion $\varepsilon$ (or at least an evaluative attitude $\varepsilon$) toward $\phi$, and $\phi$ is univocally associated with $EX_i$. The speaker intends to express $\varepsilon$, rather than describe $\varepsilon$ (Grosz, 2011). This condition relates to the need for the utterance to be a genuine expressive/mixed-exclamative speech act, not a description of one. Additionally, on the pragmatic side, several felicity conditions have to be satisfied so that the expressive attitude is genuine and appropriate in the utterance situation. Finally, $\varepsilon$ involves a scale $S$ on which $\phi$ exceeds a salient threshold. $EX_i$ only combines with scales that are anchored to the speaker and are evaluative/emotive. An approach of this sort would have the advantage of providing the needed flexibility for charting the territory of “exclamativity” in all of its forms and associated meanings.

10. Conclusions

Using data from Spanish as a starting point, it has been argued that the distribution of embedded exclamatives is a byproduct of several factors: the nature of exclamatives as speech acts, the presuppositional requirements of exclamatives, and the semantics of the embedding predicates. Exclamatives as speech acts express an emotional attitude toward a given fact, which normally is unexpected. Propositionally, they ascribe a de re belief to a degree (cf. Katz, 2005). An embedded exclamative expression has to preserve or be consistent with these requirements in order to preserve its exclamatory nature. Thus, embedded exclamatives are de re ascriptions and degree-referring. The semantics and pragmatic requirements of emotive-factive predicates allow for the embedding of exclamative constructions headed by certain degree wh-words (cómo and cuánto) or degree relative propositions (NEUT ART + que, ART + que). Certain directive predicates embed exclamatives in general and impose differential conditions. Other elements embed “mixed” exclamatives, each with its own requirements. To summarize,
embedding exclamatory content in the broad sense of this term is not a transparent process. Rather, there is an intricate interaction between the pragmatic and semantics requirements of the embedding element and the embedded content.