

## Emphatic Relatives as Answered Questions

Jon Ander Mendia

**Introduction.** This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of Emphatic Relatives (ERs) in Spanish. ERs have the surface appearance of ordinary restrictive relative clauses (RRCs), but differ in two respects: (i) they appear as complements to clause-embedding predicates (rogative predicates, veridical responsive predicates in Lahiri's 2002 typology), and (ii) they are not interpreted intersectively as denoting individuals, but as identity (*what*) or quantity (*how many*) embedded interrogatives, as indicated by the translations of (1).

- (1) { *Sé / Me pregunto* } *las manzanas que trajo Juan*  
 know me ask the.FM.PL apple.FM.PL that brought Juan  
 'I know/I wonder {what/how many} apples Juan brought'

I show that DPs involving ERs have a distinct distribution from DPs modified by RRCs and argue that they should not be given a full nominal treatment. Instead, I contend that ERs are DPs with underlyingly interrogative syntax and that they denote an (answered) question. More specifically, (i) the embedded CP has both the structure and the interpretation of an interrogative clause, and (ii) the definite article is a lexicalized variant of Dayal's (1996) ANS-operator, which applies to the set of propositions denoted by the CP. ERs thus instantiate a particular combination of the analytical pieces commonly thought to be involved in the formation of interrogative constructions which, despite being a logical possibility, has thus far gone unnoticed.

**Distinct properties of ERs vs. RRCs.** ERs do not share, despite appearances, the same syntactic distribution of DPs modified by RRCs. **I.** Unlike RRCs, ERs are only possible with the definite article.

- (2) a. { *Sé / Me pregunto* } { *las / \*esas / \*unas* } *manzanas que trajo Juan*  
 know me ask the.FM.PL those.FM.PL some.FM.PL apple.FM.PL that brought Juan  
 b. *He visto* { *las / esas / unas* } *manzanas que trajo Juan*  
 aux.1.SG seen the.FM.PL those.FM.PL some.FM.PL apple.FM.PL that brought Juan  
 'I saw {the/those/some} apples that Juan brought'

**II.** Generally, DPs modified by RRCs share the syntactic distribution of unmodified DPs. This is unlike ERs, for which the *que*-clause is obligatory.

- (3) a. { *Sé / Me pregunto / Te dije* } *las manzanas \*(que trajo Juan)* ER [= (1)]  
 b. *Yo ví las manzanas (que trajo Juan)* RRC  
 I saw the.FM.PL apple.FM.PL that brought Juan  
 'I saw the apples (that Juan brought)'

**III.** Like questions and exclamatives, ERs show obligatory SV-inversion. With RRCs, however, SV inversion is optional (just like in declarative sentences).

- (4) a. \*{ *Sé / Me pregunto* } *las manzanas que Juan trajo* ✗ER & no SV-inversion  
 know wonder the.FM.PL apple.FM.PL that Juan brought  
 b. *Yo ví las manzanas que Juan trajo* ✓RRC & no SV-inversion  
 I saw the.FM.PL apple.FM.PL that Juan brought

**IV.** Animate objects in Spanish trigger DOM-marking, by means of the preposition *a*. Whereas DPs modified by RRCs trigger DOM, surface-identical ERs do not.

- (5) a. *Estudian los delegados que enviarán* ER → DOM  
 evaluate.3.PL the.MS.PL representative.MS.PL that send  
 'They are evaluating {what/how many} representatives they will send.3.PL'  
 b. *Estudian a los delegados que enviarán* RRC → DOM  
 evaluate.3.PL to the.MS.PL representative.MS.PL that send  
 'They are evaluating the (individual) representatives they will send.3.PL'

**V.** DPs in Spanish (i) must agree in NUMBER with the matrix predicate (in subject position), (ii) and require the same NUMBER and GENDER features on anaphors that refer back to them. ERs on the other hand trigger neuter agreement with the matrix predicate, (6), and anaphoric reference with the neuter pronoun, (7).

- (6) a. *Me sorprendió los amigos \*(que invitó Juan)* ✓ER; ✗RRC  
 me surprised.3.SG the.MS.PL friend.MS.PL that Juan invited  
 ‘It surprised me the friends that Juan invited’
- b. *Me sorprendieron los amigos (que invitó Juan)* ✗ER; ✓RRC  
 me surprised.3.PL the.MS.PL friend.MS.PL that Juan invited  
 ‘The friends (that Juan invited) surprised me’
- (7) a. *Me sorprendió [ los premios que ganó Raquel ]<sub>i</sub>, estoy orgulloso de ello<sub>i</sub>.*  
 me surprised.3.SG the.MS.PL price.MS.PL that won Raquel am proud of PR.NT  
 ‘It surprised me how many papers Raquel read, I am proud of it’  $\rightsquigarrow$  proud of how many prices
- b. *Me sorprendieron [ los premios<sub>i</sub> que ganó Raquel ], estoy orgulloso de ellos<sub>i</sub>.*  
 me surprised.3.PL the.MS.PL price.MS.PL that won Raquel am proud of PR.MS.PL  
 ‘The prices that Raquel won surprised me, I am proud of them’  $\rightsquigarrow$  proud of the prices

**Proposal.** The syntactic structure that I adopt for ERs is in (8) (cf. Bianchi 1999). A null *wh*-operator moves to [Spec, CP], checking a [WH] feature on C°. In order to account for the semantic ambiguity of ERs (see (1) above), I suggest that the null-operators may varyingly instantiate either one of the overt operators *qué* (*what*), or *cuánto* (*how many*) in Spanish, as in (9) (simplified from Karttunen 1977 and Rullmann 1995). In a Hamblin/Karttunen style semantics of questions, the interpretation of each type of CP is as stated in (10).

$$(8) \left[ {}_{DP} \text{ las } [{}_{CP} [{}_{DP} \text{ WH-Op } \text{ manzanas} ]_i [{}_{CP} \text{ que}_{[WH]} [{}_{TP} \dots t_i \dots]]] \right]$$

$$(9) \text{ a. } \llbracket \text{what-Op} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{et}. \lambda Q_{et}. \exists x [P(x) \wedge Q(x)]$$

$$\text{ b. } \llbracket \text{how-many-Op} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{et}. \lambda Q_{et}. \exists x, d [P(x) \wedge |x| = d \wedge Q(x)]$$

$$(10) \text{ a. } \llbracket \text{CP}_{\text{what-Op}} \rrbracket = \lambda p_{st}. \exists x [ \text{manzanas}'(x) \wedge p = \lambda w'. \text{trajo}'(w')(Juan, x) ]$$

$$\text{ b. } \llbracket \text{CP}_{\text{how-many-Op}} \rrbracket = \lambda p_{st}. \exists d, x [ \text{manzanas}'(x) \wedge p = \lambda w'. \text{trajo}'(w')(Juan, x) \wedge |x| = d ]$$

Crucially, I argue that the definite article that appears with ERs is a lexicalized variant of the ANS-operator (Heim 1994, Dayal 1996); call it  $D_{ANS}$ . The role of  $D_{ANS}$  is to extract the maximally informative proposition from a question denotation, (11)/(12). This straightforwardly predicts the ability of ERs to serve as complements to embedding predicates like *know*, which can take propositional arguments (type  $\langle st \rangle$ ). For predicates taking only interrogative complements (of type  $\langle st, t \rangle$ ), a fix is needed; in this case a variant of Partee’s (1986) IDENT operator will do (for instance,  $\llbracket \text{IDENT}_{prop} \rrbracket = \lambda q_{st}. \lambda p_{st}. [p = q]$ ; see Uegaki 2015).

$$(11) \llbracket D_{ANS} \rrbracket = \lambda Q_{\langle st, t \rangle}. \lambda w : \exists p [p \in Q \wedge p(w) \wedge \forall q [ [q(w) \wedge q \in Q] \rightarrow p \subseteq q ]]$$

$$. \text{ip} [p \in Q \wedge p(w) \wedge \forall q [ [q(w) \wedge q \in Q] \rightarrow p \subseteq q ]]$$

$$(12) \llbracket (8) \rrbracket = \llbracket D_{ANS} \rrbracket (\llbracket \text{CP} \rrbracket) = \lambda w. \text{ip} [p(w) \wedge p = \lambda w'. \exists x [ \text{manzanas}'(x) \wedge \text{trajo}'(w')(Juan, x) ]] \quad (\text{simplified})$$

**Assessment.** That ERs are only possible with the definite article and the necessity of the *que*-clause follows immediately from the semantics of  $D_{ANS}$  and C°. (The presence of  $D_{ANS}$  also correctly precludes ERs as matrix interrogatives, since the ER does not denote a question anymore, but a proposition.) Obligatory SV inversion in ERs follows from the presence of a chain involving a quantificational operator—à la Rizzi (2004). The lack of DOM, neuter agreement and neuter anaphora also receive a straightforward explanation if the DP is not in fact headed by a nominal head, as with ordinary RRCs, but has a propositional core.

**Implications.** This analysis, if correct, has implications for the treatment of definiteness in natural language as well as the syntax-semantics interface in *wh*-constructions. **I.** The analysis provides support for the syntactic reality of the ANS-operator and motivates a unified treatment of  $D_{ANS}$  and the definite article. (From a semantic point of view, a unification is appealing: ANS-operators and the definite article both require (i) existence, (ii) uniqueness and (iii) maximal informativeness; cf. von Stechow et al. 2012.) **II.** On the view advanced here, the difference between ERs and embedded questions comes down to the overtness vs. covertness of the two operator types involved: (i) interrogative *wh*-operators and (ii) operators that mediate between questions and answers. This raises the question as to how much of the variation among different interrogative and interrogative-like constructions (e.g. free relatives, exclamatives) comes down to such differences.