

Anna Kisiel

KU Leuven, Belgium

Paratacteme

Paratactemes are the units that co-occur with other units rather than entering into traditionally construed syntactic relations with them. This means that a) they are not required to occur by any element of the sentence; b) they do not pose any requirements with regard to the class of the expressions that they co-occur with. Although not syntactically related to other elements, paratactemes stand in sharp contrast to asyntagmatic units (in Polish: *asyntagmatyki*) – elements that have no connective property whatsoever. Such asyntagmatic units (*hej, a kysz, oj, aha*) are viewed as being outside of the natural language system since, given that they do not participate in the rules that govern the very system, they are semiotically distinct from it (cf. quasi-words, para-lexemes in Wajszczuk 2011). While the use of paratactemes is governed by rules, these rules are not syntactic in nature. Paratactemes, as speech-organising units, provide a commentary on relevant chunks of knowledge (expressed by the elements of the T-R structure) and thus co-occur with expressions that fill a specific place in the T-R structure. As a result, paratactemes are eventually contrasted with syntactemes specifically on the grounds of the type of dependence between them and the other elements of a sentence: While syntactemes – units used to speak about the world, including the relations between specific elements – are bound to each other by way of syntactic relations (they fill positions opened by other units or they themselves open positions for other units), paratactemes – units that organise such speech – refer to the elements of the T-R structure itself. In other words, what matters for them is not the form or the meaning of a specific word, but the message conveyed by it as a result of the thematic or rhematic position filled by it.

The paratacteme classes that have been the most extensively researched to date are → CONJUNCTIONS and → PARTICLES.

1. The description of paratactemes – diachronic overview

It was relatively early on when the researchers recognized the existence of non-obligatory sentence elements (elements that are reducible, removable without infringing the sentence structure or affecting its truth conditions). In fact, such elements were identified even before

the class of paratactemes was theoretically distinguished (e.g. Klemensiewicz's connection markers). The opposition between the units capable of entering into syntactic relations with other units (syntagmatic units) and units that are syntactically independent (asyntagmatic units) has been fundamental for the classification of lexemes proposed by Roman Laskowski (1984). What is more, researchers acknowledged the distinction between the speech about the world and the speech about speech. Canonical texts on this matter include the paper by Anna Wierzbicka (1971, cf. Bogusławski 1979) on metatext as [the act of] "speaking in a text about that very text." These two elements – the existence of units insensitive to syntactic dependencies and the existence of the two levels of speech – were combined into one in the dual type syntax theory, which distinguishes between the two systems – the syntactic and the metatextual one (Wajszczuk 1997).

It is within this theory that the term 'paratacteme' was introduced (Wajszczuk 2005) to designate units that combine with other units on the co-occurrence basis, i.e. units which do not open any formally or semantically marked positions. The further division of paratactemes relied on the number of positions opened by them: particles bind right-sided units, while conjunctions bind units on both sides. The class of syntactemes – being the opposite of paratactemes – was divided by the researcher into autosyntagmatics units (syntactemes proper) and synsyntagmatics units (metapredicates). Insofar as autosyntagmatics units participate in double-sided relations of grammatical and semantic relevance, synsyntagmatics units enter into one-sided relations of purely semantic nature.

Relying on the fundamental separation between the syntax of dependency and the syntax of co-occurrence, Jadwiga Wajszczuk modified the scope and reference of the terms previously used in the classifications of lexemes developed by Roman Laskowski (1984, 1998) or Maciej Grochowski (1986, 1997). Although Laskowski (1984) distinguished the class of asyntagmatics relying also on their lack of capacity to enter into syntactic relations with other units, he extended this class to include – apart from syntactically independent (though capable of performing syntactic functions, cf. Grochowski 1996) interjections – also the class of contextually dependent (and thus implying the existence of a text) appositions (in Polish: *dopowiedzenia*, cf. Dobaczewski 1998; Żabowska 2011). The class of syntagmatic units, created in opposition to asyntagmatic units, consists of two major groups: units constituting segments of syntactic relations (autosyntagmatics) and the markers of syntagmatic relations (synsyntagmatics (cf. Wajszczuk 1997; Walusiak 2011; Grochowski 2019). Both the content of the relevant classes and the very understanding of the nature of units that belong to them differ in the studies by Laskowski and Wajszczuk, and thus also the place of these classes in the overall classification is different in the theories proposed by both scholars. In consequence, the type of opposition between these classes and the other classes within each of the respective classifications is not identical.

The key problem inherent to the analysis of paratactemes is the correct understanding of the nature of the capacity to open positions. This problem has been identified by the very author of the term in question. It becomes particularly relevant when it comes to the elements commenting on the entire TR structure and the attempts to make a distinction between the conjunctions that open two positions and combine two STRs and appositive comments that open a position for a single one unit which – given the meaning of such comments – require

a pre-text (cf. Kisiel 2011ab). This problem has also been approached from the perspective of phonological separation applicable to appositions (Laskowski 1984, 1998; Grochowski 1986, 1997; Dobaczewski 1998, 2014, 2020). The related issue of imposing restrictions on co-occurring elements (or the lack of such restrictions) has been discussed in particular with respect to particles (cf. e.g. the analyses by the authors of “Słownik gniazdowy partykuł polskich,” Grochowski, Kisiel, Żabowska 2014). The order of paratactemes, also in relation to their reference, has been systemically researched by Maciej Grochowski (e.g. 2002, 2003, 2007ab).

2. Paratacteme classes

The author of the term ‘paratacteme’ claimed that the ultimate criterion for the subdivision of this class is the number of positions being opened. In her initial division (Wajszczuk 2005), the criterion allowed the researcher to distinguish between conjunctions binding two elements and particles that bind only one element. Later on (Wajszczuk 2010), the very same criterion was used to make the top tier distinction within this class between conjunctions binding two elements and STR comments binding only one. At the lower level, both groups are further subdivided according to their capacity to operate on entire TR structures or the lack thereof. In consequence, conjunctions were divided into two subgroups: conjunctions combining two rhematic expressions into one whole within a single superior theme (including *i, oraz, ani, lub, czy, bądź*) and conjunctions which combine two STRs (such as *czyli, toteż, ale, gdyż, bo*). Comments, on the other hand, are divided into ad-rhematic particles (e.g. *tylko, nawet, przede wszystkim, chyba*) and appositive comments which semantically require context (including *jednak, zatem, bowiem, natomiast, skoro, jeśli, chociaż, ponieważ*). The author herself also suggested that such classes may be further subdivided (as evidenced, among other things, by the possibility of co-existence of elements from a single class, cf. *chyba również ona*). This matter has been further studied by Magdalena Żabowska (2009), who demonstrated that the scope of reference of metatextual units is diverse and may also include other metatextual expressions.

The paratacteme classes that have been thoroughly analysed include conjunctions (Wajszczuk 1997), particles (Grochowski, Kisiel, Żabowska 2014), thematizers (Sulich 2008) and selected comments, e.g. ad-clausal comments, such as *_i basta, _i tyle, _i już* (Salińska 2003) or parenthetical comments constructed on the basis of speech verbs (Ożóg 1991; Moroz 2007; Milewska 2011; Kubicka 2017).

References

- Bogusławski, A. 1979. “Performatives or metatextual comments? On the cognitive and non-cognitive linguistic conventions”. *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* 3: 301–325.
- Dobaczewski, A. 1998. *Cechy składniowe i semantyczne polskich dopowiedzeń potwierdzających*. Warszawa: Katedra Lingwistyki Formalnej UW.
- Dobaczewski, A. 2014. “Jeszcze o dopowiedzeniach”. In *Wyrażenia funkcyjne w perspektywie diachronicznej, synchronicznej i porównawczej*, eds. K. Kleszczowa, & A. Szczepanek. Katowice: UŚ University Press, 125–132.

- Dobaczewski, A. 2020. "Parataktemy vs asyntagmatyki, czyli różne oblicza kookurencji tekstowej". *Język Polski* 100(3): 20–28.
- Grochowski, M. 1986. *Polskie partykuły. Składnia, semantyka, leksykografia*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Grochowski, M. 1996. "O funkcjach semiotycznych onomatopei". In *W świecie znaków. Księga Pamięnikowa ku Czci Profesora Jerzego Pelca*, eds. J.J. Jadacki, & W. Strawiński. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Filozoficzne, 267–272.
- Grochowski, M. 1997. *Wyrażenia funkcyjne. Studium leksykograficzne*. Kraków: IJP PAN.
- Grochowski, M. 2002. "Właściwości linearne partykuł modalnych a struktura tematyczno-rematyczna wypowiedzenia". *Z Polskich Studiów Slawistycznych* 10: 67–73.
- Grochowski, M. 2003. "Szyk jednostek synsyntagmatycznych w języku polskim (główne problemy metodologiczne)". *Polonica* 22–23: 203–223.
- Grochowski, M. 2007a. "Opozycja leksemów auto- i synsyntagmatycznych (w świetle homonimów gramatycznych o postaci «aż»)". *Зборник Матице српске за славистику* 71–72: 161–171.
- Grochowski, M. 2007b. "Partykuły, parenteza a wyrażenia metatekstowe". *Z Polskich Studiów Slawistycznych* 11: 69–74.
- Grochowski, M. 2019. "Kategorie gramatyczne w dorobku Romana Laskowskiego". *Polonica* 39: 71–84.
- Grochowski, M., A. Kisiel, & M. Żabowska. 2014. *Słownik gniazdowy partykuł polskich*. Kraków: PAU.
- Kisiel, A. 2011a. "How to analyse contextuality of metatextual language units? Notes on influencing TRS by particles' meaning". *Cognitive Studies. Études Cognitives* 11: 293–306.
- Kisiel, A. 2011b. "Preliminary remarks on particles' contextuality. Erroneous thoughts on submerging particles in cotext". *Lingua Posnaniensis* 2(53): 49–59.
- Kubicka, E. 2017. "Jak mówimy, jako mówią? Formalne i semantyczne właściwości adverbialnych uzupełnień quasi-imiesłowowego «mówiąc»". *LingVaria* 23: 99–113.
- Laskowski, R. 1984. "Podstawowe pojęcia morfologii". In *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia*, eds. R. Grzegorzczkova, R. Laskowski, & H. Wróbel. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 9–57.
- Laskowski, R. 1998. "Zagadnienia ogólne morfologii". In *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia*, eds. R. Grzegorzczkova, R. Laskowski & H. Wróbel, 2nd ed., vol. 1. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 27–86.
- Milewska, B. 2011. "«Brutalnie mówiąc» i inne wyrażenia metatekstowe sygnalizujące naruszenie norm zachowań językowych". *LingVaria* 12: 35–44.
- Moroz, A. 2007. "Uwagi o ciągach parentetycznych z segmentem «mówiąc»". In *Studia nad słownictwem dawnym i współczesnym języków słowiańskich*, eds. J. Kamper-Warejko, I. Kaproń-Charzyńska, & J. Kulwicka-Kamińska. Toruń: UMK University Press, 187–194.
- Ożóg, K. 1991. "Elementy metatekstowe ze składnikiem «mówię» w polszczyźnie mówionej". In *Funkcje języka i wypowiedzi. Język a kultura* 4, eds. J. Bartmiński, & R. Grzegorzczkova. Wrocław: Wiedza o Kulturze, 183–194.
- Salińska, D. 2003. "Cechy składniowe i semantyczne metatekstowych jednostek leksykalnych (z segmentem «i») zamykających wypowiedź". *Polonica* 22–23: 269–290.
- Sulich, A. 2008. *Tematyzatory polskie. Jednostki leksykalne wyznaczające strukturę tematyczną wypowiedzi*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper.
- Wajszczuk, J. 1997. *System znaczeń w obszarze spójników polskich. Wprowadzenie do opisu*. Warszawa: Katedra Lingwistyki Formalnej UW.

- Wajszczuk, J. 2005. *O metateksie*. Warszawa: Katedra Lingwistyki Formalnej UW.
- Wajszczuk, J. 2010. "Functional Class (so Called «Part of Speech») Assignment as a Kind of Meaning-Bound Word Syntactic Information". *Cognitive Studies / Études Cognitives* 10: 15–33.
- Wajszczuk, J. 2011. "Co właściwie spójniki łączą? Powrót do pytań zasadniczych". *Prace Filologiczne* 60: 263–285.
- Walusiak, E. 2011. "Syntagmatyczność. Problemy interpretacyjne". *Prace Filologiczne* 60: 287–298.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1971. "Metatekst w tekście". In *O spójności tekstu*, ed. M.R. Mayenowa. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 105–121.
- Żabowska, M. 2009. "Hierarchia wyrażen metatekstowych". *Linguistica Copernicana* 2(2): 179–189.
- Żabowska, M. 2011. "O tzw. dopowiedzeniach zaprzeczających". *Prace Filologiczne* 60: 353–364.