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Abstract: The present study seeks to characterize the strategic realization of mirativity as a semantic category with an empirical focus on Urdu language. The study addresses the research question: How do declaratives become miratives? The question aims to elaborate the semantic composition which enables hearer to suspend the basic communicative function of declarative clause type and process it as a linguistic strategy to reach informational characterization peculiar to miratives. To address this question, the present study uses Evan’s (2009) the Lexical Concept and Cognitive Model (LCCM) as its theoretical underpinnings. This framework uses the constructs of Lexical Concept and Cognitive Model to account for the mechanisms of semantic composition for polysemous phenomena. The present work combines the LCCM theory with Gras et al.’s (2021) ‘phonological construction’ to account for the strategic realization of mirative meaning in Urdu. The study uses multiple data sources such as naturally occurring data, individual and dialogical introspections and Urdu Lughat. The study finds that to serve as miratives, declarative clauses undergo the processes of lexical concept selection, integration and interpretation for their final information characterization. Overall, the study implicates that meaning construction is a function of distinct types of information: linguistic content, conceptual content and contextual content, and the semantic compositional processes involved (selection, integration and interpretation) occur in tandem and recursively. The study concludes that a cluse type is polysemous in nature, and its pragmatic functions result from construal imposed on its content.
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Introduction
Clause types are pairings of a specific grammatical structure with a conventional pragmatic use (König & Siemund, 2007; Sadock & Zwicky, 1985). Since clause types have illocutionary potential that goes beyond their canonical illocutionary force, they
exhibit prototypical categorial structure both in their central uses and in cases where overlap between the pragmatic functions of sentence types occurs (Panther & Kopcke, 2008; Rett, 2011, 2021). Moreover, languages vary in terms of the formal realization options for meanings and functions. More specifically, languages vary as to whether they employ a ‘category’ or a ‘strategy’, to use Aikhenvald’s (2014) terms. To illustrate, if a language does not have a dedicated construction of a certain type (category), for example, imperative for commands, it may render the relevant meanings by using an established construction in a secondary sense (strategy: a subjunctive or another verb form instead). As Langacker (1987) puts it, “Linguistic convention cannot provide a fixed, unitary expression for every conceivable situation that a speaker might wish to describe” (p. 278). In order to overcome this coordination problem, as Clark (1996) argues, language use involves employing the conventional repertoire of symbolic units in non-conventional ways.

Given that the relationship between sentence type and communicative function is not one-to-one but many-to-many, and that languages may lack ‘category’ and use ‘strategy’ for linguistic expression of certain meanings/functions, a theoretically and descriptively relevant question is: if a clause type is used as a strategy to perform illocutionary functions which is otherwise prototypically associated with another clause type, how are meanings constructed? That is, what factors are responsible to override the primary meaning and then, profile the secondary meaning? Such questions need to be addressed in order to understand the polysemous nature of clause types and the relevant principles of semantic composition. As pointed out by Comrie (1985), it would form an interesting study to ascertain how grammatical categories and other linguistic items come to develop secondary uses in addition to their basic meaning. Thus, the main concern of the study is to find out shared features of semantic competence which both speaker and
hearer possess to construct meaning in a linguistically mediated communication. Against this background, the present study aims to investigate the phenomenon of mirativity in Urdu. Mirativity covers speaker’s unprepared mind, unexpected new information, and associated surprise (see Aikhenvald, 2004, 2012; DeLancey, 1997, 2001; Peterson, 2020). In some languages, mirativity is a grammatical category since mirative values are realized by grammatical markers (Aikhenvald, 2004, 2012; Bashir, 2010; DeLancey, 1997, 2001; Dickinson, 2000; Peterson, 2010, 2015, 2018, 2020) while other languages use different strategies to encode mirativity (DeLancey, 2001; Aikhenvald, 2012; Peterson, 2012, 2017).

**Literature Review**

The preliminary research shows that Urdu falls among those languages which make use of strategies to encode mirativity. Urdu/Hindi exhibits parasitic mirativity (Peterson, 2017), that is to say; mirativity is parasitic on certain kinds of structure. Urdu/Hindi can mark mirativity by aorist form of verb (Montaut, 2006). Montaut defines aorist as a form that does not mark tense and can be used for non-past meanings including future, as in (1). Example (1) occurs in the context of a couple and their fifteen years old son visiting their old friend after a long time. The friend hardly recognizes the boy whom he had known as a child:

(1) Are! Kitnâ baRâ ho gayâ! (uxtaposed ho gayâ hai)
Hey! How much tall be go [become]-AOR (uxtaposed be go-PFT)
My! How tall he has become!

(p.5, Ex.7)

Similarly, Montaut (2013, p.15) observes the use of perfect for mirative marking as in (2).

(2) mazâ â gayâ
fun come go-AOR
Great fun, I do enjoy so much!’

Hook (1974, 1976, as cited in Bashir, 2006) finds a potential mirative strategy in Urdu/Hindi in the use of simple verb (e.g., mıla ‘meet’) in contrast to compound verb (e.g., mil giya ‘meet go’). Hook observes that “In
cases where the performance of an action is completely unforeseen by the speaker, he may not use the compound verb” (1974, p.248). Again, “If there is no possibility of an action or event’s being anticipated, it is expressed with the non-compound verb” (1976, p.153). It illustrated that compound verbs are not possible.

(3) a. kalambas ne amrīkā kī khoj kī /*kar dī/ * kar lī Columbus ERG America of discovery (f.s.) does (PFV) f.s. /*do-give/*do-take ‘Columbus discovered America.’

b. kal dūdh me~ cūhā milā yesterday milk in mouse (m.s.) meets (PVF) m.s. ‘Yesterday we found a mouse in the milk.’
   (Hook, 1976, as cited in Bashir, 2006, p.153)

Bashir (2006) concurs with Hook in observing that mirative semantics is not compatible with the compound verb. She casts the distribution of compound verbs vs. simple verbs in DeLancey’s (1981, 1982, 1985a & b, 1986) model of event schema as a causal chain, and accounts for the differential behavior of these verbs, arguing that

[T]he distribution of compound verbs vis-à-vis simple verbs is related to the intersection point of an observer/speaker with an event vector. Compound verbs encode actions specified for intersection with more than one point on the vector, e.g., both origin and event, while simple verbs encode actions as an undifferentiated single stage conception, e.g., the event itself, or the end point/resultant state. A single-stage conception including only the end point gives rise to mirative semantics.(Bashir, 2006, p.3).

The recent research (Aikhenvald, 2004, 2012; Bashir, 2010; DeLancey, 1997, 2001; Mocini, 2014; Montaut, 2006; Peterson, 2012, among others) has provided a more nuanced view of mirativity. It also suggests that we have yet to uncover the basic generalizations that can draw together the myriad of ways mirativity can be linguistically
exhibited, the variety of meanings it appears to have, and also how some languages make use of other grammatical categories in the provision of mirativity. These observations are well suited in this context of Urdu because in Urdu as well as in other Indo-Aryan languages, investigation of mirativity is just in the initial stage. Very few studies are available on mirativity in Urdu/Hindi and many aspects of Urdu/Hindi mirative expressions need to be explored. For instance, a prosodic strategy for mirative realization needs special attention as suggested by Peterson (2010). Prosodic expression of emotions has already been discussed. However, their study does not exclusively focus on prosodic strategy for mirative realization; however, it takes into account the prosodic realization of four basic emotions. As far as the present researcher knows, no study is available in Urdu which has explored the phenomenon of mirativity as a conceptual category and its linguistic realization at clause level.

**Research Objectives**

The above considerations motivate the following research objectives:

- To identify the linguistic characteristics of the Urdu declarative clause type.
- To analyse the factors responsible for the mirative use of declaratives as strategies rather than as categories.
- To determine the cognitive operations involved in the semantic composition of declaratives.

**Research Question**

Given that Urdu lacks specialized morph syntactic marking and thus mostly displays parasitic mirativity, the question arises as to how non-mirative meaning turns into mirative meaning, that is, what lexico-cognitive compositional processes are involved in utterance-level meaning variation. These considerations motivate the following research question to be addressed in this study: *How do declaratives become miratives? To*
address this question, we need a framework which can incorporate situated use of polysemous expressions, and which could characterize explicitly the conditions licensing non-mirative expressions into mirative ones. The next section outlines a theoretical framework assumed to meet this requirement.

Theoretical Framework

LCCM theory presents two types of knowledge representation – linguistic system and conceptual system – and assumes that meaning is constructed when linguistic system and conceptual system reciprocate each other. Linguistic system and conceptual system are modelled in LCCM theory in terms of its two key constructs ‘lexical concept’ and ‘cognitive model’. Lexical concept belonging to linguistic system is semantic unit associated with phonological vehicle and cognitive model belonging to conceptual system is the unit of conceptual content. An expression's semantic value does not reside in either the lexical concept or the cognitive model individually, but rather in the relationship between the two.

Lexical concepts sanction multiple language instances across different usage events. These multiple instances of language use are produced by unique lexical profile of every lexical concept and its unique access point each lexical concept has in the conceptual structure of hearer. Lexical profile is the combination of semantic selectional tendencies, and formal selectional tendencies that each lexical concept has to observe in the utterance. Semantic selectional tendencies mean the way one lexical concept co-occurs with another lexical concept in utterance whereas formal selectional tendencies denote the way in which each phonological vehicle appears with other phonological vehicles in the utterance. Each lexical concept in order to produce contextually situated utterance interacts with the unique access point in the conceptual structure of hearer. These access points are referred to in LCCM theory as cognitive model profile which is prompted by lexical concept.

Interpretation is the activation of conceptual content which must be in
keeping with the linguistic content of lexical conceptual unit, involving the interpretation of other lexical concepts in the main lexical conceptual unit. Interpretation involves both types of contexts: linguistic context and extra linguistic context. When the hearer hears the whole utterance imbedded in all types of contexts, it activates the relevant cognitive models in response to the utterance or main lexical conceptual unit. LCCM theory assumes that every vehicle in the utterance activates relevant cognitive model. After the activation of each cognitive model, the match between activated cognitive models is established which results in the informational characterization of the produced utterance. This characterization is the situated meaning – an outcome of interaction between lexical concept and cognitive model in the context.

The present work combines the LCCM theory with Gras et al.’s (2021) ‘phonological construction’ to account for the strategic realization of mirative meaning in Urdu. Gras and Elvira-García (2021) take insights from the Auto-segmental Metrical framework of intonational phonology and the Tones and Breaks Indices (ToBI) transcription mode, and elaborate the role of prosody in a construction-based approach to language through the analysis of the insubordinate conditional construction (ICC) in Spanish. The theoretical possibility explored is that the prosodic patterns of a language (or language variety) can be represented as schematic constructions that pair a prosodic contour (form) with a pragmatic function that are inherited by sentence-level constructions as long as their meaning is compatible. Three potential scenarios were identified regarding the relationship between a grammatical construction and its prosody:

Scenario 1. The construction is prosodically neutral: it can combine with any intonational pattern in the language.

Scenario 2. The construction is prosodically idiosyncratic: it has its own intonational pattern which does not occur outside the construction.
Scenario 3. The construction inherits its intonation from independently existing prosodic constructions which pair a prosodic form with a pragmatic meaning.

The present study is concerned with the third scenario in which prosodic construction is abstract and can be inherited by other linguistic forms such as word-level forms and clause-level forms. We consider clause level forms such as declarative clauses as mirative strategies which suspend their basic speech acts to produce mirative functions.

**Research Methodology**

This study is based on qualitative research design that suits the research questions since it investigates the semantic contribution of Urdu clause types in the construction of mirative meanings. Moreover, the study also characterizes the interaction between linguistic knowledge and conceptual system of the Urdu speakers while producing mirative utterances. It is, therefore, necessary to use a research procedure which could tap into speaker intuition about mirativity. That is, the study requires descriptive data and the inductive analysis of the descriptive data. To meet this requirement, qualitative research is considered. In addition, qualitative research design being flexible, as pointed out by Dörnyei (2007), can respond in a flexible way to new linguistic details that emerge during the process of investigation.

**Data Collection**

The present study requires the data regarding expression of surprise which is not directly encoded in lexeme. Given the fact that the present study is delimited to the expression of surprise, and the fact that Urdu lacks specialized mirative markers, and thus, employs various other linguistic means to encode mirative meaning, the data it needs to address its question includes only those forms that carry expressive content at clause level.

This study assumes that “Multi-source evidence can either validate the theory or bring contradictory results, therefore opening new perspectives” (Grisot & Moeschler, 2014, p.10). Therefore, the data collection process is
multistage and includes four main sources to explore the maximum space of possibility of diversified mirative strategies: Naturally occurring data from TV dramas, movies and a novel, and a list of mirative strategies from native speakers. The study assumes that Urdu speakers in a day-to-day communication use various clause types to express mirative function. This is also validated by the different data sources.

**Findings and Discussion**

**Conceptual basis of declarative clause**

The following aims to explore the conceptual basis of the declarative clause structure under consideration, as given in (4) below, before accounting for its mirative interpretation involving cognitive processes.

(4) əli yəhā hε
ali here is
‘Ali is here.’

As mentioned above, part of the cognitive approach to grammar is to detect the motivation underlying grammatical structures. Thus, the lexical items (*ali, yəhā, hε*) as well as the grammatical pattern (*NP subject + ADVL subject complement + VP Predicator*) they populate in the Urdu clause in (4) above assume the status of constructions. In (4), *Ali* assumes the lexical category *noun* which represents the conceptual unit [THING], an autonomous conceptual unit with certain stability in space and time (see Langacker, 2008). Like its English counterpart *here* (see Larsen-Freeman & Celce-Murcia, 2016; Huddleston & Pullam, 2002), *yəhā* ‘here’ is a pro-adverb and functions as a substitute for a preposition phrase such as *is kəmre/*gər m ‘in this room/house’. In its use, *yəhā* ‘here’ is deictic which is used to direct the attention (see Fillmore, 1971, 1975; Jarvella & Klein, 1982; Levinson, 1983; Lyons, 1977; Zhao-xiong, 2000). Deictics invoke idealized cognitive model in the conceptual structure of the hearer (Lakoff, 1987). In LCCM terms, deictics are temporal/spatial references having excess to the cognitive models which represent the special setting associated with experiential complex. A deictic is
interpreted in terms of the Principle of Proximity which takes into consideration speaker, hear and the situation in which they interact, that is, who, where and when of a communication event. As observed by Williams (2019), deictic words lack intentional meanings or criteria for determining the set of possible referents (think: round as a defining feature of any ball). Instead, their meanings depend on a wide range of contextual factors.

The lexical concept [THING] is usually related to other conceptual units. For example, I may think of Ali as a person I teach, as a person I play with, as a person I brought up or as a person I love, etc. Situations such as these are held together by a conceptual unit [RELATION] which is expressed by verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, and conjunctions. [RELATIONS] are dependent conceptual units that link two or more [THINGS] and tend to be short-lived, i.e., have a lower degree of time stability than things. In the above examples, ‘teach’, ‘play’, ‘bring up’, ‘love’, etc. represent the conceptual unit [RELATION]. Different types of [RELATIONS] combine with different types of [THINGS] to form the conceptual cores of different types of situations. In (4) above, he expresses the conceptual unit [RELATION], more specifically it represents the relation of location between the subject and the physical space under consideration. In terms of LCCM theory, declarative clause itself is a lexical concept whose default function is to encode statement.

**Declarative Clause as Mirative Utterance**

This section addresses our research question: how do declaratives become miratives? The present section details out the contextual factors and cognitive processes responsible for making the declarative utterance as mirative.

**Mirative Construction as a Symbolic Unit**

As defined above, mirativity indicates the updating of a hearer’s cognitive model by counter expectation, resulting in new realization which moves from epistemic state of unknowingness to knowingness (Maxas,
2016). Beside this, in LCCM terms, mirativity concerns with the linguistic forms which update the cognitive model of addressee who understands linguistic forms as mirative utterance and acts accordingly. The updated cognitive model of listener contradicts his prior knowledge about the situation subject to surprise. Our analysis is based on the question as to how the cognitive model of the hearer is updated and how he reaches from unknowingness to knowingness. To register mirative reaction to the utterance Urdu speakers do not have exclusive morphemes. They instead rely on some other strategies for encoding mirativity. These mirative strategies, however, are governed by context and rising intonation. It is argued that in the mirative utterances, speakers usually make use of intonational cues, and the hearers draw on these intonational cues to interpret the utterance as mirative. This also makes the utterance polysemous and in this way the hearer is facilitated to distinguish the primary conception of the utterance from the mirative conception.

Constructions are defined as pairings of phonological, morphological and syntactic forms, and semantic, pragmatic and discourse meaning (Gras & Elvira-Gracia, 2021). As stated above, the focus of our analysis is a declarative clause whose basic meanings are suspended when it behaves miratively. In this connection, we take rising intonation as a prosodic construction which as an intonational form is paired with mirative meaning and this prosodic construction is more schematic in nature. Prosodic contours can be modelled as construction that pairs a prosodic form with the semantic structure governed by the contextual factors (Marandin, 2006; Ogden, 2010; Sadat-Tehrani, 2008; Ward, 2019). As in morphology, meanings are paired with morphemes, and in grammatical construction, meanings are associated with abstract syntactic patterns without lexical interference, and in prosodic construction, meanings come from tune (Sadat-Tehrani, 2008).
Marandin (2006), adopting autosegmental metrical approach, makes some generalization about the organization of prosodic constructions distinguishing the contours as non-stylized and stylized prosodic contours. The formal pole of non-stylized contours is following and their semantic structure is characterized as the basic speech acts such as assertions, commands and questions. Stylized contours run parallel to non-stylized contours and are adapted according to the pragmatic needs. To fulfil the pragmatic needs intonation usually performs functions such as attitudinal, emotional, lexical and social. Thus, the hearer using the semantics of understanding is able to recognize the non-linguistic meaning associated with the formal pole of prosody due to the pitch movements occurring between the last stressed syllable and intonational phrase. The tunes bared by last stress syllable in the utterance have semantic structure shared by both speaker and hearer. The present study discusses the interaction between the nuclear contours of prosodic construction with declarative construction especially to symbolic units of adverbial vehicle yəhâ and verbal vehicle he and the ways this interaction gives rise to interaction between linguistic content and conceptual content for mirative interpretation.

In terms of LCCM theory, the construction stands as symbolic unit having sound with the semantic structure whose unity is lexical concept. The prosodic construction as a symbolic unit is phonetically explicit, but lexically implicit. When a construction is lexically implicit, it requires lexical item or a clause to fill it. According to LCCM theory, every morpheme, word or a clause is a symbol unit because it stands for certain meaning. Hence, prosodic construction as a symbolic unit requires another symbolic unit to become fully realized. As mentioned earlier, we have a clause level symbolic unit which realizes prosodic construction lexically. The both symbolic units are complex in nature having part-whole structures and are integrated to produce mirative lexical concept. Against this background it is
argued that mirativity is a lexical concept due to rising contour paired with semiotic structure. The mirativity lexical concept in Urdu is, however, different from those languages where mirativity is morphologically encoded on the ground that speakers use the rising contour construction as a strategy that can be inherited by other lexico-grammatical construction.

While establishing mirativity as lexical concept in Urdu it seems more pertinent to recapitulate some of the important features lexical concept in general and mirativity lexical concept in particular. Lexical concept is the key construct of LCCM theory which affords access to the conceptual structure. It is a conventional form-meaning pairing which is uttered and received by interlocutor on the run time. Mirativity lexical concept, for instance, is conventionally shared by speakers because when the propositional content is marked by mirativity lexical concept, the interlocutor in the context responds quite appropriately without asking the question, as in (5), which is taken to express surprise, not to ask question.

(5) kea mətləb he is jomle ka what mean be this sentence of ‘What do you mean by this sentence?’

Lexical concepts are nominal and relational in nature. Mirativity lexical concept is dependent in its nature because it needs the locale of mirativity which can be encoded through nominal vehicles, verbal vehicles and clause level vehicles. Each lexical concept has its lexical profile which helps the hearer to identify its individuality. Lexical profile of a lexical concept serves as an ID tag for the hearer to single out any lexical concept attached with linguistic form. The hearer does so, following formal selectional tendencies and semantic selectional tendencies as exhibited by that lexical concept in the given context. The present section is concerned with the question as to how hearer foregrounds mirativity lexical concept associated with declarative lexical concept. Mirativity lexical
concept exhibits its profile by formal selectional tendencies including the rising contour that gives prominence to a particular word or phrase in an utterance which stands out from other forms and hearer identifies this as mirative marker. The hearer, depending on lexical profile of mirativity lexical concept, selects this lexical concept. For this purpose, the hearer relies on other contextual factors which help the hearer to select mirativity lexical concept rather than declarative lexical concept.

Our interest lies in which types of contexts the hearer uses to select mirativity lexical concept and how these contexts suspend basic elocution of declarative form. As the lexical concept selection entirely depends on the context, the hearer is facilitated by different types of contexts in lexical concept selection. In some utterances, these types of contexts jointly contribute to the lexical concept selection for the appropriate interpretation.

**Selection of Mirativity Lexical Concept**

LCCM theory provides detailed account of all levels of contexts which contribute to the semantics of understanding on the part of hearer. In our account, all the context types contribute to the lexical concept selection, involving linguistic context of utterance, manner of utterance, interactional goal, discourse level context and extra-linguistic context. These all factors are conditioned by prosodic construction to guide the hearer in mirativity lexical concept selection. If the utterance is without prosodic construction, the hearer is more likely to select declarative lexical concept.

In order to explicitly describe the process of interpreting declaratives as miratives, it’s pertinent to sketch out the context below. The mother is looking for Ali here and there, and then, on finding Ali sitting with his father unexpectedly, she says:

(6) əli ыəhã hɛ

Ali here be
‘Ali is here!

The father, upon hearing prosodic construction added to the sound length of adverbial vehicle ыəhã is likely to select surprising attitude
lexical concept, which is guided by contextual factors.

The utterance level context includes both formal features of the utterance such as the syntactic order of the utterance and prosodic features of the utterance. It contains the default word order of declarative vehicle as mentioned in 4.1. NP is followed by adverbial and adverbial vehicle is followed by verbal vehicle. The hearer is not facilitated by word order to select mirativity lexical concept instead of declaratively lexical concept. The hearer, however, is facilitated by prosodic construction which places an unusual prominence on adverbial vehicle. This extended sound of the phonological vehicle $yəhā$ marked by prosodic construction directs the attention of hearer towards adverbial vehicle which gives raise to the selection of surprising attitude lexical concept. If the utterance is without prosodic construction, the hearer is likely to interpret it as a declarative lexical concept.

Discourse level context can be equated with the construct of common ground, as pointed out by Stalnaker (1973). The discourse level context includes the knowledge of discourse participants which they bring to discourse event. This knowledge includes the textual knowledge and situational knowledge about the usage event. The mother as a speaker brings the knowledge about Ali’s unexpected presence to the speech event. What makes participants, the mother and the father, to be in a common ground is knowledge about Ali who is an individual animate. The father does not raise any question regarding the identity of Ali. This shows the knowledge about individual entity is shared. The discourse level context also includes the knowledge about prosodic construction which is shared by both participants. When the mother surprisingly says, “$əli yəhā he!’” ‘Ali is here!’ the father understands what the speaker intends to mean and selects the surprising attitude lexical concept. Thus, the selection is guided by the shared knowledge about...
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prosodic construction. The counter example, as in (7) below, illustrates the point. Given the same context as in (6) above, if the mother says:

(7) əli yəhã hē!
   ‘Ali is here!’

and in response, if the father says:

(8) tum ye kəŷu keh rəhi ho əli tomhare samne bɛtʰa hē you this why say remain be Ali your front sit be ‘Why are you saying so? Ali is sitting in front you.’

then the father, not having the knowledge of prosodic construction, fails to understand the attention of speaker for using this phonological construction. Since the father remains silent, this shows he understands what speaker intends to imply by using phonological construction.

Bringing the knowledge about Ali to the speech event, the mother initiates discourse when she unexpectedly finds sitting Ali with his father. There is no utterance before this one. So, the surprising attitude lexical concept is also selected by the hearer on finding this utterance as discourse initial. At discourse level context, the same utterance is produced by the father in response to question asked by the mother from the outside of the room. The surprising attitude lexical concept is usually produced at discourse opener which shows that there is no distance between speaker's observation and speaker's expression about that observation. As a little piece of discourse comprises just one utterance to the new environmental information (Peterson, 2015), the speech event level context does not apply here, which constitutes a larger chunk of a wide range of utterances.

Another type of context that plays a significant role in guiding the hearer to mirativity lexical concept is extra-linguistic context. Extra-linguistic context includes the temporal setting of the event, the participants, and the encyclopaedic knowledge, in LCCM terms, the basic world model which speaker and hearer must have to keep the communication moving. The setting of extra-linguistic context helps the
father to select surprising attitude lexical concept associated with prosodc construction. The reason is Ali is sitting with his father and in Ali’s presence, there is no good reason to say əli yəhâ he! ‘Ali is here!’ The mother, flouting the maxim of quantity says əli yəhâ he! ‘Ali is here! Hence, the father knows that Ali is quite visible to his mother and is guided by Ali’s visibility to conclude that the mother’s flouting the quantity maxim implies surprising attitude lexical concept. The encyclopaedic knowledge of the mother guides her to reduce surprising attitude lexical concept as she was expecting him to be somewhere else where, say, she might have sent him. So, the lack of correspondence between her present expectation structure and Ali’s sitting with his father makes the mother use produces a mirative prosodic construction. The surprising attitude lexical concept is rightly recognized by the father.

At selectional stage, we have so far discussed the factors which are responsible for surprising attitude lexical concept, and which guide the hearer to recognize speaker’s communicative intention. These factors include prosodic construction associated with surprising attitude lexical concept, utterance level context, discourse level context and extra-linguistic context. Once the surprising attitude lexical concept is selected, it is then subject to integration which is the matter of linguistic context rather than any other context.

**Integration of Mirativity Lexical Concept**

As mentioned in Section 4.2.1, prosodic construction encoding mirativity lexical concept is more schematic in nature. Unlike declarative construction (the declarative lexical concept [ATTRIBUTION OF A LOCATION TO AN ENTITY] associated with the declarative vehicle “DEFINITE-NP AdvP be-FINITE”), prosodic construction is not fully abstract. It carries sound associated with mirativity lexical concept. It is internally open in the sense that it needs to be specified by any nominal or relational
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The mirativity lexical concept is integrated with [LOCATION] lexical concept associated with the adverbial vehicle ےہا in the given context. The internal integration is governed by the Principle of Linguistic Coherence which determines its linguistic content and the Principle of Schematic Coherence which determines the schematic content of mirativity lexical concept and the lexical concept which specifies mirativity lexical concept.

In our example utterance اےہا ے ہا in the context given above, the linguistic content of surprising attitude lexical concept is carried by the rising intonation vehicle when it interacts with adverbial vehicle ےہا. The output of this interaction is the prominence the vehicle ےہا receives in contrast to other vehicles in the utterance. Now the surprising attitude lexical concept is lexically filled by [LOCATION] lexical concept. The surprising attitude lexical concept can be lexically specified by any vehicle designated as mirative locale in the given usage event. For instance, it can be integrated with nominal vehicles such as ali where it is the source of surprise, or with a verbal vehicle such as the complex predicate a jana. Ali’s brother, registering his surprise on Ali’s unexpected arrival, says: (9) اےہا ں ےہا
Ali come go be
‘Ali has come!’

The integration of surprising attitude lexical concept with a verbal vehicle makes it obvious to hearer that the locale of mirativity lays in verbal vehicle rather than nominal vehicle. The Principle of Linguistic Coherence entails that the Principle of Schematic Coherence needs to be applied to ensure linguistic coherence. The former principle does not work in the absence of schematic coherence. As to schematic coherence, surprising attitude lexical concept cannot be internally integrated with [AWARENESS] lexical concept which is encoded by the vehicles such as janna, ilm hona, pata hona ‘know’. To illustrate, the following cannot be uttered with mirative intonation in the presence of such reporting phrases that indicate prior knowledge. In other
words, the vehicles encoding [AWARENESS] lexical concept do not share schematic content of surprising attitude lexical concept.

(10) \[m^\varepsilon janta hu \, \^ali y\vartheta h\, h^e.\]
    ‘I know Ali is here.’

(11) \[m^\varepsilon j^h\, pata \, ^ali y\vartheta h\, h^e\]
    ‘I know Ali is here.’

(12) \[mere ilm \, m^\varepsilon h^e \, ^ali y\vartheta h\, h^e.\]
    ‘It is in my knowledge that Ali is here.’

As to the linguistic coherence, it may sanction different types of vehicles that can lexically fill surprising attitude lexical concept. However, some vehicles encoding close class lexical concept may not be integrated schematically with surprising attitude lexical concept. These vehicles include prepositions such as \(ka\) ‘of’, \(per\) ‘on’, \(se\) ‘from’, etc. The reason is that prosodic construction does not lengthen the sound of these vehicles conventionally. Whenever a close class lexical concept is considered the mirativity locale by the hearer, the prosodic construction usually gives prominence to the neighboring vehicle

as in the following example. Speaker A to speaker B:

(13) \[ye \, ^ali \, ki \, kitab \, h^e\]
    this ali of book be
    ‘This is Ali’s book.’

Speaker B considering it unbelievable marks possession lexical concept as a mirativity locale by integrating surprising attitude lexical concept with nominal lexical concept rather than possession lexical concept.

Now we are progressing from simple lexical concept to complex lexical concept. The external integration of these lexical concepts is guided by the Principle of Ordered Integration. Surprising attitude lexical concept is a complex lexical concept as it possesses the part-whole relation, which requires the participant as a topic of utterance and the location the participant occupies. External integration ensures the co-occurring of other lexical concepts with mirativity lexical concept. The output of both internal and external integration is the lexical profile of mirativity lexical concept which distinguishes it from declarative lexical
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Unlike externally closed lexical concepts that do not exhibit their lexical profile and can stand alone, mirativity lexical concept is externally open as it requires some other lexical concepts to co-occur with surprising attitude lexical concept. While taking other lexical concepts with it, surprising attitude lexical concept is subject to less extreme selectional tendencies not in internal integration but in external integration. It can take verbal vehicle. To illustrate, Ali’s father thinks that the rain is over, but Ali unexpectedly reports to his father:

(14) Ali: barıʃ əbʰi tək ho rɔhi ʰə
rain now still happen PROG be
‘It is still raining.’
Father: ho rɔhi ʰə!
happen remain be
‘It is raining!’

The external selectional tendencies observe less extreme restrictions mostly because the semantics of mirative content is indexical in nature. As to its lexical profile, the mirativity lexical concept externally takes declarative lexical concept to become closed. However, for declarative lexical concept, it can take only those vehicles which can describe the content and it resists those vehicles which contradict mirativity definition and exhibits that speaker is already aware of the proposition. Now after both types of internal integration and external integration of surprising attitude lexical concept we are in the position to make the lexical profile of surprising attitude lexical concept explicit. It is important to make it explicit because after doing this we would be able to answer that how declarative become mirative. The lexical profile of surprising attitude lexical concept consists of both semantic selectional tendencies and formal selectional tendencies. As to semantic selectional tendencies it is argued that surprising attitude lexical concept does not allow the conceptual structure carrying the old information without being updated. This means that any awareness on the part of interlocutor about the upcoming event is not compatible with the semantic of mirativity. It results in a generalization
that information must be new; otherwise, it will not be the matter of surprise. This means the semantic restriction is applied on the conceptual structure of interlocutor and this new information should become the part of conceptual structure of the interlocutor within the context. If it does not observe the recency restriction, it will not be considered new information. For example, if the presence of Ali becomes the part of conceptual structure of the interlocutor one hour before the context and interlocutor becomes the vocalizer of its conceptualization after one hour in a speech event, it will not be considered a source of surprise. The other semantic selectional tendency is that the new information must have potential to update cognitive model of the speaker and hearer must recognize this updating process. If the new information fails to update any of the attribute of [THING] lexical concept such as ali and the hearer does not receive any clue about the updating process, it fails to be considered as mirative utterance.

In formal selectional tendencies, as the utterance ali yəhâ he! shows, mirativity lexical concept must have prosodic construction which makes a syntactic unit prominent in the conceptual structure of the hearer. The prosodic construction must add the lengthening sound to the symbolic unit yəhâ to make it mirative rather than declarative. If the hearer receives utterance without prosodic construction, it is likely to be interpreted as declarative clause rather than mirative conception. So, the prosodic construction stands as imperative to mark any utterance as a mirative expression. This leads us to generalize that declarative lexical concept is turned into mirative lexical concept due to prosodic symbolic unit conditioned by different types of contexts.

Now, we have five lexical concepts in the utterance: a [THING] lexical concept associated with the nominal vehicle ali, a [LOCATION] lexical concept associated with an adverb vehicle yəhâ, a relational lexical concept [PRESENCE AT LOCATION]
associated with a copular verbal vehicle \( h_{e} \), a declarative lexical concept [ATTRIBUTION OF A LOCATION TO AN ENTITY] associated with the declarative vehicle “DEFINITE-NP AdvP \( be \)-FINITE”, and a mirative lexical concept [SURPRISING ATTITUDE TOWARDS A SITUATION] associated with the mirative prosodic vehicle. In the absence of prosodic construction the larger lexical conceptual unit may function as declarative lexical conceptual unit, however as the prosodic construction is included as the symbolic unit, the larger declarative conceptual unit is turned into mirative lexical conceptual unit.

**Interpretation of Mirativity Lexical Concept**

The lexical conceptual units made up of all the constituents, simple and complex, are now subject to interpretation. Interpretation involves the activation of conceptual content in terms of cognitive models accessed by linguistic content. Each symbolic unit in a larger conceptual unit receives its semantic value. The hearer, with the help of larger conceptual unit, interprets the utterance. The result of this mental effort is the ultimate conception that arises partly from the context and partly from the larger conceptual unit. This section aims to identify the conceptual content of mirativity lexical concept in terms of cognitive model and then establish the match between the other lexical concepts so far integrated with mirativity lexical concept. Mirativity lexical concept fall under the category of abstract concept. According to Lakoff (1987), abstract concepts are not held directly to be grounded in sensory motor experience; such concepts are rather structured in the content derived from sensory motor experience. Moreover, these concepts become the part of inherited content which is referred to as subjective experience (Evans, 2009)

Abstract concepts come integrated with [THING] lexical concept, [LOCATION] lexical concept, and [PROPERTY] lexical concept. The conceptual content of mirative lexical concept is more schematic in nature and its linguistic content is phonetically implicit. Thus, this lexical concept takes
its conceptual content from the basic world model. The world model includes two types of frames: frame for things and frame for situation in which things are embedded. In the light of our working definition of surprising attitude towards things and situations being confronted and the world, the conceptual content of mirativity lexical concept derives from the world model that becomes propositional content in the language. The conceptual content of proposition is marked by [SURPRISING ATTITUDE] lexical concept. This happens when cognitive models of propositional content and cognitive model of [SURPRISING ATTITUDE] lexical concept complement each other.

The cognitive model accessed by [SURPRISING ATTITUDE] lexical concept represents unprepared mind of the speaker; unexpectedness makes it match with the cognitive model that is the locale of mirativity. This type of matching overrides the default information characterization of that lexical concept. In the utterance əli yəhâ he!, the locale of mirativity is location. Thus, at linguistic level the sound which is more schematic is added to the sound of adverb yəhâ and at conceptual level, location cognitive model which represents, say, room is updated by surprising attitude about that location and the location is one of the attributes of an animate entity cognitive model which is updated by surprising attitude cognitive model. This cognitive updating is governed by the Principle of Highlighting. At phonological level, the mirative prosodic construction highlights the different aspects of any entity or process to which lexical concept is integrated. Similarly, at conceptual level the cognitive model lexical concept is updated when that lexical concept is highlighted. In our case, the hearer, while matching the cognitive model of location with surprising attitude cognitive model, is facilitated by the rising intonation which adds to the typical sound of adverb yəhâ. The cognitive model is updated whose lexical concept is integrated with surprising attitude lexical concept. The
auditory system of the hearer receives that location lexical concept is more prominent than animate entity *ali*.

Under the guided matching, the attribute of location belongs to the conceptual content of Ali and the presence at location also adds to the conceptual content of Ali. This is also obvious that one of the attributes of Ali is his daily routine, the places where he goes, the places where he usually sits but the updating of location cognitive model belongs to the conceptual content of Ali. The generic cognitive model of Ali in the mother’s mind does not present sitting of Ali with his father. This is the reason that surprising attitude cognitive model updates the location model. Thus, Ali’s unexpected sitting with his father is episodic information while his usual routine is presented by the generic cognitive model. The matching process is also constrained by the Principle of Conceptual Coherence and Principle of Schematic Coherence. According to these principles, basic world cognitive model of location can occur with the entity occupying the location and presence at location establishes the relation between the entity and the location. However, in the presence of mirativity lexical concept and the cognitive model accessed by mirativity lexical concept which represents uncertainty and unprepared mind in the conceptual structure of father, the application of the principles of conceptual coherence and schematic coherence is slightly distinct.

As stated above, mirativity updates the conceptual structure of the hearer regarding any entity or its attribute. The knowledge structure of the hearer about any entity is updated by new information and this updating arises from the fact that Ali and his attribute, location, are found conceptually incoherent with each other in the mother’s mind. This conceptual incoherence is recognized by the father as a hearer. Moreover, prosodic construction signals conceptual incoherence or discrepancy between the generic cognitive model of any entity and the episodic information which is added to the generic cognitive model. This conceptual incoherence is characterized in the literature on

Conclusion

The present study applies lexical concept selection, lexical concept integration and interpretation on the utterance əli ɣəhâ he to find out the intervening factors which turn declarative lexical concept into mirativity lexical concept. The default function of əli ɣəhâ he is a statement. However, at the manner of utterance level, the prosodic construction lengthens the sound of the vehicle ɣəhâ encoding [LOCATION] lexical concept and the extended syllable adds meaning of surprising attitude to declarative clause. This prosodic construction is governed by extra-linguistic context where mother's interactional goal is not to pass statement, but to register her surprise. These factors help the hearer to draw mirative interpretation. In short, declarative lexical concept, when joined by prosodic construction and contextual factors, turns into mirative lexical concept.
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