The grammar's reflexes of emphasis:
From information structure to the expressive dimension

29-30 September 2014

University of Konstanz

When: 29-30 September 2014
Where: Hofhalde 1 (http://www.hofhalde1.de)

The notion of emphasis has played a role in linguistics for quite some time. Unfortunately, it has not always been entirely clear how to distinguish it from information structural notions such as certain types of focus. Emphasis singles out elements of discourse by making them extra salient, but saliency as such cannot be the distinctive criterion. Behaghel (1932) was perhaps the first to notice that emphasis may be built on focus, but must not be identified with it. Emphasis signals a kind of special emotional commitment on the part of the speaker that makes it likely to be a feature of direct speech. Given that we have much improved knowledge both about information structure and about the so-called "expressive" dimension of language, the goal of this workshop is to explore as closely as possible their similarities, differences, and interactions. From a syntactic point of view, a major question is to what extent these layers of structure are hard-wired in grammar. Are there syntactic categories directly responsible for information structure and for the expressive dimension of language? With respect to information structure, there are at least two approaches which come to rather different conclusions: the cartographic approach (Rizzi 1997 and subsequent work) and the strong modularity hypothesis (Reinhart 2006; Fanselow & Lenertová 2011; Horvath 2010). With respect to the notion of emphasis, it is desirable to delineate the relevant data and to search for the most general theoretical implementation within current syntactic theory and related interface questions. Emphasis, closely related to the notion 'mirativity' (DeLancey 1997; Aikhenvald 2012; Peterson 2013), is signaled phonologically (Niebuhr 2010), by lexical means (e.g. Carrilho 2008; Torrence 2013), but also by word order (Frey 2010; Cruschina 2012). In German, for instance, the question *Wo ist dein Vater?* ('Where is your father?') can be successfully answered by *Er ist im WIRTSHAUS* ('He is in the pub'). The question is what the equally successful answer with PP-preposing, *Im WIRTSHAUS ist er* ('In the PUB he is'), adds to the former. Optional fronting with similar pragmatic effects has also been observed in DPs, in CPs to the specifier of certain complementizers (Bayer 2001; Bayer & Dasgupta 2014), and to the left of focus- as well as discourse particles (Bayer & Obenauer 2011; Trotzke, Turco & Bayer 2014). Formal syntactic approaches have been suggested at least for certain Germanic, Romance, and Indo-Aryan languages.

The workshop will bring together researchers who have been actively involved in work at the crossroad of information structure and the expressive dimension.

Speakers: Josef Bayer (Konstanz), Silvio Cruschina (Vienna), Probal Dasgupta (Kolkata), Gisbert Fanselow (Potsdam), Werner Frey (Berlin), Julia Horvath (Tel Aviv), Andreas Trotzke (Konstanz), Giuseppina Turco (Stuttgart)

Workshop organizers: Josef Bayer & Andreas Trotzke

References

Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2012). 'The essence of mirativity'. *Linguistic Typology* 16: 435-485.

Bayer, J. (2001). 'Asymmetry in emphatic topicalization'. In *Audiatur Vox Sapientiae*, C. Féry & W. Sternefeld (eds.), 15-47. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Bayer, J. & H.-G. Obenauer (2011). 'Discourse particles, clause structure, and question types'. *The Linguistic Review* 28: 449-491.

Bayer, J. & P. Dasgupta (2014). 'Emphatic topicalization and the structure of the left periphery: Evidence from German and Bangla'. To appear in *Syntax*.

Behaghel, O. (1932). *Deutsche Syntax: Eine geschichtliche Darstellung, vol. IV*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.

Carrilho, E. (2008). 'Beyond doubling: Overt expletives in European Portuguese dialects'. In *Microvariation in Syntactic Doubling*, S. Barbiers, O. Koeneman, M. Lekakou & M. van der Ham (eds.), 301-323. Bingley: Emerald.

Cruschina, S. (2012). *Discourse-Related Features and Functional Projections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DeLancey, S. (1997). 'Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information'. *Linguistic Typology* 1: 33-52.

Fanselow, G. & D. Lenertová (2011). 'Left peripheral focus: Mismatches between syntax and information structure'. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29: 169-209.

Frey, W. (2010). 'Ā-movement and conventional implicatures: About the grammatical encoding of emphasis in German'. *Lingua* 120: 1416-1435.

Horvath, J. (2010). '"Discourse features", syntactic displacement and the status of contrast'. *Lingua* 120: 1346-1369.

Niebuhr, O. (2010). 'On the phonetics of intensifying emphasis in German'. *Phonetica* 67: 170-198.

Peterson, T. (2013). 'Rethinking mirativity: The expression and implication of surprise'. Ms., University of Toronto [available at: http://semanticsarchive.net].

Reinhart, T. (2006). *Interface Strategies*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Rizzi, L. (1997). 'The fine structure of the left periphery'. In *Elements of Grammar*, L. Haegeman (ed.), 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Torrence, H. (2013). *The Clause Structure of Wolof: Insights into the Left Periphery*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Trotzke, A., G. Turco & J. Bayer (2014). 'Left peripheral particles, syntactic constituency, and emphasis'. Workshop: *Exploring the Interfaces 3: Prosodic and Constituent Structure*. McGill University, 8-10 May 2014.

WORKSHOP PROGRAM

29 September 2014

10:00 - 11:30	Silvio Cruschina (U Vienna) *Triggers and meanings of focus fronting in Romance*
11:30 - 13:00	Andreas Trotzke (U Konstanz) & Giuseppina Turco (U Stuttgart) *On emphasis and left peripheral discourse particles*
13:00 - 14:30	Lunch
14:30 - 16:00	Probal Dasgupta (Indian Statistical Institute Kolkata) *Intimacy-oriented discourse particles in Bangla: A biaxial account*
16:00 - 17:30	Josef Bayer (U Konstanz) & Probal Dasgupta (Indian Statistical Institute Kolkata) *The architectural unity of emphasis, topic and interrogative marking in Bangla*
19:00 -	Conference dinner at "Weinstube" / Hotel Barbarossa

30 September 2014

10:00 - 11:30	Werner Frey (ZAS, Berlin) *Emphasis makes everything mobile*
11:30 - 13:00	Gisbert Fanselow (U Potsdam) *Object fronting in German and Germanic: Prosody, mirativity, and topic shift*
13:00 - 14:30	Lunch
14:30 - 16:00	Julia Horvath (U Tel Aviv) *Criterial positions or direct interface effects: Movements and emphasis in the syntax of* wh-*exclamatives in Hungarian*
16:00 - 17:30	Round-table discussion

29 September, 10:00 - 11:30
Triggers and meanings of focus fronting in Romance
Silvio Cruschina
University of Vienna

In this presentation I will first give an overview of the recent findings and hypotheses on the interpretive properties associated with Focus Fronting (FF) in Romance, distinguishing between different types of focus (information focus, contrastive/corrective focus, and mirative focus). Not all types of focus allow FF. Rather, the presence or absence of this special syntactic device to mark narrow focus seems to depend on additional or concomitant requirements, leading to a wide range of analyses as for the syntactic, prosodic, or pragmatic nature of the trigger of this operation. It is generally assumed that *contrast* is the interpretive feature associated with FF in Romance (López 2009; see also Rizzi 1997). A different analysis is put forward in Samek-Lodovici (2006), according to which the initial trigger of the derivational steps that lead to the FF configuration is the *givenness* of the superficially postfocal material. Recent work, however, has highlighted that FF is not exclusively limited to contrastive interpretations, and that givenness of the background material is not a necessary condition for FF (cf. Cruschina 2012; Bianchi *et al.* 2014a). FF is also possible with an interpretation of emphasis, surprise or unexpectedness (i.e. mirative focus) in Sicilian, Sardinian, Italian and – arguably – in other Romance varieties such as Portuguese, Spanish, Romanian, and French (cf. Cruschina 2012; Remberger 2014).

Following Bianchi *et al.* (2014a,b), and concentrating on Italian, I will then show that the possibility of having FF with mirative focus goes against the traditional theories of FF based on the notion of contrast or givenness, and that FF must be ultimately analysed as triggered by conventional implicatures (cf. Frey 2010). FF with mirative focus conveys the conventional implicature that there is at least one alternative proposition which is *more likely* than the asserted proposition, and it is this implicature that gives rise to the interpretive effects that are generally described in terms of emphasis, surprise or unexpectedness. The mirative implicature belongs to an *evaluative dimension* of meaning which is supported by dedicated components of the discourse context (i.e. a contextually relevant modal base and a stereotypical ordering source shared by the conversational participants), but not by the common ground. This evaluative meaning differs from Potts's expressive meaning, although they are both separate from the at-issue meaning. I will finally discuss a possible syntactic implementation of this idea, which requires the *syntacticization* of conventional implicatures and their association with focus structures.

References

Bianchi, V., G. Bocci & S. Cruschina (2014a). 'Focus fronting and its implicatures'. To appear in: *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2013: Selected Papers from Going Romance, Amsterdam 2013*, E. Aboh et al. (eds.), Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bianchi, V., G. Bocci & S. Cruschina (2014b). 'Focus fronting, unexpectedness, and the evaluative dimension'. Ms., http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002166.

Cruschina, S. (2012). *Discourse-Related Features and Functional Projections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Frey, W. (2010). 'Ā-Movement and conventional implicatures: About the grammatical encoding of emphasis in German'. *Lingua* 120: 1416-1435.

López, L. (2009). *A Derivational Syntax for Information Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Remberger, E.-M. (2014). 'A comparative look at Focus Fronting in Romance'. In *Left Sentence Peripheries in Spanish*, A. Dufter & À. Octavio de Toledo y Huerta (eds.), 383-418. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Rizzi, L. (1997). 'The fine structure of the left periphery'. In *Elements of Grammar*, L. Haegeman (ed.), 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Samek-Lodovici, V. (2006). 'When right dislocation meets the left-periphery: a unified analysis of Italian non-final Focus'. *Lingua* 116: 836-873.

On emphasis and left peripheral discourse particles
Andreas Trotzke & Giuseppina Turco
University of Konstanz & University of Stuttgart

Discourse particles like German *bloß* (lit. 'only') are generally rooted in a pre-VP/*v*P position (1b). However, various particles can appear as a co-constituent of a *wh*-element in the clausal left periphery (1a), cf. Bayer and Obenauer (2011). In this talk, we will elaborate on the notion of emphasis in the context of configurations such as (1a = the [*wh*+Prt]-construction). In particular, we will first discuss the claim that the [*wh*+Prt]-construction is emphatically marked at a phonetic level and then turn to the hypothesis that the construction conveys an additional emotional/expressive meaning component.

(1) a. [*Warum **bloß***] *ist ein Rauschenberg   so teuer?*
      why   Prt   is a Rauschenberg so expensive
      'Why on earth is a Rauschenberg so expensive?'
   b. *Warum ist ein Rauschenberg **bloß** so teuer?*

We focus on those phonetic correlates that are associated with the notion of emphasis in the context of an expressive/attitudinal evaluation. Since Jakobson's (1960: 354) remarks on "emphatic prolongation," it is well known that the lengthening of consonants (especially fricatives) is distinctive of expressing affect/emotion (cf. *vvverdammt!*; Corver 2013). Recently, strategies such as strengthening of the word onset, duration of the nucleus, among others, have been subject to critical scrutiny in work that investigates phonetic cues conveying the expression of affect/emotion (Kohler 2005; Niebuhr 2010). We designed a reading study with eight paragraphs containing monosyllabic *wh*-elements adjacent to particles (e.g., *Wen nur*; [*wh*+Prt]) and 8 paragraphs with the same monosyllabic elements not adjacent to the particle (i.e. [*wh*/Prt]), cf. (1b). We tested whether the duration of the vocalic nucleus and/or of the word onset of the *wh*-element were longer in [*wh*+Prt] condition than in [wh/Prt] condition. We also included 8 paragraphs with *wh*-elements followed by adjacent and non-adjacent prepositional phrases (cf. [***Wo bei Euch***] *kann ich heute* […] vs. ***Wo** kann ich heute **bei Euch*** […], 'Where can I today at your place'). Results show that in [*wh*+Prt]-condition, the nucleus was significantly longer than in the other three critical conditions, (*wh*/Prt, [*wh*+PP], *wh*/PP). This difference was even more pronounced with duration of the word onset and of the nucleus as a function of condition.

Based on our phonetic evidence, we investigate the claim that the [*wh*+Prt]-construction conveys an additional emotional/expressive meaning. We will first discuss obvious parallels with other 'expressive' constructions like English *wh-the-hell* questions (Pesetsky 1987). While a regular *wh*-phrase can stay in situ (cf. *Wer kauft was?* 'Who bought what?'), it is impossible that [*wh*+Prt] occurs in this position (cf. **Wer kauft was bloß?*). In contrast to both the *wh*-element and the particle, the [*wh*+Prt]-constituent must occur in the Force domain of the clause. We will then turn to the finding that the [*wh*+Prt]-construction is incompatible with 'Surprise-Disapproval Questions', cf. (2)/(3).

(2) a. *Wie siehst du   **denn** aus?!* (3) a. *Was lachst du   **denn** so dumm?!*
      how   look you Prt   out   what laugh you Prt   so stupidly
      'You look strange/weird/…'   'Why do you laugh so stupidly?!'
   b. **[Wie **denn**] siehst du aus?!*   b. **[Was **denn**] lachst du so dumm?!*

In (2b)/(3b), the *wh*-element does not bind a variable in the sense of a regular *wh*-interrogative. In other words, given the readings in (2a)/(3a), the *wh*-items cannot occur in in-situ focus positions (**Wer hat denn WIE ausgesehen?/*Wer hat denn WAS so dumm gelacht?*). We thus see that the interpretation of the [*wh*+Prt]-construction cannot apply to exclamative question types where the *wh*-item lacks semantic alternatives. We will discuss this observation in light of recent proposals analyzing emphasis as a conventional implicature that refers to an ordering different from the ordering based on truthfulness (Frey 2010) or, more precisely, as comparative likelihood based on distinct alternative propositions (Bianchi *et al.* 2014).

References

Bayer, J. & H.-G. Obenauer (2011). 'Discourse particles, clause structure, and question types'. *The Linguistic Review* 28: 449-491.

Bianchi, V., G. Bocci & S. Cruschina (2014). 'Focus fronting, unexpectedness, and the evaluative dimension'. Ms., http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002166.

Corver, N. (2013). Affective information packaging in the nominal domain. Workshop: *NP Syntax and Information Structure (DGfS 2013)*. University of Potsdam, 13-15 March 2013.

Frey, W. (2010). 'Ā-movement and conventional implicatures: About the grammatical encoding of emphasis in German'. *Lingua* 120: 1416-1435.

Jakobson, R. (1960). 'Closing statements: Linguistics and poetics'. In *Style in Language*, T. A. Sebeok (ed.), 350-377. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Kohler, K. J. (2005). 'Timing and communicative functions of pitch contours', *Phonetica* 62: 88-105.

Niebuhr, O. (2010). 'On the phonetics of intensifying emphasis in German'. *Phonetica* 67: 170-198.

Pesetsky, D. (1987). '*Wh*-in-situ: Movement and unselective binding'. In *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, E. Reuland & A. ter Meulen (eds.), 98-129. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

29 September, 14:30 - 16:00

Intimacy-oriented discourse particles in Bangla: A biaxial account
Probal Dasgupta
Indian Statistical Institute Kolkata

The properties of discourse particles in Bangla are now undergoing closer study that contributes to our understanding of the syntagmatic architecture of the clause. The subcategory of IODPs or Intimacy-Oriented Discourse Particles, identified decades ago as 'modulators', turns out to involve a paradigmatic dimension as well. IODPs are oriented to the intimacy level of the relationship between the speaker and the addressee. At what shall be called the *voustoyer* level in a ternary system, Bangla uses the particle /go/; at the *tutoyer* level, it uses /re/; the facts are classically clear if markers showing intimacy levels are present in the clause:

(1) *tumi   hOTat   cole aSbe   SeTa to   bujhtei parini   go*
    voustu suddenly will.show.up that Prt   didn't know   GO
    'I didn't know GO that you (= voustu) would suddenly show up.'

(2) *tui   hOTat   cole aSbi   SeTa to   bujhtei parini   re*
    tu   suddenly will.show.up that Prt   didn't know   RE
    'I didn't know RE that you (= tu) would suddenly show up.'

The facts under those circumstances are as follows. IODPs immediately follow either a root clause finite verb as in (1)-(2) or an interrogative constituent as in (3)-(4):

(3) *kEno go   tumi   e   kOthagulo barbar   bolei colecho?*
    why   GO   voustu these points   repeatedly are.making
    'Why GO are you (= voustu) repeating these points?'

(4) *kEno re   tui e   kOthagulo barbar   bolei colechiS?*
    why   RE   tu these points   repeatedly are.making
    'Why RE are you (= tu) repeating these points?'

There are some wrinkles that have to do with the zero-copula construction, which are reserved for the talk itself. But they don't affect the main point. The main point is that there are sentences that carry no markers of voustoyer or tutoyer and yet license /go, re/ and that these sentences place the IODPs in the same niches:

(5) *uni   hOTat   cole aSben   SeTa to   bujhtei parini   go*
    he.Hon suddenly will.show.up that Prt   didn't know   GO
    'I didn't know GO that he.Hon would suddenly show up.'

(6) *uni   hOTat   cole aSben   SeTa to   bujhtei parini   re*
he.Hon suddenly will.show.up that Prt   didn't know   RE
'I didn't know RE that he.Hon would suddenly show up.'

(7) *kEno go   uni   e   kOthagulo   barbar   bolei colechen?*
why GO   he.Hon these points   repeatedly is.making
'Why GO is he.Hon repeating these points?'

(8) *kEno re   uni   e   kOthagulo   barbar   bolei colechen?*
why RE   he.Hon these points   repeatedly is.making
'Why RE is he.Hon repeating these points?'

A biaxial (syntagmatic and paradigmatic) account of these facts, elaborated in this study, takes a simple, syntagmatic account of (1)-(4) as its point of departure. Building on this foundation, such an account draws on independently motivated transderivational devices introduced in earlier work, *Look Across* and *Juxtapose*, and constrain them to ensure that they deliver the results for (5)-(8). The emphasis-theoretic emphasis of the study becomes clear at examples like (9) and (10):

(9) * *kEno   go   sala   uni   e   kOthagulo   barbar   bolei colechen?*
why   GO   the.fuck he.Hon these points   repeatedly is.making
* 'Why GO the fuck is he.Hon repeating these points?'

(10) *kEno   re   sala   uni   e   kOthagulo   barbar   bolei colechen?*
why   RE   the.fuck he.Hon these points   repeatedly is.making
'Why RE the fuck is he.Hon repeating these points?'

The contrast between ungrammatical (9) and grammatical (10) shows that invective can accompany interrogation only when one is speaking on terms of full intimacy. The account of IODPs proposed in this study places this contrast on the architectural map. Interactions with Q-/ba/ facts familiar from earlier work will also be considered in this presentation.

29 September, 16:00 - 17:30
The architectural unity of emphasis, topic and interrogative marking in Bangla
Josef Bayer & Probal Dasgupta
University of Konstanz & Indian Statistical Institute Kolkata

Going beyond the debate of whether discourse semantic effects of word order and intonation (information structure) are part of the computational system of language, we want to take a look at (a selected part of) the expressive side of meaning and compare it with core parts of propositional ("at-issue") meaning. Bangla (South-Asian, Indo-Aryan) is an interesting language to look at in this respect. Bangla has a system of enclitic particles that cuts across the dividing line between "components" of the grammar. In the propositional dimension one may look at interrogative marking (the particle *ki*), in the dimension of information structure at topic marking (the particle *to*), and in the expressive dimension at emphasis marking (the complementizer/particle *je*). We will provide sketches of the grammar of *ki*, *to* and *je*, showing that they are closely similar if not identical in their distribution: (i) they are enclitic particles, i.e. they cannot appear clause initially; (ii) their occurrence is clause-type dependent; (iii) they attract syntactic constituents XP which denote members of a set of semantic alternatives, in which case XP has narrow focus or (iv) they attract the entire proposition TP, in which case TP has broad focus; (v) they must be locally accessible to the root clause, most likely to the representation of illocutionary force; (vi) they succeed in the preverbal domain but (generally) crash in the postverbal domain. These properties unite the particles (and certainly not only these) under a single syntactic architecture by which the SOV-language Bangla appears to employ a hierarchy of pre-VP functional heads. Bangla is particularly interesting because it shows great freedom in displacing constituents to the post-verbal domain. The language embraces a Dravidian and an Indo-Aryan system of clausal complementation. Finite clauses corresponding to *ki*-clauses as familiar from Hindi arise only in the post-verbal domain. In this domain they are immobile and cannot extend their scope or the

scope of elements arising in such clauses. This can be shown both for interrogative scope and for the scope of emphatic marking.

This makes a point in favor of a single computational system that equally pervades areas of discourse semantics. On the other hand, all these particles seem to be optional. Bangla can have topics without *to*, interrogatives without *ki*, and emphatic statements without *je*. So what does this overt functional structure actually contribute? It seems highly unlikely that language affords "synonymy" in this domain. We will leave it for the general discussion to shed more light on this question.

30 September, 10:00 - 11:30
Emphasis makes everything mobile
Werner Frey
ZAS, Berlin

The starting point of the talk will be elements which cannot undergo normal scrambling in the German middle field, but which can be reordered under emphasis if an emphatic interpretation and an 'emphatic prosody' are possible for them (e.g. resultatives). This leads to postulation of a process of emphatic movement (EM) in the middle field. It will be argued that EM, in contrast to standard scrambling, is a root-phenomenon (i.e. it is only possible in root clauses and in embedded clauses in root contexts) due to the (potential) speaker's commitment to the emphasis marking. This will, amongst others, be demonstrated with regard to central and peripheral adverbial clauses. In contrast to scrambling, EM is necessarily reconstructed for phenomena like binding and scope.

30 September, 11:30 - 13:00
Object fronting in German and Germanic: Prosody, mirativity, and topic shift
Gisbert Fanselow
University of Potsdam

In this talk, I plan to compare contrastive and non-contrastive object fronting in German and other Germanic languages. For the non-contrastive case, I will first present experimental evidence showing that deaccentuation of the subject is the crucial factor licensing object fronting. Furthermore, we argue that mirativity (exemplified by predicatibility) plays no role in determining the acceptability of object fronting, neither in the contrastive nor in the non-contrastive case – this is suggested by a series of experiments we have carried out. The fronting of a stressed object across an accented subject is, however, nevertheless possible under certain conditions. One of these seems to be the function of initiating a topic shift, a point we also corroborate by experimental evidence. We will round up the discussion by a brief look at Swedish, Icelandic, and Yiddish data.

30 September, 14:30 - 16:00
Criterial positions or direct interface effects: Movements and emphasis in the syntax of *wh*-exclamatives in Hungarian
Julia Horvath
Tel Aviv University

The talk will explore the controversy over what types of notions are encoded in the Computational System by functional heads such that they can act as "triggers" of syntactic displacement (internal Merge), and what syntactic phenomena (if any) are attributable directly to interface needs/effects. Taking as a starting point my analysis of *wh*-interrogatives in Hungarian (Horvath 2013) and its relation to a syntactic exhaustivity operator – EI-Op, and a corresponding clausal functional head – that I posited originally for (the Hungarian-type) "Focus-movement", the talk will compare and contrast these interrogatives with the syntax of exclamatives.

Specifically, *wh*-exclamatives (and in main clauses also a particular non-*wh* exclamative) undergo apparently obligatory preposing in Hungarian. The language has a well-known series of left-peripheral (pre-verbal) quantificational and aspectual positions, a situation prima facie supporting a rich cartographic approach involving various "criterial" positions targeted by movements – in the sense of Rizzi (1997; 2004). Yet, some suggestive contrasts attested in the language turn out to challenge the feasability of any simple application of such an account. The range of surface positions exhibited by subtypes of exclamatives will provide the basis for the reassessment of uniformly criterial representations proposed for Force as a functional head and related movements by Rizzi's cartographic approach to clause structure, and will suggest drawing a set of finer distinctions as to what may be responsible for the kinds of movements involved.

The conclusions that the contrast between interrogatives and exclamatives leads to reinforce Horvath's (2010) claim about discourse notions not being syntactically encoded but involving interface induced, syntactically optional, movements. The movements attested in Hungarian exclamatives are not unified by a particular "trigger" (a dedicated functional head, such as a Force head), as would be expected under a criterial approach, and crucially, nor are they unified by a particular surface position – as would be the case if they were induced by some designated interpretive template of information structure. Rather exclamatives appear to involve movements that relate directly to an interface need for "emphasis" and specifically, to its PF implementation by (the unmarked assignment of) nuclear stress. They turn out to be distinct from the syntactic manifestations of (information) focus and of the derivation of a set of alternatives, as well as distinct from the syntax of any particular quantificational operator (such as exhaustivity, involved in what has often been termed "contrastive" or "identificational" focus – the EI-operator of Horvath 2000; 2007; 2013). The paper will thus aim to derive insights from the empirical domain of exclamatives, which at least prima facie, will contribute not only to the rich cartography versus interface effects debate, but also to our understanding of the status and functioning of emphasis, as syntactically distinct from known notions of information structure and scope.