

## SYNTACTIC STRATEGIES OF EXCLAMATIVES

**Natalia Zevakhina**

*National Research University Higher School of Economics,  
Moscow*

**Abstract.** The study presented in this paper has two aims. First, it establishes pragma-semantic features of exclamations and exclamatives relying on three formulated approaches – a constructional approach, a presupposition approach, and a scalarity approach, and suggests distinguishing proper exclamatives, the syntactic structures of which are conventionally associated with an illocutionary force of expressivity, from improper ones that do not have such an association. Second, involving the data of 45 languages, the paper reveals and describes 5 syntactic strategies of exclamatives, which are as follows: subject-verb inversion, subordinate clauses, noun phrases, anaphoric adverbs and adjectives, and wh-phrases. The latter three are further divided into several sub-strategies.

**Keywords:** exclamatives, exclamations, syntactic strategies, semantics of exclamatives, pragmatics of exclamatives, pragma-syntactic status of exclamatives

**DOI:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2013.4.2.09>

### 1. Introduction

*Exclamations* exemplified in (1a) – (1c) express the speaker's emotional state towards some state of affairs that does not meet her expectations. There are a number of pragma-semantic distinctions between exclamations like (1a) and (1b), which are additionally called *exclamatives*, and exclamations like (1c). The distinctions are dealt with in sections 2.1–2.2. Afterwards, the paper focuses on syntactic strategies of exclamatives in 45 languages.

- (1) English
  - a. *The way he looks at me!*
  - b. *What a big house you have!*
  - c. *He has come!*

The data of some of the world's languages on exclamatives are captured in the following papers: English in Elliott (1974), Grimshaw (1979) and Rett (2008), German in Fries (1988) and Brandner (2010), the Scandinavian languages in Delsing (2010) and Jónsson (2010),

French in Marandin (2008), Italian and Venetian in Portner and Zanuttini (2003), Catalan in Miró-Castroviejo (2006, 2008) and in Vilalba (2001) among others; Japanese in Ono (2006), Mandarin Chinese in Visan (2000), Hungarian in Lipták (2006), the North-Caucasian languages in Kalinina (2011), and the Austronesian languages in Kaufman (2010), Potsdam (2011) and Moyses-Faurie (2011) among others. The aforementioned studies take into account these data and develop various theoretical approaches for them. These data (and some new data) can serve as a good empirical platform for the next step in investigating exclamatives, which is a study of the *basic syntactic strategies* of exclamatives in the world's languages. Notably, such a study has not been developed so far. In my view, the explanation for that is twofold.

The first and foremost reason deals with the *notion of exclamation*. As A. Moutaouakil notes, "it is hard to find in traditional grammars a unique and precise definition of exclamation" (Moutaouakil 2005: 351). The problem is that since the prominent paper by J. Searle (1969) there has been little research undertaken on the theory of speech acts, in particular expressive speech acts (but see Miró-Castroviejo (2008)). Due to its vagueness, exclamation appears to be a rather complex topic for a study involving the data of a single language, let alone a cross-linguistic study.

The second reason lies in the fact that existent theories vary to a great extent and so far there has not been a *general theory* of exclamatives offered. As T. Oda observes, "at present, there seems to be no comprehensive research on exclamatives, and each author is working on his own framework" (Oda 2008: 216). As a consequence, from a cross-linguistic perspective, Potsdam rightly points out that "exclamatives are not prominent in typological work" (Potsdam 2011: 660).

The issues raised above determine the consequent goals and organization of the paper. In section 2, on the basis of three differentiated approaches, I define exclamations and exclamatives in pragma-semantic terms. In section 3, my aim is to reveal and describe basic syntactic strategies of exclamatives attested to in 45 languages. However, in this paper I don't purport to detect genetically or areally based implications and correlations. Rather, I determine syntactic strategies in a theoretical perspective and leave the typological issue for future research. Section 4 concludes the paper.

The current study involved the data of 45 genetically and areally divergent languages that belong to 11 language families (according to the classification of language families in Lewis et al. 2013), see Appendix for the full list of languages. The data were borrowed from

grammatical descriptions as well as from papers devoted to exclamatives (some of them are listed in the second paragraph of this paper). In addition, some data were collected from native speakers. In the latter case, all such examples are marked with [attested]. Data on the Russian language were taken from the National Corpus of the Russian language.

## 2. Exclamatives vs. exclamations

In this section, I give a brief overview of the two principal directions in research on exclamatives. The first one concerns a pragma-syntactic status of exclamatives in comparison to other sentence types (declaratives, interrogatives among others). The second one is comprised of pragma-semantic features of exclamatives and exclamations in general. In what follows, I develop an approach that benefits from the theories discussed in sections 2.1 and 2.2.

### 2.1. Pragma-syntactic status of exclamatives

According to Searle (1979: 29), expressive illocutionary acts are to “express the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about a state of affairs specified in the propositional content”. In other words, by using expressive speech acts “we express our feelings and attitudes” (ibid.). However, as Miró-Castroviejo (2008: 43) points out, J. Searle is silent about whether exclamations form a subset of expressive speech acts. Rather, he states that these are illocutionary acts that are introduced by a performative verb, e.g., *thank*, *congratulate*, *apologize*, *condole*, *deplore* and *welcome* (ibid.: 44). In addition, Miró-Castroviejo (ibid.: 44) claims that exclamations cannot be singled out on the basis of the seven parameters for illocutionary acts introduced by J. Searle (cf. Searle (1969: 77)).

Exclamations are widely acknowledged as utterances that express a speaker’s emotional states and are intonationally marked (see Michaelis (2001: 1038) and Morel (1995: 63)). In this paper, I discuss only pragma-semantic characteristics of exclamations (see section 2.2), leaving out the issue of their prosodic features. I strongly believe that this, being a separate topic, deserves a special investigation.

Exclamatives, being viewed as a subset of exclamations (see section 2.2), are analogous to declaratives, interrogatives and imperatives (cf. Sadock and Zwicky (1985), Koenig and Siemund (2007)). The idea is that there is a conventional association between an illocutionary force and a syntactic form, which is called *syntactic*

*force* (Chierchia and McConnell-Ginet 1990). To illustrate, English yes/no interrogatives like *Could you raise this heavy box?* convey an illocutionary force of asking for information, which is the most common and natural for questions. In contrast, interrogatives of the same form like *Could you pass the salt?* express an illocutionary force of a request / command, which is typical of imperatives. As far as exclamatives are concerned, they signify an illocutionary force of expressivity. To illustrate, utterances like (1a) – (1b) are only used as expressive speech acts.

Clear as it may be, I am not entirely convinced with this proposal and find it rather simplified, merely because constructions exemplified in (1a) – (1b) necessitate differentiation. They cannot be treated in the very same way since expressions like (1a) might be uttered, e.g., as elliptical answers to questions (see Schwabe (2004) for more details), whereas expressions like (1b) may only be used as exclamations. On the basis of this observation, I suggest to single out *proper exclamatives* among exclamatives<sup>1</sup>. The former constructions correspond to the illocutionary force of expressivity. In other words, they are conventionally associated with it.

Another essential question with respect to improper exclamatives is that they are not elliptical. It is entirely implausible to recover an initial syntactic form of exclamatives because there is no initial form. However, some of the syntactic strategies of exclamatives discussed below are considered to have syntactic structures identical to subordinate ones (see section 4.4). As was noted in Grosz (2011), exclamatives resemble optatives in this respect.

In what follows, I will discuss syntactic strategies of improper exclamatives. Unfortunately, there is not enough space here to discuss proper exclamatives that seem to use various syntactic structures and, therefore, syntactic strategies for proper exclamatives among various languages seem hard to examine these strategies.

## 2.2. Pragma-semantic features of exclamations and exclamatives

In this section, I will provide an overview of three theoretical approaches to studying exclamatives and formulate pragma-semantic features of exclamatives and exclamations.

---

1 Let us call the rest *improper exclamatives*. I thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing out that in fact improper exclamatives are only syntactically improper (for example, they can be questions or exclamatives) and if intonation has been taken into account, the polyfunctionality of the sentence disappears.

There is a number of theoretical studies on pragmatics and semantics of exclamatives. To the best of my knowledge, I can name three main prolific approaches. The first one, which might be called the *constructional approach*, was offered mainly on the basis of the English data within the framework of Construction Grammar by L. Michaelis and K. Lambrecht (see their joint paper (1996) and Michaelis (2001)). This approach focuses on two types of English exclamatives like (1a) and (1b) and proposes the following pragmatic-semantic features (cf. Michaelis (2001: 1041)):

- (i) Presupposed open proposition (with a degree as the variable).
- (ii) Expression of commitment to a particular scalar extent.
- (iii) Expression of affective stance toward the scalar extent.
- (iv) Person deixis (judge is the speaker by default).
- (v) Identifiability of the referent of whom the scalar property is predicated.

The second approach may be coined as the *presupposition approach*. It was developed in the papers of P. Portner and R. Zanuttini (the best known is their 2003 paper). The authors conducted a comparative investigation of wh-exclamatives in English, Italian and Venetian. Their primary concern is wh-exclamatives and P. Portner and R. Zanuttini confront them with wh-interrogatives, revealing semantic similarities in terms of alternative propositions. The only differentiating feature is that propositions of wh-exclamatives, unlike wh-interrogatives, are ranked and once an exclamation is uttered, its proposition widens a presupposed set of alternative propositions. The authors also compare wh-exclamatives with declaratives and find out that wh-exclamatives cannot be used as answers to questions (*How tall is John? – #How tall John is!*).

The third approach, which I call the *scalarity approach*, is articulated by E. Miró-Castroviejo in her 2008 paper and J. Rett in her 2008 paper. The authors' treatment of exclamatives is rather different from the discussed ones (partly due to peculiarities of the data). The former paper discusses Catalan data and the latter one considers English data. However, both approaches agree upon the idea that exclamatives are scalar and necessitate the use of gradable constituents (cf. a gradable adjective in (1b)).

In what follows, I suggest combining the features of exclamatives differentiated in the three theoretical approaches. Remarkably, exclamations are not considered by any of these approaches, but I think we need to regard them as well.

To start with, the general features of all exclamations, expression of affective stance, which was proposed by the constructional

approach and which might be called *emotionality*, characterizes all exclamations, not only exclamatives. Second, person deixis is typical of all exclamations rather than of exclamatives only. I also add expression of the speaker's subjective attitude towards the proposition and, as a consequence, we get *first egocentricity* in terms of Padučeva (1996). Third, Moutaouakil contested the necessary presence of the listener in exclamatory situations, but I am not entirely convinced with his arguments. If we view exclamations as speech acts, then the listener is required by default, according to J. Austin's speech acts theory (see Austin 1962). In other words, *perlocution* (listener's reaction to the speaker's utterance) counts as well. These three features – emotionality, first egocentricity and perlocution – are attributes of exclamations and, in particular, exclamatives. I would not say that they are the only features of exclamations (see Miró-Castroviejo 2008 for a fuller arsenal) but, with respect to the afore-mentioned literature, I intended to show first that they are necessary characteristics of exclamations and second, that they are necessary characteristics of exclamations in general (not only of exclamatives).

Now let us move to the discussion of the exclamatives' features<sup>2</sup>. To begin with, both the constructional approach and the scalar one assume that exclamatives are scalar. The idea behind this is that values of a contextually determined attribute can semantically be represented as a set of scalar degrees ordered from the ones the speaker expects to the ones the speaker does not expect. Let us call this feature *scalarity*. To illustrate, if one exclaims *What a big house I saw!*, the degree of the actual house's large size the speaker observes is higher than the degree the speaker expected. On the basis of this feature, presupposition and assertion conditions can be stated. As the constructional approach formulates the presupposition condition rather formally and lacks the assertion conditions, in my view, the presupposed part of exclamatives is that the speaker has some expectations about a scalar degree of an attribute of a particular object or situation. Respectively, the assertion is that the real state of affairs observed by the speaker doesn't meet her expectations (i.e. a scalar degree of an attribute of a particular object or situation is higher than the speaker has expected). Second, as the presupposition approach noted, exclamatives are infelicitous as direct answers to questions (*How tall is John? – # How tall John is!*). However, exclamatives are felicitous as indirect answers to questions (*Do you think I will find a job? – # How naive you are!*, borrowed from Miró-Castroviejo (2008: 50) and translated from

---

2 As a matter of fact, the following features might characterize all types of exclamations but they are only obligatory for exclamatives.

Catalan). I suggest calling this feature *weak informativity*<sup>3</sup>. Third, the constructional approach reveals that identifiability of the referent of whom the scalar property is predicated is a characteristic of exclamatives, and I name this feature as *referentiality*, meaning that a referent, which might be an object or a situation, should be accessible in discourse.

### 3. Basic strategies of exclamatives

In this section, I reveal and describe five strategies of exclamatives witnessed in 45 studied languages. They are as follows:

- (i) Subject-verb inversion
  - a. degree subject-verb inversion;
  - b. polar subject-verb inversion.
- (ii) Anaphoric adjectives and adverbs.
- (iii) Wh-phrases.
- (iv) Subordinate clauses
  - a. 'that'-clauses;
  - b. participles;
  - c. indirect questions;
  - d. infinitives.
- (v) Noun phrases
  - a. noun phrases with relative clauses;
  - b. noun phrases without relative clauses;
  - c. nominalizations.

Some of them might be additionally partitioned into sub-strategies on the basis of semantic or syntactic features. In what follows, I discuss them in the very same order as they are listed above.

Before starting discussing the strategies, I suggest that all the strategies and sub-strategies can be divided into two groups in terms of degree vs. polar scalarity. The degree variety can semantically be represented on a scale with an infinite number of scale points, and the asserted scale point has to be much higher on that scale than the presupposed one; whereas the polar variety is characterized with two scale points – one is presupposed and the other is asserted. According to this distinction, the degree constructions are the following: degree subject-verb inversion constructions, constructions with anaphoric adjectives and adverbs, constructions with wh-phrases, subordinate

---

3 Following Miró-Castroviejo (2008), by informativity I mean that exclamatives uttered change the Common Ground of the interlocutors. However, since exclamatives are infelicitous as direct answers to questions and, in this function, cannot change the Common Ground, I suggest that exclamatives have a feature called *weak informativity*.

clauses (except for ‘that’-clauses and infinitives), and noun phrases. Polar constructions made up the rest: polar subject-verb inversion constructions and subordinate clauses (‘that’-clauses and infinitives).

### 3.1. Strategy 1: Subject-verb inversion

The first strategy of exclamatives involves subject-verb inversion, which is similar to the one used in yes/no questions in languages like English. This strategy is divided into two sub-strategies: degree subject-verb inversion and polar subject-verb inversion. The difference between them concerns their scalarity (see also discussion in the previous section).

#### *Sub-strategy 1: Degree subject-verb inversion*

This sub-strategy was witnessed in the Germanic languages (English, German, Dutch, Danish, Swedish), Estonian, Mandarin Chinese and Chukchi. The following examples from German, Swedish and Estonian give an impression of what this type of exclamatives looks like.

- (2) German [Brandner 2010: 84]  
**Hat der sich aufgeregt!**  
 AUX.3SG DF.NOM.SG REFL worry.PASS.PTCP  
 ‘Did he worry!’ (conveying the meaning ‘To what extent he worried!’)
- (3) Swedish [Delsing 2010: 24]  
**Har jag jobbat i dag!**  
 AUX.PRS I work.SUP today  
 ‘Have I worked today!’ (conveying the meaning ‘For how long I have worked today!’)
- (4) Estonian [Erelt 2003: 101]  
**Ole-d sina alles tubli!**  
 be.PRS-2SG you.NOM PTCL diligent  
 ‘Are you diligent!’ (conveying the meaning ‘How diligent you are!’)

It is noteworthy that the scalarity feature (at least in German) imposes restrictions on the type of predicate used. The latter has to denote a process but not a result. The reason for this is that a process is continuous and, therefore, can semantically be represented on a degree scale, whereas a result combines an achievement of an action with a following state. This explains why the German verb *rennen* ‘run’ in the past passive form, which denotes a process, is felicitous in (5a),



whilst the German verb *gehen* ‘go’ in the past passive form, which denotes a result of the event, is unacceptable in (5b).

- (5) German [Brandner 2010: 98]  
 a. *Ist der gerannt!*  
 be.PRS.3SG DF.NOM.SG run.PASS.PTCP  
 ‘The way he ran!’  
 b. \**Ist der gegangen!*  
 be.PRS.3SG DF.NOM.SG go.PASS.PTCP  
 ‘The way he came!’

*Sub-strategy 2: Polar subject-verb inversion*

This sub-strategy was only revealed in German (in my sample). This type of a construction is described by P. Grosz (2011). It is peculiar that such constructions can be used only with particles like *doch glatt* and that they presuppose one degree out of two polar degrees on a scale and assert the other degree.

- (6) German [Grosz 2011: 41–43]  
 a. *Kennt der doch glatt*  
 know.PRS.3SG DF.NOM.SG PTCL PTCL  
*den Kaiser von China!*  
 DF.ACC.SG emperor PREP China  
 ‘(I am struck that) he knows the emperor of China!’  
 b. *Hat der doch glatt getanzt!*  
 AUX.3SG DF.NOM.SG PTCL PTCL dance.PASS.PTCP  
 ‘(I am struck that) he danced!’

### 3.2. Strategy 2: Anaphoric adjectives and adverbs

Following Michaelis (2001), I use the notion of anaphoric adverbs to refer to words like *so* in English<sup>4</sup>. L. Michaelis calls such adverbs anaphoric in a sense that “both anaphoric and cataphoric uses involve a word whose interpretation requires the hearer to find an appropriate reference point in the conversational context” (ibid.: 1044). I believe adjectives like the English *such* can also be called anaphoric and discussed here.

Below there are examples from English, Russian, Mandarin Chinese and Nanai.

4 Michaelis (2001: 1039–1041) points out that anaphoric adverbs are distinct from degree adverbs like *very*. The former can refer to the previous context, whereas the latter cannot, cf.:

- a. I almost fainted, the sun was so hot.  
 b. \* I almost fainted, the sun was very hot.

- (7) English [Michaelis 2001: 1040]  
*It is so hot!*
- (8) Russian [attested]  
*Miša takoj bol'šoj!*  
 Miša such.NOM big.NOM  
 'Miša is so big!'
- (9) Mandarin Chinese [Visan 2000: 9]  
*Zhème liáng-de shuǐ!*  
 so/such cold-ADJ water  
 'Water is so cold!'
- (10) Nanai [attested]  
*Tuj turgən tutu-j-ni ag-si!*  
 so quick run-PTCP.NPST-POSS.3SG elder.brother-your  
 'Your brother runs so quickly!'

### 3.3. Strategy 3: Wh-phrases

This strategy is well-spread in the Indo-European languages (Germanic, Romance, Slavic), Altaic and Uralic languages as well as in Basque, Georgian and Kannada<sup>5</sup>. The following examples from French, Kannada, Georgian, Turkish and Hungarian as well as from English in (1b) represent this strategy. As is clearly seen from these examples, languages use various wh-words.

- (11) French [Elliott 1974: 244]  
*Quelles belles maisons il a acheté!*  
 what.F.PL beautiful.F.PL house.PL he AUX.SG buy.PASS.PTCP  
 'What pretty houses he bought!'
- (12) Kannada [Schiffman 1983: 109]  
*Ad eST cennaag-ide!*  
 this how.much good-be.PRS.3SG  
 'How good it is!'
- (13) Georgian [attested]  
*Vin mova xval čventan!*  
 who come.FUT.3SG tomorrow to.us  
 'Who will come to us tomorrow!'

5 However, according to Potsdam (2011), this strategy is not present in the Austronesian languages in contrast to the fifth strategy that involves noun phrases.

- (14) Hungarian [Lipták 2006: 346]  
**Mi esett meg ebben a faluban!**  
 what happen.PST.3SG PV this.INE DF village.INE  
 ‘What happened in this village!’

- (15) Turkish [attested]  
**Bugün nere-ler-de-ydi-m!**  
 today where-PL-LOC-PST-1SG  
 ‘Where I have been today!’

### 3.4. Strategy 4: Subordinate clauses

This strategy can be partitioned into four sub-strategies: ‘that’-clauses, participles, indirect questions and infinitives. In what follows, I present them in this order.

#### *Sub-strategy 1: ‘that’-clauses*

This sub-strategy involves complementizers that express the meaning ‘that’, which introduces subordinate clauses, and is presented in the Indo-European languages (English, German, Danish, Swedish and French) and in Hungarian. It is illustrated in the following examples from English, German, Swedish and Hungarian.

- (16) English [Quirk et al. 1985: 841]  
***That he should have left without asking me!***

- (17) German [Schwabe 2004: 79]  
***Dass Hans komm-t!***  
 COMP Hans come-PRS.3SG  
 ‘Hans will arrive!’

- (18) Swedish [Delsing 2010: 17]  
***Att du hann med tå\_get!***  
 COMPyou do.PST PREP train.DF  
 ‘(It is surprising,) that you caught the train!’

- (19) Hungarian [Lipták 2006: 351]  
***(Hogy) mennyi könyvet el-olvastál!***  
 COMP how.many book.ACC PV-read.PST.2SG  
 ‘That you read a lot of books!’

According to Lipták (2006: 346), in Hungarian the complementizer *hogy* ‘that’ is optional and “adds extra (emotional) emphasis to the exclamative utterance as a whole”.

*Sub-strategy 2: Participles*

This sub-strategy was witnessed in the North-Caucasian languages and is described by E. Kalinina (2011). The example in (20a) illustrates the use of the participle marked with the gloss ATTR in a subordinate clause, whereas (20b) exemplifies the use of the participle in an exclamative.

- (20) Archi [Kalinina 2011: 181]  
 a. *Ez ak:u to-r-mi lo*  
 N2.1SG.DAT N2.see.PST this-F-ERG child.N2  
*orɣ:ir-t:u-t.*  
 N2.pick.up.IPFV-ATTR-N2  
 ‘I saw her picking up the child’.  
 b. *Wajo os sa<r>k:e godo-w lo ɣab-kul*  
 INTERJ once F.look.IMP this-M child quick-NML  
*uw-na heʁrʂur-t:u!*  
 M.do.PFV-CONV.IRR run.IPFV-ATTR.M  
 ‘Oh, look how quickly the boy is running!’

Remarkably, in (20b) the imperative of the predicate ‘look’ cannot be omitted. However, it is not the matrix predicate which the exclamative is subordinate to. Rather, according to Kalinina (2011: 181), it is a discourse marker that it is subordinate to. The evidence for such an interpretation comes from the fact that the participle is not case-marked, whereas the Archi predicate subcategorizes for an indirect argument marked with a superlative case.

*Sub-strategy 3: Indirect questions*

This sub-strategy is used in the North-Caucasian languages as well as in Basque. Example (21a) illustrates the use of the suffix of indirect questions, i.e. subordinated questions, which are marked with COMPL, whilst (21b) exemplifies the use of this suffix in an exclamative.

- (21) Basque [de Rijk 2008: 499]  
 a. *Etxe hau nor-k goberna-tzen du-en*  
 house this who-ERG run-IPFV AUX.TR-COMPL  
*ez daki-t.*  
 NEG know-1SG.A  
 ‘I don’t know who runs the house.’

- b. *Zer gizon handi-a d-en!*  
 what man great-DF be-COMPL  
 ‘What a great man he is!’

*Sub-strategy 4: Infinitives*

This sub-strategy might be illustrated with the following examples from English and Russian.

- (22) English [Quirk et al. 1985], cited by [Kalinina 2011: 165]  
*To think that she should be so ruthless!*
- (23) Russian [National Corpus of the Russian Language]  
*Podumat’ tol’ko on lično zna-l Nikolaj-a!*  
 think.INF only he personally know-PST.SG.M Nikolaj-ACC  
 ‘To think that he personally knew Nikolaj.’

**3.5. Strategy 5: Noun phrases**

The fifth strategy discussed in this paper is the one that involves noun phrases. It divides into three sub-strategies: (i) noun phrases without obligatory relative clauses, (ii) noun phrases with relative clauses and (iii) nominalizations. The first sub-strategy occurs in the North-Caucasian languages, Mandarin Chinese and some of the Indo-European languages. The second one is testified to in the Indo-European languages and in some of the North-Caucasian languages, whereas the third one can be found in the Austronesian languages and, again, in some of the North-Caucasian ones.

In what follows, I present the sub-strategies in this order.

*Sub-strategy 1: Noun phrases without obligatory relative clauses*

This sub-strategy was acknowledged in such languages as Adyghe, Mandarin Chinese and Russian. The following examples from Adyghe and Mandarin Chinese illustrate it.

- (24) Adyghe [Kalinina 2011: 177-178]  
*Aj, jə-qebar-xe-r!*  
 INTERJ POSS.3SG-story-PL-ABS  
 ‘What stories she tells!’ (lit. ‘Her stories!’)
- (25) Mandarin Chinese [Visan 2000: 9]  
*Zhège háizi!*  
 this child  
 ‘What a child!’

*Sub-strategy 2: Noun phrases with relative clauses*

This sub-strategy is spread in the Germanic and Romance languages. In addition, it was also witnessed in Turkish and Tswana. It is illustrated in (26)–(28), which are examples from English, Spanish and Tswana.

- (26) English [Michaelis, Lambrecht 1996: 244]  
***The amount I spent!***

- (27) Spanish [Potsdam 2011: 680]  
***La de cosas que come Juan!***  
 DF.SGPREP thing.PL REL eat.PRS.3SG Juan  
 ‘The things that Juan eats!’

- (28) Tswana [ibid.]  
***Mo-dumo o ba o dirang!***  
 CLF-noise REL they DO do.PROG  
 ‘The noise that they are making!’

According to Kalinina (2011: 184), in the North-Caucasian languages, this sub-strategy is restricted to transitive predicates<sup>6</sup>. The following examples from Archi and Adyghe illustrate it.

- (29) Archi [Kalinina 2011: 184]  
***Mū-ši b-erł:ir-t:u-b č’ele han-i!***  
 be.nice-CONV N1-lay-ATTR-N1 stone.N1 what-Q  
 ‘You are laying stones so evenly!’ (lit. ‘What is it, the stone you lay!’)

- (30) Adyghe [ibid.: 178]  
***Wə šel’am-ew b-kež’e-xe-re-r!***  
 2SG cake-ADV 2SG-bake-PL-DYN-ABS  
 ‘What tasty cakes you bake!’

Notably, in the North-Caucasian languages this sub-strategy is complemented with the next sub-strategy that involves nominalizations.

*Sub-strategy 3: Nominalizations*

There are a few varieties of this sub-strategy that I am going to discuss: (i) existential nominalization; (ii) nominalization with definite / deictic / possessive markers; (iii) nominalization without definite /

6 Unfortunately, I don’t have an example that can illustrate a non-grammatical use of noun phrases + relative clauses with intransitive predicates.

deictic / possessive markers; (iv) nominalization with transitive predicates and (v) nominalization both with transitive and intransitive predicates.

Existential nominalization. This type of nominalization is found in the Austronesian languages, namely in the Philippine languages (cf. (31) from Tagalog), the Celebic languages (cf. (32) from Volio), and in the Oceanic languages (cf. (33) from Rapanui). The existential markers are originally related to the proto-Austronesian existential marker *ka* (cf. Kaufman 2010).

- (31) Tagalog [Kaufman 2010: 725]  
***Kay ganda niya!***  
 EXT beauty 3SG.GEN  
 ‘How beautiful she is!’ (lit. Her beauty!)

- (32) Volio [ibid.]  
***Ka-luntu-na o mia sii!***  
 EXT-lazy-3.GEN DF man this  
 ‘How lazy this man is!’

- (33) Rapanui [du Feu 1996], cited by [Moyses-Faurie 2011: 150]  
***Ko te ‘aroha!***  
 EXT ART love  
 ‘Poor!’

Nominalization with definite / deictic / possessive markers. This variety with definite markers is present in the Oceanic languages like Tahitian, Maori, Samoan, Tuvaluan and Drehu. The following examples are from Maori and Tuvaluan.

- (34) Maori [Foster 1987], cited by [Moyses-Faurie 2011: 146]  
***Te ataahua o tērā kōtiro!***  
 ART beauty POSS DEIC girl  
 ‘What a beautiful girl!’ (lit. ‘Beauty of this girl!’)

- (35) Tuvaluan [Besnier 2000], cited by [Moyses-Faurie 2011: 145]  
***Te mooko mai o te matagi!***  
 SPEC cold DIR POSS SPEC wind  
 ‘The wind is blowing so freshly!’ (lit. ‘Freshness of wind!’)

The variety with deictic markers occurs in Malagasy. The marker shows that an object is invisible or is located at a vague distance.

Notably, in exclamatives it can modify not only noun phrases (cf. (36a)) but also verbal (cf. (36b)) and prepositional phrases (cf. (36c)).

- (36) Malagasy [Potsdam 2011: 679]  
 a. *Izany herim-pon' ny miaramila!*  
 DEM bravery DF soldier  
 'The bravery of the soldiers!' (lit. 'That bravery of the soldiers!')
- b. *Izany sotrohin' i Paoly!*  
 DEM drink.PASS DF Paul  
 'The things/ the amount that Paul drinks!'
- c. *Izany ao ambani-n ny fandriana!*  
 DEM LOC under-LNK DF bed  
 'The thing that is under the bed!'

The variety with possessive markers is found in the Oceanic languages (cf. West-Uvean in (37)) and Indonesian in (38)).

- (37) West Uvean [Moyses-Faurie 2011: 149]  
*Dou fale-puco giate ia!*  
 your NML-talk OBL 3SG  
 'The way you talk to him!'
- (38) Indonesian [Sneddon 1996: 335-336]  
*Alangkah fale-puco*  
 how beautiful-POSS.3  
 'How beautiful!'

Also, this variety is present in Japanese and in the Altaic languages (cf. Tuvin in (39)).

- (39) Tuvin [Monguš 1986: 27]  
*Suksaar-ym-ny!*  
 want.drink-POSS.1SG-ACC  
 'I want to drink so much!'

Nominalization without definite / deictic / possessive markers. This variety is acknowledged in the Philippine (Tagalog, Botolan, Pangasinan) and Oceanic (Iaai, Toabaita) languages, as well as Tibetan and Japanese. The following examples from Botolan and Iaai illustrate the use of this variety.



- (40) Botolan [Kaufman 2010: 731]  
**Hay bitil ko!**  
 NOM hungry 1SG.GEN  
 ‘How hungry I am!’
- (41) Iaai [Moyses-Faurie 2011: 152]  
**Ge ûliny!**  
 OBL run.quickly.3SG  
 ‘The way he/she runs!’

Nominalization (masdar<sup>7</sup>) with intransitive predicates only. This variety is witnessed in the North-Caucasian languages (Adyghe, Archi, Avar, Bezhta). If you recall, there is a sub-strategy with noun phrases and relative clauses for transitive predicates. The following example from Bezhta illustrates nominalization with an intransitive predicate<sup>8</sup>.

- (42) Bezhta (Tlyadal) [Kalinina 2011: 182]  
**Waj, hogłos liq’oro-li!**  
 INTERJ this.GEN F.dress.PRS-NML  
 ‘The way she dresses!’

Nominalization with both transitive and intransitive predicates. This variety is also present in the North-Caucasian languages such as Darghi.

- (43) Darghi (literary) [Abdullaev 1971: 57]  
 a. **Di-la čalx-la b=jač-un-diš!**  
 I-GEN body-GEN 3.SG=break-AOR-NML  
 ‘The way my body is broken!’  
 b. **Su-nna čalx-la azat-diš!**  
 she-GEN body-GEN liberty-NML  
 ‘The way her body hot fat!’

#### 4. Conclusion

The present paper distinguishes between three theoretical approaches to exclamatives (the constructional approach, the pre-supposition approach, and the scalarity approach) and, taking them

7 This is a well-known term for nominalization in Caucasian studies.

8 Unfortunately, I don’t have an example evidencing for non-grammaticality of the use masdar forms with transitive verbs.

into account, suggests that exclamatives, being a subset of exclamations, share similar pragma-semantic features with other types of exclamations (emotionality, first egocentricity and perlocution) and are differentiated from them in terms of the following features: scalarity, presupposition and assertion, weak informativity, referentiality and factivity.

Relying on the sample of data from 45 languages, the paper revealed five strategies of exclamatives, which can be divided into a number of sub-strategies.

Having established the aforementioned facts and integrated the existent approaches to exclamatives into one approach, it seems that we can now better understand the notion of exclamation in pragma-semantic and syntactic terms. It goes without saying that the theoretical approach and the established strategies will definitely benefit from subsequent studies involving more linguistic data and detecting genetically and areally based implications and correlations.

**Address:**

Natalia Zevakhina  
National Research University Higher School of Economics  
20 Myasnitskaya Ulitsa  
101000 Moscow, Russia  
E-mail: nzevakhina@hse.ru

**Abbreviations**

1, 2, 3 – 1st, 2nd and 3rd person, A – Agent, ABS – Absolutive, ACC – Accusative, ADJ – Adjective marker, ADV – Adverbial marker, AOR – Aorist, ART – Referential marker, ATTR – Attributive, AUX – Auxiliary verb, CLF – Classifier, COMP – Complementizer, COMPL – Subordinate clause marker, CONV – Converb, DAT – Dative, DEIC – Deictic, DF – Definite article or suffix, DEM – Demonstrative, DIR – Directive preverb, DO – Direct object, DYN – Dynamic marker, ERG – Ergative, EXT – Existential marker, F – Feminine, FUT – Futur, GEN – Genitive, IMP – Imperative, INE – Inessive, INF – Infinitive, INTERJ – Interjection, IPFV – Imperfective, IRR – Irrealis, LNK – Linker, LOC – Locative, M – Masculine, N1 – 1st agreement class, N2 – 2nd agreement class, NEG – Negation, NML – Nominalization, NOM – Nominative, OBL – Oblique, PASS.PTCP – Past passive participle, PFV – Perfective, PL – Plural, POSS – Possessive, PRED – Predicative, PREP –

Preposition, PROG – Progressive, PRS – Present, PST – Past, PTCL – Particle, PTCP – Participle, PTCP.NPST – Non-past participle, PV – Preverb, Q – Question marker, REFL – Reflexive, REL – Relative clause marker, SG – Singular, SPEC – Specific article, SUP – Supin, TR – Transitive verb marker.

## References

- Austin, John (1962) *How to do things with words*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Besnier, Niko (2000) *Tuvaluan: a Polynesian language of the central Pacific*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Brandner, Ellen (2010) “On the syntax of verb-initial exclamatives”. *Studia Linguistica* 64 1, 81–115.
- Chierchia, Gennaro and Sally McConnell-Ginet (1990) *Meaning and grammar: an introduction to semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Delsing, Lars-Olof (2010) “Exclamatives in Scandinavian”. *Studia Linguistica* 64, 1, 16–36.
- Elliott, Dale (1974) “Toward a grammar of exclamations”. *Foundations of language* 11, 231–46.
- Erelt, Mati, ed. (2003) *Estonian language*. (Linguistica Uralica. Suppl., 1.) Tallinn: Estonian Academy Publishers.
- du Feu, Veronica (1996) *Rapanui*. (Descriptive grammars.) London and New York: Routledge.
- Foster, John (1987) *He whakamārama: a full self-help course in Māori*. Auckland: Reed.
- Fries, Norbert (1988) “Ist Pragmatik schwer! – Über sogenannte Exklamativsätze im Deutschen”. *Sprache und Pragmatik* 3, 1–18.
- Grimshaw, Jane (1979) “Complement selection and the lexicon”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 10, 2, 279–326.
- Grosz, Patrick (2011) *On the grammar of optative constructions*. PhD dissertation. MIT.
- Jónsson, Jóhannes (2010) “Icelandic exclamatives and the structure of the CP layer”. *Studia Linguistica* 64, 1, 37–54.
- Kalinina, Elena (2011) “Exclamative clauses in the languages of the North Caucasus and the problem of finiteness”. In Gilles Authier and Timur Maisak, eds. *Tense, aspect, modality and finiteness in East-Caucasian languages*, 161–201. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Kaufman, Daniel (2010) “Exclamatives and temporal nominalizations in Austronesian”. In Foong Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta and Janick Wrona, eds. *Nominalization in Asian languages: diachronic and typological perspectives*. Vol. 2:

- Korean, Japanese and Austronesian Languages*, 721–755. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Koenig, Ekkehard and Peter Siemund (2007) “Speech act distinctions in grammar”. In Timothy Shopen, ed. *Language typology and syntactic description*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, Paul, Gary Simmons, and Charles Fennig, eds. (2013). *Ethnologue: languages of the World*. 17th ed. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Available online at <<http://www.ethnologue.com>>. Accessed on 02.04.2013.
- Lipták, Anikó (2006) “Word order in Hungarian exclamatives”. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 53, 4, 343–39.
- Marandin, Jean-Marie (2008) “The exclamative clause type in French”. In *Proceedings of the HPSG Conference*, 436–456. CSLI Publications.
- Michaelis, Laura (2001) “Exclamative constructions”. In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard Koenig, Wulf Oesterreicher, and Wolfgang Raible, eds. *Language typology and language universals: an international handbook*. Vol. 2. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Michaelis Laura, and Knud Lambrecht (1996) “Towards a construction-based theory of language function: the case of nominal extraposition”. *Language* 72, 2, 215–247.
- Miró-Castroviejo, Elena (2006) *Wh-exclamatives in Catalan*. PhD dissertation. Universitat de Barcelona.
- Miró-Castroviejo, Elena (2008) “Deconstructing exclamations”. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 7, 41–90.
- Monguš, D.A. (1986) “Predloženiya s glavnym členom (skazuemym) v vinitel’nom padeže v Tuvinskom jazyke”. In *Issledovanija po tuvinskoj filologii*, 26–32i. Kyzyl: Tuvinskij NII jazyka, literatury i istorii.
- Morel, Mary-Annick (1995) “L’intonation exclamative dans l’oral spontané”. *Faits de Langues* 6, 63–70.
- Moutaouakil, Ahmed (2005) “Exclamation: sentence type, illocution or modality?”. In Casper de Groot and Kees Hengeveld, eds. *Morphosyntactic expression in functional grammar*, 351–379. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Moyse-Faurie, Claire (2011) “Nominalization and exclamation in Oceanic languages”. In *Topics in Oceanic morphosyntax*, 111–136. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Oda, Toshiko (2008) *Degree constructions in Japanese*. PhD dissertation. University of Connecticut.
- Ono, Hajime (2006) *An investigation of exclamatives in English and Japanese: syntax and sentence processing*. PhD dissertation. University of Maryland.
- Padučeva, Elena (1996) *Semantičeskie issledovanija*. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul’tury.
- Portner, Paul and Raffaella Zanuttini (2003) “Exclamative clauses: at the syntax-semantic interface”. *Language* 79, 1, 39–81.
- Potsdam, Eric (2011) “Expressing exclamatives in Malagasy”. In Foong Yap, Karen Grunow-Hersta and Janick Wrona, eds. *Nominalizations in Asian languages*:

- diachronic and typological perspectives*, 659–683. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum Sidney, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartnik (1985) *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Rett, Jessica (2008) “A degree account of exclamatives”. In *Proceedings of SALT XVIII. CLC publications*, 601–618.
- de Rijk, Rudolf (2008) *Standard Basque: a progressive grammar*. Cambridge, London: MIT Press.
- Sadock, Jerrold and Arnold Zwicky (1985) “Speech act distinctions in syntax”. In Timothy Shopen, ed. *Language typology and syntactic description*, 155–196. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffman, Harold (1983) *A reference grammar of spoken Kannada*. University of Washington.
- Searle, John (1969) *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, John (1979). *Expression and meaning: studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sneddon, James (1996) *Indonesian: a comprehensive grammar*. Routledge.
- Vilalba, Xavier (2001) “The right edge of exclamative sentences in Catalan”. *Catalan working papers in linguistics* 9, 119–135.
- Visan, Florentina (2000) *The nature and the status of exclamatives in Chinese*. Unpublished materials. University of Bucharest.
- Wrona, Janick (2010) “The case of non-derived stand-alone nominalization: evidence from Japanese”. In Foong Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta, and Janick Wrona, eds. *Nominalization in Asian languages: diachronic and typological perspectives*. Vol. 1: *Sino-Tibetan and Iranian languages*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

### **Web-resources**

National Corpus of the Russian Language <[www.ruscorpora.ru](http://www.ruscorpora.ru)>.

## **Appendix 1**

### **Genetic classification of languages (according to Lewis et al. 2013)**

*Altaic languages*: Turkic (Turkish, Tuvian), Tungusic (Nanai).

*Austronesian languages*: Barito (Malagasy), Celebic (Volio), Malayic (Indonesian), Oceanic (Drehu, Iai, Maori, Rapanui, Samoan, Tahitian, Toabaita, Tuvaluan, West-Uvean), Philippine (Botolan, Pangasinan, Tagalog).

*Uralic languages*: Finnic (Estonian), Ugric (Hungarian).

*Indo-European languages:* Germanic (Danish, Dutch, English, German, Swedish), Romance (Catalan, French, Italian, Spanish, Venetian), Slavic (Russian).

*Kartvelian languages:* Georgian.

*North-Caucasian languages:* Northeast (Archi, Avar, Bezhta, Darghi), Northwest (Adyghe).

*Sino-Tibetan languages:* Chinese (Mandarin), Tibetan.

*Chukotko-Kamchatkan languages:* Chukchi.

*Dravidian languages:* Kannada.

*Niger-Congo languages:* Tswana.

*Japonic languages:* Japanese.

*Language isolate:* Basque.

**Kokkuvõte. Natalia Zevakhina: Eksklamatiivide süntaktilised strateegiad.**

Sellel uurimusel on kaks eesmärki. Esiteks määratletakse eksklamatsioonide ja eksklamatiivide pragmaatilised-semantilised tunnused, tuginedes varasematele töödele selles valdkonnas, ning jagatakse eksklamatiivid kahte klassi väljenduse illokutiivse jõu olemasolu alusel. Teiseks kirjeldatakse viit eksklamatiivide süntaktilist strateegiat, toetudes näidetele 45 keelest. Nendeks on subjekti ja verbi inversioon, kõrvallaused, nimisõnafraasid, anafoorsed adverbid ja adjektiivid ning küsifraasid. Viimased kolm strateegiat jagunevad mitmeteks alaliikideks.

**Märksõnad:** eksklamatiivid, eksklamatsioonid, süntaktilised strateegiad, eksklamatiivide semantika, eksklamatiivide pragmaatika, eksklamatiivide pragmaatiline-süntaktiline staatus