

The Exclamative Sentence Type in English

LAURA A. MICHAELIS & KNUD LAMBRECHT

University of Colorado, Boulder & University of Texas, Austin

0. Introduction.¹ We say that a sentence type exists when a certain communicative function is conventionally associated with a particular grammatical structure. Traditionally recognized sentence types include declaratives, imperatives and questions. The notion that various illocutionary forces receive distinct formal coding is referred to by Levinson (1983) as the Literal Force Hypothesis (LFH). Levinson casts doubt on the tenability of the LFH. In particular, he shows that it is manifestly inadequate when we attempt to account for indirect speech acts. He looks at findings in conversational analysis which indicate that "the functions that utterances perform are in large part due to the place they occupy within specific conversational (or interactional) sequences" (p. 279).

König (1986) raises further questions about the reliability of the form-function fit. He looks at examples of formal overlap involving the adverbial constructions concessive, concessive conditional and conditional. He points out that even though these three categories are typically associated with distinct formal properties, they may also be formally indistinguishable. For example, he observes that in interrogative contexts like (1a), conditionals are interpreted as concessive conditionals. He also shows that in contexts like (1b), a concessive conditional may be interpreted as a concessive:

- (1) a. Will you take the car if it is snowing? (= even if it is snowing)
- b. He looked at me kindly if somewhat skeptically. (= although somewhat...)

The issue that concerns us here is whether we can identify an exclamative sentence type for English once we confront the great variety of forms to which someone could intuitively assign an exclamative function. The expressions in (2) show the heterogeneous character of the class of exclamative sentences:

- (2) a. It's amazing how much you can get in the TRUNK.
- b. It's amazing the DIFFERENCE! (Fixodent commercial)
- c. You wouldn't believe the BICKERING that goes on. ('For Better or for Worse' 8/15/94)

¹ For inspiration and input, we wish to thank: George Lakoff, Charles Fillmore, Paul Kay, Jean-Pierre Koenig and Adele Goldberg.

- d. GOD my feet hurt.
- e. What a DAY (I had).
- f. The things I DO for that boy!
- g. Are YOU in for it!
- h. I'm amazed at how much TIME it took.
- i. It's so HOT in here!

At the very least, it seems to be a misnomer to speak of a unitary exclamative sentence type in English. The data in (2) illustrate a further difficulty inherent in presuming a form-function fit in the realm of exclamatives: sometimes there's not much form to pin a function on. In the case of (2f), for example, we find only an NP, pronounced emphatically. How can this form be related to the far more elaborate form in (2c)? It's difficult to decide what an exclamative should look like. According to Sadock and Zwicky (1985), exclamatives are closely related to declaratives, and therefore closely resemble declaratives in form. However, examples (2e) and (f) do not look like declarative sentences.

We will argue that it is possible to maintain the LFH in the case of exclamatives. In other words, we will claim that all of the constructions in (2) represent conventional means of performing an exclamative speech act. Given the variety of forms involved, we cannot presume that form is in any way predictable on the basis of the illocutionary force involved. The problem is one of the motivation: how does a learner organize the knowledge that each of the forms in (2) is dedicated to the exclamative function? We postulate that the form-meaning pairs in (2) are motivated through relations of INHERITANCE.

Inheritance networks provide a way of representing formal and semantic correspondences among constructions (Fillmore and Kay 1993, Lakoff 1987, Goldberg 1992). These inheritance networks invoke the connectionist model of memory. According to Pinker and Prince (1991:232) this model is "both associative and superpositional: individual [linguistic] items are dissolved into sets of features, and similar items...overlap in their physical representations, sharing representational real estate". Rather than invoking the superimposition metaphor, we will describe structure sharing by means of inheritance LINKS (Lakoff 1987). In the case of (2), we will claim that each of these exclamative subtypes inherits its semantic and pragmatic properties from an abstract superconstruction: the ABSTRACT EXCLAMATIVE CONSTRUCTION (AEC). This construction interacts with four templates which are independently licensed by the grammar. These are: EXTRAPOSITION, the BARE COMPLEMENT QUESTION CONSTRUCTION, the INVERTED CLAUSE CONSTRUCTION, and the SUBJECT-PREDICATE CONSTRUCTION. Our analysis of these four familiar constructions is taken from Fillmore and Kay (1993). The Extraposition construction licenses sentences like (3). The Complement Question Construction licenses indirect questions, as in the italicized portion of (4). The Inverted Clause Construction licenses main-clause questions like (5):

- (3) It's obvious why he didn't come.
- (4) I wonder *who saw me there*.
- (5) Did you ask about it?

The network of exclamative constructions will feature several instances of MULTIPLEINHERITANCE. As Goldberg points out (1995), multiple inheritance "allows us to capture the fact that some construction types seem to resist being uniquely categorized in a natural way". Notice for example sentence (2a): *It's amazing how much you can get in the trunk*. This sentence appears to instantiate two constructions: the extraposition construction and a construction which Milner (1978) refers to as an INDIRECTEXCLAMATIVE. This label suggests an analogy with indirect questions: an indirect exclamative consists of a verb which governs a clausal complement introduced by a *wh*-word. In fact, we will claim that the indirect exclamative subsumes the Bare Complement Question construction instantiated in (4).

Another instance of multiple inheritance to be found in our network involves a construction that is uniquely dedicated to the expression of exclamative semantics: the METONYMIC NP CONSTRUCTION. This construction licenses a reading of a definite NP in which a definite NP 'stands for' a proposition that invokes some degree of a scalar property. Notice, for example, sentence (2b): *It's amazing the difference*. The definite NP *the difference* can be said to stand for the propositional function "There is X degree of difference". The Metonymic NP construction is instantiated by several of our exclamative examples. By invoking this construction, we account for the paraphrase relationship shown in (6):

- (6) a. I can't believe the money I spent on clothes last summer.
- b. I can't believe how much money I spent on clothes last summer.

The rest of our paper will be structured in the following way. In the next section, we will look at the semantic and pragmatic components of the Abstract Exclamative Construction. In the third section we will demonstrate that the inheritance approach provides a way of taming the considerable syntactic variety found in the domain of exclamative constructions. We will conclude with some thoughts about the relevance of this approach for syntactic theories like Construction Grammar, which treat sentence types as a crucial basis for grammar.

1. The Abstract Exclamative Construction (AEC). The AEC, as we see it, has a grammatical status like that of the Left Isolate construction discussed by Fillmore and Kay (1993). LI is a clausal construction which licenses long-distance dependencies like *wh*-questions and topicalization. Fillmore and Kay say that the LI construction "is really a family of constructions, or better an abstract construction whose properties

are inherited by a number of more detailed constructions" (p. 11.4). The LI construction contains only very general syntactic and semantic constraints. A complement is instantiated to the left of a maximal verb, which may or may not have a subject. The valence slot that the 'extracted' complement fills is embedded at an undefined depth within the maximal verb. Any structure which is formed in accordance with the LI template must satisfy the general constraints associated with the abstract construction. The idea underlying the AEC is much the same. However, in the case of the AEC we find no formal constraints other than a general requirement that all components of the semantico-pragmatic frame receive expression. Certain of these components can be realized through metonymic construal or through a type of pragmatic construal similar to that found in instances of null complementation (Fillmore 1986).

Let's now look at the semantic and pragmatic components of exclamations. A word of caution is in order here: we are not looking at all expressions of English that could conceivably be labeled exclamations. In particular, we are excluding expressions like the ones in (7):

- (7) a. Damn!
- b. It's a beech tree!
- c. There we were in some remote part of Bali and who did we see but Joel and Dina.

Example (7a) represents an interjection rather than an exclamation. An interjection is like an exclamation in that it expresses the speaker's emotional stance toward some situation. An interjection is unlike an exclamation in that it has no recoverable propositional content. What about sentences (7b-c)? These are exclamative in that they express an affective stance toward some propositional content. What's more, the stance is one of surprise, as in our original examples. We will exclude exclamatives like (7b-c) because they do not involve the notion of DEGREE. All of the exclamatives that we will consider involve a scalar property (say, amount). The notion of surprise or expectation contravention comes into play because the exclamative utterance counts as an assertion that the degree of the scalar property in question is unusually high. The semantic and pragmatic properties shared by the exclamative examples in (1) are listed in (8):

- (8) *Semantico-Pragmatic Properties of the Abstract Exclamative Construction*
 - a. Presupposed Open Proposition
 - b. Scalar Extent
 - c. Assertion of Affective Stance: Expectation Contravention
 - d. Identifiability of Described Referent
 - e. Deixis

Let's look at properties (a)-(c) together. We'll take the sentence in (9) as our example:

- (9) I can't believe how much he's GROWN!

The presupposed open proposition contains a variable in place of a particular degree specification: *He has grown to X extent*. The person uttering (9) presupposes that the person referred to has grown to some extent. The quantity expression *much* invokes a scale whose origin is some minimal amount. The open proposition places the individual at some point on the scale of ascending quantity for growth. The entire utterance expresses the speaker's judgement that the proposition is surprising, and the surprise stems from the fact that the degree in question is higher than the speaker had expected. In example (9), the main clause *I can't believe* expresses the speaker's affective stance.

A property related to presupposition of the open proposition is that of referent identifiability (8d): the entity of whom the scalar property is predicated must be identifiable.² An identifiable referent is one for which a shared representation exists in the minds of speaker and hearer at speech time (Lambrecht 1994). Identifiable referents surface as pronominal or definite NPs. Notice, for example, the anomaly of the sentences in (10):

- (10) a. *What a nice guy someone is.
b. *It's amazing a difference.
c. ??Someone is so messy.

Thus far, our analysis resembles that of Sadock and Zwicky (1985), who distinguish exclamations from declaratives in the following way:

² It is difficult to determine whether this property is a constraint on the AEC or a general constraint on property attribution: when a speaker attributes a property to something, the speaker necessarily presupposes that the entity in question can be identified by the hearer. The authors have previously employed the more general explanation for the anomaly of sentences like (10) (Michaelis and Lambrecht 1994). There, we invoked sentences like those in (a) and (b):

- (a) ??Someone is a really nice person.
(b) ??A car is a Volvo.

Problems with the property-attribution constraint surface when we look at sentences like (c), which have an inferential quality:

- (c) Someone is a Fellini fan. (said upon seeing movie poster in an unfamiliar home)

...exclamations are intended to be expressive whereas declaratives are intended to be informative. Both represent a proposition as being true, but in an exclamation, the speaker emphasizes his strong emotional reaction to what he takes to be a fact, whereas in a declarative, the speaker emphasizes his intellectual appraisal that the proposition is true. (p. 162)

We depart from Sadock and Zwicky in emphasizing the importance of scalarity. Another crucial property for us is that of DEICTIC ANCHORING. Exclamatives involve personal and temporal deixis. The notion of affective stance entails the presence of someone making a judgement, and the speaker is the judge by default. The speaker's status as judge may be explicit, as in (9), where the main-clause predicator has a first-person subject. It may also be implicit, as in (11):

- (11) It's amazing how fast the WEATHER can change.

Sentence (11) can be paraphrased as: "I find it amazing how fast the weather can change". In some cases, however, the speaker invites the hearer to do the judging, as in (12):

- (12) a. You wouldn't believe how much he's grown.
b. You won't believe how much he's grown.

Exclamatives in which the hearer is the judge have a marked status. This is shown by the fact that sentences like (12) require a subjunctive or futurate main verb. The sentences in (12) have a conditional flavor; they convey the message: "You would find the situation remarkable if you were in the position to judge". This conditional flavor seems to be crucial; sentence (13) does not count as an exclamative:

- (13) You can't believe how much he's grown.

The sentences in (14) don't count as exclamatives either, because the judgement predicates are not deictically anchored:

- (14) a. They wouldn't believe how much he's grown.
b. My mom can't believe how much he's grown.

With respect to temporal deixis, it appears that the affect evoked by the main-clause predicator must hold at speech time, whether or not the denoted situation also holds at speech time. Therefore, sentence (15a) is exclamative, but sentence (15b) is merely a recollection:

- (15) a. I can't believe how much we spent.

- b. I couldn't believe how much we spent.

We've just argued that sentences which lack deictic anchoring do not count as exclamatives. This argument doesn't quite go through, because the sentences in (14) and the past-tense sentence in (15b) have a formal feature that is unique to exclamatives. Only the AEC licenses a valence frame in which the verb *believe* takes a complement introduced by a *wh*-word. When *believe* has this valence structure, it must be negated. Notice the anomaly of (16):

- (16) a. *I believe how much money you spent.
b. *I believe what a jerk he is.

The negation requirement is motivated by the fact that asserting lack of belief counts as a judgement of expectation contravention, as required by the AEC. Therefore, it is apparent that sentences like *My mom couldn't believe how much money we spent* are formed in accordance with the general exclamative template, even though they lack the characteristic deictic anchors. We will analyze sentences like this as instances of PERSPECTIVAL SHIFT (Fillmore 1982). Sentences like (14) and (15b) move the identity of the judge and/or the time of the judgement away from the speech scene. This type of transfer invites the hearer to empathize with the response of a third-person judge or the speaker at some point in the past.³

Thus, while deictic anchoring is not a necessary property of the AEC, the encoding of an affective judgement is. This claim might seem controversial, since there are exclamative types which do not require a predicate evoking expectation contravention. Notice (17a) as against (17b):

- (17) a. What a jerk he is.
b. I can't believe what a jerk he is.

We want to claim that sentences like (17a) require the interpreter to infer the presence of an affective judgement. If such a judgement were lacking, the sentence would not count as an exclamative. To see this, notice

³ One puzzle that presents itself when we look at this type of perspectival shift is illustrated by the contrast between (a) and (b):

- (a) I don't believe how much this is costing me.
(b) I { ??didn't } believe how much it was costing me.
 { couldn't }

If (b) is simply the shifted version of (a), why isn't the auxiliary *do* permitted?

that the *what a* complement is licensed by predicates which do not code an affective stance toward the proposition expressed by that complement. In particular, we find examples like (18), involving factive main verbs:

- (18) a. They don't realize what a jerk he is.
b. We all know what a jerk he is.

Like (17b), the sentences in (18) signal that the referent of the pronoun has achieved some value on the jerk scale, and that this value is above the norm. Intuitively, however, the sentences in (18) do not count as exclamations. This is because they do not encode the speaker's judgement that the scalar degree exceeds expectation. Therefore, the affective judgement is a necessary ingredient. Where it is not explicitly encoded, as in (17a), the interpreter must reconstruct it. Where this reconstruction is preempted by the presence of a factive verb like *realize*, the sentence does not represent an exclamation.

A word is in order on the information structure of exclamatives. Some exclamatives represent predicate focus, or topic-comment, sentences and some represent sentence-focus structures (in terms of Lambrecht 1994). We maintain that exclamatives involving extraposition are sentence-focus structures, while exclamatives like the indirect exclamative are predicate-focus structures. Therefore, when we talk about the semantico-pragmatic properties of the AEC, we leave aside the issue of information structure.

Let us now look more closely at the individual exclamative constructions. We will argue that these constructions instantiate the AEC and certain other independently motivated constructions. Some of the exclamative subtypes also subsume the Metonymic NP construction. As required, each exclamative subtype realizes, in some way or another, the semantico-pragmatic properties of the AEC.

2. The Inheritance Network. We will now consider each of the relevant exclamative subtypes in turn, looking in particular at those properties which can be motivated in terms of inheritance links. We will give informal rather than formal analyses of the various constructions.

2.1. The Indirect Exclamative. This construction is exemplified in (19):

- (19) a. I'm amazed at how much I spent.
b. I can't believe who they hired.

The Indirect Exclamative construction represents an instance of the AEC. It is also linked to the Bare Complement Question construction by a subsumption link. As we mentioned, the Bare Complement Question construction licenses indirect questions, as in (20):

- (20) a. I wonder how much I spent.
 b. I wonder who they hired.

Indirect questions, like direct questions, can be represented as open propositions: *I spent X amount, they hired X*. The open proposition represents the presupposed material. In (20a), for example, the speaker presupposes that she spent some amount. The main clause signals that the speaker wishes to determine this amount. The *wh*-complement in the case of the indirect exclamative (19a) can be given the same analysis. Again, the complement evokes the presupposition *I spent X amount*. The difference between (19a) and (20a) lies in the contribution of the main predicator. Sentence (19a), which contains a predicate denoting expectation contravention, asserts that this amount is remarkably high. Therefore, (19a) instantiates all components of the AEC: it evokes a scale (of amount), it contains a predicate expressing the speaker's epistemic stance, and it contains a presupposed open proposition.

Sentence (19b) is a somewhat complicated case. The presupposed open proposition *They hired X* does not obviously evoke a scale. Nevertheless, the sentence is not easily taken to mean: they hired a certain person, and this surprises me. Instead, the sentence does seem to evoke a scale. In accordance with Fillmore, Kay and O'Connor 1988, we assume that individuals may be assigned positions on property scales. Sentence (19b) presupposes or rather creates the presupposition that the person hired deserves to be ranked on the scale of incompetence. The sentence asserts that this ranking is remarkably high.

2.2. The Extraposed Indirect Exclamative. This construction is exemplified in (21):

- (21) It's amazing how much he's GROWN.

This construction subsumes the Bare Complement Question construction. It is an instance of the AEC and the Extraposition construction. What about the information structure of (21)? We have established that sentences like (21) assert a judgement relative to some presupposed situation. The presupposed information is represented as the open proposition *He has grown to X extent*. Although this proposition is known information, it is focal rather than topical. Sentence (21) could not be an answer to a question like: "Tell me something about how much he's grown". Formally speaking, sentence-final elements which bear accent represent focal elements. Therefore, we say that both the predicate and the open proposition are in focus, and (21) counts as a sentence-focus sentence.

2.3. The Inversion Exclamative. This construction is exemplified in (22):

(22) God, am I LATE!

This construction is linked via instance links to both the AEC construction and the Inverted Clause construction. The inversion construction licenses constructs like those in (23):

- (23) a. Am I late?
 b. Had I known...
 c. So did she.
 d. Not only did he refuse the application...
 e. And into the room walks Harry.

All of the constructions in (23) are also instances of more specific constructions, like the main-clause yes-no question, the negative adverb preposing construction, etc. By looking at the pragmatic properties of these constructions, we can make one generalization about the pragmatics of the inversion construction: inversion signals a departure from the canonical topic-comment or predicate-focus information structure. For example, sentence (23c) represents a narrow-focus construction. Sentence (23e) represents a sentence-focus construction. At the level of the speech-act type, inversion can also signal that the speech-act in question is not a declarative. Questions are not declaratives and neither are exclamatives, as Sadock and Zwicky point out.

In the case of (22), in particular, the inverted clause receives a scalar, factive interpretation: I am late to some degree. This interpretation is licensed by the AEC. Likewise, the expletive *God* represents the affective judgement: the degree is remarkably high. Since inversion is a main-clause phenomenon, the affective judgement cannot be coded by a complement-taking predicate like *amaze* or negated *believe*. Notice the anomaly of (24):

(24) *I can't believe am I late!

2.4. *The Antitopic Exclamative*. Examples of this construction are given in (25):

- (25) a. JESUS it's cold out there.
 b. GOD that boy can talk.

The Antitopic Exclamative is an instance of the AEC. It also subsumes the subject-predicate construction. The affective stance is coded by an expletive, while the presupposed scalar proposition is coded by the clause to the right. The remarkable property of this construction is its prosody: the expletive receives the sentence accent; the rest of the sentence bears no accent. This prosodic feature makes the Antitopic Exclamative look like the antitopic construction found in (26):

- (26) It's OUTRAGEOUS, what he's asking.

Sentence (26) is an instance of right dislocation. The headless relative *what he's asking* is an ANTITOPIC. An antitopic is a de-accented resumptive element which appears to the right of the focus domain. Antitopics, like topics, are referential elements which are ACTIVE or ACCESSIBLE in the discourse context. So, (25a) signals that the proposition *It's cold out there* is not only known but also active.

2.5. The What-a Exclamative. This construction is exemplified in (27):

- (27) a. What a good TIME we had.
 b. What a QUESTION!
 c. JESUS, what an IDIOT (I am).
 d. I can't believe what an IDIOT I am.
 e. They're such IDIOTS.

In this construction, the scalar degree is encoded by the nominal modifier *what* or *such*. When the modifier is *what*, there is inversion syntax, since a *wh*-element must be placed in the CP-specifier position. When the modifier is *such*, there is canonical syntax. Both modifiers select for an indefinite NP, whether singular or plural. The predicate nominal modified by *what* or *such* codes the type of entity considered. The scalar property may be encoded by a prenominal adjective, like *good* in (27a). The scalar property may also be inferred, as in (27b). A priori, we don't know whether the question at issue was particularly incisive, inappropriate or obtuse. In the case of (27c), the predicate nominal *idiot* is itself scalar, and so no adjective has to be inferred. The inverted subject, like the noninverted subject in (27e), is topical, and when the main verb is copular, both the verb and the inverted subject have the potential for null realization. For example, in (27c) the copula and the subject may be deleted.

The affective judgement may be expressed by a subordinating predicator like *I can't believe* or by an expletive like *Jesus*. The affective judgement may also be inferred, as in (27a) and (b). What-a exclamatives closely resemble indirect exclamatives. They contain *wh*-syntax and they presuppose that a particular degree of some property has been attained. In addition, what-a clauses, like indirect questions, can be tied to nonexclamative, factive matrix verbs, as in (18a): *They don't realize what a jerk he is*.

2.6. The Degree-Adverb Exclamative. This construction is exemplified in (28):

- (28) GOD, I'm so TIRED of this (that I want to SCREAM).

This construction is an instance of the AEC and the subject-predicate construction. It invokes anaphoric degree word modification, which Zwicky (1994b) distinguishes from the degree modification performed by adverbs like *very*. As an anaphor, *so* differs from *very* in that it accepts a CONSECUTIVECLAUSE like *that I want to scream*. *So* also differs from *very* in that the latter is not compatible with exclamative semantics. Sentence (29) is not an instance of the Degree-Adverb Exclamative:

(29) I'm very ANNOYED with him.

We say that (29) is not a degree-word exclamation because it is not compatible with an expletive encoding the affective judgement. Notice the oddness of (30):

(30) GOD, I'm very ANNOYED with him.

It seems to be no accident that the Degree-Adverb Exclamative requires the anaphoric degree word *so*. This adverb is invoked by a correlative construction which presupposes the attainment of a particular degree: the consecutive-clause construction. The clause denoting the consequence is new information; the fact that I am tired to some degree is presupposed. Thus, with or without a consecutive clause, sentences like (28) presuppose the attainment of a given scalar degree, as required by the AEC.

2.7. The NP-Complement Exclamative. This construction is exemplified in (31):

- (31) a. I can't believe the TIME I spent on this.
 b. I'm amazed at the PEOPLE you know.
 c. I can't believe the NERVE of some people.

In this construction, an epistemic predicate denoting the affective stance takes a definite-NP complement. This NP can be paraphrased by a *wh*-exclamative clause. For example, (31a) is synonymous with (32):

(32) I can't believe how much time I spent on this.

We propose that the NP-Complement Exclamative, in addition to being an instance of the AEC, also subsumes the Metonymic NP Construction. The Metonymic NP Construction licenses a reading of a definite NP in which the NP evokes a particular scalar extent. Notice that the NP itself need not explicitly evoke a scalar amount or degree (as it does in, e.g., *I am amazed at the degree of progress*). Definite NPs like *the nerve* do not explicitly encode an amount or degree. By positing the Metonymic NP construction, we account for the paraphrase relation between (31a) and the indirect exclamative (32).

We said earlier that the Metonymic NP Construction is uniquely devoted to the expression of exclamative meaning. This claim requires some justification, particularly in light of (33):

- (33) a. I realize the pressure you're under.
b. I now know the magnitude of that catastrophe.

The definite NPs in (33) can be paraphrased as, respectively, *how much pressure I'm under* and *how great the catastrophe was*. Thus, it seems clear that a definite NP can invoke a scalar extent whether it appears in an exclamative construction or complements a factive verb like *know* or *realize*. Notice, however, that NP complements of factive verbs are constrained in a way that the NP complements in (31) are not:

- (34) a. ??I realize the people she knows.
b. ??I now know the nerve of some people.

The examples in (34) suggest that factive verbs *know* and *realize* do not welcome NP complements which do not have intrinsic scalar meaning. The absence of this constraint in examples like (31) indicates that the principle of nominal interpretation involved in (31) is particular to exclamative constructions.

2.8. Nominal Extraposition. This construction, which is analyzed in some detail in Michaelis and Lambrecht (1994), is exemplified in (35):

- (35) a. It's amazing the DIFFERENCE!
b. It's amazing the PEOPLE she knows.
c. It's astonishing the BOOKS that can pile up.

In our earlier paper, we demonstrated that NE is distinct from right dislocation. For example, we find no number agreement between the pronominal subject and the extraposed NP, as shown in (35b). In addition, the extraposed NP lacks the deaccentuation of antitopic constituents that is characteristic of right dislocated NPs. We also showed that NE has an exclamative function: it licenses predicates denoting expectation contravention and it has a scalar interpretation. Our observations so far make it easy to see how NE fits into the family of exclamative constructions. It is an instance of the AEC, it is an instance of Extraposition, and it subsumes the Metonymic NP construction. We refer the reader to our 1994 paper for further discussion of this construction.

2.9. The Bare-NP Exclamative. This construction is exemplified in (36):

- (36) a. The things I put UP with around here.

b. The NERVE of that man!

It is tempting to regard (36b), for example, as an elliptical instance of either (37a) or (37b):

- (37) a. I can't BELIEVE the NERVE of that man!
 b. It's INCREDIBLE the NERVE of that man!

The problem is that we then have two potential sources for (36b). A simpler option, which doesn't have the taint of a deletion transformation, is simply to regard (36b) as an instance of an elliptical construction, where the affective judgement is pragmatically inferred.

3.0. Conclusion. In conclusion, we will cite Zwicky's recent prolegomenon to a theory of grammatical constructions (1994a). Says Zwicky, "Like a morpheme or a lexical item..., a construction is neither pure form nor pure meaning, but a Saussurean sign, a pairing of the two". Zwicky points out that "there is a very great latitude in the way in which formal conditions are associated with semantics". To this we add pragmatics: different constructions, with different formal conditions and different information-structure articulations, can be associated with the same complex of semantic and illocutionary properties. Where does this leave us with respect to our question concerning the form-function fit? By positing an inheritance network, we discover regularities that enable us to see a diverse array of forms as a paradigm. Given an emic level, that of the AEC, and an etic level, that of the nine exclamative types, we find that the relevant question is not: is there a form-function fit in this domain? The relevant question is: what conditions determine speaker choice in this domain? Constraints of information structure will be relevant here. We leave this problem for another paper.

References

- Fillmore, Charles. 1982. "Toward a Descriptive Framework for Spatial Deixis". In J. Jarvella and W. Klein, eds., *Speech, Place and Action*. London: J. Wiley and Sons.
- Fillmore, Charles. 1986. "Pragmatically Controlled Zero Anaphora". In K. Nikiforidou, et al., eds., *BLS 12*. Berkeley: BLS, Inc.
- Fillmore, Charles and Paul Kay. 1993. *Construction Grammar*. Unpublished ms., UC Berkeley.
- Fillmore, Charles, Paul Kay and M.C. O'Connor. 1988. "Regularity and Idiomaticity in Grammatical Constructions". *Language* 64: 501-538.

- Goldberg, Adele. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- König, Ekkehard. 1986. "Conditionals, Concessive Conditionals and Concessives: Areas of Contrast, Neutralization and Overlap". In E. Traugott et al., eds., *On Conditionals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, Stephen. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Michaelis, Laura and Knud Lambrecht. 1994. "Nominal Extraposition: A Constructional Analysis". In S. Gahl, et al., eds., BLS 20. Berkeley: BLS, Inc.
- Milner, Jean-Claude. 1978. *De la syntaxe à l'interprétation*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Pinker, Steven and Alan Prince. 1991. "Regular and Irregular Morphology and the Psychological Status of Rules of Grammar". In L. Sutton, et al., eds., BLS 17. Berkeley: BLS, Inc.
- Sadock, Jerrold and Arnold Zwicky. 1985. "Speech Act Distinctions in Syntax". In T. Shopen, ed., *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zwicky, Arnold. 1994a. "Dealing out Meaning: Fundamentals of Grammatical Constructions". In S. Gahl et al., eds., BLS 20. Berkeley: BLS, Inc.
- Zwicky, Arnold. 1994b. "Exceptional Degree Markers: A Puzzle in Internal and External Syntax". Unpublished ms., Ohio State University and Stanford University.