Chapter 7

On the syntax and semantics of *kakoj* and *čto za* in Russian

Ilse Zimmermann

Centre for General Linguistics (ZAS), Berlin

This contribution deals with the attributive pronouns *kakoj* and *čto za* in interrogative and exclamative sentences of Russian. It is an investigation into the polyfunctionality of these expressions, their integration into the DP structure, and their interplay with sentence mood. The morphosyntactic and semantic properties of these lexical items will be considered within the framework of Chomsky's Minimalist Program, taking into account their semantic form and conceptual structure.

1 Introduction

I examine Russian interrogative and exclamative sentences with the attributive wh-pronouns *kakoj* and *čto za* within the framework of the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995, 2004). As in my treatment of sentence mood (Zimmermann 2009), I assume that the differentiation of sentence types with illocutionary force is anchored syntactically and semantically in the functional head C. Phrases containing *kakoj* and *čto za* are attracted to SpecCP. I will argue that the meaning of these pronouns is integrated into the semantic form of the corresponding utterances in situ and that it consists of a parameter (variable) which will be bound by the semantics of C. I will discuss how *kakoj* and *čto za* are built into the syntax of the DP structure and how they relate to determiners. I will account for the fact that it is possible to answer questions like *Kakuju/Čto za knigu on čitaet*? 'Which/What kind of book is he reading?' not only by specific predicate expressions like *interesnuju* 'an interesting one', *o revoljucii* 'one about the revolution', etc., but also by terms like *istoričeskij roman* 'a historical novel', *Vojna i mir* 'War

and Peace', etc. I hope to shed light on the syntactic and semantic analysis of *čto za*, a borrowed expression, with respect to compositionality and the external behavior of the container DP. I will also address the stylistic distribution of expressions with *kakoj* vs. *čto za*.

2 The data

Contemporary Russian interrogative and exclamative sentences are characterized by special intonation and word order and/or lexical means, which contribute by their semantics to the respective sentence type. The pronominal entities *kakoj* and *čto za* serve this aim. They occur as components of noun phrases at the left periphery of exclamative or interrogative sentences.

(1) Kakoj prekrasnyj den' segodnja!
    what nice   day today
    'What a nice day it is today!'

(2) Čto za jubilej   zdes' otmečajut?
    what for anniversary here is-being-celebrated
    'What anniversary is being celebrated here?'

Russian allows the separation of the pronominal *kakoj* and the pronominal component *čto* of *čto za* from their DP.

(3) Kakaja ėto reka?
    which this river
    'What river is this?'

(4) Čto ėto za reka?
    what this for river
    'What river is this?'

The integration of *kakoj* and *čto za* into the DP structure must account for this possibility.

  Čto za seems to prefer negative qualifications of the pertinent referent, whereas *kakoj* is neutral in this regard.[1]

---

[1] For sentences (5)–(6) and (39) I thank E. Gorishneva (p.c.).

(5) Čto ona za ženščina! Nastojaščaja zmeja! / ??Umnica, krasavica!
    what she for woman   real   snake   clever-girl beauty
    'What a woman she is! A real snake!/A clever girl, a beauty!'

(6) Kakaja ona ženščina! Umnica, krasavica! / Nastojaščaja zmeja!

But (7)–(9) show that *čto za* is compatible with positive characterizations of the
referent as well.

(7) Kakoj / čto   za čudesnyj čelovek moj drug!
    what   what for wonderful person my friend
    'What a wonderful person my friend is!'

(8) Čto za prelest' ėti   skazki!
    what for treasure these fairy-tales
    'What a treasure these fairy-tales are!'   (Google)

(9) Čto ona za ženščina! Čto   za aktrisa! No kak ona živet!
    what she for woman   what for actress but how she lives
    'What a woman she is! What an actress! But the way she lives!' (Google)

In contrast to *kakoj*, the composed expression *čto za*, which is borrowed from
Germanic languages and is also used in other Slavic languages, is restricted to
colloquial speech. This stylistic restriction does not apply to German *was für ein*.
    Furthermore, *čto za* in Russian — in contrast to German, Bulgarian, and Slove-
nian[2] — does not co-occur with prepositions.

(10) S   kakimi / *S   čto   za ljud'mi Maša obščaetsja?
     with what   with what for people Masha has-contact
     'What kind of people does Masha have contact with?'

---

[2]Compare:

  (i) Na što   za čovek Mitko pomaga!
     in what for person Mitko is-helping
     'What kind of person Mitko is helping!'   (Bulgarian)

  (ii) Na kaj   za enem uradu dela?
      in what for an   office works
      'For which office does he work?'   (Slovenian)

(11) Za kakogo / *Za čto   za čeloveka Maša   vyšla zamuž?
      for what   for what for man   Masha went for-husband
      'What kind of man did Masha marry?'

Moreover, the overwhelming majority of examples with *čto za* I have seen are in nominative or accusative noun phrases. Oblique cases are exceptions, at least in Russian. Here are some examples:[3]

(12) Čto za erundoj   ej   moročili golovu!
      what for nonsense.INST her.DAT turned   head
      'What nonsense they filled her head with!'   (Google)

(13) Čto za čeloveku   on doveril   svoju naxodku?
      what for person.DAT he trusted-with his   finding
      'What kind of person did he trust with his finding?'   (Israeli 2006)

(14) Čto za celej   Boris xočet dostič'?
      what for aims.GEN Boris wants to-achieve
      'What goals does Boris want to achieve?'

These co-occurrence restrictions must somehow be accounted for in a descriptively adequate grammar of Russian. For the present I cannot offer any explanation.

Whereas *kakoj* morphosyntactically behaves like an adjective, *čto za* does not agree with the head noun in gender, number, or case (see the examples above). It is an uninflected composite expression. Its components also behave strangely. *Za* does not function as a preposition: it does not assign case. (At least not in Russian; in Czech *za* can assign the accusative to the head noun, as in *Co je to za knihu/kniha?* 'What kind of book.ACC/book.NOM is this?'.) Furthermore, in Russian the wh-word *čto* of the composed expression *čto za* does not combine with specificity markers like *koe-*, *-to*, or *-libo*.

(15) Ja tebe koe-čto   / koe-kakoj podarok / *koe-čto   za podarok
      I you something   some   present   some-what for present
      prinesla.
      have-brought
      'I have brought you something (nice)/some (nice) present.'

---

[3]Example (12) is the only example from 97 pages of Google citations in which *čto za* shows up in a noun phrase with an oblique case.

Both *kakoj* and *čto za* function as modifiers which introduce a semantic parameter, i.e., an unspecified predicate. This predicate refers to properties or gradations. In addition to the examples (1) and (7) with adjectival modifiers, the following exclamation shows that nouns like *sčast'e* 'luck', *radost'* 'joy', *čudo* 'miracle', *razočarovanie* 'disappointment', *erunda* 'nonsense', *durak* 'idiot', and *krasavica* 'beauty' also express gradable qualifications.

(16) Kakoe / Čto za (bol'šoe) udovol'stvie bylo naše putešestvie!
      what   what for great   pleasure   was our journey
      'What a (great) pleasure our journey was!'

In many cases (compare (2)–(4)), *kakoj* and *čto za* seem to function like determiners which convert a predicate of type $\langle e, t \rangle$ into a term of type $\langle e \rangle$ or $\langle \langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle$.[4]

In the analysis below I will try to account for these semantic peculiarities of *kakoj* and *čto za*.

But first, a short comparison with German might be useful. I will concentrate on the use of *welch* (*ein*), *welcher*, and *was für ein* (see Engel 1988 and Bhatt 1990).

Welch (*ein*) is restricted to exclamative sentences. *Welch* is the uninflected part of the composite pronoun. *Ein* can be omitted when it is not inflected.

(17) Welch (ein) Vergnügen / Welch einen Spaß wir bei Dieter hatten!
      which a   pleasure   which a   fun we at Dieter had
      'What pleasure/What fun we had at Dieter's!'

Plural DPs with *welch* have a zero article and occur only with inflected attributes.

(18) Welch *(schöne)   Blumen er bekommen hat!
      which beautiful flowers he received   has
      'What nice flowers he got!'

Welcher is a selective determiner and refers to alternative individuals of a given set, whereas *was für ein* refers to properties.

(19) Welcher Koffer   gehört Ihnen?
      which   suitcase belong you.DAT
      'Which suitcase belongs to you?'

---

[4]The determiner function of *kakoj* prevails when the particles *koe-*, *-to*, or *-libo* are added (see Kagan 2007).

(20) Was für einen Koffer haben Sie verloren?
     what for a   suitcase have   you lost
     'What kind of suitcase did you lose?'

Admittedly, the lines of differentiation here are fuzzy, but I will not go into details.

Like Russian *kakoj* and *čto za*, German *welcher* and *was für ein* occur in interrogative and exclamative sentences.

Like the *čto* of the composite expression *čto za*, the corresponding German pronominal component *was* of *was für ein* can be separated from the DP.

(21) Was möchten Sie für einen Koffer kaufen?
     what like   you for a   suitcase buy
     'What kind of suitcase would you like to buy?'

In contrast to Russian *čto za*, German *was für ein* can be used in DPs of all cases, with or without a preposition.

(22) Mit was für einem Buch könnte ich dich erfreuen?
     with what for a   book could   I   you please
     'What kind of book would please you?'

German requires that the indefinite article within the composed pronoun *was für ein* agree with the noun in gender, number, and case. Russian does not have explicit articles. When the noun phrase is absent, the plural form of the German indefinite article *ein* is suppleted by *welche*.

(23) Was für Bücher / was für welche bevorzugen Sie?
     what for books   what for which prefer   you
     'What kind of books/which ones do you prefer?'

In contrast to *was für ein*/*was für welche*, *welcher* can be used as an indefinite determiner.

(24) Wir brauchen zum Gartenfest   viele Stühle. Können Sie welche /
     we need   for garden-party many chairs can   you some
     *was für welche mitbringen?
      what for some   bring-with
     'We need a lot of chairs for the garden party. Can you bring some with you?'

In view of these Russian and German data, the following analysis is proposed to account for the polyfunctionality of *kakoj* and *čto za*, for the case restrictions of *čto za*, and for the separability of *kakoj* and *čto* from their DP.

3 The analysis

3.1 The left periphery

Russian phrases with *kakoj* and *čto za* or the pronouns *kakoj* or *čto* alone appear at the left periphery of interrogative, exclamative, and relative clauses. This is also true in many other languages. In line with my morphosyntactic analysis of Russian wh-pronouns and adverbials like *kto* 'who' or *kogda* 'when' (Zimmermann 2000) and my treatment of sentence mood (Zimmermann 2009), I assume that wh-phrases are attracted to the left periphery of their clauses by a +wh-feature of the functional category C at the top of root and embedded clauses, which are differentiated by the feature [±force].[5] Exclamative sentences have the feature [+exclam], whereas interrogative sentences are characterized by [+quest]. These features correspond to the semantic interpretation of the zero complementizer C.

(25) $/\emptyset/$; +C, αforce, +wh, +exclam;
$\lambda P (\text{EXCLAM})_\alpha \exists! X[P\,X]\ \text{EXCLAM} \in \langle t, a \rangle, P \in \langle \beta, t \rangle, \beta \in \{e, t, \langle e, t \rangle\}$

(26) $/\emptyset/$; +C, αforce, +wh, +quest;
$\lambda P (\text{QUEST})_\alpha\ ?X[P\,X]\ \text{QUEST} \in \langle t, a \rangle, P \in \langle \beta, t \rangle, \beta \in \{e, t, \langle e, t \rangle\}$

It is important that the Semantic Form (SF) of the complement of C constitutes an open proposition with an unbound variable which is only bound by the semantics of C. In exclamative +wh-sentences this variable is bound by the definite existential operator $\exists! X$ corresponding to the iota-operator (Zybatow 1990, Rosengren 1992, Brandt et al. 1992). In interrogative +wh-sentences the binder of the variable is the question operator $?X$ characterizing the openness of the respective proposition (cf. Brandt et al. 1992). In addition, root sentences are mapped by the sentence-mood operator EXCLAM or QUEST to speech act types (cf. Krifka 2001).

In this respect, my analysis of C departs from Brandt et al. (1992), Reis (1999), d'Avis (2002), Zanuttini & Portner (2003), and Abels (2007), who do not assume

---

[5]Editors' note: Zimmermann (2009) was referred to as Zimmermann (forthcoming) in the original text.

any element in syntax responsible for introducing illocutionary force characterizations. According to Zimmermann (2009), every root clause adds to the common ground a proposition and a set of communicative commitments associated with the respective force type.[6]

The treatment of sentence mood as in (25) and (26) implies that there is no need for the movement of wh-phrases to the left periphery at the level of Logical Form (LF). The appearance of wh-phrases at the left periphery is a surface matter. The +wh-phrases move cyclically, from syntactic phase to syntactic phase (see Chomsky 1995, 2004). They are attracted to SpecCP by the feature +wh in C (see (25)–(26)).

Semantically, wh-phrases are interpreted in situ. Their semantics introduce the unbound variable as a parameter which is specified by appropriate answers to the question involved or by the conceptual representation of individual terms or specific predicates on the level of Conceptual Structure (CS), depending on the shared knowledge of hearers and speakers and/or the situational context. This assumption corresponds to the analysis of exclamative sentences by Zybatow (1990) and is in accord with the treatment of the Dutch *was* (*voor*) (*een*) constructions by Bennis (1995) and Bennis et al. (1998).

3.2 On the syntax and semantics of *kakoj*

The syntactic structure of phrases containing *kakoj* must account for its semantic functions, for the separability of the pronoun from its noun phrase, for its agreement in gender, number, and case with the head noun, and for its movement to the specifier position of C (SpecCP). Semantically, the analysis must guarantee the introduction of a predicate or individual variable.

As for syntax, I assume the following structures:

(27) [$_{NP}$ [$_{AP}$ *kakoj*] NP]

(28) [$_{DP}$ [$_{D}$ ∅][$_{NP}$ [$_{AP}$ *kakoj*] NP]]

---

[6]Whereas interrogative clauses denote a set of alternatives specifying the variable bound by the question operator, exclamative clauses widen the domain of quantification for the wh-operator. This aspect of meaning derives from the exclamative-force operator or from the corresponding embedding predicate. (For the concept of widening and the relation of exclamatives to scales of expectedness, see Zanuttini & Portner 2003: 49ff.) Likewise the factive presupposition which is associated with exclamative clauses is not represented in syntax – as Zanuttini & Portner (2003) propose – but derives from the embedded predicate or from the exclamative force operator of root clauses.

In (27) *kakoj* is represented as adjunct to NP, and in (28) the DP layer with a zero head in D is added.

Kakoj as a lexical entry is characterized by the following morphosyntactic and semantic features:

(29) /kakoj/; +N+V, +wh; $(\lambda Q)\lambda x[Qx]$

I consider *kakoj* an adjective phrase which is characterized as a +wh-entity. Semantically, it has a dual character. The predicate variable Q can function as a parametrical modifier of the noun phrase or it can be specified by the predicate expressed by the head NP. These two possibilities are illustrated in (31) and (32).

(30) MOD = $\lambda Q_1 \lambda Q_2 \lambda x[[Q_1\,x] \wedge [Q_2 x]]$

(31) $[\![kakaja\ kniga]\!]$ = MOD $(\lambda x[\textsc{book}\ x])(\lambda x[Q\,x])$
$\equiv \lambda x[[\textsc{book}\ x] \wedge [Q\,x]]$

The semantic template MOD in (30) (see Zimmermann 1992) combines the modifier with the meaning of the head noun. As for agreement, I assume that an adjectival modifier like *kakoj* and what it modifies must agree in case, number, and gender. This is to say that the specified morphosyntactic features associated with the external argument of the respective predicates must coincide.

In (32) the semantic contribution of *kakoj* is an identity function.

(32) $[\![kakaja\ kniga]\!]$ = $\lambda Q \lambda x[Q\,x](\lambda x[\textsc{book}\ x])$
$\equiv \lambda x[\textsc{book}\ x]$

In combination with the semantics of the determiner we obtain (33) and (34). In (33), D is categorized by +Det −wh, while in (34) by +Det +wh.

(33) $[\![\varnothing]\!]\,([\![\text{NP}]\!])$ = $\lambda P_1 \lambda P_2 \exists x[[P_1 x] \wedge [P_2\,x]](\lambda x[[\textsc{book}\ x] \wedge [Q\,x]])$
$\equiv \lambda P_2 \exists x[[[\textsc{book}\ x] \wedge [Q\,x]] \wedge [P_2 x]]$

(34) $[\![\varnothing]\!]\,([\![\text{NP}]\!])$ = $\lambda P_1 \lambda P_2[[P_1\,x] \wedge [P_2\,x]](\lambda x[\textsc{book}\ x])$
$\equiv \lambda P_2[[\textsc{book}\ x] \wedge [P_2\,x]]$

In the last case the predicate variable Q is absent and *kakaja kniga* is interpreted like *kto* (Zimmermann 2000; see also Paul 1958: 145).

(35) $[\![kto]\!]$ = $\lambda P_2[[\textsc{animate}\ x] \wedge [P_2\,x]]$

Thus the semantics of *kakoj* as given in (29) brings in the parameter Q or enables the NP to get its external argument λx blocked by a +wh-determiner. The free variables, Q and x, are bound by the semantics of C depending on the respective clause type, as in (36)–(39).

(36) Kakie knigi vy   predpočitaete, populjarnye ili xudožestvennye?
      what books you prefer   popular   or art
      'What kind of books do you prefer, popular or literary?'

(37) Kakie reki   vpadajut v   Volgu?
      which rivers flow   into Volga
      'Which rivers flow into the Volga?'

(38) Kakie u   vas est' interesnye knigi!
      what by you are interesting books
      'What interesting books you have!'

(39) Kakim prekrasnym pedagogom ty   stal!
      what good   teacher   you have-become
      'What a good teacher you have become!'

In the last example, the phrase with *kakoj* is a predicate expression, an NP without the DP layer. Moreover, *kakoj* here refers to a high degree of the property expressed by the adjective *prekrasnyj*. The same is true in the example (40), from Zybatow (1990).

(40) Kakoj krepkij čaj vy   svarili!
      what strong tea you have-made
      'What a strong tea you have made!'

In these cases, another template, MOD', is activated in order to combine the parameter Q introduced by *kakoj* with the semantics of its container NP. This template integrates modifiers like *očen'* 'very' into the semantics of their gradable modifiees, as in [DP ∅ [NP [AP *očen' krepkij*][NP *čaj*]]].

(41) MOD' $= \lambda Q_1 \lambda Q_2 \lambda x \exists d [[Q_1 d\, x] \wedge [Q_2\, d]]$

In (39) and (40) the pronominal adjective *kakoj* does not figure within the adjective phrase together with the adjective semantically modified by it. For cases like (40) I assume the syntactic configuration [DP ∅ [NP [AP *kakoj*][NP [AP *krepkij*][NP *čaj*]]]]. The semantic amalgamation for the complex NP proceeds as follows:

(42) ⟦*kakoj krepkij čaj*⟧
      $= (\text{MOD } (\lambda x[\text{TEA } x])(\text{MOD}'(\lambda d \lambda x[\text{STRONG } d \, x])))(\lambda x[Q \, x])$
      $\qquad\quad = ⟦čaj⟧ \qquad\qquad = ⟦krepkij⟧ \qquad = ⟦kakoj⟧$
      $\equiv \lambda Q_2 \lambda x[[\text{TEA } x] \wedge \exists d[[\text{STRONG } d \, x] \wedge [Q_2 \, d]]](\lambda x[Q \, x])$
      $\equiv \lambda x[[\text{TEA } x] \wedge \exists d[[\text{STRONG } d \, x] \wedge [Q \, d]]]$

The enriched argument structure of the AP *krepkij* is inherited by the modified NP *krepkij čaj* so that *kakoj* as a predicate expression can come into play at this rather remote level of syntactic structure.

Thus *kakoj* in its function as modifier gets a syntactic and semantic analysis which applies uniformly to cases like (36) and (40). The templates in (30) and (41) are necessary for independent reasons. I think it is worthwhile to reduce syntax and to exploit the capacities of semantics.

3.3 Consequences for the analysis of the colloquial expression *čto za*

As mentioned in section 2, *za* does not function as a preposition. It is a semantically empty annex to NP. In contrast to German, Dutch, and Slovenian, the Russian pronominal expression *čto za* lacks an explicit determiner. I propose an analysis which is quite similar to the one given in the preceding section for *kakoj*.

(43) $[_{\text{DP}} [_{\text{D}} \varnothing][_{\text{NP}} [_{\text{NP}} \check{c}to][_{\text{NP}} za \, ([_{\text{NP}} \text{AP})[_{\text{NP}} kniga](\ )]]]]$

The semantic burden of the composite expression *čto za* is assigned to *čto*.

(44) $⟦\check{c}to⟧ = (\lambda Q)_\alpha \lambda x[Qx](\lambda x \exists y[[\text{KIND } x \, y] \wedge [Qy]])_\beta$
      with $\beta = + \rightarrow \alpha = +$

   a. $= \lambda x \exists y[[\text{KIND } x \, y] \wedge [Qy]]$
   b. $= \lambda x[Qx]$
   c. $= \lambda Q \lambda x[Qx]$

The only semantic difference between *čto za* and *kakoj* consists in the facultative presence of the reference to kinds in the case of *čto za*.[7]

(45) Čto   za knigu ty   čitaeš?
      what for book you read
      'Which/what kind of book are you reading?'

---

[7]Cf. Pafel (1991, 1996a, 1996b) for German *was für* (*ein*). In contrast to his analysis, I regard the reference to kinds as one possible interpretation and as a modifier to the head NP.

a. Ljubovnyj roman.
   love   story
   'A love story.'

b. O   revoljucii.
   about revolution
   'One about the revolution.'

c. *Vojna i   mir.*
   war   and peace
   '*War and peace.*'

The three possible answers to the question in (45) correspond to the three meaning variants of *čto za*: (a) reference to kinds; (b) specification of Q as predicate variable in the modifier $[Qx]$ (cf. (33)); and (c) specification of x as individual variable in $\lambda P_2 [[\text{book } x] \wedge [P_2\, x]]$ (cf. (34)).

The lexical entry for *čto* in *čto za* has to account for its peculiar combinability: the co-occurrence with *za*, the lack of occurrence within preposition phrases, and the lack of enrichment by specificity markers like *koe-*, *-to*, *-libo*.[8] Furthermore, *čto* in *čto za* is uninflectible and does not show any agreement with the head NP, in contrast to the AP *kakoj*. Like *kakoj*, *čto* can leave its container phrase and appear at the left periphery of the sentence. The peculiarities have to be worked out.

4 Conclusion

The inspection of the morphosyntactic and semantic properties of the Russian pronouns *kakoj* and *čto za* has brought me to important conclusions on the divi-

---

[8]In contrast to *čto* in *čto za*, the pronoun *kakoj* — like other wh-pronouns and adverbs — can be enriched by specificity markers. They characterize conventional implicatures concerning various types of specificity or non-specificity (see Kagan 2007). The wh-pronouns and adverbs by themselves are neutral in this respect (Zimmermann 2000). I assume that the particles *koe-*, *-to*, *-libo*, *ne-*, *ni-* have their base position in D and combine with the right wh-neighbor and also with a preceding preposition in PF. Thus *ni s kem* 'with nobody', *koe s kem* 'with a certain person', *dlja kakogo-to studenta* 'for some student' will have the base structures (i) and (ii), respectively:

(i) $[_{PP} [_{P} s][_{DP} [_{D} \textit{ni/koe}][_{NP} \textit{kem}]]]$

(ii) $[_{PP} [_{P} \textit{dlja}][_{DP} [_{D} \textit{to}][_{NP} [_{AP} \textit{kakogo}][_{NP} \textit{studenta}]]]]$

Editors' note: A later version of Kagan (2007) has been published as Kagan (2011).

sion of labor between syntax and semantics in the mutual correlation of sound and meaning. I have utilized current work within the framework of Minimalism and taken note of the differentiation between the Semantic Form of linguistic expressions, which is grammatically determined, and their Conceptual Structure, which has to do with world knowledge (see Bierwisch & Lang 1987, Bierwisch 2007). I have taken templates like MOD and MOD' (see (30) and (41)) to be considered as universal components of the semantic interpretation. But discussion of their status in comparison with corresponding functional zero heads in the syntactic representation goes beyond the limits of this paper.

My analysis of Russian wh-pronouns and adverbs (Zimmermann 2000) has shown how phrases with *kakoj* and *čto za* get an unbound variable in their base position. I believe the multifunctionality of wh-words can best be captured by taking into account the various syntactic domains of referential specification (binding) of entities in situ, in the middle field, or in the CP domain (cf. Postma 1994, 1995). I have shown the interplay of unbound variables of various semantic types with the semantics of sentence mood (see also Zimmermann 2009). The existence of semantic parameters (variables) introduced by the semantics of *kakoj* and *čto za* gives broad room for the conceptual interpretation of the relevant clauses.

(46) Kakaja ona ženščina!
      what   she woman
      'What a woman she is!'

This exclamation, in the context of a volume honoring an outstanding linguist, is immediately understood as high estimation.

I hope that my treatment of the Russian pronouns *kakoj* and *čto za* and of the correlation of form and meaning can be applied to the corresponding expressions of other languages as well.

Abbreviations

DAT dative   INST instrumental
GEN genitive

Acknowledgements

References

Abels, Klaus. 2007. Deriving selectional properties of 'exclamative' predicates. In Andreas Späth (ed.), *Interfaces and interface conditions* (Language, Context, and Cognition 6), 115–140. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110926002. 115.

Bennis, Hans. 1995. The meaning of structure: The *wat voor* construction revisited. In Marcel den Dikken & Kees Hengeveld (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1995* (Linguistics in the Netherlands 12), 25–36. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/avt.12.05ben.

Bennis, Hans, Norbert Corver & Marcel den Dikken. 1998. Predication and nominal phrases. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 1(2). 85–117. DOI: 10.1023/A:1009780124314.

Bhatt, Christa. 1990. *Die syntaktische Struktur der Nominalphrase im Deutschen* (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 38). Tübingen: Narr.

Bierwisch, Manfred. 2007. Semantic form as interface. In Andreas Späth (ed.), *Interfaces and interface conditions* (Language, Context, and Cognition 6), 1–32. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110926002.1.

Bierwisch, Manfred & Ewald Lang (eds.). 1987. *Grammatische und konzeptuelle Aspekte von Dimensionsadjektiven* (Studia grammatica 26/27). Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Brandt, Margareta, Marga Reis, Inger Rosengren & Ilse Zimmermann. 1992. Satztyp, Satzmodus und Illokution. In Inger Rosengren (ed.), *Satz und Illokution* (Linguistische Arbeiten 278), 1–90. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. DOI: 10.1515/9783111353210.1.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2004. Beyond explanatory adequacy. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *The cartography of syntactic structures*, vol. 3: *Structures and beyond* (Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax), 104–131. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

d'Avis, Franz Josef. 2002. On the interpretation of *wh*-clauses in exclamative environments. *Theoretical Linguistics* 28(1). 5–31. DOI: 10.1515/thli.2002.28.1.5.

Engel, Ulrich. 1988. *Deutsche Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Groos.

Israeli, Alina. 2006. Review of Alan Timberlake: *A Reference Grammar of Russian*. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 14(1). 91–122.

Kagan, Olga. 2007. Specificity and the speaker's beliefs. Unpublished manuscript, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Kagan, Olga. 2011. On speaker identifiability. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 19(1). 47–84. DOI: 10.1353/jsl.2011.0008.

Krifka, Manfred. 2001. Quantifying into question acts. *Natural Language Semantics* 9(1). 1–40. DOI: 10.1023/A:1017903702063.

Pafel, Jürgen. 1991. *was für*-Phrasen: Syntax und Semantik. In Marga Reis, Inger Rosengren & Jürgen Pafel (eds.), *Weitere Aspekte von w-Fragesätzen: Sprachtheoretische Grundlagen für die Computerlinguistik* (Arbeitspapiere des SFBs 340, Bericht Nr. 6), 69–97. Tübingen: Universität Tübingen.

Pafel, Jürgen. 1996a. Die syntaktische und semantische Struktur von *was für*-Phrasen. *Linguistische Berichte* 161. 37–67.

Pafel, Jürgen. 1996b. Kinds of extraction from noun phrases. In Uli Lutz & Jürgen Pafel (eds.), *On extraction and extraposition in German* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 11), 145–177. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/la.11.06paf.

Paul, Hermann. 1958. *Deutsche Grammatik*, vol. 3, Teil 4: *Syntax*. Halle (Saale): Niemeyer.

Postma, Gertjan. 1994. The indefinite reading of *wh*. In Reineke Bok-Bennema & Crit Cremers (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1994* (Linguistics in the Netherlands 11), 187–198. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/avt.11.19pos.

Postma, Gertjan. 1995. Zero semantics: The syntactic encoding of quantificational meaning. In Marcel den Dikken & Kees Hengeveld (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1995* (Linguistics in the Netherlands 12), 175–190. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/avt.12.17pos.

Reis, Marga. 1999. On sentence types in German: An enquiry into the relationship between grammar and pragmatics. *Interdisciplinary Journal for Germanic Linguistics and Semiotic Analysis* 4(2). 195–236.

Rosengren, Inger. 1992. Zur Grammatik und Pragmatik der Exklamation. In Inger Rosengren (ed.), *Satz und Illokution* (Linguistische Arbeiten 278), 263–306. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. DOI: 10.1515/9783111353210.263.

Zanuttini, Raffaella & Paul Portner. 2003. Exclamative clauses: At the syntax-semantics interface. *Language* 79(1). 39–81. DOI: 10.1353/lan.2003.0105.

Zimmermann, Ilse. 1992. Der Skopus von Modifikatoren. In Ilse Zimmermann & Anatoli Strigin (eds.), *Fügungspotenzen: Zum 60. Geburtstag von Manfred Bierwisch* (Studia grammatica 34), 251–279. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Zimmermann, Ilse. 2000. Die Analysierbarkeit von Pronomen und Proadverbialia. In Andreas Bittner, Dagmar Bittner & Klaus-Michael Köpcke (eds.), *Angemessene Strukturen: Systemorganisation in Phonologie, Morphologie und Syntax*, 261–282. Hildesheim: Olms.

Zimmermann, Ilse. 2009. Satzmodus. In Tilman Berger, Karl Gutschmidt, Sebastian Kempgen & Peter Kosta (eds.), *Die slavischen Sprachen / The Slavic languages: Ein internationales Handbuch zu ihrer Struktur, ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung / An international handbook of their structure, their history, and their investigation* (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 32/1), 484–505. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110214475.1.7.484.

Zybatow, Gerhild. 1990. Mit *kakoj* und *kak* eingeleitete Exklamativsätze im Russischen. In Anita Steube (ed.), *Syntaktische Repräsentationen mit leeren Kategorien oder Proformen und ihre semantischen Interpretationen*, 182–200. Berlin: Zentralinstitut für Sprachwissenschaft.