Mykhaylenko V. V.,
Doctor of Philology, Professor at Department of Foreign Languages and
Theory and Practice of Translation of
Institute of International Relations and Social Studies,
Interregional Academy of Personnel Management

CORRELATION OF INTERJECTION AND EXCLAMATION: ANTHROPOCENTRIC ASPECT

Summary. The present article is focused on the correlation of exclamation and interjection in language paradigmatics and discourse continuum. In language system there are two different units, on the contrary, as units in use they are interchangeable. Obviously, the functional semantics of exclamation may cause its grammaticalization. Despite an intrepid quest of linguists trying to prove, that the interjection does not belong to any part of speech, it keeps on developing and attract many parts of speech to be used, as secondary interjections.

Key words: interjection, exclamation, utterance, discourse, open and close parts of speech.

Introductory remarks. A permanent change in the language studies is due to the introduction of new tools of analysis enabling the scholar to highlight some aspects of the object, which were impossible to reveal in the previous linguistic paradigms. We believe, that the discourse model of research, a constituent of the general anthropocentric paradigm, underlines the correlation of language units in use, then in the long run most irregularities in the language system would turn out to be regularities in language use, i.e. on the discoursemic level of the language structure. The speaker with his/her communicative needs becomes the core of the language analysis and the notion of human status is crucial in all the areas of human endeavour. Anthropocentrism is a normal way of human being, perceiving the world, which presupposes interpreting it in terms of human values and experiences. This thesis takes its roots in anthropocentrism, a philosophical viewpoint, which argues that human beings are the central or most significant entities in the world (Britannica).

In the next part of the paper I will focus on ambiguity of interjection, exclamation and emotion in the process of investigating their correlation in English. One of the "outlaws" of the English school grammar is interjection within language and across languages. The fact is that, there is a scholastic substitution of concepts: the category of interjection is approximately ignored of its grammatical status, but referred to the close part of speech. R. Quirk et al. consider, that interjections (exclamations, we admit, somewhat misleadingly) interfere with the structure of the language [14, p. 413–414]. G. Leech ultimately does not refer primary interjections to any grammatical category due to their exclamatory functions, simply express the speaker's emotion or wish [9, p. 57], now we can see, that the tradition of treating such interjections as alien body in language. The primary sound-interjections are the object of our investigation – the form, meaning and function. In this respect Felix Ameka's classification will be basic. He distinguishes between primary interjections (*oh, er, ah, whoops, aha, boo, eew, gosh, ha, oops, ouch, uh-oh, uh-huh, ugh, yowza, gee, yay, whoa, wow, yum,* etc.) and secondary interjections (*man, my God, Good Lord, goodness, boy, please, O.K,* etc) [1, p. 101–118].

Totally, there are more than 500 interjections and many of them multifunctional, though taken out of their contexts or from communicative situations only some of them – the most frequent and used across the country, can retain their functional-semantic meaning.

Interjection in theoretical fuzziness. Interjection is treated as a kind of a "grammatical outlaw" since the term has not been bound to a language unit. The definitional analysis of the concept of interjection reveals its various nominations, for instance: an abrupt remark (communication); a word or a sentence; a word or phrase; a separate category from the other parts of speech; a little word or a non-word; a marginal class of words (morphology [13, p. 232, 349]); a grammatical term for a word (grammar); any other linguistic element (a phenomenon of linguistics [18, p. 159]); a variable autonomous phrasal unit (syntax [8, p. 17]), an emotional expression; pragmatic particles or discourse particles emotive words (pragmatics [8, p. 18]); inserts (embedded units), which have exclamatory function (syntax [3, p. 1083]), etc., which do not enter into syntactic relation; they are resorted to when speakers encounter events, that cause pain, surprise or any other unexpected feelings. All these terms show, that there is neither a clear-cut definition, nor a definite level of interjection status in the language structure. However, they have a common feature, most scholars admit their periphery status feature – a context-bound meaning since these terms refer to the units, which have no reference of their own as any other [19, p. 119–120] lexeme. Although Anna Wierzbicka suggests, that "interjections like any other linguistic element have their meaning and this meaning can be identified and captured in the natural semantic metalanguage" introduced by the author [18, p. 159–160]. There is also a comment of interjection "as a part of the quoted conversation" in the function of indexing the interactional context of the utterance [6, p. 171].

The traditional definition of interjection as a part of speech is based on three fundamental principles: 1) form – invariable; 2) meaning – absent; and 3) function – that of a "word-sentence either autonomous or of a clause in the sentence structure". We believe that this approach still retains the assumption, that the meaning must be described in terms of lexical semantics, but in this case the approach to the meaning must employ the tools of functional semantics, then we can share Anna Wierzbicka's opinion, that to reveal the meaning of interjections, particularly, sound interjections, we have to elaborate a special metalanguage. Consequently, interjections cannot constitute a semantic field, for instance, that of feeling or emotion since they do not share a common semantic feature of feeling or emotion. Igor Mechuk's thesis on the common semantic component in the lexical meaning of the Semantic Field constituent [11, p. 165–188; 12, p. 424]. Nevertheless, they can join the conceptual system of "Feeling" or "Emotion" as an autonomous category actualizing the functional-semantic meaning. Of course, this thesis contradicts the definition of the Semantic Field, but it may be labeled as an irregularity and one can see, that irregularities are the causes of progress.

Exclamation & interjection overlapping. In discourse or speech continuum the phenomenon of exclamation can be defined: 1) broadly as any utterance marked with strong emotion; or 2) narrowly as a sentence type used to express a strong emotional state. It contrasts in syntax or morphology with other sentence types, which typically express statements, commands and questions (SIL). Manik Joshi uses the terms of exclamation and interjection indiscernibly, evidently, for the EFL/ESL learners to avoid an additional stumble point [7, p. 5.] Laura H. Michaelis introduces the term "exclamative constructions" for exclamations – a nomination between a morphologically indefinite unit of a word and a sentence or an utterance. These constructions "form a variegated class within and across languages, but then she specifies them as a sentence type [12, p. 1038]. In the referred definitions exclamation is interpreted as an utterance – a unit of speech, or a sentence – a unit of syntax, although thee both express a strong emotional state. David Crystal also underlines its dual nature: a term used in the classification of sentence functions and sometimes defined on grammatical and sometime on semantic or sociolinguistic grounds [5]. Traditionally, he admits, that this term refers to any emotional utterance. In a previous edition of his dictionary David Crystal writes, that exclamation expresses a strong emotion, whose exact value depends on the speaker's choice of intonation and his/her facial expression. Such assumption refers this sentence type, whose expression paradigm is limited and due to the speaker's intonation it can evolve any other sentence type [5, p. 289]. One can come across the non-intellectual-sentence types defined as exclamation.

In the given definitions of exclamation the interjection is not specified as the dominant means of its expression and the involvement of the Speaker and Addressee as the main actors of communication is not specified. Irma Taavitsanen in her article "Interjections in Middle English" introduces those actors: if the exclamation is focused on the Speaker, then it is used either in the emotive or conative. If it is focused on the addressee, it is used in the vocative or conative functions. Then investigating the Middle English written texts she underlines, that interjection can fulfill the turn-taking in the performance of text – vocative and turning points in the text, foregrounding in narration and stylistic Investigating discourse or registered speech continuum it performs the segmentative and intensifyng function Taavitsanen [16, p. 575–577].

Anthropocentricity of language. I shall pay attention on the adaptability of language as a feature of anthropocentricity of human language. Language is a perfect phenomenon with its system and structure organized by the "emic" level represented by their units: phonemic – phoneme; morphemic – morpheme; lexemic – lexeme; syntaxemic – syntaxeme; sememic – sememe; textemic – texteme; and discoursemic – discourseme. Here is a strong architecture and, at first sight, if we change the order the structure would fall apart. But not in language is a self-adaptable system and changes reflect primarily the speaker's inferences. In case of interjection it can be represented by a sound like Oh! Which can express the speaker's "surprise", when meeting a friend unexpectedly after a long time that is the communicative situation turns the sound into a word, or rather an utterance, which further on decompress into a text or discourse, which is redundant between friends. Through, in the play the author has to specify that two close friends meet after a long separation, etc. for the actors or the readers. Vladimir Ž. Jovanović says, that people "use forms, which cannot be easily and distinctly defined as words, but which have to be considered as phonemic clusters with or without characteristic meaning [8, p. 17].

The terms exclamation and exclamative refer in general to expressive utterances. Then later exclamation has been applied to related expressive phenomena, like interjections and news-reporting declaratives [12, p. 1038], cf.: an exclamation is considered to be equal to interjection and it is a short sound or word, or phrase which is spoken suddenly to express strong emotion. An exclamatory word can be a word-sentence while expressing strong emotion or reaction traditionally called an exclamation or interjection. They lack a full grammatical sentence structure анв marked by strong intonation. Exclamative utterances are said to encode surprise. In conveying surprise exclamation resemble a subset of interjections [9, p. 445–6], because they express the speaker's appraisal, another subset expresses the speaker's evaluation – positive or negative.

The fact is that the boundaries between interjections and exclamations are not watertight, which leads to their misconception. However, primary interjections belong to a grammatical category of part of speech, nevertheless their origin is not truly linguistic, it is rather paralinguistic, but their meaning is accepted and supported in the speaking community. The question of their close or open status as a part of speech is debative. *In modern grammars, the interjection is a periphery unit of the grammatical system and it not in the focus of the university grammar as it is of minor importance* [14, p. 67]. Therefore, most grammarians refer the syntactical units of various structure marked with the exclamatory point to the exclamative sentence type and the interjections within the sentence treat as an embedded unit, and an autonomous interjection in the discourse is treated as a pseudo-sentence. Consequently, they consider, that exclamations and interjections overlap with the exclamation in the leading position, ignoring the fact, that exclamation is a grammatical meaning of the interjections and exclamations constitute a functional-semantic field, wherein all the constituents share a common component of emotion, which is a context-bound and their function to express exclamation. Then the given field can represent the concept of exclamation in discourse. There are nearly all sound-interjections are polifunctional, for instance: *oh* can also express pain, dismay, pain, surprise, etc. Collin's dictionary differentiation of functional semantics of *oh* 1) to express a feeling such as surprise, pain, annoyance, happiness; 2) to introduce a response or a comment on something that has just been said. And Cambridge dictionary: 1) oh as an interjection to express surprise or disappointment; 2) as a discourse marker to respond to new information or to show, that we have just discovered something surprising. Dwight Bolinger underlines every interjection must be associated with a particular emotion and non-verbal behaviour [4, p. 226; 16]. But here comes the context, which verifies the use of interjection and a possibility of the semantic combinability of the interjection the proceeding / following words, or the proceeding / following utterances/sentences when used as an autonomous utterance/sentence. All the relevant parameters of global and local contexts, says Carla Bazzanella, appear to be crucial not only to understand the semantic component of emotion or exclamation actualized in the given context, but also to avoid fuzziness of emotional word, exclamation and interjection. The author stresses the dynamic nature of the local context, which affects every individual interjection expressing emotion and regulates its intensity, duration [2, p. 57–58]. Distinct prosodic entity, tend not to have a specific semantic meaning, and contribute to the core meaning poses many problems, since each element may appear in such a multiplicity of functional context, and with such a varied array of meanings, it is difficult to a core meaning, especially in the case of pause markers and interjections. D. Schiffrin admits that, interjections are used in discourse functions to play in communication and D. Biber et al share her emphasis [15, p. 74; 3, p. 1083]. They have

not only be seen as a sort of words, which express speakers' internal feelings, but also to have different interpretations according to the context in which they are used.

As for their function they do not enter into syntactic relation; they are resorted to when speakers encounter events that cause pain, surprise or any other unexpected feelings and can be defined as "pro-sentences, which do not enter into syntactic relations with the rest of the sentence" [14, p. 853]. The scholars employ the traditional two-member sentence structure to determine the sentence type expressed by interjections ignoring the fundamental goal of any sentence to express the speaker' thought or idea. From the semantic or rather the functional-semantic view the interjections play the role of a true utterance as the speaker chooses the means of expressing his/her message, which can be understood by the addressee. We can classify the primary interjections into interjections used to express the speaker's inner feelings: pleasure, resignation, realization, surprise, grief, pity, pain and interjections used to express his/her feelings for cooperation with the addressee: pleading, greeting, hesitation, continuation, introductory, summative. Most frequent interjections in discourse: *yeah, no, hey, oh, uh, um, huh, ah, wow, err, umm* and others are primary ones.

Conclusion & perspectives. Despite an intrepid quest of linguists trying to prove, that the interjection does not belong to any part of speech, it keeps on developing and attract many parts of speech to be used assecondary interjections. The present study sums up the findings that despite Felix Ameka's referring interjections to the periphery of the language system [1, p. 101–118], they play a significant role in communication. One cannot imagine the actual discourse bereft of these units. They are witnesses of the scholars' futile attempts to elaborate a new approach to describe such a complex phenomenon conveying the notion without notional lexemes.

A classification of primary interjections is suggested: 1) addressor-oriented – interjections used to express the speaker's inner feelings: pleasure, resignation, realization, surprise, grief, pity, pain; and 2) addressee-oriented – interjections used to express his/her feelings for cooperation with the addressee: pleading, greeting, hesitation, continuation, introductory, summative.

As for the cooperation of interjections with exclamations in language system and discourse – the former are the open functional part of speech, which can constitute a subsystem of the conceptual system "Feeling/Emotion"; the other is the functional of interjections in various discourse registers.

The "universal" conclusion, that the interjection is a characteristic feature of the informal discourse needs the corpus analysis to reconsider it. Especially in professional discourses, where the secondary interjections may prevail.

References:
1. Ameka Felix. Interjections. The Universal Yet Neglected part of Speech / Journal of Pragmatics. – 1992. – Vol.18. – Issues 2-3. – P. 101–118.
2. Bazzanella Carla. Emotions, Language, and Context / Carla Bazzanella, Edda Weigand (ed). Emotion in Dialogic Interaction: Advances in the Complex. – Amsterdam. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2004. – P. 55–72.
3. Biber D. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. – London: Longman, 1999. – XXVIII. 1204 p.
4. Bolinger Dwight. Intonation and Its Uses. – Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1989. – 477 p.
5. Crystal D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Linguistics. – Oxford: Blackwell, 2011. – 560 p.
6. Goddard C., Wierzbicka A. (Eds.). Meaning and Universal Grammar – Theory and Empirical Findings. Vol-s. I-II. – Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2002. – 337 p.
7. Joshi Manik. Learn English Exclamations: Popular Exclamatory Words and Sentences. – New York: Create Space Independent Publishing, 2013. – 60 p.
8. Jovanović Vladimir Ž. The Form, Position and Meaning of Interjections in English. FACTA UNIVERSITATIS Series: Linguistics and Literature. – 2004. – Vol. 3. – No 1. – Pp. 17–28.
9. Leech Geoffrey. Glossary of English Grammar. – Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006. – 144 p.
10. Makkai Adam. Where Do Exclamations come from? / A. Makkai, Alan K. Melby (eds.). Linguistics and Philosophy: Essays in Honor of Rulon S. Wells. –Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1984. – P. 445–472.
11. Mel'chuk Igor A. Semantic Description of Lexical Units in an Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary: Basic Principles and Heuristic Criteria / International Journal of Lexicography. – 1988. – Vol. 1. – Issue 3. – P. 165–188
12. Michaelis Laura H. Exclamative Constructions / Martin Haspelmath et al. (eds.). Language Typology and Language Universals. – Vol. 2. – Berlin. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008. – P. 1038–1049.
13. Mykhaylenko Valery V. A Glossary of Linguistics and Translation Studies. – Ivano-Frankivsk: I-FKDGU, 2015. – 527 p.
14. Quirk R. et al. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language / R Quirk, S.G. Greenbaum, G. Leech, J. Svartvik. – London: Longman 1985. – 1779 p.
15. Schiffrin Deborah. Discourse Markers. – Washington DC: Georgetown University, 1987. – x. 364 p.
16. Stange Ulrike. Emotive Interjections in British English. – Amsterdam: Johm Benjamins, 2016. – 242 p.
17. Taavitsaintn Irma. Exclamation in Middle English / Jacek Fisiak (ed). Studies in Middle English Linguistics. – Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997. – P. 573–609.
18. Wierzbicka Anna. The Semantics of Interjections / Journal of Pragmatics. – 1992. – Vol. 18. – Issues 2-3. – P. 159–192.
19. Wilkins David p. Interjections as Deictics / Journal of Pragmatics. – 1992. – Vol. 18. – Issues 2-3. – P. 119–158.

Михайленко В. В. Кореляція «вигуку» та «оклику»: антропоцентичний аспект

Анотація. Ця стаття присвячена кореляції «вигуку» та «оклику» у системі мови та англомовному дискурсі. Справа в тому, що у системі мови – це дві різні одиниці і, навпаки, у разі функціонування у певному контексті, вони виступають взаємозамінними одиницями. Вочевидь, функціональна семантика «оклику» може спричиняти його граматикалізацію.

Ключові слова: вигук, оклик, антропоцентризм, дискурс, відкриті та закриті частини мови.

Михайленко В. В. Кореляция междометия и восклицания: антропоцентрический аспект

Аннотация. Настоящая статья посвящена корреляции междометия и восклицания в системе языка и англоязычном дискурсе. Дело в том, что в системе языка – это две разные единицы и, наоборот, при функционировании в определенном контексте, они выступают взаимозаменяемыми единицами. Очевидно, функциональная семантика восклицания может вызывать его грамматикализацию.

Ключевые слова: междометие, восклицание, антропоцентризм, дискурс, открытые и закрытые части речи.