

Agata ROZUMKO

Uniwersytet w Białymstoku

arozumko@gmail.com

MODAL ADVERBS, PARTICLES AND DISCOURSE MARKERS ACROSS LANGUAGES. RECENT ATTEMPTS AT DELIMITING THE CATEGORIES IN ANGLOPHONE AND POLISH LINGUISTICS

Epistemic modality has received a significant amount of scholarly attention in Anglophone linguistics. However, for many years, most of the research focused on modal verbs, while other means of expressing modality remained considerably understudied. Recently, the tendency appears to have changed. Many recent publications concerning epistemic modality discuss modal adverbs and particles (e.g. Nuyts 2001; Wierzbicka 2006; Simon-Vandenberg and Aijmer 2007) and modal adjectives (e.g. Nuyts 2001; Van linden 2012). The discussion is also becoming increasingly cross-linguistic: English adverbs and particles are put in a contrastive perspective with their equivalents in other languages, such as German, Dutch, Swedish and French. The major concern of most recent publications in the field is establishing classification criteria for each type of the modal expressions in question, and delimiting the categories in the languages discussed. Such was also the aim of the recent monograph *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. Categorization and Description* edited by Liesbeth Degand, Bert Cornillie and Paola Pietrandrea (2013).

The volume offers a collection of articles discussing modal particles and discourse markers in eight languages, both Indo-European (English, German, Swedish, French, Italian, Catalan) and non-Indo-European (Estonian, Japanese). The contributors' aim is to "investigate the intersection between modal particles (MP) and discourse markers (DM), and to discuss whether or not it is possible to draw a line between these two types of linguistic expressions" (p.1). In the introduction ("Modal particles and

discourse markers: Two sides of the same coin?"), Liesbeth Degand, Bert Cornille and Paola Pietrandrea provide an overview of the literature on the subject: definitions of modal particles and discourse markers, their properties, and categorization criteria used by a number of authors. They point out that while modal particles are usually defined as a specific class of words, discourse particles are often perceived as expressions which do not form a recognized class.

The contributors situate their work within the linguistic research on categorization, which makes use of such notions as *prototype categories* and *fuzzy boundaries*. Prototype categories display all the features of a class in question, while there are also other expressions which are less typical and only show some of its properties. However, as stated by the editors, it is not the aim of the volume to merely confirm that the boundaries between the categories are fuzzy. All the contributors attempt to identify a set of criteria which make it possible to classify both types of expressions. They focus on the behavioural patterns and functional properties of modal particles and discourse markers in the eight languages analysed.

Although the volume explores the functions of modal particles and discourse markers in eight languages, the focus is primarily on German or a comparison of German expressions with those found in other languages. German particles are discussed by Gabriele Diewald in the article "Same same but different': Modal particles, discourse markers and the art (and purpose) of categorization", and Stevens Schoonjans in his paper "Modal particles: Problems in defining a category", where he compares his findings obtained for German with examples from French. The German particle *also* is analyzed alongside Swedish *alltså* by Kerstin Fischer and Maria Alm in the article "A radical construction grammar perspective on the modal particle-discourse particle distinction". Katsunobu Izutsu and Mitsuko Narita Izutsu's observations presented in the article "From discourse markers to modal/final particles: What the position reveals about the continuum" are based on modal markers used in Japanese, French and German. The general conclusion of the authors is that the class of modal particles has fuzzy boundaries (at least in German) and tends to overlap with other categories, and it is the use of lexemes in specific constructions that determines their function, which is why their definitions should be construction-based, and, thus, language specific. Katsunobu Izutsu and Mitsuko Narita Izutsu argue that German, French and Japanese show similar processes concerning the development

of discourse markers into modal particles, and postulate a common cross-linguistic framework for the study of these expressions.

In addition to the cross-linguistic studies where German serves as a point of reference, there is also Mario Squartini's analysis of Italian *già* ("From TAM to discourse: The role of information status in North-Western Italian *già* 'already'") and its French cognate *déjà*, where the author concludes that modal particles and discourse markers are "two sides of the same coin". The volume also contains three monolingual studies. Annika Valdmets argues in her article "Modal particles, discourse markers and adverbs with *-lt* suffix in Estonian" that the same forms function as discourse markers in some constructions and as modal particles in others. Maria Josep Quenca investigates "The fuzzy boundaries between discourse marking and modal marking" in Catalan. Karin Aijmer explores the functions of the English expression *of course* ("Analyzing modal adverbs as modal particles and discourse markers"). She argues that such expressions display a functional split: in some contexts they function as modal adverbs, in others as particles or discourse markers. The distinction between the uses of *of course* as a modal particle and a discourse marker can, in Aijmer's view, be established on functional grounds.

The choice of the languages included in the volume clearly results from their coverage at the IPRA conference in Manchester in 2011, where its contributors discussed their findings (p. 15). It also reflects a more general tendency: most cross-linguistic studies of modality tend to focus on Germanic languages and, less frequently, French and Japanese (e.g. Nuyts 2001 and Simon-Vandenberg and Aijmer 2007, Narrog 2012). Polish and, more generally, Slavonic languages are almost entirely absent from such cross-linguistic studies.

Overall, the volume provides an important step towards identifying the boundaries between modal particles, adverbs and discourse markers on functional grounds. It identifies certain paths which need to be explored and offers some hypotheses which need to be tested. Hopefully, it will also provide an impulse for Slavonic linguists to participate in cross-linguistic research on modal expressions.

While it has to be admitted that contrastive accounts of means of expressing modality in English and Slavonic languages have so far been rather fragmentary (in English-Polish contrastive research, only modal verbs have received a serious amount of scholarly attention: Kakietek 1980, Warchał 2010), interest in epistemic modality has not bypassed Pol-

ish linguistics. A number of linguists have dealt with the issue, most notably Danielewiczowa, whose research is situated within formal semantics and is thus quite distant from the functional/pragmatic stand represented by the contributors to *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. Categorization and Description*. Her monograph on Polish epistemic verbs (Danielewiczowa 2002) remains the most systematic and comprehensive publication in the field, and her publications concerning epistemic adverbs (Danielewiczowa 2008a, 2008b, 2012) raise a number of important methodological questions and provide important insights into their properties. In her recent monograph (Danielewiczowa 2012), she demonstrates that the distinction between modal adverbs, modal particles and discourse particles is not the only distinction within non-verbal means of expressing modality which linguists need to investigate. Danielewiczowa's study introduces a new category of epistemic expressions in Polish linguistics: *metapredykaty przysłówkowe* (Eng. 'adverbial metapredicates'). Adverbial metapredicates comment on the selection of predicates by the speaker. They do not function on the level of metatext the way particles do, neither do they refer to the content of the proposition the way regular adverbs do. They appear to have developed from adverbs of manner, and, as the author argues, are homonymic with them, e.g. *spokojnie: oddycha spokojnie* (Eng. 'he's breathing calmly') vs. *spokojnie wystarczy* (Eng. 'you can be sure that will do': that will do nicely), and *dosłownie: przetłumaczyć dosłownie* (Eng. 'to translate literally') vs. *on dosłownie stracił dla niej głowę* (Eng. 'he literally lost his head over her'). Danielewiczowa's observations are based on Polish, but, considering the similarity between Eng. *literally* and Pol. *dosłownie*, they may also be useful in cross-linguistic studies. Her book is skillfully argued and very well documented. It provides a solid groundwork for further research into the properties of epistemic expressions. Both monographs discussed here demonstrate that the categories of modal adverbs and modal particles are both heterogeneous and dynamic, which makes them difficult to categorize. Their dynamicity requires from linguists a considerable amount of vigilance to ensure that new developments within the class are accounted for.

REFERENCES

- Danielewiczowa, Magdalena. 2002. *Wiedza i niewiedza. Studium polskich czasowników epistemicznych*. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski, Katedra Lingwistyki Formalnej

- Danielewiczowa, Magdalena. 2008a. "Opis przysłówków epistemicznych jako wyzwanie teoretyczne", *Prace Filologiczne* t. LIV. *Seria Językoznawcza*, 47–62.
- Danielewiczowa, Magdalena. 2008b. "Jak nie należy opisywać przysłówków epistemicznych?", *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, Sonderband 72, *Lexikalische Evidenzialitäts-Marker in slavischen Sprachen*, 109–128.
- Danielewiczowa, Magdalena. 2012. *W głąb specjalizacji znaczeń. Przysłówkowe meta-predykaty atestacyjne*. Warszawa: BEL Studio.
- Degand, Liesbeth, Bert Cornillie and Paola Pietrandrea. 2013. *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. Categorization and Description*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins
- Kakietek, Piotr. 1980. *English Modal Auxiliaries and Their Equivalent Constructions in Polish*. Uniwersytet Śląski.
- Narrog, Heiko. 2012. *Modality, Subjectivity, and Semantic Change. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nuyts, Jan. 2001. *Epistemic Modality, Language, and Conceptualization: A Cognitive-Pragmatic Perspective*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Simon-Vandenberg, Anne Marie and Karin Aijmer. 2007. *The Semantic Field of Modal Certainty: a Corpus-Based Study of English Adverbs*, Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Van linden, An. 2012. *Modal adjectives. English deontic and evaluative constructions in synchrony and diachrony*, Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter
- Warchał, Krystyna. 2010. "Encoding certainty. On some epistemic modality markers in English and Polish research articles. The case of MUST/MUSIEĆ", *Internet-Zeitschrift für Kulturwissenschaften* Nr 17. http://www.inst.at/trans/17Nr/2-7/2-7_warchal/17.htm
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 2006. *English: Meaning and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MODAL ADVERBS, PARTICLES AND DISCOURSE MARKERS ACROSS LANGUAGES. RECENT ATTEMPTS AT DELIMITING THE CATEGORIES IN ANGLOPHONE AND POLISH LINGUISTICS

Summary

The aim of this article is to outline some of the recent tendencies in Anglophone and Polish research on epistemic modality. The author observes that while traditionally research focused on modal verbs, most recent publications are concerned with epistemic adverbs, adjectives and modal particles. Attempts at establishing classification criteria for these categories have been made in both Anglophone and Polish linguistics, though international publications discussing means of expressing epistemic modality tend to focus on Germanic and Romance languages. Polish and, more generally, Slavonic languages are almost

entirely absent from such cross-linguistic studies (cf. e.g. *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. Categorization and Description* edited by L. Degand, B. Cornillie, P. Pietrandrea, 2013). The author stresses the importance M. Danielewiczowa's contribution to the description of epistemic adverbs in Polish linguistics.

Key words: epistemic modality, adverbs, particles, cross-linguistic studies, tendencies

**PRZYSŁÓWKI I PARTYKUŁY MODALNE W UJĘCIU KONTRASTYWNYM.
PRÓBY KLASYFIKACJI I OPISU WYKŁADNIKÓW MODALNOŚCI
EPISTEMICZNEJ WE WSPÓŁCZESNYM JĘZYKOZNAWSTWIE
ANGLOJĘZYCZNYM I POLSKIM**

Streszczenie

Artykuł jest próbą uchwycenia aktualnych tendencji w opisie wykładników modalności epistemicznej w publikacjach anglojęzycznych i polskich. Autorka odnotowuje przeniesienie uwagi z czasowników modalnych na nieczasownikowe wykładniki modalności – w szczególności przysłówki epistemiczne i partykuły – wśród autorów anglojęzycznych i podsumowuje próby opisania tych jednostek podejmowane w najnowszych publikacjach międzynarodowych i polskich. Zauważa, że międzynarodowe publikacje anglojęzyczne, np. omawiana w artykule monografia *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. Categorization and Description* (red. L. Degand, B. Cornillie, P. Pietrandrea, 2013), koncentrują swoją uwagę na językach germańskich i romańskich, podczas gdy języki słowiańskie są w nich niemal zupełnie nieobecne. Podkreśla też wkład publikacji M. Danielewiczowej w badania nad przysłówkami epistemicznymi w językoznawstwie polskim.

Słowa kluczowe: modalność epistemiczna, przysłówki, partykuły, badania kontrastywne, tendencje