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Abstract Exclamative Construction
Polish constructions partly licensed by AEC
How to develop AleEC from Concessive Coordinating Construction?
Four basic steps
Insubordination, incoordination
Incoordination revised
Michaelis & Lambrecht (1996)

- It’s amazing how much he has GROWN
- It’s amazing the DIFFERENCE!
- You wouldn’t believe the BICKERING that goes on
- GOD, am I late!
- What a DAY (I had).
- The things I DO for that boy!
- Are YOU in for it!
- I’m amazed at how much TIME it took
- It’s so HOT in here!
The Abstract Exclamative Construction (AEC)

- Presupposed Open Proposition
- Scalar Extent
- Assertion of Affective Stance: Expectation Contravention
- Identifiablity of Described Referent
- Deixis
There seem to be at least two Polish exclamative constructions which seem to be instantiations of AEC

- Co to za (wspaniała) kobieta!
  - [What a wonderful woman she is]

- Co za klęska!
  - [What a thrashing]

- Ale ona jest (wspaniałą) kobietą!
  - Ale (wspaniała) kobieta
  - [But she is a wonderful woman – What a wonderful woman!]

- Ale klęska
  - [But a thrashing! = What a thrashing]

Both constructions are licenced by Abstract Exclamative Construction
They differ exactly in their inheritance from the source constructions:

- *Co to za* is licensed by „specifying questions”, whereby the referent is contextually given and S asks for its specification or identification, e.g.

  - *Co to była za kobieta? Co to za skrzynia?*
  - *[Who’s that woman? What’s that box]*
Ale allows for the whole range of grammatical complements, all of them motivated by full “clause”–like structures:

- Ale (ona jest) mądra!
- Ale tu (jest) pięknie!
- Ale przegraliście/wygraliście!
The inheritance looks like this:

- CoZaQC >>>> AEC <<< CONC COORD aleC

Diagram:

- CoZaEC
- ALeEC
From coordinating to exclamative a/e.

In grammars of Polish, a/e is classified as a multifunctional particle belonging to the classes of coordinating conjunctions, a/e1, illustrated by (1) and a/e 2 classified as one of “modifiers of declarativeness”, illustrated by (2) (Grochowski, 1986:50).

- (1) Może Ewa wydaje się bardzo poważna, ale ma poczucie humoru
- [Perhaps Eve seems ro be very serious but she has sense humour]
- (2) ALE ma poczucie humoru!
- [But she has sense of humour!]
A cognitive linguist’s question is:

- Is there a motivated link between $a/e_1$ and $a/e_2$?
- In particular – Can it be shown that the coordinating $a/e$ motivates the exclamative $a/e$ found in $A/eEC$?

Since the most obvious difference between compound coordinated sentences with $a/e$ and $A/eEC$ is that coordinating $a/e$ occurs in biclaustral sentences $C_1-a/e-C_2$ with $a/e$ heading $C_2$, whereas $A/eEC$ is a monoclausal sentence with initial $A/e$, we must account somehow for the disappearance (deletion?) of $C_1$ in coordinating sentences.
Barth’s (2000) claims that expressing concessivity in spoken English usually conforms to the Cardinal Concessive Schema (CCS), which has the following structure:

- A: X (stating something or making some point)
- B: X’ (acknowledging the validity of this statement or point, the conceding move)
- Y (claiming the validity of a potentially contrasting statement or point)
The working of CCS may be illustrated by the following exchange, based on 25:

A: (X) Ewa wydaje się bardzo poważna  
- [Eve seems to be very serious]

B: (X’)Może Ewa wydaje się bardzo poważna,  
- [She may seem serious]

(Y) ale ma sporo poczucia humoru  
- [But she has quite a lot of sense of humour]
What Barth (2000) ignored in his discussion of even „variations on the Cardinal Concessive schema” was the common case when X’ is left out and B’s rejoinder is reduced to Y (split coordinate), as in the exchange below:

A: (X) Ewa wydaje się bardzo poważna
B: (Y) Ale ma poczucie humoru
Step 2: Split coordinate $A/eC_2$ becomes more and more autonomous and more and more expressive, i.e. various uses of $A/e2$ can be used with expressive illocutionary force in split coordinates!
A: Ona jest dobra w lekkiej atletyce
[She is good at athletics]
B: Ale pływa też bardzo dobrze
[But she swims very well too]
A: Nigdy nie jakoś nadzwyczajny. Byłem dość dobry w lekkiej atletyce
B: Ale pływałeś też bardzo dobrze

[A: Well, I was never in any way special. I was quite good at athletics [SELF-EFFACING
B: But you swam very well too! ]
[COMFORTING, BOOSTING SELF-ESTEEME]
Opposing polarity in split coordinates – Complaints!

A: Jill zaproszono

B: Ale jej męża nie!

- [A: Jill had been invited
- B: But her husband hadn’t.]
Preventative *but*

- A sense which H&P (1312) call “preventative”, illustrated by (1) below, whereby “the situation expressed in the second coordinate prevents the realization of the one hypothetically entertained in the first”.

  1) I would have gone, but I was too busy
Preventative *but* in split coordinates

- In split coordinates, preventative *but* in *accusations* and *self-defence* and it may become highly emotional

- A: You should have gone with her
- B: But I was too busy
A/eC2 – no longer part of the well-formed coordinated sentence:

- A: They invited me
- B: But they didn’t invite ME!

Contradictory:
- They invited me but they didn’t invite me!
Incoherent:

A: You should have gone with her
B: But I was too busy

??? You should have gone with her, but I was too busy
Stage 3: Information packaging changes – Focus shift (and stress) on evaluative *A/e*, Entity/Event become presupposed.

Subjectivization (E. Traugott, e.g. 1982): primarily concessive *A/e* becomes a highly subjective evaluative discourse marker.
The answer lies in the tendency in development of meaning called subjectivization.

Traugott's principle of subjectivization – from descriptive to evaluative meanings in lexical semantics (knave, silly, 

straight > not curved or bent > neat (of alcoholic drinks) > correct > not funny > honest > heterosexual > not taking drugs
A/e is not normally stressed as a coordinating conjunction (Focus on Predicate), it is heavily stressed in A/eEC, which doesn’t occur in coordinated sentences:

*Była słabsza, ALE go trafiła!

- [She was weaker, BUT she hit him]

Vs. Była słabsza, ale go TRAFIŁA (i wygrała walkę)

[She was weaker but she HIT him (and won the fight)]

ALE go trafiła!

- [But (How) she hit him!]
“Emphatic reaffirmative” but used with repeated expressions denoting extreme values, as in H&P’s 58 (p.1312) and 59:

Nic, ale to nic, nie sprawi, że ona zmieni zdanie
- [Nothing, but nothing, will make me change my mind]
Strzał Messiego był doskonały, ale doskonały
- [Messi’s shot was perfect, but perfect]
Step 4: Autonomous A/eC2 develops its own idiosyncracies and well-formededness constraints (i.e. becomes A/eEC)
Common ellipsis of the copula (unacceptable in coordinate C2)

Ale (ona jest) mądra!
- [But (she is) smart! = How smart she is! ]

Ale tu (jest) pięknie!
- [But here (is) beautiful! = How beautiful it is here]
Ellipsis of the gradable concept with *a/e* designating the high degree of property

Ale to był (mądry) pies!
- [What a (smart) dog he was]

Ale to był (wspaniały skok)!
- [What a (wonderful) jump it was]
1. A/eEC (as an instance of AEC) doesn’t tolerate negated predicates (deictic anchoring, existential presupposition!)

- *ALE go nie trafiła! Vs. Ale chybiła!
- [But (How) she didn’t hit him! What a miss]
- *ALE nie jesteś miła! Vs. ALE jesteś niemiła!
- [But (How) you aren’t kind! How unkind you are!]
2. A/eEC does not tolerate indefinite topics:

Ale to jest kobieta!

*Ale to jest jakaś kobieta!
[What some woman she is!]

*Ale to był jeden z jego strzałów!
[What one of his shots it was!]
1a) Wszystkich zdziwiło, że on się dał tak zabrać
[It suprised everybody that he allowed them to take him away like that.]

1b) Że on się dał tak zabrać!
[That he (should have) allowed them to take him away like that!]
Insubordination

“the conventionalized main clause use of what, on prima facie grounds, appear to be formally subordinate clauses” (Evans 2006:367).
Evans (2006) calls this process insubordination and represents it in four stages (p.370):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1: Subordination</th>
<th>Stage 2: Ellipsis</th>
<th>Stage 3: Conventionalized ellipsis</th>
<th>Stage 4: Reanalysis as main clause structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate construction</td>
<td>Ellipsis of main clause</td>
<td>Restriction of interpretation of ellipsed material</td>
<td>Conventionalized main clause use of formally subordinate clause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incoordination

- the conventionalized main clause use of what, on prima facie grounds, appear to be formally coordinate clauses
- 1st approximation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1: Coordination</th>
<th>Stage 2: Ellipsis</th>
<th>Stage 3: Conventionalized ellipsis</th>
<th>Stage 4: Reanalysis as main clause structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate construction</td>
<td>Ellipsis of the first coordinate clause</td>
<td>Restriction of interpretation of ellipsed material</td>
<td>Conventionalized main clause use of formally coordinate clause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The AleEC results from a general process which might be called constructionalization of subjectification.

Guess: Inccordination is more complex because the ellipsed coordinate C1 is less semantically determinate than the ellipsed main clause in insubordination.
## Final proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1: Coordination</th>
<th>Stage 2: Partial ellipsis</th>
<th>Stage 3: Conventionalized ellipsis - Information packaging changes – Focus shift</th>
<th>Stage 4: Reanalysis as main clause structure as <em>AleEC</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate construction</td>
<td>Ellipsis of C1 in split coordination Detopicalization of C1. IF of C2: assertive &gt;&gt;&gt; expressive</td>
<td>Focus on C2 (pr) &gt;&gt; Subjectification: focus (?) on evaluation of presupposed Entity/Event C2 Form: stress shift from PR to <em>Ale</em> IF of C2 – Expressive (exclamative)</td>
<td>Conventionalized autonomous constructional use of formally coordinate structure (copula deletions, constraints on negation, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future research:

- Incoordination in other languages
- Cognitive basis of incoordination
Thank you very much