Assessing the role of pattern and matter replication in the development of Polish discourse structuring elements based on non-finite *verba dicendi*

Part 1 – Synchronic state

The Polish language employs a whole range of deverbal discourse structuring elements (henceforth DSE), such as *ogólnie mówiąc* 'generally speaking', *szczerze powiedziawszy* 'frankly speaking (lit. having said)' or *właściwie biorąc* 'strictly speaking (lit. taking).' Those based on non-finite *verba dicendi* are of special interest since the majority of them represent a semi-productive formation pattern: the base *mówiąc* is evidenced in collocations with more than a hundred adverbs of various semantics; the collocations can be classified according to their discourse functions (cf. Birzer accepted a). In addition, we know from the history of other Slavonic languages (cf. Birzer 2012 for Russian and Birzer accepted b for Croatian) that structurally similar items in the respective languages developed under the influence of language contact. The aims of this paper are thus, firstly, to explore what role language contact, pattern and matter replication played in the development of Polish discourse structuring elements based on *verba dicendi*, and, secondly, to compare the outcome of this process in the Polish language with that of Russian and Croatian.

This paper is organized as follows. In the first section, we will describe the morphological and (morpho)syntactic characteristics that allow identification of the research object. The second section describes the functioning of the research object in contemporary Polish, followed in the third section by a description of its historical development and the role of language contact in that process. The fourth, concluding section compares the role of replication processes in the historical development of Polish deverbal DSE with that of Russian and Croatian.

1. Defining the research object

Polish linguistics offer an abundance of literature on metatextual issues with Wierzbicka (especially her seminal article 1971) and Grochowski (1983; 1986a; 1986b and 1998, to mention just a few) among the most renowned researchers working in this field. It is thus hardly surprising that several terms are currently circulating which are of relevance for our research object. Three of them deserve closer inspection: *wyrażenie metatekstowe* ('metatextual expression'), *operator metatekstowy* ('metatextual operator') and *komentarz metatekstowy* ('metatextual comment').[1] *Wyrażenie metatekstowe* is the superordinate term that encompasses *operator metatekstowy* and *komentarz metatekstowy* (this and the following

---

1   In the interest of space, we refrain from an all-encompassing critical discussion of terminology, as this is already provided in Birzer (2015).

cf. Żabowska 2009, 180-181). Particles and conjunctions form the "[d]wie główne klasy operatorów metatekstowych [two main classes of metatextual operators – translation S.B.]" (Żabowska 2009, 180) – although Żabowska does not elaborate on minor subtypes – whereas the *komentarze metatekstowe* 'metatextual comments' form a category of their own. The delineation is on purely formal grounds: metatextual comments "występują na powierzchni tekstu w postaci skróconych zdań, najczęściej zwrotów imiesłowowych, […]; mogą to być wyrażenia samodzielne, wkomponowane w składnię wypowiedzenia, wyrażenia wtrącone, występujące w konstrukcjach tzw. wyodrębnionych [occur on the text surface in the form of reduced clauses, most frequently in the form of adverbial participle clauses […]; they can be autonomous expressions integrated into the syntax of the utterance or parenthetical expressions figuring in so-called detached constructions – translation S.B.]" (Żabowska 2009, 181). Given the lack of strict regulation on the position of adverbial participles (henceforth APs) in Polish (cf. Weiss 1977; Feret 2005), we may assume that the syntactic status of a parenthesis is a characteristic trait of discourse structuring elements.

It is not surprising that the overwhelming majority of works (see Czapiga 2006, 7-20 and Grochowski et al. 2014, 19-26 for accounts of the research history) on metatextual expressions has so far been concerned with operators. Although the extension of *particle* is rather fuzzy, this quite often equals the study of particles. Grochowski et al. (but cf., among others, also Grochowski 1986b) illustrate this point by stating that their conception of *particle* does not correspond with that of (school) grammarians (2014, 26-27) or other linguists (2014, 27-28).[2] Research on parentheses has been conducted from a very early stage on (cf. Grochowski 1983), but with less intensity, probably due to their high variability in morphosyntax (that is, they may contain a finite, non-finite or no verbal element at all, in semantics as well as in number (and partially order) of constituents (for the latest, probably most all-inclusive description of research on parentheses in general, see cf. Dehé & Kavalova 2007; for an assessment of parentheses in the light of grammaticalization theory, see cf. Kaltenböck, Heine & Kuteva 2011). Among the more recent work on Polish parentheses, Wołk's analysis of *powiedzmy* 'let's say' (2007) should be mentioned. She describes the possibilities of syntactic positioning (Wołk 2007, 6) and prosodic features (Wołk 2007, 7) of

---

[2] We must state that the defining traits of particles in Grochowski et al. (2014) are contradicted by the choice of items analyzed. Among others, constructions based on *verba dicendi*, are denied the status of particle (Grochowski et al. 2014, 29), all the more so if the verbal form combines with several synonymous adverbs, yet *krótko mówiąc* 'in short (lit. shortly speaking)' is one of the analyzed "particles" (Grochowski et al. 2014, 160-162) despite the fact that it is based on a *verbum dicendi* and is paralleled, among others things, by synonymous *najkrócej mówiąc* 'most shortly speaking'. *Między nami mówiąc* 'in private speaking' (Grochowski et al. 2014, 299-300) and *nawiasem mówiac* 'by the way (lit. in brackets speaking)' (Grochowski et al. 2014, 302-304) are also analyzed despite their verbal basis. Furthermore, *tak by rzec* 'so to say' (Grochowski et al. 2014, 140-141) is an example of a verb-based item whose synonymity with *tak by powiedzieć* also relies on the verbal basis.

the item under investigation. She does not however elaborate on the question of whether different syntactic positions influence the readings of *powiedzmy*, as they do, e.g., in the case of *ogólnie mówiąc* (cf. Birzer 2015).

With regard to our research object, Ożóg (1991) deserves special mention, as, he gives a survey of discourse structuring elements based on inflectional forms – both finite and non-finite – of various *verba dicendi* and *cogitandi* in spoken Polish. This paper has to be considered seminal both for the role of discourse structuring elements in spoken Polish and for the usage of *verba dicendi* therein. Some drawbacks are however inevitably present, as we will see in the discussion.

The first critical point concerns the delineation of the research object. This problem is mirrored in the usage of terminology: Ożóg himself calls the items under investigation *jednostki metatekstowe* 'metatextual items' (1991, 184), *elementy metatekstowe* (1991, 184) and *operatory [metatekstowe]* (1991, 184). On the one hand, the fact that the distinction between *operatory* and *komentarze metatekstowe* was introduced only after the publication of Ożóg's paper in Wajszczuk (2005)[3] certainly explains part of the terminological confusion. On the other hand, the labels *jednostka* 'item' and *element* 'element' imply no specific size of the unit under research. Cases of *verba dicendi*, in turn, display a rather complex semantic structure with three semantic participants – emitting agent, addressee and content. Syntactic realization of the latter may be highly complex, ranging from a "simple" NP to a PP or complementizer clause. Valid diagnostic criteria are therefore needed to distinguish *verba dicendi* in metatextual function from other occurrences. Ożóg (1991, 184) offers the so-called "self-correction test (*test korekty*)" as diagnostics: he argues that discourse-structuring elements cannot be subject to self-correction unlike other constituents of a clause. This sounds rather convincing if one considers only the discourse structuring elements *wiesz* 'you know'*, słuchaj* 'listen.2.IMP'*, coś ci powiem* 'I will tell you something'*, rozumiesz* 'you understand'*, mówię ci* 'I tell you' in Ożóg's example (1). They do not allow the insertion of the self-correction marker *chciałem powiedzieć* 'I wanted to say' followed by another metatextual expression (1[i]) as the arguments of "normal" verbs do (1[ii]).

(1) *wiesz słuchaj coś ci powiem /wczoraj Janek rozumiesz przyszedł z kina całkowicie zdenerwowany mówię ci.*

    'you know, listen, I will tell you something / yesterday Janek, you understand, returned from the cinema completely exhausted, I tell you.'

---

[3]   Unfortunately, this work is not available and can be perceived only via Żabowska (2009) and Grochowski et al. (2014).

(1[i])   **wiesz chciałem powiedzieć rozumiesz** /wczoraj Janek przyszedł z kina całkowicie zdenerwowany.

'you know, I wanted to say, you understand / yesterday Janek   returned from the cinema completely exhausted.'

(1[ii]) wczoraj **Janek chciałem powiedzieć Jurek** przyszedł z kina całkowicie zdenerwowany.

'Yesterday Janek, I wanted to say, Jurek Janek returned from the cinema completely exhausted'

All discourse-structuring elements discussed by Ożóg serve the same functions: they may be used either to guide the listener's attention to the information that follows, or as fillers to secure continuity of speech flow (especially *wiesz* 'you know'[4] and *rozumiesz* 'you understand'). In these functions, the respective elements may be considered semantically eroded – an observation Ożóg (1991, 185) himself makes as well: "Nie należy do rzadkości, kiedy informacja typu *meta* przerasta właściwą (that information of the type *meta* [i.e. the pragmatic information – S.B.] frequently exceeds the proper one)"[5] – which makes a self-correction impossible, as no semantics exist that could be traded out for a more corresponding phrase. Ożóg does not elaborate on his self-correction test in other examples of discourse structuring elements with more specific, maybe even composite semantics. He nevertheless takes up this subject in other aspects. Discourse structuring elements based on *mówiąc* 'speaking' belong to the latter type and are a good example of such elements also being potentially subject to self-correction (2).

(2) **Mówiąc krótko, chciałem powiedzieć, (mówiąc) szczerze**, Janek nie odpowiada mojej koncepcji dobrego przyjaciela.

'In short (lit. shortly speaking), I wanted to say, frankly (speaking), Janek does not correspond with my notion of a good friend.'

At the same time, example (2) illustrates quite nicely that Ożóg's self-correction test is in fact an implicit test for the scope of negation, as (3) is a periphrasis of (2) with overt negation at work.

---

4 cf. also Schiffrin's (1987) analysis of English *y'know*,

5   Cf. furthermore Birzer (2015, chapter 4.5.) on the semantic voidness of *ogólnie (mówiąc)* 'generally (speaking)' in the filler function.

(3) ***Mówiąc nie krótko, a szczerze**, Janek nie odpowiada mojej koncepcji dobrego przyjaciela*.

'Not in short (lit. shortly speaking), but frankly, Janek does not correspond with my notion of a good friend.'

Non-negatability is one of the defining properties Rathmayr (1985, 72) proposes for particles serving as pragmalexemes, i.e. for particles with metatextual function. This criterion has to be modified regarding the scope of negation. As a particle consists of just one lexical item, it is not surprising that the (factually inacceptable) negation has scope over the whole particle. DSEs, however, may be constructions consisting of several lexical items. Quite interestingly, different DSEs behave differently under negation. Ożóg's self-correction tests the negatability of the whole metatextual element, but even if the DSEs consist of several lexical items, the type of elements he discusses cannot be subject to partial negation either. Specifically, for the DSE *mówię ci,* the negation of the (enclitic) pronominal element **mówię nie ci, a mu* 'I don't tell you, but him' is not acceptable, whereas *mówię* in the predicative function allows for the negation of its (long, i.e. focused) pronominal argument (*mówię nie tobie, a jemu* 'I don't tell you, but him'). This is also corroborated by the behavior displayed with the negation of *powiedzmy* 'let's say' (Wołk 2007, 10), another representative of the type of DSEs discussed by Ożóg. Contrary to these findings, the DSEs based on *mówiąc* 'speaking' show that some types of DSEs allow partial negation if the modifier is negated (3), but not if the head (4-6) is under negation.

(4) ****Nie mówiąc szczerze**, Janek nie odpowiada mojej koncepcji dobrego przyjaciela*.

'Not to be speaking frankly, Janek does not correspond with my notion of a good friend.'

(5) ****Nie mówiąc, a powiedziawszy szczerze**, Janek nie odpowiada mojej koncepcji dobrego przyjaciela*.[6]

'Not to be speaking, but having spoken frankly, Janek does not correspond with my notion of a good friend.'

(6) ****Nie mówiąc, a pisząc szczerze**, Janek nie odpowiada mojej koncepcji dobrego przyjaciela*.

'Not to be speaking, but writing frankly, Janek does not correspond with my notion of a good friend.'

---

6   Some DSEs based on the adverbial participle have doublets in the sense that they can be formed either with the simultaneous adverbial participle *mówiąc* or with the anterior one *powiedziawszy*. In this case we test the possibility of partial negation by using such a doublet.

As we are interested in DSEs based on non-finite inflectional forms of *verba dicendi*, we will also have a look at DSEs based on the infinitives *powiedzieć* 'say' and *rzec* 'tell/say'. Our research in the Polish National Corpus[7] showed that only two constructional types of DSEs exist on this basis: *aby /by / żeby tak powiedzieć / rzec* 'so to say / in order to say so' (8) and *aby /by / żeby nie powiedzieć / rzec* 'not to say / in order not to say' (7). The fact that *aby / by / żeby nie powiedzieć / rzec* 'not to say / in order not to say' contains a built-in negation but no modifier, makes the insertion of a second negation impossible (7[i]). Structurally, it might well theoretically be possible that *aby / by / żeby nie powiedzieć / rzec* 'so to say / in order to say so' allows partial negation, i.e. negation of the modifier, but the semantics of *tak* 'so' prohibits this (8[i]). Negation of the head is impossible (8[ii]), just like with *mówiąc*.

(7) *Szanse są więc niewielkie, by nie powiedzieć zerowe.*

　　'The chances are thus small, in order not to say zero.'

　　(*Trybuna Śląska*, 2004-04-24)

(7[i]) 　**Szanse są więc niewielkie, by nie nie powiedzieć zerowe.*

　　'The chances are thus small, in order *not* not to say zero.'

(8) *Wyjątkowy ma także życiorys i - żeby tak powiedzieć - osiągnięcia.*

　　'He [Trotsky's murderer] also has an extraordinary CV and – so to speak – accomplishments.'

　　(*Gazeta Wyborcza*, 1993-06-09)

(8[i]) 　**Wyjątkowy ma także życiorys i - żeby nie tak, a inaczej powiedzieć - osiągnięcia.*

　　'He [Trotsky's murderer] also has an extraordinary CV and – not to put it like this,,(lit. not to say so) but in another manner – accomplishments.'

(8[ii]) 　**Wyjątkowy ma także życiorys i - żeby tak nie powiedzieć, a pisać - osiągnięcia.*

　　'He [Trotsky's murderer] also has an extraordinary CV and – not to say it like this (lit. so not to speak), but put it in writing – accomplishments.'

To summarize this stage of analysis, DSEs behave differently regarding negation. Among those DSEs consisting of several lexical items, some allow partial negation with scope over the modifier, but never over the head, while others do not allow any negation whatsoever. Formal criteria do not seem to play a role, as, DSEs based on non-finite *mówiąc* may take

---

partial negation, but DSEs based on non-finite *powiedzieć* and *rzec* do not. Instead, the semantics seem to explain the different behavior of DSEs. To obtain the full picture, the semantic analysis must also consider another characteristic semantic property of DSEs, namely their syntactic eliminability due to their irrelevance for the content, i.e., the proposition (4[i] and 8[iii]; cf. Rathmayr 1985, 42).[8]

(4[i])   *Janek nie odpowiada mojej koncepcji dobrego przyjaciela.*
         'Janek does not correspond with my notion of a good friend.'

(8[iii]) *Wyjątkowy ma także życiorys i osiągnięcia.*
         'He [Trotsky's murderer] also has an extraordinary CV and accomplishments.'

Tak 'so' in (8) is a deictic particle referring to (part of) the content, but lacking any other semantic components. Just like the elimination of the DSE *aby /by / żeby tak powiedzieć / rzec* is irrelevant for the content, its partial negation with e.g. *inaczej* 'otherwise' (8[i]) also has no influence on the content per say, but nevertheless creates a contradiction, since the content offers just one point of reference for both *tak* and *inaczej* – namely *osiągnięcia* 'accomplishments.' The working mechanism for *aby / by / żeby nie powiedzieć / rzec* 'not to say / in order not to say' is basically the same, as it also relies on reference to (part of) the content. The DSEs based on *mówiąc* behave differently in this respect. Their constitutive lexical elements, such as *szczerze* 'frankly,' have semantics of their own which do not refer to (part of) the content. The negation of these items thus does not lead to a referential mismatch, but opens a slot for another lexical item carrying "semantic weight" such as *krótko* 'shortly.' We may furthermore deduce that partial negatability is a test for establishing (semi) productivity in construction-based DSEs such as ADV + *mówiąc*. The mere possibility of extending the construction by inserting *nie* X *a* Y 'not X but Y' suggests productivity. If the set of elements eligible for insertion in places X and Y is restricted, we may speak of a partially lexicalized semiproductive pattern.[9]

To summarize, our discussion of negatability in general and of Ożóg's self-correction test in particular shows that negatability is a weak property and needs to be accompanied by other,

---

[8]   This approach also finds a parallel in English linguistics, where Fraser (2006, 189) establishes integration into a discourse segment without contributing to its proposition as a defining criterion. However, as our discussion of semantics shows quite nicely, this criterion is a semantic rather than a syntactic one, although it does carry *syntactic* in its name.

[9]   Fraser's statement that some of the elements he defines as discourse markers form the interchangeable part of fixed constructions (cf. Fraser 2006, 194) supports our observation on the semiproductivity of some constructions "producing" DSEs. This, however, does not mean that we share Fraser's concept of *discourse marker*.

more distinct ones. One of them is syntactic eliminability, which interplays with negatability at the semantic level.

Additionally, Rathmayr (1985) offers some more properties:

DSEs cannot be subject to questions, i.e., as with particles (cf. Rathmayr 1985, 72) DSEs do not serve as answers to (probe) questions.[10]

(4ii) *Jakim sposobem / dlaczego Janek nie odpowiada mojej koncepcji dobrego przyjaciela? – *Szczerze mówiąc.*

    'In what way / why doesn't Janek correspond with my notion of a good friend? – Frankly speaking.'

(8iv) *Jakim sposobem / dlaczego ma także wyjątkowy życiorys i osiągnięcia? – *By tak powiedzieć.*

    'In what way / why does he [Trotsky's murderer] also have an extraordinary CV and accomplishments? – So to speak.'

Rathmayr (1985, 72) gives two more defining criteria typical for particles, namely that they are unstressed and cumulative with other particles. These however only apply partially to DSEs. DSEs may bear secondary stress if they consist of several words.

On that token, the possibility of using DSEs cumulatively also varies. One dividing line seems to run between spoken and written language: (1) is a transcript of spoken language, where DSEs with the same function – direction of hearer's attention – are used cumulatively. In written language ― probably due to stylistic reasons ― cumulation seems to be possible in two cases. In the first case, the DSEs serve different discursive needs, as shown in (9) below. *Zresztą* 'by the way' is a text structuring device, whereas *ściślej mówiąc* 'more precisely speaking' may be considered a reformulation marker.

(9) *Takim* [*zwierzęciem krwiożerczym* – S.B.] *mnie stworzono.* **Zresztą ściślej mówiąc***, nie tyle krwiożerczym,ile mięsożernym ...*

    'I was born as such a bloodthirsty beast. By the way, more precisely speaking, not so much a bloodthirsty as a carnivorous beast …'

    (S. Mrożek. 1997. *Teatr 3*.)

---

10   *Powiedzmy* 'let's say' seems to be an exception from the rule, as it may serve as answer at least to polar questions (Wołk 2007, 7).

Concretization constitutes the second case and seems to involve only DSEs with connective function, usually reformulation markers. Mendoza (2009, 983) states that

> [d]ie Bedeutung bzw. Funktion von multifunktionalen koordinierenden Konjunktionen kann durch die Kombination mit sog. Konkretisatoren spezifiziert werden […], wobei die Konkretisatoren alleine wiederum meistens ebenfalls Konnektorenfunktion übernehmen können.
> [the meaning, or the function of multifunctional coordinating conjunctions, respectively, may be specified by a combination with so-called concretisators […], whereupon in most cases the concretisators may, in turn, take over the function of connectives. *translation – S.B.*]

Czy in example (10) is a multifunctional item that may serve as a complementizer with the meaning 'whether,' as a conjunction with the meaning 'or', and as a question particle. *Właściwiej mówiąc* 'more correctly speaking' specifies that *czy* functions as a conjunction.

(10)   *Ten wybór, **czy właściwiej mówiąc** nominacja* [sic!], [...] *Gierek* [...] *przyjął bez skrępowania.*
    'This election, or more precisely speaking, the nomination which Gierek accepted without hesitation...'
    (J. Rolicki. 2002. *Edward Gierek: życie i narodziny legendy*.)

To recap the general criteria for identifying DSEs, we have, namely, their irrelevance for the proposition, their non-negatability, the impossibility of being the subject of probe questions or of being under stress, along with the possibility of cumulating them. As we have discussed, some words are in order on our choice of DSEs based on non-finite forms of *verba dicendi* as the subject of research. This choice shares all the semantic traits that have been described above as typical for DSEs based on *verba dicendi*. Let us reconsider Żabowska's (2009, 181) properties of metatextual comments: "występują na powierzchni tekstu w postaci skróconych zdań, najczęściej zwrotów imiesłowowych, […]; mogą to być wyrażenia samodzielne, wkomponowane w składnię wypowiedzenia, wyrażenia wtrącone, występujące w konstrukcjach tzw. wyodrębnionych [occur on the text surface in the form of reduced clauses, most frequently in the form of adverbial participle clauses […]; they can be autonomous expressions integrated into the syntax of the utterance or parenthetical expressions figuring in so-called detached constructions – translation S.B.]". At first sight, it seems that all the DSEs based on *verba dicendi* that are discussed by Ożóg (1991) fulfill these criteria, since *mówię ci* 'I tell you', *wiesz* 'you know' or *rozumiesz* 'you understand' may be considered reduced clauses, in which case the syntactic realization of the semantic role 'content' is missing.

However, another possible analysis reads the utterance, i.e. the actual information, as realization of the semantic role 'content.' This is the more probable scenario, as, the pragmatic function of Ożóg's DSEs enumerated above is guiding the listener's attention to the information that follows. Admittedly, the syntactic realization does not correspond to the prototypical scheme expected in written language, where the utterance content forms a complement sentence, but structures of the type *mówię ci (to): CONTENT X* 'I say to you (this): content X' or *coś ci powiem: CONTENT X* 'I will tell you something. That is, content X' is also acceptable in written language and parallels the encoding of direct speech in both written and spoken language. The specifics of spoken language where intonation contours and pauses structure information, serve to make such constructions even more expectable and easy to digest. This means that the enumerated expressions do not fulfill Żabowska's criterion of integration into the utterance, especially if they are set apart from the actual information by a pause or two different intonation contours stretching over the DSE and the utterance proper, respectively. The former has been shown to be the case e.g. for the parenthetical DSE *powiedzmy* 'let's say' (Wołk 2007, 7). In contrast, expressions based on adverbial participles of *verba dicendi* constitute prototypical representatives of DSEs, as Żabowska (2009, 181) herself states in the citation above.

Additional evidence of absent integration into the clause is the positioning of the enclitic conditional marker *by* + ending. This complex is known to be attached to the verbal stem only loosely and to preferably cliticize the "first pronounced word in the clause" (Hansen 2010, 345). Consequently, if DSEs were integrated into their host clause, the conditional marker should cliticize them in cases when they take the sentence-initial position. Our corpus research for the DSE *wiesz* 'you know', and the DSEs based on the infinitive *powiedzieć* 'say' and *rzec* 'say' as well as the adverbial participle *mówiąc* 'speaking' showed that this is not the case.[11]

---

11   We assumed that the clitic does not take intermediate position between the elements of the DSEs based on *verba dicendi*. Therefore, we conducted the queries
        "wiesz|rzec|powiedzieć|mówiąc" by for cases without punctuation
        "wiesz|rzec|powiedzieć|mówiąc" ",|:" by for the cases with punctuation
        We found four instances where the conditional marker *by* + ending follows immediately after the DSE constituent *mówiąc* 'speaking'. However, in (1) the DSE does not constitute the first word in the sentence, so we may interpret (1) as evidence that the DSE forms one prosodic segment with the element it scopes over, i.e. *najchętniej* 'preferably', and the conditional marker *by* cliticizes to this prosodic segment. (2) represents the other three instances, where the DSE is followed by a purpose clause introduced by the (contracted) complementizer *by*.
(1)   Najchętniej, szczerze mówiąc, bym słyszał pańskie odpowiedzi:
        'Preferably, frankly speaking, I would like to hear your answers:'
        (Stenogram z 53. posiedzenia Komisji Śledczej do zbadania ujawnionych w mediach zarzutów dotyczących przypadków korupcji podczas prac nad nowelizacją ustawy o radiofonii i telewizji (SRTV) w dniu 2 lipca 2003 r.)

Furthermore, just like DSEs based on the infinitive of *verba dicendi*, the DSEs based on the adverbial participle display morphosyntactic properties that clearly distinguish them from other occurrences of *verba dicendi*, as the discussion below will show. Additionally, constructions containing an adverbial participle are a (semi) productive means of forming DSEs (cf. Birzer accepted a), whereas other verb forms seem to be used only haphazardly in lexicalized units. We therefore limit our discussion of DSEs based on *verba dicendi* to those with the adverbial participle or infinitive as formative.

Morphosyntactically, our DSEs are distinct from other occurrences of *verba dicendi* in the following respects. For the adverbial participles, the most important syntactic issue is undoubtedly the loss of co-reference between the covert subject of the adverbial participle and the first argument of the matrix verb. Instead, the speaker is the covert subject of the adverbial participle (11). The aforementioned co-reference is the characteristic trait of prototypical adverbial participles (12).

(11) **Ø$_{sp}$** ***Szczerze mówiąc,*** *Adam* *jest* *głupi.*
frankly speak-AP Adam-NOM is stupid-NOM.SG.M
'Frankly speaking, Adam is stupid.'

(12) **Ø$_j$** ***Mówiąc z kolegą,*** *Adam$_j$* *się* *śmiał.*
speak-AP with friend-INSTR Adam-NOM REFL laugh-PST.3SG.M
'Speaking with a friend, Adam laughed.'

The loss of co-reference also indicates that the adverbial participle ceases to function as a secondary predication. It is a trait that all adverbial participles share – even those that may not be considered prototypical due to the co-reference of their covert subject with a matrix verb argument other than the first one (13).[12]

(13) *Wujek$_i$ prosi nas$_p$ zwrócić pożyczone pieniądze, nie mówiąc$_p$ o tym nikomu.*
'The uncle asks us to return the borrowed money, not speaking with anybody about it.'

---

(2) *Ikona próbuje czynić widzialnym niewidzialne, pozwala tym samym, aby widzialne nie przestawało odsyłać do czegoś innego niż ono samo.* **Inaczej mówiąc***: by niewidzialne nie zastygło w widzianym.*
'The icon tries to make the invisible visible, and allows in the same way that the visible does not stop to relate to something else than just to itself alone. In other words (lit. in another way speaking): that the invisible does not congeal in the visible.'
(Dariusz Czaja. 2009. *Lekcje ciemności*.)

12 In fact, the loss of secondary predication status implies that the affected item should no longer be labelled as adverbial participle. Yet for reasons of convenience, we will retain this term.

(cited after Feret 2005, 83)

For the DSEs based on the infinitive, loss of co-reference and control is the most important issue. Hints to be discussed below imply that the point of departure for this kind of DSE is a purpose clause or complement clause introduced by the complementizer *(że)by* 'in order to; that' and containing an infinitve as a predicative element (14). The infinitive is controlled by the first argument of the superordinate clause (14; cf. Hansen 2010 for reference and control in Polish conditional and purpose clauses). If the construction is used as a DSE, however, control of and referential identity with the first argument of the superordinate clause are replaced by control of and referential identity with the speaker, who becomes the first covert argument of the infinitive (15).

(14) *Zadzwoniłam$_j$,*   *żeby ci*   *powiedzieć$_j$,*
      call-PST.1SG.F   COMPL you-DAT   say-INF
      że   znalazłam   przyjaciółkę   dla   twojego   psa.
      that   I_found   girlfriend   for   your   dog
      'I called you in order to tell you that I found a girlfriend for your dog.'
      (Filipiak, I. 2006. *Magiczne oko. Opowiadania zebrane.*)

(15) *Sytuacja   jest   niewesoła,*   *żeby   nie   powiedzieć* –
      situation-NOM is   not_funny-NOM.SG.F   COMPL not   say-INF
      dramatyczna.
      dramatic-NOM.SG.F
      'The situation is not funny, not to say – dramatic.'
      (*Tygodnik Ciechanowski*, 2002-09-16)

Why do we assume the purpose clause as the point of departure for the items under investigation? The secondary complementizers *aby* 'in order to' and *żeby* 'that; in order to' consist of the primary conjunction *a* 'and, but' or complementizer *że* 'that', respectively and the conditional marker *by*. They introduce purpose clauses as well as one complement type of control verbs. In both cases, the controller reference is decisive:

> "In complement clauses governed by [control] verbs, the conditional is used if the subject of the main clause does not control the subject of the subordinated clause, i.e. if the subjects refer to different entities.[…] In the case of referential identity, the conditional is excluded and we have to use the infinitive [as direct argument of the control verb, instead of a complement clause – S.B.]" (Hansen 2010: 352)

The same rule applies to purpose clauses (Hansen 2010, 353). Since our DSEs have the speaker as the covert first argument, this means that as the point of departure for our DSEs, we must assume purpose clauses or complement clauses of control verbs whose first argument was co-referent with the first argument – in the first person (singular) – of the superordinate clause.

Some words are given in order to illustrate why we do not include participles into our analysis, although they undoubtedly constitute non-finite verb forms. Moreover, agreeing participle forms can be generally excluded, as, they are integrated into their host utterance and thus go against one of our defining criteria for DSEs. Hence, only the indefinite-personal active predicates on *–no/-to* (henceforth *–no/-to* forms) which have developed out of the passive participle via diathesis from passive to active (cf. Weiss 1984, 156), remain subjects of discussion. Their representatives, formed of *verba dicendi*, namely *mówiono* 'having spoken' and *powiedziano* 'having said'[13], have the ability to function as predicates of parenthetical constructions in collocations of the type *jak mówiono / powiedziano (powyżej)* 'as has been said (above). However, our corpus analysis revealed a slightly different story.[14] In a first step, we searched[15] for adverbs that colligate with the described *–no/-to* forms in order to identify adverbial collexemes.[16] The results showed that adverbs – even *jak* 'so, as' and (*po)wyżej* 'above' – function as collexemes only rarely[17] and that the construction as a whole lacks several of the characteristic traits of DSEs.

---

[13]   Since English has no corresponding construction, we will make use of the passive construction in the translations of our examples. *Rzeczono* 'having said' is not discussed, as it was attested to only twice in the corpus. The participle *rzeczony* 'aforementioned' is not analyzed because it is integrated into the utterance and thus does not fulfill our criteria of DSE.

14   If not indicated otherwise, research was conducted in the balanced subcorpus of NKJP.

15   For these endings, we used the queries

  [pos=adv] mówiono [] [orth!=że]
  [pos=adv] powiedziano [] [orth!=że]
  mówiono [pos=adv] [] [orth!=że]
powiedziano [pos=adv] [] [orth!=że]

  that excluded instances with complement clauses introduced by *że* 'that,' as they are indicative of the predicative usage of *verba dicendi*.

16   For the notion *collexeme,* see Stefaenowitsch & Gries 2003.

[17]   This finding is corroborated by an additional search for the collocation of all inflectional forms based on the participle passive stems *powiedzian-* and *mówion-* and the adverb (*po)wyżej* 'above' (queries *powyżej powiedzian.** respectively *mówion.** and vice versa) gave just 17 matches: no matches were evident for mówion*, and of the 17 matches for *powiedzian.** Only seven represented the impersonal construction on *–o* (the others are instances of participles,which are integrated into the utterance and thus do not agree with our DSE criteria). Yet the contexts were not large enough to reconstruct whether the speaker or a protagonist from the narration has to be assumed to be a demoted agent. These findings are the more interesting, as *powyżej* 'above' occurs 134 times in discourse structuring contexts (query *[base=powyżej & pos=adv]*, followed by manual post-processing); however, these contexts do not display signs of (ongoing) lexicalization:

(1)   *Znowu* [to zrobiłem – S.B.] *nie z sympatii, ale z motywów przedstawionych powyżej.*
    'Again I did this not out of sympathy, but based on the motives presented above.'
    (Stanisław Mrożek. 1975. *Jak zostałem filmowcem*)

The construction under investigation (with some rare exceptions) does not display a metatextual function. Although our queries excluded instances with complement clauses, the majority of all matches still took complements, e.g. (16-17).

(16) [Budynek teatru niemieckiego – S.B.] *był symbolem szowinizmu, a z jego sceny, jak powiedziano przy otwarciu, nie miało nigdy paść słowo polskie.*
'The building of the German theater was a symbol of chauvinism, and on its stage, as was said at the opening ceremony, a Polish word was never ever supposed to be uttered.'
(Jan Bałdowski. 1997. *Warmia, Mazury, Suwalszczyzna.*)

(17) *Niektórzy już tacy są, że potrzebują wodza. – A Putin im nie wystarczy? – Nie wystarczy. Putin przy Stalinie to liliput. Albo - jak mówiono o Breżniewie - niedonosek.*
'Some are already of the kind that they demand a vozhd'. – And Putin isn't enough for them? – No, he isn't. In comparison to Stalin, Putin is a wimp. Or – as was said about Brezhnev – a runt.'
(Aleksander Kaczorowski. Włodzimierz Wojnowicz, pisarz rosyjski, o Polsce, Europie i nowej powieści. // *Polytika*. 2006-04-01)

As described above, the existence of complements constitutes one of the dividing lines between *regular* inflectional forms and the verbal constituents of DSEs. Another distinguishing feature is the speaker as the (covert) first argument of the DSE. However, most instances of the *–no/-to* construction without complements do not allow for this interpretation, be they modified by an adverb (18) or not (19). Rather, lay people have to be assumed to be the covert first argument.

(18) *Zwłaszcza w ciągu ostatnich trzech lat przed wojną władze państwowe poświęcały sprawie budowy wygódek (albo sławojek, **jak mówiono ironicznie)** szczególną uwagę.*
'Especially in the course of the last three years before the war, the government paid special attention to the construction of sanitary facilities (or jakes, as was said ironically).'
(Stanisław Berenda-Czajkowski, 2001. *Dni grozy i łez.*)

(19) *Welch sprzedał bank - **jak mówiono** – "po cenie złomu".*

---

(2) *... redakcja chętnie oceni Twój tekst – jednak, z powodów jak p*owyżej*, przypomnij jej się tak raz na miesiąc.*
'The editorial board will be happy to assess your text – however, for the reasons as above, remind us about it roughly once a month.'
(Archiwa magazynu *Esensja*. 2005-2008).

'Welch sold the bank – as is said – "for the price of scrap".

(Gazeta Wyborcza. 1997-06-06)

Only in highly formal texts, such as the statement from the Supreme Court, the modified construction based on *mówiono* or *powiedziano,* respectively, functions clearly as DSE (20).

(20)   *... zarzut podnoszony przez oskarżonego nie dotyczy sądu właściwego, lecz wyraża obawę o kierowanie się solidaryzmem środowiskowym. W takiej jednak sytuacji, jak powiedziano, każdy inny sąd może narazić się na analogiczny zarzut.*
'... the objection raised by the accused does not relate to the specific court, but expresses concern about being guided by solidarity with one's own milieu. However, in such a situation, as said, any other court might be confronted with a similar objection.'
(POSTANOWIENIE Z DNIA 17 SIERPNIA 2004 R., V KO 47/04. Orzecznictwo Sądu Najwyższego, Izba Karna. 2004-08-17)

For these reasons, we decided to refrain from discussing this construction comprehensively.

2. Functions in Contemporary Polish

Since the functions of DSEs based on the adverbial participle *mówiąc* have already been described in Birzer (accepted a), we limit ourselves to a short survey of the three superordinate functions and the construction that goes along with the respective function prototypically.

The first superordinate function is the stance-marking function with ADV + *mówiąc* as prototypical construction. In the Polish National Corpus, 104 different adverbs are utilized to fill the ADV slot of this construction, among them the near-synonyms *delikatnie / łagodnie mówiąc* 'mildly speaking', *dokładnie / konkretnie / precyzyjnie mówiąc* 'precisely speaking' and *generalnie / ogólnie mówiąc* 'generally speaking'. At a pragmatic level, the construction ADV + *mówiąc* expresses the speaker's stance towards the proposition. At the syntactic level, the construction may function as a connective. Both functions are inherent in the construction, but depending on the semantics of the adverb inserted into the construction, their manifestation varies accordingly. Connectivity is thus less pronounced with e.g. *szczerze mówiąc* 'frankly speaking', but the speaker's stance figures prominently (compare (21), where the speaker's stance is dominant, with (22), where connectivity is also at work); whereas with

e.g. *krótko mówiąc* 'in short,' connectivity is dominant (23) and the speaker's stance plays only a minor role (compare (23) with (24), where stance is more in focus).[18]

(21) *Malownicza zakopiańska zima przerodziła się w wiosenne roztopy. **Szczerze mówiąc**, wolę skrzypiący śnieg pod stopami niż błoto ...*

'The picturesque winter in Zakopane degraded into springtime thaws. Frankly speaking, I prefer crunchy snow under my feet over mud…'

(Mój "Dzienniczek Polski" // *Dziennik Polski*, 2002-02-01)

(22) *Wystąpienie było bardziej nastawione na efekt propagandowy niż merytoryczny - z podaniem konkretnych spraw czy terminu rozwiązania zagadnień. **Szczerze mówiąc**, informacja była przypomnieniem albo powtórzeniem exposé wygłoszonego przez pana premiera ...*

'The address was aimed rather at a propagandistic effect than at content – with the presentation of concrete issues or a date for the solution of issues. Frankly speaking, the information was a reminder or repetition of the exposé that had been delivered by the prime minister … '

(*Sprawozdanie stenograficzne z obrad Sejmu RP z dnia 09.06.1995, 2 kadencja, 51 posiedzenie, 3 dzień*)

(23) *... ponad 64% przestępstw popełnianych w naszym kraju nie jest znanych policji [...]. Wystarczy powiedzieć, że według cytowanych badań policja nie wie o ok. 70% pobić, 80% kradzieży i 90% przestępstw o charakterze seksualnym. **Krótko mówiąc**, w świetle badań wiktymizacyjnych Polska jest krajem, w którym zagrożenie niektórymi typami przestępstw, zwłaszcza popełnianych przy użyciu przemocy, jest jedno z najwyższych w świecie.*

'... more than 64% of the crimes committed in our country are not reported to the police […] It's sufficient to say that according to the police surveys cited, the police don't know about 70% of all instances of violence, 80% of all thefts and 90% of all crimes of a sexual nature. In short, in the light of victim surveys, Poland is the country where the threat of several types of crimes, especially of those committed with violence, is among the highest in the world.'

(*Sprawozdanie stenograficzne z obrad Sejmu RP z dnia 14.02.2001, 3 kadencja, 101 posiedzenie, 1 dzień*)

(24) *Halina ma płaszcz. Taki płaszcz to skarb, choć na pozór nic specjalnego - znoszony, trochę za długi i zbyt szeroki, **krótko mówiąc**, niemodny.*

---

[18] A case study of the various syntactic contexts and thus the various semantic and functional nuances is offered for *ogólnie mówiąc* 'generally speaking' in Birzer (2015).

'Halina has got a coat. Such a coat is a treasure, although by all appearances, it is nothing special – worn out, a bit too long and a bit too wide ⸺ in short, out of style.'
(*Granica wytrzymałości*. // Dziennik Polski. 2006-06-03)

Quite interestingly, the construction ADV + *mówiąc* forms a doublet with ADV + *powiedziawszy*, i.e. with a construction based on the perfective adverbial participle of anterior meaning. Yet the latter construction has to be considered a non-productive pattern for forming DSEs, since only seven different instantiations – with the adverbs *dokładniej* 'more precisely', *inaczej* 'differently', *lepiej* 'better', *najprościej/prosto* '(most) simply', *ściśle(j)* 'strictly' and *szczerze* 'frankly' and the noun *prawdę* 'truly (lit. the truth)' – are evidenced in the Polish National Corpus.

The second superordinate function is contextualization with the prototypical construction AP + ADJ.INSTR + NOUN.INSTR, for which Polish offers 27 instantiations. It relates (part of the) proposition within certain discourse – be it modern terminology for well-known phenomena (cf. (25) or different style registers that characterize certain types of discourse (26).

(25)   *Dziwne zjawisko: skrajna prawica i skrajna lewica zgadzają się w sprawach granic - no, może nie całkiem, ale tak na 95%.* **Zgodnie też proponują plan, mówiąc dzisiejszym językiem**, *czystek etnicznych ...*
   'A bizarre phenomenon: The ultimate right and the ultimate left agree on [national – S.B.] border issues – well, maybe not completely, but perhaps 95%. In unison they also propose a plan about ⸺ speaking in today's language ⸺ ethnic cleansing …'
   (Andrzej Anonimus. 1999. *Nie nadaje się, przecież to jeszcze szczeniak.*)

(26)   *Skuteczny zrazu sprzeciw pozwanych* [...] *bazował na "braku czynnej legitymacji prawnej* **po stronie powodów"**. **Mówiąc to samo językiem kolokwialnym**: *"Nie do przyjęcia jest, że czegoś chcą jacyś Jabłkowscy, będący spadkobiercami niektórych tylko właścicieli, nieistniejącej od daywna firmy".*
   'The effective objection on the part of the defendants [...] based on the "absence of an effective legal legitimation on the complainants' side." Saying the same in colloquial terms: "it cannot be accepted that the people who are after something are these Jabłkowskis, who are the heirs to some proprietors of a long since non-existent company."'
   (Feliks Jabłkowski. 2005. *Dom Towarowy Bracia Jabłkowscy: romans ekonomiczny*.)

The third superordinate function is the marking of quotation[19] (27) with the prototypical construction *mówiąc + językiem/słowami*.INSTR + NOUN.GEN. The construction provides "discourse-salient information" (Güldemann 2012, 140), since it lays open the source of the discourse rendered (cf. also Weiss in preparation, who states for the usage of citations in political discourse that "the identification [of the source cited – S.B.] is the more explicit in cases where the source cannot be considered to be common knowledge" [translation – S.B.]). At the same time, it also links two excerpts of discourses with each other, namely the discourse which the citation is integrated into, one of which is the source of the citation. Weiss (in preparation) describes the mechanism at work as follows: "As the basis for the connection [between citation and the text it is integrated into – S.B.] functions as the metatextual operation of comparison, i.e. an implicit or explicit parallel between the actual […] situation […] and the content of the xeno-text [the quote – S.B.]" [translation – S.B.].

(27)   *Ja myślę, że obaj mają swoje - mówiąc językiem Lecha Wałęsy - plusy dodatnie i plusy ujemne.*
'I think that both have their – using Lech Wałęsa's wording (lit. speaking with Lech Wałęsa's language) – positive pluses and negative pluses.'
(*Dziennik Polski*. 2001-05-18)

Let us now turn to the functions of the constructions based on the infinitives of *verba dicendi*. These constructions consist of three elements – a complementizing element, the negation *nie* 'not' or the deictic element *tak* 'so' and an infinitive (28). The choice of the "intermediate" element determines the function of the construction; the complementizers and infinitives are basically interchangeable.[20] Quite interestingly, our corpus research showed that only the perfective verbs *powiedzieć* 'say' and *rzec* 'say' serve as bases for these DSEs.

(28)

żeby	*tak* 'so'	*powiedzieć* 'say'
by	*nie* 'not'	*rzec* 'say'
aby		

---

19   Quite interestingly, Wołk notes a "citational" usage (*użycie cytacyjne*) of *powiedzmy* (2007, 13-15). However, this citational usage does not encompass a function from the quotative realm, but rather the fact that the true value of the utterance segment marked by *powiedzmy* cannot be determined.
20   In our eyes, the fact that constructions with *aby* 'that' are in general much less frequent than with *żeby* or *by,* explains why *aby nie mówić* 'not to say' and *aby tak powiedzieć* 'so to say' are not evidenced, failing thus to attest to the incompatibility of the elements.

Aby / by / żeby tak powiedzieć / rzec 'so to say / in order to say so' has two functions. The first one is that of a downtoning hedge:

> A hedge is either defined as one or more lexico-syntactical elements that are used to modify a proposition, or else, as a strategy that modifies a proposition. The term 'hedging' is used to refer to the textual strategies of using linguistic means as hedges in a certain context for specific communicative purposes, such as politeness, vagueness, mitigation, etc.
> (Schröder and Zimmer 2000 cited after Gries & David 2007)

The semantic implications of the constructional element *tak* 'so' are pivotal for the semantic explication of *aby / by / żeby tak powiedzieć / mówić / rzec* in the hedging function, which could sound as follows: 'Apart from description P, several additional ways of describing the given situation can be pinpointed. The speaker chooses P, although they are aware of the fact that P might be offensive to the listener and that another description might be more acceptable to the listener.' Consequently, the hedge applies to entities – usually autosemantics or NPs containing autosemantics – that either bear a subjective semantic component in the sense of Traugott & Dasher (2002, 96) or whose semantics form part of a scale in the wider sense. E.g., *biograficznie* 'biographically' in example (29) is part of the scale "biographical – fictional" and is accompanied by the downtoning hedge *by tak powiedzieć*, as other approaches to the interpretation of the drama are also possible. The author of (30) is aware that the noted societal justification of the reason mentioned can be challenged (the possible evaluation scale ranges from socially justified to unjust); in (31), the downtowner preceding *czynnościowy* 'functional' (31) marks that the adjective is an approximation to the concept which the author cannot describe more appropriately.

(29) *Chmielowski interpretuje go [aktu II dramatu Wyspiańskiego – S.B.] —* **by tak powiedzieć** *— biograficznie, tzn. uważa, iż jest on bezpośrednim przekazem wewnętrznych walk Wyspiańskiego, jego "spowiedzią autorską".*
'Chmielowski interpretes it [the second act of a drama by Wyspiański – S.B.] – so to speak – biographically, i.e. he pays attention to question of whether it is an immediate re-narration of Wyspiański's inner struggle, his "confession as an author".'
(Głowiński, M. 1997. *Ekspresja i empatia*.)

(30) *Jest to nawet racja,* **żeby tak rzec**, *"społecznie słuszna".*
'This is even a reason that is, so to say, "justifiable for society".'
(*Gazeta Wyborcza*, 1997-08-04)

(31) *To samo wyrażone językiem, **aby tak rzec**, czynnościowym, będzie brzmiało następująco*:

'That same [content – S.B.] expressed in – so to speak – functional language, will sound as follows:'

(*Gazeta Ubezpieczeniowa*, 2001-09-19)

The second function of constructions with the element *tak* 'so' is that of a filler (32-35), i.e. an element used to cover speech disfluency. It may be considered semantically void, as it does not contribute any metatextual information; its function is the mere maintenance of speech flow.

(32) *Za mały byłem, **by tak powiedzieć**. Teraz jestem za duży*.
'I was too small, so to speak. Now I am too big.'
(Kornaga, D. *Gangrena*. 2005)

(33) *Wyszedłem, **żeby tak powiedzieć**, w niedzielę na miasto*...
'I went, so to speak, on Sunday to town …'
(Myśliwski, W. 2007. *Traktat o łuskaniu fasoli*.)

(34) *Grupa składa się z trzech, **żeby tak powiedzieć**, podgrup: olsztyńskiej, łódzkiej i żyrardowskiej ....*
'The group consists of three, so to speak, subgroups: the ones from Olsztyn, Łódź and Żirardów … '
(*Polityka*, 2001-12-01)

(35) *Niby nie czujesz fizycznego bólu, ale wiesz, że umierasz, i to wywołuje niedający się z niczym porównać strach. To ten strach boli cię, **by tak rzec**, naprawdę.*
'You kind of don't feel physical pain, but you know that you are dying, and that evokes a fear that cannot be compared to anything. And it is fear that is, so to speak, actually hurting you.'
(Mariusz Czubaj. 2010. *21:37*)

As Gries & David (2007) note, many elements used as hedges may also be employed as fillers. This is probably due to the fact that attenuating expressions usually do not arouse unpleasant reactions on the interlocutor's side of the equation, therein leading to excessive use.

The discrimination of hedging and filler function poses some problems, but is not as unclear as Gries & David assume: "without hearing the utterance, it is not fully clear whether there is in fact a break around *sort of* that indicates that *sort of* is just a disfluency marker" (2007, note 4). In fact, two characteristics distinguish the filler from the hedging function. The above-mentioned semantic void constitutes the first one and constitutes the basis for the second one. A filler may occur in any syntactic position (cf. especially 33 and 35) since it is semantically void and does not dictate any semantic and syntactic prerequisites to its surroundings. This distinguishes it from all other functions of DSEs that are tied to a certain syntactic (and partially semantic) context.

The negation *nie* 'not' is the constitutive element for the other group of DSEs based on the infinitives of *verba dicendi*. The functions of *aby / by / żeby nie powiedzieć / rzec* 'not to say / in order not to say' can be ascribed to the superordinate function of stance marking. The DSE introduces a reformulation, but at the same time features a downtoning function.[21] The DSE implies that the speaker is aware of the fact that the chosen reformulation is probably conceived as too strong, since the reformulation constitutes a pointed description of the situation outlined more moderately before.

(36) *Refleksja ta otwiera paradoksalne (**by nie powiedzieć** absurdalne) pole niczym nie skrępowanej wolności interpretacyjnej.*

'This reflection opens a paradox (not to say absurd) field of unlimited interpretative liberty.'

(Jerzy Adamski. 2000. *Świat jako niespełnienie albo Samobójstwo Don Juana*.)

(37) *... i ten prosty,* by nie powiedzieć*: prymitywny, rachunek pokazuje prawdę ...*

'... and this simple, not to say, primitive calculation shows the truth ...'

(Sprawozdanie stenograficzne z obrad Sejmu RP z dnia 13.11.2002, 4 kadencja, 34 posiedzenie, 2 dzień)

(38) *To jednak tylko teoria, **aby nie rzec**: utopia.*

'But this is only theory, not to say: utopia.'

(Gazeta Wyborcza, 1993-07-01)

(39) *Był postawny, **by nie rzec** gruby, włosy miał lekko przerzedzone, a na twarzy dobrotliwy uśmiech.*

'He was stately, not to say coarse, his hair was slightly thinning, and on his face he had a good-natured smile.'

---

[21]   No instances where just one function is realized were identified in the Polish National Corpus.

(Iwona Surmik. 2005. *Ostatni smok*.)

What could be the reason that only the perfective infinitives occur in these DSEs? The most plausible explanation seems to be that hedging is central to these DSEs, and hedging always pertains to a specific situation, i.e. hedging is situation-specific. Specific situations are usually episodic ones, and episodicity is marked by perfective aspect (cf. Hansen 1996).

Bibliography

Birzer, Sandra. (accepted a) "Formal unity and functional diversity: a corpus-linguistic approach to Russian and Polish adverbial participles with the meaning 'speaking' between discourse and grammar./" In: Fried, Mirjam; Lehečková, Eva (eds.) *Conjunctions vs. Contextualizers*. John Benjamins. (working title) (Ms. 40 pages)

Birzer, Sandra. (accepted b) "Historical development and contemporary usage of discourse structuring elements based on *verba dicendi* in Croatian." In: Grković-Major, Jasmina; Hansen, Björn; Sonnenhauser, Barbara. (eds.) *Diachronic Slavonic Syntax*. Mouton de Gruyter. (Ms. 53 pages)

Birzer, Sandra. 2012. "From subject to subjectivity: Russian discourse structuring elements based on the adverbial participle *govorja* 'speaking'." *Russian Linguistics* 36.3; 221-249.

Birzer, Sandra. 2015. "Generally speaking, connectivity and conversation management combined. The functions of Russian *voobšče govorja* and Polish *ogólnie mówiąc* 'generally speaking'." *Russian Linguistics* 39.1. DOI 10.1007/s11185-014-9143-0.

Czapiga, Zofia. 2006. *Rosyjskie operatory metatekstowe i ich polskie odpowiedniki.* Rzeszów, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.

Dehé, Nicole; Kavalova, Yordanka (eds.) 2007. *Parentheticals*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Feret, Andrzej S. 2005. *Das Partizip im Deutschen und Polnischen*. Frankfurt /M. – Berlin – Bern – Bruxelles – New York – Oxford – Wien, Peter Lang.

Fraser, Bruce. 2006. "Towards a theory of discourse markers." In: Fischer, Kerstin (ed.) *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. 189-204. Amsterdam et al., Elsevier.

Gries, Stefan. T.; David, Caroline V. 2007. "This is kind of / sort of interesting: variation in hedging in English." In: Pahta, Päivi et al. (eds.) *Studies in variation, contacts and change in English. Volume 2: Towards multimedia in corpus studies*. http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/02/gries_david/, 01.03.2015.

Grochowski, Maciej et al. 2014. *Słownik gniazdowy partykuł polskich*. Kraków, Polska Akademia Umiejętności.

Grochowski, Maciej. 1983. "Metatekstowa interpretacja parentezy." In: Dobrzyńska, Teresa; Janus, Elżbieta (ed.) *Tekst i zdanie. Tom studiów*. 247–258. Wrocław.

Grochowski, Maciej. 1986a. "O metapredykatywnej funkcji niektórych wyrażeń partykułowo-przysłówkowych w strukturze tekstu." In: Dobrzyńska, Teresa (ed.) *Teoria tekstu. Zbiór studiów*. 139-148. Wrocław et al., Ossoliński.

Grochowski, Maciej. 1986b. *Polskie partykuły. Składnia, semantyka, leksykografia*. Wrocław.

Grochowski, Maciej. 1998. *Funktionswörter im Polnischen*. Oldenburg, BIS.

Güldemann, Tom. 2012. "Thetic speaker-instantiating quotative indexes as a cross-linguistic type." In Buchstaller, Isabelle; van Alphen, Ingrid (eds.) *Quotatives: cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*. 117-142. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Hansen, Björn. 1996. *Zur Grammatik von Referenz und Episodizität*. (Specimina philologiae slavicae Supplementband 46) München, Verlag Otto Sagner.

Hansen, Björn. 2010. "Mood in Polish." In: Rothstein, Björn; Thieroff, Rolf (eds.) *Mood in the Languages of Europe*. 342-357. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Kaltenböck, Gunther; Heine, Bernd; Kuteva, Tanja. 2011. "On thetical grammar." *Studies in Language* 35.4; 852–897.

Mendoza, Imke. 2009. "Anaphorische Mittel: Konnexion." In: Kempgen, Sebastian et al. (eds.) *Die slavischen Sprachen. Ein internationales Handbuch zu ihrer Struktur, ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung. Band 1* (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft, *32.1*). 982–990. Berlin, New York, De Gruyter.

Ożóg, Kazimierz. 1991. "Elementy metatekstowe ze składnikiem mówię w polszczyźnie mówionej." *Język a kultura*. 183-194.

Rathmayr, Renate. 1985. *Die russischen Partikeln als Pragmalexeme*. München, Otto Sagner.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge.

Traugott, Elizabeth C.; Dasher, Richard B. 2002. *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge, Cambridge UP.

Wajszczuk, Jadwiga. *O metatekście*. Warszawa, Katedra Lingwistyki Formalnej UW.

Weiss, Daniel. (in preparation). Deputaty ljubjat citaty: ssylki na ksenoteksty v Gosdume.

Weiss, Daniel. 1977. *Syntax und Semantik polnischer Partizipialkonstruktionen im Rahmen einer generativ-transformationellen Sprachbeschreibung*. Bern, Lang.

Weiss, Daniel. 1984. "Kongruenz vs. Kongruenzlosigkeit: Zur typologischen Entwicklung des Polnischen." *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* 44; 144-192.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1971. "Metatekst w tekście." In: Mayenowa, Maria Renata (ed.) *O spójności tekstu*. 105–121. Wrocław; Ossolineum.

Wołk, Mariola. 2007. "Co mówimy, mówiąc *powiedzmy*?" *Poradnik językowy* 1/2007; 5-19.

Żabowska, Magdalena. 2009. "Hierarchia wyrażeń metatekstowych." *Linguistica Copernicana* 2/2009; 179-189.