

Emphatic relative constructions as answered questions*

Jon Ander Mendia

Heinrich Heine University, Düsseldorf

1. Introduction

1.1 Preliminary remarks

Emphatic Relative Constructions in Spanish, ERCs henceforth, are constructions that superficially resemble definite DPs modified by a restrictive relative clause. However, despite their surface appearance, they differ from these in two important respects: (i) they can be embedded under a great variety of *wh*-embedding predicates, and (ii) they are not interpreted as definite individuals, but as OBJECT (“what”) or AMOUNT (“how many”) questions.¹

(1) *Responsive predicates*

- a. Yo sé { qué / cuántas } manzanas trajo Pedro
I know what how many apples brought Pedro
‘I know {what/how many} apples Pedro brought’
- b. Yo sé las manzanas que trajo Pedro.
I know the apples that brought Pedro
‘I know {what/how many} apples Pedro brought’

(2) *Rogative predicates*

- a. Me pregunto { qué / cuántas } manzanas trajo
me wonder what how many apples brought
‘I wonder {what/how many} apples Pedro brought’

*I am grateful to Rajesh Bhatt and Vincent Homer for the many discussions we have had on this and related topics. I am also indebted to Athulya Aravind, Daniel Altshuler, Seth Cable, Barbara Partee and audiences at UMass and NELS 48 for providing me with very useful comments at different stages of this project.

¹Among many others, see Plann (1982), Torrego (1988), Bosque & Moreno (1990), Brucart (1999), and Leonetti (1999).

- b. Me pregunto las manzanas que trajo Pedro
me wonder the apples that brought Pedro
'I wonder {what/how many} apples Pedro brought'

In a sense, ERCs like (1) and (2) seem to show a “hybrid” nature, they seem to be DPs that nevertheless are interpreted as interrogatives. Thus, ERCs prompt two immediate questions, one syntactic and one semantic: (i) What accounts for the distribution of ERCs in environments that otherwise resist DPs? (ii) How do we account for the range of interpretations ERCs can and cannot receive?

This paper provides an answer to the two questions. From a syntactic standpoint, it is argued that ERCs involve an interrogative core that combines with a definite determiner. From a semantic point of view, it is argued that the interrogative core yields a question meaning and the definite determiner is an exponent of the ANS operator which returns the most informative proposition from the Hamblin-set delivered by the CP (*à la* Dayal 1996). The resulting picture is one where ERCs denote the most informative proposition out of a (relevant) set of propositions; i.e., their interpretation is similar to an “answered” question.

My goal in this paper is thus twofold: First I present a series of arguments demonstrating that ERCs pattern with clausal *wh*-constructions and unlike ordinary nominals, including concealed questions. Given this evidence, I propose a syntactic analysis treating ERCs as interrogative constructions, and then I build on the proposed syntax to present a compositional analysis that derives the available interpretations.

2. Two basic properties of ERCs

ERCs are subject to two general syntactic constraints. The first one involves a restriction on the form of the determiner: ERCs are only possible with the definite article. Any attempt to construct an ERC with a determiner other than the definite article results in ungrammaticality.

- (3) *{ Me pregunto / sé } { éstas / algunas / muchas / dos } manzanas que trajo.
me wonder know these some many two apples that brought
Lit.: 'I {wonder / know} {these / some / many / two} apples that he brought'

This is true even of cases like (4), where the definite article is present, but further modified by the universal quantifier *all*.

- (4) *{ Me pregunto / sé } todas las manzanas que trajo Pedro.
me wonder know all.FM.PL D.FM.PL apples that brought Pedro
Lit.: 'I {wonder/know} all the apples that Juan brought'

The second general syntactic constraint on ERCs pertains to the obligatoriness of the *que*-clause. Unmodified definite DPs are not usually grammatical as complements of rogative

Emphatic Relative Constructions as Answered Questions

predicates (5a).² Under responsive predicates some speakers may allow a concealed question interpretation, but the AMOUNT interpretation is absent.

- (5) a. *Yo me pregunto las manzanas.
I me wonder the.FM.PL apples
- b. ?Yo sé las manzanas.
I know the.FM.PL apples
'I know which ones are the (relevant) apples'

Note that this is not just a requirement on having a modified NP, as other types of NP modification will not do. This is the case of PPs, participial phrases and, more surprisingly perhaps, reduced relatives clauses.

- (6) a. *Yo me pregunto las manzanas de la bolsa.
I me wonder the.FM.PL apples of the bag
- b. *Yo me pregunto las manzanas traídas por Juan.
I me wonder the.FM.PL apples brought by Juan
- c. *Yo me pregunto las personas jugando a poker.
I me wonder the.FM.PL people playing poker

As I will argue below, these two constraints should be taken as the first signs that ERCs are not ordinary DPs modified by restrictive relative clauses. In what follows, I will present further evidence that sets these constructions apart from ordinary DPs.³ Using surface-identical DPs that receive a non-interrogative interpretation—i.e. restrictive relative clauses referring to an individual—and other definite DPs like free relatives as contrast points, I make the argument that ERCs should be treated on par with *wh*-constructions.

2.1 Subject-Verb inversion

In Spanish, the canonical word order is SVO. However, Subject-Verb inversion is a common, optional process, and in many environments subjects may vary freely between preverbal and postverbal positions.

- (7) a. Hoy Juan ha traído las manzanas.
today Juan AUX. brought the apples
'Today Juan brought the apples'
- b. Hoy ha traído Juan las manzanas.

²Some notable exceptions, which I abstract away from here, are “functional” nouns like *price*, *time*, etc. (Nathan 2006).

³Space limitations preclude from presenting more; see Mendia (2017).

However, in many constructions involving A-bar movement of a *wh*-operator, SV inversion is obligatory. I show it here with subordinate questions, but the same holds of matrix questions, matrix and subordinate exclamatives, focus fronting, a.o (see Torrego 1984, Suárez 1994 a.o.).

- (8) a. Me pregunto { qué / cuántas manzanas } ha traído Juan.
 I wonder what / how many apples AUX. brought Juan
 ‘I wonder {what / how many apples} Juan brought.’
 b. *Me pregunto { qué / cuántas manzanas } Juan ha traído

As shown in (9) ERCs require inversion, a pattern that is unexpected if they involved a garden-variety relative clause (the pattern extends to *wh*-embedding predicates of all sorts (Plann 1984, Torrego 1988, a.o.).

- (9) Me pregunto las manzanas que { comió Pedro / *Pedro comió }.
 me wonder the.FM.PL apples that ate Pedro
 ‘I wonder {what/how many} apples Pedro ate’

2.2 Agreement

In Spanish nominative subjects must agree with the verb in person and number, irrespective of whether they are pre- or post-verbal, as shown by the contrasts in (10). Instead, with clausal subjects, the verb bears default agreement, presumably because clauses are not ϕ -feature bearers in Spanish (cf. Halpert 2015). Thus, we observe a reversed agreement pattern that tracks the nominal/clausal difference.

- (10) Agreement patterns: DPs vs. CPs
 a. Me { sorprendieron / *sorprendió } [_{DP} mis amigos].
 me surprised.3.PL surprised.3.SG I.POSS.PL friends
 ‘My friends surprised me’
 b. Me { *sorprendieron / sorprendió } [_{CP} cuántos vinieron].
 me surprised.3.PL surprised.3.SG how many.MS.PL came
 ‘It surprised me how many friends came’

If ERCs were truly nominal we would expect them to pattern with the examples in (10a) and restrictive relative clauses. This is not what we find. As the contrast between the two examples in (11) indicate, the ϕ -agreeing variants are interpreted as ordinary restrictive relative clauses (RRCs for short in the examples). This interpretation is unavailable for the

Emphatic Relative Constructions as Answered Questions

non agreeing variant in (11b), which are instead interpreted as embedded interrogatives as either OBJECT or AMOUNT subordinate questions (Torrego 1988, Bruccart 2003).⁴

- (11) Availability of ERC interpretation: ϕ -agreement vs. no ϕ -agreement
- a. Me sorprendieron los amigos que invitó Pedro.
me surprised.3.PL the.MS.PL friends that invited Pedro
'The friends that invited Pedro surprised me' ✓RRC, ✗ERC
- b. Me sorprendió los amigos que invitó Pedro.
me surprised.3.SG the.MS.PL friends that invited Pedro
'It surprised me {what/how many} friends that Pedro invited' ✗RRC, ✓ERC

Using the semantic availability of an AMOUNT-question interpretation can be useful to further tease apart ERCs from ordinary DPs in cases of nominals with special ϕ -agreement requirements.

Notice that the two properties of ERCs we have seen so far hang together. In (11) above, the two examples—the agreeing and the non-agreeing variants—were introduced with SV inversion. But given the distribution of ERCs reported earlier, we would expect that the ordinary SV word order is compatible only with the agreeing variant. This is exactly what we find:

- (12) No ϕ -agreement, no SV inversion
- a. *Me sorprendió los amigos que Pedro invitó.
me surprised.3.SG the.MS.PL friends that Pedro invited
Int.: 'It surprised me {what/how many} friends that Pedro invited'
- b. *Se me ha olvidado los libros que Pedro me prestó
REFL me AUX.3.SG forgotten the.MS.PL books that lend Pedro
Int.: 'I forgot {what/how many} books Pedro lend me'

2.2.1 Differential Object Marking

Spanish is a language where direct objects that are both specific and human must be preceded by the preposition *a* ("to"). This is an instance of Differential Object Marking (DOM; see Torrego 1998, Leonetti 2004 a.o.).

- (13) a. María besó *(a) Raquel
María kissed to Raquel
- b. María besó (*a) el retrato
María kissed to the portrait

⁴Notice that, even if an OBJECT-question interpretation may be available as a concealed question in agreeing variants, the AMOUNT-question interpretation is nevertheless impossible and requires default agreement instead.

Unlike this subset of nominals, clausal arguments never show DOM. We can construct minimal pairs using the strong/weak distinction of *wh*-pronouns. Spanish has two variants of *wh*-pronouns, one prosodically strong and one prosodically weak, a distinction reflected in the orthography as well (e.g. *quien* for the weak variant of “who” and *quién* for the strong one, *cuanto* and *cuánto* for “how many”, etc.). Crucially, depending on the construction, only one or the other variant is permitted: strong *wh*-pronouns occur in propositional environments, i.e. true questions and exclamatives, whereas the weak variant is used in nominal environments, i.e. free relatives. Thus, only the strong pronoun forms subordinate interrogatives, which, being clausal, do not trigger DOM; weak pronouns, on the other hand, form free relatives, which, if animate and specific, trigger DOM.

(14) Strong vs. Weak *wh*-pronouns

- a. María vió (*a) *quién* vino a la fiesta
 María saw to who came to the party
 ‘María saw who came to the party’
- b. María vió *(a) *quien* vino a la fiesta
 María saw to who came to the party
 ‘María saw the person who came to the party’

If the animacy/specificity of the superficial head noun in ERCs were sufficient to trigger DOM, this would suggest that despite the variability in interpretation, ERCs are syntactically garden-variety DPs. However, this is not what happens; ERCs do not trigger DOM, as shown in (15). Not only is the variant without DOM in (15a) grammatical and has an AMOUNT reading available, the sentence in (15b) with DOM cannot receive such an interpretation (examples adapted from Bosque 1983).

- (15) a. Estudian los delegados que enviarán
 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
 evaluate.3.PL to the.MS.PL representative.MS.PL that send
 ‘They are evaluating the (individual) representatives they will send.3.PL’

2.3 Interim conclusion

To sum up, despite their superficial resemblance to ordinary DPs, ERCs have the external distribution and share with embedded *wh*-constructions all the syntactic traits that set them apart from DPs. They (i) can complement verbs that otherwise do not take nominal complements, (ii) they do so with semantic interpretations unavailable to ordinary DPs; (iii) they show syntactic constraints that do not apply to ordinary DPs (i.e. obligatoriness of a *que*- clause and a restriction to appear with the definite article); and (iv) behave like subordinate questions and unlike DPs in three grammatical contexts, as reported throughout this

section. I take it then that all this evidence points towards ERCs being clausal, and so they cannot be treated as a form of concealed questions; they are true clausal *wh*-constructions, and they should be treated as such.

Nevertheless, despite bearing all the signature properties of *wh*-embedded interrogatives, there is no denying that they rely on the presence of the definite article—see (3) and (4) above—, suggesting that they are categorically DPs. Thus, we should also account for the “hybrid” nature of ERCs. In the remainder of the paper, I propose a structure for ERCs that takes seriously their syntactic and semantic parallels with subordinate interrogatives and their differences with ordinary DPs.

3. The interrogative syntax of ERCs

ERCs are not born as DPs, but as full clauses. The syntactic make-up of ERCs is akin to interrogative clauses, which involve a [+WH] specified C° head with an interrogative core. The resulting construction is a DP with an embedded CP providing question semantics that is only superficially identical to an NP modified by a relative clause. Consider the example in (16) as a working case.

- (16) ... las manzanas que trajo Pedro.
 the.FM.PL apples that brought Pedro

This example looks like a restrictive relative clause, but, as discussed earlier, there are a number of reasons to believe that it cannot just be an ordinary DP modified by a relative clause. The (simplified) structure that I propose for DPs like (16) *qua* ERCs is represented below.⁵

- (17) Syntactic structure of ERCs
 [DP [D_[uφ] las] [CP [DP_[FM.PL] *Op_{wh}* manzanas.FM.PL]_i [C_° que [TP ... *t_i* ...]]]]

The structure above is reminiscent of that proposed by Borsley (1997) and Bianchi (1999) for restrictive relative clauses. For these authors, D directly takes a CP as its complement (see also Kayne 1994), and the constituent targeted for movement is not an NP, but a DP headed by a null determiner. The main differences between their structures and mine are: (i) the presence of a C° head with a [+WH] feature in (17) and (ii) that the null determiner in (17) is a *wh*-operator. With these ingredients, the crucial aspects of the derivation proceed as follows. The [+WH] C° head probes for an element in its domain with matching [WH] specifications, either a question or an exclamative, and agrees with that element. Spanish is a *wh*-movement language, and this Agree relation triggers movement of the *wh*-goal to the specifier of CP. Finally, the D introducing the definite article enters in the derivation with an unvalued ϕ -feature, D[*uφ*]. In the current structure, unlike with restrictive relative clauses, the sister of D lacks these features, but the DP in [Spec,CP], which is equidistant to CP and also in the *c*-command of D[*uφ*] can serve as a suitable goal. In sum, the key

⁵For simplicity I am abstracting away from the correct characterization of SV inversion in Spanish.

aspects of (17) amount to (i) a [+WH] feature on C° , (ii) the presence of a null *wh*-operator generated in VP internal position, and (iii) the ability of the definite article to combine with a non-relative CP.

4. The semantics of ERCs

In this section I show how we can capture the semantic properties of ERCs by interpreting them as questions. The desiderata is to capture the two types of interpretations that ERCs may give rise to: OBJECT and AMOUNT interpretations.

4.1 Background assumptions

The baseline theory of questions that I am assuming is a fairly standard blend of Hamblin (1973) and Karttunen (1977), with the incorporation of the Answerhood operator from Dayal (1996). The syntax-semantic mapping I assume follows the LF-oriented renditions of Karttunen (1977) in von Stechow (1996) and Bittner (1998). First, I assume that *wh*-words denote existential quantifiers.

- (18) a. $\llbracket who \rrbracket = \lambda P. \exists x [person(x) \wedge P(x)]$
 b. $\llbracket what \rrbracket = \lambda P. \lambda Q \exists x [P(x) \wedge Q(x)]$

Following von Stechow (1996), I define the denotation of the operator Q as an identity relation between propositions:

- (19) $\llbracket Q \rrbracket = \lambda p. \lambda q. [p = q]$

In the spirit of Karttunen (1977), I assume that the syntactic locus of the question operator is on C° , akin to his proto-question rule. A simple question like *what books did Liz read* with an LF like (20a) is interpreted as in (20b).

- (20) a. $[_{CP1} \lambda p [_{CP2} [_{DP} \text{what books}]_i \lambda x [_C^\circ Q [_{TP} \text{Liz read } t_i]]]]$
 b. $\llbracket (20a) \rrbracket = \lambda p. \exists x [*book(x) \wedge p = \lambda w'. read(w')(L, x)]$

In (20a) the *wh*-word, a quantifier, undergoes QR to [Spec,CP] pied-piping its nominal complement and leaves an individual trace internal to TP. (The type of a trace left by a moved element corresponds to the type this moved element quantifies over.) The CP level is the level at which “intensionalization” happens. For simplicity, assume Intensional Functional Application (Heim & Kratzer 1998), in order to allow the combination of the C° head, which requires a propositional argument, with the TP, which provides a truth-value. The result is again a truth-value, but now a world variable w has been introduced and abstracted over the predicate.

As in Karttunen (1977), the free propositional variable in CP2 is bound by a lambda operator, effectively creating a set of propositions. The resulting interpretation of this LF is the proposition-set denotation of the question *what books did Liz read*, i.e. the Hamblin-

of (24) with the ordinary definite article are quite apparent. Answerhood operators and the definite article are fulfilling the same task, albeit in different domains. For one, they are both looking at uniquely maximally informative elements that are true in the evaluation world. Moreover, both D_{ANS} and the definite article presuppose the existence of such unique, maximal and true element.

4.3 Application to ERCs

We are now well equipped to dive into how to map structures like ERCs to their semantic interpretation. Our desiderata is to account for the wide range of interpretations that ERCs are capable of delivering. Given the syntactic analysis presented in §3, the constitutive pieces involved in ERCs permit a straightforward application of the semantic analysis sketched above. As a working example, consider the two interpretations of (25a).

- (25) a. las manzanas que trajo Pedro
the.FM.PL apples that brought Pedro
- b. OBJECT interrogative: *what apples Pedro brought*
- c. AMOUNT interrogative: *how may apples Pedro brought*

The parsing responsible for the OBJECT-question interpretation in (25a) is the LF in below (again, abstracting away from SV inversion).

- (26) $[_{DP1} \text{ las } [_{CP} [_{DP2} Op_{wh} \text{ manzanas }]_i [_{C'} \text{ que}_{[+WH]}] [_{TP} \text{ Juan trajo } t_i]]]]$

As explained above, the composing analytical pieces of (26) are identical to any OBJECT question using the relative pronoun *qué* (“what”); the only differences between ERCs and constituent questions are phonological. Thus, up to CP nothing of interest happens, and semantic composition proceeds as with ordinary interrogatives:

- (27) $\llbracket CP_{(26)} \rrbracket = \lambda p. \exists x [*manzana(x) \wedge p = \lambda w'. trajo(w')(P, x)]$

The same is true of the derivation of the AMOUNT interpretation in (25c). The LF is analogous to that of a *how many* question, with a *wh*-operator that quantifies over degrees and a null gradable predicate *many*.

- (28) a. $[_{DP1} \text{ las } [_{CP} [_{DP2} Op_{wh} \text{ MANY manzanas }]_i [_{C'} \text{ que}_{[+WH]}] [_{TP} \text{ Juan trajo } t_i]]]]$
b. $\llbracket CP_{(28a)} \rrbracket = \lambda p. \exists d [p = \lambda w'. \exists x [*manzana(x) \wedge |x| = d \wedge trajo(w')(P, x)]]$

We now have to interpret the definite article in (24) above. As discussed earlier, the definite article is defined as the Answerhood operator D_{ANS} . With this, we can finally give a full denotation to the two types of ERCs (presuppositions omitted).

- (29) a. Final interpretation of OBJECT ERC
 $\llbracket (26) \rrbracket = \lambda w. \iota p [p(w) \wedge \exists x [*manzana(x) \wedge p = \lambda w'. tra jo(w')(P, x)]]$
- b. Final interpretation of AMOUNT ERC
 $\llbracket (28a) \rrbracket = \lambda w. \iota d [p(w) \wedge p = \lambda w'. \exists x [*manzana(x) \wedge |x| = d \wedge tra jo(w')(P, x)]]$

In each case, the result is a function from worlds to propositions, a propositional concept. The definite article D_{ANS} takes a CP denoting a set of propositions—either one of CP1 in (27)/(28b) above—and returns the intension of the maximally informative proposition from that set, if there is one. This is in accordance with current standard theories of questions and so it can be adapted to any variant of question semantics that delivers a weak exhaustive interpretation of questions. From here, stronger interpretations can be derived by applying additional operators (cf. Heim 1994, Beck & Rullmann 1999, a.o.). The take-aways is that ERCs are not semantically special in any way; their particularities lies in the relationship between the overtness and covertness of their constitutive morphological pieces. Once this is acknowledged, there is no significant difference with ordinary interrogative constructions.⁷

5. Conclusions and discussion

This paper provides an account of ERCs in Spanish when they appear as complements to *wh*-embedding predicates. From a syntactic standpoint, I have argued that ERCs are DPs with a full question embedded at the CP level. This conclusion is supported by a number of syntactic criteria, which in turn speak against treating ERCs as being syntactically nominal. Semantically, they are interpreted as questions, not because of additional operations or type-shifting procedures usually assumed for concealed questions, but because they *are* questions. What is special about Spanish is the presence of D_{ANS} , a version of the definite article that applies to questions and returns the maximally informative true answer. Once D_{ANS} is accepted, there is not much work left to do to understand why Spanish ERCs are allowed in a variety of distinct grammatical environments. The conclusion is that ERCs in Spanish belong to its own kind and constitute a third kind of embedded question, but one that is not very far from other more familiar constructions. Thus, if the analysis of ERCs provided here is on the right track, the definite determiner in Spanish can be taken to be an overt exponent of the Answerhood operator $ANS-D_w$ in Dayal (1996). From a semantic point of view alone, that her Answerhood operator is realized as a definite determiner is hardly surprising; see the discussion in above in §4.2.

The resulting state of affairs has consequences for the nature of Answerhood operators in general. Dayal (2017, 55) raises the issue of the precise status of Answerhood operators, and suggests three options: that they should be taken to be meaning postulates, lexically triggered type-shifts or syntactically projected operators.

- (30) a. $\llbracket know(x, Q) \rrbracket \leftrightarrow \llbracket know(x, ANS(Q)) \rrbracket$ Meaning postulate

⁷An open question that remains is the availability of mention some and mention intermediate questions with ERCs. I leave this task for a future occasion.

- b. $\llbracket \text{know } Q \rrbracket = \lambda Q. \lambda x. \text{know}(x, \text{ANS}(Q))$ Type-shift
 c. $[\text{know } [OP_{\text{ANS}} [\text{CP} \dots]]]$ Syntactic operators

If correct, the view of ERCs defended here speaks in favor of the plausibility of the third option.

A further consequence of the analysis is that Answerhood operators should be available even with predicates which exclusively embed questions, such as *wonder* and *ask*. Under most analyses, the lexical semantics of rogative verbs are such that their complements must denote full questions, that is, sets of propositions. ERCs do not denote sets of propositions and yet they are grammatical with rogative predicates; see (2) above. As a consequence there is a type mismatch that must be resolved. One way of solving this intuitively unwanted limitation is by means of a type-lift similar to the Ident operator (Partee 1987). An alternative, following Groenendijk & Stokhof (1982), is to maintain the extensional/intensional division of the complement of *wh*-embedding verbs: extensional *wh*-predicates would combine with propositions directly (type $\langle st \rangle$) and intensional predicates would instead combine with their intensions, type $\langle s, st \rangle$. Thus, the difference would not rely on the type of ERCs, but on that of the embedding predicate.

I have left open many questions, some without discussion (e.g. selection problems, the relation of ERCs to exclamatives, etc.). But the hope is that the questions that remain are not questions about ERCs *per se*, but questions that have to do with general aspects of the semantics of interrogatives, such that whatever solutions we find to those general problems, they should apply wholesale to ERCs as well. On the other hand, there is a contribution to be made by ERCs to the general theory of questions, namely the reality of Answerhood operators and their relationship to definite descriptions, a conclusion that should be confirmed by looking into more languages.

References

- Beck, Sigrid, & Hotze Rullmann. 1999. A flexible approach to exhaustivity in questions. *Natural Language Semantics* 7:249–298.
- Bianchi, Valentina. 1999. *Consequences of antisymmetry. headed relative clauses*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bittner, Maria. 1998. Cross-linguistic semantics for questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 21:1–82.
- Borsley, Robert D. 1997. Relative clauses and the theory of phrase structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28:629–647.
- Bosque, Ignacio, & Juan Carlos Moreno. 1990. Las construcciones con *lo* y la denotación del neutro. *Lingüística, Revista de ALFAL* 2:5–50.
- Brucart, J. M. 1999. La estructura del sintagma nominal: las oraciones de relativo. In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, ed. I. Bosque & V. Demonte, chapter 7, 395–522. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

Emphatic Relative Constructions as Answered Questions

- Brucart, José María. 2003. Adición, sustracción y comparación. In *Actas del XXIII Congreso Internacional de Lingüística y Filología Románica*, ed. F. Sánchez Miret, 11–60. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Cresti, Diana. 1995. Extraction and reconstruction. *Natural Language Semantics* 3:79–122.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 1996. *Locality in Wh-quantification: Questions and relative clauses in Hindi*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 2017. *Questions*. Oxford University Press.
- Groenendijk, Jeroen, & Martin Stokhof. 1982. Semantic analysis of wh-complements. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 5:175–233.
- Hackl, Martin. 2000. Comparative quantifiers. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Halpert, Claire. 2015. *Argument licensing and agreement*. Oxford University Press.
- Hamblin, Charles. 1973. Questions in Montague grammar. *Foundations of Language* 10:41–53.
- Heim, Irene. 1994. Interrogative semantics and karttunen semantics for *know*. In *IATL 1*, ed. R. Buchalla & A. Mittwoch, 128–144. Jerusalem: Akademon.
- Heim, Irene, & Angelika Kratzer. 1998. *Semantics in generative grammar*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Higginbotham, James. 1993. Interrogatives. In *The view from building 20*, ed. Kenneth Hale & Samuel Jay Keyser, 195–228. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Karttunen, L. 1977. Syntax and semantics of questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1:3–44.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Leonetti, Manuel. 1999. El artículo. In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, ed. Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte, 787–890. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Leonetti, Manuel. 2004. Specificity and Differential Object Marking in Spanish. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 3:75–114.
- Mendia, Jon Ander. 2017. Amount Relatives Redux. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Nathan, L. 2006. On the interpretation of concealed questions. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Partee, Barbara. 1987. Noun phrase interpretation and type-shifting principles. *Studies in Discourse Representation Theory and the theory of generalized quantifiers* 8:115–143.
- Plann, Susan. 1982. Indirect questions in Spanish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13:297–312.
- Plann, Susan. 1984. The syntax and semantics of *más/menos... que* versus *más/menos... de* in comparatives of inequality. *Hispanic Linguistics* 1:191–213.
- Romero, Maribel. 1998. Focus and reconstruction effects in *wh*-phrases. Doctoral dissertation, UMass Amherst.
- Rullmann, Hotze. 1995. Maximality in the semantics of *wh*-constructions. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- von Stechow, Arnim. 1996. Against LF pied-piping. *Natural Language Semantics* 4:57–110.
- Suñer, Margarita. 1994. V-movement and the licensing of argumental *wh*-phrases in Spanish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12:335–372.

Jon Ander Mencia

- Torrego, Esther. 1984. On inversion in Spanish and some of its effects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15:103–129.
- Torrego, Esther. 1988. Operadores en las exclamativas con artículo determinado de valor cuantitativo. *NRFH* 36:109–122.
- Torrego, Esther. 1998. *The dependencies of objects*, volume 34. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Jon Ander Mencia
mencia@hhu.de