Krystyna Kleszczowa   https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4872-5484
University of Silesia in Katowice

From Object-Level Meaning to Metatextual Meaning.
The Case of Polish Particles

Abstract

The article focuses on particles derived from object-level expressions, but operating at a higher, metatextual level. Such particles are sourced chiefly from speaker-oriented parentheticals composed of *verba dicendi* and *verba sentiendi.* Following the elision of parentheticals and other expressions, functional homonymy arises: a particle/a different part of speech (most commonly an adverb). This results in an uncertainty regarding the status of particles. The understanding of particles as parts of speech is also problematic due to the linguistic tradition which relies on the Latin name *particula,* meaning 'a little part'/'a particle'. The classification of expressions operating both at the object and the metatextual level creates further concerns. The meaning of particles does not change, as at most they may undergo a phonetic change (cf. *bodaj* 'probably', *ponoć* 'they say'/'apparently', *oczywiście* 'of course'). The discrepancy between the two levels is brought about mainly by changes taking place at the object level (e.g. *mówię w prawdzie* 'I am telling the truth' > *wprawdzie* 'admittedly'; *wiem za pewne* 'I know for sure' > *zapewne* 'probably'). Thus, a class of particles is being formed that is a separate and formally distinct part of speech.

Keywords

parts of speech, functional expressions, metatext, particle, language change

Abstrakt

W artykule mowa o partykułach powstających na bazie wyrażeń planu przedmiotowego, funkcjonujących na wyższym poziomie – metatekstowym. Źródłem partykuł są głównie autoreferujące parentezy, budowane przez *verba dicendi* i *verba sentiendi.* Wskutek zerowania elementów parentez i innych wyrażeń tworzy się homonimia funkcyjna: partykuła/

inna część mowy, głównie przysłówek. Efektem jest dyskusyjny status partykuł. Kłopoty w rozumieniu partykuły jako części mowy sprawia też tradycja lingwistyczna nawiązująca do łacińskiej nazwy *particula* 'cząstka'. Przynależność wyrażeń do różnych planów – przedmiotowego i metatekstowego – ma dalsze konsekwencje. Partykuły nie zmieniają znaczenia, mogą co najwyżej ulec przekształceniom fonetycznym (por. *bodaj, ponoć, oczywiście*). Rozdźwięk między obu planami powodują przede wszystkim zmiany, które dokonują się na poziomie przedmiotowym (np. *mówię w prawdzie > wprawdzie, wiem za pewne > zapewne*). W ten sposób kształtuje się klasa partykuł jako odrębna, wyrazista formalnie część mowy.

Słowa kluczowe
części mowy, wyrażenia funkcyjne, metatekst, partykuła, zmiany językowe

Introduction[1]

The division into parts of speech, even if a specific classification criterion is applied – be it of a semantic, morphological, syntactic or functional nature – has always been a source of controversy. It is difficult to draw a clear line between participles and adjectives, adjectives frequently become substantivized, and the status of some numerals and pronouns can be disputed. It is often the case that the same textual word may be ascribed to two, or even three classes. Consider, for instance, the lexeme *uczony* in the sentence: *Jan jest starannie **uczony** angielskiego przez lektora* 'Jan is being conscientiously **taught** English by a teacher' – where it belongs to the class of verbs; in the sentence: ***Uczony** odebrał medal od prezydenta* '**The scholar** received a medal from the president' – where it is a noun; and in the sentence: *Lubi czytać **uczone** książki* 'He likes reading **learned** books' – where *uczone* is an adjective. The situation becomes even more complicated when the analysis includes the author's comments on his/her own act of speaking, i.e. metatextual expressions – this function is often performed by elements which operate at the object level. Let us consider e.g. *prawdopodobnie* 'probably'; in the sentence: *Czy zeznania oskarżonego brzmią **prawdopodobnie**?* 'Does the defendant's testimony sound **plausible**?'. In this case the word is an adverb, but in the following sentence: *Nie jestem dziennikarzem i **prawdopodobnie** nigdy nim nie będę.* 'I am not a journalist and I will **probably** never become one', the same expression acts as a particle. The new function creates a new value which leads to a situation where, for a certain period of time, expressions co-exist at two levels: the object level and the metatextual, that is they represent two different parts of speech.

One of the ways which allows us to comprehend the instability of the classification of lexemes into parts of speech is by considering the processes behind the formation of the units of a certain class; this provides a basis for understanding the processes underlying functional homonymy, and sometimes also provides the tools which facilitate the classification of words into parts of speech. A strict division into synchronic and diachronic linguistics is a thing of the past. Language is known to constantly evolve and, as a consequence, phenomena which were "contemporary" in the language that was used 30 years ago may cease to exist, being a passing linguistic trend. Only the neologisms and linguistic constructions which are part of the mechanisms governing the evolutionary line of a given language stand a chance of survival. To give an example, the grammaticalization of *-man* in all Slavic languages[2] arises from the fact that these languages tend to borrow agentive morphemes (formerly: *-ator, -ar, -er, -ant, -ent*). The popularity of the English *-ing* form in words denoting activities is not surprising when we realise that Polish, throughout its entire history, has absorbed foreign suffixes denoting activities, cf. *-acja* (*prezentacja* 'presentation'), *-cja* (*ingerencja* 'interference'), *-sja* (*aneksja* 'annexation'), *-zja* (*rewizja* 'revision'), *-ada* (*galopada* 'gallop'), *-ata* (*prenumerata* 'subscription'), *-unek* (*rabunek* 'robbery'), *-aż* (*kolportaż* 'distribution') (Kleszczowa 2001). For this reason, linguistic research should not only follow and describe linguistic phenomena typical of a given period of time, but also try to identify the mechanisms which have led to changes throughout the entire history of a specific language. This line of inquiry was adopted by the research team working on the project: *Polish functional expressions in a diachronic perspective.*[3]

1. The choice of functional expressions was determined by the current state of the research into contemporary Polish. Linguists based in Warsaw and Toruń (e.g. Andrzej Bogusławski, Maciej Grochowski, Jadwiga Wajszczuk, Magdalena Danielewicz) have studied functional expressions for several decades and it is clear that in order to examine a given phenomenon within the history of a language, it needs to be recognised and sufficiently described in the contemporary variety of this language. The accomplishments of the Warsaw and Toruń linguists provided the stimulus for the research

---

[2]   See, for instance, the following examples: Polish: *biznesmen, jazzmen; kongresmen;* Slovak: *finišman, kameraman, kongresman;* Russian: *barmen, kongresmen, jahtsmen;* Belarussian: *spartsmien, džazmien, bizniemien;* Ukrainian: *rekordsmen, shoumen, iakhtsmen;* Bulgarian: *barman, kongresmen, jahtsmen.*

on the mechanisms underlying the formation of functional expressions.[4] The work undertaken by our research team has resulted in the publication of 38 research articles and seven volumes. The publications include: 1) Aleksandra Janowska's (2015)[5] work on the origin and formation of secondary prepositions (e.g. *w razie* 'in the event', *w pobliżu* 'close (to)', *z racji* 'due to', *w odniesieniu do* 'with regard to'); and 2) Dagmara Bałabaniak and Barbara Mitrenga's (2015) study on intensifiers (*niezmiernie* 'incredibly', *niemożebnie* 'impossibly', *nadzwyczaj* 'extraordinarily', *szalenie* 'wildly', *obłędnie* 'insanely', etc.). Although the project concluded in 2015, the historically-oriented research into functional units has continued. Its outcomes include e.g. the monograph authored by Magdalena Pastuch (2020) that focuses on one-word replies to questions such as the following examples: (...)? *Niechybnie* 'Undoubtedly'; (...)? *Oczywiście* 'Of course'; (...)? *Zdecydowanie* 'Surely'). Research into metatextual meanings in contemporary Polish includes, e.g. an analysis of thematic operators, which is presented in the monograph by Magdalena Danielewiczowa (2021). Soon after the publication of this monograph, Kleszczowa (2021) wrote an article demonstrating the separation of *jako* 'as', a primary thematic operator, from the comparative function performed at the object level. At this point, it should be underscored that phenomena examined in diachronic studies are related both to the language of the past and its contemporary variety. What is of importance, is the identification of rules which govern the formation of expressions performing specific functions which are typical of Polish irrespective of the period that they represent.

2. Given that the focus of my research was chiefly on particles, I will use this part of speech to demonstrate the formation of particles at the object level, their separation from this level, and, consequently, the formation of individual lexical units typical of the metatextual level.

Particles are the most controversial part of speech, a fact which can be observed in lexicographical practice. A lexeme that is described as an adverb in one dictionary, is characterised as a particle in another, and in yet another, as

---

[4]	Our team adopted the following definition of functional expressions: "lexical units which may not constitute a sentence on their own (or, to use traditional terminology, which may not fill the position of the predicate or the predicative) and which as such may not be elements of object-level denotation, distinguishing between reference to objects and reference to states of affairs. (...) Functional expressions form relationships with other linguistic objects only as metapredicative expressions (lexical units) or as part of verbal predicates (unit elements). They therefore perform the intratextual function" (Grochowski 1997: 36).

[5]	This issue was addressed alongside the changes occurring at the syntactic level, with the disappearance of some of the functions of cases – synthetic syntax was being replaced by prepositional phrases.

something different. To give an example, the certainty particle *niewątpliwie* 'undoubtedly' is described as an adverb by the author of this entry in the SWJP and the ISJP, but in the PSWP, *niewątpliwie* is also described as a particle. The lexeme *rzeczywiście* 'indeed', in turn, is described as an adverb in the PSWP and the ISJP, whereas in the ISJP another category is included: that of an interjection; in the SWJP, *rzeczywiście* is regarded as a modal marker. It is also worth noting that certain dictionaries do not provide any grammatical qualification. This applies to, e.g. the SJPD, the SJPSzym, and sometimes also to the USJP, in addition to cases in which lexemes take the form of adverbs. An even greater lexicographical challenge is that of classifying multi-word particle-like expressions. These are typically regarded as phraseologisms and are sometimes described in such a way that each element of the phraseologism has a separate entry, as is the case with, e.g. *być może* 'maybe', which can be found both in the entry for *być* 'be' and *móc* 'may' (SJPDor). Similarly, the particle *ani chybi* 'sure thing' described in the SJPDor is treated as a phraseologism in the entry for *chybiać* 'miss' (imperf.), yet in the SJPSzym, the USJP and the PSWP, it is located in the entry for *chybić* 'miss' (perf.). The particle *bez wątpienia* 'no doubt' is described as a phraseologism in the entry for *wątpienie* 'doubt' (SJPDor, USJP), whereas elsewhere it is found in the entry for *wątpić* 'to doubt' (PSWP).

An understanding of the particle as a part of speech is complicated by the linguistic tradition of relying on the Latin name *particula* meaning 'a little part'/'a particle'. In the introduction to the SGPP dictionary of particles (SGPP: 19) it is stated that "Particles were distinguished on the basis of their association with "a little word", "a little part" and were treated like a ragbag."

It was only possible to provide a more transparent definition after an analysis considered the theme-rheme perspective, as well as the inclusion in the classification of the class of paratactemes:[6]

A particle is a metatextual operator (a lexical unit referring to the speaker or one that refers to the expressions used in the utterance): (1) opening one position for the rheme of an utterance which is unmarked grammatically (that is both in the case of words representing different parts of speech and syntactic groups and sentences) and semantically (not requiring a specific element of content), (2) co-occurring with expressions which fill the position, but are syntactically independent of them, (3) not filling independently positions opened by units representing other grammatical classes, (4) commenting on the rheme of the utterance. Most particles do not take stress unless it is for contrastive purposes, nor can they be negated (unless they are citation forms)" (SGPP: 26).

---

[6]   This refers to units which are not required by other expressions and which do not impose any grammatical restrictions on other units (Wajszczuk 2005: 115–116).

It is also worth adding that particles do not appear in conjunction with other particles (*przeważnie i głównie *'mainly and chiefly'); that they may not be combined with gradation operators (*całkiem doprawdy *'quite truly)', (*niemal chyba *'almost surely'); that they may not be predicatives; and that they are outside the degree system – these properties are a consequence of the origin of particles, which is the subject addressed in the following section.

3. Since the definition of metatext encompasses the speaker's commentary on his/her own act of speaking, it comes as no surprise that the origin of particles involves speaker-oriented parentheticals, in particular those that include the first-person forms of *verba dicendi* and *verba sentiendi* in the present tense or participles ending in -*qc* or -*wszy/-szy*. It can be easily observed that the use of a parenthetical of this kind is redundant in this context, as its sense is simply stating: 'I'm saying that I'm saying" or 'I'm saying because I know'. In the case of metatextual parentheticals, including participles, redundancy is evidenced by the absence of the formal requirement for the co-referentiality of subjects, as indicated by the use of these participles at the object level: *Jan ucząc się, chętnie słuchał Mozarta* 'Jan was learning, while happily listening to Mozart' (= *Jan się uczył i Jan słuchał Mozarta*) (= 'Jan was learning and Jan was listening to Mozart'); in metatextual use, the speaker him-/herself is the subject (Weiss 2005).

With time, speaker-oriented parentheticals become formally simplified. The VP is elided, while their adverbial complements begin to operate as particles, as in, e.g.:

> *krótko powiadam* > *krótko,* **'I'm saying it briefly'** > **'briefly (put)'**
> *wiem pewnie* > *pewnie,* **'I know for sure'** > **'surely'**
> *właśnie mówiąc* > *właśnie,* **'just saying'** > **'just'**
> *w prawdzie powiedziawszy* > *wprawdzie,* **'telling the truth'** > **'admittedly'**
> *więcej powiem* > *więcej.* **'I will say more'** > **'more'**

A different type of ellipsis can be linked to the origin of specificational particles such as *zwłaszcza* 'especially', *głównie* 'mainly', *szczególnie* 'particularly', *w szczególności* 'in particular', and *przede wszystkim* 'above all' (Kisiel 2012). This refers to the set which is defined by the same predication: *Wszyscy chłopcy w tej klasie są łobuzami, a* **szczególnie** *Janek* [jest łobuzem] 'All the boys in this class are rascals, and **in particular** Janek [is a rascal])'. The highlighted element (*Janek*) belongs to the set of boys in the class, a set with a certain property (being a rascal), so repeating the predication [being a rascal] is redundant and so it is elided.

Occasionally a particle which is already in use binds an element operating at the object level. This was the case with the particle *też(e)* derived from Proto-Slavic: *też(e) podobnie, też jednako, też równie, też jeszcze.* It was

enough for the original particle *też(że)* 'also' to be elided for the adverbs to acquire the status of particles: *równie(ż)* 'also', *podobnie* 'likewise', *jednak(o)* 'equally', *jeszcze* 'yet', *niemniej* 'nevertheless', *także* 'also'.

Additionally, particle status was sometimes acquired by verbs, cf. *widać* 'apparently', *znać* 'apparently',[7] *być może* 'maybe', *może* 'maybe', *znaczy się* 'that is', *zdaje się* 'it seems'. They are derived from impersonal constructions referring to the sender's knowledge: *mówi się, że* 'it is said that'; *wiadomo, że* 'it is known that'. As to particles in the form of infinitives, they are vestiges of impersonal constructions which existed in the past (17th–19th cent.) (Pisarkowa, 1984: 35).

I have highlighted several "paths" in the formation of particles, which naturally is not an exhaustive account of this phenomenon.[8] A given grammatical type normally depends on a wide range of factors and various paths may lead to the same effect. For the purpose of this analysis it is important to note that metatextual expressions are derived from the object level, and since this is the case, there must be a period during which the same expression operates at both levels, cf. present-day forms such as: *prawdopodobnie* 'probably', *najwyraźniej* 'clearly', *widocznie* 'apparently', *istotnie* 'indeed', *naturalnie* 'naturally'. What is not surprising is the fact that we are dealing mainly with a pairing: a particle/an adverb, for it is clear that the primary adverbs in the above-mentioned metatextual expressions play the main role with regard to the introduction of a rheme.[9] It is worth noting as well that despite their transparent name (*przy+słówki* = *ad+verbia*), adverbs are not typically required to fill the position next to a verb.[10] Indeed it is the co-existence of the object-level meaning and the meta-level meaning that is the main reason for the presence of the homonymy of adverbs and functional expressions.

4. The classification of an expression as belonging to both the object level and the meta-level had further consequences. Particles, as opposed to units

---

[7] This particle is not included in the SGPP, but can be found in the SJPDor: *Jakże ci ludzie powoli się suną! Znać dobrych wieści nie niosą – to pewna* 'How slowly these people are moving! They are most probably bringing bad news – that's certain'). Rap. *Maćko76*; *Spoziera w okienko... znać kogoś dojrzała, bo jakby różyczka, spłonęła wnet cała* 'She's looking through the window ... she must have seen someone because her face soon turned red, like a little rose'). Grudz. *Poezja* 89.

[8] More information can be found in Kleszczowa (2015: 37–86).

[9] Not only the rheme. As shown by Magdalena Danielewiczowa (2021), adverbs also mark the thematic aspect.

[10] As noted by Danielewiczowa (2012: 103), "the weakening of the bond with the verb, resulting in the extension of the collocability by the addition of an adjective, an adverb and an intensifier, is considerable and may indicate that the process of the formal and functional differentiation of the expressions under scrutiny has just begun."

operating at the object level, cannot change their meaning. They can at most undergo a phonetic change, e.g. *bodaj* 'maybe' ← *bog**d**aj*; *raczej* 'rather' ← *radszej* (*rado* + *-szej*); *oczywiście* 'of course' ← the compound *oči* 'eyes' (dual form of the noun *oko* 'eye' + *vi**st**e* from **viděti* 'widzieć' 'see'); *ponoć* 'they say'/'apparently' ← *podob**n**oć*.

The only morphological change comprised the occasional addition of the metalinguistic *-ć* (*podobno – podobnoć*) 'they say' / 'apparently' and *-ż(e)* 'that', as in: *przecie – przecież* 'but', *równie – również* 'also', *chocia – chociaż* 'although', *znowu – znowuż* 'again'. However, since both morphemes, i.e. *~ć* and *~ż(e)*, belong to the metatextual level, they intensified the particles, but did not contribute any new content.

5. The discrepancy between the levels creates above all changes to the object level, whose elements are sensitive to contextual and extralinguistic factors.

5.1. It may be the case that a word disappears, or that its object-level meaning disappears, but its particle use continues. For instance, *chyba* is a word which is no longer used at the object level, although the root *chyb-* is present in many Polish words, cf. *chybotać* 'to wobble', *chybot* 'wobble', *rozchybotać się* 'to begin to wobble', *uchybiać (etykiecie)* 'to breach the etiquette', *chybiony (pomysł)* 'ill-conceived (idea)', *niechybny (koniec)* 'inevitable (end)'. There is also a phraseological unit with a Ukrainism: *na pohybel z nim* 'to lead him to destruction/an end'. The meaning of the particle *chyba* in the sense of 'it is possible that not R' (SGPP), is related to its etymology – it is a noun derived from **chybati*, **chybiti* 'to wobble' (Králik 2015), which gave rise to the meaning of 'to hesitate'/'to be unsure'. Unfortunately, the word *chyba* is not attested in the SStp, although this dictionary has an entry for *pochybować* 'to hesitate' / 'not to be sure', whereas in the SPXVI, the first meaning of *chyba* is that of 'error', which is followed by 400 instances in which *chyba* has a metalinguistic function.

Among the contemporary particles, the following units can be enumerated: *w gruncie rzeczy* 'essentially', *w istocie rzeczy* 'in fact', *w rzeczy samej* 'as a matter of fact', *rzecz jasna* 'obviously'. In all of the above, the word *rzecz* is used, with the now extinct meaning of 'speech, speaking' (← **rěčь* from the Proto-Slavic **rekti* 'to say'). Today, *rzecz* refers to a 'material object', 'the gist of the matter'; formerly it referred to 'speaking', although today the expression *rzecz długa* 'long speeches' from Adam Mickiewicz's epic poem sounds archaic:

> *Bo choć zawsze i płynnie mówił, i z rozsądkiem, wiedział, że niecierpliwa młodzież teraźniejsza, że ją nudzi **rzecz długa**, choć najwymowniejsza.* Mick. Tad. 21 (SJPDor).

'For though he always spoke fluently and with discretion, he knew that the youth of today are impatient, that they are bored by **long speeches**, even by the most eloquent'.[11]

5.2. Some particles have retained their old inflected forms. An example is the unit *innymi słowy* 'in other words' / 'put differently', in which the old ending *-y*, is subsequently replaced by *–ami*, and this has resulted in a two-level pairing in contemporary Polish: the metatextual *innymi słowy* 'in other words' / 'put differently' corresponds to the phrase *innymi słowami* 'explained/said differently', which operates at the object level: *Można to powiedzieć innymi słowami* 'One can say that differently'. An inflectional archaism has been preserved in the particle *bądź co bądź* 'at any rate' / 'after all' – in this case we are dealing with a synthetic form of the imperative *bądź* 'be!', with the phrase *niech będzie* 'so be it' / 'let it be' also currently in use. A similar phenomenon can be noted in the case of the particle *bodaj* 'probably', as today we would say: *Niech Bóg da* 'May God give'. The particle *znowu* 'again' has retained the simple inflection of the adjective (← *z nowu*, today: *z nowego*), and among the particles, the Proto-Slavic form of the present passive participle has also been preserved: *rzekomo* 'one talks about it'.

    5.3. The discrepancy between the object level and the metatextual level may also be an effect of the syntactic changes that occurred at the object level, during which the particle retained the old construction. Consider the particles: *doprawdy* 'really', *wprawdzie* 'admittedly', *zapewne* 'probably', as although current speakers of Polish will no longer use the following forms: *mówię w prawdzie / do prawdy* 'I am telling the truth'; *wiem za pewne* 'I know for sure', examples are attested in historical dictionaries:

- *Czy ona mówi **do prawdy**, czy tylko na drwiny?* Teat. 41 b, 281 (SL);
'Is she telling the truth or is she saying this for fun?'
- *Dobrześ Nauczycielu/ **w prawdzie** powiedział/ iż jeden jest Bog.* WujNT (SPXVI);
'You are right, Teacher/You have correctly said that there is one God'
- *A wszkoż to wiem **za pewne** o Czernych cnym domu.* KlonŻal A2 (SPXVI).
'But I know this for sure about the Czernys' respectable house'

The changes illustrated above at the object level, led to certain units separating from the metatextual level – they have retained properties which no longer exist at the object level, thus being different both functionally and formally. In this way, particles are formed as a separate, distinct part of speech which does not overlap with any other part of speech. This applies in particular to adverbs.

---

[11]   Translation by Rapall Noyes (1917: 27).

6. Contemporary particles whose form, but not function, resembles that of adverbs, draw a language historian's attention to extinct linguistic signals. Below are examples of adverbial uses of contemporary particles, examples that no longer form particle-adverb pairings.

● In the 16th century, the bohemism *właśnie* (contemporary use: 'just'; former use: 'accurately' / 'appropriately') can be found in a sequence of words[12] that is not possible in particles:

> *Jakoż to **dobrze i właśnie** wyraził/ czasów swych ten/co ty wierszyki naprzód złożył.* CzechEp 335 (SPXVI);
> 'He who first composed these rhymes described his times so well and so accurately'
> *Że przez nasienie niewieście od Boga obiecane/ku starciu głowy wężowej **właśnie i z osobna** rozumieć mamy.* (...) CzechEp 292 (SPXVI).
> 'That we are to understand appropriately and in a particular way the seed of the woman promised by God/that was to crush the serpent's head'

● In the following example, the expression *głównie* (contemporary use: 'chiefly'; former use: 'clearly') is preceded by an intensifier, which is not possible in particles, but which is possible in adverbs:

> *A co? Czy widzisz? **Bardzo głównie** widzę.* Min. Ryt. 1,283 (SL).
> 'And what? Can you see? I can see very clearly.'

● The predicative use of the expression *oczywiście* (contemporary use: 'of course'; former use: 'in person') has the value of an adverb in the sentence:

> *Wiem iż gdy tu był sam **oczywiście** na ziemi w możności Bostwa swojego/iż mu to było bardzo łacno uczynić/a tego diabła tak niszczyć* RejPos (SPXVI).
> 'I know that when he was here himself on earth thanks to his God's power/ it was very easy for him to do it/and to destroy this devil so'.

The above examples indicate that a careful analysis of contemporary expressions can provide valuable insights which may be of use to language historians and which may provide arguments relevant to an assessment of the values of expressions in older texts.

7. Even though particles are an "immobile" part of speech, and they do not undergo change, except for a phonetic change, their stock is constantly evolving. The list of particles which are no longer used in Polish is long – in the SZWF there are more than 70 such attestations,[13] which, of course,

---

[12] The adverb *właśnie* ('accurately'/'appropriately') already operated alongside the native form: *włośnie / włostnie,* in Old Polish, similarly to the adjectival bohemism *własny – włosny, włostny* ('own') (Proto-Slavic **volst-ьnъ* od **volstь* 'property').

[13] If we were to consider phonetic differences, the figure would be 100.

does not mean that all are extinct particles; as we know, the deeper into the past we reach, the more fragmentary is the linguistic material which has been preserved. Among the extinct particles, epistemic particles are the most common;[14] they include, for instance: *krom / kromia wątpliwości* 'no doubt', *musi / musić* 'probably', *płaci / płać* 'probably', *wierę* 'indeed', *wiernie* 'indeed', *z do prawdy* 'truly', *zawierne / zawiernie* 'indeed' / 'in fact', and *znać* 'apparently'. Contemporary Polish has a great number of epistemic particles (47), which underlines that stressing the veracity of the communicated information is valued most by the speakers.

Redundancy, the expiration of particles and the formation of new particles result from the openness of the level from which they originate. As shown by Marzena Stępień, new speaker-oriented parentheticals are still being formed and these are numerous. "I therefore argue for the recognition of lexical units in the form of: *(jakoś) mówiąc* '(somehow) speaking'*; (jakoś) biorąc* '(somehow) taking'*; (jakoś) ujmując* '(somehow) putting)" (Stępień 2014: 162). The element *(jakoś)* 'somehow' may be replaced by such adverbs as *dokładnie* 'precisely', *formalnie* 'formally', *generalnie* 'generally', *obiektywnie* 'objectively', *praktycznie* 'practically', *statystycznie* 'statistically', *teoretycznie* 'teoretically', and *z grubsza* 'roughly'. Will these adverbs acquire the status of particles in the future? This will depend on the stability of these parentheticals, that is the possibility of the elements *mówiąc* 'speaking'; *biorąc* 'taking'; *ujmując* 'putting (in words)' becoming elided.

Conclusion

The deconstruction of the functional homonymy of adverbs and particles discussed in this paper justifies the definition of the particle referred to earlier in the text. It is a part of speech which meets the definitional criteria, but also a part of speech which departs from its genetic base on formal grounds. The expressions which are thus formed do not operate at the object level. Therefore, understanding the processes which govern the formation of a part of speech may justify this distinction.

---

[14]   Others include e.g.: *co większa* 'what is more', *czuż / czusz / cusz / cosz* 'that is', *ledwie / ledwo / ledwa / jedwo* 'only'/'merely', *osobie* 'particularly', *owszejki / owszem / owszeki* 'especially', *w powszechności* 'generally', *z osobna / zosobna* 'particularly', *z prosta* 'simply', *zasię* 'again'.

References

Bałabaniak Dagmara, Mitrenga Barbara (2015). *Polskie intensyfikatory w ujęciu historycznym*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Danielewiczowa Magdalena (2012). *W głąb specjalizacji znaczeń. Przysłówkowe metapredykaty atestacyjne*. Warszawa: BEL Studio Sp. z o.o.

Danielewiczowa Magdalena (2021). *Aspekt tematyczny w strukturze informacyjnej wypowiedzi. Rozszerzanie i integracja wiedzy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Grochowski Maciej (1997). *Wyrażenia funkcyjne. Studium leksykograficzne*. Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.

Janowska Aleksandra (2015). *Kształtowanie się polskiej klasy przyimków wtórnych*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Kisiel Anna (2012). *Polskie partykuły wyróżniające. Studium semantyczne*. Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy.

Kleszczowa Krystyna (2001). Rola pożyczek w przekształcaniu polskiego systemu słowotwórczego. In *Słowotwórstwo a inne sposoby nominacji. Materiały z 4 konferencji Komisji Słowotwórstwa przy Międzynarodowym Komitecie Slawistów. Katowice 27–29 września 2000 r.*, Krystyna KLESZCZOWA, Ludwig SELIMSKI (eds.), 203–208. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Kleszczowa Krystyna (2015). *U źródeł polskich partykuł. Derywacja funkcjonalna, przemiany, zaniki*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Kleszczowa Krystyna (2021). Operator tematyczny *jako* wobec jego historycznej funkcji porównawczej. *Słowo. Studia językoznawcze* 12, 73–80.

Pastuch Magdalena (2020). *Polskie wyrażenie o funkcji dopowiedzeniowej – historia i współczesność*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Pisarkowa Krystyna (1984). *Historia składni języka polskiego*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Stępień Marzena (2014), *Wyrażenie parentetyczne w strukturze wypowiedzi. Właściwości semantyczne, składniowe, prozodyczne*. Warszawa: BEL Studio Sp. z o.o.

Wajszczuk Jadwiga (2005), *O metatekście*. Warszawa: Katedra Lingwistyki Formalnej Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Weiss Daniel (2005). Nowe przyimki o pochodzeniu imiesłowowym? In *Przysłówki i przyimki. Studia ze składni i semantyki języka polskiego*, Maciej GROCHOWSKI (ed.), 177–207. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.

Sources

Králik Ľubor (2015). *Stručný etymologický slovník slovenčiny*. Bratislava: Veda, vydavateľstvo SAV.

PSWP – Halina Zgółkowa (ed.) (1994–2005). *Praktyczny słownik współczesnej polszczyzny*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Kurpisz.

SGPP – Maciej Grochowski, Anna Kisiel, Magdalena Żabowska (eds.) (2014). *Słownik gniazdowy partykuł polskich*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.

SJPDor – Witold Doroszewski (ed.) (1958–1969). *Słownik języka polskiego*. 11 vols. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

SJPSzym – Mieczysław Szymczak (ed.) (1978–1981). *Słownik języka polskiego*. 3 vols. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

SL – Samuel Bogumił Linde (1854–1860), *Słownik języka polskiego*. 2nd edition. 6 vols. Lwów: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

SPXVI – Maria Renata MAYENOWA (ed.). *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku* (1966–1999). 27 vols. Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

SStp – Stanisław URBAŃCZYK (ed.) (1953–2002). *Słownik staropolski*. 11 vols. Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.

SWJP – Bogusław Dunaj (ed.) (1998). *Słownik współczesnego języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Przegląd Readers Digest.

SZWF – Radosław Pawelec (ed.) (2015). *Słownik zapomnianych wyrażeń funkcyjnych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper.

USJP – Stanisław Dubisz (ed.) (2003). *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

WSJP – Piotr (ed.) (2008–). *Wielki słownik języka polskiego*. URL: www.wsjp.pl.

WSWO – Mirosław Bańko (2005) (ed.). *Wielki słownik wyrazów obcych PWN*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Krystyna Kleszczowa
Emerita Professor
University of Silesia
krystyna.kleszcz(at)us.edu.pl