

Review by Xavier Villalba

Does the paper make a novel contribution to the understanding of the topic under investigation? [max 250 words]*

Yes, certainly. It offers a clear analysis of se-exclamatives in Italian which opens new lines of research for similar constructions across Romance.

Is the empirical content of the paper sound (i.e. the data are collected and presented properly, the experiments are well designed, the statistics is well done, the examples contain no spelling mistakes, etc)? [max 400 words]*

The data are sound and have been collected properly. I would suggest adding some short comments on the productivity and extension of the construction.

Is the argument coherent and sound, with no major flaws and/or shortcomings, within the context of the theoretical assumptions made by the author? [max 500 words]*

Yes, the argumentation is sound, and well-grounded on data. The whole proposal is theoretically sound.

Are there any relevant scholarly works that have been overlooked by the author? If the answer is YES, please provide the full references.*

I suggest having a look at works on insubordination and exclamatives:

Gras, Pedro & María Sol Sansiñena. 2017. Exclamatives in the functional typology of insubordination: Evidence from complement insubordinate constructions in Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 115. 21–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.04.005>.

Trotzke, Andreas & Xavier Villalba. 2021. Expressive insubordination. In Andreas Trotzke & Xavier Villalba (eds.), *Expressive Meaning Across Linguistic Levels and Frameworks*, 108–120. Oxford University Press.

Have you seen this paper, its content, the proposed analysis, or the conclusions published in other venues? [If your answer is YES, please add the relevant reference.]*

No.

If you accept the paper with minor revisions, please list the revisions you would advice (you are not required to proofread the paper) [max 500 words]

In the discussion of (17), one should have in mind that ESC might work like typical conversational implicature. Note for example the case of a declarative answer to 17A: *Ti chiami ogni fine-settimana!* The meaning of this utterance must be interpreted in context, so we generate the implicature that 17A cannot be true. What distinguishes such a case from ESC is the surprise meaning. Hence, it would be nice to have some connection between ESC and conversational implicatures. Note the comment on p. 17: "This flexibility means that the same ESC might be interpreted differently depending on the surrounding context or the shared knowledge between the speaker and listener." This is precisely what happens with

conversational implicatures. By the way, an example of this variable interpretation would reinforce the claim.

I disagree with the interpretation of (40). Regardless of the fact that the speaker might be asking for confirmation or just expressing surprise, the answers are felicitous as expression of the commitment of the hearer towards the truth of the proposition.

Regarding (39) I would not talk about ungrammaticality, but rather about infelicity.