Magdalena Żabowska

Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, Poland

Pro-form

Pro-forms are expressions that either perform a semantic function (related to the designation of the elements of extralinguistic reality) or a grammatical function (related to the introduction of syntactic structures in a sentence). Owing to their syntactic properties, pro-forms may belong to different classes, e.g. nouns, adjectives, numerals, adverbs, etc. From the perspective of semantic subclasses, pro-forms may be divided into personal, deictic, possessive, reflexive, indeterminate etc. Pro-forms are the exponents of reference – deictic or anaphoric – and they point to both extralinguistic and textual objects. The role of pro-forms may be performed by expressions which traditionally do not fall into this category, e.g. *rzecz*, *sprawa*, *dany*, *następujące*. Due to their function, many expressions which have the form of pro-forms are actually classified to other categories of expressions, e.g. approximators or particles. In the historical development of the Polish language, certain function words have been derived from pro-forms; these include conjunctions, particles, and connectors.

1. General properties of pro-forms

1.1. Defining properties of pro-forms

As regards the defining properties of pro-forms, grammars of the Polish language typically list the following: a) pointing to rather than naming objects (e.g. Szober 1923); b) replacing other parts of sentence endowed with full meaning (e.g. Doroszewski 1963); c) being replaceable by other parts of sentence endowed with full meaning (e.g. Jodłowski 1973); d) generality of the meaning of pro-forms which obtain a specific meaning only when used in a specific situation (e.g. Szober 1959); e) denotation and non-mnemonicity (e.g. Jodłowski 1976).

1.2. Semantic and functional diversification of pro-forms

Relying on the syntactic functions that pro-forms may perform in a sentence, we may distinguish their following functional subclasses (corresponding to the so-called basic parts of speech): a) pronouns, e.g. *ja*, *ty*, *my*, *wy*, *on*, *oni*, *to*, *nikt*, *nic*, *ktokolwiek*, *cokolwiek*, *ktoś*, *coś*, *kto?*, *co?*; b) pro-adjectives, e.g. *mój*, *twój*, *nasz*, *swój*, *taki*, *inny*, *ten sam*, *jakikolwiek*, *jakiś*,

żaden, jaki?, który?, czyj?; c) pro-adverbs, e.g. *tak, inaczej, tak samo, tu, tam, gdzieś, nigdzie, nigdy, gdziekolwiek, jak?, gdzie?, kiedy?, skąd?*; d) pro-numerals, e.g. *tyle, tyle samo, ile?, ilu?*; e) pro-verbs referred to as action pro-forms (in Polish *zaimki czynnościowe*, Jodłowski 1976), *proverba* (Topolińska 2008a) or *zasłówki* (Żurowski 2014), such as *przytego, tentego, tentegować*.

Pro-forms are divided into the following semantic subclasses: a) personal, e.g. *ja, ty, wy*; b) deictic, e.g. *on, ten, to, taki, tam, tu*; c) possessive, e.g. *mój, twój, nasz*; d) reflexive, e.g. *się, sobie*; e) comparative, e.g. *taki sam, ten sam, inny, inaczej*; f) interrogative-relative, e.g. *kto?, co?, gdzie?, kiedy?, ile?*; g) indeterminate, e.g. *ktoś, gdzieś, jakiś, jakoś, kiedykolwiek*; h) generalizing, e.g. *wszyscy, wszędzie, zawsze*; i) excluduing (negating), e.g. *nikt, nic, nigdzie, nigdy*.

1.3. Pro-forms in the classifications of parts of speech

Given the functional diversity of pro-forms, it is impossible to put them together in a single coherent class of parts of speech defined by applying the same criteria – morphological, syntactic or inflectional – to the entire lexical resource of a language. In contemporary classifications of parts of speech, pro-forms are usually not treated as a separate class, distinguished on the basis of functional-semantic properties. Likewise, in classifications based on inflectional criteria, pro-forms are not considered as a separate lexeme class either, while their subclasses are included into the relevant part of speech classes, e.g. nouns, adjectives, etc. (Saloni; Saloni, Świdziński). The application of the syntactic criteria is also insufficient to distinguish a separate class of pro-forms (Laskowski, Wróbel). An overview of the older approaches to pro-forms in comparison to other parts of speech may be found in Skarżyński (2001).

2. Pro-forms in traditional grammar

In traditional syntax, the basic function of pro-forms is viewed primarily – in accordance with the etymology of the word (*zaimek*, literally 'pro-name' in Polish) – as that of substitution for other expressions (especially nouns, or, more generally – names). In the description of grammatical and semantic functions of the elements of an utterance, pro-forms are assigned the very same syntactic functions as the classes of expressions that they replace.

In a sentence, pro-forms may perform the function of a subject (pronouns), noun modifier, e.g. adjectival modifier (pro-adjectives) or an adverbial (pro-adverbs), e.g. of place, direction or time. As regards the types of subordinate clauses that pro-forms may introduce, we may distinguish, for example, subordinate attributive clauses (*który, jaki, co*), adverbial clauses of place (*gdzie, skąd*), degree or measurement (*tyle…, ile…*).

In the main-subordinate clause systems, owing to the manner in which the content of such clauses is linked, pro-forms, as the markers of the fusion of the component utterances, may perform the functions of: a) a relative pro-form, introducing the content of the subordinate clause, potentially announced in the main clause by a demonstrative pro-form such as *ten, to, tam, tak* (cf. *(ten), kto*; *(to), co*; *(gdzie), tam*; *(jak), tak …*); b) a subordination anticipator (in Polish *zapowiednik*) announcing the subordinate clause introduced by the relative pro-form (cf. *tam, gdzie*; *to, jak*; *ten, który …*) or a conjunction (e.g. *tak, że …*); c) an

interrogative-subordinate pro-form with the main verb and with the obligatory zero marker announcing the subordinate clause (e.g. *(wiem), kto, gdzie, jak …*).

In traditional approaches, pro-forms are viewed as not being involved in expressing any semantic relationships between utterances (e.g. conjunctive, disjunctive, exclusive, contrapositive, consequential, synonymous utterances in: Jodłowski 1976), and therefore it is believed that – when combining clauses – pro-forms only perform grammatical functions, cf. e.g. *który*, *jaki*.

Scholars further point out to the primary and secondary functions of pro-forms, e.g. the function of the relative pronoun *który* may be performed by the pro-adverb *gdzie*, e.g. *sala, gdzie jedliśmy.* On the other hand, the properties of component utterances that are atypical from the perspective of syntactic properties are considered as "peculiarities," e.g. utterances that develop content introduced e.g. by *który*, *co*, *skąd*.

The analyses of pro-forms that take account of their syntactic distribution examine such of their syntactic properties that are a manifestation of their 'pro-formness', i.e. the capacity to perform a specific function (e.g. that of the subject) or the incapacity to take attributions (Jodłowski 1976). The latter observation was questioned by Misz who pointed out such phrases as *prawie nikt*, *zupełnie taki*; however, in these phrases, pro-forms are not modified by adverbs, but by metapredicative expressions.

3. Pro-forms in semantic grammar

3.1. The role of pro-forms in reference – designation and identification

Pro-forms perform a key role in establishing a **reference** for expressions – they participate (independently or together with other expressions (as determiners (Lyons 1989)) in designating and identifying objects. As the elements of a nominal group (Topolińska 1984), pro-forms may constitute groups that are a) definite (in Polish *scharakteryzowane*, literally 'characterised') e.g. *ten (tamten) człowiek*, *ja*, cf. **definite designation**, definite specific reference or b) indefinite (in Polish *niescharakteryzowane*, literally 'non-characterised') e.g. *jakiś człowiek*, *ktoś*, cf. **indefinite designation**, specified indefinite reference. As regards the specific markers of reference in the form of pro-forms in the Polish language, we distinguish between: 1) **definite reference** (*ja*, *ty*, *on*, *ten człowiek*; *wtedy*, *wówczas*, *tu*, *tam*, *tak*), 2) **indefinite reference**, further divided into; a) cryptoindefinite (*pewien*, *jeden*), b) indefinite (*jakiś*, *ktoś*; *kiedyś*, *gdzieś*, *jakoś*), c) existential (*jakiś*, *ktoś*; *kiedyś*, *gdzieś*, *jakoś*), d) restricted to a specific element of a set (*ktoś z_*, *któryś z_*) or excluding a specific element (*ktoś inny*, *jakiś inny*; *kiedy indziej*, *gdzie indziej*, *inaczej*), e) discretionary (*ktokolwiek*, *cokolwiek*, *jakikolwiek*; *gdziekolwiek*, *jakkolwiek*), f) partial (*niektórzy*; *gdzieniegdzie*) and 3) **general reference** : a) distributive (*każdy*) and b) collective (*wszyscy*, *wszędzie*) (pro-forms do not participate in generic reference) (Grzegorczykowa 1990) cf. individual (definite and indefinite) and general (distributive and collective) as well as generic reference (Lyons 1989).

What is more, pro-forms participate in the mechanisms of **textual reference (deicticity)** (Lyons 1989) cf. *Człowiek! To brzmi dumnie*, see section 3.3.). Pro-forms specific to **discursive reference** (Żabowska 2017), such as *ten i ten*, *tak a tak*, *dany*, *określony*, represent a separate type of reference.

In Stanisław Karolak's (2001) SPA (predicate-argument structure) theory, pro-forms fill the positions of arguments. The use of indefinite pro-forms is an explicitly expressed lack of designation of a specific element (in contrast to failure to fill the argument position); the cause for the lack of designation is expressed by the selection of the right pro-form, cf. e.g. *ktoś – ktokolwiek – ktoś z _.*

According to Zuzanna Topolińska, pro-forms perform functions related to reference; they denote, but do not connote – this function distinguishes them from the remaining so-called parts of speech, irrespectively of the formal diversity of expressions categorised into this class. Apart from (deictic or anaphoric) designation, pro-forms also convey generic information about a specific object (e.g. the designation of the sender/addressee, place, time, quality, measurement, etc.). Due to their reference, pro-forms used to identify an object (*ja, ty, mój, twój, tu, teraz, ten, każdy, nikt, ktokolwiek …*) form a central pro-formal subsystem. The secondary subsystem is made of indefinite pro-forms (*ktoś, coś, jakiś, jeden …*), while the tertiary one consists of relative/ interrogative pro-forms. The pro-formal markers of reference include pro-forms proper, as well as (para)pro-forms, e.g. forms of adjectives such as *cały, obecny, aktualny, własny, wspólny*, or adverbs, e.g. *dzisiaj* etc. (Topolińska 2011).

3.2. The role of pro-forms in an utterance – pro-form actualizers

The context of communication is the key parameter in defining the references for the pro-forms used in an utterance (sender, recipient, time, place, etc.). This is a consequence of the fact that pro-forms are **occasional expressions**, and their reference is determined in every single case on the basis of knowledge of the parameters of a specific communicative act, cf. *shifters* in Jakobson's theory or indices in the theory of Peirce, cf. e.g. pro-forms *ja, ty, to, tu, tam, teraz, wtedy* (see Bogusławski 1977). Benveniste considers pro-forms as expressions that derive directly from the acts of speech, cf. *ja, ty, to, tu* (quoted in: Padučeva 1992: 55–56). The distinguished subclass of actualizers (as defined by Bailly) is made of pro-forms, cf. *ten, tamten, ten sam, taki, każdy, żaden, pewien, jakiś, jakikolwiek, ten lub inny* etc. (Padučeva 1992: 115).

One common semantic feature shared by pro-forms is their referential function – their meaning entails a reference to the acts of speech or a designation of the type of reference of an utterance to reality (Padučeva 1992: 17). The general content of pro-forms allows for their broad application – in reference to the extralinguistic reality, to a portion of an utterance, to an entire utterance or a component thereof or to an expressed opinion.

On the basis of reference, Elena Padučeva (1992) distinguished between: 1) pro-forms: a) deictic pro-forms that refer to an act of speech or a linguistic situation – the first and second person pro-forms and demonstrative pro-forms and b) anaphoric pro-forms, referring to the utterance of which they are a component – third person pro-forms, reflective and relative pro-forms; 2) quantifying pro-forms – pro-forms of the lack of knowledge (*jakiś*), weakly defined (*pewien, jeden, niektóry*), existential (*jakikolwiek*), universal (*każdy*), of negation (*żaden*) and interrogative. Pro-forms are further divided into thematic classes organised according to specific abstract conceptual classes, e.g. animate/inanimate (*kto – co*), adjectival/substantive (*jaki – kto*), of object/place/time (*kto – gdzie – kiedy*) (Padučeva 1992).

3.3. Pro-forms in anaphoric-cataphoric references

Apart from the direct designation of the elements of an extralinguistic reality, pro-forms also perform the function of indirect designation, i.e. a designation mediated by another element used in a text, cf. exo- and endophoric function of pro-forms in Grzegorczykowa 2015. Pro-forms are one of the formal means of anaphorisation; either independently (as pro-nominalisation markers) or together with the repeated expression, they substitute for the anaphorised phrase, e.g. *Znaleźliśmy psa. Był on / pies ten był całkiem ogłuszony.*; the anaphoric phrase designates a definite object, e.g. 'the dog mentioned before' (Grzegorczykowa 1990; Topolińska 1984). The anaphoric quality is an inherent property of relative pronouns such as *który*, *gdzie* etc. Also such pro-forms as *ów*, *wówczas* or *oto* have specialised in the function of anaphora. Pro-forms used anaphorically are **co-referential** with another element of the sentence to which they refer.

According to the concept developed by Anna Wierzbicka (1971), anaphoric expressions, including pro-forms, perform metatextual functions, e.g. *tam* = 'in the place that I mentioned', etc.

Pro-forms participate in syntactic transformations (syntactic derivation), e.g. **pronominalisation** and **prosententialisation,** e.g. *zauważył coś/ to, że…* (see Topolińska 1977, 2008a), cf. also discursive predicates, such as *przy tym, że, obok tego, że, po to, żeby* (Topolińska 2008b).

3.4. The form v. function of pro-forms

In semantic grammar, following Karolak, it has been assumed that the universal conceptual level of language is superior with respect to the idiomatic level of forms. From this perspective, we may distinguish between the forms and functions of pro-forms. As a result of applying this opposition, we may 1) identify the various functions performed by the same pro-forms, cf. e.g. the distinctively and narratively relative clauses identified by Leon Zawadowski (1952), which may be introduced by the same pro-forms, e.g. *gdzie*, *który*; 2) extend the class of pro-forms by including such expressions that perform the functions of pro-forms, even though they do not have the form of a pro-form themselves, cf. e.g. *rzecz*, as in *rzecz ciekawa*, *powiem ci jedną rzecz*; *fakt*, *sprawa*; *następny*, *poprzedni*, *następujący*, *poniższy*, *niniejszy* (Klemensiewicz 1960; Pisarkowa 1969) or *dany*, *określony*, e.g. *w danym roku* (Żabowska 2017); 3) exclude from the class of pro-forms a variety of expressions having a pro-form form, which perform other functions, the so-called quasi-pro-forms, e.g. a) conventional dative (*mi*, *ci*, *tu*, *tam*), cf. *też mi_*, *to ci_*, b) the so-called modal particles, e.g. *coś*, *jakoś*, *jakiś*, c) approximators, e.g. *jakiś (tysiąc)*, d) intensifiers, e.g. *tak (mądry)*, e) modifiers of declarativeness, e.g. *Te (ruchy)!*, as well as lexicalized phrases, such as *tak czy siak/ inaczej*, *coś podobnego*, *coś takiego*, *gdzie (komuś/czemuś) do (kogoś/czegoś)*.

4. From pro-form to a functional expression: functional changes in the pro-form class

In the historical development of the Polish language, pro-forms served as the building blocks of the so-called additional components of a sentence, i.e. conjunctions, particles, interrogative particles, etc. The original pronominal lexemes gave rise, for example, to the following

expressions *cóż, przecz, czy, czyli, gdy*; *jako…, tako…*; *jak…, tak…*; *to…, to…*; *tudzież* (Pisarkowa 1984). On top of this, pro-forms participate in the discourse-making process: lexicalized preposition-pro-form combinations perform the function of connectors of various types, e.g. *poza tym, przy tym, tymczasem*. The basic functioning mechanism of such expressions is the anaphoric reference to the preceding text, and sometimes also to the co-situation; this is why Topolińska (1995) classifies them as belonging to the class of conjunctive predicates, cf. e.g. *nadto, wtedy, w tym czasie, dlatego, wobec tego, w związku z tym, mimo t*o. The combination of a preposition having a causative function and an anaphoric pro-form gave rise to resultative particles *przeto, dlatego, zatem*; additive particles include such expressions as *ponadto, nadto, przy tym, poza tym*; in the referential function (broadly construed) a marker of anaphorisation could take the form of the pro-form *to* or *co*, cf. obsolete *zaczym, nad co* or the contemporary *dzięki czemu, przez co* etc. (Grochowski, Kisiel, Żabowska 2012; Kleszczowa 2014).

Reference

Bogusławski, A. 1977. "O interpretacji zdań z wyrażeniami okazjonalnymi". *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 2: 39–56.

Doroszewski, W. 1952. *Podstawy gramatyki polskiej*, vol. 1. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Grochowski, M., A. Kisiel, & M. Żabowska. 2012. "Granice jednostek języka a praktyka leksykograficzna". *Polonica* 32: 177–190.

Grzegorczykowa, R. 1990. *Wprowadzenie do semantyki językoznawczej*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Grzegorczykowa, R. 2015. "Jeszcze o odróżnianiu określeń temporalnych deiktycznych od wyznaczających narracyjnie (anaforycznych)". *LingVaria* 10: 61–75.

Jodłowski, S. 1973. *Ogólnojęzykoznawcza charakterystyka zaimka*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Jodłowski, S. 1976. *Podstawy polskiej składni*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Karolak, S. 2001. "O pojęciach określoności i nieokreśloności". In S. Karolak, *Od semantyki do gramatyki. Wybór rozpraw*. Warszawa: SOW, 315–335.

Klemensiewicz, Z. 1960. *Podstawowe wiadomości z gramatyki języka polskiego*, 3rd ed. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Kleszczowa, K. 2014. "Zaimkowy rodowód wybranych partykuł". In *Maiuscula Linguistica. Studia in honorem Professori Matthiae Grochowski sextuagesimo quinto dedicata*, eds. A. Moroz, P. Sobotka, & M. Żabowska. Warszawa: BEL Studio, 131–140.

Lyons, J. 1989. *Semantyka*, vol. 1–2. transl. Adam Weinsberg. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Padučeva, E.V. 1992. *Wypowiedź i jej odniesienie do rzeczywistości (Referencyjne aspekty znaczenia zaimków)*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Pisarkowa, K. 1969. *Funkcje składniowe polskich zaimków odmiennych*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Pisarkowa, K. 1984. *Historia składni języka polskiego*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Skarżyński, M. 2001. *W kręgu gramatyk polskich XIX i XX wieku*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Wydawnicze "Historia Iagellonica".

Szober, S. 1923. *Gramatyka języka polskiego*, 2nd ed. Lwów–Warszawa: Książnica Polska–Towarzystwo Nauczycieli Szkół Wyższych.

Topolińska, Z. 1977. "Mechanizmy nominalizacji w języku polskim". *Studia Gramatyczne* 1: 175–212.

Topolińska, Z. 1979. "Wyznaczoność tzw. argumentów zdarzeniowych predykatu". *Otázky slovanské syntaxe* 4(1): 187–194.

Topolińska, Z. 1984. "Składnia grupy imiennej". In *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Składnia*, ed. Z. Topolińska. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 301–389.

Topolińska, Z. 1995. "Wokół predykatów spójnikowych". In *Wyrażenia funkcyjne w systemie i tekście*, ed. M. Grochowski. Toruń: UMK University Press, 27–31.

Topolińska, Z. 2008a. "O «pronominalizacji» wyrażeń werbalnych". In *Z Polski do Macedonii: studia językoznawcze. T. 1: Problemy predykacji*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Lexis, 142–147.

Topolińska, Z. 2008b. "Polish «że» – all-powerful introducer of new clauses". In *Z Polski do Macedonii: studia językoznawcze. T. 1: Problemy predykacji*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Lexis, 241–256.

Topolińska, Z. 2011. "I nadal w kręgu (para)zaimków". *Linguistica Copernicana* 2(6): 39–45.

Topolińska, Z. 2016. "Zaimki – uniwersalny system referencji". *LingVaria* 1(21): 35–41.

Wierzbicka, A. 1971. "Metatekst w tekście". In *O spójności tekstu*, ed. M.R. Mayenowa. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 105–121.

Wierzbicka-Piotrowska, E. 2011. *Polskie zaimki nieokreślone: wybrane zagadnienia semantyczne, syntaktyczne i pragmatyczne*. Warszawa: Wydział Polonistyki UW.

Zawadowski, L. 1952. *Zagadnienia teorii zdań względnych*, Wrocław: WTN.

Żabowska, M. 2017. "Niedookreślenie, dekonkretyzacja i zmienne językowe – o quasi-tautologicznych układach typu «ten i ten», «to i to», «tak a tak»". *LingVaria* (1)23: 115–129.

Żurowski, S. 2014. "Kontekstowa interpretacja wyrażeń o tzw. znaczeniu ogólnym". In *Semantyczne i pragmatyczne aspekty komunikacji. Od deminutywów do gestów*, ed. W. Pskit. Łódź: UŁ University Press, 27–50.