

## THE MEANS OF EXPRESSION OF THE CATEGORY OF ADMIRATIVENESS IN RUSSIAN, FRENCH AND ENGLISH

Elena K. Kuzmina<sup>1</sup>

Gulnara G. Nazarova<sup>2</sup>

Lilia R. Nizameeva<sup>3</sup>

Gérard Broussois<sup>4</sup>

**Abstract:** The comprehension of admirativeness as an independent category took place relatively recently – at the end of the 20th century. Until now, some scholars have not recognized an independent character of admirative. However, in recent years there has been an increasingly noticeable tendency to recognize the separate role of admirativeness and to indicate that the expression of surprise evoked by unexpected information cannot be combined with similar meanings. At the same time, the ways and degree of expression of admirativeness in different language systems vary significantly. The introduction of such grammatical category as admirativeness and the term “admirative” refers to the second half of the 19th century. In 1879, O. Dozon coined the term in his works on the Albanian language. The choice of this name (Fr. *admiratif* comes from the verb “to admire”) is determined by the fact that the linguist interpreted the concept as a

certain sense of admiration or surprise, often having an ironic character. Further the development of this direction showed that admirative had the meaning of surprise rather than admiration. In this connection, in 1997, S. de Lancey first singled out this concept into a separate grammatical category. The scholar substantiates it by the fact that in a number of languages, such as Korean, Turkish, Tibetan, Dardic, Sanvar, etc., admirative has a separate grammatical expression. The identification of admirativeness as a separate linguistic phenomenon with a number of specific features has been still the subject of controversy among the researchers. Characteristics and distinctive features of admirativeness, allowing for the separation it from other similar categories will be considered later in the paper (Davletbaeva et al., 2013). In his writings, S. de Lancey uses the term “mirative”, thereby excluding its correlation with admiration introduced by O.

<sup>1</sup> Kazan Federal University, Tel.: 8 9503226949. e-mail: lenysinka@yandex.ru

<sup>2</sup> Kazan Federal University

<sup>3</sup> Kazan Federal University

<sup>4</sup> Ministère de l'Éducation nationale, Applied foreign languages

Dozon from the meaning of the concept, and indicating that its primary function is to convey the subject's astonishment. To date, the term "mirative" is widely used in English-language grammar. V.A. Plugnyan notes that the use of this term is more grounded from a typological point of view, however, the use of the concept "admirative" is often retained in domestic works (Smagina, 1996).

**Keywords:** language, culture, knowledge, admirativeness, intercultural communication.

## Introduction

Admirativeness can be defined as a formal grammatical category denoting information that is not included in the existing world image of the addressee, and therefore, has the character of unexpectedness, novelty for him. In this case, admirative is the opposite of indicative, which includes knowledge to be already previously available to the addressee. Admirative is used to indicate a new level of knowledge, implying surprise and, therefore, incomplete, the addressee's lack of data (Foolen, 1997).

K. Hengeveld understands admirativeness as a category that characterizes the proposition as being

new, surprising. At the same time, the scholar notes that within the framework of admirativeness, there may be the cases when the information is unexpected for both the speaker and the addressee (Davletbaeva et al., 2013).

It should be noted that this category has a grammatical expression only in certain languages (Albanian, Turkish, Quechua, Yanomami), but in others it has an implicit expression and is often rendered by means of intonation (English, French, Russian, etc.).

Considering that admirative is emotional, it is especially widely used in spoken language. In this case, the subject can be both the first, second, and third persons. However, examples of the use of admirativeness with the first person are much less common since unexpected information is rarely addressed by the speaker to himself, much more often it refers to the addressee or to any third person.

## Methods

Analyzing the semantics of the category of admirativeness, one can define the following key features:

– discovery of something that happened suddenly for the addressee;

– astonishment;

– consciousness being ready for the present information;

– conflict;

– novel nature of information (Smagina, 1996).

R. Nitsolova identifies two main types of situations within which the admirative functions:

- the speaker or the addressee does not have any knowledge (the probability of the absence of situation on the whole is not denied);

- the speaker or the addressee has just got information about the situation (one implies its presence) (Savchenko, 2011).

The structure of the sentence containing admirative can be represented in several ways, namely, presupposition and assertion. Presupposition implies the presence of certain knowledge of the addressee, which is the basis for evaluating new information. In such a situation, knowledge can be both general and individual, that is, related to a concrete person or concrete time. Assertion, on the contrary, does not

contain any preliminary information, but only designates the fact of reality (Plungyan, 2011).

V.A. Plungyan notes that admirative serves to express an opinion related to the expectations of the addressee, contrasting the opinions of the communicants before the speech act, when the probability of the situation was extremely small for them, and the fact of the emergence of this situation, which results in surprise (Smagina, 1996).

Thus, admirativeness is a special category which serves to express the subject's surprise evoked by new, unexpected information for him.

Based on studies of Turkish, Korean, Tibetan and other languages, S. de Lancey concludes that admirativeness is independent and should be referred to a separate grammatical category. In addition, the linguist points to the Albanian language as one of the most obvious examples of the independent functioning of admirative. In this language, admirative serves to express surprise of the speaker, as well as other emotions (irony, doubt, etc.) (Foolen, 1997). Following it, a number of scholars found the presence of admirative in other languages, especially in the Tibetan-

Burmese subfamily. However, some linguists represent a challenge to such emphasis. Thus, J. Lazar claims that admirative is inseparable from mediative, and N. Hill says that the arguments given in the works by S. de Lancey are insufficient for such conclusions, indicating that the Atabask language he analyzes contains only the category of evidentiality (Davletbaeva et al., 2013).

The nondifferentiation between the categories of admirativeness and evidentiality in the works of many linguists is conditioned by the similarity in relation to their semantic and formal aspects. So, often these concepts are combined into one when analyzing the grammatical structure of the Bulgarian language in which admirative is expressed by the forms of evidentiality, which allows the researchers to consider them as a single whole (Smagina, 1996).

### **Results And Discussion**

A number of researchers attributed the concept of admirativeness to evidentiality, considering it one of the grammemes of this category. This is due to the fact that the surprise prompted by new information implies that the speaker

perceives information. In addition, examples of the coincidence of the grammemes of these categories in a number of languages are an additional argument in favor of relating admirativeness to the category of evidentiality. Despite this, the nondifferentiation of these concepts can be called grammatically unjustified. First of all, it is connected with the fact that the main component of admirative is a component of novelty, an unexpected nature of the received information. So, the semantics of admirative is in sharp contrast to the evidential meanings since it does not imply information about the source of information, estimates the probability of information received, and does not serve to repeat the information obtained from other persons.

V.A. Plungyan also notes that the grammatical and semantic aspects of these categories do not coincide in a number of languages. For example, the Atabask language is characterized by discordancy of the paradigms of admirativeness and evidentiality, and in English evidentiality is not grammaticalized, admirative is expressed implicitly with the help of intonation (Smagina, 1996).

Specialists differ on the question of whether native speakers of these countries perceive the similarities among the variants spoken in them (Yakubova et al., 2016; Guzii, 2014).

Another related category of admirativeness is epistemic modality. This category serves to express the opinion of the addressee regarding the truth of information or his judgment on the extent to which the situation in reality is believable.

In the work of grammarians, the ratio of these two categories is considered from different viewpoints. One should emphasize the approach of I.A. Melchuk who refers admirativeness and epistemic modality to the category of reactivity. This category serves to express the speaker's attitude to a certain situation in terms of the probability of its occurrence. The linguist contrasts this category of evidentiality on the basis that the latter serves to express a statement about the presence of a situation.

T.V. Bulygina, A.D. Shmelev, M.K. Saboneyeva are wedded to the idea that admirativeness and epistemic modality cannot be combined into one category on the basis that conveying surprise at a situation in admirative does

not imply the obligatory presence of the opposition “opinion – knowledge” (Davletbaeva et al., 2013).

Within the text, admirative can be found both in direct speech and in speech from the author aimed at characterizing a character or an action.

Depending on the role of admirative in constructing the message in direct speech, the following types of message can be distinguished:

- admirative of initiation utterance;
- admirative of answer utterances.

The main characteristic of the first type is the removal of the core of admirative beyond the utterance, which determines the admirative's performance of various pragmatic functions depending on the semantic content of the sentence. So, admirative can indicate the mobilization of the speaker's mental process, contain the information about the recipient's attitude to new information, or take into account the listener's possible reaction to the message.

Considering admirative response utterances, A.A. Savchenko distinguishes their types:

– predominantly emotional admirative utterances;

– predominantly intellectual admirative utterances.

This division is based on the predominance in the utterance of an emotional or intellectual component, respectively (Davletbaeva et al., 2013; Hill, 2012).

The first type of admirative utterance is characterized by syntactic incompleteness, the use of means indicating a short nature, the intensity of the reaction.

The second type of admirative utterance in most cases implies the presence of a complete syntactic structure, as well as the explication of meaning.

The functioning of the category of admirativeness within the author's text also has a number of specific features. Considering the admirative of the author's text, it should be noted that it can mean a person's astonishment, affecting the following aspects:

– change in psychological condition;

– change in physical condition.

A.A. Savchenko notes that the second type of change implies the presence in the author's text of a number of physical reactions that follow the communication of new information. They comprehend the body language or facial movements (to open one's mouth, shake one's head and much more) (Davletbaeva et al., 2013).

The scholar correlates the difference in the explication / implication of admirative meaning with the division of the field of admirative into the core and the periphery.

The core admiratives have a number of psychological characteristics. N.V. Dorofeyeva distinguishes among them the following:

1. Surprise evoked by new unexpected information is perceived by a person visually or through hearing and is comprehended by him. Examples of these admiratives in the Russian language are the units “узнать/обнаружить/увидеть с изумлением”, in the English language – “to be surprised/ to note/ find with wonder, etc.”, in the French language – “être surpris/ remarquer/ s'étonner”.

2. Surprise is unexpected or it is intensified gradually and can be repeated.

3. The duration of surprise can be different: it can be long or short-term (мигновенное изумление / fleeting amazement).

4. The level of intensity and power of surprise can vary from slight to very intense (страшно изумиться/ to wonder greatly/ Se surprendre). Besides, the degree of surprise may be increasing when uttering (возрастающее изумление/ a growing wonder).

5. Surprise may be accompanied by other experiences and emotions. For example, there may be cases of the simultaneous presence of feelings such as astonishment and interest (смотреть удивленно и с любопытством / look surprised and curious), amazement and doubt (puzzled amazement, étonnement perplexe), astonishment and confusion (confused astonishment, étonnement confus) (Dorofeyeva, 2002).

Moreover, N.V. Dorofeyeva believes that in addition to the emotions that are neutral and intellectual, a combination of surprise with both positive and negative emotions is

possible. The researcher notes that in such cases, the admirative can develop into a feeling with a connotation of meaning. Among the combinations of the admirative and positive emotional reactions N.V. Dorofeyeva distinguishes the following:

- surprise in a combination with gratification (приятно изумить, delightful surprise, surprise agréable);

- surprise in a combination with ecstasy (ecstatic wonder, восторженно-удивленный, extatique merveille);

- astonishment in combination with admiration, worship of somebody (worshipping astonishment, étonnement affectueux);

- astonishment in combination with affection (affectionate astonishment, stupéfier);

- astonishment in combination with appreciation, gratitude (удивление и признательность);

- surprise in combination with pleasure (happy surprise, émerveiller);

- wonder in combination with respectfulness, deference (respectful wonder, révérence).



– surprise in combination with amusement (amused surprise, surprise drôle).

Considering the combination of the admirative with emotional reactions that convey a negative connotation, N.V. Dorofeyeva points out, first of all, to the following:

- surprise in combination with disappointment, grief (grim, sullen surprise/ wonder/astonishment, surprise avec déception);

- surprise of disagreeable nature (неприятно изумиться/удивиться, displeased surprise, surprise désagréable);

- surprise in combination with indignation, irritation (angry astonishment, быть удивленным и шокированным, surprise avec l'indignation, l'irritation, choquer);

- astonishment in combination with fright (horrified/fearful wonder/astonishment; испуганное удивление, surprise trouillant);

– astonishment in combination with anxiety (anxious astonishment);

– wonder in combination with injury (injured wonder, être offensé) (Dorofeyeva, 2002).

## Summary

It should be noted that the admirative is often accompanied by an indication of the particular physical condition of the person.

The presence of an admirative in the utterance often creates the need for additional information which can be formulated in the form of a question (to ask with wonder / astonishment, спросить изумленно, étonner).

In addition, the scholar notes that the core admirative contributes to the activation of addressee's speech (говорить изумленно / удивленно / с удивлением, ответить с изумлением, to say / to ask / to reply / to cry with wonder / astonishment / in amazement, dire / demander / répondre avec émerveillement / étonnement) (Dorofeyeva, 2002).

The functioning of the core admirative within the framework of the utterance is supplemented in some cases by various paralinguistic means. The researcher refers to them the slowed speech of the subject (протянуть удивленно/ изумленно), the raised voice (вскричать/ воскликнуть / в изумлении / удивлении; to cry / to shout



with surprise/ wonder/ in astonishment, hurler/ crier / étonné /émerveillé), as well as the presence of emotional repetitions (спросить еще раз в изумлении).

It should also be noted that mechanisms such as intonation and voice have a meaningful function for the core admirative.

### Conclusions

We can't but note the role of admirative in the expression of movements and somatic reactions of the subject. At the same time, a set of common reactions is distinguished, among them are trembling (tremble with astonishment), inability to talk (be struck dumb with astonishment), loss of sensation (be dead on feet with amazement) or balance.

The external expression of a kernel admirative in the utterance may vary in degree of explication. So, the following degrees of expression of this category are distinguished:

- open expression (to be frankly surprised);
- subtle expression;
- lack of expression, often characterized by self-control by the

subject (do not show surprise) (Dorofeyeva, 2002).

Concerning peripheral admiratives, they, according to G.P. Alfirenko and A. Vezhbitskaya, can be divided into two types on the basis of (non-)mediation of emotional expression:

- primary emotives;
- secondary emotives (Vezhbitskaya, 1999).

Primary emotives serve to reflect the emotions of the subject, which are socially meaningful. The second type is the admiratives that lose the function of conveying an emotional component in the utterance.

Thus, admirativeness is a broad category that comprehends the units of various kinds. The nature of an admirative can vary depending on the type of text within which it functions. Thus, the admiratives of direct speech and author's text are differentiated. Within the framework of the latter type one can distinguish the admiratives of initiating and response remarks.

### Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government

Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

Materials of International Philological Conference XL, March 14-19, 2011

### References

Vezhbitskaya, A. (1999). Semantic universals and description of languages. *M.: School «Languages of Russian culture.*

Dorofeyeva, N. V. (2002). Surprise as an Emotional Concept (Based on Russian and English Languages). The Dissertation for the Degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences. Specialty 10.02.20 – Comparative-Historical, Typological and Comparative Linguistics. Research Supervisor – Doctor of Philosophy, Professor S. G. Vorkachev. Kuban State Technological University, Krasnodar, 214 p.

Plungyan, V. A. (2011). Introduction to Grammatical Semantics: Grammatical Meanings and Grammatical Systems of World Languages. – M.: RSHU.

Savchenko, A. A. (2011). Identities and Transformations of Means of Expression of Admirative in French and Russian.

Actual Problems of Translation Studies. Edited by prof. V.I. Shadrin. – St. Petersburg: Faculty of Philology, St. Petersburg State University, 140-146

Smagina, S. V. (1996). Verbs of Surprise in English and Russian (Comparative Approach): Author's Theses for Candidate of Philology. *Pyatigorsk*, 16 p.

Davletbaeva, D., Sadykova, A., & Smirnova, E. (2013). The aspects of modern phraseology modeling. *World Applied Sciences Journal (Education, Law, Economics, Language and Communication)*, 27, 58-62.

Foolen, A. (1997). The expressive function of language: Towards a cognitive semantic approach. *The language of emotions: conceptualization, expression, and theoretical foundation*, 15-32.

Guzii, T. (2014). God Phenomenon in Anglo-Saxon Mythological Image of the World. *International Journal of*

*Linguistics and Communication*, 2(1),  
13-25.

Hill, N. W. (2012). “Mirativity” does not exist: ḥdug in “Lhasa” Tibetan and other suspects. *Linguistic Typology*, 16(3), 389-433.

Yakubova, D., Pleuchova, E., & Muñoz, R. G. (2016). Linguistic and Cultural Characteristics of the Caribbean Spanish. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 20, 263