Dutch Particle Exclamatives

New perspectives on exclamative constructions

Gouming Martens

A thesis presented for the degree of
Master of Arts

Universiteit Leiden

Linguistics Department
Leiden University
The Netherlands, 12 July 2016

Abstract

Ever since Elliott's (1974) seminal work on exclamatives in English, formal linguists have dealt with questions such as how to formally characterize exclamatives, which components contribute to exclamativity and how many components are involved. In the literature there are several different approaches to exclamative constructions. Some have argued that exclamatives are semantically derived from questions (Gutiérrez-Rexach, 1996; Zanuttini and Portner, 2003), others, however, derive exclamatives from degree constructions (Rett, 2008). Then there are some accounts claiming that exclamatives are derived from neither one of the two. Chernilovskaya and Nouwen (2012) for instance, claim that noteworthy evaluation is most crucial to exclamatives. The current thesis will follow Chernilovskaya and Nouwen (2012) by claiming that noteworthiness is a crucial component of exclamatives.

This thesis aims at getting a better understanding of exclamative constructions. It makes an attempt to identify the components that are crucial to exclamative constructions and explain how each component semantically contributes to exclamativity. To do so, I examine Dutch particle exclamatives and define its characteristic components. These constructions consist of a first person singular pronoun *me* and a modal particle *toch*, as in, for example, the sentence *Hij heeft **me toch** een boel auto's!* 'Boy, does he have a lot of cars!'. Interestingly, unlike any other pronoun, the *me* pronoun in exclamative constructions occurs invariably in first person singular form and therefore has no other paradigmatic forms. I argue that this *me* pronoun is semantically distinct from all other pronouns in that it marks ego-evidentiality. Such being the case, the *me* particle indicates that the source of the content is the actual speaker him/herself or in other words the EGO. As a direct consequence of ego-evidentiality, the exclamative proposition becomes veridical, that is to say that whatever the speaker's opinion is, it should be assumed to be true according to his/her perceptive world. To simplify matters, I have taken veridicality to be equal to factivity.

The modal particle *toch* in isolation indicates an inconsistency with the common ground (Hogeweg et al., 2011), a notion we see back in the semantics of *toch* in exclamative constructions. I take the exclamative *toch* to be the overt realization of *widening*, a concept introduced by Zanuttini and Portner (2003). According to Zanuttini and Portner (2003) *widening* can be characterized as an operation extending the domain of a certain proposition to a wider domain which lies beyond what is expected. My concept of widening, however, slightly differs from Zanuttini and Portner's concept of widening as I will incorporate the notion of *noteworthiness*, as defined by Chernilovskaya and Nouwen (2012), as well as a non-specificity requirement (a notion to some extent comparable to Rett's (2008) degree restriction). By doing so, I am able to account for a wider range of exclamative constructions. The interaction of these two particles gives rise to exclamativity. It can be concluded that lexically the particle exclamatives consist of two components: an ego-evidentiality marker *me* and a *widening* marker *toch*. Semantically, it consists of

factivity and *widening*. At the end of this thesis I examine to what extent this analysis is applicable to another Dutch exclamative construction, namely *wh*-exclamatives and how such analysis relates to the more general literature on exclamative constructions.

List of Glosses

1	First person
2	Second person
3	Third person
CL	Classifier
COMP	Complementizer
DAT	Dative
F	Feminine
GEN	Genitive
IMP	Imperative
INF	Infinitive
M	Masculine
NEG	Negation
OBJ	Object
PL	Plural
PTC	Past Participle
PTCL	Particle
REFL	Reflexive
SFP	Sentence-Final Particle
SG	Singular
SUB	Subordinator

Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

Ever found yourself in the middle of a conversation between chit-chattering aunts during a family reunion? Well if you have, chances are big that while you were listening, you encountered a myriad of exclamative constructions like the ones in (1). Exclamatives are grammatical constructions that convey a strong emotion of the speaker towards a certain matter. These strongly emotive expressions are accompanied by an idiosyncratic intonation pattern which often results in an high frequency pitch contour on focused elements.

(1)   a.   Wat   heeft   zij   een hoop kinderen!
            what have.3SG 3SG.F a   heap children
            'What a lot of children she has!'

        b.   Zij   heeft   me toch   een hoop kinderen!
            3SG.F have.3SG ME TOCH a   heap children
            'Boy, does he have a lot of children!'

        c.   Een hoop kinderen dat   zij   me heeft!
            a   heap children COMP 3SG.F ME have.3SG
            'Boy, does she have a lot of children!'

Even though native speakers do not have any trouble at all producing and understanding these exclamative constructions, linguists are still far from understanding such constructions and there is still an ongoing debate about how they should be analyzed. What is/are, for instance, the component(s) contributing to this speech act? Are exclamative constructions lexically determined, indicated purely and only by intonation or are they structurally encoded in the syntax? The different ideas and analyses about which properties should be ascribed to exclamatives are numerous and still hotly debated (Elliott, 1974; Grimshaw, 1979; Zanuttini and Portner, 2003; Rett, 2008; Beyssade, 2009; Chernilovskaya and Nouwen, 2012; Badan and Cheng, 2015). Exclamatives have often been associated with a high emotional load of surprise or amazement towards a certain proposition, as well as a property known as factivity which is a feature that presupposes the truth of a certain proposition (Zanuttini and Portner, 2003). There is a long tradition in the literature to ascribe such properties (i.e. high degree of suprise and factivity) to exclamative constructions, recent literature however, present accounts revising these properties in order to be applicable to a wider set of exclamatives and even advocating against some of these properties.

One such debated topic is related to the surprise reading of exclamatives. Zanuttini and Portner (2003), which have been regarded as the authorities on exclamatives from

a generative point of view, link exclamative force directly to an operation called *widening*. The operation of *widening* gives rise to a surprise reading usually associated with exclamatives. A high degree of surprise has long been assumed to be inherent to exclamatives (Zanuttini and Portner, 2003). Contrary to Zanuttini and Portner (2003) however, Badan and Cheng (2015) argue that widening is not a necessary component of exclamatives and therefore not all exclamatives have such surprise reading. In a similar fashion, the general tradition has been and to a large extent still is, to characterize exclamatives as factive presuppositions. Beyssade (2009) though argues, contra the general believes, that exclamatives are not of a presuppositional nature, but should be analyzed as implicatures instead. An even more controversial matter has to do with which components are essential to exclamative constructions. Some have claimed that there is only one exclamative operator giving rise to the exclamative force (Gutiérrez-Rexach, 1996; Rett, 2008). Others like Zanuttini and Portner (2003) and Badan and Cheng (2015) argue that exclamatives can be deconstructed into different components interacting with each other. In the eyes of Zanuttini and Portner (2003) for instance, exclamatives are a product of the interaction between a *wh*-operator and a factive operator, the interaction of the two gives rise to an operation called *widening* which connects high degree/surprise reading to such constructions. Badan and Cheng (2015) on the other hand, regard scalar focus, ego-evidentiality and factivity as an integral part of exclamatives. As should have become clear, there still is no agreement between linguists on the exact nature of exclamative constructions. In the next chapter I will discuss these issues in more detail.

The current thesis mainly focuses on Dutch exclamative constructions containing a first person pronoun *me* and a modal particle *toch* as illustrated in Example (1b). I will refer to these constructions as *particle exclamatives*. In order to get a better understanding of exclamative constructions in general, I will have a closer look at these particle exclamatives and determine which components are essential to the exclamative construction, what their actual semantics are and how the different components interact with each other. I argue that Dutch particle exclamatives essentially consist of two lexical components, namely a *me* particle and a modal *toch* particle, which give rise to two semantic components, namely factivity and widening. According to my analysis, the Dutch *me* particle is the overt realisation of ego-evidentiality and *toch* the overt realisation of widening. As such, the *me* particle both indicates that the source of the proposition is the speaker him/herself. In addition, the *me* particle indicates that the proposition reflects the speaker's opinion. Therefore whatever falls within the scope of *me* is regarded to be veridical (i.e. presupposed to be true). In order to simplify matters I have taken veridicality to be equal to factive. The modal particle *toch* expresses that a certain proposition is inconsistent with the common ground (Hogeweg et al., 2011) and its function is comparable to Zanuttini and Portner's idea of *widening* and Rett's (2008) notion of evaluality. My concept of widening, however, slightly differs from Zanuttini and Portner's concept of widening. My definition of widening will incorporate the notion of *noteworthiness*, as defined by Chernilovskaya and Nouwen (2012), and contains a non-specificity requirement (a notion comparable to yet not similar to Rett's degree restriction). By doing so, it better explains the data found in Dutch particle exclamatives than Zanuttini and Portner's concept of *widening* could have done. At the end of this thesis I examine in what way this analysis is applicable to another Dutch exclamative construction, namely *wh*-exclamatives, and how such analysis relates to the more general literature on exclamative constructions.

There are two main goals of this thesis, first of all it attempts to identify the different

components of Dutch particle exclamatives and their semantics. Second of all, based on this analysis of particle exclamatives, it attempts to draw a more general conclusion for all exclamative constructions.

In the next sections, I consider the distinction between exclamations and exclamatives and narrow down the object of study by excluding other exclamative constructions and only focusing on the so-called particle exclamatives.

1.1 Exclamation vs. Exclamative

Before discussing exclamative constructions, it is crucial to make a difference between the *exclamatives* and *exclamations*. Although the two are often used interchangeably in the literature (Castroviejo, 2008), it will become clear that making a nuance between *exclamatives* and *exclamations* is inevitable for further research. I have adopted Castroviejo's (2008) definitions for *exclamatives* and *exclamations*. According to Castroviejo an exclamation is a pragmatic construction whose function is to express the speaker's feelings. An exclamative on the other hand, is a syntactic construction which conveys the pragmatic function of exclamation. In other words, *exclamatives* are a subset of *exclamations*, therefore not every exclamation is an exclamative construction, but every exclamative construction is an exclamation. Examples 2 and 3 below provide a clear image of the nuance between the two terms.

(2)   a.   Hij   heeft   **veel auto-'s!**
         3SG.M have.3SG many car-PL

         'Boy, does he have a lot of cars!'

     b.   Hij   heeft   **niet veel auto-'s!**
         3SG.M have.3SG really NEG many   car-PL

         'He doesn't have a lot of car1s!'

(3)   a.   Wat heeft   hij   veel auto-'s!
         What have.3SG 3SG.M many car-PL

         'What a lot of cars he has!'

     b.   *Wat heeft   hij   niet veel auto-'s!
         What have.3SG 3SG.M NEG many car-PL

         'What a lot of cars he hasn't!'

Example (2) illustrates a case in which the sentence expresses exclamation but is not an exclamative from a grammatical point of view. Example (3) though, does represent an exclamation sentence which is also an exclamative construction. Syntactically speaking the sentences in (2) are declaratives and besides their intonation there is nothing differentiating these sentences from declaratives. By changing the intonation pattern from a declarative tune with a final fall in pitch to exclamated intonation with a high pitch on the prominent items, these sentences can be interpreted as expressing exclamation. Note however that there is nothing in the syntax nor in the semantics of the lexical items which could contribute to a shift in speech act. It becomes clear that in case of syntactically pure declarative sentences, it is intonation which is the most salient component indicating certain speech acts, i.e. intonation determines whether sentence (2a) is interpreted as an assertion or an exclamation.

The group of exclamative constructions like (3) separates itself from other exclamations by being subject to certain grammatical behavior not present in non-exclamative exclamations. In Example (2) and (3) I have only illustrated one such feature, but as we will see in the rest of this thesis, there are several features distinguishing exclamative constructions from other constructions. One such feature has to do with the fact that exclamatives cannot be negated, as becomes clear from Example (3b). Exclamated declaratives however, can be negated without resulting in an ungrammatical sentence (2b). [1] The current thesis only deals with exclamative constructions since these seem to be grammatically most interesting.

1.2 Exclamative constructions

Constructions expressing exclamation come in different shapes and sizes and it is not surprising that there is no uniform grammatical construction specifically dedicated to this speech act. Even excluding all the exclamations that are not exclamatives, there is still a wide variety, within the group of exclamative constructions, in the way of encoding exclamation into a grammar. The examples in (4) below provide just a small part of this great variety of exclamative constructions in Dutch, to give one an idea of how diverse exclamative constructions actually are.

(4) a. Wat heeft hij een boel auto-'s!
what have.3SG 3SG.M a lot car-PL

'What a lot of cars he has!'

b. Wat een boel auto-'s heeft hij!
what a lot car-PL have.3SG 3SG.M

'What a lot of cars he has!'

c. Eten dat-ie kan!
eat.INF COMPL-3SG.M can.3SG

'Boy, the things he eats!'

d. Hij heeft me toch een boel auto-'s!
3SG.M have.3SG ME PTCL a lot car-PL

'Boy, does he have a lot of cars!'

e. Heeft hij me toch een boel auto-'s!
have.3SG 3SG.M ME PTCL a lot car-PL

'Boy, does he have a lot of cars!'

f. Het regen-t me toch hard!
it rain-3SG ME PTCL strong

'Boy, is it raining a lot!'

The examples in (4a) and (4b) are both *wh*-exclamatives, but differ in the position of the *wh*-word and the NP it quantifies. In analogy to the position of the *wh*-word

---

[1]Note that there are also exclamative constructions containing negation (Zanuttini and Portner, 2000; Zevakhina, 2015). It thus seems that ugrammaticality due to negation is not a grammatical feature characteristic for all exclamative constructions. However, it is argued by Zanuttini and Portner (2000) that such apparent negated sentences are actually not negated, but have lost their negation semantics. That being the case, it would be more appropriate to call such constructions, 'expletive negations' Zanuttini and Portner (2000). Regardless of whether negation is a test for exclamativity, the point made here, is that exclamative constructions like (3) have certain grammatical features not found in non-exclamative exclamations like (2).

and the quantified DP these two constructions have been called *split wh-exclamative* and *non-split wh-exclamative* respectively (Corver, 1990). *Wh*-exclamatives have been well-accounted for in the literature; in fact, most literature on exclamatives has focused on *wh*-exclamatives in which the *wh*-word is the main indicator of exclamation (Zanuttini and Portner, 2003; Castroviejo, 2006; Rett, 2008). The construction illustrated in (4c) concerns an infinitival verb form followed by what seems to be an embedded clause. In these constructions, the verb is the most prominent element and is placed sentence initially to receive focus.[2] The last group of exclamatives I would like to discuss are the ones illustrated in (4d-f). I have referred to these sentences as particle exclamatives, since they involve the use of two exclamative particles: a first person pronoun *me* and a modal particle *toch*. Example (4e) is similar to (4d) with the exception that the former has its verb in initial position. The construction in (4f) differs from the other constructions in that there is an expletive pronoun serving as the subject of the sentence.

Despite the fact that there is a vast variety of syntactic forms indicating an exclamative construction, *wh*-exclamatives are the ones which have received the most attention in the literature. They have been examined in more detail compared to other exclamative constructions. In the current thesis I focus on exclamative constructions containing exclamative particles like the one in (4d). To make things less complicated I will not look at the inverted particle exclamatives (4e) nor at the expletive particle exclamatives (4f).

Looking at particle exclamatives one could wonder how exclamation is expressed in these particle exclamatives. Is it due to the grammatical configuration or is it purely lexically determined by the particles itself? How do the first person pronoun *me* and the modal particle *toch* contribute to the semantics of the exclamative construction? And are these particles obligatory or optional, and why are they obligatory or optional?

1.3 Following Chapters

In this chapter I have clarified the goals of this paper and determined the subject of research. In the next chapter I review some previous literature on exclamative constructions and compare the different approaches and different components that are assumed to be crucial to exclamative constructions (Chapter 2). At the end of the next chapter, I take a closer look at the literature on Dutch exclamatives and more specifically Dutch particle exclamatives, making a bridge between Chapter 2 and Chapter 3. Chapter 3 deconstructs the particle exclamatives and explains how the different components contribute to the exclamative reading and interact with each other. Chapter 4 reviews the possibility to extend this analysis to another Dutch exclamative constructions, namely the Dutch *wh*-exclamatives. Finally, at the very end of Chapter 4, we will see how this analysis relates to the more general discussion on exclamatives.

---

[2]Interestingly there does not seem to be any matrix clause in these constructions.

Chapter 2

Previous Literature

The earliest account of exclamative constructions from a generative perspective can be traced back to the work of Dale E. Elliott done in the early 70s (Elliott, 1971, 1974). In these works Elliott argues that exclamatives should be regarded as a separate sentence type distinct from questions. Despite the apparent similarities between questions and exclamatives on the surface, Elliott designed several grammatical tests differentiating exclamatives from questions. Although his analysis is mainly limited to the application of the English language, his approach and tests have been influential for later research. Through the work of Elliott in the early 70s a great interest in exclamatives within formal linguistics arose.

After Elliott's seminal work in the 70s, more and more linguist have engaged in research on exclamatives in different languages of the world: Romance (Benincà, 1995; Zanuttini and Portner, 2000; Castroviejo, 2006; Mayol, 2008; Gutiérrez-Rexach and Andueza, 2011), West-Germanic (Grimshaw, 1979; Fries, 1988; Bennis, 1998; Corver, 1990) , Scandinavian languages (Abels and Vangsnes, 2010; Delsing, 2010; Jónsson, 2010; Lohndal, 2010; Petersson, 2011), Hungarian (Lipták, 2005), Japanese (Sasai, 2006; Ono, 2006; Yamato, 2010), Malagasy (Potsdam, 2011), Austronesian (Kaufman, 2010) and Chinese (Visan, 2000; Badan and Cheng, 2015).

Currently, there are many different views and opinions on how exclamative should be analyzed, what components they consist of and what an exclamative actually expresses. Despite these varying and often contradicting thoughts, there is more or less consensus that exclamatives constitute a separate sentence type distinct from assertions and questions. Exclamative construction have certain properties which mark them as a separate group. In the following sections, the question concerning what these properties are and how many properties there are, will be discussed.

2.1   Components

There have been many different opinions on the question of which components should be attributed to exclamatives. The issue is complicated by the fact that there is a multitude of different grammatical constructions which can all be categorized as exclamatives. Basically, there are two major approaches dealing with exclamatives: on the one hand there are accounts regarding exclamatives as degree constructions (Rett, 2008) and on the other hand there are accounts that derive exclamatives from the semantics of questions (Gutiérrez-Rexach, 1996; Zanuttini and Portner, 2003).

2.1.1 Guttierez (1996)

Although similarities between exclamatives and interrogatives have been noticed ever since the first descriptions of exclamative constructions, Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) is among the first to formally derive exclamatives from interrogatives. According to Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) an exclamative expresses the emotive attitude of the speaker towards a certain proposition in a high degree. In their view, there is one illocutionary exclamative operator (EXC) that is responsible for the illocutionary force of exclamatives. Essentialy, it turns an interrogative sentence into an exclamative sentence. Syntactically speaking, an exclamative is similar to an interrogative. The illocutionary operator EXC belongs to the semantic type of $< i, < s, << s, t >, t >>>$, in which i is the type of the speaker's variable and s is the type of the world variable. The illocutionary operator EXC is defined by Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) as follows:

> Let a be an agent (the speaker), w a world (typically the actual world), p a proposition and P $\in$ EMOT (the set of emotive properties). Then, EXC=
> $_{df}\lambda a_i \lambda w_s \lambda p_{< s, << s,t >, < e,t >>>}[P(w)(p)(a)]$

Basically the function, described above, links an emotive property (P) to a proposition (p) about the world (w) with a speaker (a). In other words when a speaker uses an exclamative in the real world, the operator links the emotion of the speaker with the proposition about the real world.

Basically, the semantics of the exclamative proposition itself is derived from the semantic denotation of interrogatives in a similar way as proposed by Groenendijk and Stokhof (1984):

(5) How tall is John?

(6) $\lambda w'[id[tall(w)(j, d)] = id[tall(w')(j, d)]]$

(Castroviejo, 2006, p. 31)

Applying the formula in 2.1.1 causes sentence 2.1.1 to mean that the set of worlds in which the maximal degree of John's tallness is similar to the maximal degree of John's tallness in the actual world (Castroviejo, 2006). This question semantics assigns an exhaustive reading to the exclamative construction. The main difference between questions and exclamatives does not lie in their propositional denotation, since both constructions have the same denotation (2.1.1), but in their occurrence of an exclamative operator which only applies to exclamatives (7).

(7)   a. How tall John is!

        b. EXC$(a)(w)(\lambda w'[id[tall(w)(j, d)] = id[tall(w')(j, d)]])iff$
           $\exists P \in$ EMOT$[P(w)(\lambda w'[id[tall(w)(j, d)] = id[tall(w')(j, d)]])(a)]$

(Castroviejo, 2006, p. 32)

2.1.2 Zanuttini and Portner (2003)

Similar to Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996), Zanuttini and Portner (2003) derive exclamative semantics from question semantics: both interrogatives and exclamatives denote a set of alternative propositions (Karttunen, 1977; Groenendijk and Stokhof, 1984).

Zanuttini and Portner (2003) claim that exclamatives consist of two components: a factive morpheme (FACT) which gives the exclamative a presuppositional reading and a *wh*-operator which denotes a set of alternative propositions. The interaction of the two gives rise to a semantic operation called *widening* which widens the domain of quantification along the context of a given scale. Widening the domain D1, the set of alternative propositions denoted by the *wh*-word, to D2 which is the set of unexpected things. Zanuttini and Portner (2003) formalize *widening* in the following way:

(8) WIDENING: For any clause S containing $R_{widening}$, widen the initial domain of quantification for $R_{widening}$, D1, to a new domain, D2, such that
   a. $\forall x \forall y [(x \in D1 \& y \in (D2 - D1)) \rightarrow x \prec y]$
   b. $[\![S]\!]_{w,D2,<} - [\![S]\!]_{w,D1,<} \neq 0$

The formula basically explains that $[\![S]\!]_{w,D2,}$ is the set of true (in w) propositions, where the *x* is drawn from the new domain D2, while $[\![S]\!]_{w,D1}$ is the corresponding set for the old domain D1. Saying that the difference between these two, $[\![S]\!]_{w,D2,} - [\![S]\!]_{w,D2,}$, must be nonempty, amounts to requiring new items to be added to the domain. *Widening* is a formal representation of emotive intentions like unexpectedness, surprise and amazement, often associated with exclamatives. More specifically, *widening* is the formalization of *scalar implicature* which is a notion denoting that a certain proposition lies at the extreme end of a contextually given scale.

Fundamentally both Zanuttini and Portner (2003) and Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) posit that exclamatives share partial semantics with questions. Both claim that besides all characteristics of question semantics, exclamatives contain an operator that distinguishes exclamative from interrogatives. For Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996), this is an additional exclamative operator which changes the sentence type, for Zanuttini and Portner (2003) it is not an operator specifically dedicated to exclamativity, but a factive operator. In other words, whereas Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) claims that besides all characteristics of question semantics, exclamatives also contain an exclamative operator, Zanuttini and Portner (2003) claims that it is only the addition of a factive operator that causes exclamatives to differ from interrogatives. As we have seen earlier, unlike Zanuttini and Portner (2003), Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) does not incorporate factivity into the concept exclamatives, but rather assumes that factivity arises from the factive verb it is embedded under.

Another major difference between the two accounts on exclamatives, is their concept of question semantics. While Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) attributes exhaustivity to question semantics, Zanuttini and Portner (2003) argue that the *wh*-operator gives rise to a set of alternative propositions. It is only through the interaction between the factive operator and the *wh*-operator that widening arises. As a consequence of widening, scalar implicature arises which causes the exhaustive reading. So while Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) directly ascribes exhaustivity to question semantics, Zanuttini and Portner (2003) assign this reading through the interaction between factivity and question semantics.

Finally another major difference lies in the way the two accounts relate the exclamated proposition to the actual world. Zanuttini and Portner (2003) link a factive proposition to the real world. Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) on the other hand, links an emotive proposition about the real world to the speaker. Crucially one account incorporates the speaker

while the other does not. Note also that although Zanuttini and Portner (2003) emphasize the factive nature of the proposition, Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) characterizes it more as an emotive proposition. This emotive nature has been characterized as a direct consequence of *widening* by Zanuttini and Portner (2003) and is therefore not formally represented in any semantic operator. This contrasts with Gutierrez's account which explicitly incorporates emotive content into the exclamative operator. The current analysis, strongly emphasises the importance of the relation between the speaker and the proposition. This relation is regarded to be one of ego-evidentiality, as will become clear from Chapter 3.

2.1.3 Rett (2008)

Rett (2008) approaches the semantics of exclamatives from a different perspective. In contrast to earlier accounts that derive exclamatives from question semantics, Rett (2008) derives exclamatives from degree semantics. As I have done in the previous chapter, Rett (2008) makes a distinction between exclamations and exclamatives. Essentialy, there are two requirements shared by all exclamations: first of all its content must be salient in the discourse and second of all the speaker regards this content as surprising in some way (Rett, 2008). Exclamatives distinguish themselves from exclamations based on the fact that they are subject to two additional restrictions, namely degree restriction and evaluativity restriction. To put it simple, the exclamative "content must be about a degree, and this degree must exceed a relevant standard" (Rett, 2008). The sentences in Example (9) below illustrate the difference between exclamations and exclamatives, and the importance of the degree restriction and the evaluativity restriction.

(9) a. (Wow,) Mimi speaks Portuguese and Romanian!
     b. # (My,) What languages Mimi speaks!

(Rett, 2008, p. 604)

While exclamations can convey surprise about individual objects like Portuguese and Romanian (9a), exclamatives cannot relate to individual cases (9b). Exclamatives are only able to convey amounts or gradable adjectives, i.e. all properties expressing some kind of degree.

A similar observation is made for *How*-exclamatives. The *wh*-word *how* in English can either refer to manner or evaluation (10)

(10) How does Buck ride his horse?
      a. **manner**: bare-backed, saddled
      b. **evaluation**: beautifully, dangerously, clumsily...

Similar to the previous Example, an exclamative like *(My,) How Buck rode his horse!* can only receive an evaluative interpretation not an manner interpretation.

According to the degree restriction, exclamatives are incapable of expressing surprise about something which is not a degree (i.e. an set of individuals or a manner). Hence, every exclamative contains a gradable element, be it overt or covert. In case of no overt gradable element, Rett (2008) postulates a null gradable adjective to account for the gradable reading $\mathbb{P}$ or a null gradable adverb ADV to account for the evaluation interpretation.

Claiming that exclamatives have to relate to some kind of degree is not enough to explain all the grammatical behaviors of exclamatives. In order for the speaker to be

surprised about a certain degree, an expression needs to make reference to a degree that exceeds a certain standard. The evaluative restriction does exactly that.

In a certain sense the evaluative restriction can be equated to Zanuttini and Portner's (2003) idea of *widening*. The crucial difference between the two analyses is the fact that (Zanuttini and Portner, 2003) cannot account for the degree restriction with their analysis (Rett, 2008). Widening takes as its argument a set of propositions, since no formal distinction is made between propositions denoted by a degree question(e.g. how) and propositions denoted y an individual question (e.g. who), Zanuttini and Portner's theory cannot explain the degree restriction. Put differently, Zanuttini and Portner's theory is not specific enough to restrict the group of exclamatives.

Rett (2008) assumes that these restrictions on exclamatives are imposed by the illocutionary force of exclamatives which has been formulated as a illocutionary force operator as follows:

DEGREE E-FORCE (d $_{<d,<s,t>>}$) is expressively correct in context C iff D is salient in C and $\exists d, d > s$[the speaker in C is surprised that $\lambda w.d(d)(w)$]

Basically the formula above tells us that the utterance of an exclamative is expressively correct if and only if its content is a degree property which is salient in the discourse, the speaker is surprised that a specific degree holds of that degree property and that degree exceeds a contextualy provided standard *s* (Rett, 2008). Since the illocutionary force operator binds a free degree argument and since each utterance can presuably be expressed with only one illocutionary force operator, Rett (2008) predicts that expressions with Degree E-FORCE can have at most one free degree argument. This would imply that exclamatives containing multiple *wh*-clauses are infelicitous, which is indeed the case as becomes clear from example (11).

(11)   *How very fat how very many people are!

(Rett, 2008, p. 610)

Just like Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996), Rett's (2008) explanation for the semantics of exclamatives, ascribes an important role to the speaker of the utterance. But while Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) simply associates any emotive content to the speaker, Rett's degree DEGREE E-FORCE specifically associates surprised content to the speaker. Besides the incorporation of the speakers perspectives, the similarities between Gutierrez's illocutionary force operator and Rett's operator seem to stop.

Examining the Degree E-FORCE operator, the similarities with *widening* immediately stand out: both indicate that a certain domain is larger than another domain. However, the two accounts differ on the type of arguments the operators take. While the argument of widening consist of sets of propositions, the Degree E-FORCE takes a degree argument. This difference exactly underlies the point of critique Rett (2008) has towards Zanuttini and Portner (2003). The alternative set of propositions as defined by Zanuttini and Portner (2003) includes both propositions of degree items as well as items having an individual reading, thus conflicting with the degree restriction argued by Rett (2008). In other words, Zanuttini and Portner's account is not restrictive enough to eliminate nouns with individual readings and adverbs with evaluative readings to be excluded as potential arguments. Although the current account will not posit a degree restriction the way Rett (2008), I will propose a similar kind of restriction on the possible arguments of an exclamative operator.

10

2.1.4 Chernilovskaya and Nouwen (2012)

A completely different approach is taken by Chernilovskaya and Nouwen (2012). According to their account it is neither degree semantics nor interrogative semantics that characterize exclamatives, rather they take *noteworthiness* to be most defining for exclamatives. According to Chernilovskaya and Nouwen (2012) *"an entity is noteworthy iff its intrinsic characteristics (i.e. those characteristics that are independent of the factual situation)* ***stand out considerably*** *with respect to a comparison class of entities."* (Chernilovskaya and Nouwen, 2012, p. 275). A major argument against a degree approach in Rett's (2008) sense, is based on the fact that non-gradable *wh*-words can occur in exclamative constructions in Dutch as becomes clear from (12).

(12)   Wie ik net gezien heb!
       who I   just seen   have
       'You are not going to believe who I have just seen!'

(Chernilovskaya and Nouwen, 2012, p. 273)

Example (12) goes against Rett's degree restriction since such restriction cannot account for the example in (12). The *wh*-word *wie* in Example (12) is non-gradable and would therefore be infelicitous in exclamative constructions according to Rett's degree restriction. Yet this sentence is perfectly fine in Dutch. Rett's account seems to be insufficient to account for all exclamative constructions crosslinguistically.

In the next sections we will elaborately treat some of the properties discussed earlier.

2.1.5 Factivity

Factivity is defined as a property which assumes the truth of its proposition, the term was first coined by Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1968):

[*a factive predicate*] *... presupposes that the embedded clause expresses a true proposition, and makes some assertion about that proposition.*

(Kiparsky and Kiparsky, 1968, p. 147)

The connection between factivity and exclamatives has been noticed throughout the literature ever since the beginning of the 1970's. In his influential work on English *wh*-exclamatives, Elliott (1974) made an attempt to distinguish questions from exclamatives as a separate sentence type based on their grammatical properties. It was Elliott (1974) who had first made the connection between factivity and exclamatives. He observed that English exclamative clauses can only be selected by factive verbs like *know* and *realize* and more generally by factive predicates like *it's amazing..., it's great..., it's unbelievable... etc.*. Non-factive predicates like *I asked..., I thought...etc.* on the other hand result in infelicitous sentences, see Example (13) below:

(13)   a. I know what an attractive woman she is.

       b. It's incredible how beautiful these flowers are.

       c. *He wonders what an attractive woman she is.

Despite the fact that exclamatives can only be embedded under factive predicates, Elliott does not go as far as to claim that exclamatives are inherently factive. In his opinion, it is only the predicate which is factive, rather than the exclamative itself. Grimshaw (1979) nonetheless, took it one step further by claiming that exclamatives are factive themselves.

In a similar fashion to Elliott (1974), Grimshaw (1979) examined the semantic and pragmatic differences between questions and exclamatives. She elaborates on their selectivity for different semantic types of predicates (i.e. factive and non-factive predicates). Like Elliott (1974), she observes that exclamatives can only be selected by factive predicates. Grimshaw however, claims that exclamatives are inherently factive, a claim Elliott (1974) did not dare to make. Claiming that exclamatives are factive implies that they presuppose the truth of the proposition that is exclamated. So according to Grimshaw (1979) by uttering an exclamation like (14a), the proposition in (14b) is presupposed, that is to say that it is part of the common ground between speaker and listener:

(14)   a. How tall John is!

       b. John is tall

<div align="right">(Grimshaw, 1979, p. 320)</div>

Keeping in mind the claim that exclamatives are factive, Grimshaw (1979) provides an explanation for the fact why exclamatives cannot function as answers in question-answering pairs (see 15), while declaratives like (16)can :

(15)   a. Question: How tall is John?
          #Response: How tall John is!

       b. Question: Did John buy a big car?
          #Response: What a big car John bought!

(16)   Question: How tall is John?
       Response: John is extremely tall.

<div align="right">(Grimshaw, 1979, p. 321)</div>

The oddness of an exclamative as a response to a question cannot be attributed to the lack of information in the response itself since we have just established that exclamatives are factive and therefore presuppose the information that is exclaimed. Both declaratives and exclamatives contain the same propositional information. However, as a result of factivity, exclamatives cannot function as proper answers. In other words, the ill-formedness originates from the fact that questions cannot be answered with an reply that already presupposes the answer (Grimshaw, 1979). Example (17) below tests this claim:

(17)   Question: Did Bill leave?
       #Response: It's odd that he did.

<div align="right">(Grimshaw, 1979, p. 322)</div>

In Example (17) we are dealing with a factive assertion functioning as a response. Note that similar to the exclamative case it is not the lack of information that creates the problem, since the listener can deduce the answer to his question, rather there seems to be a discourse principle working which prevents questions to be replied with a response

which presupposes the answer (Grimshaw, 1979). Zanuttini and Portner (2003) treat these questioning-answering pairs as a grammatical test to identify exclamatives, and like Grimshaw (1979) they hold factivity responsible for their inability to function as true answers.

Another property of factivity, as noticed by Grimshaw (1979), relates to negation. Whenever an exclamative is embedded under a factive verb with a first person subject, the verb cannot be negated, as seen in (18):

(18)   *I don't know what a fool Bill is.

(Grimshaw, 1979, p. 283)

The ungrammaticality in (18) results from a conflict between the factive proposition and the denial of the speaker's own knowledge: it is odd for the speaker to deny his/her own opinion.

Most researches agree with each other that there is a connection exclamatives and factivity, but there are different ideas on how this factivity should be represented and which components are factive. Both Elliott (1974) and Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) place factivity outside the exclamative content itself and ascribe it to the factive predicate embedding the exclamative. Grimshaw (1979) on the other hand, as we have seen earlier, simply states that exclamatives are inherently factive. However, Grimshaw (1979) does not explicitly propose a formalized representation of factivity. Other accounts however, do provide a formal representation for factivity. A very influential line of thought is the one advocated by Zanuttini and Portner (2003). They propose an abstract morpheme (FACT) in the CP domain specifically dedicated as a factive operator. The factive operator is semantically defined as (2.1.5):

(19)   FACTIVITY: For any clause S containing $R_{factivity}$ in addition to $R_{widening}$, every $p \in [\![S]\!]_{w,D2,i} - [\![S]\!]_{w,D1,i}$ is presupposed to be true.

(Zanuttini and Portner, 2003, p. 54)

Put differently, facitivity ensures that any proposition that has been added to the denotation through widening, is pressuposed to be true. Notice that by giving such a definition of factivity, they diverge from Grimshaw (1979) on what the exact content is, that is presupposed. According to Grimshaw (1979) a sentence like "How tall Bill is!" only has one presupposed proposition, namely "Bill is tall.". According to Zanuttini and Portner (2003) however the presupposed content consists of all propositions that are contained within the widened domain of a certain scale, i.e. all propositions larger than an certain initial domain.

2.1.5.1 Against factivity

Sofar we have treated the literature in favour of the claim that exclamatives are factive. There is however, a substantial amount of literature which questions the factive nature of exclamatives. Claims have been made that exclamatives are not presuppositional at all.

The issue, first posited by Elliott (1974), about whether factivity is inherent to an embedded exclamative structure or not, has been discussed by Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) in more detail. Interestingly, instead of asserting that exclamatives are inherently factive, Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996) argues that the emotive factive predicate which embeds these

exclamatives are responsible for this factive reading. But if exclamatives are not inherently factive, what causes them to be only embedded under factive predicates? In other words, if not factive in nature, then what is its nature?

Beyssade (2009) claims that exclamatives are not factive, but implicational. To provide solid evidence,Beyssade (2009) determines the grammaticality tests used to identify factivity and argues against them. If factivity is equated to presuppositions, then grammaticality tests used to test presuppositions, should be applicable to factives as well. Chierchia and McConnell-Ginet (2000) have set up a collection of test, called the family test, which can determine whether a certain proposition is presuppositional. Presuppositions give rise to ungrammatical sentences when negated, questioned or embedded under attitude verbs, all these features are part of the family test. According to Beyssade (2009), exclamatives do not show such distribution.

It is generally assumed that exclamatives cannot be negated, as can be seen in Example (20). A sentence like (20a) sounds perfectly fine, while the negated one (20b) is ruled out. The antonym version (20c) of (20a)though, is preferred over the negated form.

(20)　　a.　Comme Marie est belle!
　　　　　　how　　　Mary　is　beautiful
　　　　　　'How very beautiful Mary is!'

　　　　b.　#Comme Marie n'est pas　　　belle
　　　　　　how　　　Mary　is.not beautiful
　　　　　　'How very beautiful Mary is not!'

　　　　c.　Comme Marie est laide!
　　　　　　how　　　Mary　is　ugly
　　　　　　'How very ugly Mary is!'

Beyssade (2009) though, points out that there are cases in which an exclamative contains a negation, as is observed in (21). Therefore she argues that, based on negation, exclamatives are not presuppositional.

(21)　C'est fou.　Regarde comme elle (ne) court pas　vite.
　　　　it.is　crazy look　　how　　she NEG runs　NEG quickly
　　　　'It's crazy. Look how slow she runs!'

Another property of presuppositions is that they cannot be questioned. With regard to questioning an exclamative content, there seem to be a restriction for exclamatives to be questioned, as becomes clear from Example (22).

(22)　　a.　*Est-ce que　　comme Marie est belle?
　　　　　　is-it　　COMP how　　Mary　is　beautiful

　　　　b.　Est-ce que　　Marie est si　belle?
　　　　　　is-it　　COMP Mary　is　so beautiful
　　　　　　'Is mary so beautiful?'

　　　　c.　Est-ce que　　Marie est si　belle　　qu'on　　le dit?
　　　　　　is-it　　COMP Mary　is　so beautiful as.people it　say
　　　　　　'Is mary as beautiful as they say?'

As expected, Example (22a) is ungrammatical, since presuppositional content cannot be questioned. The sentence in Example (22b) though seems to contradict this claim.

However in this case the adverb *si* functions as an anaphora rather than an exclamative adverb. As such, the degree of her beauty can be made specific in context, and a sentence like (22b) could be paraphrased as (22c). This example indicates that her beauty reaches certain degree which complies with what people tell it is. With regard to questioning the content, it seems that exclamatives react as presuppositions.

A last test within the family tests to determine presuppositionality is related to the type of verbs that can embed exclamatives. The argument that exclamatives only embed under factive predicates and therefore they are factive, is a rather tricky matter. As Beyssade (2009) points out (as well as Elliott (1974)), it is hard to determine whether these tests actually show that presuppositionality (i.e. factivity) is inherent to exclamatives themselves or whether the factive verb contributes to the presuppositional nature of the entire utterance. The problem basically boils down to the chicken or the egg dilemma. There is no way to determine whether the factive predicate is factive or whether the embedded exclamative is factive, or both? Therefore this test does not seem to be a legitimate test to identify presuppositionality according to Beyssade (2009).

Previously proposed tests for factivity have also been brought in doubt by other researchers. The argument, for instance, that exclamatives cannot function as an answer to question due to its presuppositional nature, has been strongly questioned by Rett (2011). Rett (2011) makes the claim that questions can only be answered by assertions. So the fact that exclamatives cannot function as an answer, has nothing to do with its presuppositional nature. A test like (15), repeated in (23) below, would in such case only provide evidence that exclamatives are not assertions.

(23) a. Question: How tall is John?
         #Response: How tall John is!

   b. Question: Did John buy a big car?
         #Response: What a big car John bought!

Sofar it seems that the previous tests for presuppositions do not always work. Since this is the case, Beyssade (2009) decided to come up with several of her own tests to identify presuppositionality. A first test provided by Beyssade (2009) is related to redundancy. Beyssade (2009) assumes that a presupposed proposition cannot be re-asserted in a dialogue sequence. This restraint explains why a dialogue sequence like the one shown in (24a) is odd, since it is redundant to repeat that *Mary has a son*. Yet the exclamative example in (24b), which would be expected to be infelicitous if it was analyzed as a presupposition, is perfectly fine.

(24) a. #Le fils de Marie est venu. Marie a   un   fils
         the son of Mary is come Mary has one son

         'Mary's son has come. Mary has a son'

   b. Comme Marie est belle?   Elle est vraiment belle.
         how   Mary is beautiful she is really   beautiful.

         'How very beautiful Mary is! She is really beautiful.

Another test put forward by Beyssade (2009) is based on the *wait a minute*-test as proposed by von Fintel (2004). Beyssade (2009) shows that the *wait a minute*-test can only be applied to presuppositions like an assertion in (25), but not to exclamatives (26) which would this go against the claim that exclamatives are presuppositional.

(25)   A: Le fils de Marie est malade
      'Mary's son is ill.'
      B:Parce que Marie a un fils!
      'Hey wait a minute. I had no idea that Mary has a son.'

(26)   A: Comme il est fort, ce type!
      'How strong he is, this guy!'
      B: #Parce qu'il est fort!
      'Hey wait a minute. I had no idea he was strong.'

A third test provided by Beyssade (2009) to identify presuppositionality, is based on the fact that a discourse connective cannot establish a link between presupposed content and a content-related subsequent sentence.

(27)   a. Marie est sortie avec ses enfants. # En effet, elle a toujours rêvé d'être mère.
          'Marie is out with her children. As a matter of fact, she always dreamt being a mother.'

    b. Marie a des enfants. En effet, elle a toujours rêvé d'être mère.
          'How Marie has children. As a matter of fact, she always dreamt being a mother.'

The assumption made here is that in (27a) the discourse connective *en effet* cannot link the two sentences because the linked content is presupposed in the initial sentence. Since (27b) does not contain a presupposition according to Beyssade (2009), the discourse connective is able to link the two sentences.

Examining Example (28) one would conclude that exclamatives react just like other presupposition triggers and therefore exclamatives are presuppositional as well. We see that a discourse connective *donc* can connect the two sentences in (28a) since there is no presupposition, but an exclamative in the same context is not acceptable. Without this connective however, it is perfectly fine (28c).

(28)   a. Pierre est (très) travailleur. Donc, il réussira.
          'Pierre is hard-working. Then he will succeed.'

    b. #Comme Pierre est travailleur! Donc il réussira.
          'How hard-working Pierre is. Then he will' succeed.

    c. Comme Pierre est travailleur! Il réussira.
          'How hard-working Pierre is. He will succeed.'

Although it might at first look, seem as if exclamatives behave similar to presuppositions, the data in (29) prove differently according to Beyssade (2009). When dealing with presupposed content it is neither acceptable to have a connective (29b) nor is it acceptable to lack one (29c). This contrasts with exclamatives which are felicitous without connectives.

(29)   a. Il a plu. Donc il ne sera pas nécessaire d'arroser.
          'It rained. Therefore it won't be necessary to water (the lawn).'

    b. Jean regrette qu'il ait plu. # Donc il ne sera pas nécessaire d'arroser.
          'Jean regrets that it rained. Therefore, it won't be necessary to water (the lawn).'

      c. Jean regrette qu'il ait plu. # Il ne sera pas nécessaire d'arroser.
         'John regrets that it rained. It won't be necessary to water (the lawn).'

A fourth argument against exclamatives as presuppositions, is based on the fact that exclamatives are not a shared belief. Because the proposition expressed by exclamatives is not a shared believe between the speaker and the listener, it is felicitous to ask the listener's opinion in case of an exclamative (30a). In case of presuppositions though, it is unfelicitous to ask the same (30b).

(30)   a. Comme Marie est belle! Tu ne la trouves pas belle, toi?
         How beautiful Mary is. Don't you find her beautiful¿'

      b. # Jean regrette qu'il pleuve. Tu ne (penses / trouves) pas qu'il pleut, toi?
         'Jean regrets that it's raining. Don't you thing it is raining.'

Finally, Beyssade (2009) discusses the inability of exclamatives to function as answers to questions, as discussed earlier in (15). In contrast to Grimshaw (1979) however, Beyssade (2009) argues that presuppositions are able to function as an answer to a question (2.1.5.1).

(31)   A: Est-ce que tu as déjà fumé?
       A: Have you ever smoked?
       B: J'ai arrêté à 20 ans.
       B: I quit when I was 20.

The tests provided by Beyssade (2009) argue against the claim that exclamatives are presuppositional. But if not presuppositional, then what is its nature?

According to Beyssade (2009), exclamatives convey an expressive content, associated with an implicature, rather than a presupposition. Whereas a presupposition represents a shared and uncontroversial content, conventional implicatures represent the belief of the speaker. She follows Potts (2007)'s definition of expressive content, according to which there is a list of properties associated with an expressive content. At least two of them also apply to exclamative sentences, these are repeatability and non-displaceability.

Repeating an exclamative enforces the emotive content, this is in contrast to presupposition since they result in a redundancy in information as argued earlier by Beyssade (2009). Another property of expressive content, namely non-displaceability, is also found in exclamatives and explains the infelicitous example in (32a). In case of exclamatives, the consciousness of the emotive content has to be actual or present in order to be felicitous. In contrast to exclamative sentences, declarative sentences are possible in such contexts without resulting in any contradictions (32b).

(32)   a. # Comme il faisait chaud! Je n'en ai pas le souvenir, mais c'est écrit dans mon journal.
         'How hot it was. I don't remember, but it is written in my diary.'

      b. Il faisait très chaud. Je n'en ai pas le souvenir, mais c'est écrit dans mon journal.
         'It was very hot. I don't remember, but it is written in my diary.'

I agree with Beyssade (2009) that the emotive content has to be actual or present, but I disagree on how to analyze Example (32a). According to Beyssade (2009), the property of nondisplaceablility is explained due to the past tense in the exclamative sentence. In my

opninion however, the contradiction arises due to the sentence following the exclamative. It is strange to utter an exclamative when one does no longer remember its attitude towards the proposition, e.g. *How hot it was! Although I do not remember how hot it was.* is odd because the exclamative is denied altogether. Note also that one could perfectly well say *How nice that guy was!*, illustrating that past tense is perfectly fine in combination with exclamatives. As we will see in Chapter 4 the emotive content is still actual and present, however the proposition itself does not necessarily has to be.

Besides repeatability and non-displaceability, Beyssade (2009) provides another argument in favor of analyzing exclamatives as an expressive content. Asking a question like *Tu trouves?* 'What do you think?', is an adequate test to identify emotive content which is not shared by the addressee. However, asking whether the listener *believes* a certain emotive content, is infelicitous. This is exactly what we observe for exclamatives in French (33a). Note also that the opposite pattern is found for assertions (33b). Therefore one could conclude, based on this and previous tests, that exclamatives are implicational of nature rather than presuppositional.

(33) a. A: Comme il fait froid !
          'How cold it is !'
          B: Tu trouves? # Tu crois?
          'Do you think it? Do you believe it?'

      b. A: La maison a deux étages.
          The house has three floors.
          B: # Tu trouves ? / Tu crois.
          Do you think it? / Do you believe it?

Based on the tests provided by Beyssade (2009) one would have to conclude that exclamatives are not presuppositional (i.e. factive). In the next section I will examine to what extent some of these tests provided by Beyssade (2009) are legitimate tests for presuppositionality.

2.1.5.2   Contra Beyssade (2009)

In this section I would like to discuss (Beyssade, 2009) in more detail. Based on her own tests, Beyssade (2009) concluded that exclamatives should not be analyzed as presuppositions but as conventional implicatures. Recall Beyssade's redundancy test, repeated below in (34), according to which presuppositions cannot be reasserted. Since assertions are presupposed, it is infelicitous to reassert the presupposed information, as is clear from (34b). For exclamatives however, this does not seem to be the case (see34a) and therefore Beyssade (2009) concludes that exclamatives are not presuppositional.

(34) a. Comme Marie est belle?   Elle est vraiment belle.
          how   Mary is beautiful she is   really   beautiful.
          'How very beautiful Mary is! She is really beautiful.

      b. #Le fils de Marie est venu. Marie a   un   fils
          the son of Mary is   come Mary has one son
          'Mary's son has come. Mary has a son'

In my view however, the subsequent sentence in (34b) is not odd due to the presuppositional nature of the preceeding sentence, rather it seems odd to express a proposition

completely unrelated to the previous sentence and therefore it flouts Grice's maxim of relevance (REF). If we were to apply the same information structure to the exclamative construction in (34a), one would end up with a similar odd subsequent sentence, as can be seen in (35).

(35) a. #Comme le fils de Marie est belle?   Marie a   un fils.
          how   the son of Mary is beautiful Mary has a   son.
          'How very beautiful Mary's son is! Mary has a son.

The same critical reasoning applies to the *wait a minute*-test, see (25) and (26). To me it seems that the *wait a minute*-sentence cannot contain the same main proposition as indicated by the previous sentence, it can however contain presupposed propositions if those presupposed propositions are not similar to the main proposition. I would therefore say that Example (26) is odd, not because the exclamatives lack presupposed propositions all together, but because the presupposed proposition is similar to the main proposition which would result in redundant information. If we would somehow incorporate presuppositions not containing the same content as the main proposition into the exclamative, it would no longer be infelicitous. This is exactly what I have done in Example (36) and (37) below:

(36) A: Comme il est fort, le fils de Marie!
      'How strong he is, Mary's son!'
      B: Parce que Marie a un fils!
      'Hey wait a minute. I had no idea Mary has a son.'

In (36) I have added the presupposition asserting that Mary has a son. By doing so, the *wait a minute*-test is completely fine. Reversely if one were to remove this very same presupposition from the declarative in (25), one ends up with an odd conversation (37).

(37) A: Il est malade
      'He is ill.'
      B:# Parce qu'il est malade!
      'Hey wait a minute. I had no idea that he is ill.'

The newly introduced tests, provided by Beyssade (2009), seem to be rather controversial and no conclusive evidence has yet been given to dismiss the idea that exclamatives are inherently factive. The issue of factivity is one that will not be resolved in this thesis and we will come back to this in the discussion at the end of the last chapter.

2.1.6 Scalarity

Zanuttini and Portner (2003) assume scalar implicature to be a crucial property of exclamatives. Formally it is represented by the semantic operation of *widening* and it conveys a certain proposition which is surprising or noteworthy in some way. Via a conventional scalar implicature, the exclamative proposition is placed on the extreme end of a contextually given scale. Zanuttini and Portner (2003) choose to call it a conventional implicature, because it goes beyond the sentence's truth-conditional meaning and it's content is non-defeasible (38a) and detachable (38b).

(38) a. ??How very cute he is! - Though he's not extremely cute.
      b. He's quite cute! - though not extremely cute.

Marandin et al. (2008) illustrated the fact that exclamative constructions need a scale to operate on. He shows that adjectives with an open scale yield felicitous exclamatives (39a), while adjectives with a closed scale do not (39b).

(39) a. Comme le livre de Marie est intéressant!
    'How interesting Mary's book is!'

   b. *Ce que le verre de Marie est plein!
    'How full Mary's glass is.'

(Marandin et al., 2008, p. 447)

That scalarity is an essential component for the semantics of exclamativity, is once more asserted by Lipták (2005). According to her "*exclamatives assert that a degree of a particular scalar property lies at the extreme end of a (contextually given) scale*" and that property is placed "*on a scale that contains alternative values corresponding to various degrees, ranging from small to high degrees. The exclamative singles out a high/extreme degree on this scale*" (Lipták, 2005, p. 20).

Recall that the set of alternatives on this contextually given scale emerges from the question semantics of the *wh*-word according to Zanuttini and Portner (2003). Badan and Cheng (2015) however, contra the idea that sets of alternatives come from interrogative operators, suggest that it is focus which is responsible for generating a set of alternatives in exclamative constructions.

Badan and Cheng (2015) suggest that Chinese exclamative constructions always contain a scalar focused part. They show that the degree adverbs *zhème* "this much", *nàme* "that much" and *duōme* "so much" receive prosodic focus. Typical focus constructions change the information structure by providing new information, this results in generating a set of alternatives. Scalar focus functions in a similar way, but places those alternatives on an ordered scale. The claim made is that adverbs function as scalar operators and since they are focused, they generate a set of alternatives on a certain scale.

2.1.7 Ego-evidentiality

Evidentiality is a grammatical mechanism to indicate the source of the content. There are several ways to obtain certain information and some languages in the world grammaticaly indicate whether the source is directly obtained, through perception, hearsay or inference (Aikhenvald, 2006). Garrett (2001) introduces a special kind of evidentiality, called *ego-evidentiality*, which indicates that the content comes from the speaker's immediate and direct knowledge.

Marandin et al. (2008) has incorporated the notion of ego-evidentiality in his analysis of French exclamative constructions. He observes that exclamatives are incompatible with perspective markers (40):

(40) #Selon Paul, les élèves ne sont pas bons. Selon Pierre, comme ils sont forts / ils sont tellement forts !
   'According to Paul, the students are not good. According to Pierre, how good they are.'

(Marandin et al., 2008, p. 443)

According to Marandin et al. (2008) this incompatibility results from a redundancy or conflict in the marking of the source of evidence. More evidence comes from the types of verbs, exclamatives can be embedded under. Only verbs of perception indicating the direct perception of a certain event, are felicitous in exclamative constructions (41a). Other verbs involving hearsay (41b), inference (41c), an interactive process (41d) or a mental posture towards the content other than intuition (41e) are infelicitous in combination with exclamatives (Marandin et al., 2008).

(41)   a. Il a entendu comme elle chantait bien.
             'He heard how well she sang'

        b. * Il a entendu dire comme elle chantait bien.
             'He heard it said how well she sang.'

        c. * Il en aconclu — déduit comme elle chantait bien
             'He concluded how well she sang.'

        d. * Il a convaincu Paul comme elle chantait bien.
             'He convinced Paul how well she sang'

        e. * Il croit comme elle chante bien.
             'He believes how well she sang.'

(Marandin et al., 2008, p. 444)

Ego-evidentiality plays a crucial part in exclamative constructions according to Marandin et al. (2008) and it is responsible for the veridicity of the proposition (i.e. the truth of the proposition). Veridicity is a consequence of ego-evidentiality, it explains why a sentence like *I don't know what a lot of children she has.* is ungrammatical, since the speaker cannot deny the truth of his/her own believes.

In line with Marandin et al. (2008), Badan and Cheng (2015) also assign a crucial role for ego-evidentiality in exclamatives. They argue that the sentence final particle *a* is the overt realization of ego-evidentiality. Similar to French exclamatives, perception verbs not making a direct link between the agent and the source, are infelicitous in Mandarin Chinese (42):

(42)   *Huaì xiaōxi, wǒ tīngshuō Lǐsì zhème/ duōme   fēngkuáng a!
       Bad   news   I   hear   Lisi this.ME much.ME crazy   SFP
       'Bad news, I heard how crazy Lisi is!'

(Badan and Cheng, 2015, p. 405)

The sentence final particle *a* expresses a speaker-oriented opinion of which its source is the speaker him/herself. More support for analyzing the SFP as an overt realization of ego-evidentiality, comes from its phonetic value. Chu (1998) and Li (2006) propose that there are two pitch variations of the SFP *a* which signal a difference in pragmatic function: a low pitched *a* signals "speaker orientation, while a high pitch *a* signals "addressee orientation". In case of exclamatives it is the low pitched *a* which goes along with it, thus indicating that the utterance is speaker-oriented.

In Chinese there are several different exclamative constructions, crucial to the discussion about ego-evidentiality is the division between exclamatives of Type I (*zhème/nàme*) and exclamatives of Type II (*duōme*). Only the exclamatives of type II need to have this SFP(43a), without it, it is ungrammatical (43b).

(43) a. Lǐsi duōme   gaō a!
          Lisi much.ME tall SFP

          'How tall Lisi is!'

      b. *Lǐsi duōme   gaō!
          Lisi   much.ME tall

          'How tall Lisi is!'

(Badan and Cheng, 2015, p. 388)

Although a Type I exclamative can both occur with or without the SFP *a*, it is only with the SFP that it functions as an exclamative (44a). Without the SFP, the speaker indicates the actual height with gestures or the context has already provided the exact height. Note also that without the final particle, the sentence seems incomplete and requires some kind of continuation to indicate to what extent the person is tall (44b).

Besides the SFP *a*, Badan and Cheng (2015) suggest that the deictic elements *zhè* 'this' and *nà* 'that' have a similar function to *a*: both express the immediate and direct knowledge of the speaker.

(44) a. Tā   zhème gaō a!
          3.SG this.ME tall SFP

          'How very tall he/she is!'

      b. Tā   zhème gaō, wǒ kàn bú dào tā-de yǎnjīng
          3.SG this.ME tall SFP I   see not arrive 3.SG-SUB eye

          'S/he is so tall, that I cannot see her/his eyes.'

(Badan and Cheng, 2015, p. 387)

Based on the fact that the sentence final particle is obligatory, Badan and Cheng (2015) conclude that ego-evidentiality is a necessary component of exclamatives.

2.1.8 Mirativity

As discussed before Zanuttini and Portner (2003) hold the semantic operation of *widening* responsible for the force of exclamatives. *Widening* assigns the notion of unexpectedness within the context of a certain scale to the proposition of the exclamative. The constrast between what the speaker expects, i.e. the speaker assumes that the likelihood of the proposition is low, and what the clause actually asserts, i.e. the clause asserts that the proposition is in fact true, gives rise to a surprise effect (Badan and Cheng, 2015). This surprise effect is also known as 'mirativity' (DeLancey, 2001) which is strongly related to the expression of unexpectedness. Although Zanuttini and Portner (2003) do not regard this surprise effect to be obligatory for exclamatives, they do claim that it is an essential component for exclamativity.

Badan and Cheng (2015) on the other hand, give a more prominent role to mirativity and discuss both surprise and non-surprise exclamatives. They provide contexts in which only surprise exclamatives are grammatical and contexts in which only non-surprise exclamatives are allowed showing that there is a crucial difference between them. In Mandarin Chinese there are two kinds of exclamatives: the Type I exclamatives (*zhème/nàme*) which have a surprise reading and the Type II exclamatives (*duōme*) which lack the surprise reading. I have taken their examples to clarify this.

Surprise Context

A girl (whom the speaker does not know) who is 2m10 comes into the office. She is so tall that she has to bend to enter the room. In this context, a Mandarin speaker can express surprise by using a Type I exclamative (45a). In contrast, a Type II duōme-exclamative is excluded (45b).

(45) a. Tā zhème gaō a!
          3.SG this.ME tall SFP
          'How very tall he/she is!'

      b. *Tā duōme   gaō a!
          3.SG much.ME tall SFP
          'How very tall he/she is!'

<div align="right">(Badan and Cheng, 2015, p. 401)</div>

Non-surprise Context

Lisi goes to his friend's place for dinner. His friend prepared excellent food. Under this context, Type II duōme exclamatives (46a) can be used by Lisi as an exclamation that the dinner was very good. In contrast, Type I zhème/nàme-exclamative (46b) is not appropriate in this context; in fact, since it expresses surprise, it is quite offensive in this context.

(46) a. Nǐ-de   wǎncān duōme   haǒ a!
          2.SG-SUB dinner   much.ME good SFP
          'How delicious your dinner is!'

      b. #Nǐ-de   wǎncān zhème haǒ a!
          2.SG-SUB dinner   this.ME good SFP
          'How delicious your dinner is!'

<div align="right">(Badan and Cheng, 2015, p. 402)</div>

More evidence that a clearcut distinction should be made between surprised exclamatives and non-surprised exclamatives, comes from the following observation made in (47) by Badan and Cheng (2015):

(47) a. Kàn yi kàn/ kàn nàlǐ! Nà-ge rén duōme   gaō a!
          Look one look look there that-CL man much.ME tall SFP
          'Look! How tall that man is!'

      b. Kàn yi kàn/ kàn nàlǐ! #Nà-ge rén zhème/ nàme   gaō a!
          Look one look look there that-CL man this.ME that.ME tall SFP
          'Look! How tall that man is!'

<div align="right">(Badan and Cheng, 2015, p. 403)</div>

By exclaiming a verb of perception like *look* the speaker attracts the attention of the listener. The speaker wants to attract the listener's attention to a fact that the speaker is already aware of and no longer surprised about. Using the non-surprised exclamative is therefore prefered (47a) over the surprised exclamative (47b). It can thus be concluded that mirativity plays a role in some exclamatives but not all.

Having looked at the previous literature on exclamatives in general, I will now turn to the Dutch exclamatives.

2.2   Dutch exclamatives

Corver (1990) is among the first to give a theoretical account of Dutch *wh*-exclamatives, these *wh*-exclamatives are characterized by a *wh*-word *wat* and an exclamative DP over which it has scope.

(48) a. Wat   heeft   Jan   een auto-'s gekocht!
          What have.3SG John a   car-PL bought

          'What a lot of cars he has!'

      b. Wat   een auto-'s heeft   Jan   gekocht!
          What a   car-PL have.3SG John bought

          'What a lot of cars he hasn't!'

The *wh*-exclamative in (48a) has been called split *wat*-exclamative by Corver, as the auxiliary *heeft* 'has' is intervening between the *wh*-word *wat* and the DP *een auto's* 'a cars'. Not surprisingly, the *wh*-exclamative illustrated in (48b) has been called non-split *wh*-exclamative because the *wh*-word and the exclamated DP form one constituent. Intuitively, one is inclined to analyze the two constructions as being derived from one another. That is to say that in (48a) the *wh*-word has moved while the DP has stayed in-situ and in (48b) one could consider the whole *wh*-word plus the DP to have been pied-piped to the front of the sentence. Corver (1990) however, convincingly proves that such an analysis would be wrong. The two constructions should rather be regarded as separate constructions, not derived from each another. He proposes that in 48b the *wh*-word is incorporated in the DP and the whole DP is indeed moved to the front. In the split-exclamative though, the *wh*-word does not endsup in its position through movement, but has been base-generated high in the tree, while the exclamated DP is indeed in-situ.

Bennis (1998) is the first to ever mention Dutch exclamative constructions consisting of a first person pronoun *me* and a modal particle *toch*. According to Bennis (1998) the exclamative particles function in a similar way as *wh*-words in *wh*-exclamatives function, namely as exclamative operators. He supports his analysis based on two observations : first of all, like *wh*-words, these particles have to precede the exclamated DP, which is indicated by a spurious *een* (Bennis et al., 1997), and second of all these particles are subject to locality constraints (49) just like the exclamative operator *wat* is subject to locality constraints (50).

(49) a. Het is me opgevallen dat   Jan me   toch een mooie   boek-en heeft!
          it is me remarked COMP Jan PRTL PRTL a   beautiful books   has

          'It struck me that John had such a lot of beautiful books.'

      b. *Het is me   toch opgevallen dat   Jan een mooie   boeken heeft!
          it   is PRTL PRTL remarked COMP Jan a   beautiful books has

(50) a. Het is me opgevallen wat   Jan een mooie   boeken heeft!
          it is me remarked what Jan a   beautiful books has

          'It struck me that John had such a lot of beautiful books.'

      b. *Wat is jou opgevallen dat   Jan een mooie   boeken heeft!
          what is you remarked   COMP Jan a   beautiful books has

<div align="right">(Bennis, 1998, p. 35)</div>

As shown in (49), whenever the exclamative particles are positioned within the embedded clause, where the exclamative DP is situated, the sentence is grammatically acceptable (49a). Whenever the exclamative particles are positioned in the matrix clause while the exclamative DP is still in the embedded though, the sentence is no longer grammatical (49b). The exact same observation is made for *wh*-exclamatives like the ones in (50); once again the sentence is grammatical whenever the *wh*-exclamative *wat* occurs in the local domain of the exclamative DP (50a), but as soon as the *wh*-word is not in the same clause as the exclamative DP. This results in an infelicitous sentence (50b). Based on these observations Bennis (1998) concludes that just like the *wh*-word in *wh*-exclamatives, the exclamative particles also function as an exclamative operator.

2.2.1 Critique Bennis (1998)

Having discussed the previous literature on Dutch particle exclamatives, I will now critically assess the assumptions made and arguments given before adopting Bennis' (1998) analysis into my own analysis of particle exclamatives.

My first point of critique is related to Example (50) and the distinction between split-exclamatives and non-split exclamatives. As you might recall from the previous chapter, according to Corver (1990) and Krijgsman (1982), the main syntactic feature that sets non-split exclamatives apart from split-exclamatives, is their ability to be embedded. In other words, non-split exclamatives are able to be embedded while split exclamatives are not. Despite these earlier claims and my own native intuitions, Bennis (1998) still supports his analysis with an example containing split-exclamatives in an embedded structure, see (50). Of course, it could very well be the case that different speakers have different intuitions and there might be a divide within the Dutch language community with regard to these constructions. I however regard it very unlikely that this is the case and I assume that it is simply a matter of an erroneous example. According to previous literature, split-exclamatives cannot be embedded, therefore it would be preferable to alter Example (50) into something like (51):

(51) a. Het is me opgevallen wat een mooie   boeken Jan heeft!
         it is me remarked   what a   beautiful books Jan has
         'It struck me that John had such a lot of beautiful books.'

      b. *Wat is jou opgevallen dat   Jan een mooie   boeken heeft!
         what is you remarked   COMP Jan a   beautiful books has

      c. *Wat een mooie   boeken waren jou opgevallen dat   Jan heeft!
         what a   beautiful books were you remarked   COMP Jan has

      d. Wat voor een boeken waren je   opgevallen dat   Jan heeft!
         what for   a   books were you remarked   COMP Jan has
         'What kind of books did you notice Jan has?'

Although, Example (50) might not be completely felicitous, their argument claiming that *wat* is constraint by locality effects could still be valid in case of non-split exclamatives shown in Example (51b). One possible analysis for (51b) would be to argue that the *wh*-word can indeed not move out of its local domain (i.e. the clause in which the exclamative DP is located) without resulting in an infelicitous sentence. Another possibility could be that since in case of non-split exclamatives the *wh*-word is internal to the DP construction (Corver, 1990), the whole DP has to move as one constituent and the *wh*-word plus NP should be pipe-pied to the initial position. But as one can see from (51c)

even if the whole DP is moved to the front, the sentence is still infelicitous. Notice that if locality would be the only constraint on exclamative constructions, then (51c) should be grammatical as the *wh*-word is located within the local domain of the exclamative noun, which is in the DP itself. In case of *wh*-questions though, it is grammatical to move the whole DP to the front, as can be observed in (51d). I do not yet have a clear explanation for this.

As discussed earlier, locality constraints between the exclamative DP and the *wh*-word cannot account for the ungrammaticality found in (50) and (51), but how about particle exclamatives? When examining Example (49), the exclamative particles do seem to be subjected to locality constraints.

Looking back at (49), I must first of all note that in (49b) the *me* and *toch* in the matrix clause have been erroneously analyzed as exclamative particles by Bennis (1998). Rather than being an exclamative particle, the *me* particle is part of the verb *opvallen* 'to remark' and indicates the subject of the clause in a similar fashion to *me* in the English construction *it struck me*. Thus, we must exclude *me* in (49b) as an exclamative particle and only consider *toch* for that specific example.

Bennis (1998) has analyzed these exclamative particles as the lexicalized representations of the exclamative operator. He based this claim on two observations: first of all, the particles have to precede the exclamative DP, just like *wh*-words have to precede the DP, and second of all they are subject to locality constraints. Both properties are related to the scope of the exclamative particles over the exclamative DP. Examining Example (52), it becomes clear that their first claim (i.e. exclamative particles have to precede the exclamative DP) seems to be incorrect.

(52) een boeken dat   Jan me toch   heeft!
      a   books COMP Jan ME TOCH has
      'The books John has!'

In (52) the exclamative DP precedes the exclamative particles which are embedded within another clause. However, assuming that the exclamative originated from within the exclamative DP, it is still the case that the particles precede the DP. Therefore they still have scope over it and are local to the DP. Either there is a trace in the embedded clause or a copy of the exclamative DP shipped off to LF for interpretative reasons. In both cases the exclamative particles have scope over the DP (53).

(53) een boeken$_i$ dat   Jan me toch t_i heeft!
      a   books   COMP Jan ME TOCH TRACE has
      'The books John has!'

With regard to locality constraints, the matters are somewhat more controversial. According to the analysis in (53) both the particles and the trace/copy of the DP are local to each other. In my view however, the ungrammmaticality of Example (49b) is not because the exclamative particles are not local to the DP, but because the exclamative DP is lacking a particle exclamative altogether. Example (54) shows that the particles in the main clause are not related to the embedded clause. The modal particle *toch* in the matrix clause has no connection with the exclamative DP in the embedded clause since the embedded DP is already within the scope of the embedded exclamative particles.

(54) a. Het is me toch   opgevallen wat   een mooie   boeken Jan heeft!
         it   is me TOCH remarked   what a   beautiful books Jan has
         'It struck me that John had such a lot of beautiful books.'

b. Het is me toch   opgevallen dat   Jan me toch   een mooie   boeken heeft!
   it   is me TOCH remarked   COMP Jan ME TOCH a   beautiful books   has

'It struck me that John had such a lot of beautiful books.'

To conclude this section, particle exclamatives do not seem to be subjected to locality constraints. The fact that the lack of these particles in an embedded particle exclamative results in infelicitous sentences, rather indicates that such particles are essential to the construction and cannot be left out.

Unfortunately, Bennis (1998) does not go into much detail about what the separate contributions of the different particles *me* and *toch* are within the particle exclamative constructions. He simply regards them as exclamative operators. It still remains unclear though, why it would be necessary to have two lexical items serving a similar function and how this exclamative operator essentially works. In the next chapter I will decompose the particle exclamatives and argue that each particle should be assigned with a separate function which, when combined, gives rise to exclamativity.

2.3   Summary

In this chapter I have reviewed some previous literature on exclamative constructions. There is a major division between accounts that approach the data from an interrogative point of view and accounts that derive the exclamatives from degree constructions. Some accounts even disregard both approaches, like the one by Chernilovskaya and Nouwen (2012) who regard noteworthiness as most defining for exclamatives. Each component that has been proposed in the beginning of Section 2.1 has been discussed in more detail in the subsections, these properties are: factivity, scalarity, ego-evidentiality and mirativity. In the next chapter, I decompose the particle exclamatives and explore the different components and its functions.

Chapter 3

Dutch Particle Exclamatives

In the previous chapter I have discussed several views on the components that are crucial to exclamative constructions. We have seen that factivity, scalarity, gradability, mirativity and ego-evidentiality are some of the properties that have been ascribed to exclamative constructions according to different accounts.[1] At the end of the previous chapter, I quickly touched upon Dutch exclamative constructions and more specifically constructions that I have called *Particle Exclamatives*. I have shown that these particle exclamatives are not subject to locality constraints, and I questioned Bennis's (1998) claim that these particles merely function as an exclamative operator. Such an approach would not explain anything about the exact properties of particle exclamatives: why there are two particles and only one exclamative operator, what an exclamative operator exactly does and which properties can be ascribed to particle exclamatives. As should have become clear at the end of the previous chapter, Bennis's account of particle exclamatives is insufficient to account for all the intricacies of the particle construction.

The current chapter specifically deals with *Particle Exclamatives* in Dutch and discusses which elements form a crucial part of the exclamative force of particle exclamatives. Using the particle exclamatives, I redefine some properties proposed in the previous literature and incorporate other properties that can be directly applied to particle exclamatives. Some properties like scalarity and mirativity are less prominent in this account and other properties like gradability and widening will be redefined in order to account for all data. I argue that both ego-evidentiality and widening play a crucial role in particle exclamatives and through the concept of these properties, all data (i.e. that of particle exclamatives) can be explained.

This chapter starts out with identifying the items that are essential to the particle exclamative construction (Section 3.1). The subsections of the first section elaborate on the exact functions of each particle in more detail. The last section (section 3.2), brings the two particles together and discusses how the different elements interact with each other and give rise to exclamativity.

3.1 Components

As discussed earlier, the Dutch particle exclamatives consist of two main elements: a first person pronoun *me* and a modal particle *toch*. In this section I argue that each has their

---

[1]Note that these are just some properties ascribed to exclamativity and not all properties occur in all exclamative constructions or are even argued for within one and same account.

own semantics which when used in combination gives rise to exclamativity. I propose that the *me* pronoun is an evidentiality marker, and more specifically an ego-evidentiality marker (Section 3.2.1). As an ego-evidentiality marker *me* indicates a link between the actual speaker of the utterance and the linguistic content. The *toch* particle is the overt realization of widening (Section 3.2.2), a concept proposed by Zanuttini and Portner (2003) which widens a certain domain to another domain that exceeds the expectations of the speaker. In order to be able to account for all Dutch particle exclamatives, I will slightly alter this concept of widening. Rather than simply widening a certain domain, I argue that a widening takes place between two domains along a set of alternative propositions that are noteworthy.

3.1.1 Exclamative *me* particle

Before discussing the exclamative *me* particle and its functions, I first discuss the origins of this particle and justify its status as an independent exclamative particle. In other words, I have to show that the *me* pronoun found in exclamative constructions constitutes a separate morpheme specifically dedicated to express exclamativity and is not simply derived from other related homophonous morphemes.

Originally, the *me* particle is a pronoun derived from the so-called strong object pronouns and can be regarded to be its weak counterpart. Tables 3.1 and 3.2 below, provide the weak and strong pronouns in Dutch.

Strong Object Pronouns			
1SG	mij	1PL	ons
2SG	jou	2PL	jullie
3SG	hem/haar/het	3PL	hen/hun

Table 3.1: *Strong Object Pronouns*

Weak Object Pronouns			
1SG	me	1PL	-
2SG	je	2PL	-
3SG	'm/'r/'t	3PL	ze

Table 3.2: *Weak Object Pronouns*

Although one could argue that the weak pronouns are simply phonologically reduced forms of the strong forms, Berendsen (1986) shows that this is not the case. In fact, he clearly shows that weak pronouns have their own syntactic distribution distinct from strong pronouns, see (55).

(55)   a.   Hij   kus-te   me/mij.
            3SG.M kiss-3SG.PST 1SG.OBJ

            'He kissed me.'

      b.   Jij   schaam-t   je/*jou.
            2SG to.be.ashamed-2SG 2SG.REFL

            'You are ashamed.'

      c.   Ik   heb   ze/*hen ge-repareer-d
            1SG have.1SG 3PL.OBJ PTC-repair-PTC

            'I repaired them.'

There are cases in which both weak and strong pronouns can be used interchangeably (55a). However, other distributions are only felicitous for weak pronouns, as shown in (55b) and (55c). As becomes clear from (55), the weak pronoun has several functions: it can function as a reflexive (55b) or as the object argument of a transitive verb (55c). How can we be sure that the *me* in exclamative clauses is not simply derived from one of the

other functions of weak pronouns? In other words, are there reasons to assume that the *me* pronoun in exclamatives is specifically dedicated to exclamativity?

As already mentioned earlier, the *me* particle is invariable and unlike reflexives it does not have different paradigmatic forms differing in person and number, nor does it have to agree with the subject of the sentence (4d). Moreover, the reflexive and exclamative ME particle can even occur simultaneously in the same sentence, see(56a) and (56b), thus providing evidence that the two are not one and the same morpheme.

(56) a. Die heeft   me zich toch vol staan   te vreten!
          that have.3SG ME REFL TOCH full stand.INF to eat.INF

          'Boy, did that one eat a lot!'

      b. Ik zit me me   toch een potje   zorg-en te maken!
          1SG sit ME REFL.1SG TOCH a   short.time worry-PL to make.INF

          'I was so worried!'

The same goes for object pronouns, both the ME particle and object pronoun can occur at the same time (57a). What is more, Example (57b) shows that the three different weak pronouns can even occur simultaneously in the same sentence. The observations made in these examples provide strong evidence that *me* in exclamative constructions constitutes an independent morpheme, distinct from other weak pronouns.

(57) a. Ik sloeg   me hem   toch hard!
          1SG beat.PST ME 3SG.OBJ TOCH hard

          'I beat him so hard!'

      b. Hij herinner-de   me zich hem   toch nog goed!
          3SG remember-PST ME REFL 3SG.OBJ TOCH still good

          'He remembered him so well!'

To conclude, Example (57) clearly shows that, although all weak first person pronouns are homophonous, their distinct functions separate them as independent morphemes. Therefore there is a legitimate reason to claim that the *me* in exclamatives specifically functions as an element contributing to the exclamative meaning. Claiming that the exclamative *me* particle has a specific function distinct from other pronouns, does not directly imply that it marks ego-evidentiality. Having proved the independent status of *me* in exclamative constructions, I will in the next subsection provide solid arguments for why the exclamative *me* should be analyzed as the overt realization of ego-evidentiality.

3.1.1.1 Ego-evidentiality

This section argues that *me* in exclamative constructions is the overt realization of ego-evidentiality. Ego-evidentiality indicates that the source of a certain proposition is the speaker itself, or the EGO in other words.

What is shared among all homophonous *me* pronouns, is the fact that all of them refer to a first person singular (i.e. the speaker). However, though this is the case, it does not automatically mean that the core meaning of the exclamative particle *me* expresses ego-evidentiality. The main difference that sets exclamative *me* apart from both object pronouns and reflexive pronouns has to do with the level at which the different pronouns operate. While reflexive and object pronouns operate at the linguistic level, the exclamative pronoun operates both at the linguistic as well as the extra-linguistic level. As

an evidential marker, the exclamative *me* functions at the pragmatic level and forms a bridge between the linguistic and the extra-linguistic world. More specifically, it relates the linguistic content to the speaker in the actual world, or the EGO.

Evidence for this claim comes from grammaticality judgements of what person can serve as the subject of the sentence. Whenever the subject of a sentence is a first person singular, a direct link can be made between the linguistic subject and the actual speaker of the sentence. Due to this inherent feature, particle exclamatives in an embedded clause are compatible with first person singular subjects and can be embedded by them, as can be induced from Example (58).

(58) Ik realiseer-de me   dat hij   me toch   een hoop kinderen
     1SG realize-PST 1SG.REFL COMP 3SG.M ME TOCH a   lot   children
     had!
     have.SG.PST
     'I realized what a lot of children he has!'

On the other hand, whenever there is no first person singular acting as the subject of the matrix sentence, no direct link can be made between the linguistic subject and the actual speaker (see 59). The fact that there is an expletive in (59a) indicates that the content is more or less a general belief which would contradict the ego-evidentiality marker that commits a specific speaker to the utterance. By adding a dative first person pronoun, the subject of the main clause is once again the speaker him/herself and the sentence becomes grammatical (59b).

(59)   a.   *Het is opvallend dat   hij   me toch   een hoop kinderen heeft!
          it   is striking   COMP 3SG.M ME TOCH a   lot   children have.3SG
          'It's striking how many children he has!'
     b.   Het is me   opgevallen dat   hij   me toch   een hoop kinderen
          it   is ME.DAT striking   COMP 3SG.M ME TOCH a   lot   children
          heeft!
          have.3SG
          'It's striking to me how many children he has!'

Due to similar reasons, Example (60) sounds somewhat odd (at least for some people). The reason can be traced back to the fact that the subject of the main clause is not a first person singular and, just like (59), no direct connection can be made between the linguistic content and the actual speaker. For other people, however, the third person singular subject does not pose any problems for the interpretation of the sentence. I have provided an explanation for the group of people who judge Example (60) as odd, but what would make this sentence felicitous for other people?

(60)   ?Jan weet   dat   hij   me toch   een hoop kinderen heeft!
     Jan   know.SG COMP 3SG.M ME TOCH a   lot   children have.3SG
     'John knows how many children he has!'

One possible explanation for people accepting sentence (60), could be that the exclamative clause operates in a similar way as so-called expressive contents (Potts, 2007). According to Potts (2007) an expressive content should be analyzed as an conventional implicature. In a sentence like *This foolish John passed the test*, the proposition that *John is foolish* is not presupposed because it only commits the speaker but not the addressee to

the fact that John is foolish (Beyssade, 2009). Such expressive content is not limited to the matrix clause as exemplified in (61) below.

(61)   He said that **this foolish John** had won the race.

The boldfaced expressive content in (61) can be either ascribed to the subject of the main clause or to the opinion of the actual speaker. In case of the former, the content remains within the linguistic domain. In the latter however, the expressive content bypasses the linguistic content and makes a direct connection to the speaker of the utterance. Speakers that approve of Example (60) would analyze the ego-evidentiality marker as a conventional implicature. As a result of this, the subject of the main clause does not cause a clash with the ego-evidential content of the exclamative clause.[2] Although analyzing the particle exclamative as an expressive content would seem quite fitting, they do not completely behave the same. Unlike particle exclamatives, an expressive content like *this foolish John* is perfectly fine when embedded under an expletive subject (see (62)).

(62)   It is surprising that **this foolish John** had won the race.

Section (3.1.2) goes into more detail about the exact nature of exclamatives and discusses whether an exclamative content should be regarded factive, veridical or expressive as discussed here.

So far, I have brought forth convincing evidence that the exclamative *me* indicates ego-evidentiality. This analysis allows us to provide a proper explanation for some of the examples associated with factivity. Recall from the previous chapter that it is infelicitous to negate a main clause embedding an exclamative (see 63b).

(63)   a. Ik   weet   dat   hij me toch   een hoop kinderen heeft!
            1SG know.SG COMP 3SG ME TOCH a   lot   children have.3SG

            'I know what a lot of children he has'

       b. *Ik weet   niet dat   hij   me toch   een hoop kinderen heeft!
            1SG know.SG NEG COMP 3SG.M ME TOCH a   lot   children have.3SG

            'I did not know what a lot of children he has'

Example (63) clearly illustrates that denying the knowledge of a first person singular subject (i.e. the speaker) creates a conflict between the negated content of the matrix clause and the ego-evidential nature of the embedded exclamative clause. In other words the matrix clause directly denies the authority of the speaker. The ungrammaticality in (63b) tells us more about the nature of the ego-evidential content and its connection to truth values: apparently the exclamated content cannot be denied, but has to be true (i.e. veridical). Zanuttini and Portner (2003) argued that an example like (63) supports the claim that exclamatives are factive, I however argue that the ungrammaticality in (63b) arises due to a clash with the veridical nature of ego-evidentiality and the denial of this. The next section elaborates in more detail on the very nature of ego-evidentiality and its relation to veridicality.

---

[2]Interestingly, the expletive seems to create a stronger violation than a third person singular. Unfortunately, I do not have an explanation for that.

3.1.2 Veridicality

Marandin et al. (2008) links ego-evidentiality directly to veridicality. According to her, veridicality is a feature that assumes the truth of what is stated. Which makes sense since it is undeniable that, whatever subjective opinion the speaker has, should be assumed to be true according to his perceptive world. Therefore it cannot be denied by others since they do not have the authority over his/her opinions.

One such test to see whether something is veridical, assumes that a clash or redundancy should arise whenever there is more than one indicator of the source of the content (Marandin et al., 2008). Marandin et al. (2008) assumes a restriction on evidential sources which implies that there can only be one source of content. In case of Dutch though, this test does not completely work. As can be observed in (64), it is indeed the case that a clash arises whenever there is another source in the sentence besides the ego-evidentiality marker. Notice that a first person singular as source is better (64b) than having a third person singular as source (64a). The reasons are similar to what we have seen in Example (60): the ego-evidentiality marker *me* prefers first person singulars since it can make the bridge between the linguistic and extra-linguistic world. Since first person singulars do not block the connection between the ego-evidentiality marker and the actual speaker, a redundancy in source indicators arises, rather than a clash: it only violates the restriction of having more than one source indicator. A third person perspective marker however, clashes with the ego-evidentiality marker and causes two violations: first of all it blocks the link between an ego-evidential *me* and the actual speaker and second of all, it violates the restriction that there can only be one source of content. Since first person singular source indicators only violate one restriction while other persons violate two restrictions, first person singulars are considered more grammatical than any other grammatical person and number.

(64) a. *Volgens   haar, heeft   hij me toch   een hoop kinderen!
          According.to her   have.3SG 3SG ME TOCH a   lot   children!

          'According to her, boy does he have a lot of children!

      b. ??In mijn   og-en, heeft   hij   me toch   een hoop kinderen!
          in   1SG.GEN eye-PL have.3SG 3SG.M ME TOCH a   lot   children!

          'Boy, does he have a lot of children in my eyes.'

There are however exceptions to this. Although the sentences in (65) both contain an ego-evidentiality marker and another source indicator, they are still grammatical. One could wonder what makes these sentences more grammatical than the ones in (64). The solution lies in the position of the source markers. Whenever these markers are positioned in sentence initial position, ungrammaticality arises due to this clash. On the other hand, whenever the source markers are positioned lower in the sentence, they are more integrated into the linguistic content and can be incorporated within the veridical content of the *me* particle. To put it simply, in (64) the veridical content does not include the source marker, therefore both the source marker and the ego-evidentiality marker assert that *he has a lot of children*. Since it is not possible to have the same veridical content asserted by two different sources simultaneously, as is illustrated in Example (64), a clash emerges between the two source indicators. In cases in which the source marker is located lower in the sentence, no such clash arises since one source marker is incorporated within the veridical content of the ego-evidentiality marker (i.e. the other source marker). So in (65),

33

the veridical content of *me* consists of *according to her/me, he has a lot of children*, while in (64) the veridical content consists solely of *he has a lot of children*.

(65)   a. Hij   heeft   me, volgens haar, toch een hoop kinderen!
            3SG.M have.3SG ME according her   TOCH a   lot   children!
            'Boy, does he have a lot of children in my eyes.'
            ex
            Hij   heeft   me, volgens   mij, toch een hoop kinderen!
            3SG.M have.3SG ME according.to me TOCH a   lot   children!
            'Boy, does he have a lot of children in my eyes.'

Another issue not tackled yet, has to do with the definition of veridicality. What does it mean for a certain proposition to be true, or more specifically to be veridical? I take veridicality to refer to truth values, rather than the truth of the content itself. That is to say that veridicality indicates that the content is true along the lines of a parameter that can be either true or false. To clarify this claim, I would like to look back at question-answering pairs. Remember that it is claimed that exclamatives cannot function as proper answers to questions (Grimshaw, 1979; Zanuttini and Portner, 2003). An interesting fact to keep in mind is that although assertions are prototypically used as answers to questions, pragmatically any sentence type can be used as a reply to a question. There is however a difference between answers and replies: whereas the former provides the right and direct information to the question, the latter does not directly provide an answer and the answer might be pragmatically deduced from the reply, see Example (66) below.

(66)   a. Heeft   hij   een hoop kinderen? - Waarom vraag   je   dat?
            have.3SG 3.SG.M a   lot   children - why   ask.2SG 2SG that
            'Does she have a lot of children? - Why are you asking?'
      b. Heeft   hij een hoop kinderen? - Stel niet zulke stomme vrag-en
            have.3SG 3.SG a   lot   children - posit NEG such stupid   question-PL
            'Does she have a lot of children? - Don't ask such silly questions.'
      c. Heeft   hij   een hoop kinderen? - Nou, hij   heeft   me toch   een
            have.3SG 3.SG.M a   lot   children - well 3.SG have.3SG ME TOCH a
            hoop kinderen!
            lot   children
            'Does she have a lot of children? - Boy, does she have a lot of children!'

Although all sentence types in (66) are adequate replies, none of them are adequate answers. By replying with a question, the speaker is deflecting the previous question (66a) and no proper answer is given. Using an imperative, as in (66b), also deflects the question in a similar way the previous sentence does. The exclamative response, however, is interesting as it shows the veridical nature of exclamatives. Due to veridicality, the content of its proposition is assumed to be true and the exclamative in (66c) can only imply an affirmative answer.

The question-answer pairs we have dealt with so far, have all been polar questions which basically means that there are only two possible answers, namely yes or no (i.e. affirmative or negative). Examining question-answer pairs containing *wh*-question, one observes completely different grammaticality judgements. As becomes clear from (67), while the asserted sentence (67a) is felicitous as a reply, the particle exclamative is not (67b).

(67) a. Hoeveel   kinderen heeft   hij?   - Nou, hij   heeft   een hoop
          how.many children have.3SG 3SG.M - well 3SG.M have.3SG a   lot
          kinderen.
          children

          'How many children does he have? - Well, he has a lot of children.'

      b. #Hoeveel kinderen heeft hij? - Nou, hij   heeft   me toch een hoop
          how.many children has   3SG - well 3SG.M have.3SG ME TOCH a   lot
          kinderen!
          children

          'How many children does he have? - Boy, does he have a lot of children!'

The reason for the different grammaticality judgements between polar questions and
wh-questions is that polar questions simply require a positive or negative answer while
wh-questions like the one in (67) require an answer containing the content of what is
questioned by the *wh*-word. This distinction is crucial to my definition of veridicality. I
make an essential distinction between utterances presupposing the propositional truth of a
certain content, and utterances presupposing truth values of a certain content. According
to my view, veridicality refers only to truth values, rather than the truth of the content
itself. Whereas truth values are bipolar (i.e. either true or false), the propositional truth
refers both to this bipolar nature of truth values as well as to the exact content that is
indicated.[3]

With this knowledge it becomes clear from Examples (66) and (67) that the ego-
evidential marker in particle exclamatives indicates a true truth value rather than a com-
plete true content. This also explains why particle exclamatives are not felicitous as a
reply to *wh*-questions. *Wh*-questions not only require an answer to be true with regard to
truth values, but they also require them to provide the right true content. Based on the
examples and explanation provided in this section, it can be concluded that veridicality
only refers to truth values rather than presupposing the truth of the whole content.

The veridical nature of particle exclamatives also explains why these exclamatives
cannot be questioned (68). Whenever a proposition is questioned it no longer assumes
the truth value of the proposition, this is in contradiction to the veridicality of the ego-
evidentiality marker.

(68) *Heeft   hij   me toch   een hoop kinderen?
       have.3SG 3SG.M ME TOCH a   lot   children

In summary, the *me* particle indicates ego-evidentiality which means that the excla-
mative proposition is strongly related to the speaker itself. As a consequence of ego-
evidentiality the exclamative content is veridical which means that the truth value of the
exclamated proposition is assumed to be true, rather than the content itself.

---

[3]To clarify this, I will use an metaphor based on two different machines which represent the two different
representations of truth. Think of the next fictitous situation, imagine there are two machines that are able
to determine who is guilty of a crime. Machine A exactly tells you who the guilty one is, by showing a
picture of that person. Machine B however, only tells you whether a certain suspect is the guilty one or not.
Machine A could be asked the question *who committed the crime?* and it will provide the exact information
required to identify that person. Machine B on the other hand can only be asked the question *Is this person
guilty?* and the machine will answer with either true or false. The data provided by Machine A can be
equated to information containing the propositional truth since it not only tells you whether something is
true or not, but also what the exact content of this truth is. The data of Machine B on the other hand, can be
equated to information containing the truth value since it only tells you whether something is true or not.

Associating truth values with evidentiality seems very natural, as uttering your own thoughts and values is the closest one can get to a relative truth. Thus an ego-evidential marker would in such sense indicate that, regardless of the content, whatever opinion the speaker has, it is assumed to be true according to his/her world of thinking. Denying that truth (i.e. denying that the opinion of the speaker is true) conflicts with the authority that the speaker has over his own opinions. Of course, whatever opinion the speaker holds toward a certain matter is not related to the absolute truth whatsoever. That is not to say that one cannot disagree with the speaker. Any proposition made by the speaker can be disagreed upon, however, it is impossible to disagree that a certain proposition is the opinion of the speaker. Therefore whatever opinion a speaker has towards some proposition, should be assumed to be true relative to the speaker's world of perception.

We have seen that particle exclamative constructions are veridical, but where does that leave factivity in this story? Many of the test used for factivity can also be used as evidence for veridicality. One could of course claim that factivity and veridicality are similar and if one defines factivity to be a concept presupposing the truth of a proposition, then veridicality does match this definition. To distinguish the two one has to find distributions that are factive but not veridical or the other way around. For reasons of space though, I will not address this issue and assume that factivity and veridicality are one and the same concept. Evidence in favor of equating the two concepts has to do with the observations that particle exclamatives select for factive verbs only (69a), but not for non-factive ones (69b). The fact that particle exclamatives only select for factive verbs implies that, regardless of whether factivity is part of the verb or the embedded clause, there must be some connection between particle exclamatives and factivity. I will come back to this issue in the next chapter.

(69) a. Ik realiseer-de me   opeens dat hij   me toch een hoop
          1SG realize-SG.PST 1SG.REFL suddenly COMP 3SG.M ME TOCH a   lot
          kinderen heeft!
          children have.3SG

          'I suddenly realized what a lot of children he has!'

      b. *Ik vroeg   me   af   dat hij   me toch een hoop
          I   ask.SG.PST 1SG.REFL suddenly COMP 3SG.M ME TOCH a   lot
          kinderen heeft!
          children have.3SG

          'I wondered what a lot of children he has!'

3.1.3 Exclamative *toch*

This section describes and discusses the functions of *toch* in exclamative constructions. I argue that *toch* is the overt realization of *widening*. Widening is characterized as an operation extending the domain of a certain proposition to a wider domain which lies beyond what is expected. Unlike Zanuttini and Portner (2003) though, I will incorporate the notion of noteworthiness which can be understood as an indication that some proposition is noteworthy within a certain expected context (Chernilovskaya and Nouwen, 2012). Before going into more detail about the functions and semantics of *toch* in exclamative constructions, I examine the functions of *toch* on its own in general.

3.1.3.1 Modal particle *toch*

Schermer-Vermeer (1984) made an attempt to provide a unified description of *toch*. According to them, whatever *x* in constructions like "toch *x*", the modal particle has scope over, *x* is presented as incompatible with expectations associated to *x* (Schermer and Vermeer, 1984). In a similar way, Daalder (1986) provides a unified interpretation of both *toch* and *doch* (an adversative conjunction with a common origin to the English *though*) in the light of unfulfilled expectations: "Explaining the meaning of ... *toch* boils down to an association...with interpretation contexts in which we can speak of a poor connection, something that is not quite right, something unexpected, or a change of course.". Finally, Hogeweg et al. (2011) provides a somewhat more formal description of *toch* according to which *toch* indicates an inconsistency or contrast with the *common ground*.[4]

Example (70) below, illustrates a prototypical use of *toch*. In this sentence *toch* indicates that his going to the birthday is an unexpected event in the light of the previous sentence which provides a reason for the subject of the sentence not to be able to go to the party. In other words, despite *y* (i.e. an event which deems x to be unlikely), *x* is the case. *Toch* evaluates *x* against the background of *y*. I take the account by Hogeweg et al. (2011) to best describe the modal particle *toch* (i.e. *toch* indicates a contrast or inconsistency with the common ground).

(70)   Hoewel hij   geen tijd had,   is hij   **toch** naar de verjaardag
        Although 3SG.M no   time have.SG.PST, is 3SG.M *toch* to   the birthday
        ge-gaan.
        PTC-go
        'Although he had no time, he still went to the birthday.'

All the accounts on *toch* dealt with so far, provide an account along the lines of certain expectations that are not met. The way *toch* functions can be neatly associated with the notion of widening. My definition of widening will however, slightly differ from Zanuttini and Portner's definition. In the next section I elaborate on my definition of *widening* and give arguments for why it should be analyzed as such.

3.1.3.2 Widening

In a more or less similar way as Zanuttini and Portner (2003), I claim that exclamatives widen the domain of quantification of a non-specific item, which gives rise to a set of alternative propositions denoted by the sentence. My concept of *widening* though, incorporates Zanuttini and Portner's idea of widening and Chernilovskaya and Nouwen's idea of noteworthiness, and does not explicitly incorporate *wh*-words into the semantics of widening. I define widening as follows:

> **Widening** is an operation that widens a certain initial domain D1 to domain D2 along a set of alternative propositions that are noteworthy in the context.

A major difference between the current the current concept widening and Zannuttini and Portner's concept of widening, is that the former incorporates the notion of noteworthiness while the latter does not. Recall from Chapter 2 the following quotation by Chernilovskaya and Nouwen (2012) which clearly explains what is meant with noteworthiness:

---

[4]Of course that what is assumed by the common ground can be equated to that what is expected.

> ***noteworthy**: an entity is noteworthy iff its intrinsic characteristics (i.e. those characteristics that are independent of the factual situation) **stand out considerably** with respect to a comparison class of entities.*

In other words, connecting the two concepts with each other, noteworthiness can be understood as a set of alternative propositions in D2 that stand out in comparison to the proposition(s) in D1. This is more or less similar to claiming that *toch* indicates an inconsistency between the common ground and the actual proposition. In terms of expectations, noteworthiness can be equated to a sense of unfulfilled expectations. Although Zanuttini and Portner (2003) claim that widening gives rise to a sense of unexpectedness, surprise and high degree, they do not explicitly incorporate these concepts to the semantics of widening. Saying that one domain contains more items than another is not sufficient to explain the function of an exclamative, a word like *more* for instance also indicates that a certain proposition is larger than another proposition, but it would be odd to call sentences containing the word *more* to be exclamative.[5] Therefore I incorporated noteworthiness into the concept of widening which ensures that not only a domain expands, it also expands with items that stand out considerably from the initial domain.

As already remarked by Chernilovskaya and Nouwen (2012), noteworthiness is a gradable concept. I have not incorporated this gradable aspect into my definition of widening, since I ascribe gradability to intonation. A more emphatic intonation (usually indicated by a higher F0), indicates a higher degree in noteworthiness of the feature that gives rise to the alternative propositions. Therefore high degree is only partially associated with exclamatives according to my account. Unlike Rett (2008), who regards degree semantics to be fundamental to exclamatives, I do not directly incorporate degree into the semantics of exclamatives. By doing so this analysis is able to account for cases in Dutch, German and Russian in which one encounters exclamatives that are not intrinsically gradable, think of *wh*-words such as *who* or *where* (Chernilovskaya and Nouwen, 2012). As can be observed from Example (71), even non-gradable items can occur in exclamative constructions, which would contradict the degree restriction on exclamatives posited by Rett (2008)

(71) a. Wie ik me toch net ge-zien heb!
         Who 1SG ME TOCH just PTC-see have.1SG

         'Boy, you are never going to believe who I have just seen!'

      b. Waar ik me toch net geweest ben!
         Where 1SG ME TOCH just be.PTC be.1SG

         'Boy, you are never going to believe where I have been!'

Although I do not posit a degree restriction the way Rett (2008) does, I do claim that in case of particle exclamatives there is a non-specificity restriction on all items within the scope of *toch*. In the next section, I provide grammatical arguments to support this claim.

3.1.3.3   Non-specificity

As I argue that *toch* is the overt realization of widening, it appears to run against Zanuttini and Portner's (2003) claim that widening is not directly encoded in the syntax. Syntactically speaking, the *toch* particle can occur in different positions in the sentence, its posi-

---

[5]Notice that Rett (2008) does equate exclamatives to comparative constructions. However, that still does not mean that every sentence containing *more* is an exclamative.

tion marking the scope of the particle. I argue that *toch* can only select for non-specific items.

Thinking of the English *what*-exclamatives and all previously shown Dutch examples, one might come to think that an exclamative clause is only felicitous whenever its predicate is indefinite, in case of DP's, or evaluative, in case of adjectives and adverbs.[6] Assuming this would be true, it would seemingly provide a proper explanation as to why an exclamative sentence containing an indefinite noun in its predicate is grammatical (72a), while a demonstrative (72b), proper name (72c) or definite noun (72d), which are all definite expressions, are ungrammatical.

(72) a. Hij   heeft   me toch   een mooie   jongen ge-zien!
          3SG.M have.3SG ME TOCH a   beautiful boy   PTC-see
          'Boy, did he see a beautiful boy!

      b. *Hij   heeft   me toch   die mooie   jongen ge-zien!
          3SG.M have.3SG ME TOCH that beautiful boy   PTC-see
          'Boy, did he see that beautiful boy!

      c. *Hij   heeft   me toch   Klaas ge-zien!
          3SG.M have.3SG ME TOCH Klaas PTC-see
          'Boy, did he see Klaas!'

      d. *Hij   heeft   me toch   de boterhamm-en gegeten!
          3SG.M have.3SG ME TOCH the sandwich-PL   PTC-eat
          'Boy, did he eat the sandwiches

This is exactly the claim made by Rett (2008) who posits a degree restriction on all exclamative constructions. This restriction would be the cause of the ungrammaticality in sentences like the ones in (72). Contra Rett (2008) however, I argue that exclamatives can contain both definite as well as indefinite nouns in their predicate. Example (73) illustrates such exclamative construction in which the predicate contains a definite proper name.

(73) Hij   heeft   me Klaas toch   zien   dansen!
      3SG.M have.3SG ME Klaas TOCH see.INF dance.INF
      'Boy, did he see Klaas dancing!'

The main difference between the examples in (72b-d) and the one in (73), which all contain a definite item, can be traced back to the position of the DP relative to the modal particle *toch*. The claim that exclamatives can only contain indefinite items in the predicate due to degree restrictions is therefore ungrounded, as we have seen from Example (73). However, I do not want to completely get rid of this claim. Rather I suggest a slightly different analysis which would be able to account for all the Dutch data.

---

[6]English seems to be contradicting this non-specificity requirement.

(1) a. The children he has!

     b. *Those children he has!

Despite the definite article *the*, it is not the case that a reference is made to a specific set of children in the actual world. This becomes clear from (1b), in which a reference to a specific set of children is ungrammatical.

Instead of claiming that all exclamative predicates are subjected to degree restrictions, I claim that all items within the scope of *toch* need to be nonspecific. Since the definite expression *Klaas* in (73) does not fall within the scope of *toch*, the sentence is grammatical even though Klaas is a specific entity. The scope of *toch* can be defined as its c-command domain.

This non-specificity requirement might at first look somewhat similar to the degree restriction, but it does not directly refer to gradability. The non-specificity requirement does not only refer to non-specificity of entities (i.e. definite/indefinite nouns), but also to non-specificity of adjectives, adverbs and even verbs. Let me clarify what I mean with non-specificity. Non-specificity means that a certain property, individual or event does not refer to one specific item or set of items, but refers to a non-specific set of items, as such it can give rise to a set of alternative items.

Basically for nouns, it boils down to the distinction between definite and indefinite nouns: a definite noun refers to one specific individual in the world, while an indefinite noun refers to a set of individuals and is not specifically referring to one *x* in the real world. A DP like *a boy* for instance does not refer to one specific boy and could in fact apply to more than one individual in the real world, *the boy* however does not give rise a set of alternative boys, but pinpoints to only one specific boy. I have shown examples containing two DP's in which the DP following *toch* has to be non-specific. To give even more compelling evidence that items following *toch* have to be non-specific, examine (74).

(74) a. *Hij   heeft   me Klaas toch de mooie   brief geschreven
        3SG.M have.3SG ME Klaas TOCH the beautiful letter write.PTC

        'Boy, did he write Klaas a nice letter.'

     b. Hij   heeft   me Klaas toch een mooie   brief geschreven
        3SG.M have.3SG ME Klaas TOCH a   beautiful letter write.PTC

        'Boy, did he write Klaas a nice letter.'

Example (74) contains three DPs of which the one following *toch* has to be non-specific (74b), otherwise it is judged to be ungrammatical (74a). In a similar way adjectives and adverbs can be divided in specific and non-specific adjectives and adverbs. Rett (2008) distinguishes evaluative adverbs from manner adverbs, the former is gradable while the latter is not. Only gradable adverbs can occur in exclamative constructions. Gradability can be easily explained along the lines of non-specificity: while manner adverbs/adjectives only refer to one specific way to modify a phrase, gradable (i.e. evaluative) adverbs/adjectives do not refer to one specific way to modify a phrase but implicitly contain a set of alternative states along a scale indicated by the adverb/adjective. For particle exclamatives we observe the same incompatibility with manner adverbs as Rett (2008) has observed for English, see (75).

(75) a. Hij   zit   me toch elegant   op dat paard!
        3SG.M sit.SG ME TOCH elegantly on that horse

        'He sits so elegantly on that horse!'

     b. *Hij   zit   me toch achterstevoren op dat paard!
        3SG.M sit.SG ME TOCH backwards   on that horse

        'He sits so backwards on that horse!'

I argue that a similar reasoning along the lines of non-specificity applies to verbs. There are several verbs and verb forms that can be regarded as non-specific. A first and

most logical group of non-specific verbs is the group of infinitives. Infinitives are tenseless and aspectless on their own and they often have an implicit indefinite nominal meaning. As becomes clear from Example (76) below, infinitives can be easily replaced with an indefinite plural noun.

(76)   a. Hij   houd-t   van koken!
           3SG.M love-3SG GEN cook.INF

           'He loves cooking.'

       b. Hij   houd-t   van eieren
           3SG.M love-3.SG of   eggs

           'He loves eggs.'

Infinitives like the ones in Example (73) are a special case of infinitival constructions which go very well with exclamatives. Such constructions consist of a verb like *lopen, staan, liggen* 'to walk, to stand, to lay' or a verb of perception like *zien, horen* 'to see, to hear'. The former group has completely lost its lexical verb meaning while the latter still retains its lexical meaning, both though have grammaticalized into a serial verb/auxiliary construction. These constructions indicate that whatever verb x follows the infinitive, is 'in the process/state of x' or in case of perception verbs, is perceived to be 'in the process/state of x'. So the literal meaning of (73) would be that 'he has seen Klaas in a state of dancing'.

This brings me to the next group of verbs that can be selected by *toch*, the so-called atelic verbs. These verbs are characterized as lacking an inner aspect (or aktionsart) altogether, for example stative verbs and atelic verbs, but certainly not to forget also infinitives. It becomes clear from Example (77) that a verb like *to dance* which does not have an inner aspect is grammatical within the scope of *toch* (77a). A telic verb like *to repair* on the other hand, is not grammatical within the scope of *toch*, see (77b). Note that for certain verbs, their status of telicity is dependent on the specificity of the object or the type of object. In other words the object determines whether the VP is telic or atelic and in turn the VP determines whether the phrase following *toch* is specific or non-specific. The different grammaticality judgements between telic and atelic verbs in (77) can once again be attributed to the non-specific nature of verbs lacking an inner aspect, which gives rise to a set of alternative aspectual states of the verb.

(77)   a. Hij   heeft   me toch ge-dans-t
           3SG.M have.3SG ME TOCH PTC-dance-PTC

           'Boy, did he dance alot! '

       b. *Hij   heeft me dat kastje toch   ge-repareer-d
           3SG.M has   ME that closet TOCH PTC-repaire-PTC

           'Boy, did he made that closet!'

Note also that non-specific items in exclamatives should still exist in the real world, therefore negation is excluded as a potential non-specific item, as is clear from the ungrammatical sentences in (78).[7]

---

[7]Notice that there are examples in which an exclamative contains negation. In these cases however, negation no longer retains its original negative semantics which, but is grammaticalized into a construction indicating emphasis. In these sentences the *wel* and *niet* always occur together.

(78) a. *Hij heeft me toch geen kinderen!
3SG.M have.3SG ME TOCH no children

b. *Dat is me toch niet mooi!
that is ME TOCH NEG beautiful

c. *Hij heeft me toch niet ge-dans-t!
3SG.M has ME TOCH not PTC-dance-PTC

Another thing to notice is that the scope of *toch* includes whatever phrase is positioned within the c-command domain. Therefore all phrases from the right edge up to *toch* should be non-specific. Whenever it contains a specific phrase, the sentence becomes ungrammatical, while in case of non-specific phrases the sentence is grammatical, see (72). There are however exceptions to this requirement, as we have seen earlier in Example (71a) repeated here in (79a):

(79) a. Wie$_i$ ik me zojuist toch t_i ge-zien heb!
Who$_i$ 1SG ME just.now TOCH t$_i$ PTC-see have.1SG

'Boy, you are never going to believe who I have just seen!'

b. *Hij heeft me Klaas toch ge-zien!
3SG.M have.3SG ME Klaas TOCH PTC-see

'Boy, did he see Klaas!'

Usually *toch* cannot have scope over *gezien* 'seen' (79b), since *gezien* is not a non-specific item. Even though that might be the case, (79a) seems to contradict the non-specificity requirement as it is still perfectly fine. The reason that (79a) is grammatical, has to do with the original position of *wie* 'who'. The *wh*-word *who* originates in a position following *toch*, therefore the non-specificity requirement is met. The movement explanation also clarifies why *wh*-words like *wie* 'who', *wat* 'what', *waar* 'where' and *hoe* 'how', can occur in exclamative constructions, at least for Dutch (80a-80d), while *waarom* 'why' cannot (80e).

(80) a. Wie$_i$ ik me zojuist toch t_i ge-zien heb!
Who$_i$ 1SG ME just.now TOCH t$_i$ PTC-see have.1SG

'Boy, you are never going to believe who I have just seen!'

b. Wat$_i$ hij me nou toch t_i gekocht had!
what$_i$ 3SG.M ME now TOCH t$_i$ buy.PTC have.SG.PST

'Boy, the things he had bought'

c. Waar$_i$ ik me toch t_i geweest ben!
where$_i$ 1SG ME TOCH t$_i$ be.PTC be1SG

'Boy, you are not going to believe where I have been!'

d. [Hoe moe$_i$] hij me toch t_i eruit zag!
[how tired$_i$] 3SG.M ME TOCH t$_i$ out see.SG.PST

'Boy, how tired he looked!'

e. *Waarom hij me toch slaap-t!
why 3SG.M ME TOCH sleep-3SG

---

(1) Kinderen dat hij me toch wel niet heeft!
children COMP 3SG.M ME TOCH WEL not have.3SG

'Boy, the children he has!

Since all *wh*-words, except for *waarom* in (80), start out within the scope of *toch*, they are all possible items that can give rise to a set of alternatives. *Waarom* 'why' however, is base-generated in the SpecCP and therefore does not start out within the scope of *toch*. Now the question is why it would be the case that *toch* can only have scope over non-specific items.

The reason lies in the fact that, in order for a certain domain to be widened, it is crucial that the predicate can give rise to a set of alternatives, be it a set of alternative entities, alternative degrees or alternative states of the verb. Clearly, definite expressions refer to one specific item in the real world and therefore cannot give rise to a set of alternatives. Recall that Zanuttini and Portner (2003) link *wh*-words with giving rise to a set of alternative propositions. As was observed earlier, non-specific items (to which *wh*-words also belong) give rise to a set of alternative propositions in a similar way. Therefore *wh*-words can be regarded as a subset of non-specific items, and thus contrast with specific items like definite expressions.

Not only is it the case that a non-specific element has to be in the scope of the *toch* particle, the claim is even stronger in that a non-specific element cannot occur outside this scope. Therefore a non-specific item cannot occur in a position where specific items would occur, and vice versa. Earlier we have seen that specific items cannot occur in non-specific positions (i.e. within the scope of *toch*) since they do not give rise to a set of alternatives. Whenever a non-specific object occupies a specific object position, it results in an odd sentence as well, as becomes clear from (81b). This has to do with the fact that specific items are able to scramble out of the VP, while non-specific ones are not.

(81)   a. Hij   heeft   me **die jongen** toch zien   dansen!
             3SG.M have.3SG ME that   boy TOCH see.INF dance.INF
             'Boy, did he see that boy dancing!'

        b. ??Hij   heeft   me **een jongen** toch zien   dansen!
             3SG.M have.3SG ME a   boy TOCH see.INF dance.INF
             'Boy, did he see a boy dancing!'

        c. Hij   heeft me toch   **een jongen** zien dansen!
             3SG.M has   ME TOCH a   boy see.INF dance.INF
             'Boy, did he see a boy dancing!'

In summary, the *toch* particle is the overt realization of *widening* which widens a certain domain to another domain, along a set of alternatives that are noteworthy within a certain context. All items within the c-command domain of *toch* should be non-specific in order to give rise to a set of alternatives.

3.2 Interaction

Having examined the exclamative particles on their own, I now discuss the interaction between the two. Remember that, according to Zanuttini and Portner (2003), *widening* functions along two domains: Domain D1 and Domain D2. D1 forms the base from which widening makes an extension to domain D2 along a certain given scale. I take D1 to be the expectations or common ground indicated by the ego-evidentiality marker and D2 the changed domain built upon D1 and differentiated along the lines of the set of alternatives within the scope of *toch*. Take for instance the sentence *Hij heeft me toch een hoop kinderen* 'Boy, does he have a lot of children'. The ego-evidentiality marker *me*

takes as its content *Hij heeft een hoop kinderen* 'He has a lot of children' which is the D1. *Toch* widens this domain to D2 along the lines of all alternative sets in the quantity of Children that are noteworthy within a certain context. To put it differently, the ego-evidential content constitutes the common ground and *toch* in turn indicates that there is an inconsistency with this common ground along the lines of a non-specific property, individual or event which is noteworthy.

The fact that each item has their own separate function can be illustrated by examples in which one of the two particles is missing. We have seen that *toch* indicates an inconsistency between a certain expectation or the common ground (i.e. D1) and the actual situation (i.e. D2). For *me* however there is nothing in its semantics that relates the proposition with certain expectations. Therefore an example like (82a) in which there is only a *me* particle in the following sentence, is odd due to the lack of expectations that should be assumed according to the initial sentence. If we add an *toch* however, certain expectations are assumed and the sentence becomes felicitous (see 82b).

(82) a. ?Dat had ik   echt   niet verwacht, maar hij   heeft   me een boel
          That had 1SG really NEG expected, but   3SG.M have.3SG ME a   lot
          kinderen!
          children

          'I really didn't expect that, but Boy, does he have a lot of children!'

      b. Dat had ik   echt   niet verwacht, maar hij   heeft   me toch   een
          That had 1SG really NEG expected, but   3SG.M have.3SG ME TOCH a
          boel kinderen!
          lot   children

          'I really didn't expect that, but Boy, does he have a lot of children!'

When the particles occur in isolation they can no longer be considered an exclamative construction. The *me* particle in isolation only indicates ego-evidentiality and can be paraphrased as *Ik vind dat...* "In my opinion", as can be seen in Example (83a). The *toch* particle indicates an adversative relation between the expected and the current sentence (83b). Notice that both can occur with negation in the sentence which indicates that the particles in isolation should not be regarded as particle exclamatives since the particle exclamative is ungrammatical when negated as was discussed earlier and observed in (83c).

(83) a. Hij   heeft   me niet veel geg-eten!
          3SG.M have.3SG ME NEG much PTC-eat

          'He has not eaten a lot/In my opinion he has not eaten a lot.'

      b. Hij   heeft toch   niet veel geg-eten!
          3SG.M has   TOCH NEG much PTC-eat

          'He still has not eaten much.'

      c. *Hij   heeft me toch   niet veel geg-eten!
          3SG.M has   ME TOCH NEG much PTC-eat

          'Boy, has he not eaten a lot.'

This section made clear that the particles *me* and *toch* only give rise to exclamativity when used in combination. When combined, the *me* particle indicates an initial domain (D1) that is veridical, on to which *toch* widens that domain to domain D2 along the lines

of a non-specific item that is noteworthy in the context. Whenever the particles occur in isolation however, they no longer indicate exclamativity, therefore it is infelicitous to call them exclamative particles altogether. In the next chapter, I will look at the bigger picture and see how this analysis can be applied to Dutch *wh*-exclamatives and how it relates to the general discussion on exclamatives.

Chapter 4

Dutch *Wh*-exclamatives

In the previous chapter we have seen that the Dutch particle exclamatives essentialy consist of two elements: an ego-evidentiality marker *me*, and a widening operator *toch*. The ego-evidentiality marker ensures the veridical nature of the proposition and the widening operator widens the veridical proposition along the lines of a non-specific item and assigns noteworthiness to this set of non-specific propositions. While each particle has its own function, it is only through the interaction of the two that exclamativity arises. Now the question is of course to what extent this analysis can be applied to other Dutch exclamative constructions. The current chapter attempts to apply this analysis to *wh*-exclamatives and discusses the differences between particle exclamatives and *wh*-exclamatives in more detail.

4.1 Dutch Wh-exclamative

As we have seen in Chapter 2, a *wh*-exclamative basically consists of a *wh*-word and its argument (i.e. an element it operates on). I first discuss the components and properties proposed for particle exclamatives and see to what extent they apply to *wh*-exclamatives. Later on in this section, I discuss the major properties that are distinctive for *wh*-exclamatives, but not present in particle exclamatives.

4.1.1 Factivity and ego-evidentiality

Unlike particle exclamatives, there is no indication of ego-evidentiality in *wh*-exclamatives. In Chapter 3 we have already seen that particle exclamatives cannot be embedded under expletive subjects nor under a subject other than the first person singular in the matrix clause due to the ego-evidentiality marker. The reason being that no direct connection can be made between the *me* particle and the speaker in the real world whenever the grammatical subject in the matrix clause is a person other than the speaker him/herself. No such restriction is observed for *wh*-exclamatives though, as is clear from (84). Both an expletive subject in the matrix clause (84a) and a third person singular subject (84b) are possible matrix subjects embedding *wh*-exclamatives.

(84) a. Het is opvallend wat   een hoop kinderen hij   heeft!
          it is striking   what a   lot   children 3SG.M have.3SG
          'It's striking how many children he has!'

    b. Jan weet   wat een hoop kinderen hij   heeft!
       Jan know.SG what a   lot   of   children 3SG.M have.3SG
       'John knows how many children he has!'

The fact that *wh*-exclamatives do not indicate ego-evidentiality, makes one wonder whether such constructions are veridical or factive. Although *wh*-exclamatives are not ego-evidential, Maradin's test for veridicality does seem to work at first sight. This test is based on the fact a redundancy in source indicators results in a clash between two or more source in indicators. Since exclamatives are assumed to be veridical, they are expected to be incompatible with explicit perspective markers. As becomes clear from (85) this is exactly what happens. Notice that once again placing the perspective markers in sentence-initial position results in a worse sentence (85a) than placing it at the end (85b). This is due to the fact that the *wh*-word cannot move to initial position because the perspective markers already occupy that position.

(85)   a. *Volgens   haar, heeft   hij   wat een hoop kinderen
             According.to her   have.3SG 3SG.M what a   lot   children
             'According to her, boy does he have a lot of children!'
       b. ??Wat een hoop kinderen heeft   hij,   volgens   haar!
             what a   lot   children have.3SG 3SG.M according.to her
             'According to her, boy does he have a lot of children!'

Let us look back at Example (64a),repeated below in (86a). As can be observed the subject of the matrix clause is positioned after the verb. Since it is assumed that verbs in Dutch are verb second and occupy the C^0 position, it can be concluded that the perspective marker occupies the SpecCP position. The ungrammaticality in (85a) then arises due to a syntactic clash between the perspective markers and the *wh*-word. On the other hand, whenever the source markers are positioned lower in the sentence, they no longer occupy the same position as the *wh*-word. Therefore sentence (85b) is better than (85a). One would expect that since there is no syntactic clash anymore in (85b), this sentence should be grammatical just like the particle exclamative is grammatical with a low-positioned perspective marker (86b). However, against expectations, this is not the case. Why would that be?

Recall that the ungrammaticality in (86a) results from a semantic clash between the two perspective markers, as would have been predicted by Maradin's test for veridicality. When one perspective marker is embedded within the other, i.e. the ego-evidential marker takes scope over the persepctive marker, the sentence becomes grammatical since there no longer is a semantic clash. For the *wh*-exclamative however, it is a completely different story. The ungrammaticality in (85a)[1] is due to a syntactic clash rather than a semantic one, caused by an incompatibility of having more than one source indicator. The oddness of (85b) however, is due to a semantic error, albeit not one caused by a clash in perspective markers, but by the situational nature of *wh*-exclamatives, I will come back to this issue later on in this chapter. In short, it has to do with a distinction between situational and reportative exclamatives in which reportative exclamatives like particle exclamatives can have explicit source indicators, but situational exclamatives like *wh*-exclamatives cannot. For now I will leave it at this, but I will come back to this in Section (4.1.3). All in all, it can be concluded that Maradin's test for veridicality does not work for *wh*-exclamatives.

---

[1]It should be noted that (85a) is felt to be more ungrammatical than (86a) which is in line with the idea that syntactic errors result in stronger ungrammaticality judgements than semantic errors.

(86)   a. *Volgens   haar, heeft   hij   me toch een hoop kinderen!
            According.to her   have.3SG 3SG.M ME TOCH a   lot   children!

            'According to her, boy does he have a lot of children!'

       b. Hij   heeft   me, volgens   haar, toch   een hoop kinderen!
            3SG.M have.3SG ME according.to her   TOCH a   lot   children!

            'Boy, does he have a lot of children in her eyes.'

Another diagnostic test put forward to evaluate factivity is based on question-answering pairs. Dutch *wh*-exclamatives are not allowed as proper answers to either polar questions (87a) or *wh*-questions (87b). Notice that, although particle exclamatives are well-formed replies to polar questions, *wh*-exclamatives are not. This means that the two exclamative constructions are at least different in the content that is presupposed.

(87)   a. *Heeft   hij   een hoop kinderen? - Nou, wat   een hoop kinderen
            have.3SG 3.SG.M a   lot   children - well what a   lot   children
            heeft   hij!
            have.3SG 3.SG.M

            'Does she have a lot of children? - What a lot of children he has!'

       b. *Hoeveel kinderen heeft hij?   - Nou, wat   een hoop kinderen heeft
            how.many children has   3SG.M - well what a   lot   children have.3SG
            hij!
            3.SG

            'How many children does he have? - What a lot of children he has!'

The ungrammaticality in (87), in which an exclamative cannot function as a proper answer, has been explained by Grimshaw (1979) and Zanuttini and Portner (2003) as a consequence of the factive nature of exclamatives. According to their explanation, an reply cannot presuppose the answer. Rett (2011) however, has argued that this diagnostic test does not provide evidence showing whether some proposition is factive or not, rather it indicates that questions can only be answered by assertions. An argument against Rett (2011) could be that although assertions are preferred answers to questions, it is not the case that other sentence types cannot function as proper replies to questions at all, as was shown in (66). Nonetheless it still remains questionable whether this test actually indicates factivity. What should be kept in mind though, is that *wh*-exclamatives behave differently from particle exclamatives with regard to polar questions.

More clear evidence comes from the fact that *wh*-exclamatives can only embed under factive verbs (88a), but not non-factive ones (88b). Based on such observations some have claimed that exclamatives are factive themselves (Grimshaw, 1979). Others however claim that it is the factive verb rather than its embedded clause that causes factivity (Elliott, 1974; Gutiérrez-Rexach, 1996). Even though it is hard to determine whether the test provided below truly proves that the embedded clause is factive, the undeniable fact still remains that embedded exclamatives only embed under factive verbs, but not under non-factive. Somehow, there must be a certain property that licenses embedding *wh*-exclamatives under factive verbs. Most straightforwardly, one would then assume that the embedded exclamative itself is factive.[2] For this exact reason, I assume that *wh*-exclamatives are factive.

---

[2]That is not to say that all clauses embedded by factive verbs are factive. A sentence like *I realized what happened* with a factive verb and embedded interrogative, does not make the embedded interrogative factive. The claim I have made here is that *wh*-exclamatives can be regarded as factives because of their

(88) a. Hij realiseer-de   zich wat een hoop kinderen Jan   had.
          3SG realize-SG.PST REFL what a   lot   children John have.SG.PST
          'He realized what a lot of children John had.'

      b. *Hij vroeg   zich af wat een hoop kinderen Jan   had.
          3SG ask.SG.PST REFL off what a   lot   children John have.SG.PST
          'He wondered what a lot of children John had.'

We can thus conclude that although *wh*-exclamatives are not ego-evidential, they are factive just like particle exclamatives. Although, in particle exclamatives there is a lexical item indicating ego-evidentiality and therefore indirectly an overt marker of factivity, there is no such overt lexical item in *wh*-exclamatives. Either one could assume that it is the *wh*-word which marks factivity, this would rather be hard to account for based on its meaning, or one assumes that there is a covert factive operator as proposed by Zanuttini and Portner (2003). I will follow Zanuttini and Portner (2003) in this analysis.

4.1.2 Widening

Just like particle exclamatives there is a non-specificity requirement for *wh*-exclamatives which implies that the argument of the exclamative cannot be specific (see Section 3.1.3). Therefore definite nouns are infelicitous arguments (89a), while indefinite ones are felicitous (89b). The same observation is made for adverbs and verbs, as becomes clear from the examples in (89). Adverbs of manner are ungrammatical in combination with *wh*-exclamatives (89c) while evaluate adverbs are not (89d) and telic predicates are ungrammatical (89e) while atelic ones are grammatical (89f).

(89) a. *Wat heeft   hij   de mooie   tafel ge-maak-t!
          What have.3SG 3SG.M the beautiful table PTC-make-PTC

      b. Wat heeft   hij   een mooie   tafel ge-maak-t!
          What have.3SG 3SG.M a   beautiful table PTC-make-PTC
          'What a beautiful table he made!'

      c. *Wat zit   hij   achterstevoren op dat paard!
          what sit.SG 3SG.M backwards   on that horse
          'He sits so backwards on that horse!'

      d. Wat zit   hij   elegant op dat paard!
          what sit.SG 3SG.M elegantly on that horse
          'He sits so elegantly on that horse!'

      e. *Wat heeft   hij   ge-repareer-d   ,zeg
          what have.3SG 3SG.M PTC-repair-PTC, SFP
          'He sits so backwards on that horse!'

      f. Wat kan   hij   repareren, zeg!
          what can.3SG 3SG.M repair.INF., SFP
          'Jeez, does he complain'

The examples in (89) however, do not show that *wh*-exclamatives necessarily require an operation of widening. It merely shows that exclamatives require non-specific items.

---

grammatical behavior. *Wh*-exclamatives only select for factive verbs which is not the case with interrogatives.

But why would there be a non-specificity restriction at all? As we have seen in Section (3.1.3) the reason for this requirement is related to the fact that the operation of *widening* requires arguments which can give rise to a set of alternatives. Based on this, I assume that a similar operation should apply to *wh*-exclamatives. As we have seen at the end of Chapter 3, the widening particle *toch* indicates an inconsistency with the common ground, i.e. it marks a difference in what is expected. So if we want to claim that *wh*-exclamatives contain a widening operator, we should at least find an example that shows that *wh*-exclamatives have two domains, an initial domain and an widened domain. In other words, we have to show that *wh*-exclamatives are based on expectations. Example (90a), shows that expectations indeed play a role in *wh*-exclamatives, just like they play a role in particle exclamative (90b).

(90) a. Dat had ik echt niet verwacht,
       that had 1SGc really NEG expected
       maar wat heeft hij een boel kinderen!
       but what have.3SG 3SG.M ME a lot children

       'I really didn't expect that, but Boy, does he have a lot of children!'

   b. Dat had ik echt niet verwacht, maar hij heeft me toch een
      That had 1SGc really NEG expected but 3SG.M have.3SG ME TOCH a
      boel kinderen!
      lot children
      'I really didn't expect that, but Boy, does he have a lot of children!'

It can be concluded from this section that *wh*-exclamatives react just like particle exclamatives with regard to the operation of *widening*. I will leave in the middle whether *widening* is overtly expressed by the *wh*-word or whether there is a covert widening operator as is proposed by Zanuttini and Portner (2003). The point made here though, is that both particle exclamatives and *wh*-exclamatives consist of the properties factivity and widening and it seems that these properties are most defining for Dutch exclamatives.

In the next sections, I turn to the differences between particle exclamatives and *wh*-exlamatives. There are several properties distinguishing *wh*-exclamatives from particle exclamatives. A first difference is based on a division between the situational exclamatives like *wh*- exclamatives and reportative exclamatives like particle exclamatives. A second property, related to the division between situational and reportative exclamatives, has to do with mirativity (i.e. surprise reading). I claim that *wh*-exclamatives can have such readings, but particle exclamative cannot.

4.1.3 Situational and Reportative exclamatives

The main property that separates *wh*-exclamatives from particle exclamatives, is related to the distinction between, what I have called, situational exclamatives and reportative exclamatives. I claim that *wh*-exclamatives are situational while particle exclamatives are reportative. This distinction can be best explained in terms of perspectives from which the utterance is expressed. Situational exclamatives place the utterance in the actual situation in the world to which it applies. Reportative exclamatives on the other hand, report about a situation in the world outside the event to which it applies, instead of actually placing the utterance in the situation itself. Let me give an example to clarify this classification.

Adding a sentence like *Dat wil je niet weten!* (lit. 'You don't want to know'), which can be paraphrased in English as "I am telling you/ you are not going to believe this", indicates that the speaker wants to inform the listener that a certain expression X is noteworthy in a certain context. Depending on the pragmatic context this noteworthiness can be interpreted as being a surprising or amazing situation. However, rather than directly and genuinely being surprised or amazed about a certain situation, it indirectly reports that the speaker deems the situation to be amazing or surprising. I define situational exclamative and reportative exclamative as follows.

(91) a. **Situational exclamative** = An exclamative uttered when the speaker *x* places his/her emotive content towards a proposition *p*, in the actual moment of the situation.

  b. **Reportative exclamative** = An exclamative uttered when the speaker *x* reports proposition *p* that is deemed noteworthy in *x*'s eyes to a listener *z*.

In other words, adding a sentence like *Dat wil je niet weten*, literally implies that the speaker just reported a certain proposition *x* and that proposition is noteworthy in the context according to the speaker, to the extent that the listener is not going to believe it. Being of such nature, situational exclamatives are more speaker-oriented and express the emotions of the speaker, while reportative exclamatives also involve the listener. It should be obvious that the listener is actively involved in reportative exclamatives because it is impossible to report something if there is nobody to report it to. Reportative exclamatives express an subjective proposition of the speaker to the listener. Interestingly, combining a sentence like *Dat wil je niet weten* with *wh*-exclamatives results in an odd sentence (92a-b), while this is not the case for particle exclamatives (92c).

(92) a. Wat een hoop kinderen heeft   hij!   #Dat wil   je   niet
      What a   lot   children have.3SG 3SG.M that want.3SG 2SG NEG
      weten!
      know.INF
      'You're not going to believe this, but, what a lot of children he has!'

  b. Wat heeft   hij   een hoop kinderen! #Dat wil   je   niet
      What have.3SG 3SG.M a   lot children   that want.3SG 2SG NEG
      weten!
      know.INF
      'You're not going to believe this, but, what a lot of children he has!'

  c. Hij   heeft   me toch een hoop kinderen! Dat wil   je   niet
      3SG have.3SG ME TOCH a   lot children   that want.3SG 2SG NEG
      weten!
      know.INF
      'You're not going to believe this, but, Boy, does he have a lot of children!

More evidence for such division comes from the fact that only *wh*-exclamatives can combine with imperatives (93a), but not with particle exclamatives (93b). This observation can be easily explained when assuming that *wh*-exclamatives are situational and particle exclamatives are reportative. Since an imperative is also situational in a sense that it is uttered at the actual moment of a certain event, it can without any problems integrate with *wh*-exclamatives. Particle exclamatives on the other hand, do not place the

proposition in the actual moment and therefore a clash arises between particle exclamatives and imperatives. Badan and Cheng (2015) observed a similar division in Mandarin Chinese, however, they did not make this distinction between situational and reportative exclamatives.

(93) a. Kijk   nou, wat een hoop kinderen hij   heeft!
        look.SG.IMP now what a   lot   children 3SG.M have.3SG
        'Look what a lot of children he has!'

    b. ??Kijk   nou, hij   heeft   me toch   een hoop kinderen!
        look.SG.IMP now 3SG.M have.3SG ME TOCH a   lot   children

Keep in mind that although situational exclamatives have to be placed in the actual moment of the event, it does not mean that situational exclamatives can only be expressed during the actual moment of the event. It can even be expressed for an event in the past. In such case, it still places the exclamative in the actual moment of the event, the actual moment of the event however is in the past. Important to notice is that it does not have to be expressed during the actual moment of the event, but it does have to be placed within the actual moment of the event. In case of past exclamatives, it can be understood that the speaker still conveys his/her genuine amazement/surprise or any other emotive content towards a certain proposition albeit in the past.

The distinction between situational and reportative exclamatives seems very fundamental across all kinds of Dutch exclamative constructions. In fact, it seems that only *wh*-exclamative constructions are situational and therefore infelicitous in combination with a sentence like *Dat wil je niet weten!* (94a-b), while all other exclamative construction in Dutch are felicitous. Example (94) shows that except for *wh*-exclamatives, object initial exclamatives (94c), verb-initial exclamatives (94d) and exclamatives containing a degree word (94e) are all felicitous in combination with *Dat wil je niet weten!* and therefore they are all reportative just like particle exclamatives.

(94) a. Wat kan   hij   mooi   dansen! #Dat wil   je niet
        what can.SG 3SG.M beautifully dance.INF that want.3SG 2SG NEG
        weten!
        know.INF
        'How nice he can dance! I am telling you!'

    b. Wat een boel auto-'s heeft   hij! #Dat wil   je niet weten!
        what a   lot car-PL have.3SG 3SG.M that want.3SG 2SG NEG know.INF
        'What a lot of cars he has! I am telling you!'

    c. een kinderen dat   hij   me heeft!   Dat wil   je niet weten!
        a   children COMP 3SG.M ME have.3SG that want.3SG 2SG NEG know.INF
        'You're not going to believe this, but, Boy, the children he has!'

    d. Eten   dat-ie   kan! Dat wil   je niet weten!
        eat.INF COMPL-3SG.M can.SG that want.3SG 2SG NEG know.INF
        'Boy, the things he eats! You are not going to believe it!'

    e. Hij   kan zo mooi   dansen! Dat wil   je niet weten!
        3SG.M can.SG so beautifully dance.INF that want.3SG 2SG NEG know.INF
        'I am telling you! Boy, can he dance! '

To conclude this section, there is a strong division between situational exclamatives and reportative exclamatives. Situational exclamatives like *wh*-exclamatives place the exclamative content in the actual moment of the event and reportative exclamatives like particle exclamatives place the exclamative content outside the actual moment of the event. Knowing that there is such a division it should become clear why there are mirative and non-mirative exclamatives. While the former expresses a genuine emotive content towards an actual event, the latter one only reports about it and indirectly expresses a genuine emotive content. *Wh*-exclamatives can be mirative because they are situational and particle exclamatives are non-mirative because they are reportative. I will treat this distinction in more detail in the next chapter.

4.1.4 Mirativity

An issue not yet addressed so far, but of great importance to many accounts on exclamatives, is the surprise reading often associated with exclamatives. The reason that mirativity has not been dealt with in the previous chapter simply has to do with the fact that the goal of the previous chapter was to account for all components that are present in particle exclamatives and it just happens to be that mirativity is not one of these components. However, when comparing different exclamative constructions with each other, mirativity seems to be the defining property which sets different exclamative constructions apart from each other.

A major difference between particle exclamatives and *wh*-exclamatives lies in the fact that *wh*-exclamatives seem to have a surprise reading while particle exclamatives do not have such surprise reading (see 95). *Wh*-exclamatives easily embed under expressions of surprise (95aa) or amazement (95b). Particle exclamatives on the other hand, cannot embed under expressions of surprise (95c) or amazement (95d).

(95)   a. Het verras-te   me   wat een hoop kinderen hij   had!
             it   to.surprise-PST 1SG.DAT what a   lot   children 3SG.M have.SG.PST

           'I was surprised what a lot of children he has!'

      b. Ik   was verbaasd wat een lekker eten hij   had
           1SG was astonished what a   nice   food 3SG.M have.SG.PST
           ge-maak-t!
           PTC-make-PTC

           'I was astonished by how nice the food was he had made!'

      c. *Het verras-te   me   dat   hij   me toch een hoop kinderen
           it   surprise-SG.PST 1SG.DAT COMP 3SG.M ME TOCH a   lot   children
           had!
           have.SG.PST

           'I was surprised what a lot of children he has!'

      d. *Ik was verbaasd dat   hij me   toch een lekker eten
           1SG was astonished 3SG.M ME TOCH a   nice food have.SG.PST
           had   ge-maakt-!
           PTC-make-PTC

           'I was astonished by how nice the food was he had made!'

As already remarked by Zanuttini and Portner (2003) and Badan and Cheng (2015), although *wh*-exclamatives can have a surprise reading, it is not the case that it always has.

The example in (96a) below, shows that besides a mirative clause, a *wh*-exclamative can embed under a clause indicating noteworthiness. In addition, Example (96b) supports the claim that particle exclamatives can only be embedded under a non-mirative clause since Example (96b) is grammatical but Examples (95c) and (95d) are not.

(96) a. Het viel   mij   op wat   een hoop kinderen hij   had!
        it   fall.PST 1SG.DAT on what a   lot   children 3SG.M have.SG.PST

        'I noticed what a lot of children he had!'

     b. Het viel   mij   op dat   hij   me toch   een hoop kinderen
        it   fall.PST 1SG.DAT on COMP 3SG.M ME TOCH a   lot   children
        had!
        have.SG.PST

        'I noticed what a lot of children he had!'

There is a clear reason why *wh*-exclamatives are mirative and particle exclamatives are non-mirative. As we have seen in the previous section, the difference between mirative and non-mirative exclamatives is related to the distinction between situational and reportative exclamatives. Since both situational and mirative exclamatives are actual and present, they are compatible with each other. Non-mirative and reportative exclamatives however, are not actual and present. Therefore reportative exclamatives are not compatible with a mirative proposition but are a compatible with non-mirative ones.

Chapter 5

Conclusion and Discussion

In this thesis I have shown that particle exclamatives consist of two components: an ego-evidentiality marker *me* and a widening operator *toch*. The ego-evidential nature of *me* makes the exclamative proposition veridical. That is to say that the truth value of the proposition is presupposed to be true: whatever the speaker says is assumed to be true according to his/her perceptive world. Since both veridicality and factivity presuppose the truth of the proposition, one could assume that the two concepts are similar to each other. However as we have seen in Section (4.1.1), *wh*-exclamatives and particle exclamatives behave differently with respect to these properties. To simplify matters though, I have taken the two concepts to be similar to each other. The *toch* particle widens a certain initial domain D1 to domain D2 along a set of alternative propositions that are noteworthy in the context. In order for a certain item to give rise to a set of alternatives, all items within the scope of *toch* are subject to the non-specificity requirement. It is only through the interaction of the two that exclamativity arises.

Comparing particle exclamatives with *wh*-exclamatives it becomes clear that a fundamental categorization can be made between situational exclamatives, which place the proposition in the actual moment, and reportative exclamatives, which report about the exclamative and place the proposition outside the actual moment. In addition, the *wh*-exclamatives are able to express mirativity while the particle exclamatives are, not due to this distinction. What the two constructions do have in common are the properties of widening and factivity. However, for both it seems that these properties are not completely the same. Although both *wh*-exclamatives and particle exclamatives can be said to be factive, they do not behave similar on grammaticality tests for factivity. The reason might be that the two are not both factive and it might be necessary to make a distinction between veridicity and factivity (despite the fact that I just proposed to assume the two concepts to be equal to each other).

Based on Dutch exclamatives one could propose that exclamatives consist of at least a widening component and a factive component. Ego-evidentiality and mirativity are then optional components that only characterize some exclamative constructions. As should have become clear, the current account on exclamatives essentialy resembles Zanuttini and Portner's account on exclamatives. Both the current account and their account assume that there are two crucial components to exclamatives, i.e. *widening* and factivity. The two accounts both assume that the interaction of these two components gives rise to exclamativity. The difference however, between the my account and Zanuttini and Portner's account lies in the definition of the two concepts. Although Zanuttini and Portner (2003) only defined *widening* as an semantic operation widening a certain domain to a

larger domain, I extended this definition by claiming that widening happens along a set of non-specific alternative items that stand out from the common ground. The advantage of this adjustement is that, by defining *widening* as I have done, the possible exclamative arguments are limited to non-specific items only. As argued by Rett (2008), Zanuttini and Portner's flaw in their concept of *widening* is, that it is not restrictive enough to limit the possible arguments of an exclamative. In order to exclude exclamatives with definite arguments, for instance, Rett (2008) proposed a degree restriction on exclamatives. However, as was already pointed out by Chernilovskaya and Nouwen (2012), such restriction cannot account for *wh*-exclamatives containing *which* or *who*. To account for these cases as well, I proposed a non-specificity restriction rather than a degree-restriction on exclamatives. Incorporating Chernilovskaya and Nouwen's concept of *noteworthiness* into the concept of *widening*, has allowed me to incorporate the speaker's subjective emotive content toward the exclamative proposition. It also ensures that exclamatives do not necessarily invoke a surprise-reading which, as we have seen, is not always present in exclamative construction. Unlike Zanuttini and Portner (2003) who argue that the *wh*-operator gives rise to a set of alternative propositions, I have proposed that this is done by non-specific items. Therefore my account on exclamatives is based neither on question semantics nor on degree semantics. In order to see how applicable this analysis is for other exclamative constructions crosslinguistically, more research is required.

This thesis on Dutch exclamative construction has been far from extensive and there are still a lot of issues that remain unsolved. I will mention some of these below.

So far I have treated *wh*-exclamatives and particle exclamatives as two separate exclamative constructions with each their own distinctive properties. However, as already mentioned by Bennis (1998), the two constructions can also be combined into one exclamative construction, as is illustrated in (97) below.

(97) Wat heeft   hij   me toch   een lekkere vlaai ge-bakken!
      what have.3SG 3SG.M ME TOCH a   tasteful flan PTC-bake
      'What a nice flan he baked!'

According to Bennis (1998) the exclamative particles should be interpreted as elements that emphasize the quantification relation between *wat* and the (exclamative) DP, rather than regarding them as exclamative operators themselves. If this is true, are we then still dealing with exclamative particles as found in particle exclamatives or do the particles in *wh*-exclamatives behave differently from the exclamative particles? If one assumes that they are the same then one should presume that the *toch* particle type-shifts from a *widening* operator to an emphasis marker. If one assumes that they are not the same particles, then evidence should be provided proving that the two behave differently.

Another issue mentioned already a couple of times pertains to veridicality and factivity. In this paper I have just assumed that the two concepts are similar to each other, but as we have seen in Section (4.1.1) *wh*-exclamatives and particle exclamatives do not completely behave similarly with regard to this property. It might therefore be useful to make such distinction, however more research is needed. If one assumes that such distinction is meaningful, one should look for cases which are veridical but non-factive and vice-versa. Perhaps, we should should not even analyzed it as veridicality or factivity, but as an conventional implicature as argued by Beyssade (2009). The fact that exclamatives only select for factive verbs though, provides strong support that exclamatives should be regarded factive. In short, there is still much to explore with regard to exclamatives and the way the truth of the proposition is conveyed.

A final issue I would like address in more detail is related to ego-evidentials. De Haan (1998) has argued that there are no other languages that have ego-evidentials, except for the Tibetan languages. Despite this claim, it has been claimed that ego-evidentials also occur in Chinese (Badan and Cheng, 2015) and Dutch (current thesis). As we have seen in Chapter 2 Badan and Cheng (2015) propose ego-evidential SFPs in exclamative constructions and the current thesis has proposed an ego-evidential pronoun particle. What makes something ego-evidential and to what extent do they form a uniform group? It has for instance, been observed that both in Chinese and Tibetan ego-evidentials occur sentence-finally, however in Dutch this is not the case. How should these different positions of ego-evidentials in the sentence be accounted for in syntax? And does it perhaps mean that there are different types of ego-evidentiality markers?

In conclusion, this thesis has provided a solid approach at least to Dutch exclamatives, but more crosslinguistic research is required to see to what extent this analysis of exclamatives can account for other typologically distinct languages. There are still a lot of issues unsolved with regard to a formal description of exclamatives which will hopefully be addressed in the future.

Bibliography

Abels, K. and Vangsnes, Ø. A. (2010). Introduction: Exclamatives in north germanic and beyond. *Studia Linguistica*, 64(1):1–15.

Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2006). Evidentiality in grammar. *Elsevier*.

Badan, L. and Cheng, L. (2015). Exclamatives in mandarin chinese. *East Asian Linguist*, 24:383–413.

Benincà, P. (1995). Il tipo esclamativo. *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, 3:127–152.

Bennis, H. (1998). Exclamatives! *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, 15(1):27–40.

Bennis, H., Corver, N., and Den Dikken, M. (1997). Predication in nominal phrases. *Journal of comparative Germanic linguistics*, 1(2):85–117.

Berendsen, E. (1986). *The phonology of cliticization*. Walter de Gruyter.

Beyssade, C. (2009). Exclamation and presupposition. In *Presuppositions and implicatures: Proceedings of the MIT–Paris Workshop, eds. PEgré & G. Magri*, volume 60.

Castroviejo, E. (2006). *Wh-exclamatives in Catalan*. PhD thesis, Universitat de Barcelona.

Castroviejo, M. (2008). Deconstructing exclamations. *Catalan journal of linguistics*, 7:041–90.

Chernilovskaya, A. and Nouwen, R. (2012). *On wh-exclamatives and noteworthiness*. Springer.

Chierchia, G. and McConnell-Ginet, S. (2000). *Meaning and grammar: An introduction to semantics*. MIT press.

Chu, C. C.-H. (1998). *A discourse grammar of Mandarin Chinese*, volume 6. P. Lang.

Corver, N. (1990). *The syntax of left branch extractions*. PhD thesis, Katholieke Universiteit Brabant.

Daalder, S. (1986). Element en structuur: Nederlands toch en doch. *Syntaxis en lexicon. Veertien artikelen bij gelegenheid van het emeritaat van Albert Sassen*, pages 132–156.

De Haan, F. (1998). The category of evidentiality. *Unpublished ms., University of New Mexico*.

DeLancey, S. (2001). The mirative and evidentiality. *Journal of pragmatics*, 33(3):369–382.

Delsing, L.-O. (2010). Exclamatives in scandinavian*. *Studia Linguistica*, 64(1):16–36.

Elliott, D. E. (1971). *The grammar of emotive and exclamatory sentences in English*. PhD thesis, The Ohio State University.

Elliott, D. E. (1974). Toward a grammar of exclamations. *Foundations of language*, 11(2):231–246.

Fries, N. (1988). Ist pragmatik schwer! - Über sogenannte exklamativsätze im deutschen. *Sprache und Pragmatik*, 16(3):193–205.

Garrett, E. J. (2001). *Evidentiality and assertion in Tibetan*. PhD thesis, UCLA.

Grimshaw, J. (1979). Complement selection and the lexicon. *Linguistic inquiry*, 10(2):279–326.

Gutiérrez-Rexach (1996). The semantics of exclamatives. In Garrett, E. and Lee, F., editors, *Syntax at Sunset*, pages 146–162. UCLA Working Papers in linguistics, Los Angeles.

Gutiérrez-Rexach, J. and Andueza, P. (2011). Degree restrictions in spanish exclamatives. In *Selected Proceedings of the 13th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, pages 286–295.

Hogeweg, L., Ramachers, S., and Wottrich, V. (2011). Doch, toch and wel on the table. *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, 28(1):50–60.

Jónsson, J. G. (2010). Icelandic exclamatives and the structure of the cp layer*. *Studia linguistica*, 64(1):37–54.

Kaufman, D. (2010). Exclamatives and temporal nominalizations in austronesian. *Nominalization in Asian languages: diachronic and typological perspectives*, 2:721–755.

Kiparsky, P. and Kiparsky, C. (1968). *Fact*. Linguistics Club, Indiana University.

Krijgsman, K. (1982). Wat-uitroepen en wh-verplaatsing. *GLOT*, 5:123–156.

Li, B. (2006). *Chinese final particles and the syntax of the periphery*. PhD thesis, Leiden University.

Lipták, A. (2005). The left periphery of hungarian exclamatives. *Contributions to the thirtieth Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*, pages 161–183.

Lohndal, T. (2010). Silent elements and some norwegian exclamatives. *Linguistic Analysis*, 34:245–270.

Marandin, J.-M. et al. (2008). The exclamative clause type in french. In *Proceedings of the HPSG Conference*, pages 436–456.

Mayol, L. (2008). Catalan 'déu n'hi do' and levels of meaning in exclamatives. In *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics. Cascadilla Press*. Citeseer.

Ono, H. (2006). *An investigation of exclamatives in English and Japanese: Syntax and sentence processing*. PhD thesis, University of Maryland.

Petersson, D. (2011). Swedish exclamatives are subordinate. *Working Papers in Scandinavian syntax*, 88:169–237.

Potsdam, E. (2011). Expressing exclamatives in malagasy. *Nominalizations in Asian languages: diachronic and typological perspectives*, pages 659–683.

Potts, C. (2007). Into the conventional-implicature dimension. *Philosophy compass*, 2(4):665–679.

Rett, J. (2008). A degree account of exclamatives. In *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, volume 18, pages 601–618.

Rett, J. (2011). Exclamatives, degrees and speech acts. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 34(5):411–442.

Sasai, K. (2006). The structure of modern japanese exclamatory sentences: On the structure of the nanto-type sentence. *Studies in the Japanese language*, 2(1):16–31.

Schermer-Vermeer, E. (1984). De betekenis van het woord toch in samenhang met de rol van intonatie (la signification du mot toch en liaison avec le rôle de l'intonation). In *Forum der letteren*, volume 25, pages 208–219. Smits.

Visan, F. (2000). The nature and the status of exclamatives in chinese. *Unpublished materials. University of Bucharest.*

von Fintel, K. (2004). Would you believe it? the king of france is back!(presuppositions and truth-value intuitions). In Reimer, M. and Bezuidenhout, A., editors, *Descriptions and Beyond*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Yamato, N. (2010). The left periphery of japanese exclamatives*. *Studia Linguistica*, 64(1):55–80.

Zanuttini, R. and Portner, P. (2000). The characterization of exclamative clauses in paduan. *Language*, pages 123–132.

Zanuttini, R. and Portner, P. (2003). Exclamative clauses: At the syntax-semantics interface. *Language*, 79(1):39–81.

Zevakhina, N. (2015). Russian negative exclamatives in a cross-linguistic perspective. *Higher School of Economics Research Paper No. WP BRP*, 21.