Izabela Duraj-Nowosielska    ⬤ https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9470-3801
*Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń*

# The Word Order and Prosody of Polish Constructions with Subject-oriented Evaluative Adverbs and Their Impact on the Meaning of These Structures (Part 1)[1]

**Abstract**

The article examines the impact of word order and prosody on the meaning of constructions with evaluative adverbs in Polish. While Polish literature on adverbs often suggests that the position of adverbs "proper" carries no semantic significance, unlike that of metatextual particles (some of which are formally identical to them), there exists a specific subclass of adverbs that exhibit similar behaviour to particles in this regard. This subclass, known as subject-oriented adverbs, includes evaluative adverbs, which are the main focus of this analysis.

The article is divided into two parts. Following a brief introduction, Part 1, Section 2, discusses evaluative adverbs in comparison with other subject-oriented adverbs, outlining their shared semantic-syntactic properties. Section 3 focuses on the ambiguity of sentences containing evaluative expressions, which is influenced by word order and/or prosody. In line with structural semantics, the analysis seeks to identify a general mechanism underlying the observed interpretative differences, presenting basic syntactic-semantic formulas corresponding to these variants, along with related prosodic patterns and, consequently, information structure. These considerations lay the groundwork for Part 2, which will extend the analysis through a detailed examination of corpus data.

---

**Abstrakt**
Przedmiotem artykułu jest wpływ szyku wyrazów i prozodii na znaczenie konstrukcji z przysłówkami oceniającymi w języku polskim. W polskiej literaturze na temat przysłówków często przyjmuje się, że pozycja przysłówków „właściwych", w odróżnieniu od metatekstowych partykuł (czasami formalnie z nimi identycznych), nie jest istotna semantycznie. Istnieje jednak pewna podklasa wyrażeń, które mają pod tym względem właściwości podobne do partykuł – są to mianowicie przysłówki zorientowane na podmiot, w tym przysłówki oceniające, będące przedmiotem tego artykułu.

Artykuł jest podzielony na dwie części. Po krótkim wprowadzeniu, w sekcji drugiej części pierwszej artykułu, zaprezentowano przysłówki oceniające na tle innych przysłówków zorientowanych na podmiot oraz omówiono podstawowe wspólne dla nich właściwości semantyczno-syntaktyczne. Sekcja trzecia koncentruje się na wieloznaczności zdań z wyrażeniami oceniającymi, których interpretacja zależy od szyku i/lub cech prozodycznych. Opierając się na założeniach semantyki strukturalnej, w artykule przedstawiono ogólny mechanizm kryjący się za wskazanymi różnicami oraz zaproponowano podstawowe formuły syntaktyczno-semantyczne reprezentujące opisywane warianty, a także uwzględniono odpowiadające im struktury prozodyczne (a co za tym idzie – komunikacyjne). Prowadzone rozważania stanowią punkt wyjścia do szczegółowej analizy wybranych przykładów korpusowych, która zostanie przygotowana w części drugiej artykułu.

# 1. Introduction

The aim of this article is to look at selected Polish adverbs the syntactic position of which apparently influences the interpretation of the entire construction, i.e. it has a semantic value. I analyse a number of examples, both constructed and attested, that illustrate the relevant meaning differences, and I try to determine, first, what other factors, including word order, contribute to these discrepancies, and second, which specific semantic-syntactic structures represent particular meanings. I also ask the question as to which structure, if any, can be considered primary, and what is the lexical status of expressions that introduce different meanings at the sentence level despite their identity in form and basic semantic properties.

First of all, it should be noted that the very claim that the position of adverbs may influence the meaning of sentences may seem controversial, since in studies of Polish grammar one can come across the view that adverbs "proper", i.e. adverbial – and at the same time adverbal – expressions belonging

to the textual plane of the utterance (referring to the described world) are relatively flexible with regard to their sentence position. This syntactic feature, among others, is said to distinguish them from metatextual markers (i.e. expressions that do not form syntactic dependency relations with other sentence components and that refer to the act of speaking itself), some of which are formally identical with adverbs.[1] This is true, indeed, for most adverbial subclasses, yet there is a certain class whose members have properties similar to metatextual particles in this respect – these are mostly subject-oriented adverbs, including evaluative ones such as *lekkomyślnie* 'carelessly', *sprawiedliwie/niesprawiedliwie* 'justly'/'unjustly', *egoistycznie* 'selfishly', *mądrze/niemądrze* 'wisely'/'foolishly', *okrutnie* 'cruelly, mercilessly', *despotycznie* 'despotically', *heroicznie* 'heroically', *nikczemnie* 'despicably', *głupio/niegłupio* 'stupidly'/'cleverly', *konsekwentnie/niekonsekwentnie* 'consistently'/'inconsistently', *śmiało/nieśmiało* 'boldly'/'timidly', or *roztropnie/nieroztropnie* 'prudently'/'imprudently'. Such adverbs are the main focus of my study.

　　In Section 1, I introduce evaluative adverbs in comparison with other subject-oriented adverbs, and present their shared basic semantic-syntactic properties. The main objective is to determine how many meanings can be systemically distinguished in structures with such adverbs, depending on word order, and/or sentence stress, as well as certain semantic factors. Then, in Section 2, I focus on more specific issues related to evaluative adverbs (also referred to as evaluators here), in particular on recognising the ambiguity of sentences containing them. While discussing ambiguity, I mostly use my own constructed examples, which provide contexts that are general enough to avoid implying any particular sense. In contrast, examples excerpted from the National Corpus of Polish (NCP), given later (mostly in Part 2 of the article), usually (although not always) suggest a single interpretation due to their specific contexts. The main theoretical goal of this section is to find a general mechanism behind the identified interpretative differences and to present basic semantic-syntactic formulas matching these

---

[1] The difference between adverbial expressions in the strict sense and their metatextual counterparts is of particular interest to Polish researchers associated with the linguistic centres in Toruń and Warsaw. These scholars propose detailed criteria for distinguishing between them, as well as for distinguishing metatextual expressions *sensu stricto* (usually referred to as particles), which refer to the utterance plane, from what Danielewiczowa (2012) refers to as "adverbial metapredicates" (Pol. *metapredykaty przysłówkowe*), which provide the subject's comments on the predicates used in the sentence; cf. e.g. Grochowski (1997, 2008, 2014), Grochowski et al. (2014), Wajszczuk (2005). This is a very complex issue in itself, the details of which arouse various controversies. However, since these discussions do not directly impact the arguments presented in this article, they will not be considered here. For a more detailed bibliographical review, together with a critical commentary regarding the criteria for distinguishing between, on the one hand, adverbs and metatextual expressions, and, on the other hand, between particles and metapredicates, see Duraj-Nowosielska (2022).

interpretations, along with the corresponding prosodic patterns (indicating their information structure). In the theoretical discussion, I draw on the assumptions of structural semantics and semantically-oriented syntax. Specifically, I refer to the foundational ideas formulated by Bogusławski (e.g. 1977, 1978a, 1978b) and Mel'čuk (2001, 2012):[2]

a) The meaning of expressions can be analysed only in sentential contexts, and despite many practical difficulties, it is generally possible to identify their invariant semantic features, which correspond to their basic syntactic characteristics reflected in the predicate-argument structure (PAS) of these expressions. PASs, together with lexical definitions in terms of simpler concepts, are basically regarded as crucial for lexicology and lexicography, which otherwise may appear to lack a proper object of description. The relevant procedures for their formulation involve various linguistic tests, including substitution and contradiction tests.

b) The basic semantic-syntactic structure of the sentence, matching its semantic interpretation, may not be isomorphic with its surface syntactic design. In such a case, a specific derivational mechanism responsible for the syntactic shift should be found.

c) One of the main factors influencing the reading of a sentence is its information structure, also known as the theme-rheme structure (hereafter TRS), inherently connected with the prosodic pattern of the entire construction, especially with the main sentence stress, which determines the rheme in the strict sense, and a possible pause between the thematic part and the "maximal rheme".[3]

d) A specific TRS may result from the placement of the sentence in a given textual or situational context or, *additionally*, it may reflect the internal characteristics of those sentence components for which the TRS is semantically relevant. Only through in-depth linguistic analysis can it be determined which of these factors is at play in a particular case.[4]

Part 2 of the article (Duraj-Nowosielska 2024) will begin with a series of NCP examples, which – as mentioned above – in most cases imply a specific understanding of the adverbial construction. Assuming that such sentences typically suggest their most natural prosodic reading, these examples also illustrate the impact of word order and sentence stress on the meaning of the structure. I will then present, on the one hand, additional surface features characteristic of the interpretations under discussion, i.e. lexical-syntactic markers that are unique to one particular reading. On the other hand,

---

[2] Admittedly, there are considerable differences in the approaches of these two scholars; however, I consider them of minor importance for the following discussion.

[3] Moreover, the TRS is seen as a hierarchical, "Chinese-box" structure, which is what distinguishes the approach of the two aforementioned researchers from the ones in which the TRS is perceived as a "flat" arrangement of elements.

[4] Cf. also the distinction between Common Ground management and Common Ground content in Krifka (2007).

I will address the problem of potential ambiguity in sentences with the same word order and prosodic pattern, exploring its causes, given that the TRS is usually sufficient to distinguish the meanings.

I will conclude Part 2 of the article by discussing the lexical status of expressions occupying different syntactic positions and exhibiting distinct TRS characteristics. In doing so, I will provide a brief overview of the literature on the subject with references to research dealing with the problem of word order in the context of adverbs, both within Polish linguistics – such as Bogusławski (2005), Grochowski (2008, 2014), Danielewiczowa (2012), Grochowski et al. (2014), Duraj-Nowosielska (2021a) – as well as comparative analyses (Ozga 2011) and research focusing on English. The latter includes early studies on the topic by Austin (1957) and Jackendoff (1972), comprehensive grammatical compendia (Quirk et al. 1985, Huddleston and Pullum 2002), and, last but not least, in-depth semantic-syntactic analyses of various types of "oriented" adverbs, such as Croft (1984), Vendler (1984), Wyner (1994), Swan (1997), Núñez (2002), Ernst (2002, 2003), Geuder (2002), Piñón (2009), Taverniers and Rawoens (2010), Hofland (2011) or Kelepouris (2012).

Although some of these and other references are mentioned in earlier sections as well, the main rationale behind locating the core of the bibliographical discussion at the end of the article is to enable the reader to compare easily some of the ideas expressed in the literature with the approach presented here. In the proposed review, I will focus mainly on the issue of mono- and polysemy, and it is by no means my intention to discuss all the topics that appear in the vast literature on subject-oriented adverbs. I should also clarify that I use this term as a general name for adverbs that refer to the subject/agent. However, various terms appear in this context in the literature, depending on the author and the proposed adverbial classification. For example, "subject-orientedness" sometimes applies only to adverbs that exhibit "passive sensitivity", meaning that when the voice is changed from active to passive, they continue to refer to the grammatical subject of the sentence, thereby having changed their referent.[5] Other terms used to describe a broad class of expressions that includes evaluators are "agent-oriented" (e.g. Geuder 2002) or, more broadly, "participant-oriented" (Hofland 2011), "speaker-oriented" (Jackendoff 1972), as well as – when viewed from a different perspective – "predicative" (Ernst 2002) or "topic-oriented" (Potts 2005).

---

[5] On this topic, cf. McConnell-Ginet (1982), Ernst (2002) or Núñez (2002). However, this phenomenon is very rare among Polish "oriented" adverbs, see the discussion in Duraj-Nowosielska (2021a: 551–553).

## 2. Adverbs, particles and "particle-adverbs"

As mentioned above, it is often assumed in Polish studies on adverbs that the position of adverbs "proper" has no semantic significance. This would mean that, unlike metatextual expressions (including particles, which may be formally identical with adverbs), their position in the sentence does not affect syntactic relations and, consequently, does not influence the basic propositional meaning of the structure. For example, consider *na czczo* 'on an empty stomach' or *niebawem* 'soon' in (1) and (2), in contrast to *chyba* 'probably' or *głównie* 'mainly' in (3) and (4) (examples from Grochowski 1986: 53–54, 64–65):

(1)    *Jan na czczo poszedł na badania.*
   =  *Jan poszedł na czczo na badania.*
   =  *Jan poszedł na badania na czczo.*
       'Jan went for tests on an empty stomach.'

(2)    *Niebawem Jan dostanie pieniądze.*
   =  *Jan niebawem dostanie pieniądze.*
   =  *Jan dostanie niebawem pieniądze.*
   =  *Jan dostanie pieniądze niebawem.*
       'Jan will get money soon.'

(3)    *Chyba Jan przemawiał jako pierwszy.*
       'It's probably Jan who spoke first.'
   ≠  *Jan chyba przemawiał jako pierwszy.*
       'Jan probably spoke first.'

(4)    *Głównie Ewa pomaga siostrze przy odrabianiu lekcji.*
       'It is mainly Ewa who helps her sister with her homework.'
   ≠  *Ewa pomaga głównie siostrze przy odrabianiu lekcji.*
       'It is mainly her sister whom Ewa helps with the homework.'
   ≠  *Ewa pomaga siostrze głównie przy odrabianiu lekcji.*
       'It is mainly homework that Ewa helps her sister with.'

In (3–4), the particles *chyba* and *głównie* are semantically related to the phrase immediately following them, which bears the main sentence stress (i.e. the rhematic phrase). Consequently, the meaning of the sentence depends directly on their linear position, which is a characteristic feature of this part of speech. Compare, for example, the following homonymous pair: the adverb *właściwie* 'correctly, appropriately' in (5) and the metatextual particle *właściwie* 'actually, in reality' in (6):

(5)    *Zofia sformułowała wszystkie zarzuty **WŁAŚCIWIE**.*
   =  *Zofia **WŁAŚCIWIE** sformułowała wszystkie zarzuty.*
   =  *Zofia sformułowała **WŁAŚCIWIE** wszystkie zarzuty.*
       'Zofia formulated all the allegations CORRECTLY.'

(6)    *Właściwie **ZOFIA** sformułowała wszystkie zarzuty.*
        'It was actually ZOFIA who formulated all the allegations.'
   ≠   *Zofia właściwie **SFORMUŁOWAŁA** wszystkie zarzuty.*
        'Zofia actually DID formulate all the allegations.'
   ≠   *Zofia sformułowała właściwie **WSZYSTKIE** zarzuty.*
        'Zofia formulated actually ALL the allegations.'[6]

Importantly, constructions with particles that are not directly preposed to the phrase to which they are semantically related are also in use, in which case the scope of their reference is signalled solely by sentence stress indicating the rheme. This basically means that word order is relevant insofar as it serves as an exponent of the TRS. Therefore, in cases of interpretive ambiguity, prosody – considered the primary indicator of the TRS – proves decisive; compare the following examples:

(7)  *Właściwie sformułowała wszystkie zarzuty **ZOFIA**.*
      'Actually, the person who formulated all the allegations was ZOFIA.'
(8)  *Właściwie Zofia sformułowała **WSZYSTKIE zarzuty**.*
       'Actually, Zofia formulated ALL the allegations.'
(9)  *Ewa głównie pomaga siostrze | przy **odrabianiu LEKCJI**.*
      'Ewa mainly helps her sister with her HOMEWORK.'[7]

Still, the above rule, when applied to adverbs as such, turns out to be too general, because certain groups of adverbs exhibit distributional behaviour somewhat similar to particles. At the same time, as expressions belonging to the textual level of the sentence and capable of taking on the main sentence stress, they clearly are not particles, even in syntactic positions in which they are not stressed. These are therefore *sui generis* "particle-adverbs", although the term is used here in a sense different from that employed by Saloni (1974) and his followers.[8] This is characteristic of, for instance, quantifying adverbs such as *zawsze* 'always' or *przeważnie* 'usually', as seen in the following examples:

(10)  *Zawsze/przeważnie **EWA** pomaga siostrze przy odrabianiu lekcji.*
       'It is always/usually EWA who helps her sister with homework.'

---

[6] The following notation is used for basic prosodic features that are likely to influence the reading of a sentence: the maximal rhematic content is marked in bold, the "narrow" rheme (associated with the main sentence stress) in bold capital letters, and a possible pause between the thematic and rhematic part will be signalled with a vertical bar. In the English translations, only the "narrow" rheme is indicated.

[7] For a discussion on the semantic and prosodic properties of Polish particles see, in particular, Grochowski (1997), Wajszczuk (2005) and Grochowski et al. (2014).

[8] For those researchers, particle-adverb lexemes constitute a morphosyntactic "other" category comprising all uninflected Polish lexemes apart from prepositions, conjunctions and exclamations.

(11)  *Ewa zawsze/przeważnie **POMAGA** siostrze przy odrabianiu lekcji.*
      'Ewa always/usually HELPS her sister with homework.'

(12)  *Ewa zawsze/przeważnie pomaga **SIOSTRZE** przy odrabianiu lekcji.*
      'It is her SISTER whom Ewa always/usually helps with homework.'

Quantifying adverbs, with properties distinct from those of adverbs as regular syntactic modifiers of the VP, constitute a relatively limited group.[9] A much broader and more diverse class is formed by subject-oriented adverbs, which are characterised as those that semantically refer not only to the verb phrase but also to the subject. As such, this group is rarely addressed in Polish linguistics (cf. Grzegorczykowa 1975; Ozga 2011; Duraj-Nowosielska 2021a, 2021b). More extensive research on their syntactic properties has been conducted with reference to English, a language whose fixed word order attracts considerable scholarly attention since it plays a significant role in determining meaning. Subject-oriented adverbs include primarily exponents of intentionality, such as *(nie)celowo* '(not) purposely', *(nie)umyślnie* '(un)intentionally', *(nie)rozmyślnie* '(non-)deliberately', or *niechcący* 'inadvertently' (discussed in detail in Duraj-Nowosielska 2021a); mental state adverbs, such as *wesoło* 'joyfully', *wściekle* 'furiously', or *smutnie* 'sadly' (cf. Grzegorczykowa 1975; Ozga 2011; also on Russian with crosslinguistic implications, see Boguslavskaya and Boguslavsky 2015); and evaluative adverbs, as illustrated above, which are the primary focus of this study.

According to most researchers dealing with this issue (cf. Jackendoff 1972; Grzegorczykowa 1975; McConnell-Ginet 1982; Croft 1984; Ernst 2003 or Ozga 2011), these adverbs are therefore bi- rather than monovalent, and this property is usually considered the basic source of potential ambiguity in structures containing them. Certainly, only one valency slot – the verbal one – is reflected in surface syntactic relations; the other – that associated with the subject – illustrates what, following Boguslavsky (2003), could be termed discontinuous valency, as it has no direct impact on the surface structure of the sentence.[10]

With such expressions, changes in syntactic position and/or rhematic reference may have clear truth-conditional effects, as seen in examples involving intentionality exponents. In constructions conveying intentional ("positive") meaning, this difference, while demonstrable through specially designed semantic tests, is often blurred in speech (since all elements of

---

[9] For further details on this group in comparison to other adverbial classes, see Grzegorczykowa (1975). Surprising as it may seem, since her research few Polish studies have addressed the question of adverbs in such a comprehensive manner. Among the rare exceptions is the comparative monograph by Ozga (2011), although it is based on far more limited Polish material.

[10] As for intentionality exponents, I argue elsewhere that they may be considered trivalent; see Duraj-Nowosielska (2021a: 535–543). For some basic assumptions, see fn. 11.

the action fall within the scope of intentionality). However, the interpretive contrast is clearly visible in their negated counterparts and, as in (13–14), in sentences with "negative" exponents.

(13) *Jan niechcący/przez pomyłkę wsypał sobie **SÓL** do herbaty.*
'Jan unintentionally/accidentally poured SALT into his tea.'
(→ Jan did not want to pour salt into his tea, but something else, e.g. sugar.)

(14) *Jan niechcący/przez pomyłkę wsypał **SOBIE** sól do herbaty.*
'Jan unintentionally/accidentally poured salt into his OWN tea.'
(→ Jan wanted to pour salt into someone else's tea.)

In other words, there is a fundamental difference between Jan having no intention of pouring salt into anyone's tea and Jan intending to pour salt into tea, just not his own cup.

If intentionality exponents, or i-exponents, as they are referred to here, operate on rhemes, it seems to follow that the number of possible interpretations must generally correspond to the number of rhematisable sentence constituents, just as it does in the case of particles. However, in practice, they have systemically one fewer interpretation, and one of the readings does not coincide with the semantic potential of the particles.

This discrepancy arises because, on the one hand, i-exponents never comment on the subject itself, as the latter cannot represent *the result* of an action, which, as a rule, is the main object of intentionality comments.[11] Compare (13–14) and the sentence in (15) below, which can only answer the default question 'Who intentionally poured salt into their own tea?':

---

[11] I explain this mechanism in greater detail in Duraj-Nowosielska (2021a; see also a brief English presentation in Duraj-Nowosielska 2021b). The basic semantic formula for i-exponents is *X, by doing p* [i-exponent]*, caused/did q*, where *q* indicates the result of the action (basic or intentional) *p* and is typically represented by the rhematised component of the sentence, whereas *p* is either thematised or derived from the context. In another type of structure, the VP expresses *p*, while *q* is implicit or – with intentional adverbs – expressed by a purpose clause. For illustration, consider the following sample analysis from Duraj-Nowosielska (2021a: 508–509). Both the sentence *Maria umyślnie zadzwoniła do Krysi o pierwszej w nocy* 'Maria intentionally called Krysia at 1 a.m', and, even more so, *Maria nieumyślnie zadzwoniła do Krysi o pierwszej w nocy* 'Maria unintentionally called Krysia at 1 a.m', require clarification as to whether:

(a) Maria, in calling Krysia (*p*) at 1 a.m., did or did not intend to achieve the *q* that the speaker has in mind;

or (b) Maria, in calling someone at 1 a.m. (*p*), did or did not intend to call Krysia (*q*);

or (c) Maria, in calling Krysia (*p*), did or did not intend to call her at 1 a.m. (*q*);

or (d) Maria, in calling someone (*p*), did or did not intend to call Krysia at 1 a.m. (*q*);

or, finally (e) Maria, while doing something with the phone (*p*), did or did not intend to call Krysia at 1 a.m. (*q*).

Only interpretations (b)–(d) operate exclusively on the components of the sentence, while in the remaining two interpretations either the (intended or unintended) effect *q* (in (a)) or the action *p* itself (in (e)) is removed outside the immediate sentence context.

(15)  *[To] **JAN** celowo wsypał sobie sól do herbaty.*
      '[It was] JAN [who] intentionally poured salt into his own tea.'

For the same reason, i-exponents also cannot have an ad-sentential interpretation either, i.e. unlike particles, they cannot refer to a rheme in the form of a sentence, as this would include the subject within the scope of the adverb. Among explicit components of the sentence, they can only comment on the VP or selected parts thereof, according to the model explained in fn. 11. This is because i-exponents focus on the point of view of the subject – what the subject intended (or did not intend) to achieve by their actions – and intentionality comments *at the textual level* do not extend beyond this perspective.

   Unlike with explicitly evaluative expressions, the assignment of blame or merit by the speaker that i-exponents may entail (as first noted by Austin 1957) is a *default pragmatic* component, added implicitly to the basic predication. Therefore, up until now, i-exponents seem to have systemically two interpretations less than particles. (This does not mean that each reading will be equally probable in a given context; these are rather structural possibilities applied in a specific way to specific contexts.) However, it may also be the case that an intentionality adverb is not related to any component explicitly stated in the sentence, but refers to a default result, not expressed on the surface (see fn. 11 again): *X zrobił to niecelowo* 'X did not do it on purpose' may simply mean that X did not intend to perform the action in question, but it may mean just as well that they did intend to perform the action itself, but the achieved result that the speaker has in mind was not intended. The last interpretation distances i-exponents from particles, which never comment on the implicit components of a statement, but it effectively reduces the difference between the two categories in terms of the number of available readings to one. On the other hand, a property that brings these two classes closer to each other is the possibility of directly preposing an i-exponent to the word/phrase to which it is semantically related, as in:

(16)  *Jan wsypał sobie sól przypadkowo **do HERBATY**.*
      'John poured salt accidentally into TEA.' (though he intended to put it somewhere else, e.g. in a bowl of soup)

(17)  *Jan przypadkowo **SOBIE** wsypał sól do herbaty.*
      'John poured salt accidentally into his OWN tea.' (though he intended to pour it into someone else's tea).

It is also possible for i-exponents – albeit only those that express "positive" intentionality and only in certain types of constructions (excluding, among others, collocations with prepositional phrases) – to rearrange the hierarchy of sentence components so that the adverb forms a syntactic unit with

the word/phrase to which it is preposed and which it modifies semantically. This feature again distances i-exponents from particles, which do not enter into syntactic dependency-relations with the components to which they refer. For example, consider the structure *Powiedział to* [*rozmyślnie* **GŁOŚNO**]$_{AdvP}$ 'He uttered it [deliberately LOUD]$_{AdvP}$' and the corresponding nominal phrase [*rozmyślnie głośne*]$_{AP}$ *powiedzenie (tego)* '[deliberately loud] $_{AP}$ uttering (of this)', in which *rozmyślnie* 'deliberately' syntactically modifies, respectively, the adverb and the adjective.[12]

As for evaluative expressions, the number of potential interpretations of (written) sentences involving them is, conversely, one greater than the number of rhematisable components of the sentence, unless limited contextually, which, as a matter of fact, is usually the case. Therefore, let me emphasise that I am referring to structural potential. In this case, the adverb has the potential to comment on each component of the sentence (whether a word or a phrase), including the entire sentence itself, i.e. the fact that X performed an action. Additionally, when occupying the position of a manner adverb, it can express an evaluation of the manner, which itself is not named in any "objective" way. In the latter case, the adverb is rhematised, while in other cases it belongs to the thematic proposition of the sentence.

The reason for this structural difference, compared to i-exponents, is that with evaluators the speaker is positioned as a superordinate epistemic subject, an external observer selecting specific aspects of the agent's performance to comment on. Therefore, they can, among other things, assess both the fact that X undertook a given action (as opposed to another event occurring) and the fact that a given action was performed by X rather than someone else. Translated into the TRS, this means that the adverb is a comment on the entire rhematised sentence structure in the first case, and on the rheme represented by the subject of the sentence in the second.

The third type of subject-oriented adverbs mentioned above, those indicating mental states, focus – just like i-exponents – on the subject's point of view, which means that neither the subject nor the situation described by the entire sentence falls within the adverb's scope of reference. The linguistic pattern that such adverbs exhibit apparently does not cover situations in which the agent is at the same time the object of their own mental attitudes. Although such adverbs cannot – like particles and evaluators, and unlike i-exponents (cf. fn. 11) – refer to the default components of the sentence,

---

[12] The sentence under discussion differs syntactically and prosodically from *Powiedział to rozmyślnie* | **GŁOŚNO** 'He said it deliberately | LOUD', in which *rozmyślnie* 'deliberately', separated from *głośno* 'loud' by a short pause, modifies the entire verb phrase at the syntactic level, and the relevant semantic distinction – related to the TRS – is independently constructed on top of this structure; in such a case, we observe word order inversion with respect to *Rozmyślnie powiedział to* **GŁOŚNO** 'He deliberately said it LOUD'.

the number of potential structures involving them is ultimately equal to the number of those with evaluators, because like the latter they can occupy the position of a manner adverb. Whether it is indeed a manner related to the external manifestation of certain qualities of the action that the speaker comments on, or just some internal state of the agent accompanying the action, remains a debatable issue that is probably insoluble at a systemic level (although such attempts have been made, cf. Ernst 2002; Ozga 2011). Regardless, this group presents its own set of research problems, which will be set aside for the purposes of this study.

## 3. Evaluative adverbs – theoretical issues

The key idea is that the positional-syntactic and prosodic properties of evaluative adverbs, such as those listed above, influence the semantic interpretation of the entire structure. Let us begin our discussion with a fundamental semantic opposition that depends on the information-structure status of the adverb (rhematic vs thematic), illustrated by the following constructed examples:

(18) *Skonfrontował się z trudnościami **ODWAŻNIE/ŚMIAŁO**.*
'He confronted the difficulties COURAGEOUSLY/BOLDLY.'

(19) *Odważnie/śmiało **SKONFRONTOWAŁ się z trudnościami**.*
'Courageously/Boldly, he CONFRONTED the difficulties.'

Sentence (18) is understood to mean that, in confronting the difficulties, X showed courage/boldness, whereas (19) suggests that the very decision to confront the difficulties was a manifestation of these traits (which does not necessarily imply courage/boldness in the confrontation itself).

(20) *Odmawiała **KONSEKWENTNIE udziału w tym projekcie**.*
'She CONSISTENTLY refused to participate in this project.'

(21) *Konsekwentnie **ODMAWIAŁA udziału w tym projekcie**.*
'Consistently, she REFUSED to participate in this project.'

Similarly, (20) suggests that the subject's successive refusals were consistent with one another, while (21) indicates primarily that the acts of refusal as such were consistent with something else, e.g. the subject's earlier declarations.

(22) *Obrażał go **BEZMYŚLNIE**.*
'He insulted him THOUGHTLESSLY.'

(23) *Bezmyślnie go **OBRAŻAŁ**.*
'Thoughtlessly, he INSULTED him.'

Sentence (22) is understood as conveying the idea that the insults were thoughtless, whereas (23) implies that the very fact that the subject insulted someone was a manifestation of thoughtlessness.

(24)  *Odpowiadała **ROZWAŻNIE** na wszystkie pytania.*
      'She answered all the questions SENSIBLY.'

(25)  *Rozważnie **ODPOWIADAŁA na wszystkie pytania**.*
      'Sensibly, she ANSWERED all the questions.'

In (24), the subject is understood to have given sensible answers, while (25) indicates rather that, in the speaker's opinion, the decision to answer all the questions was sensible.

(26)  *Na kilka pytań odpowiedział **LEKKOMYŚLNIE**.*
      'He answered a few questions CARELESSLY.'

(27)  *Lekkomyślnie **ODPOWIEDZIAŁ na kilka pytań**.*
      'Carelessly, he ANSWERED a few questions.'

In (26), the answers are assessed as careless, whereas (27) suggests that it was flippant of the subject to answer the questions at all (instead of remaining silent when confronted with them).

The precise interpretation of these sentences is certainly influenced by various factors, including verbal categories such as aspect or distributiveness, yet the key role is played by what may be termed the "positional-communicative complex", that is, the thematisation of the adverb combined with its sentence position (either before or after the subject),[13] compared to its rhematisation in combination with its placement before or after the verb.

As in the examples (7)–(9) featuring particles cited in Section 2, the crucial factor in interpretation is not the word order itself (as often suggested in the literature on the subject, particularly with regard to English), but information structure. The latter is related to word order in the sense that a specific arrangement of constituents accompanied by the neutral intonation of the sentence (i.e. most natural prosodic pattern for a given arrangement of elements) suggests a specific TRS, which in turn implies a given reading. Yet a reverse order is by all means possible too, as illustrated by the following test sentences:

---

[13] The initial position is less common in Polish than in English, and usually – but not exclusively, as will be shown – applies to sentences without an overt subject; cf.: *Rozważnie **ODPOWIADAŁA na wszystkie pytania*** 'Sensibly, [she] ANSWERED all the questions' and *Joanna rozważnie **ODPOWIADAŁA na wszystkie pytania*** 'Sensibly, Joanna ANSWERED all the questions'.

(28) **ODPOWIADAŁA** *rozważnie* **na WSZYSTKIE pytania**, *choć nie można powiedzieć, żeby same te odpowiedzi cechowały się szczególną rozwagą.*
'She ANSWERED, sensibly, ALL the questions, although it cannot be said that the answers themselves were particularly sensible.'

(29) **ODPOWIEDZIAŁ** *wtedy lekkomyślnie* **na kilka PYTAŃ** – *wprawdzie same te odpowiedzi były dobrze przemyślane, ale w tej sytuacji nie powinien był odpowiadać na żadne pytania.*
'He then ANSWERED, carelessly, a few QUESTIONS, but while the answers themselves were well thought out, in this situation he shouldn't have answered any questions at all.'[14]

Thus, although differences in the surface arrangement of words typically do translate into differences in meaning, the relevant distinctions are not always reflected in word order.

When the adverb is rhematised (i.e. bears the main sentence stress), it refers to certain internal properties of the action signified by the predicator. As mentioned in Section 2, it is usually interpreted as an adverb of manner (cf. the "secondary manner interpretation" in Ernst 2002 or Huddleston and Pullum 2002), which can be represented by the following formula:

($\mathrm{Adv_{Eval}Rh}$) *X did p **y-ly*** ≈ '{TD} *X* did *p* {R} **in the way *y*.**'

Here, the adverb naturally takes as its topic the VP and at the same time modifies it syntactically, which means that, within the sentence structure, an evaluator serves as a typical modifier, a second-degree predicate. However, while this formula represents what occurs on the surface of the sentence, it does not capture an important semantic fact about this kind of adverbs: in the rhematic position, they *do not* represent the manner as such, but specifically an evaluation of the manner, which itself is not explicitly stated. Thus, a more adequate syntactic-semantic structure for such constructions – one that still captures their natural TRS, while delving deeper into the semantic relations – would be as follows:

($\mathrm{Adv_{Eval}Rh})_i$ *X did p **y-ly*** ≈ '[About {T:}] *X* did *p* in a certain way *q*
[it is said that {R:}] *q* **is *y*** (on the part of X).'

This formulation highlights that it is some implicit manner being evaluated, not the action as such (as represented by the VP), despite the surface-syntactic pattern. This means that the syntax of $\mathrm{Adv_{Eval}Rh}$ constructions is

---

[14] The prosody of these two sentences, in the adopted notation, reflects the fact that inserting a thematic component into the rheme results in the splitting of the latter into two intonation groups, each with its own nuclear tone (on this topic in reference to English, see e.g. Cruttenden 1997).

partly non-isomorphic with their base semantic structure. The exact nature of the mechanism underlying this syntactic shift will be discussed later on.

Another question is the extent to which such constructions convey an assessment of the subject themselves, which is particularly emphasised in bivalent approaches. On the one hand, the derivational base of the evaluator is typically the corresponding adjective, which primarily denotes a personal quality. On the other hand, the crucial point about adverbs, however trivial it may seem, is that they are not adjectives; they do not serve to characterise the subject in absolute terms, but only with reference to its role as the agent of a particular action. For example, it is always possible to say that someone is wise and prudent, but that, at some point, they acted unwisely or imprudently. Certainly, one can also say that someone was foolish to act in a certain manner, thereby limiting their foolishness to a specific instance of their behaviour; however, this is a stronger statement than one merely describing a foolish way of acting. In the latter case, the subject, as a person, appears to be somehow protected, "safe" – to some extent at least – within the confines of the subject phrase.

Therefore, a compromise formula is needed that captures the reference to the agent, echoing the semantic characteristics of the adjectival base, but that does not focus directly on their evaluation, which in this type of structures clearly recedes into the background (as reflected in the surface formula $[\text{Adv}_{\text{Eval}}\text{Rh}]$, where X is not included within the scope of $y$ at all). The tentative bracket phrase in $(\text{Adv}_{\text{Eval}}\text{Rh})_i$, "on X's part", is a preliminary proposal, to be modified – together with the whole formula – later, following further discussion of semantic details.

On the other hand, thematised adverbs suggest a completely different reading; they introduce an assessment of the subject's undertaking of a given action, without necessarily evaluating its realisation (albeit not precluding such an evaluation either):

(30) *Rozważnie **ODPOWIADAŁA na wszystkie pytania**, choć nie można powiedzieć, żeby same te odpowiedzi cechowały się szczególną rozwagą.*
'Sensibly, she ANSWERED all the questions, although it cannot be said that the answers themselves were particularly sensible.'

(31) *??Odpowiadała na wszystkie pytania **ROZWAŻNIE**, choć nie można powiedzieć, żeby same te odpowiedzi cechowały się szczególną rozwagą.*
'??She answered all the questions SENSIBLY, although it cannot be said that the answers themselves were particularly sensible.'

(32) *Lekkomyślnie **ODPOWIEDZIAŁ** wtedy **na kilka pytań** – wprawdzie same te odpowiedzi były dobrze przemyślane, ale w tej sytuacji nie powinien był odpowiadać na żadne pytania.*
'Carelessly, he ANSWERED then a few questions – although the answers themselves were well thought out, in this situation he shouldn't have answered them at all.'

(33) ??*Odpowiedział wtedy na kilka pytań* **LEKKOMYŚLNIE** – *wprawdzie same te odpowiedzi były dobrze przemyślane, ale w tej sytuacji nie powinien był odpowiadać na żadne pytania.*
'??He then answered a few questions CARELESSLY – although the answers themselves were well thought out, in this situation he shouldn't have answered them at all.'

Unlike rhematised adverbs, which, on the surface, modify the predicator, a thematic adverb –*syntactically* speaking – always refers to the entire sentence, that is, both the subject phrase and VP together, commenting on the fact that X did *p*. This means that, in this case, the agent does indeed fall structurally within the scope of the adverb. Nonetheless, the corresponding hypothetical formula $(Adv_{Eval}Th)_?$ "The fact that X did *p* is *y* (on the part of X)" would be inadequate, for two reasons. First, it reverses the TR characteristics of these structures, and more importantly, despite their basic syntactic pattern, actually it cannot be said that a thematised adverb is, as a rule, *semantically* related to the entire sentence structure (as is often suggested in the literature, where such expressions are typically treated as sentence operators). Strictly speaking, the adverb refers to the rheme of the sentence, just like the speaker's other comments localised in the thematic proposition, including particles, which are a special part of speech serving this purpose.

If the sentence itself constitutes the "maximal" rheme in a given context (as with "out of the blue" utterances or implicit theme exponents), as in examples (19, 21, 23, 25, 27), the adrhematic reading is at the same time ad-sentential, but this need not always be the case; in fact, in actual usage, it occurs rather sporadically. Consequently, precise semantic interpretation is obtained not at the syntactic level, but at the TRS level, where the speaker selects specific elements of the described situation on which to comment. There is, therefore, no reason to talk about a systemic modification of the VP by the adverb in this case, either at the surface-syntactic level (as was the case with $Adv_{Eval}Rh$) or the semantic-syntactic level; the VP is semantically significant only insofar as it forms the rheme of the sentence.

For this reason, I propose a reformulation of $(Adv_{Eval}Th)_?$, with a different placement of semantic accents, that is more in accordance with the hierarchy of components conveyed by such structures:

$(Adv_{Eval}Th)$ X *y-ly* **did p** ≈ '{TD} it is *y* of X {R} **to do p**.'

Firstly, this formula, which indicates that the adverb is used predicatively rather than being used as a modifier,[15] matches the basic TRS of these constructions, stressing the key role of the rheme-based scope of reference.

---

[15] These two types of adverbial usage were first described by Reichenbach (1966 [1947]); see also a classic development of this idea in Thomason and Stalnaker (1973).

Secondly, it highlights X as the object of assessment, although not as a sep-arate participant but as a contributor to the situation commented on, even if it is a key player in it.[16] In this respect, $(\text{Adv}_{\text{Eval}}\text{Th})$ may be considered as mediating between $(\text{Adv}_{\text{Eval}}\text{Th})_?$, which does not highlight the evaluation of the subject at all, and "X is $y$ [in doing $p$]", which, on the contrary, places too much emphasis on it, considering the semantics of adverbials in general.

   In cases where only part of the sentence is in the rheme, the basic syntac-tic design is the same as for the "maximal" ad-sentential reading (and oppo-site to the manner-evaluative reading), yet that is because there is no other way to capture the semantic contribution of the selected part of the sentence to the entire structure (in order to evaluate it) than by viewing it against the whole. Hence, despite the potential multitude of interpretations, there are only two basic syntactic models, with different hierarchical settings. All necessary distinctions within structures featuring thematic adverbs are in-troduced at the higher, information-structure level, which should therefore be seen as the proper operational level for evaluators. The general formula $(\text{Adv}_{\text{Eval}}\text{Th})$ can then be developed accordingly – when evaluating the choice of the object of an action, it would take the form:

   $(\text{Adv}_{\text{Eval}}\text{Th})_{\text{Obj}}$ X $y$-$ly$ $did$ $p$ **with Y** ≈ '{TD} it is $y$ of X to do $p$ {R} **with Y**';

Or, when evaluating the choice of time:

   $(\text{Adv}_{\text{Eval}}\text{Th})_{\text{T}}$ X $y$-$ly$ $did$ $p$ **at $t$** ≈ '{TD} it is $y$ of X to do $p$ {R} **at $t$**', etc.

It should be emphasised that this formula involves not only the information packaging in the sentence in a given context but also potentially the assign-ment of truth value, which is especially clear when part of the action includ-ed in the thematic proposition is explicitly assessed differently. For example, in sentence (34) below the negative evaluation applies to the fact that only some of the questions were answered, while the rest were not. That means that the act of answering questions in itself deserves, in the speaker's opin-ion, a positive evaluation, and thus is certainly not considered "imprudent". This is reflected in the information structure of the sentence, in which only *kilka* 'a few' is rhematic:

(34) *Padały pytania z sali i wszyscy na nie z ochotą odpowiadali, ale Joanna nierozważnie*
      *odpowiedziała tego dnia tylko **na KILKA** z nich, resztę pomijając milczeniem.*
      'Questions were asked from the audience, and everyone answered them willingly,
      but Joanna imprudently answered only a FEW of them that day, ignoring the rest.'

---

[16] That is why one can still say that X is generally $y$, but acted *un-y-ly* at a particular point in time.

Analogously, in (35), only the late timing of the reaction is negatively assessed, while the fact that the subject answered the questions at all is generally welcomed by the speaker (as prudent):

(35) *Pytania przesyłano mailem, ale Joanna się nimi specjalnie nie przejęła i nierozważnie na większość z nich odpowiedziała **z tygodniowym OPÓŹNIENIEM**.*
'The questions were being sent by e-mail, but Joanna didn't really care about them and imprudently replied to most of them with a week's DELAY.'

Similarly, the following sentences, taken from the NCP, are naturally interpreted such that their entire content – that is, the subject distracting someone from something (36) or mentioning something (37) – is seen as a manifestation of wisdom:

(36) *Mama jednak mądrze **odwracała jego uwagę od tego, czego mógł się BAĆ, i skupiała ją na tym, co było dla malca INTERESUJĄCE**.*
'However, Mom wisely diverted his attention from what he might be AFRAID of and focused it on what was INTERESTING to the boy.'

(37) *Mądrze Pani **wspomniała o PRZYMUSIE społecznym**.*
'You wisely mentioned social COERCION.'

However, in their modified variants shown in (38) and (39) it is stated that the agent, generally considered unwise for distracting the son's attention or mentioning too many things, is nevertheless assessed as acting wisely when, among others, distracting the son from what frightened him or mentioning a particular problem close to the speaker's interests:

(38) *Mama niemądrze **odwracała jego uwagę praktycznie od WSZYSTKIEGO**, w tym od tego, co mogłoby mu przynieść ulgę, ale mądrze odwracała ją też **od tego, czego mógł się BAĆ**.*
'Mom unwisely diverted his attention from EVERYTHING, including what could have brought him relief, but she wisely diverted it from what he could have been AFRAID of.'

(39) *Niemądrze Pani **wspomniała o WIELU różnych rzeczach**, w większości niepotrzebnych, ale przynajmniej mądrze Pani wspomniała **o PRZYMUSIE społecznym**.*
'You unwisely mentioned many different THINGS, most of them unnecessary, but at least you wisely mentioned social COERCION.'

Furthermore, in example (40), taken from the NCP, when read in isolation, the adverb is understood as commenting on the fact of taking the documents, which is introduced in the rheme.

(40) *Roztropnie **zabrał ze sobą DOKUMENTY potwierdzające kupno roweru**.*
'He prudently took with him the DOCUMENTS confirming the purchase of the bicycle.'

However, in some contexts, the adverb may acquire a specific interpretation, in which taking the documents is singled out and possibly evaluated differently than the act of taking other objects, as in the following constructed example:

(41) *Bezsensownie **zabrał ze sobą MNÓSTWO rzeczy**, ale przynajmniej zabrał roztropnie **DOKUMENTY potwierdzające kupno roweru**.*
'He mindlessly took a LOT of things with him, but at least he prudently took the DOCUMENTS confirming the purchase of the bicycle.'

What is more, the following NCP example demonstrates that the selected component, which is the proper object of an adverbial comment – as I have already mentioned in Section 1 – need not be part of the VP:

(42) *I to ja **wyznałam Marcinowi MIŁOŚĆ**, niemądrze i niepotrzebnie, **a potem UCIEKŁAM**...*
'And it was I who confessed my LOVE to Marcin, foolishly and unnecessarily, and then RAN away...'

In sentence (42), it is not so much the "bare" fact of confessing love by the subject that is being commented on, but the fact that it was the subject who did it, and not the other party. The linguistic means employed by the speaker in this case is syntactic splitting, but the same effect could have been achieved prosodically; compare the constructed sentences in (43–44), for a change:

(43) *Niemądrze **MARCIN wyznał jej miłość jako pierwszy**, zamiast poczekać, **żeby ONA to zrobiła**.*
'Foolishly, [it was] MARCIN [who] confessed his love to her first, instead of waiting for HER to do it.'

(44) *Niemądrze **wyznał jej miłość jako pierwszy MARCIN**, zamiast poczekać, **żeby ONA to zrobiła**.*
'Foolishly, [the one who] confessed his love to her first [was] MARCIN, [who did it] instead of waiting for HER to do it.'

In such cases, the corresponding semantic-syntactic formula would be:

$(Adv_{Eval}Th)_{Sub}$ *Y-ly [it is]* **X** *[that] did p* $\approx$ '{TD} it is *y* of X {R} to be **the one who did p**.'

Unlike in other $Adv_{Eval}Th$ structures, here the adverb is naturally preposed to the subject. Interestingly, the evaluated X need not be the agent at all; it is also possible to use this structure occasionally to assess other Xs, seen as responsible for the choice of the agent:

(45) *Niemądrze **organizacją przyjęcia zajmował się MARCIN**.*
'Unwisely, the one in charge of organising the party was MARCIN.'
($\rightarrow$ It was foolish of X to let Marcin organise the party)

When the rheme has a different scope, this kind of interpretation is perhaps more difficult to achieve, but in certain contexts it is possible as well – as in (46), which can mean that it is foolish of someone to have assigned tasks the way they were assigned:

(46)  *Niemądrze **MARCIN zajął się organizacją przyjęcia**, a JOANNA rozsyłaniem zaproszeń.*
       'Unwisely, it was MARCIN who took charge of organising the party and JOANNA who handled sending out the invitations.'

Nonetheless, constructions like these are on the surface obviously elliptical, so there is no reason to extend the base semantic formula to include such cases – ultimately the X under evaluation is always someone who did something or at least had some impact on the course of the described events.[17]

Now, there remains the nagging question as to whether the two semantic-syntactic models given above, namely $(Adv_{Eval}Rh)_i$ and $(Adv_{Eval}Th)$, can be reduced to one semantic formula, representing evaluative adverbs in general. In fact, it follows from the discussion above that sentences focusing on the evaluation of manner do not necessarily match the pattern $(Adv_{Eval}Rh)$ "X did *p y-ly*", but may also have the form:

$(Adv_{Eval}Th)_{Man}$ X *y-ly* did *p* **in the manner *q*,**

where the manner component is explicit and rhematised. Basically, I consider these structures semantically equivalent, compare the $(Adv_{Eval}Th)_{Man}$ examples in (47) and (49) to the $Adv_{Eval}Rh$ structures in (48) and (50):

(47)  *Joanna głupio postąpiła **TAK, że nie MOŻNA było się potem z tego pomysłu wycofać**.*
       'Joanna foolishly acted in SUCH a way that it was IMPOSSIBLE to withdraw from this idea later on.'

(48)  *Joanna postąpiła **GŁUPIO**.*
       'Joanna acted FOOLISHLY.'

(49)  *Jan nieroztropnie odpowiadał **wyłącznie ALUZJAMI**.*
       'Jan imprudently responded using only ALLUSIONS.'

(50)  *Jan odpowiadał **NIEROZTROPNIE**.*
       'Jan responded IMPRUDENTLY.'

Certainly, $(Adv_{Eval}Th)_{Man}$ structures are semantically more specific, because they pinpoint the manner commented on, while $Adv_{Eval}Rh$ structures refer to it implicitly. Still, in the former case, the manner component may be

---

[17] The occasional, elliptical nature of such structures is also the reason why I do not consider this kind of reading a systemic potential of evaluators.

defined in a more general way, and in the latter, while it can remain unde-
fined, it may also be specified contextually. In point of fact, this is exactly
what the addressee normally expects from the speaker – some kind of justi-
fication for their assessment, as in:

(51) *Joanna postąpiła* **GŁUPIO***, bo* **nie MOŻNA było się potem z tego pomysłu
wycofać***.*
'Joanna acted FOOLISHLY, because it was IMPOSSIBLE to withdraw from this
idea later on.'

(52) *Jan odpowiadał* **NIEROZTROPNIE***, bo* **używał wyłącznie ALUZJI***.*
'Jan responded IMPRUDENTLY, because he spoke only in ALLUSIONS.'

Given that the two types of structures coexist synchronically and that there
is an intuitive relation between them (i.e. they are not independent), it is
reasonable to assume that $(\text{Adv}_{\text{Eval}}\text{Th})_{\text{Man}}$ constructions, with a rhematical-
ly highlighted manner as the object of evaluation, are semantically basic,
and $\text{Adv}_{\text{Eval}}\text{Rh}$ structures are secondary. This would mean that the latter are
the result of a metonymic operation, in which the evaluator is moved to
the position of the rhematised manner adverb.

Although this interpretation is consistent with the approach represented in
the literature, where terms like "secondary manner interpretation" are often
used, it may seem questionable because it contradicts the apparent direction
of the diachronic development in which the adverb's primary function has al-
ways been to modify the verb. Thus, one can speak of semantic dependence in
the opposite direction only from a synchronic perspective, in which both struc-
tures function simultaneously. Based on these data – and these data alone – one
can conclude that one structure is semantically dependent on the other. It is
worth noting that such a reinterpretation of the direction of semantic depend-
ence is not unusual in language, as shown by certain examples of the discrepan-
cy between the synchronic and diachronic word formation within Polish nouns
and verbs (Grzegorczykowa et al. 1999). Therefore, I propose that a general se-
mantic formula for evaluative adverbs should be based on the $(\text{Adv}_{\text{Eval}}\text{Th})$ syn-
tactic model, which, unsurprisingly, corresponds to rough paraphrases offered
in the literature, many of which take the form "It is ADJ of someone to..." (see
also Section 1 in Part 2 of this article). $\text{Adv}_{\text{Eval}}\text{Rh}$ constructions are thus con-
sidered a derivative of a specific variant of $(\text{Adv}_{\text{Eval}}\text{Th})$, namely $(\text{Adv}_{\text{Eval}}\text{Th})_{\text{Man}}$,
which can be paraphrased as "It is *y* of X to do *p* **in the manner *q***". They can
be translated into this kind of syntactic formula with the implicit manner *q* and
a reversed TRS. Consequently, they would read:

$(\text{Adv}_{\text{Eval}}\text{Rh})_{\text{ii}}$ *X did p* ***y-ly*** $\approx$ '{TD} To do *p* in a certain manner *q* {R} **is *y* of X**.'

Of course, the suggested common semantic core does not change the fact
that these are ultimately two syntactic variants of evaluative structures, ex-
pressed by two semantic-syntactic formulas.

Part 2 of this article takes a closer look at specific examples of usage excerpted from the NCP in order to demonstrate the regularity of the described phenomenon. It also addresses other problems related to the interpretation of sentences with evaluators and discusses how certain problematic issues are resolved in the literature on the subject.

# Abbreviations

$Adv_{Eval}Rh$ – evaluative adverb in the rhematic position
$Adv_{Eval}Th$ – evaluative adverb in the thematic position
NCP – National Corpus of Polish
R – rheme
TRS – theme-rheme structure

# References

Austin Jonh L. (1957). A plea for excuses: The presidential address. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 57, 1–30.

Boguslavskaya Olga J., Boguslavsky Igor (2015). Emotion and inner state adverbials in Russian. In *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Dependency Linguistics (Depling 2015), 24–26 August 2015*, Joakim Nivre, Eva Hajičová (eds.), 38–47. Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Boguslavsky Igor (2003). On the passive and discontinuous valency slots. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Meaning-Text Theory, 16–18 June 2003*, 129–138. Paris: Ecole Normale Supérieure.

Bogusławski Andrzej (1977). *Problems of the Thematic-Rhematic Structure of Sentences.* Warszawa: PWN.

Bogusławski Andrzej (1978a). Jednostki językowe a produkty językowe. Problem tzw. orzeczeń peryfrastycznych. In *Z zagadnień słownictwa współczesnego języka polskiego.* (*Prace Językoznawcze* 91), Mieczysław Szymczak (ed.), 17–30. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Bogusławski Andrzej (1978b). Towards an operational grammar. *Studia Semiotyczne* 8, 29–90.

Bogusławski Andrzej (2005). O operacjach przysłówkowych. In *Przysłówki i przyimki. Studia ze składni i semantyki języka polskiego*, Maciej Grochowski (ed.), 15–44. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.

Croft William (1984). *The Representation of Adverbs, Adjectives and Events in Logical Form.* (*Technical Note* 344). Menlo Park: SRI International.

Cruttenden Alan (1997). *Intonation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Danielewiczowa Magdalena (2012). *W głąb specjalizacji znaczeń. Przysłówkowe metapredykaty atestacyjne.* Warszawa: Katedra Lingwistyki Formalnej Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Duraj-Nowosielska Izabela (2021a). *„Chcąc – nie chcąc?” Intencjonalność działania w wyrażeniach języka polskiego.* Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.

Duraj-Nowosielska Izabela (2021b). A semantic-syntactic structure of intentionality modifiers (on the example of Polish adverbs). In *Contributions to the 23th Annual Scientific Conference of the Association of Slavists (Polyslav)*. (*Die Welt der Slaven Sammelbände* 68), Katarzyna Bednarska, Dorota Kruk, Borislav Popov, Olga Saprikina, Traci Speed, Kamil Szafraniec, Svitlana Terekhova, Radoslav Tsonev, Aneta Wysocka (eds.), 90–98. Wiesbaden: Harrassovitz.

Duraj-Nowosielska Izabela (2022). Szare strefy, w różnych odcieniach szarości: między wyrażeniami adwerbialnymi z poziomu przedmiotowego a nieprzedmiotowego oraz z poziomu metapredykatywnego a metatekstowego. *Linguistica Copernicana* 19, 109–150.

Duraj-Nowosielska Izabela (2024). The word order and prosody of Polish constructions with subject-oriented evaluative adverbs and their impact on the meaning of these structures (Part 2). *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 19(3).

Ernst Thomas B. (2002). *The Syntax of Adjuncts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ernst Thomas B. (2003). Semantic features and the distribution of adverbs. In *Modifying Adjuncts*, Ewald Lang, Caudia Maienborn, Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen (eds.), 307–334. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Geuder Wilhelm (2002). *Oriented adverbs: Issues of the lexical semantics of event adverbs*. PhD dissertation. Universität Tübingen.

Grochowski Maciej (1986). *Polskie partykuły. Składnia, semantyka, leksykografia*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Grochowski Maciej (1997). *Wyrażenia funkcyjne. Studium leksykograficzne*. Kraków: IJP PAN.

Grochowski Maciej (2008). O hierarchii kryteriów w opisie przysłówków formalnie odprzymiotnikowych. In *Wyraz i zdanie w językach słowiańskich VI*, Michał Sarnowski, Włodzimierz Wysoczański (eds.), 121–128. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Grochowski Maciej (2014). Kryteria opozycji homonimicznych partykuł i przysłówków. *Acta Universitatis Vratislaviensis* 69, 141–148.

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

Grzegorczykowa Renata (1975). *Funkcje semantyczne i składniowe polskich przysłówków*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Grzegorczykowa Renata, Laskowski Roman, Wróbel Henryk (eds.) (1999). *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego*, vol. 1. *Morfologia*. Warszawa: PWN.

Hofland Sigve Berge (2011). *Adverbs in conceptual semantics*. MA thesis. University of Oxford.

Huddleston Rodney, Pullum Geoffrey K. (2002). Adjectives and adverbs. In *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Rodney Huddleston, Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.), 525–596. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jackendoff Ray (1972). *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Kelepouris Stavros (2012). *The syntax and semantics of subject-oriented adverbs. A proposal for a new classification*. MA thesis. University of Ghent. [URL: https://lib.ugent.be/fulltxt/RUG01/001/891/615/RUG01001891615_2012_0001_AC.pdf; accessed 5 October 2024].

Krifka Manfred (2007). Basic notions of Information Structure. In *Studies on Information Structure* 6: *The Notions of Information Structure*, Manfred Krifka, Caroline Féry, Gisbert Fanselow (eds.), 13–55. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam.

McConnell-Ginet Sally (1982). Adverbs and logical form: A linguistically realistic theory. *Language* 58(1), 144–184.

Mel'čuk Igor (2001). *Communicative Organisation in Natural Language. The Semantic-Communicative Structure of Sentences.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mel'čuk Igor (2012). *Semantics. From Meaning to Text.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

NCP: *Narodowy korpus języka polskiego.* [URL: https://nkjp.pl/poliqarp/; accessed 5 October 2024].

Núñez José M. G. (2002). Adverb orientation: Semantics and pragmatics. *Estudios de Lingüistica Inglesa Aplicada* 3, 299–315.

Ozga Krzysztof (2011). *On Isomorphism and Non-Isomorphism in Language.* Łódź: Primum Verbum.

Piñón Christopher (2009). Agent-oriented adverbs as manner adverbs. Handout for *Ereignissemantik-Workshop, 11–12 December 2009.* Berlin: Humboldt-Universität.

Potts Christopher (2005). *The Logic of Conventional Implicature.* (*Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics* 7). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Quirk Randolph, Greenbaum Sidney, Leech Geoffrey, Svartvik Jan (1985). *The Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London, New York: Longman.

Reichenbach Hans (1966 [1947]). *Elements of Symbolic Logic.* New York: Macmillan.

Saloni Zygmunt (1974). Klasyfikacja gramatyczna leksemów polskich. *Język Polski* 54(1), 3–13; 54(2), 93–101.

Swan Toril (1997). From manner to subject modification: Adverbialization in English. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 20(2), 179–195.

Taverniers Miriam, Rawoens Gudrun (2010). Three types of oriented adjuncts in English and Swedish. *Moderna Språk* 104(1), 1–14.

Thomason Richmond, Stalnaker Robert C. (1973). A semantic theory of adverbs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4, 195–220.

Vendler Zeno (1984). Adverbs of action. In *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 20, *Papers from the Parasession on Lexical Semantics*, David Testen, Veena Mishra, Joseph Drogo (eds.), 297–307. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

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

Wyner Adam Z. (1994). *Boolean event lattices and thematic roles in the syntax and semantics of adverbial modification.* PhD dissertation. Cornell University.

Izabela Duraj-Nowosielska
Katedra Teorii Języka
Wydział Humanistyczny
Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika w Toruniu
ul. Fosa Staromiejska 3
87-100 Toruń
Poland
iza_duraj(at)umk.pl