Agata Rozumko

MODAL ADVERBS IN ENGLISH AND POLISH

A FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Agata Rozumko

MODAL ADVERBS IN ENGLISH AND POLISH

A FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Białystok 2019

Reviewers:
dr hab. Ewa Willim (UJ)
dr hab. Krystyna Warchał (UŚ)

Graphic design:
Paweł Łuszyński

Editing:
Peter Foulds

Proofreading:
Peter Foulds

Technical editing and typesetting:
Zbigniew Łaszcz

Table of content

8. EPISTEMIC EMPHASIZERS

9. LOW CONFIDENCE ADVERBS

10. ADVERBS OF NECESSITY

11. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Acknowledgements

1. Introduction

1.1. Motivation for writing this book

The notion of modality has received considerable attention from linguists, but its potential as a source of inspiration for linguistic enquiry seems inexhaustible because new proposals and perspectives create the need for further investigation. Linguistic manifestations of modality have been analyzed both on the level of individual languages and from cross-linguistic perspectives. The amount of research in the area is impressive (cf. e.g. Portner 2009; Narrog 2012; Nuyts and van der Auwera 2016). However, contrastive studies of English and Polish modal markers remain both scarce and fragmentary. For many years, Anglophone research into modality focused on auxiliary verbs; such was also the focus of early English-Polish contrastive studies, as exemplified by one of the major publications in the field, *English Modal Auxiliaries and their Equivalent Constructions in Polish* by Piotr Kakietek, published in 1980. Since then, there have been no systematic book-length attempts to re-visit the area investigated by Kakietek or to examine any other class of English and Polish modal markers from a contrastive perspective. Some attention was given to modal markers in English-Polish contrastive grammars, such as Fisiak *et al*. (1978), and Willim and Mańczak-Wohlfeld (1997). A number of cross-linguistic studies comparing the inventories and functions of modal markers in different languages (e.g. Hansen and Karlik 2005; Diewald and Smirnova 2010b; Degand *et al*. 2013a) also discussed some data from Polish. This study constitutes the first attempt at a systematic cross-linguistic comparison of the repertoires and functions of modal adverbs in English and Polish. It also provides some insights into methodological and termi-

nological differences in the treatment of modal adverbs in Anglophone and Polish linguistics, thus contributing to the discussion of the ways in which such linguistic concepts as *modal adverb*, *modal particle* and *discourse marker* are understood across European languages and linguistic traditions.

Speakers of English and Polish have the same classes of modal markers at their disposal: modal verbs, adverbs, adjectives, and nouns. However, studies have demonstrated that while in English the majority of modal meanings are expressed by modal auxiliaries, in Polish modality is primarily expressed by lexical markers (e.g. Hansen 2009). This tendency also appears to be characteristic of other Slavonic languages. For instance, as demonstrated by van der Auwera *et al.* (2005), and Usoniene and Šoliene (2012), in the expression of epistemic meanings Slavonic languages show preference for modal adverbs, while in English modal auxiliaries are more frequently employed. English modal auxiliaries form a small, but clearly delineated and highly grammaticalized set, while Polish modal verbs do not form a uniform category, and only show a medium degree of grammaticalization (Hansen 2009), which is why they are rarely classified as a distinct category in Polish grammar books (cf. e.g. Nagórko 2007, 2012; Bańko 2012). English modal auxiliaries are versatile with respect to the types of modality they express, while their Polish counterparts have been observed to typically express deontic modality (Rytel 1982: 69), which is why many meanings characteristic of English modal auxiliaries are expressed by modal adverbs and non-modal verbs in Polish (Fisiak *et al.* 1978: 130; Warchał 2015: 257). This difference alone makes a comparative study of the functions of epistemic adverbs in English and Polish worth undertaking.

English modal adverbs are more numerous than the modal auxiliaries, but they are typically carriers of one type of modal meaning: epistemic (e.g. Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 767), i.e. they refer to the speaker's knowledge and assessment of a situation (*epistemic* 'pertaining to knowledge', from Greek ἐπιστήμη 'knowledge'). More specifically, in their basic sense they indicate the degree to which the speaker is certain that the state of affairs referred to is true (e.g. *certainly, obviously, possibly*). In Polish, most modal adverbs also express epistemic meanings. Thus, a contrastive

study of modal adverbs in English and Polish largely focuses on epistemic modality (and related notions, such as evidentiality), and requires the understanding of its realizations and functions in the two languages.

Wierzbicka (2006: 247) argues that English "has a much larger repertoire of epistemic (sentential) adverbs than other European languages", a property which she links with the cultural heritage of English, particularly with the role of the philosophy of the Enlightenment in English culture. She sees "the post-Lockean emphasis on the limitations of human knowledge, on the need to distinguish knowledge from judgement" (Wierzbicka 2006: 247) as a major factor in the development of English epistemic adverbs. Wierzbicka formulated her claim in opposition to an opinion expressed by Nuyts (2001a: 56) that modal adverbs and adjectives in English, Dutch and German are "remarkably comparable". In her view, the similarity is only superficial. The comparison undertaken in this study enables at least partial verification of Wierzbicka's claim with reference to data from English and Polish. The cultural heritage of Polish has been shaped by different factors, with the ideals of Romanticism playing a more important role than those of the Enlightenment (cf. e.g. Hryniewicz 2004; Davies 2005: 28-32). If the range and functions of English epistemic adverbs have primarily cultural determinants, a comparison with their Polish equivalents is likely to reveal some of the differences postulated by Wierzbicka (2006).

1.2. Anglophone and Polish research into modality – a brief introduction

Traditionally, epistemic modality was associated with "the speaker's angle" (Halliday 2004: 624), and epistemic markers were discussed in terms of the semantic properties which enabled them to express the speaker's commitment to the truth value of the proposition (e.g. Palmer 1990 [1979]; Coates 1983). However, more recent studies have demonstrated that the functions of epistemic markers extend far beyond the expression of commitment (cf. e.g. White 2000, 2003; Aijmer 2007b, 2009; Martin and Rose 2003; Martin and White 2005; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007; Mortensen 2012; Sidnell 2012). Since linguistic communication involves both the speaker and the addressee, as well as the social context in which

it takes place, the things which the speaker says are rarely intended only to express the speaker's perspective. As noted by Ädel (2014: 102), the speaker always addresses a specific type of audience, even if the audience is not physically present. Thus, while selecting modal markers, speakers take into account the knowledge, attitudes and expectations of their actual or "anticipated" addressees. They also say things in response to their audience.

The view that language is essentially dialogic, i.e. that it always refers to something which has already been said, or anticipates the addressee's response to what is being said goes back to Bakhtin (1981 [1935]), but it was first applied to the study of modality by White (2000, 2003), Martin and Rose (2003), and Martin and White (2005). Their proposals inspired studies on the pragmatic properties and discourse functions of modal markers. As noted by White (2003: 280-281), "[w]e no longer see truth-value as the primary motivation. Rather we see modality as a semantics by which the textual voice maps out its relationships with the various value positions brought into communicative play by the text". Martin and Rose (2003) note that modality creates space for negotiation and mediation. Epistemic modality can thus be seen as "a resource for taking up different positionings" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 42). By using modal expressions, speakers/writers invite alternative voices and different points of view to the discussions they initiate; they may also use modal markers to discourage disagreement and defend their own positions as well as the positions argued by other speakers.

Epistemic meaning is thus not only monologic (speaker-oriented), but also dialogic (addressee- and interaction-oriented). With the identification of the role of modal markers in discourse, modality has begun to be increasingly seen as "an inherently pragmatic phenomenon" (Verschueren 1999: 100), and the use of epistemic markers has been said to have a pragmatic motivation. Hoye (2005: 112) argues that "pragmatically speaking, the expression of relative degrees of doubt or (un)certainty is highly significant. Speakers may often wish to soften the impositive force of their arguments in the interests of tact, openness and the overall smoother negotiation of discourse in which this results". A number of studies (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007; Bonami and Godard 2008; Cornil-

lie and Pietrandrea 2012) have stressed the centrality of the pragmatic properties and interactional functions of modal adverbs in a description of their functions. However, in Polish linguistics, the pragmatic properties of modal markers and their discourse functions have not been discussed extensively. 20 years ago, Duszak observed that in Poland "most linguistic work is still done in the areas of syntax and semantics, while little recognition is given to the interactive properties of texts" (1997: 31). In the area of modality, this observation still holds good today. Polish studies of epistemic adverbs (e.g. Danielewiczowa 2012; Grochowski et al. 2014) tend to focus on their syntactic and semantic properties, while their pragmatic functions are considered as secondary and still wait to be recognized. Some of them have been identified in cross-linguistic studies of politeness (e.g. Jakubowska 1999; Lubecka 2000), but works focusing on epistemic adverbs as a category, and on the properties of individual adverbs tend to omit pragmatic information or provide a piecemeal treatment of the issue.

Another issue which sets Anglophone and Polish studies of modal markers apart is their approach to the grammaticalization framework. While the development of epistemic and post-epistemic meanings of English adverbs is usually explained with reference to grammaticalization processes (cf. Traugott 1995b; Traugott and Dasher 2002; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007), recent Polish monographs on epistemic adverbs, such as Tutak (2003), and Danielewiczowa (2012), omit grammaticalization from their considerations. As noted by Hansen and Drobnjaković (2010), grammaticalization theory has so far played an insignificant role as an explanatory instrument in Polish linguistics, which, generally speaking, maintains a rather strict separation between synchrony and diachrony. Diachronic phenomena tend not to be used to explain current usage. The adoption of a synchronic perspective in the study of modal adverbs results in the treatment of the category as a rather static system, where every form is assigned its own distinct position. What Anglophone studies usually consider to be different meanings (and functions) of one polysemous item, e.g. the manner and inferential uses of *clearly* (e.g. *to speak clearly* vs. *She is clearly unhappy*), current Polish linguistics classifies as two distinct (homonymic) units. As a result, the manner adverb *wyraźnie*, as in *mówić wyraźnie* 'to speak clearly', is considered to be homonym-

ic with the metapredicative operator *wyraźnie*, e.g. *Ona jest wyraźnie nieszczęśliwa* 'She is clearly unhappy' (cf. Grochowski *et al.* 2014; *WSJP*).

1.3. Modality and the socio-cultural context

Appropriate use of modal expressions can be considered as a skill – "a social-communicative survival skill", as Boye (2012: 39-40) puts it. Boye's claim echoes Holmes's (1982: 24) observation that the skillful use of epistemic forms is a matter of "a speaker's social survival". It is a skill which requires different strategies in different languages and cultures, as the use of modal markers is in many ways language and culture specific. Historical changes in ways of expressing modality in English have demonstrated the considerable sensitivity of modal markers towards the evolution of socio-cultural norms of behaviour and communication (Myhill 1995, 1997). Its language-specific characteristics are particularly pronounced in cross-linguistic/cross-cultural contacts and foreign language education. Learning to express the appropriate degree of commitment to a proposition in a foreign language has been demonstrated to be quite difficult (cf. Holmes 1983; Hyland and Milton 1997). At the same time, because of its association with politeness and sociolinguistic norms of communication, it is very important. The use of discourse markers – a role associated with numerous epistemic adverbs – has also been demonstrated to be both crucial and difficult for non-native speakers trying to produce meaningful utterances in English (Williams 1992; Trillo 2002; Müller 2005; Liao 2009; Cribb 2012). A contrastive study such as this one needs to take both cross-linguistic and cross-cultural differences into consideration.

Discourse functions of epistemic adverbs are also connected with politeness. As Kärkkäinen (2003) notes, stance-taking is an interactive activity involving "the need to take the recipient's or the speaker's claims to maintaining face into consideration". The languages which this work focuses on represent different patterns of politeness. English is associated with negative politeness (social distance, indirectness, individualism), while Polish has been said to be a positive politeness language (a smaller degree of social distance, collectivity) (Lubecka 2000; Ogiermann 2009). Modal adverbs have usually been associated with negative politeness and indirectness. This cultural difference is likely to play a role in the expres-

sion of modality in the two languages, which is why the present study makes references to linguistic politeness in the analysis of modal adverbs.

1.4. Aims and methodology

The general aim of this book is to compare the inventories and functions of modal adverbs in English and Polish. More specific aims include delineating the category in both languages, developing a typology of modal adverbs to facilitate a cross-linguistic comparison, establishing the functions of the identified subcategories of adverbs, and, finally, examining the properties of the individual adverbs. As this study focuses on the entire category of modal adverbs in both languages (over forty items in English and a similar number in Polish), a detailed and comprehensive analysis of the individual items is beyond its scope. Rather, what it aims to offer is a discussion of the types of modal adverbs in the two languages, the inventories of the adverbs within the groups, and the functions of the different types.

This book adopts a functional perspective on modal adverbs, though some attention is also given to their semantic, morphological and syntactic properties. As noted by Willim (2010: 82), functional approaches to language are, generally speaking, "usage-based". There is, however, considerable diversity within functionally-oriented research. This broad area includes both Functional Linguistics and Cognitive Linguistics, which themselves do not have clearly delineated boundaries, and include a number of linguistic schools. Functionally-oriented research also includes studies conducted within the grammaticalization framework. As noted by Nuyts (2007: 548), what distinguishes Functional Linguistics from Cognitive Linguistics is its focus on the communicative dimensions of language (interactional features of language, interpersonal relations between the speaker and the addressee), rather than the conceptual semantic ones. Cognitive Linguistics, in contrast, is semantically oriented. Even though, as observed by Aijmer (2016: 50), "functional approaches to modality are now converging with cognitive perspectives", most of the Cognitive Linguistics research on modality is concerned with semantics, particularly the semantics of modal auxiliaries (cf. Mortelmans 2007; Portner 2009). The approach taken in this book is functional in the sense that it is pri-

marily concerned with the interpersonal, textual and rhetorical functions of modal adverbs. It is not semantically oriented. Like the majority of functional studies of modality (cf. Portner 2009: 106), it is also largely descriptive in character. It describes the uses of modal adverbs using data excerpted from language corpora. This study is synchronic in character, but it makes reference to the diachronic findings of researchers who have studied modality using the grammaticalization framework (Traugott and Dasher 2002; Traugott 2010, 2014), demonstrating that adverbs have developed their modal meanings from their manner senses in the process of (inter)subjectification. The process is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3. The meanings expressed by modal adverbs show different degrees of (inter)subjectivity, and can be arranged on a cline from less to more (inter)subjective (cf. Traugott 2014). Such an arrangement is employed in the discussion of individual modal adverbs in this study.

This study draws substantially from Systemic Functional Linguistics, developed by Halliday and his colleagues, particularly from the appraisal framework proposed by White (2003), and Martin and White (2005) within this paradigm. Halliday (2004: 31) notes that "functionality is intrinsic to language: that is to say, the entire architecture of language is arranged along functional lines. Language is as it is because of the functions in which it has evolved in the human species". The term "language functions", however, is used to mean different things. As noted by Halliday (2004: 31), it is often used simply to refer to "purpose or way of using language". Within the paradigm of Systemic Functional Linguistics, three language functions are distinguished: ideational, interpersonal and textual. Halliday calls them "metafunctions" to indicate that function is "an integral component within the overall theory" (Halliday 2004: 31). The ideational function is connected with the construal of "human experience": "It names things, thus construing them into categories" (Halliday 2004: 29). The interpersonal function involves "enacting our personal and social relationships with the other people around us" (2004: 29), while the textual function is concerned with "the construction of the text", with "organizing the discursive flow and creating cohesion and continuity" (Halliday 2004: 30).

The interpersonal function is realized in different ways, depending on the type of discourse. In talk-in-interaction it involves such issues as politeness and attention to the addressee's face, as well as issues connected with turn-giving and turn-taking, and eliciting information from the addressee (cf. Traugott 2014: 10). In monologic genres it is primarily concerned with the interaction of the writer's voice with other positions signalled in the context. Martin and White's (2005) appraisal framework is primarily concerned with the interpersonal function in written monologic texts, but it is also useful in the analysis of the functions of modal adverbs in more dialogic contexts. One of the categories it includes is engagement. This refers to the ways in which speakers position themselves towards "prior utterances, alternative viewpoints and anticipated responses" (Martin and White 2005: 97). Martin and White's (2005) framework builds on the dialogistic and heteroglossic view of language introduced by Bakhtin (1981 [1935]), and Vološinov (1929 [1995]). Within the appraisal framework modal meanings are analyzed in terms of the ways they engage with alternative voices. More specifically, they are "seen to provide speakers and writers with the means to present themselves as recognising, answering, ignoring, challenging, rejecting, fending off, anticipating or accommodating actual or potential interlocutors and the value positions they represent" (Martin and White 2005: 2).

White (2003), and Martin and White (2005) propose a taxonomy of the functionalities of heteroglossic engagement which classifies utterances into "dialogically expansive" and "dialogically contractive". A dialogically expansive utterance "makes allowances for dialogically alternative positions", while a dialogically contractive one "acts to challenge, fend off or restrict the scope of such" (Martin and White 2005: 102). Dialogically expansive utterances represent two modes: entertain (a discussed alternative is presented as one of many alternatives available), and attribute (the proposition is attributed to an external voice). Attribution may take the form of acknowledgement or distancing. Acknowledgements are neutral towards the proposition, while distancing utterances are used to decline responsibility for it. Dialogically contractive utterances are used to disclaim (deny or counter), or proclaim a dialogic position. While disclamation involves a rejection of a dialogic alternative, proclamation

consists in limiting its scope. The subcategories of proclamation include: concurrence (the speaker signals shared knowledge and agreement with the addressee), pronouncement (the speaker insists on a certain point or emphasises it), and endorsement (the speaker presents a position attributed to an external source as valid and correct). Endorsement shares some features with attribution, as both functionalities attribute the proposition to an external voice. However, while attribution involves a neutral or distancing attitude, endorsement involves taking (or sharing) responsibility for the proposition. In addition to the engagement categories presented in Martin and White (2005), White (2003: 274) also identifies the functionality of justification, which refers to utterances used to substantiate "non-'factual' propositions".

Some modal markers combine their interpersonal functions with textual ones (cf. Traugott 2010; Narrog 2014). In this work, textual functions performed by modal adverbs are identified with reference to the typology of adverbial functions proposed by Quirk *et al.* (1985). The authors identify four major grammatical functions of adverbials: adjunct, conjunct, subjunct, and disjunct. Adjuncts are structural elements of the clause; they are expressions of time, place, manner, etc. (e.g. *for two years, quickly*). Subjuncts and disjuncts are more detached from the rest of the sentence, and belong to the metatextual level of language, i.e. they comment on the content of the proposition. Disjuncts modify sentences, such as *obviously* in: "*Obviously,* nobody expected us to be here today" (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 622), while subjuncts usually modify sentence elements and their constituents, e.g. *plainly* in: "She *plainly* likes the dress" (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 584). Textual functions are in the domain of conjuncts and, less often, subjuncts. Conjuncts express relations between pieces of discourse. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 634-635) identify seven textual functions performed by this group of adverbs: listing, summative, appositive, resultive, inferential, contrastive, and transitional. The textual functions associated with subjuncts include restricting (e.g. *precisely*) and particularizing (e.g. *particularly*) the scope of an utterance. Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) taxonomy is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3, which presents an overview of approaches to modal adverbs.

As observed by Hasselgård (2010: 23), the distinction between subjuncts and disjuncts is rarely made in other grammars and studies of modal markers. Quirk *et al.* (1985) admit that in some cases it is not easy to make. However, I wish to argue that, if revised slightly, it can be useful in the discussion of the functions of modal adverbs. An attempt at a redefinition of the two terms is made in Chapter 11. Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) distinction is also useful from a cross-linguistic perspective, as it largely corresponds to the division of modal adverbs into metapredicative operators and particles employed in Polish studies (cf. e.g. Wajszczuk 2005; Grochowski *et al.* 2014).

This study is primarily qualitative in character. It makes reference to statistical data obtained from language corpora (cf. section 1.5), and looks at the frequencies of the analyzed adverbs and their collocations, but statistical analysis is not the major aim of the book. It is not corpus-based, but corpus-illustrated. It focuses on a systematic presentation of the types of epistemic adverbs in the two languages, and their functions. The list of adverbs used in the analysis was established on the basis of the lists of epistemic adverbs presented in reference grammars and earlier studies of modal adverbs in the two languages (discussed in Chapter 3), as well as on the basis of data obtained from the translation corpus *Paralela*. The typology proposed in this work is motivated both functionally and semantically. It builds primarily on the taxonomy used by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) in their study of English adverbs of certainty, and on the classification employed by Grochowski *et al.* (2014) in their study of Polish particles. Cross-linguistic studies usually take English as their point of departure, and pay more attention to English markers than their equivalents in other languages. The present study is similar in this respect. It also begins by examining the English adverbs within the identified sets, and then discusses the corresponding sets in Polish.

1.5. The material

This study draws analytic material from three language corpora. The English examples are taken from the British National Corpus (BNC at: http://bncweb.lancs.ac.uk/ – ca. 100 million words), while the Polish ones come from the National Corpus of Polish (NKJP at: http://www.nkjp.uni.lodz.

pl/index_adv.jsp – ca. 240 million words). It also uses a parallel corpus: *Paralela* (at: http://paralela.clarin-pl.eu/ - ca. 260 million words) to establish the translation equivalents of English adverbs in Polish. The three corpora are too large to allow a study of all the occurrences of the modal adverbs they contain. Such an analysis is only possible in the case of low-frequency adverbs. Therefore, this study limits itself to the analysis of the uses of the adverbs in selected contexts and samples of the corpora. If not indicated otherwise, the observations concerning the uses of modal adverbs in the two monolingual corpora are based on 200-item samples of the corpora. In the case of the parallel corpus, a 100-item sample was employed to identify the translation equivalents of the English adverbs. The study material was collected between June 2017 and March 2018. The procedure adopted in the analysis is discussed in detail in section 3.12.

The two monolingual corpora are similar in structure; they both contain samples of written language and speech representing different language genres (periodicals, academic and non-academic prose, conversation, parliamentary proceedings) and registers (formal, informal). The parallel corpus employed in this study is, however, of a very different character. *Paralela* is an open-ended corpus which contains English and Polish renderings of texts representing a variety of genres: prose, EU parliamentary proceedings, EU documents, popular science articles, film subtitles, most of which have been drawn from "large, publicly available multilingual text collections and open-source parallel corpora" (Pęzik 2016: 68). More specifically, it is composed of texts imported from the *JRC Acquis Communautaire*, *Open Subtitles*, *European Parliament Proceedings*, *EU Books* and *EMEA* corpora, European Commission Press Release database (RAPID), the Community Research and Development Information Service (CORDIS), the European Space Observatory website (ESO), popular science articles, and literary classics. It currently contains 262 million words in 10,877,000 translation segments (Pęzik 2016). In the case of EU documents it is often more appropriate to talk about English and Polish versions of the same texts than translations, as both languages are official languages of the EU. Moreover, texts in both languages are in some cases translations from other EU languages. In other sections of the corpus, such as film subtitles, English-Polish translations dominate over

Polish-English ones. The section comprising literary classics has not been taken into consideration in the analysis, as many of them are 19th-century works containing archaisms; only contemporary sources have been taken into account.

The usefulness of translation corpora in cross-linguistic analysis of epistemic adverbs has been demonstrated by Aijmer *et al.* (1996), Aijmer (2007b), Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2004), and Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007). Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) stress the advantages of using translation corpora in the study of modal meanings. They argue that "translations can contribute to providing a fine-grained picture of the multiple senses of words in the source language. By looking at correspondences in other languages one discovers subtle meaning distinctions which may go unnoticed if one considers monolingual data only" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 7). Dyvik (1998, 2004) proposed a model for the use of translation corpora specifically for semantic analysis. It is a model which focuses on "linguistically predictable translations", which is why it disregards "translational choices that can be motivated only by reference to the particular text and its circumstances" (Dyvik 1998: 52). As observed by Krzeszowski (1990a: 17), "translation equivalents are often semantically non-equivalent". This study, however, is not semantically-oriented; it is more interested in the pragmatic and textual meanings of the modal adverbs which are activated in different contexts. Translation corpora can be used to identify interpersonal and textual functions of modal adverbs, which are, generally, less well explored than their semantic properties. If a given modal adverb has non-modal translation equivalents which serve connective functions, e.g. conjunctions, it signals that the adverb performs textual functions.

Translation corpora also have their disadvantages, as some translations may be inaccurate. Therefore, the bilingual corpus and the monolingual corpora are used as complementary sources. Monolingual and bilingual dictionaries are additionally consulted to discuss the correspondences between English and Polish adverbs.

1.6. The problem of equivalence

Equivalence is an important concept in cross-linguistic analysis. In the case of modal markers, which are usually polysemous, a high degree of equivalence between individual items is not to be expected. As noted by Boye (2012: 8), "it cannot be taken for granted that a dubitative expression in one language means exactly the same as a dubitative expression in another language". The meanings of modal adverbs have been shown to be highly context-dependent (Nuyts 2001a; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007). As noted by Jaszczolt (2009: 94), they "do not have rigidly determined semantic functions". Their uses have also been demonstrated to be both language- and culture-specific (Wierzbicka 2006).

When discussing the problem of cross-linguistic correspondence between constructions in English and Polish, Krzeszowski (1990b) employs the concept of "prototypical" and "less prototypical" equivalents, and argues that the similarities and differences between corresponding items in two languages are a matter of degree and can be established using a gradient scale. Prototypical equivalents are those which show the greatest degree of similarity on semantic, pragmatic and syntactic levels. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) use the term "prototypical equivalents" to refer to those items which are most frequently used as translation equivalents of a given adverb in a translation corpus. The less frequent equivalents, as the researchers argue, illustrate "more context bound correspondences" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 8). This study is interested both in the prototypical and the less frequent context-bound equivalents, as both types provide insight into the meanings and functions of modal adverbs.

As observed by Krzeszowski (1984, 1990a), contrastive studies need *tertium comparationis*, i.e. "a common platform of reference" (1990a: 15), which can be used to identify differences between the languages studied. The *tertium comparationis* employed in this study involves, for the most part, functional and pragmatic equivalence. Functional equivalence, as it is understood in Nida's (2001) translation theory, emphasises the role of context in translation, the importance of culture and the effect the translated text has on its audience. When comparing words and expressions used in two languages, it is often difficult to separate different levels of lan-

guage. As noted by Jaszczolt (2011: 115), "contrastive analysis cannot be neatly divided into contrastive phonology, syntax, semantics, etc. The final description of a phenomenon which constitutes the object of contrast may have to be achieved through a complex process and by utilising an eclectic method (which amounts to there being no overall method): every level of analysis has its own methodological principles". Thus, while the primary focus of this book is on the interpersonal and textual functions of modal adverbs, their meanings, morphological and syntactic properties are also referred to.

1.7. Outline of the book

Chapter 2 provides an overview of selected approaches to modality in Anglophone and Polish linguistics. It discusses the types of modality, and focuses in more detail on the distinction between epistemic modality and evidentiality, as both notions are crucial in the analysis of modal adverbs. Then, it provides an overview of selected Polish studies on modality, and outlines the methodological and terminological differences between Anglophone and Polish research in the area. Finally, it briefly compares the types of modal markers used in English and Polish. Chapter 3 offers an overview of studies of English and Polish modal adverbs. It notes the different treatment of modal adverbs in English and Polish grammars. In Polish, the category of adverbs is understood narrowly, as modifiers of verbs (or, in some approaches, as modifiers of verbs, other adverbs and adjectives). Modal adverbs are thus excluded from the class, and categorised as particles or metapredicative operators. In addition to discussing the methodological and terminological differences between Anglophone and Polish studies, Chapter 3 examines the definitions, descriptions and typologies of modal adverbs postulated in other studies, and presents the classification of modal adverbs employed in this book. Chapters 4-10 discuss the categories of adverbs distinguished in Chapter 3: Chapter 4 offers an analysis of reportive adverbs; Chapter 5 focuses on inferential adverbs; Chapter 6 discusses confirmatory adverbs; Chapter 7 discusses argumentative adverbs; Chapter 8 focuses on epistemic emphasizers; Chapter 9 examines low confidence adverbs; Chapter 10 discusses English adverbs of necessity and their Polish counterparts. They all begin by looking at the

English adverbs in the group, then their Polish equivalents are discussed, and, finally, the two sets are compared. Chapter 11 offers a summary of the findings. It compares the inventories of English and Polish adverbs within the identified categories, and their functions. It also presents some problematic points of the classification employed, e.g. those connected with the multifunctionality of some adverbs. The book ends with suggestions for future research in the area of modal adverbs.

2. Defining modality. Research on modality in Anglophone and Polish linguistics

2.1. Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the notion of modality, and the ways it has been approached in Anglophone and Polish linguistics. In Anglophone linguistics modality has been the subject of increased enquiry since at least the late 1970s, when Kratzer's (1977) seminal article and Palmer's (1990 [1979]) first monograph on modality were published. Originally, researchers focused on modal auxiliaries (e.g. Palmer 1990 [1979]; Coates 1983), which is why the term *modal*, when used as a noun, tends to refer exclusively to modal verbs (cf. *Modality and the English Modals* (1990 [1979]) by Palmer). With time, scholarly interest gradually shifted towards modal adverbs, particles and adjectives (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007; Tarano 2008; Van linden 2012). More recent research brought interest in the use of modal adverbs as discourse markers (e.g. Aijmer 2013) – a development discussed within the framework of grammaticalization theory (e.g. Traugott 1995b). Their use as hedges has also been investigated with reference to the theory of politeness and the concept of face. The number of monographs and articles in the area of modality is impressive. The major approaches and tendencies in the study of modality are outlined, among others, by Palmer (2001 [1986]), Papafragou (2000), Frawley (2006), Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007), Portner (2009), Cornillie and Pietrandrea (2012), Narrog (2012), and Nuyts and van der Auwera (2016). Some of them will be referred to later in this work in the description of the problems pertaining to the study of modal adverbs.

In Polish linguistics increased interest in modality seems to have begun at a similar time. Early studies include an article by Bellert (1971) on a semantic perspective on propositional attitudes, Bogusławski's (1971, 1977) discussions of sentence modality and epistemic modality, Boniecka's (1976) overview of research problems in the study of modality, Bralczyk's (1978) study of lexical ways of expressing epistemic modality, Honowska's (1984) study of the epistemic marker *prawdopodobnie*, and Jędrzejko's (1987) monograph on the semantics and syntax of Polish deontic verbs. Polish research on modality has drawn considerably from Russian linguistics (e.g. Vinogradov 1975 [1950]; Panfilov 1977; Bulygina and Šmelev 1993, 1997; Majsak and Tatevosov 2000). Numerous studies concerning modal expressions have been conducted in the area of Polish-Bulgarian contrastive analysis, e.g. Koseska-Toszewa *et al.* (1996), and Korytkowska and Roszko (1997). However, while a substantial number of studies concerned with individual markers and selected issues in the area of modality have been written, the task of writing a comprehensive monograph devoted to modality and the ways it is expressed in Polish is still to be accomplished. Recent works in the field include Danielewiczowa's (2002) and Stępień's (2010) studies of epistemic verbs, and a number of studies devoted to other epistemic markers, in particular adverbs and particles (Bogusławski 2003; Tutak 2003; Wiemer 2006; Danielewiczowa 2008a, 2008b, 2012; Heliasz 2012; Żabowska 2013, 2014; Grochowski *et al.* 2014; Socka 2015; Wiemer and Socka 2017a, 2017b).

As noted in the introduction, contrastive accounts of modality in English and Polish largely focus on modal auxiliaries (e.g. Fisiak *et al.* 1978; Kakietek 1980; Willim and Mańczak-Wohlfeld 1997; Warchał 2010). The early studies (Fisiak *et al.* 1978; Kakietek 1980) were conducted within the framework of transformational generative grammar. Willim and Mańczak-Wohlfeld (1997) offer a practical approach to the uses of modal auxiliaries (and other elements of English and Polish grammar). Their account is primarily intended to help Polish students of English to practice English structures. Warchał (2010, 2015) compares the use of epistemic markers in English and Polish academic discourse. Selected modal adverbs have also been discussed in a contrastive perspective by Rozumko (2012a, 2012b, 2016a, 2016c). Rozumko (2015) compares the uses of *surely* and *for sure* in texts produced by native speakers and those written by Polish students of English, noting numerous cases of negative transfer resulting from the assumption that the usage of the two items is the same as that of their Polish equivalent *na pewno*.

Several studies have also been written contrasting selected Polish modal markers with their equivalents in other European languages. Rytel (1982) compared lexical ways of marking modality in Polish and Czech; Koseska-Toszewa *et al.* (1996) compared modality marking in Polish and Bulgarian; Ligara (1997) contrasted Polish modal verbs with their French equivalents; Roszko (1993) discussed modal markers in Polish and Lithuanian; Wiemer (2010) compared markers of hearsay across European languages, including Polish. Some analogies between Polish and English evidential adverbs have been signalled by Wiemer (2006), and Wiemer and Socka (2017a, 2017b), but these studies do not involve a systematic comparison.

2.2. Defining modality

There is a long tradition of discussing modality as a semantic-grammatical category (e.g. Palmer 1990 [1979], 2001 [1986]; Coates 1983). Within this perspective, modality can be defined as "the linguistic phenomenon whereby grammar allows one to say things about, or on the basis of, situations which need not be real" (Portner 2009: 1). In traditional accounts, modality is understood as a speaker-oriented category, concerned with the "issues of speaker/writer certainty, commitment and knowledge" (Martin and White 2005: 2). More recent studies, such as White (2003), Martin and White (2005), and Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) emphasize the importance of the interpersonal functions of modal markers. Some scholars now see modality as an inherently pragmatic notion (Verschueren 1999; Hoye 2005), and stress the importance of the context in shaping the meanings of modal markers (Klinge 1995; Nuyts 2001a; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007). Modal concepts have also been viewed from a wider perspective. Jaszczolt (2009) suggests that the concept of time is related to epistemic modality, as "temporality is underlyingly detachment from certainty" (Jaszczolt 2009: 165). The sections

which follow are concerned with the types of modality distinguished in Anglophone and Polish studies.

2.3. Types of modality distinguished in Anglophone studies

As noted by Narrog (2012: 8), "modality can be semantically differentiated *ad infinitum*, depending on the degree of semantic detail with which one analyzes it". Narrog (2012: 8-10) lists the following types: epistemic, deontic, teleological, preferential, boulomaic, participant-internal, circumstantial, existential, and evidential. Other researchers additionally list dynamic modality (Palmer 1990 [1979]; Portner 2009; Nuyts 2001a, 2006; Cornillie and Pietrandrea 2012), and alethic modality (e.g. Palmer 1990 [1979]; Papafragou 2000; Nuyts 2006; Portner 2009). Alternative typologies are discussed in Portner (2009). A discussion of the multitude of types of modality distinguished by various linguists is, however, beyond the scope of this book. A number of scholars (e.g. Nuyts 2006; Van linden 2012) have pointed out that three basic types of modality are usually distinguished in linguistic analysis: epistemic, deontic and dynamic. I will also focus on these three; reference to the other types will only be made if their properties intersect with epistemic, deontic, and dynamic modality. Since most English modal adverbs convey epistemic meanings (cf. Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 767; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007; Cornillie and Pietrandrea 2012), the distinction between epistemic and other types of modality seems central in this context. Evidentiality is not always classified as a modal notion (see Aikhenvald 2003, 2004, 2018), but it is also an important concept in the study of modal adverbs. The sections which follow define epistemic modality and discuss its relation to other types of modal meaning and evidentiality.

2.3.1. Epistemic modality and evidentiality

As suggested by the etymology of the term *epistemic*, which goes back to the Greek word ἐπιστήμη meaning 'knowledge', epistemic modality is concerned with knowledge, "typically that of the speaker" (Narrog 2012: 8). More specifically, it refers to "matters of knowledge or belief on which basis the speakers express their judgements about states of affairs, events or actions" (Hoye 1997: 42). Epistemic markers communicate the speak-

er's estimate concerning the likelihood that a given proposition is true, as illustrated in examples (1) and (2):

(1) John *may* be in his office.
(2) She has *probably* finished by now.

Epistemic modality has also been explained with reference to the concept of possible worlds (cf. Portner 2009: 20-24). Nuyts (2001a: 21) defines it as the speaker's assessment of the probability of a state of affairs in the possible world "which serves as the universe of interpretation for the evaluation process, and which, in the default case, is the real world". The speaker's knowledge has alternatively been referred to as the speaker's commitment to the truth value of the proposition. Reference to the speaker's commitment to the truth value of the proposition in defining epistemic modality can be found, among others, in Coates (1990) and Bybee *et al.* (1994). Lakoff (1973: 491) notes that in linguistic terms, truth is not an absolute notion; it is gradable. This is why some authors (e.g. Quirk *et al.* 1985) discuss epistemic adverbs in terms of the "degrees of truth" they express.

As a result of the association of epistemic modality with degrees – of certainty (e.g. Holmes 1982), or truth (e.g. Quirk *et al.* 1985) – epistemic meanings are often illustrated by means of a scale (epistemic scale). Nuyts (2001a: 22) links this approach with cognitive phenomena, i.e. the tendency displayed by humans to think in terms of a scale. Epistemic scales usually involve three levels of certainty: high, medium and low (e.g. Givón 1982: 41-45). Nuyts's (2001a: 21) scale also consists of three levels: "from certainty that the state of affairs applies, via a neutral or agnostic stance towards its occurrence, to certainty that it does not apply", but he stresses that "intermediary positions on the positive and the negative sides of the scale" (Nuyts 2001a: 21) are also possible. Boye (2012) also describes epistemic meanings as "covering a continuous quantitative scale" (Boye 2012: 21). His scale consists of full epistemic support (corresponding to the highest certainty), partial support (involving probability, likelihood, doubt, uncertainty), and neutral support (corresponding to epistemic possibility). While presentations of epistemic markers by means of a scale are common, they have also been observed to be problematic. Vold (2006: 227) notes that it is sometimes difficult "to draw the line between the un-

certainty and the certainty part of the scale". The difficulty can partly be attributed to the multifunctionality of modal markers, and particularly to their different interpersonal functions and their role in politeness. There are contexts in which they are not primarily used to express degrees of certainty, but to indicate the position of the speaker towards the address-ee.

While the association of epistemic modality with knowledge raises little doubt, there is no agreement as to the specific territory which the concept encompasses. On the one hand, Palmer (1990 [1979]: 50) states that epistemic modality "is most clearly distinct from the others and has the greatest degree of integral regularity and completeness" (see also Hoye 1997: 285, who expresses a similar opinion on the subject), a claim which finds support in the commonly made distinction between epistemic and non-epistemic modalities (cf. Hoye 1997: 44). On the other hand, defi-nitions of epistemic modality differ with respect to how they specify the spectrum of the notions and meanings the term covers.

Papafragou (2000: 4) writes about the whole conceptual family of epis-temic notions, which she also refers to as "speaker-oriented modalities" (cf. also Bybee and Pagliuca 1985). The family comprises alethic modal-ity, epistemic modality and evidentiality. Alethic modality is central to philosophical thought and logic. It refers to what is logically possible or necessary, as illustrated in example (3):

(3) It *must* be the case that two plus two equals four. (Papafragou 2000: 4)

Hoye (1997: 49) explains that both alethic and epistemic modalities "conform to rational laws of deduction and inference", but alethic modali-ty refers to what is logically possible or necessary while epistemic modality concerns what the speaker believes to be possible or necessary: "the one is a matter of logical arguments, the other an expression of human opinion" (Hoye 1997: 45). Since this work focuses on linguistic understandings of modality, alethic modality will not be referred to in the discussion.

Linguistic studies are usually concerned with the distinction between epistemic modality and evidentiality (cf. e.g. de Haan 1999; Cornillie 2009; Wiemer 2018). It is a distinction which Hoye (2005: 119) calls "the great divide". Evidentiality has been defined as a category which signals

that the speaker's knowledge comes from an external source or evidence (cf. Palmer 2001 [1986]: 8; Narrog 2012: 11). In the case of English, it usually means that some information has been reported to the speaker by other people, as illustrated in (4), or that the speaker has formed a conclu-sion on the basis of some perceptible evidence, as in (5).

(4) *Reportedly*, the problems do not concern our region.
(5) The house looks deserted. Its inhabitants *must* have left a long time ago.

Evidentiality has also been said to involve marking the source of infor-mation (Aikhenvald 2004, 2007). Recent studies in the field tend to define it as the "grammatical marking of information source" (Aikhenvald 2018: 2; Boye 2018: 261). Déchaine *et al.* (2017: 25) suggest that "all evidentials are presentational", i.e. "they present, but need not assert, *p*" (2017: 22). Some linguists consider evidentiality to be distinct from epistemic modal-ity (Lazard 2001; Aikhenvald 2004, 2018); others prefer to consider it as a component of epistemic modality (Willett 1988; Traugott 1989; Kärkkäin-en 2003; McCready and Ogata 2007), or vice versa, they see it as a category encompassing epistemic modality (Chafe 1986; Biber and Finegan 1989). Bybee and Fleischman (1995: 4), and Wiemer (2010) note that epistemic modality can also be understood as overlapping with evidentiality, while Matthewson (2011) argues that all evidential markers are in fact epistem-ic in character (an observation which, in Aikhenvald's (2018: 14) view, "bears an imprint of an English-language bias"). As summarized by Faller (2017: 57), "[a]ll possible relations between the two categories have been proposed in the literature." Those scholars who consider evidentiality to be distinct from epistemic modality also differ with respect to whether they consider it to be a modal notion – a position maintained, among oth-ers, by Palmer (e.g. 2001 [1986]) – or a non-modal one – a position held, among others, by Aikhenvald (e.g. 2004, 2018).

As Kronning (2003: 135) rightly observes, the way linguists describe the relationship between epistemic modality and evidentiality depends on how they define the two notions. The difference seems to be quite clear when evidentiality is defined as a linguistic category whose role is limit-ed to marking the source of information without signalling the speaker's assessment of the likelihood of the state of affairs it refers to. Such an ap-

proach has mostly been adopted by scholars who have studied evidentiality in non-European languages, such as Quechuan (spoken in Peru and Ecuador), Arawak (Peru), and Garrwa (Australia), where it is a grammatical category (cf. Faller 2002; Aikhenvald 2004; Nuckolls and Michael 2014). Aikhenvald argues that evidentials proper do not express certainty or possibility; they only signal the source of information, i.e. "the ways in which information is acquired by seeing, hearing, or in any other way" (Aikhenvald 2004: 4). As such, they are non-modal in character. As Faller (2002: 251) summarizes it, "non-modal evidentials focus on the type of evidence the speaker has, whereas epistemic modals focus on the reasoning process". Such non-modal evidentials, however, tend not to be used in most European languages.

Aikhenvald (2004), and Nuckolls and Michael (2014) claim that the tendency exhibited by many scholars to treat evidentiality as a type of modality results from the absence of grammatical means of marking evidentiality in most European languages. Aikhenvald writes: "Scholars tend to assume that evidentials are modals largely because of their absence in most major European languages, thus trying to explain an unusual category in terms of some other, more conventional, notion. There is simply no other place in a Standard Average European grammar where they could be assigned" (Aikhenvald 2004: 7). In a similar vein, Nuckolls and Michael (2014: 14) argue that "speakers of languages that lacked grammatical evidentials found it difficult to understand evidentials as anything other than a proxy for epistemic modality, which was a familiar category to them". Aikhenvald (2004) is of the opinion that languages such as English, which only have lexical means of indicating the source of information, do not have evidentiality. She refers to non-grammatical ways of marking the source of information as "evidential strategies".

As noted by Cornillie and Pietrandrea (2012), such an approach has the advantage of clarifying the field, but it also imposes considerable restrictions on the study of evidentiality. On the one hand, it makes the distinction between epistemic modality and evidentiality sharp and well-defined. On the other hand, it undermines the role of lexical markers of information source, and questions the validity of research into evidentiality marking in most European languages. Such a radical and restrictive

view of evidentiality has also been opposed by Diewald and Smirnova (2010a), who consider evidentiality and epistemic modality to be distinct notions, but their view of evidentiality is not limited to its grammatical realizations. They argue that instead of separating what is grammatical from what is lexical, it is more appropriate to talk about a grammatico-lexical continuum in the area of evidentiality. They observe that a number of forms used in European languages seem to show intermediate developments between lexical and grammatical ways of expressing evidentiality, such as *werden* and infinitive, and *scheinen* and *zu*-infinitive in German (Diewald and Smirnova 2010a: 5; see also Cornillie (2007) for data from Spanish). The existence of such forms suggests that they may be undergoing grammaticalization, which, as Diewald and Smirnova (2010a) suggest, should not exclude them from analysis.

A broad view of evidentiality has been proposed by Chafe (1986), who considers epistemic judgement to be one of the notions within evidentiality, understood as a category which comprises not only the source of knowledge, but also different types of speaker attitudes. Aikhenvald (2018: 4) argues that such an "all-embracing definition confuses evidentiality proper with related, but different notions and categories, creating an obstacle for its investigation as a distinct category and obfuscating its cross-linguistic status". In most Anglophone studies of epistemic modality and evidentiality, the two notions tend to be described as related and difficult to separate, "to the extent that some forms might be both epistemic and evidential" (Nuyts 2001a: 56-57). Generally speaking, the two notions are said to differ with respect to the source of certainty: in the case of epistemic modality it is the speaker's own "world of knowledge and beliefs" (Narrog 2012: 11), while in the case of evidentiality the sources of information are external to the speaker, and the statement's validity is assessed "on the basis of its evidential source" (Marín-Arrese 2009: 237). Both notions are, however, often associated with the speaker's subjective attitude to the content of the proposition, and the speaker's assessment of its truth value (e.g. Palmer 2001 [1986]; Kärkkäinen 2003; Marín-Arrese 2009). Papafragou even defines epistemic meaning with reference to the concept of evidence: "the possibility or necessity of an inference drawn from available evidence" (Papafragou 2000: 3).

A different approach to the relation between the two categories has been offered by Faller (2002: 9), who considers it to be a matter of distinguishing between encoded and implicated information: "a true evidential *encodes* a type of source of information, as opposed to (conversationally) *implicating* it. The same can be said for modals: a true modal encodes a degree of a speaker's commitment, and does not just implicate it. Thus, when investigating an element that conveys both meanings, it may well be that one of them is merely implicated". Faller's explanation echoes the observation made by Anderson (1986: 274), who claims that the indication of evidence is the primary meaning of evidentials, not "a pragmatic inference", thus suggesting the need to distinguish between the primary and inferred information. In fact, even Aikhenvald (2004), who argues for the need to separate non-modal evidentiality and epistemic modality, observes that some evidentials do acquire secondary epistemic meanings of reliability, probability or possibility. The problem is that, as Faller (2002: 9) puts it, "one's source of information for a proposition influences one's judgment of its truth". A similar observation has been made by Nuyts, who notes that evidentials indicate "the status or quality of the sources" (Nuyts 2001a: 35), and the type of evidence provided by the speaker – direct visual perception vs. less reliable hear-say evidence – influences the "outcome of his/her epistemic modal evaluation of a state of affairs, if (s)he makes one" (Nuyts 2001a: 27). Reliable evidence implies certainty, while less reliable implies uncertainty. As noted by Boye (2012), there is evidence both for the claim that the two notions are distinct as well as for the claim that they are related.

Attempts at separating evidentiality from epistemic modality have been made alongside attempts at identifying a superordinate category encompassing both notions (e.g. Palmer 2001 [1986]; Boye 2012; Hennemann 2013). Palmer (2001 [1986]: 8) considers epistemic modality and evidential modality to be the main types of propositional modality because they both have a proposition in their scope, and express the speaker's judgement of the proposition. For him, the two categories are modal. Boye (2012), in contrast, introduces a superordinate notion which he names "epistemicity", but he avoids the term modality. Epistemicity is equivalent to "the philosophers' notion of justificatory support" (Boye

2012: 3). It is a notional category, which can be used with reference to both grammatical and lexical units. Epistemicity comprises "epistemic support", which in Boye's terms corresponds to epistemic modality, and "epistemic justification", which corresponds to evidentiality. Epistemic justification refers to the source of information, evidence, and justification, while epistemic support refers to degrees of certainty and commitment. Epistemic justification is thus concerned with the force of knowledge, while epistemic support is concerned with its source.

The fact that epistemic modality and evidentiality are difficult to separate in most European languages does not mean that it is generally accepted that they should not be separated. Many of the scholars who argue that they are closely related also maintain that it is useful to separate them (cf. Nuyts 2001a; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007; Wiemer 2010, 2018). Diewald and Smirnova (2010a) see evidentiality as belonging to a "semantic-functional" domain, which can be applied both with reference to languages with grammatical and lexical evidentiality. A similar approach has been taken by Wiemer (2010: 60), who treats evidentiality as a conceptual rather than grammatical category. Interestingly, definitions of evidentiality proposed by scholars who view it as a notional category are in many cases very similar to the ones formulated by those researchers who consider it to be the domain of grammar. Wiemer (2010: 60) considers Aikhenvald's (2004: 1) definition of evidentiality formulated as "stating the existence of a source of evidence for some information; that includes stating that there is some evidence, and also specifying what type of evidence there is" to be applicable to his study of non-grammatical markers of information source in European languages. The position taken by Diewald and Smirnova (2010a), and Wiemer (2010, 2018) is also adopted in this book.

Both English and Polish adverbs which express evidential meanings have been demonstrated to also have an epistemic component in their semantics (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 31; Stępień 2010: 47). Therefore, I will use the term epistemic to refer to all the adverbs which are concerned with the speaker's knowledge, and, additionally, I will employ the term evidential to refer to those epistemic adverbs which signal that the speaker's knowledge is based on external sources of infor-

mation. The two notions, epistemic and evidential, will thus be treated as distinct, but capable of being combined in the semantics of some modal adverbs.

2.3.1.1. The notion of evidence and types of evidential meaning

The meaning of the term *evidence* in linguistic research is different from what it denotes in everyday language and legal discourse. It is not material, and it does not have to be empirically verifiable. It is equivalent to the source of information (cf. Nuyts 2001a: 35; Aikhenvald 2004: 4). In languages with grammatical evidentials, the source of information is stated explicitly, and its marking is often (though not always) obligatory (cf. Aikhenvald 2004). In languages which mark the source of information by non-grammatical means, such as English and Polish, it may be left unspecified (cf. Diewald and Smirnova 2010a: 1; Tutak 2003).

Aikhenvald (2018: 12) identifies six "semantic parameters in grammatical evidentiality", which largely correspond to what other studies term sources of information, types of evidence, or types of evidentials. They include:

- visual,
- non-visual sensory (hearing, smell, taste, less often touch),
- inference ("based on visible or tangible result"),
- assumption (based on logical reasoning and knowledge),
- reported (reported information with no indication of the reporting source),
- quotative (reported information with an overt indication of its source).

Similar distinctions have been made by other researchers. Plungian (2001: 352) introduces an additional distinction between two types of inference: synchronous (based on the signs the speaker can observe), and retrospective (based on the traces the speaker can observe). He also adds a type of evidence which he terms "endophoric", i.e. what the speaker feels (intentions, desires). Boye (2012: 20) additionally lists performative and participatory evidence. Some authors explain that reported information can be of different types: second-hand, third-hand, or hearsay (Willett 1988; Boye 2012); Plungian (2001: 352) adds tradition and common knowledge to this domain. The evidential parameters which are important

for the purposes of this study primarily include inference, assumption, and reported information, as these meanings are expressed by modal adverbs in English and Polish. Additionally, I will make reference to Plungian's (2001) distinction between synchronous and retrospective inference because it is relevant to the semantics of inferential adverbs in the two languages. In their analysis of inferred evidentials, some researchers also employ the notion of conjecture. Aikhenvald (2006: 324) treats conjecture as "an epistemic extension" of inferred evidentials, while Thornes (2018: 418) defines it as "a variety of inferential that does not require physical evidence". Conjectures involve a less close reliance on evidence and deduction than inferences, and a greater amount of epistemic judgement (cf. Rozumko, forthcoming). In the present study this notion is associated with such adverbs as *seemingly, apparently* (cf. Chapter 5), and *presumably* (cf. Chapter 9).

Even a cursory glance at the parameters enumerated by Aikhenvald (2018) enables the conclusion that evidential meanings represent very different types. The visual, non-visual sensory, reported and quotative may be said to belong to "*pure* evidentials" (Faller 2002: 270). They may acquire additional meanings, but they primarily signal the source of information. Inference and assumption are less "pure", as they both necessarily involve reasoning. Because of the reasoning component characteristic of inference and assumption, the two notions are also used in discussions of epistemic modality (cf. van der Auwera and Plungian 1998). Inference largely corresponds to what Palmer (2001 [1986]: 24) terms "deductive judgement" ("inference from observable evidence"), while assumption corresponds to what he terms "assumptive judgement" ("inference from what is generally known"). Faller (2002: 10) argues that in the case of inference, it is impossible to differentiate between reasoning as a way of acquiring information and the epistemic judgement concerning the truth value of the proposition. Squartini (2012: 2116-2117) makes a similar observation about assumption. In Faller's (2002: 7) view, direct types of evidence and reasoning form a continuum.

The different nature of the identified sources of information has led to the distinction between direct and indirect types (e.g. Willett 1988; Palmer 2001 [1986]; Plungian 2001; Faller 2002; Boye 2012), or "firsthand"

and "non-firsthand" (Aikhenvald 2004: 26), where firsthand evidence is sensory, while non-firsthand refers to inference and reported information (Willett 1988; Plungian 2001; Boye 2012). Aikhenvald (2018) and Nuckolls (2018) have, however, pointed out that such a binary distinction is "an imperfect heuristic for the study of evidential systems" (Nuckolls 2018: 202) as it is not applicable to all languages. In some systems the categories are more complex. In this study I will refer to specific types of evidential meaning without dividing them into direct and indirect.

Some researchers suggest that the different types of evidence have different strengths (with direct evidence being considered stronger than indirect), which can be presented by means of evidential scales. De Haan's (1998) scale starts with the visual, which is the strongest type, and ends with reportative, while non-visual and inferential evidence is located in the middle of the scale. De Haan (1998) assumes, by analogy to Horn scales (cf. Horn 1972), that the use of an evidential which is lower in a scale suggests that the evidence the speaker has is too weak to allow him/her to use a stronger evidential. Faller's (2002) idea of a scale is different. She argues that the strength of reportative and conjectural evidence (which in her terminology corresponds to inference) is roughly the same, but both are weaker than direct evidence. To avoid comparing the strengths of reportative and conjectural evidence, she proposes two scales, each based on different criteria. One scale, which Faller calls personal, "is ordered according to the amount of inference involved in arriving at a statement" (Faller 2002: 8), and involves the following levels: performative > visual > auditory > other sensory > inference from results > reasoning > assumption. The second scale, which Faller calls the "mediated evidence cline", "is ordered according to the number of intervening speakers" (Faller 2002: 8). It begins with direct evidence, followed by second-hand and third-hand, and ends with hearsay/folklore (Faller 2002: 8). As noted by Aikhenvald (2018: 6), the notion of strength does not apply to evidentiality understood as grammaticalized marking of information source. She argues that "just like there is no 'weaker' or 'stronger' tense, nor 'weaker' or 'stronger' gender", "there is no 'weaker' or 'stronger' evidentiality" (Aikhenvald 2018: 6).

The types of evidence (or sources of information) discussed in this section are important in the study of modal adverbs, as those adverbs which express evidential meanings (in addition to epistemic ones) refer to knowledge obtained from different sources. They will be used to categorise evidential adverbs into subgroups: reportive and inferential (see Chapters 4 and 5).

2.3.1.2. Epistemic modality, evidentiality and discourse

Research on epistemic modality and evidentiality tends to broaden its scope and increasingly focus on the pragmatic properties of modal markers and their discourse functions. Traditionally, epistemic markers were said to express the speaker's stance. More recent studies have brought the view that, as White (2003: 280) puts it, stances "operate interactively". Martin and White (2005: 1) observe that speakers and writers "adopt stances towards both the material they present and those with whom they communicate". Within this approach modality began to be viewed as a notion which creates space for mediation and negotiation of alternative opinions (Martin and Rose 2003). Such interactional perspectives on modality are connected with the view that language is essentially dialogic, as formulated by Vološinov (1995 [1929]), and Bakhtin (1981 [1935]). Speakers always refer to what has been said before, and anticipate the reactions of their potential audience. White (2003: 260) argues that "the textual voice acts first and foremost to acknowledge, to engage with or to align itself with respect to positions which are in some way alternatives to that being advanced by the text" (White 2003: 260). In a broader perspective, "language construes social roles and relationships" (White 2003: 259). White (2000, 2003), and Martin and White (2005) propose an approach in which modality is "a semantics by which the textual voice maps out its relationships with the various value positions brought into communicative play by the text" (White 2003: 280-281), and where "to modalize … is to construe the communicative context as heteroglossically diverse and to engage in different ways with that diversity" (White 2003: 280). Modal expressions have also been studied as discourse markers (Aijmer 2007b, 2009, 2013), indicating the nature of the relationship between the speaker and the hearer, and signalling connections between utterances.

Discourse functions performed by evidential markers have also been discussed in a number of studies (e.g. Fox 2001; Cornillie 2010; Cornillie and Pietrandrea 2012; Cornillie and Gras 2015; Sidnell 2012; Hanks 2012; Mushin 2012, 2013; Alonso-Almeida 2015; Marín-Arrese *et al.* 2017; Nuckolls 2018). It is now generally agreed that indicating the source of information is not the only reason why speakers use evidential markers. Mushin (2013) suggests that evidential markers are used to make "the status of one's knowledge 'visible' in discourse" (Mushin 2013: 628), rather than to merely signal the source of information. In some cases, she argues, they do not even necessarily indicate the actual source of information (Mushin 2013: 633). Their employment is often connected with sociolinguistic and sociocultural factors, such as responsibility for claims (cf. Wiemer and Socka 2017a, 2017b; Rozumko 2019), authority, and the right to claim knowledge (cf. Sidnell 2012; Hanks 2012; Rozumko 2019). In her analysis of the functions of reportative evidentials, Fox (2001) demonstrates that the speaker's decision whether or not to qualify a claim as reported depends on whom they are speaking to, i.e. the social relationship between the speaker and the addressee. She observes: "zero marking correlates with greater claims to authority, responsibility, and entitlement, while overt marking correlates with at least some distancing from, or denial of, such claims" (Fox 2001: 182). The term "evidential strategies" which Aikhenvald (2004) uses to refer to ways of marking the source of information in languages which do not have grammatical markers of evidentiality has been (re)interpreted as implying "steps taken on purpose with an aim in view" (Hanks 2012: 171). As observed by Hanks (2012: 171), "from the level of a strategy, evidentiality is only sometimes a linguistic problem". Speakers of languages which do not have obligatory markers of information source often have extralinguistic reasons for employing them. By using evidential markers, speakers may "challenge, undermine, counterchallenge, support, etc. one another's claims to authority, entitlement or responsibility" (Fox 2001: 185). Such a dialogic perspective, focusing on the interpersonal functions of epistemic and evidential markers is also adopted in this study.

2.3.2. Non-epistemic modality

Distinctions made within the area of non-epistemic modality are less relevant for the purposes of the present study, since non-epistemic categories are only marginally connected with modal adverbs, both in English and Polish. Therefore, they will be discussed very briefly here. The major types distinguished in the area of non-epistemic modality are deontic and dynamic modalities, which are sometimes collectively referred to as root modality (Hoye 1997: 44; Portner 2009: 138). Non-epistemic modalities are also termed "agent-oriented" (Coates 1995: 55), in contrast to epistemic modality, which is said to be essentially speaker-oriented. However, there is some disagreement in this area, as some researchers consider deontic modality to be speaker-oriented (though not unambiguously so, cf. Hoye 1997: 43), or both speaker- and agent-oriented (Nuyts 2001a: 25). The meanings associated with both deontic and dynamic modalities are outlined below.

2.3.2.1. Deontic modality

The notions associated with deontic modality include the necessity and possibility of "acts performed by morally responsible agents" (Papafragou 2000: 3) within, as Narrog (2012: 8) puts it, "the framework of a particular system of social rules". Nuyts (2001a: 25) adds that deontic modality involves "an evaluation of the moral acceptability, desirability or necessity of a state of affairs". More specifically, it is typically concerned with the notions of permission and obligation (Hoye 1997: 43; Nuyts 2001a: 25). Palmer (2001 [1986]: 9-10) notes that the sources of these are external to an individual. Nuyts (2001a: 25) argues that the inclusion of deontic modality in the category of agent-oriented modalities is problematic because deontic modality shows orientation towards both the speaker and the agent, as it is the speaker who gives permission or lays obligations even if they are directed at the agent. Hoye (1997: 43) associates deontic modality with subjectivity, but he also notes that the association is problematic, as the type of speaker involvement varies, and it is not always the speaker who gives permissions or lays obligations. While interpretations concerning the orientation of deontic modality towards the speaker or agent vary, there seems to be little doubt among linguists regarding the notions which

this type of modality is concerned with, i.e. a system of norms, permissions, obligations, and prohibitions, as illustrated in examples (6)-(8).

(6) You *may* come in now (permission);
(7) John *must* come in now (obligation);
(8) John *can't* come in now (prohibition).

2.3.2.2. Dynamic modality

Dynamic modality is usually said to encompass the notions of ability, capacity and willingness, i.e. the factors which are internal to an individual, as exemplified in (9) and (10).

 (9) John *can* speak French (ability);
(10) John *will* do it for you (willingness) (Palmer 2001 [1986]: 9-10).

As such, dynamic modality typically involves animate referents (Nuyts 2001a: 25). The inclusion of this type of modality within agent-oriented modalities raises little doubt. As Hoye (1997: 44) puts it, in the case of dynamic modality "the subject's ability or willingness is at issue, not the speaker's attitudes or opinions". The association of dynamic modality with willingness situates it close to boulomaic modality, which marks a proposition "as a necessity or possibility with respect to someone's volition or intentions" (Narrog 2012: 9). In some accounts, such as Perkins (1983), it is treated as a subcategory of dynamic modality. Portner (2009: 36-37), however, subsumes boulomaic (his preferred term is bouletic, cf. also Palmer 2001 [1986]: 12) modality together with deontic and teleological (goal-oriented) modality under a superordinate category of priority modalities. The three types correspond to three types of priority: desires, rules, and goals, which "serve to identify some possibility as better than, or as having higher priority than, others" (Portner 2009: 135). In Portner's interpretation boulomaic modality is connected with ability and desire, while dynamic modality is concerned with ability, opportunity, disposition, etc.

A distinction which cuts across the division into epistemic and non-epistemic modalities is that between intrinsic and extrinsic modality. Intrinsic modality involves human intervention and control, and covers such areas as permission, obligation, and volition. In general introduc-

tions to modality, such as Biber *et al.* (1999: 485), it tends to be treated as synonymous with deontic modality. Extrinsic modality is not connected with human intervention, and expresses the notions which are usually understood to be epistemic and dynamic, i.e. possibility, necessity and prediction (Hoye 1997: 44). Biber *et al.* (1999: 485) treat extrinsic modality as synonymous with epistemic.

2.4. Approaches to modality in Polish linguistics

Polish research shares many of the concerns found in Anglophone studies on modality, though emphasis has been given to different problems, and the research has been less extensive. Some of the differences in approach result from the influence of Russian linguistics on Polish studies, and the adoption of the methodology used in contrastive studies of Slavonic languages, developed to account for the modal categories identified in this group of languages (cf. e.g. Koseska-Toszewa *et al.* 1996). The major differences between Anglophone and Polish accounts of modality are outlined in sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3.

Most Polish sources define modality as the speaker's attitude towards the content of the proposition (Rytel 1982: 8), but the specific accounts differ in the ways they understand the expression of modal meanings. As noted by Łapa (2003: 9), older works, such as Milewski (1969), present modality as involving two components: the text and reality. In such approaches modality is defined as the truth relation between the text and reality. Bartmiński and Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (2012: 170) refer to this type of modality as logical, objectivist, and impersonal. More recent approaches see modality as a subjective notion, and define it as a phenomenon involving a relation between three (speaker, text, and reality) or four (speaker, text, reality, and addressee) elements. In the three-component perspective modality is concerned with the speaker's assessment of the truth relation between the text and the real world (Łapa 2003: 10; Bartmiński and Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2012: 172). As Bartmiński and Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (2012: 170) put it, the speaker relates the content of the proposition to the real world. Boniecka (1999: 11) is one of the linguists who identify four elements in the frame within which modality operates: the propositional content, reality, speaker and addressee,

and defines modality as a verbalized mental act intended by the speaker to fulfill a specific communicative aim in his/her relation with the addressee. The recognition of the role of the addressee situates this perspective within interactional views of modality.

Another distinction made in the field is that between obligatory and optional modality (e.g. Krzyżyk 2008; Grzegorczykowa 2010). Obligatory modality is concerned with grammar, and corresponds to the category of mood (declarative, imperative, interrogative, and exclamative). Krzyżyk (2008: 35) notes that this type of modality is also referred to as syntactic, objective, and basic. Its obligatory nature results from the requirements of Polish grammar, i.e. obligatory mood marking on verbs. In semantic terms, obligatory modality has also been referred to as intentional (Grzegorczykowa 2010: 147), as it reflects the speaker's intention for an utterance to function as an assertion (declarative mood), directive (imperative mood), question (interrogative mood) or an expression of his/her mental and emotional state (exclamative mood). Optional modality is concerned with the expression of the speaker's stance, and the presentation of the state of affairs as intended, desired, possible or necessary (Krzyżyk 2008).

Grzegorczykowa (2010: 149) distinguishes two types of optional modality: epistemic and deontic. Epistemic modality refers to the truth value of a proposition (Grzegorczykowa 2010: 149) or, as Rytel (1982: 14) puts it, to the world of personal judgements of the speaker. Deontic modality refers to the world of norms: obligations, permissions, prohibitions. The speaker may lay obligations on the addressee, and give permissions or, alternatively, communicate obligations, orders, or permissions issued by someone else (Rytel 1982: 14). Some authors, e.g. Rytel (1982), and Krzyżyk (2008), include alethic modality in this group. In Rytel's (1982: 14) account alethic modality expresses objective necessity or possibility, without signalling the speaker's attitude. The absence of subjective evaluation in alethic modality results in its exclusion from linguistic types of modality by some authors, e.g. Grzegorczykowa (2010). The types of modality which are usually discussed in Polish linguistics are thus deontic, epistemic, and, in the case of some linguists, alethic (cf. also Rytel 1982; Birecka 2005). Dynamic modality tends not to be distinguished as a distinct type; an exception is Hansen (1998), whose work draws from Anglo-

phone and German research on modality. Some studies add a fourth type: imperceptive modality (Pol. *modalność imperceptywna*) (Roszko 1993; Koseska-Toszewa *et al*. 1996; Korytkowska and Roszko 1997), which partly overlaps with evidentiality. Accounts of epistemic and imperceptive modality will be discussed in more detail in sections 2.4.1. and 2.4.2, as they are relevant to the study of modal adverbs.

2.4.1. Epistemic modality

Epistemic modality has been defined as a category expressing the speaker's assessment of the degree of probability of the state of affairs (e.g. Grzegorczykowa 1975: 119), which is why Polish epistemic markers, like their English equivalents, have often been grouped according to the degree of certainty which they express. A tripartite scale comprising high, medium, and low levels of certainty was proposed by Bralczyk (1978). It was followed in a number of later studies, such as Rytel (1982), and Krzyżyk (2008). Recently, a number of linguists have raised some objections towards the tendency to discuss epistemic markers in terms of degrees of certainty (e.g. Tutak 2003; Danielewiczowa 2008a, 2008b, 2012). Tutak (2003: 65) argues that such a model of description can be treated as a theoretical postulate rather than a reflection of the actual semantic properties of epistemic expressions because their meanings form a continuum; they do not form any well-defined levels of certainty. Danielewiczowa (2008a, 2008b, 2012) criticizes such treatments for their reliance on intuition, which in her view, situates scale-based approaches close to lay perspectives. Most of the current research focuses on establishing the semantic properties of individual markers and groups of markers (for an overview see Danielewiczowa 2012, and Grochowski *et al*. 2014), rather than locating them at specific positions of the epistemic scale.

An alternative approach, taken, among others, by Tutak (2003), draws from Kiseleva and Pajar's (1998) analysis of discourse markers in Russian. It relies on the category of *gwarant* (Eng. 'guarantee'/'guarantor'/'warrant'), introduced by Culioli (1995). Kiseleva and Pajar (1998) define 'guarantor' as someone who takes responsibility for the truth value of a statement. Propositions may have an internal guarantor, i.e. the speaker, or an external one, i.e. the addressee or an external source of information. The speaker 'guarantees' the truth value of a judgement, and takes respon-

sibility for it when s/he is convinced of its truthfulness, and abstains from the responsibility when s/he doubts its truth value. The speaker may also attempt to transfer responsibility onto an external guarantor, such as the addressee, by asking him/her for confirmation, or, in the case of reported information, onto the person who has reported the information to 'the primary speaker' (Tutak 2003: 80).

2.4.2. Imperceptive modality

Discussions concerning the relation between epistemic modality and evidentiality, which form a considerable part of Anglophone research on modality, are largely absent from Polish linguistics. More opinions have been voiced regarding the inclusion (or more recently: exclusion) of emotional attitudes in the field of modality (cf. Tutak 2003: 64; Grzegorczykowa 2010: 145). Evidential meanings tend to be subsumed under the label epistemic modality, which is noticeable in definitions of epistemic modality offered by some linguists. Krzyżyk (2008: 36), for instance, defines it as the expression of the speaker's subjective or objectivized judgements and convictions. Likewise, Grzegorczykowa (2010: 156) writes that epistemic modality refers to different levels of conviction, based on different sources of information. The area of objectivized judgements and judgements based on different sources of information corresponds to the notions which are usually associated with evidentiality.

Polish linguists use two additional categories to distinguish between different sources of information: the witness category (Pol. *kategoria świadka*), i.e. someone who has direct access to evidence, and the non-witness category (Pol. *tryb nieświadka*), i.e. someone who does not have direct access to evidence (Roszko 1993; Danielewiczowa 2012: 9). In Slavonic linguistics (e.g. Bulgarian, Macedonian) a separate modal category is identified to refer to markers which indicate that the speaker's information is based on reported evidence – imperceptive modality (Pol. *modalność imperceptywna*) (Roszko 1993; Koseska-Toszewa *et al.* 1996; Korytkowska and Roszko 1997). This category has mainly been used in contrastive studies of Polish and other Slavonic languages, in particular Bulgarian (Korytkowska and Roszko 1997), and, less often, Lithuanian (Roszko 1993). Roszko (1993: 18) explains that markers of imperceptive modality signal that the speaker refers to hearsay and reported informa-

tion, and is not entirely certain that it is true, which is why s/he refrains from taking responsibility for the truth value of the proposition. Tutak (2003: 94-95) argues that the main function of imperceptive markers is to stress that the source of information is external to the speaker, rather than that the speaker is not convinced of its reliability. She interprets their use as a strategy to avoid responsibility for a claim rather than a way of assessing its likelihood. Because of its association with an external source of information rather than the speaker's own judgement, imperceptive modality can be considered as overlapping with evidentiality. The overlap concerns reportive (or hearsay) markers, such as Pol. *rzekomo* 'allegedly'.

2.4.3. Modality, metatext, and metadiscourse

While much of the Anglophone research into modal markers focuses on their functions in discourse, current Polish linguistics discusses them as elements of the metatext. The adoption of the category of metatext rather than the category of discourse as a point of departure for the study of modal markers has its roots in the Polish linguistic tradition. In Anglo-American linguistics discourse analysis goes back to the 1950s (e.g. Harris 1952), and has since then become a well-established field of linguistic research. In Polish linguistics discourse analysis is a relatively new field (cf. Witosz 2012). Of the three major trends in European discourse analysis identified by Angermüller (2013), i.e. "French formalism", "German hermeneutics" and "Anglo-Saxon pragmatism", Polish seems to have been most influenced by the French trend (cf. Labocha 1996; Tutak 2003), which "gives priority to the written text and to large groups of texts; their underlying rules of construction … and analytical models" (Angermüller 2013: 10). Polish linguistics is more form-oriented than Anglo-American research, and less concerned with functional and pragmatic properties of linguistic items. It focuses on text rather than on discourse. However, the treatment of the two terms in Anglo-American and Polish linguistics needs some clarification.

Discourse is defined in various ways in Anglo-American linguistics. As summarized by Barron and Schneider (2014: 1-2), in its narrow sense discourse refers to spoken language, while text is a unit of written language. In a broader perspective, "discourse refers to the totality of a social interaction, and text, by contrast, only to its linguistic components"

(Barron and Schneider 2014: 2). However, Barron and Schneider (2014: 2) also note that the two terms – text and discourse – are often used interchangeably. In Polish linguistics discourse (Pol. *dyskurs*) was traditionally defined as an argumentative text on a serious topic (Grzegorczykowa 2007: 41). This traditional understanding of the term can still be found in dictionaries of Polish (e.g. *ISJP*), and dictionaries of literary terms (e.g. Głowiński 1988). Even today, it is usually used to refer to specialist varieties of language, such as legal discourse (Pol. *dyskurs prawniczy*) and academic discourse (Pol. *dyskurs akademicki*).

The understanding of *dyskurs* as a communicational event has its origins in the interest of Polish linguists in Anglo-American research in the field (cf. Grzegorczykowa 2007: 41). Anglo-American studies on discourse have been presented to the Polish audience by Duszak (1998), and Duszak and Kowalski (2013). Duszak (1998) sees discourse studies as a natural extension of text linguistics. She defines discourse as an act of communication in its entirety, involving both its textual level and extralinguistic factors (its participants and the situational context). Labocha (1996) stresses the significance of the situation in which the speech event takes place as well as the intentions of both the speaker and the addressee, and their aims. The importance of the relation between the speaker and the addressee in the process of constructing and shaping discourse has also been noted by Grabias (1994: 231). Despite a considerable increase of interest in discourse studies in Polish linguistics, some degree of scepticism towards it can be noticed in some works. For instance, Tutak (2003: 38) suggests that the category is overused in Anglophone linguistics. In a similar vein, Boniecka (1998) argues that the notion of text is sufficient to discuss the problems of linguistic communication.

Polish studies of the notion of *metatext* go back to Wierzbicka (1971), who argued (in one of her early papers published in Polish) that texts are composed of two levels: the textual level and the metatextual one. She observed that metatextual expressions show relations between different parts of the text, and indicate the speaker's attitude towards his/her own words. Tutak (2003: 49) argues that expressions of a metatextual character also involve the addressee in the (re)construction of the text. The understanding of the metatext as a system which influences text interpretation,

such as the one represented by Tutak (2003), has become quite common in Polish linguistics (cf. Piekarczyk 2015: 17). This change of perspective on text has brought the study of metatext closer to discourse studies. Still, however, the pragmatic aspects of texts are given less attention in Polish linguistics than in Anglophone studies. They tend to be treated as less important than semantic and syntactic description.

The term *metatext* has been created in analogy to the term *metalanguage* to describe the level of text which is used to refer to the text itself (Piekarczyk 2015: 15). In simple terms, *metalanguage* is used to discuss language, i.e. linguistic signs, names of things, rather than the things themselves, while *metatext* is used to comment on a text while producing it (Bartmiński and Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2012: 190). Metatext is thus created simultaneously with the text on which it comments (Piekarczyk 2015: 24). It serves as a tool for the speaker/writer to comment on his/her own communicative behaviour.

The notion of *metatext* can be compared to the notion of *metadiscourse,* a term used by Ädel (2014: 104) to refer to "discourse about discourse". In Ädel's (2010, 2014) account metatext is one of the types of metadiscourse, the other one being audience interaction. Metatext is oriented towards the code/discourse itself, and represents the textual type of metadiscourse, while audience interaction is interpersonal and oriented towards the addressee(s). The elements of metadiscourse, as identified by Ädel (2014: 104), comprise the following:

> stance markers (*unfortunately; I agree; surprisingly*), expressions of certainty (*definitely; it is clear that*) and doubt (*might; perhaps; possible*), connectives *(but; thus; and*), self mention (*I*), 'engagement markers'/'commentary' (*consider; note that; dear reader*), references to other texts (*according to NAME; (NAME, 1990)*)), as well as clearly reflexive categories (*What I want you to remember is...),* 'illocution markers' (*to conclude; briefly stated*), 'code glosses' (*namely; in other words*), 'sequencers' (*firstly; secondly*), 'announcers' (*as we shall see in Chapter 5*), and 'reminders' (*as noted above*).

Thus, Ädel's notion of metadiscourse corresponds to the notion of metatext, as it is defined in Polish linguistics.

58   *MODAL ADVERBS IN ENGLISH AND POLISH. A FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVE*

2. Defining modality. Research on modality in Anglophone and Polish linguistics   59

2.5. Grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification in research on modality

In Anglophone research the development of modal meanings and discourse functions has been explained with reference to the grammaticalization framework (e.g. Traugott 1995b, 2006, 2014; Traugott and Dasher 2002; Brinton 2008). Grammaticalization is "the process whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions and, once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions" (Hopper and Traugott 1993: xv). A classic example of grammaticalization is the development of modal auxiliaries from lexical verbs. The parameters used to identify cases of grammaticalization have been described differently by different authors. Those used by Traugott (e.g. 1995b) will be referred to later in this section. For a comparison of the criteria used by Lehmann (1982 [1995]), Traugott (1995b), and Tabor and Traugott (1998), see Lewis (2011). Boye and Harder (2013) identify three paths of grammaticalization which provide a brief introduction to the processes it involves: (1) a development of a lexical morpheme into a grammatical morpheme; (2) a development of a lexical item into a bound morpheme; (3) a development of new pragmatic properties by a lexical item. The last path is most closely connected with the development of modal adverbs. The change is typically presented as unidirectional, though some exceptions to unidirectionality have also been noted, e.g. the development of *maybe* from the verbs *may* and *be*. Such cases have been referred to as lexicalization, i.e. the development of a grammatical item into a lexical one (Ramat and Ricca 1998: 297; Traugott 2006: 122).

The developmental path of epistemic adverbs has been studied by Traugott, on the basis of the diachronic changes identified for items such as *indeed, in fact, actually* (Traugott 1995b), and *surely* and *no doubt* (Traugott 2014). In Traugott's (1995b: 1) view, the process involves the following stages: adverbial > sentence adverbial > discourse particle. When adverbials develop epistemic senses they become partly procedural, i.e. "they are abstract, schematic expressions that cue how the Speaker conceptualizes relationships within the clause and between clauses, and how the Addressee is to interpret the clause" (Traugott 2014: 19). The changes which can be observed in the process include those which are attested in

the development of grammatical markers, i.e. "decategorialization, phonological reduction, and generalization" as well as pragmatic strengthening and subjectification, i.e. the characteristics which, as Traugott argues, "should be considered salient to grammaticalization" (Traugott 1995b: 1). Traugott (2014: 20) writes that "from a functional perspective on grammaticalization, epistemic linkers are highly procedural grammatical markers". When epistemic adverbs become discourse particles they become more procedural, while at the same time retaining some modal properties (Traugott 2014: 19). Cornillie and Pietrandrea (2012: 2112) discuss epistemic and post-epistemic meanings of modal adverbs. In post-epistemic uses they function as discourse markers, which link elements of discourse and influence its interpretation.

It has been suggested that grammaticalization theory does not provide a sufficient framework to explain the development of discourse markers and modal particles. Erman and Kotsinas (1993), Aijmer (1997), and Beeching (2012) argue that the emergence of discourse markers should be discussed within the framework of pragmaticalization. Erman and Kotsinas (1993) explain that the two processes differ with respect to the functions of the items which they shape: grammaticalization produces grammatical markers, while pragmaticalization produces discourse markers. In a similar vein, Dostie (2004: 27) notes that pragmaticalization gives rise to conversational roles, not grammatical ones. Beeching (2012: 15) presents several arguments against considering grammaticalization to be responsible for the emergence of discourse markers: "they are not phonetically reduced or fused, they do not undergo a categorial change and they are syntactically unconstrained, relatively speaking". Traugott and Dasher (2002: 158-159) argue, however, that discourse markers are "indubitably 'part of the grammar' or part of the structure of the sentence (i.e. they are not extra-grammatical)" even though they "carry scope over more than the sentence" and are primarily pragmatic in meaning and function, and therefore the grammaticalization framework is sufficient to explain their development. In Traugott's (2014) view the suggestions that pragmatic (or discourse) markers develop as a result of pragmaticalization rather than grammaticalization results from a different understanding of the nature of grammaticalization. She writes:

60   *MODAL ADVERBS IN ENGLISH AND POLISH. A FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVE*

2. Defining modality. Research on modality in Anglophone and Polish linguistics   61

Those who argue that the development of discourse markers is a case of grammaticalization assume that grammaticalization is primarily a functional change, i.e. about meaning and about the role of grammatical markers. Those who argue that the development of discourse markers is a case of pragmaticalization, not grammaticalization, assume that grammaticalization is a formal change, in which reduction and increase in dependency are defining characteristics. (Traugott 2014: 19)

Lewis (2011: 440) summarizes her study of the development of discourse functions by *instead* and *rather* with the observation that "[t]he changes observed in these markers do not support a 'pragmaticalization' process distinct from grammaticalization." Traugott (2014: 20) offers a third way of viewing the relation between grammaticalization and pragmaticalization. She writes that while pragmaticalization is not a separate process, it may be treated as "a subclass of grammaticalization the members of which have primarily pragmatic meaning" (Traugott 2014: 20; see also Prévost 2011). A similar view has been proposed by Diewald (2006, 2011), who also considers pragmaticalization to be a type of grammaticalization, and suggests that the pragmatic functions of discourse markers can in fact be considered to be their grammatical functions.

The development of modal adverbs has also been discussed in the context of (inter)subjectification. The relation between grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification is a matter of some dispute (see Narrog 2015 for a summary). Traugott (2010: 38) observes that while "there is a strong correlation between grammaticalization and subjectification", the correlation between grammaticalization and intersubjectification is less strong. As noted by Narrog (2015: 151), (inter)subjectification is not only found in the area of grammar, but also in the lexicon. Thus, (inter)subjectification does not have to entail grammaticalization. Traugott and Dasher (2002: 225) summarize the changes involved in the process of (inter)subjectification using the following cline: "non-/less subjective > subjective > intersubjective" (cf. also Traugott 2010: 35). Subjectification, as defined by Traugott (2014: 9), "is a process of change giving rise to expressions of the Speaker's beliefs, and stance toward what is said", while intersubjectification is "the development of markers that encode the Speaker's (or Writer's) attention to the cognitive stances and social identities of the Addressee" (Traugott 2014: 9). In a historical perspective, subjectification

"involves shifts from less to more subjectively construed obligation, epistemic attitude, etc." (Traugott 2006: 115). In the case of epistemic adverbs, it refers to the shift from concrete referential meaning to modal: "probably 'in a provable manner' > 'presumably'" (Traugott 2006: 115). Traugott (2010: 35) observes that some items are pragmatically (inter)subjective, i.e. their (inter)subjective character results from contextual factors, while others have coded (inter)subjective meanings which do not depend on the context. (Inter)subjectification proper involves the development of newly coded (inter)subjective meanings, and not pragmatic ones. Traugott (2010: 34) has also proposed an (inter)subjectivity cline which can be used to organize synchronic data: "non-/less subjective – subjective – intersubjective". It is based on the diachronic (inter)subjectification cline presented by Traugott and Dasher (2002).

The process of (inter)subjectification as well as the notions of subjectivity, intersubjectivity and objectivity have been discussed by a number of researchers. Scholarly interest in the concepts of subjectivity and objectivity in language has a long tradition. Early studies include Bréal (1897), Bally (1965 [1932]), Benveniste (1966), Halliday (1970), and Lyons (1977). More recent accounts can be found in Langacker (1991, 2002), Finegan (1995), Hoye (1997), Nuyts (2001a, 2001b, 2014), Verstraete (2001), Traugott and Dasher (2002), Traugott (1995a, 2003, 2010), De Smet and Verstraete (2006), Facchinetti (2009), Portner (2009), Narrog (2012), and many others. Generally speaking, the distinction between subjectivity and objectivity can be said to correspond to the distinction between "speaker-related and content-related function" (Verstraete 2001: 1506). However, scholars differ substantially in the ways they define subjectivity. As noted by Nuyts (2014: 53), "[s]everal 'versions' of it are circulating in the literature", and those versions do not refer to exactly the same phenomena (cf. also Nuyts 2015). In the area of functionally-oriented research, Traugott's views of subjectivity and (inter)subjectification formulated within the grammaticalization framework are usually contrasted with those formulated by Langacker (1991, 2002) within the framework of cognitive linguistics. Traugott views (inter)subjectification as a diachronic process of the development of inherently subjective and intersubjective meanings. Langacker's notion of subjectivity is concerned with the explic-

it presence of the speaker in an utterance. As summarized by Nuyts (2015: 107), "the more explicit the speaker, the more subjectively construed is the event referred to". The present study adopts Traugott's perspective.

A number of linguists have suggested that subjectification has become an umbrella term for such a wide range of developments that there is a need for fine-grained distinctions in the field (Breban 2006; Visconti 2013; Narrog 2014). Visconti notes that its heterogeneity "risks 'diluting' the definition, making it hard to identify precise criteria for distinguishing subjective vs non- (or less) subjective expressions" (Visconti 2013: 9). Generally speaking, the scholars argue for the need to give separate recognition to "the development of 'text-creating' meanings" (Breban 2006: 246). Visconti suggests that "cases of 'lexical' subjectification, concerning shifts from concrete to internal evaluative but still propositional meanings", and "cases of 'textual' subjectification, concerning the development of devices coding cohesion" can be separated and "conferred a different status" (Visconti 2013: 8). The recent revisions of the understanding of subjectification have led Narrog (2014) to argue that the process of grammaticalization does not always end with the intersubjective stage, as presented, among others, in Traugott and Dasher (2002), and Traugott (2010). He notes that "in the modal domain there are shifts from the intersubjective further to the textual, which is the end stage of change" (Narrog 2014: 48). In his study, Narrog (2014) focuses on concessive uses of *may*, which combine (inter)subjective functions with textual ones, as in the sentences quoted in (11) and (12).

(11) We *may* have our differences from time to time, but basically we trust one another's judgement. (Narrog 2014: 37, excerpted from Quirk *et al.* 1985: 224)
(12) Improbable though it *may* seem, they won. (Narrog 2014: 36, excerpted from the ICE Australia corpus)

In (11) and (12), *may* performs a primarily connective function; its epistemic sense is, as argued by Narrog (2014: 37), "weakened, or backgrounded in favour of a concessive function, relating two propositions to each other". Traugott (2010: 31) observes that such functional duality is common among connective markers. As demonstrated in Chapters 4-10, modal adverbs also combine intersubjective functions with textual ones.

2.6. The grammaticalization framework in Polish linguistics

While in Anglophone linguistics the grammaticalization framework has been widely used to explain the rise of new grammatical and pragmatic functions of linguistic items, in Polish linguistics its application has so far been rather limited. As Hansen and Drobnjaković (2010: 37) observe, "grammaticalization theory has not yet made its way into Polish linguistics". The few studies which have applied the grammaticalization framework to the study of Polish markers of modality include Hansen (2009), and Hansen and Drobnjaković (2010), both focusing on modal verbs, and Kokorniak and Fabiszak (2014), discussing the prefixes of Polish mental predicates (all published in English). The lack of interest in the grammaticalization framework can probably be linked to the tendency, observed in much of the current Polish research on modal markers (e.g. Danielewiczowa 2012; Heliasz 2012; Grochowski *et al.* 2014), to separate synchronic research from diachronic investigations, and to focus on text rather than on discourse processes. As noted by Nuyts (2001a: 15), increased research in the field of grammaticalization is connected with a change from treating grammar as a fixed and stable construct to perceiving it as a dynamic, constantly changing entity. This change has not yet taken place in Polish linguistics, certainly not in the area of research concerning modal markers.

As far as Polish studies in semantic change are concerned, Buttler (1978) remains the most comprehensive monograph. She discusses, among other things, the development of modal (and non-modal) particles from content words, such as adverbs and nouns. The examples she discusses include *chyba* 'surely/I think', which was originally a noun meaning 'a failure, loss, mistake'. Buttler (1978: 175) notes that the change from a content word to a particle involves the loss of the word's morphological transparency and semantic motivation. She does not use the term grammaticalization to refer to the processes described, but her observations largely overlap with Traugott's (1989, 1995b, 2014) findings concerning the development of discourse markers and epistemic meanings (cf. also Stępień 2010: 8). The development of metatextual functions by Polish adverbs has also been noted by Danielewiczowa (2012), but she does not

discuss the processes involved, and largely focuses on their use in present-day Polish.

2.7. Subjectivity, objectivity, and intersubjectivity in the study of modal markers

Most studies on modality make some reference to subjectivity and objectivity, but the way this relation is understood depends both on how modality and its types are defined, and what is meant by subjectivity and objectivity (for an overview of the approaches see, e.g. Narrog 2012). Since modality was traditionally said to first of all express the speaker's perspective, it was usually associated with subjectivity. For Palmer (2001 [1986]), subjectivity is an essential characteristic of modality because it is "the grammaticalization of speaker's (subjective) attitudes and opinions" (Palmer 2001 [1986]: 16). A similar view has been expressed by Grzegorczykowa (2010: 145).

However, a number of scholars have argued that modal expressions can be used both subjectively and objectively, e.g. Lyons (1977), and Coates (1983). In some accounts the subjective or objective reading of an expression is said to depend on the context (e.g. Coates 1983; Narrog 2005, 2012). Subjectivity has also been said to have a scalar character (Coates 1983), some expressions being more subjective than others. Traugott and Dasher (2002: 21) argue that the specific choices from the objective/subjective continuum which speakers make depend on their social role and authority (cf. also Macaulay 1995). Generally, they link objective language with authority (at least in the Euro-American tradition), and subjective language with the lack of authority or dissociation from it.

The three major types of modality – epistemic, deontic and dynamic – have all been defined with reference to the notions of subjectivity and objectivity. Most scholars agree that in the case of epistemic modality, subjectivity can be considered to be its defining characteristic (Halliday 1970; Hoye 1997). Hoye (1997: 43), for instance, argues that subjectivity is "an essential feature of epistemic modality since the speaker is expressing judgements in accordance with his own (subjective) set of beliefs". Since objective information is independent of the speaker's intentions or judgements, and epistemic modality always involves the speaker as the

"filter" of information, the state of affairs described by him/her necessarily depends on his/her perception, knowledge and intentions. Verstraete's (2001) analysis also shows the association of epistemic modality with subjectivity. A number of linguists, however, argue that markers of epistemic modality can have both subjective and objective meanings (e.g. Lyons 1977; Coates 1983), the difference being that objectivity is associated with logical inference and logical statements, while subjectivity is associated with the speaker's judgement (cf. Coates 1983; Narrog 2012: 24). The objective element in epistemic modality has also been associated with references to evidence, in particular by those linguists who consider epistemic modality to include evidentiality, e.g. Krzyżyk (2008). She argues that objectification of the speaker's opinion may involve references to objective evidence (Krzyżyk 2008: 36). The connection between objectification and evidence has led Nuyts (2001a, 2001b) to argue that subjectivity should not be associated with epistemic modality but with evidentiality, defined as "characterization of the status or quality of the sources (evidence) for that qualification" (Nuyts 2001a: 35). In his view, "an epistemic evaluation based on better or stronger evidence is probably considered more objective than one based on shaky evidence" (Nuyts 2001a: 34). Hoye (1997: 53) stresses that objectification always takes place within a subjective modal framework, and amounts to asserting or highlighting particular modal meanings (with the purpose of being formal or non-straightforward) rather than referring to any truly objective data. Thus, in Hoye's view, subjectivity remains the defining property of epistemic modality.

Views on the relation between dynamic and deontic modality and subjectivity also differ among scholars. Lyons (1977) and Coates (1983) consider both types to have subjective and objective uses, but most scholars seem to agree that deontic modality is associated with both subjectivity and objectivity, while dynamic modality has an essentially objective reading (Halliday 1970; Hoye 1997; Nuyts 2001a; Verstraete 2001). Verstraete (2001) notes that in the case of deontic modality, it is sometimes the speaker who is committed "to the necessity/permissibility of an action", and sometimes necessity is said to exist without "the speaker's commitment to it" (Verstraete 2001: 1525). Dynamic modality is associated with objectivity because "[f]unctionally, dynamic modals do not serve to

position the speaker with respect to the propositional content of the utterance, but belong themselves to that propositional content" (Verstraete 2001: 1525). As Hoye puts it, in the case of dynamic modality, "the subject's ability or willingness is at issue, not the speaker's attitudes or opinions" (Hoye 1997: 44).

Recognition of the importance of modality in the speaker/hearer interaction has brought increased interest in the notion of intersubjectivity. The concept has already been referred to by Benveniste (1966), but without a definition, and in his use it seems to reflect the conviction that the speaker's self is "to a large degree constituted through language" (Narrog 2012: 14) and intersubjective communication. Ädel (2014: 102) understands intersubjectivity as the speaker's awareness of the addressee. This perspective is close to Traugott's view of intersubjectification as involving the development of markers which signal attention to the stances of the addressee. A different approach has been proposed by Nuyts (2001a, 2006), who views intersubjectivity as sharing responsibility for the truth value of a claim with the receiver (Nuyts 2001a, 2006, 2015). Nuyts suggests that "an evaluation is subjective if the issuer presents it as being strictly his/her own responsibility; it is intersubjective if (s)he indicates that (s)he shares it with a wider group of people, possibly including the hearer" (Nuyts 2006: 14). In this view, subjectivity involves personal responsibility for the truth value of the proposition, while intersubjectivity involves shared responsibility (cf. also Marín-Arrese 2009). Nuyts's concept of intersubjectivity was developed specifically for the study of modal markers, and, as stressed by the author himself (e.g. Nuyts 2015), its application outside the domain of modality is rather limited.

Different types of modal markers (mental state verbs, modal auxiliaries, adverbs and adjectives) have been argued to show different degrees of subjectivity (for an overview of approaches see Narrog 2012). Modal adjectives are usually said to represent a low level of subjectivity because of their association with the content of the proposition (content-related functions are associated with objectivity, cf. Verstraete 2001: 1506); first-person mental verbs (e.g. *I think*), in contrast, are considered to be highly subjective because of their association with the speaker (cf. e.g. Perkins 1983; Hengeveld 1988; Wierzbicka 2006). Modal adverbs are sometimes

situated in the middle field between adjectives and verbs (e.g. Wierzbicka 2006), while modal auxiliaries are said to be neutral with respect to subjectivity (Perkins 1983; Nuyts 2001a).

This interpretation is not, however, shared by all scholars. In the conceptualist approach, represented by Langacker (e.g. 1985, 1990, 2002), and Radden and Dirven (2007), modal auxiliaries are seen as highly subjective, while mental state verbs are considered to represent a low level of subjectivity. Perkins (1983), in contrast, links the low level of subjectivity with both modal adverbs and modal adjectives, while Watts (1984), and Hengeveld (1988) consider modal adverbs to show a high degree of subjectivity. Hoye, whose scepticism towards discussing epistemic meanings with reference to objectivity has already been noted (cf. section 2.5.), argues that "the adverb alone is a signal of the speaker's presence and an indicator of his commitment or attitude to propositional content" (Hoye 1997: 53). Nuyts (2001a: 64) adopts yet a different position, and claims that modal adverbs are intersubjective because they express commitment shared by other people (general knowledge). Danielewiczowa (2008b: 50, 2012: 57), in her study of Polish epistemic adverbs, argues that all three notions, i.e. subjectivity, objectivity and intersubjectivity, can be identified in the semantics of modal adverbs (she does not, however, use the term intersubjectivity, but refers to the ability of epistemic adverbs to establish a common cognitive ground between the speaker and the addressee, thus encouraging the addressee to agree with the speaker).

The common ground component is also present in Wierzbicka's (2006) explications of the meanings of epistemic adverbs, which stress "the place of other people" in their semantics. She writes: "if I say *I presume*, I am presenting my own personal stance and nobody else's, buy if I say *presumably*, I am, as it were, supporting my stance with an appeal to some expected general consensus" (Wierzbicka 2006: 259). Wierzbicka's (2006) account seems to partly mirror the concerns expressed by Nuyts (2001a) in his description of the concept of intersubjectivity. Nuyts (2001a: 64) claims that modal adverbs cannot be considered as purely subjective because they express commitment shared by other people (general knowledge), i.e. they are intersubjective. In fact, the identification of the common ground has also been suggested as a property of modal adjectives, such as *apparent,*

68   MODAL ADVERBS IN ENGLISH AND POLISH. A FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

2. Defining modality. Research on modality in Anglophone and Polish linguistics   69

clear, evident, and *obvious*, when these are used in phrases such *it is clear that* or *it is obvious that*, functioning as modifiers of entire propositions (Tarano 2008). Tarano argues that such "discourse adjectives provide interlocutors with a way to talk about their conversation rather than their world" (Tarano 2008: 305), and their use allows "speakers to synchronize their common ground".

The notions of subjectivity and objectivity have also been associated with specific adverbs. Ernst (2009: 515-516) considers evidential adverbs, such as *obviously* and *clearly*, to be objective because they rely on evidence. Epistemic adverbs can, in his view, have both subjective and objective readings. For instance, he argues that *perhaps* is usually subjective, while *possibly* and *probably* may be interpreted as objective if the context suggests logical inference. The emphasis on the role of the context in the perception of specific items as subjective, objective or intersubjective is also shared by Nuyts (2001a).

2.8. Epistemic modality, evidentiality, and the socio-cultural context

It has been observed that the development of linguistic categories is to some extent conditioned by social and cultural factors (Wierzbicka 2006; Nuckolls and Michael 2014: 15). As Wierzbicka (2006: 171) puts it, "certain meanings are so important to communities of speakers that they become not just lexicalized (linked with individual words) but grammaticalized, that is, embodied in the language's structural patterns". Modality marking seems to be particularly sensitive to the social and cultural context. The choices speakers make regarding the use of epistemic and evidential expressions depend on the dynamics of the speaker-hearer interaction in "the wider social context" (Mortensen 2012: 229). Bybee and Fleischman (1995: 8) refer to modal markers as "strategic linguistic tools for the construction of social reality" (see also Gerhardt 1985, 1990). They both mirror certain socio-cultural patterns and help to shape them.

Diachronic research has demonstrated close links between the evolution of socio-cultural norms and the expression of modality (e.g. Myhill 1995, 1997). Swan (1988) reports that some modal adverbs were already in use in Old English, but their number has increased systematically since

then. *Certainly* and *clearly* were added to the native stock in Middle English, while *probably, presumably, possibly* and *conceivably* appeared in Early Modern English. Swan (1988: 418) observes that while in Old and Middle English speakers seem to have mainly used high confidence adverbs to emphasize their views, in the modern English period, particularly in the 20th century, the tendency was reversed, and speakers started to increasingly use adverbs expressing a low degree of certainty. Modal adverbs started to be used in the function of hedges mitigating the speaker's opinions. Myhill (1995, 1997) suggests that the tendency to increasingly use weaker modals in English, and to replace stronger ones (*ought to, must*) with weaker ones (*need, going to*) is connected with socio-cultural developments, i.e. the society becoming less authoritarian and more democratic (cf. also Traugott 2006 for an overview of historical changes in the area of modality).

No similar studies have been conducted for Polish so there are no Polish data to compare Myhill's findings with. The 20th century brought different socio-cultural influences on Polish than those attested in English: the communist system after the second world war, the collapse of communism in 1989, and the influences from western Europe after that. Those factors, together with earlier historical developments, are likely to have resulted in the formation of different speech patterns than those found in English. In her comparison of polite speech patterns in Polish and American English, Lubecka (2000) argues, from a synchronic perspective, that Polish is characterized by "hierarchy-based respect" (2000: 255), "large power distance", and "strong uncertainty avoidance" (2000: 49), while American English is marked by "equality-oriented respect" (2000: 255), "small power distance", and "low uncertainty avoidance" (2000: 49). Lubecka's observations suggest that the preference for weaker modal markers is not to be expected in Polish. Warchał's (2015) cross-linguistic study of epistemic markers used in linguistics research articles seems to support this view. She observed that the Polish authors whose works were included in her corpus showed preference for markers expressing a medium degree of certainty, while the Anglophone authors preferred weak markers (Warchał 2015: 255). Interestingly, markers expressing a high degree of certainty were found to be more frequent in the

70   *MODAL ADVERBS IN ENGLISH AND POLISH. A FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVE*

2. Defining modality. Research on modality in Anglophone and Polish linguistics   71

Anglophone papers than in the ones written by Polish authors. Warchał (2015: 263) links this property with a higher degree of subjectivity of the English research papers, which is a plausible explanation, but it may also result from the employment of some items as discourse markers. In such cases, their functions are loosely connected with their literal meanings (cf. Biber and Finegan 1988).

The relation between ways of expressing epistemic modality and the cultural heritage of linguistic communities has been studied by Wierzbicka in a number of publications. In her discussions of the cultural heritage of English, Wierzbicka uses the concept "Anglo" English, i.e. the variety of English as used in those countries where it is the primary language (see e.g. Wierzbicka 2010: 5). The varieties of English used in such countries as the UK, Ireland, the USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have similar cultural baggage (in addition to their individual developments). Wierzbicka (2006: 251) argues that "the need to qualify one's statements and differentiate one's degrees of 'epistemic commitment' is greater in English than in most other languages". She links this need with a more general tendency found in Anglo-American discourse for accuracy of speech, understatement, tact, and non-imposition. Wierzbicka argues that such speech patterns go back to the philosophy of the British Enlightenment, and the works of empirical philosophers, such as John Locke, whose *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690) emphasized the limitations of one's knowledge, and the need to distinguish between what one knows and what one thinks, i.e. between knowledge and judgement. The linguistic devices used to make this distinction include first person epistemic verbal phrases such as *I think, I presume, I assume, I guess, I gather*, etc., and epistemic adverbs. Both epistemic verbs and epistemic adverbs "allow the speakers to say what they think and to delineate their stance accurately, carefully, responsibly, and unimposingly" (Wierzbicka 2006: 258). Epistemic verbal phrases did not appear in English during the Enlightenment; as demonstrated by Brinton (2008), they were already in use in earlier historical periods. Their frequent use in English can, however, in Wierzbicka's (2006: 249) view, be attributed to the influence of the Enlightenment on English culture. Wierzbicka's opinion concerning the frequent use of epistemic expressions in English finds confirmation

in Warchał's (2015) study of English and Polish academic discourse. Warchał (2015: 255) found epistemic modality markers to be almost twice as numerous in the English section of her corpus of linguistics research articles than in the Polish one.

Other linguistic devices which illustrate "the saturation of English with British empiricism" (cf. Wierzbicka 2010: 6) include the words *fact, evidence*, *precise, exact, findings*, minimizers and diminishers (*hardly, scarcely, rather, quite*), etc. Wierzbicka (2006: 42-43) also notes the existence of numerous phraseological units related to *fact*, such as *in fact, a matter of fact, the fact of the matter, in point of fact, in actual fact, to know something for a fact*, and *facts are facts*. *In fact* and *the fact is* have even become common discourse markers (cf. Traugott and Dasher 2002; Aijmer 2007a), which demonstrates how deeply this notion is engrained in English. The philosophy of the Enlightenment was not the only factor in the development of English speech patterns based on facts. Shapiro (2000) adds the following: the English common law with its system of jurors who relied on facts and evidence in forming their opinions, the English Protestant Church, which adopted the legal concept of fact (in opposition to the Roman Catholic doctrine based on the oral tradition and the belief in infallibility), and the natural sciences with their concept of "scientific facts". Shapiro summarizes the influence of the notion of fact on English intellectual and cultural life in the following way: "By the early eighteenth century 'fact' was so widely deployed in so many diverse enterprises – legal, historical, religious, and scientific – that we can reasonably speak of England as a 'culture of fact'" (Shapiro 2000: 167). "A culture of fact" can be expected to put emphasis on the epistemic qualification of claims.

Another important concept in Anglo discourse is that of evidence. The concepts of fact and evidence are, in fact, closely related. When people disagree on "matters of fact", they can resolve their differences "with reference to the evidence" (Wierzbicka 2010: 115). Wierzbicka (2010) argues that evidence is one of the cultural key words in English. She writes: "In many domains, it is almost impossible to engage in a serious discussion in English without drawing on it at some point … there is in present-day English a whole rich discourse based on the word *evidence* and its collocations. In particular, discussions, debates, and polemical exchanges often

72   *MODAL ADVERBS IN ENGLISH AND POLISH. A FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVE*

2. Defining modality. Research on modality in Anglophone and Polish linguistics   73

hinge on the use of this crucial and … uniquely English concept" (Wierzbicka 2010: 94-95). The English "phraseology of evidence" includes such expressions as: *convincing evidence, overwhelming evidence, conclusive evidence, to collect evidence, well supported by evidence*, etc. (Wierzbicka 2010: 96). Wierzbicka demonstrates that *evidence* is not the same as *proof. Proofs* may be obtained by pure reasoning, while *evidence* requires an empirical basis. She also notes the absence of direct equivalents of the word *evidence* in other European languages, including Polish.

Wierzbicka's observations concerning the special emphasis on epistemic qualification in English find support in numerous reports concerning the problems which non-native speakers have in expressing the right degree of conviction in English and identifying cross-linguistic equivalents of English epistemic expressions (Holmes 1983; Hyland and Milton 1997). Such problems have also been reported in the case of Polish students (Rozumko 2008). Empirical philosophy has been less influential in Poland, where the ideals of the Baroque and Romanticism have played a more important role (Hryniewicz 2004; Davies 2005: 28-32). Both the Baroque and Romanticism gave priority to feelings, free expression of emotions, honesty, and spontaneity. The Roman Catholic religion stressed the importance of oral tradition, absolute values, and truth. Such an intellectual climate favoured speech patterns based on truth rather than those based on facts and evidence, which is why the functional equivalent of *in fact* in Polish is *tak naprawdę* lit. 'in truth'. Generally speaking, Polish is rich in expressions based on the notion of truth which have no equivalents in contemporary English, such as *wprawdzie* 'while, admittedly', *co prawda* 'while, however', *co prawda to prawda* lit.'what is truth is truth', *święta prawda* lit. 'holy truth'/'it's true indeed' (see also Rozumko 2012c). Wierzbicka (2006: 44-45) demonstrates that English phraseology referring to truth was richer and more frequent in Shakespeare's times than it is today. The Shakespearean "truth is truth" gave way to *facts are facts*, and "the older respect for truth appears to have been replaced in Anglo culture with respect for facts" (Wierzbicka 2006: 45). Polish has borrowed a number of phraseologisms with the word *fact* from English, e.g. *facts are stubborn things, hard facts* (Rozumko 2012c), but expressions making use of the notion of truth are still more common in Polish. From the

cultural and historical perspective, Polish can thus be expected to put less emphasis on references to evidence than English. Lubecka (2000: 48) argues that "when Polish people communicate … much news is inferred from the social context without the explicit need to have it directly stated". Lubecka (2000), however, focuses on linguistic politeness. It remains to be investigated whether her observation is applicable to the use of evidential markers in Polish.

Evidentiality appears to be related to cultural practices also in those languages where it is realized as a grammatical category. Aikhenvald (2004) argues that "the introduction of new cultural practices such as radio, television or reading may provide additional semantic extensions for evidentials" (Aikhenvald 2004: 9). A similar observation has been made by Wierzbicka (2006), who attributes the appearance of *reportedly* in English to the development of the media and media reports.

2.9. Epistemic modality and politeness. The concept of face

The use of epistemic markers has been discussed as one of the strategies connected with linguistic politeness. As noted by Mortensen (2012), epistemic expressions signal intersubjective relations between the speaker and the addressee. They indicate the status of the participants of an interaction, help to create the speaker/writer persona, their authority or solidarity with the speaker, and signal the speaker's intentions towards the addressee. They have a potential for performing face-saving and face-threatening functions, which is why the concept of face and linguistic politeness form an important point of reference in a cross-linguistic analysis of epistemic adverbs.

The notion of face was introduced by Goffman (1972 [1955]: 319) to refer to "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact". It was later adapted by Brown and Levinson in their politeness theory. Brown and Levinson (1987: 61-62) distinguish between positive and negative face, which correspond to the want of the speaker to be liked and accepted by others, and the want that the speaker's actions be unimpeded by others, respectively. Every speech act is considered as potentially face threatening as regards both the speaker's and the hearer's face, which is why speakers

use a number of strategies to avoid or lessen the threat. Some of those strategies involve using epistemic markers.

However, the notion of face as defined by Brown and Levinson (1987) is not culture neutral. Ogiermann (2009: 11) observes that it is individualistic ("something that individuals claim for themselves"), and reflects the concerns of Anglo-American speakers. Brown and Levinson associate politeness with the negative face and non-imposition: "In our culture, negative politeness is the most elaborate and the most conventionalized set of linguistic strategies for FTA redress; it is the stuff that fills the etiquette books" (Brown and Levinson 1987: 129–130). Scholars from more collectivist cultures, i.e. those which put less emphasis on individualistic claims, prefer to redefine face as "the perception of self in relation to other" (Lee-Wong 1999: 24). When defined in this way, it has more in common with Brown and Levinson's notion of positive face. Polish culture also shows traits which are characteristic of collectivist cultures, and its understanding of the notions of face and politeness differs from how they are perceived in Anglo-American culture.

As observed by Ogiermann (2009: 38), the differences between the perception of the needs of positive and negative face have led to the classification of cultures into positive and negative politeness cultures. English belongs to negative politeness cultures, while Polish is classified as a positive politeness language. In positive politeness cultures more value is assigned to positive face needs, while negative face needs are more likely to be disregarded. Negative politeness tends to be associated with indirectness, while in positive politeness cultures indirectness is not necessarily linked with politeness. On the contrary, in cultures such as Polish, directness, low social distance and connectedness are perceived as polite. The notions of negative and positive politeness, indirectness and directness are also connected with ways of expressing epistemic modality. Epistemic markers have been analyzed as markers of negative politeness. They often function as hedges, and as such they contribute to the perception of pieces of discourse as indirect. Brown and Levinson (1987) also discussed hedges as indicators of negative politeness. They distinguished a group of "quality hedges", such as *I think, I believe,* and *I assume*, used to signal responsibility for the message. Since Polish is a positive politeness lan-

guage, it can be expected to use markers of negative politeness less often. As demonstrated by Lubecka (2000), requests are made in a more direct way in Polish than in English, and direct orders are more acceptable. She also notes that instead of using hedges "Polish can modify the strength of the illocutionary force of the imperative by various terms of address" (Lubecka 2000: 90). Differences between the use of English and Polish modal adverbs in polite requests, offers, etc. are discussed in Chapters 9 and 11.

2.10. Summary of Anglophone and Polish approaches to modality

The outline of approaches to modality in Anglophone and Polish linguistics presented in this chapter demonstrates that Anglophone and Polish researchers have so far tended to place emphasis on different issues, and employed different methodological frameworks in their works. Anglophone research in the field has devoted considerable attention to the distinction between epistemic modality and evidentiality, while Polish studies have not given much attention to this distinction. Some aspects of evidentiality have been examined in cross-linguistic studies of Polish markers and their equivalents in other Slavonic languages. Such studies tend to distinguish a type of modality which is not usually identified in Anglophone linguistics, i.e. imperceptive modality. Imperceptive modality is largely concerned with reportive markers. While the major types of modality distinguished in Anglophone studies are epistemic, deontic and dynamic, the major types distinguished in Polish linguistics are epistemic and deontic modality. Polish studies tend not to discuss dynamic modality. While in Anglophone linguistics the developments characteristic of modal markers have been studied within the grammaticalization framework, in Polish linguistics grammaticalization theory has not been used extensively to account for the functions of modal markers. Such differences have important consequences for the criteria used to identify and classify modal adverbs in English and Polish. Selected typologies which have been employed to classify modal adverbs in the two languages are discussed in Chapter 3.

3. Modal adverbs in English and Polish: an overview of selected studies

3.1. Introduction

Studies of modal adverbs in English and Polish have so far progressed along rather different lines. The differences are related both to the understanding of adverbs as a category, i.e. word-class classification, and approaches towards studies of modality. The major methodological and terminological differences between Anglophone and Polish studies of modality have already been outlined in Chapter 2. This chapter provides an overview of the treatment of modal adverbs in Anglophone and Polish research. It begins by discussing the ways of expressing modality in the two languages, and outlining the points of difference. Then, it focuses on the presentations of the category of adverbs in English and Polish grammars, and summarises earlier studies on modal adverbs in the two languages. Finally, it presents the typology of modal adverbs employed in the present study, and describes the procedure adopted in the analysis.

3.2. Ways of expressing modality in English and Polish

Both English and Polish have grammatical, lexical and prosodic means of expressing modal meanings. In English, modal auxiliaries are considered to be the grammatical manifestation of modality, while in Polish it is the category of mood, marked on the verb by a specific set of inflections (Bartmiński and Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2012). As noted by Bybee and Fleischman (1995: 2), and Bartmiński and Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (2012: 177), mood provides a modal frame, which, in inflectional

languages such as Polish, is an obligatory element of every sentence. In English, morphological ways of mood marking are much more limited. The indicative is marked by the past tense inflection -*ed*, and the present tense ending in the 3rd person singular -*s*. The subjunctive is restricted to a small number of contexts, as in *I wish he were here*. The functions originally assigned to mood have been transferred onto the system of modal verbs. In contrast to English modal auxiliaries, which form a small, clearly delineated and highly grammaticalized set (cf. e.g. Palmer 1990 [1979]; Coates 1983), Polish modal verbs show a small degree of grammaticalization (Hansen 2009: 266), and do not form such a uniform and well-defined set. Hansen (2009) argues that resistance to grammaticalization is a characteristic feature of Slavonic modals. In his study of modal verbs in Russian, Polish, and Serbian-Croatian, Hansen (2009) argues that the Slavonic languages are quite conservative when it comes to the historical evolution of modal verbs: "the Slavonic modals remain relatively stable over time and seem to defy further going grammaticalization" (Hansen 2009: 267). This cross-linguistic difference is consistent with Palmer's (2001 [1986]: 104) observation that the system of mood is not likely to co-exist with the system of modal verbs, and if they do, their co-existence is likely to be temporary.

Polish modal verbs include the following items: *musieć, móc, woleć, mieć, trzeba, należy, powinien, wolno, można, da się* (Bartmiński and Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2012: 177) and *będzie* lit. 'will be' in some of its senses, i.e. 'will, would' (Fisiak *et al.* 1978). Fisiak *et al.* (1978) and Kakietek (1980) note that the English system of modal auxiliaries expresses a number of meanings which Polish modal verbs do not express. In consequence, other markers of modality perform more functions in Polish. This observation seems to be particularly true about epistemic modality, which, as argued by Rytel (1982: 67), is mostly expressed by modal adverbs in Polish. Rytel (1982: 68-69) notes that modal verbs such as *móc, musieć, mieć*, and *powinien* have primarily deontic meanings, while their epistemic senses are only secondary and less frequent. Warchał's (2015) study of the use of epistemic modality markers in English and Polish academic discourse demonstrates that epistemic meanings are more often conveyed by adverbs in Polish than in English, which confirms Rytel's (1982) ob-

servations. On the other hand, some of the modal meanings expressed by verbs in Polish are expressed by adverbs in English, e.g. hearsay. In English, hearsay is expressed by modal adverbs, such as *allegedly, reportedly*, while in Polish, it is expressed by both reportive adverbs, e.g. *rzekomo, podobno*, and the verb *mieć* 'be reported to'/lit. 'to have' (e.g. Wierzbicka 1969: 59, 69; Bralczyk 1978: 21, 85-86; Wiemer 2010; see also Chapter 4).

In addition to modal verbs, both English and Polish use lexical verbs naming speech acts and mental acts (*verba dicendi et sentiendi*) to express modal meanings, such as *allow* (Pol. *pozwalać*), *forbid* (Pol. *zabraniać*), *think* (Pol. *sądzić*), *suppose* (Pol. *przypuszczać*). As observed by Fisiak *et al.* (1978: 128), some of the Polish lexical verbs perform the functions characteristic of English modal auxiliaries, e.g. *He can swim* will be rendered by the non-modal *umieć* in Polish, as in: *On umie pływać*.

Modal adverbs, which current Polish grammar terms modal particles and metapredicative operators (cf. e.g. Grochowski *et al.* 2014), typically express epistemic meanings, though some of them are used as emphasizers in deontic contexts, e.g. *koniecznie* 'necessarily' (e.g. Grzegorczykowa 1975; Żabowska 2006), as in: *Zrób to koniecznie* lit. 'Do it necessarily' (see also Chapter 10). As observed by Fisiak *et al.* (1978: 128), there is some degree of overlap between the functions performed by the English modal auxiliaries and Polish modal adverbs. For instance, in English, prediction can be expressed by the modal auxiliary *will*, as in *The game will be finished by now*, while in Polish the same meaning will be rendered by the adverb *zapewne* 'most probably': *Gra się już zapewne skończyła* (other cases of functional overlap between English verbs and Polish adverbs are discussed in Chapter 11).

In both languages modality is additionally expressed by adjectives, such as *probable, likely* (Pol. *prawdopodobny, możliwy*), and modal nouns, e.g. *possibility, probability* (Pol. *możliwość, prawdopodobieństwo*). Downing and Locke (2006: 380-381) also list parenthetic verbal expressions (*I think*, *I guess*) and past tense forms indicating unreality (*I thought I'd go along with you*). Rytel (1982) and Krzyżyk (2008) enumerate Polish markers of this type: epistemic phrases (*prawdę powiedziawszy* 'to tell the truth'), as well as morphological markers (past tense marking, conditionals). Bartmiński and Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (2012: 177) also in-

clude particles, such as *czy* 'if/whether' and interrogative pronouns (*kto* 'who', *co* 'what'). Prosodic means used to mark modality include special intonation patterns distinguishing questions from statements, warnings, threats, etc.

The above presentation may suggest that modal markers form a closed set, while Simon-Vandenbergen (1996: 391) argues that they are, in fact, an open-ended class. This view acknowledges the development of new discourse functions by originally non-modal items in the processes of grammaticalization. As argued by Lehmann (2008: 210), "items and constructions serving the cognitive function of language are mainly recruited among the lexical items of the language". Many adverbs whose modal status in contemporary English or Polish is unquestionable were once adverbs of manner (e.g. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007). The existing categories are thus likely to acquire new members.

Simon-Vandenbergen (1996) observes that the modal effect can be achieved by a combination of different devices, e.g. verbs, adverbs, and intonation. In fact, it has been demonstrated that modality is rarely expressed by individual items. As observed by Hoye, modal meanings are often expressed by "two or more elements operating interdependently and dynamically" (Hoye 1997: 7). Several modal elements existing in one sentence, e.g. a modal auxiliary and a modal adverb, function in *modal harmony*, thus reinforcing each other's meanings (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 767; Downing and Locke 2006: 381). Hoye (1997), who has studied co-occurrences of modal adverbs with modal auxiliaries, as well as Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007), who have examined combinations of different types of modal markers, demonstrate that such combinations not only strengthen the modal meanings the markers express, but they also reveal the semantic and pragmatic properties of individual items. Cumulative uses of English and Polish modal markers, in particular those involving modal adverbs, will be referred to further in this study.

3.3. The category of adverbs in English and Polish grammar

Adverbs have a reputation for being "the least homogeneous of the traditional parts of speech" (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 57), and "the function adverbial" is said to be one of "the most controversial notions

of grammatical theory" (Kiss 2009: 1). Scholars often signal the classification problems they pose, and observe that some items are classified as adverbs because they do not meet the criteria established for other parts of speech. In consequence, as Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 563) observe, the category of adverbs is treated as a "residual category". Other descriptive terms used to illustrate their problematic character include "nebulous" and "puzzling" (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 438). Quirk *et al.* (1985: 479) identify "seven main categories of semantic role" performed by adverbs: space, time, process, respect, contingency, modality, and degree, each of them further subdivided into more specific types. The range of semantic categories identified by Quirk *et al.* (1985) provides a good illustration of the heterogeneity of the class. The formal similarity between adverbs and other word classes results in the opinion that they form a category with fuzzy boundaries (e.g. Ramat and Ricca 1998: 189).

Observations concerning the heterogeneous nature of adverbs can also be found in Polish linguistics, but mostly in earlier studies. An overview of mid-20th-century classifications of Polish lexemes shows that most scholars found adverbs problematic. Tokarski (1949), for instance, compared the category to an attic where people put things they do not know what to do with – a statement which reflects the same concerns as Huddleston and Pullum's (2002) observation on adverbs being a residual category. More recent studies note the dynamic character of adverbs as a category, and their expansion to the levels of language where they were not used previously (e.g. Danielewiczowa 2012), but, overall, concerns about the heterogeneity of the class are less frequently expressed in current grammars of Polish than English. This difference results from the adoption of new classification criteria to identify word classes in contemporary Polish linguistics.

Both the English and Polish criteria for identifying adverbs go back to Dionysius Thrax's (100 BC) definition of adverbs formulated for classical Greek: "indeclinable sentence elements [which] modify or accompany the verb" (quoted in Haumann 2007: 1). According to Thrax, adverbs "may be simple or complex and they fall into a number of semantically defined classes, e.g. adverbs of place, time, manner, quantity, etc." (quoted in Haumann 2007: 1-2). While both in English and Polish adverbs are still

described as items modifying verbs, in English, "the modifying function of adverbs has been generalized to other domains, i.e. adverbs not only modify verbal predicates (and by extension sentences), but also adjectives, adverbs, prepositions and nominal expressions" (Haumann 2007: 1). In current Polish grammatical theory, adverbs are defined as modifiers of verbs, like in classical Greek (cf. Grochowski *et al.* 2014: 27). This view is, however, quite new, as it goes back to the recent taxonomy developed by Wajszczuk (1997, 2000, 2005, 2010). Before her typology was accepted, adverbs were defined as modifiers of verbs, adjectives, and other adverbs. This view can still be found in some grammars which represent a more traditional approach, e.g. Grzegorczykowa *et al.* (1998), Bańko (2012), Nagórko (2012), and in school grammars. A comparison of definitions included in studies published in the 1980s by authors whose research focuses on adverbs, e.g. Grochowski (1986a), with more recent ones, e.g. Grochowski *et al.* (2014), reveals that their authors have narrowed their classification criteria for adverbs.

The definition of adverbs used in English grammar is broad enough to contain modal adverbs. As noted above, modality is one of the seven semantic categories identified for adverbs by Quirk *et al.* (1985: 479). However, the adoption of the narrow definition in Polish grammar results in the exclusion of modal adverbs from the category. In consequence, the category of modal adverbs is not distinguished in current Polish grammar. The current classification of word classes in Polish linguistics takes into account the distinction between the textual and metatextual levels of language, and, consequently, distinguishes between the textual and metatextual categories of words and expressions (cf. Wajszczuk 1997, 2000, 2005, 2010). Polish equivalents of the items which are classified as modal adverbs in English grammars are categorised as particles or metapredicative operators, depending on the degree of syntactic flexibility they show. Particles are more flexible; they can co-occur with all sentence elements and clauses, while metapredicative operators co-occur with a restricted type of sentence elements, and tend not to modify clauses. Particles and metapredicative operators represent the meta level of language, and both belong to the superordinate category of metatextual operators. A recent typology of Polish metatextual markers proposed by Wajszczuk (2005)

comprises three levels of metatext: metapredicative operators, metatextual operators, and metatextual commentaries. Metapredicative operators (Pol. *operatory metapredykatywne*) function within the syntactic structure of a sentence, and comment on the predicate; they include such items as intensifiers (e.g. *bardzo* 'very') and approximators (*niemal* 'almost'). Metatextual operators (Pol. *operatory metatekstowe*) function above the level of sentence structure, and comprise conjunctions and particles (e.g. modal particles, such as *oczywiście* 'of course'). Both metapredicative and metatextual operators are individual words (lexemes). More complex expressions of a metatextual character, e.g. verbal phrases, such as *ściśle rzecz biorąc* ('strictly speaking') form a category of metatextual commentaries (Pol. *komentarze metatekstowe*). As noted by Żabowska (2014), metapredicative operators require certain semantic properties from the elements they modify (e.g. *bardzo* 'very' and *całkowicie* 'entirely' can be used with names of gradable properties, such as *szczęśliwy* 'happy'), while metatextual operators do not require any specific properties from the items they co-occur with. This typology focuses on patterns of co-occurrence and the semantic properties of metatextual units, while their interpersonal functions and intersubjective meanings are not taken into account.

The categories of particles and metapredicative operators contain both modal markers and non-modal items of a metatextual character, e.g. those which have connective properties, such as *przede wszystkim* 'first of all', and those which function as degree modifiers, e.g. *bardzo* 'very'. Adverbs, in contrast, represent the textual level of language, and modify verbs. The categories of degree and modality, identified for adverbs by Quirk *et al.* (1985: 479), are not considered as adverbial notions in current Polish grammatical theory. The new typology of word classes is employed in the recent study of Polish particles by Grochowski *et al.* (2014), and the newest online dictionary of Polish (*Wielki Słownik Języka Polskiego* (*WSJP*) – 'The Great Dictionary of Polish'), used as one of the references in the contrastive analysis of adverbs presented in Chapters 4-10 of this work.

3.4. Formal characteristics of English and Polish adverbs

In both English and Polish the category of adverbs comprises single words as well as multi-word units. One-word adverbs can be simple, e.g. *soon, too, quite,* etc. (Biber *et al.* 1999: 539), or complex, i.e. formed by means of affixation or compounding, and multiword units. Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 565) note that most English adverbs are morphologically complex. Numerous English adverbs, including the modal ones, are derived from adjectives by the addition of the *-ly* suffix, e.g. *finally, arguably, clearly*. Some *-ly* adverbs have nouns as their bases, e.g. *bodily, partly* (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 266). Other relatively frequent suffixes used to form adverbs include *-wise*, e.g. *clockwise, otherwise; -wards*, e.g. *afterwards, homewards; -ways*, e.g. *lengthways, sideways*. Some adverbs are created using the prefix *a-*, e.g. *afresh, anew*. Multi-word adverbs include phrases such as *no doubt*, *of course*, and *at last* (Biber *et al.* 1999). Quirk *et al.* (1985: 622), however, do not include *of course* and *no doubt* in the category of adverbs; they only note that the two expressions perform adverbial functions.

Adverbs can be graded, though, as noted by Biber *et al.* (1999: 544), superlative forms of adverbs are rare in English, while their comparative forms are used "occasionally". On the formal level, ways of comparing adverbs are the same as in the case of adjectives, i.e. inflectional, e.g. *fast, faster, fastest*, and analytic, e.g. *often, more often, most often*. However, comparison is considerably more frequent with adjectives than with adverbs. Some modal adverbs can also be graded, e.g. *more probably*, *most probably*, which indicates a scalar character of modal notions.

Typical Polish adverbs are single-word units ending in *-o*, such as *szybko* 'quickly', and *-e*, e.g. *wyraźnie* 'clearly' (Grzegorczykowa 1998). Like their English equivalents, they are often de-adjectival formations: *szybko* 'quickly' < *szybki* 'quick', *wyraźnie* 'clearly' < *wyraźny* 'clear', and they can be graded, e.g. *szybciej* 'quicker', *najszybciej* 'quickest'. There is also a group of adverbs ending in *-em*, e.g. *cichaczem* 'quietly, silently', which are non-gradable (cf. Cyran 1967: 7-8; Heliasz 2012: 27). Some Polish adverbs derive from pronouns. They are typically adverbs of place, ending in *-dzie*, e.g. *nigdzie* 'nowhere', and *-dy*, e.g. *tędy* 'this way' (Rospond 2009: 116). Multi-word units are also included in the category of adverbs in Polish,

e.g. *do pełna* 'to the full', *na wesoło* 'in a happy/joyful way' (Grzegorczyko-wa 1998; Nagórko 2012: 117). Grzegorczykowa (1998) treats the prepositions which occur in such formations as prefixes. She notes that many adverbs of this type contain the prefix *po-* and the suffix *-u*, e.g. *po chińsku* 'the Chinese way'; another combination is the prefix *z-* and the suffix *-a*, e.g. *z francuska* 'the French way'. The category of modal adverbs in Polish also comprises both single-word items, such as *niewątpliwie* 'undoubtedly', and multi-word units, such as *na pewno* 'for sure'.

3.5. Adverbs vs. particles

As already noted, the terms *adverb* and *particle* are used to refer to different categories of words in Anglophone and Polish grammars. In standard English grammar presentation, the term *particle* is used to refer to uninflected words (cf. Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 280). Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 280) define it as "a one-word phrase functioning as the complement of the verb". Their list of particles includes prepositions, as in "She brought *down* the bed", adjectives complementing verbs, as in "They cut *short* their holiday", and some verbs, as in "She let *go* his hand." (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 280). However, the term is also used in discourse studies to refer to items performing various textual and interpersonal functions, i.e. discourse particles. Discourse particles are defined in different ways by different scholars, and the terminological confusion is considerable in this area. They are alternatively referred to as *discourse markers, pragmatic markers* and *pragmatic particles* (for an overview of terms see e.g. Brinton 1996; Andersen 2000; Aijmer 2002; Beeching 2002; Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2006, 2009; Fischer 2006a, 2006b, 2014; Weydt 2006; Fraser 1990, 1996, 1999; Degand *et al.* 2013b; Rozumko 2016b). Some scholars argue for the need to draw distinctions between the terms, particularly between discourse markers and discourse particles (cf. Fischer 2006a), while others use them interchangeably.

In Polish linguistics ways of defining particles have changed a number of times (for an overview see Grochowski 1986a; Grochowski *et al.* 2014). Bańko (2012: 118) observes that Polish grammars originally used the term to refer to all uninflected word classes, i.e. adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections. In the 19th century, the category was redefined to

include a small group of lexemes which did not show the properties of any of the traditional word classes, such as *czy* 'if, whether', *niech* (roughly: 'let', as in: *Let there be light*), *nie* 'no'. At that time, the category was understood in a similar way as it is now presented in standard English grammars, such as Huddleston and Pullum (2002). In later accounts it gradually absorbed numerous lexemes which were difficult to classify, mostly adverbs and conjunctions which did not possess the prototypical features of the categories they had been earlier assigned to, until the class expanded so considerably, that some authors described it as a rubbish sack (Jodłowski 1971; see also Grochowski *et al.* 2014). Grochowski (1986a) lists the following terms which were used by different Polish scholars to refer to the items in question: 'additional intellectual markers' (Pol. *dodatkowe wyznaczniki intelektualne* – Klemensiewicz 1963; Misz 1968), 'modifiers of entire sentences' (Pol. *modyfikatory całych zdań* – Grzegorczykowa 1975), 'modulators' (Pol. *modulanty* – Jodłowski 1976), 'metatextual and modal adverbs' (Pol. *przysłówki metatekstowe i modalne* – Rachwałowa 1983). A number of linguists considered the ability of particles to modify nouns as the property which distinguished them from adverbs (Grochowski 1997; Laskowski 1998; Wróbel 2001). The number of terms used and their diversity indicate the problems which Polish linguists faced in their attempts to delineate and name the category. In the 1990s, the category of particles was redefined again, to refer to a distinct word class comprising items of a metatextual character (Wajszczuk 2005; Grochowski *et al.* 2014), such as stance markers, textual markers, and emphasizers. The new definition of particles is now used in most Polish studies of modal markers. Some of its members are considered to be homonymic with members of other classes, such as adverbs. As observed by Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (2007: 142), the relation of homonymy is usually postulated for words whose forms are "identical for historical reasons, but whose meanings are etymologically unrelated". In the current word-class classification in Polish, such historical relations are not taken into consideration. The approach is synchronic. The metatextual uses of items which also function as adverbs of manner are classified independently. Thus, *widocznie* 'visibly/in a visible way' is classified as a manner adverb, and is said to be homonymic with the particle *widocznie* 'apparently' (Grochowski *et al.* 2014: 59). The historical relation which exists between the two meanings is thus obscured.

3.5.1. Discourse particles vs. modal particles

Discourse particles (or discourse markers) are usually identified on the basis of "purely functional" (Fischer 2006b: 5) or functional-pragmatic criteria (Mosegaard Hansen 1998). Schiffrin (1987: 35) defines discourse markers as items which "bracket" such "units of talk" as sentences, propositions, speech acts, and tone units. Such items are said to be "intonationally, syntactically, and semantically independent from the surrounding discourse" (Travis 2006: 219). Discourse markers are a heterogeneous group. According to Lewis (2006: 44), they comprise "subtypes of sentence adverbials, parentheticals, conjunctions, or transparent predicates", such as: "*[w]ell, I mean, so, in fact, though, of course, anyway, actually, on the other hand*". It seems to be generally agreed that the main role of discourse particles is to guide the addressee through discourse by showing connections between utterances and by acting as prompters and fillers (Jucker and Ziv 1998). However, some scholars aditionally associate them with the expression of epistemic stance (Ochs 1996), and with interpersonal functions (Schiffrin 1987). In fact, some discourse markers are multifunctional (cf. e.g. Fischer 2000), and combine their interpersonal functions with textual ones.

In addition to *discourse particles*, scholars distinguish the category of *modal particles*. It was traditionally identified in languages such as German, Danish and French, where it can be distinguished on syntactic grounds, the most important criterion being their use in clause-internal positions (cf. Hansen 1998). In German particles have also been treated as a word class, comprising single-word units "just like other linguistic terms such as verb and noun" (Weydt 2006: 206), an approach which resembles the Polish tradition of describing particles (though the classification criteria are different in the two languages, cf. Weydt 2006; Grochowski *et al.* 2014). Since English does not have a corresponding class of markers used in clause-internal positions, it was said not to have any modal particles (cf. Traugott 2007; Aijmer 2013). However, recent studies of English modal markers, beginning with Aijmer (1997), treat modal markers as a functional category, "a subclass of pragmatic markers" (Aijmer 2009: 111), a term which Aijmer treats as equivalent to discourse markers. In this view, discourse particles (or discourse markers) signal connections between ut-

terances, while modal particles offer metapragmatical comment on the content of the proposition, and perform interpersonal and interactional functions, such as indicating the common ground between the speaker and the addressee (e.g. Aijmer 2013). Aijmer argues that the functional category of modal particles comprises modal adverbs, e.g. *of course* (Aijmer 2013; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007), as well as non-adverbial epistemic expressions, e.g. *I think* (Aijmer 1997). Generally, modal particles are said to express epistemic modality and "the speaker's attitude to the proposition" (Hasselgård 2006: 95), but the specific ways in which the term is used differ among discourse scholars (cf. Degand *et al.* 2013b; Diewald 2013; Schoonjans 2013), and the related discourse categories seem to "shade into one another" (Foolen 1996 online).

3.5.2. Modal adverbs vs. modal particles

The distinction between modal adverbs and modal particles has been made in a number of recent studies of epistemic adverbs. It is generally associated with the degree of grammaticalization of the two sets (cf. e.g. Traugott 1995b; Traugott and Dasher 2002), but views concerning the boundaries between the categories differ among researchers. Hoye (1997) links modal particles with the category of subjuncts, as identified by Quirk *et al.* (1985). He writes: "It would not be implausible to redefine subjuncts expressing modality as 'modal particles', subdivided into the following categories: evidential particles (*clearly, obviously*); hearsay particles (*apparently*); reinforcement or emphasizing particles (*certainly, surely, well*); and focus particles (*only, simply*)" (Hoye 1997: 212). Subjuncts typically relate to individual sentence elements and appear in the sentence medial position. It thus seems that Hoye (1997) is influenced by the way particles are defined in languages such as German, where the sentence medial position is one of their major distinguishing properties (see section 3.5.1). Semantically, in Hoye's (1997: 212) view, "modal particles express abstract sense relations rather than literal meanings". His opinion probably results from the fact that modal subjuncts are frequently employed as emphasizers. Modal adverbs, he argues, "more clearly [than particles] express lexical meanings in their characterization of the speaker's orientation, comment-wise or content-wise, towards his utterance" (Hoye 1997: 209-210). However, while postulating the distinction between modal adverbs

and modal particles, he also notes that the same items perform different functions, and some adverbs can be used as modifiers of verbs as well as sentence adverbs. Ultimately, Hoye suggests that: "it may be more appropriate to consider modal particles as a special subset of modal adverbs rather than as an entirely separate word class and to define them according to their use rather than in terms of any meanings they might possibly convey" (Hoye 1997: 212).

Wierzbicka (2006) distinguishes modal adverbs from modal particles on the basis of their pragmatic properties. In her account modal particles are interactional, dialogical and addressee-oriented, while epistemic adverbs are monological, speaker-oriented and do not encourage interaction. She writes:

> Particles build bridges between the speaker and the addressee and often exercise more or less subtle pressure on one's interlocutor (as, for example, *surely* does in English). The epistemic adverbs serve a different, "hands-off", kind of interaction. By pointedly emphasizing that "I want to say what I think", they indicate that the speaker has no wish to "impose" his or her point of view on the addressee. This attitude of "non-imposing" is not part of the meaning of epistemic adverbs, but it can well be their pragmatic effect and, indeed, part of the modern Anglo speaker's motivation for using them. (Wierzbicka 2006: 287)

Wierzbicka's examples of modal particles include *indeed, maybe, surely, perhaps,* and *of course* (Wierzbicka 2006: 287). Her list of epistemic adverbs comprises items such as *probably, presumably, obviously, arguably, certainly,* and *undoubtedly*. Because of the interactional character of modal particles, they can be used to elicit a response from the addressee, e.g. *Perhaps he did it himself*? (Wierzbicka 2006: 249). The ability to occur in questions is, Wierzbicka argues, one of the most characteristic properties distinguishing them from modal adverbs. The inability of epistemic adverbs to occur in questions has been noted in other studies, e.g. Bellert (1977), and Nuyts (2001a). However, questions of the type quoted by Wierzbicka for *perhaps* are also possible for some of the items she classifies as epistemic adverbs, e.g. *presumably*, as illustrated in (1), while *obviously* can be used as a question tag in a similar way as *surely* (cf. also Rozumko 2016c), as in (2).

(1) *Presumably* Meryl invited him … ? (BNC, C8D 2953)

(2) But … but you don't agree with them, *obviously*? (BNC, HHA 2243).

Examples such as (1) and (2) demonstrate that the ability (or its lack) to be used in questions is not a distinctive property of items such as *perhaps* and *surely*, and cannot be used as a reliable criterion to distinguish them from modal adverbs. The problematic character of the distinction is also revealed in Wierzbicka's (2006: 285) analysis of the uses of *certainly*. She classifies *certainly* as an epistemic adverb, but she also notes that in the sentence initial position, "*certainly* is used to agree, or to partially agree, with what has been said before", and thus, "is not an epistemic adverb at all" (Wierzbicka 2006: 285). It thus appears that a clear-cut distinction between the categories is not easy to draw. As noted by Wiemer (2010: 90), no "fail-safe difference" between them seems to exist. Wierzbicka (2006) separates epistemic adverbs from modal particles with the intention to demonstrate that in comparison with other languages, the English class of epistemic adverbs is exceptionally rich. She argues: "Blurring the boundary between epistemic adverbs like *undoubtedly* and *evidently* and words like *surely* or *perhaps* obscures the existence of an extended class of epistemic adverbs in modern English" (Wierzbicka 2006: 248). Items such as *perhaps* and *maybe,* are, in her view, more language universal, as they have been shown to have equivalents in numerous languages (Wierzbicka 2006: 250). The analysis of data from Polish conducted in Chapters 4-10 confirms the suggested lack of cross-linguistic parallels in the case of some epistemic adverbs. However, it shows that the category of modal adverbs in Polish is also quite rich. I will, therefore, return to Wierzbicka's account in Chapter 11.

In this work I follow Aijmer (e.g. 1997, 2009) in treating modal particles as a functional category. As I demonstrate further in this book, most epistemic adverbs have some interactional uses; they differ in the extent to which their interactional potential is utilized. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 64) note that many of the divisions proposed for epistemic adverbs work well for "prototypical cases", while "from the heteroglossic perspective … it makes more sense to see these distinctions as reflecting aspects or dimensions of meaning that can be combined in single instances rather than as categories in which individual adverbs need to be accommodated" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 64). I think this observation is also applicable to the distinction between epistemic adverbs and modal particles, which is why the two types are not separated in this study.

3.6. Studies of modal adverbs in English

This section focuses on earlier accounts of the category of modal adverbs in English. It begins by outlining the ways modal adverbs are presented in reference grammars, and then examines their treatment in other studies in the area. It looks at the terminology used in the studies, as well as the definitions and typologies of modal adverbs proposed by different authors. The overview serves as the starting point for establishing the list of modal adverbs to be analyzed later in this study, and delimiting the category of modal adverbs in English.

3.6.1. Quirk *et al.* (1985)

Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) typology of adverbial functions is employed in the analysis of the functions of modal adverbs undertaken in Chapters 4-10, which is why it will be discussed more extensively than the other accounts. Quirk *et al.* (1985) identify four grammatical functions of adverbials: adjunct, subjunct, disjunct and conjunct. **Adjuncts** are syntactic elements of the clause, like the verb, subject, complement and object. They are expressions of time, place, manner, e.g. "The guests arrived *in the early evening*" (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 526), "She lives *in a cottage.* / The children were running *very fast*" (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 514), "He glanced at her *(very) lovingly*" (1985: 556). Adjuncts themselves do not have modal functions, which is why they will not be discussed any further. However, some of them have developed modal senses as their secondary meanings, and additionally function as subjuncts and disjuncts, e.g. *clearly*.

Subjuncts have a subordinate function towards other sentence elements. They may be subordinate to entire clauses, but, as Quirk *et al.* (1985: 568) observe, such cases are rare, and subjuncts "typically relate specifically to an individual element or even to a constituent of an element". Quirk *et al.* (1985: 567) divide them into "wide-orientation" and "narrow-orientation" subjuncts. Wide-orientation subjuncts comprise:

– viewpoint subjuncts, e.g. "*Morally, politically*, and *economically*, it is urgent that the government should act more effectively on aid to developing countries." (1985: 569);

– courtesy subjuncts, e.g. "He *kindly* offered me a ride" (1985: 569).

Narrow-orientation subjuncts include:

– item subjuncts, e.g. "subject-oriented" adverbials, e.g. "*Bitterly*, he buried his children" (1985: 575);

– emphasizers, i.e. subjuncts expressing modality, "which have a reinforcing effect on the truth value of the clause or part of the clause to which they apply" (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 583). The group includes adverbs which also function as disjuncts expressing degrees of truth: *actually, certainly, clearly, definitely, indeed, obviously, plainly, really, surely, for certain, for sure, of course*, and adverbs which communicate that what the speaker says is true: *frankly, honestly, literally, simply, fairly. Necessarily* is added to the list with a comment that it only functions as an emphasizer when it is preceded by *must*, as in: "A school teacher who wishes to be honest must *necessarily* prepare her lessons". In its other uses, *necessarily* is classified as an adjunct of contingency, typically preceded by negation, as in: "That doesn't *necessarily* follow" (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 589).

– intensifiers, i.e. degree adverbials, comprising "amplifiers (maximizers, e.g. *completely*; boosters, e.g. *very much*), and downtoners (approximators, e.g. *almost*; compromisers, e.g. *more or less*; diminishers, e.g. *partly*; minimizers, e.g. *hardly*)" (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 589-590);

– focusing subjuncts, i.e. adverbials "which can draw attention to a part of a sentence" (1985: 604). They are divided into: restrictive (exclusives, e.g. *only, precisely, simply*, e.g. "I was *simply* taking my dog for a walk"; particularizers, e.g. *chiefly, largely, mainly, particularly*, e.g. "He favours *particularly* young women"), and additive subjuncts, e.g. *also, further, similarly*, as well, e.g. "We bought some beer *as well*" (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 604).

Disjuncts refer to the speaker and the way s/he is speaking. They "have a superior role as compared with the sentence elements; they are syntactically more detached, and ... seem to have a scope that extends over the sentence as a whole" (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 613). Disjuncts "express an evaluation of what is being said either with respect to the form of the communication or to its meaning" (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 440), thus they are divided into style and content disjuncts. Style disjuncts refer to modality and manner e.g. *truthfully*, *frankly, bluntly*; and respect, e.g. *personally, in broad terms* (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 615). Content disjuncts are divided into: those which express degrees of truth, and those expressing value judgement. Disjuncts expressing degrees of truth are further subdivided into:

– disjuncts expressing conviction: *admittedly, assuredly, avowedly, certainly, decidedly, definitely, incontestably, incontrovertibly, indeed, indisputably, indubitably, surely, unarguably, undeniably, undoubtedly, unquestionably, clearly, evidently, manifestly, obviously, patently, plainly*;

– disjuncts expressing some degree of doubt: *allegedly, arguably, apparently, conceivably, doubtless, likely, maybe, most likely, perhaps, possibly, presumably, purportedly, quite likely, reportedly, reputedly, seemingly, supposedly, very likely*;

– disjuncts stating "the sense" in which the speaker considers the proposition to be true or false: *actually, really, factually, only apparently, formally, hypothetically, ideally, nominally, officially, ostensibly, outwardly, superficially, technically, theoretically, basically, essentially, fundamentally* (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 620-621).

Disjuncts expressing value judgements form a rather heterogeneous group, and signal different types of judgement. Some of them indicate whether, according to the speaker, the proposition is right or wrong, e.g. *rightly, correctly, incorrectly, justly, unjustly, wrongly*. Some signal that the state of affairs is expected, e.g. *inevitably, naturally*; others communicate that the situation is fortunate or unfortunate, e.g. *fortunately, unfortunately, happily, luckily*, etc. (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 620-621). The role of expressing value judgement is also associated with such expressions as *of course, to be sure, no doubt*, which Quirk *et al.* (1985: 622) do not classify as adverbs, but as "prepositional phrases and clauses". Some adverbs are listed in both categories of content disjuncts, i.e. disjuncts expressing degrees of truth and disjuncts expressing value judgements, e.g. *certainly* and *obviously*,

which indicates that the same items are used to offer different types of comment on the content of the proposition.

Since both subjuncts and disjuncts express modal meanings, and numerous items can perform both functions, it is useful at this stage to compare Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) examples of both types. The examples quoted in point a. illustrate the uses of modal adverbs as subjuncts, while the ones quoted in b. are examples of disjuncts.

    a. They will *surely* object to his intervention.
       They *obviously* don't want it.
       They will warn us *for sure*. (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 584)
    b. *Certainly*, he had very little reason to fear their competition.
       Obviously, nobody expected us to be here today.
       Evidently, he doesn't object. (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 622-623)

Clearly, disjuncts are primarily associated with the sentence initial position, and detachment from the rest of the clause, which is emphasized by the use of a comma. Since the sentence initial position is associated with subjectivity (cf. Traugott 2014), they are more clearly than subjuncts oriented towards the speaker. Hasselgård (2010: 23) notes that the category of subjuncts is only distinguished by Quirk *et al.* (1985), while other authors find three adverbial types of functions sufficient. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 582) themselves admit that some items, e.g. subjuncts and disjuncts of time, may be difficult to separate. However, I find it useful to separate those uses of modal adverbs in which they typically relate to elements of clauses from those uses in which they modify entire sentences. As demonstrated in Chapters 4-10, some modal adverbs are used almost exclusively as subjuncts, while others are frequently employed as both subjuncts and disjuncts. This tendency can be linked with grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification. The distinction between disjuncts and subjuncts is also similar to (though not identical with) a distinction made by Polish linguists (Wajszczuk 2005; Grochowski *et al.* 2014) between particles and metapredicative operators (cf. section 2.4.4). I refer to both distinctions in Chapters 4-10; in Chapter 11, I also attempt to redefine the categories of subjunct and disjunct to make them more useful in the analysis of the functions of modal adverbs.

The fourth category of adverbs distinguished by Quirk *et al.* (1985) – **conjuncts** – includes items which perform connective functions, i.e. they express relations between pieces of discourse. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 634-636) distinguish seven types of conjuncts:

   – listing (enumerative, e.g. *first, first of all, finally*; additive: equative, e.g. *likewise, in the same way, similarly*; reinforcing: *in particular, what is more*);
   – summative, e.g. *altogether, then, in sum*;
   – appositive, e.g. *namely, in other words*;
   – resultive, e.g. *accordingly, consequently, of course*;
   – inferential, e.g. *otherwise, then*;
   – contrastive (reformulatory, e.g. *more precisely, in other words*; replacive, e.g. *rather, better;* antithetic, e.g. *on the contrary, in contrast*; concessive, e.g. *anyhow, nevertheless, of course*);
   – transitional (discoursal, e.g. *incidentally, now*; temporal, e.g. *meantime, meanwhile*).

Quirk *et al.* do not associate the category of conjuncts with modal adverbs (though they list *of course* as an example of resultive and concessive conjuncts), but, as argued later in this book, many of them have developed textual functions which correspond to those which Quirk *et al.* (1985) identify for non-modal adverbials.

3.6.2. Biber *et al.* (1999)

Biber *et al.* (1999: 549) divide adverbials into three types: (1) circumstance adverbials, which are highly integrated into clause structure, and provide information concerning the time, place and manner of the event described in a clause; (2) stance adverbials, which express the speaker's epistemic evaluation of or his/her attitude towards the proposition of the clause, as well as the style "in which the proposition is being conveyed"; (3) linking adverbials, which connect parts of text. Roughly, Biber *et al.*'s (1999) circumstance adverbials correspond to adjuncts as they are defined in Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) typology; stance adverbials correspond to disjuncts, while linking adverbials overlap with conjuncts. The category of subjuncts does not have a direct counterpart in Biber *et al.*'s (1999) typology. Items belonging to this category can be found among both circumstance adverbials and stance adverbials.

Biber *et al.* (1999) list epistemic adverbs in their category of stance adverbials, which also includes attitude and style adverbials (Biber *et al.* 1999: 764). Stance adverbials have scope over the whole clause, and are usually optional in clause structure. Biber *et al.* (1999: 859) note a high frequency of stance adverbials, in particular epistemic adverbials, in conversation and academic discourse; they also note that many words combine the function of adverbials with the function of discourse markers. The authors link their high frequency in academic English with the importance of the notions of certainty and source of information in academic registers. Epistemic stance adverbials relate to "certainty, reality, sources, limitations and precision of the proposition"; attitude stance adverbials "express the speaker's attitude towards or evaluation of the content", e.g. *appropriately, to my surprise, fortunately*, while style stance adverbials explain "how the speaker is speaking or how the utterance should be understood", e.g. *technically speaking, quite frankly* (Biber *et al.* 1999: 764).

Epistemic stance adverbials are said to be a highly diverse category (Biber *et al.* 1999: 854). They are subdivided into the following groups:
– "doubt and certainty adverbials", which indicate both a high level of certainty and various levels of doubt, such as *no doubt, undoubtedly, certainly, probably, maybe, perhaps, arguably, decidedly, definitely, incontestably, incontrovertibly, most likely, very likely, quite likely, of course, I guess, I think;*
– "actuality and reality adverbials", which mark a proposition as representing "real-life fact" (Biber *et al.* 1999: 854): *in fact, in actual fact, for a fact, actually, really, truly;*
– "adverbials of source of knowledge", which indicate the source of information: *evidently, apparently, reportedly, reputedly, according to ..., as sb notes...* (Biber *et al.* 1999: 855);
– "limitation adverbials", which "mark the limitation of the proposition": *in most cases, mainly, typically, generally, in general* (Biber *et al.* 1999: 855);
– "viewpoint or perspective adverbials", which mark the "perspective from which the proposition is true", e.g. *in our view, from our perspective, in my opinion* (Biber *et al.* 1999: 856);

– "imprecision adverbials", which indicate that "the proposition being conveyed is somehow imprecise" (Biber *et al.* 1999: 856). This category contains expressions functioning as hedges, e.g. *about, like, sort of, kind of, roughly, so to speak, if you can call it that.*

Biber *et al.* (1999) note that some items are difficult to classify, and allow both circumstance and stance interpretation, e.g. *really*, as in: "I had no choice *really*", where it means 'in truth, in reality', while in "It's *really* wonderful" it is an intensifier, meaning 'very much'. They also note that some stance adverbials have a linking function, e.g. *in fact*, which can be used to semantically connect two sentences, e.g. "She's never seen him on the porch. *In fact*, there's no chair to sit on" (Biber *et al.* 1999: 858). Biber *et al.*'s (1999) list is unlikely to have been intended as complete, since numerous epistemic adverbs are omitted from it, e.g. *obviously* and *presumably.* They do not discuss *indeed*, which is only listed in a table showing "most common adverbs by semantic domain" (1999: 562), but it does not appear in any of the subcategories they discuss.

In Biber *et al.*'s (1999) account epistemic modality is understood broadly. In addition to adverbs expressing different levels of certainty and its source, the category of epistemic adverbials also includes those which present a given perspective as subjective, e.g. *in my opinion*, as well as actuality adverbials, e.g. *in fact, for a fact*, and hedges, such as *sort of, like.* In their account a modal adverbial is one which "adds the speaker's face" to the text, as Biber and Finegan (1988: 22) put it. The speaker's imprint is manifested not only by expressions of certainty and likelihood, but also by hesitation markers, and markers of a point of view. In this work, I consider the category of modal adverbs to comprise Biber *et al.*'s (1999) "doubt and certainty adverbials" and "adverbials of source of knowledge", as these two express the meanings which are usually attributed to epistemic modality (doubt and certainty) and evidentiality (source of information).

3.6.3. Huddleston and Pullum (2002)

Huddleston and Pullum (2002) do not divide adverbials into categories corresponding to adjuncts, disjuncts and conjuncts. They use the term *adjunct* to refer to "modifiers in the VP or clause together with related supplements" (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 665). Thus, all types of adverbials are referred to as adjuncts in their approach. They divide adjuncts

into twenty-six semantic categories, such as manner, instrument, means, spatial location, temporal location, source, goal, act-related, domain, modality, evaluation, connective, etc. Those which are closely integrated into clause structure, such as adjuncts of manner and temporal location, are termed complements, while those which show a lower degree of integration, and are prosodically detached from it, such as evaluation and connective adjuncts, are termed supplements (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 666).

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 767) list epistemic adverbs in the category of *modal adjuncts*, noting that most modal adjuncts express epistemic meanings, and express "the speaker's assessment of the truth of the proposition ... or the nature of the speaker's commitment to its truth". They prefer to use the term modal over epistemic because some adverbs are non-epistemic in character, e.g. *necessarily* and *possibly*. They compare two uses of *necessarily*:

a. You're his uncle, so *necessarily* he's your nephew.
b. Twice as many people turned up as we had been told to expect, so *necessarily* things were a little chaotic for a while. (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 767)

In Huddleston and Pullum's (2002) interpretation the example quoted in a. has an epistemic reading, while the one quoted in b. expresses dynamic modality, as it indicates that one situation is "the result of another" (2002: 767), and "a matter of interaction between one situation and another" (2002: 768) is, in their account, subsumed under dynamic modality. According to Quirk *et al.* (1985: 479), the relation of cause and result belongs to the domain of non-modal notions, and is termed "contingency". Clearly, the two grammars adopt different views of modality. In Huddleston and Pullum's (2002: 768) view, *possibly* loses its epistemic sense in requests, where it occurs "in modal harmony with deontic *can*", as in: *Could I possibly borrow your bicycle for half an hour?*

Huddleston and Pullum's (2002: 768) category of modal adjuncts comprises 32 items divided into four categories according to the degrees of certainty they express (with the reservation that this criterion is not always easy to apply). The four categories are as follows:

- strong adverbs: *assuredly, certainly, clearly, definitely, incontestably, indubitably, ineluctably, inescapably, manifestly, necessarily, obviously, patently, plainly, surely, truly, unarguably, unavoidably, undeniably, undoubtedly, unquestionably*;
- quasi-strong: *apparently, doubtless, evidently, presumably, seemingly*;
- medium: *arguably, likely, probably*;
- weak: *conceivably, maybe, perhaps, possibly* (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 768).

In contrast to Quirk *et al.* (1985), Huddleston and Pullum (2002) exclude *allegedly* from their list of modal adverbs, explaining that: "*allegedly* absolves me from responsibility for the residual proposition: the latter has the status of an allegation, and I can't say whether it is true" (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 769). The same reason may have motivated the omission of other adverbs expressing reported information, such as *reportedly* and *reputedly*. The only adverb expressing hearsay that they include is *apparently*, probably because it can also be used to signal inference (see Chapters 4 and 5). Their rejection of *allegedly* (and omission of *reportedly* and *reputedly*) suggests that Huddleston and Pullum (2002) understand modality as a category which is related to the speaker's responsibility for a claim. In the present work, adverbs expressing reported information are included in the category of epistemic markers (see Chapter 4).

3.6.4. Greenbaum (1969)

Greenbaum (1969) distinguishes between three types of adverbs: (1) conjuncts, which work "intersententially", and function as linkers between clauses and sentences; (2) disjuncts, which have a sentence in their scope; and (3) adjuncts, which work within clause structure. His typology largely corresponds to the distinctions made later by Biber *et al.* (1999), who also group adverbs into three categories. Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) typology, as already noted, additionally includes subjuncts. In Greenbaum's (1969) view, the position of an adverb in a sentence is crucial, as it determines its function and meaning. Greenbaum refers to epistemic adverbs as "attitudinal disjuncts" (Greenbaum 1969: 94, 202), and explains that they "express the speaker's attitude to what he is saying, his evaluation of it, or shades of certainty or doubt about it" (Greenbaum 1969: 94). He also

notes that they are both polysemous and polyfunctional. Greenbaum distinguishes between adverbs expressing conviction (*definitely, certainly, admittedly, undoubtedly, decidedly, surely,* etc.), and adverbs expressing some degree of doubt. Within both groups he identifies additional, more specific meanings for some sets of adverbs. Among the adverbs of conviction he distinguishes a set of adverbs which indicate conviction resulting from perception or observation, such as *clearly, evidently, manifestly, obviously, patently, and plainly*. This group corresponds to the category of evidential adverbs as delineated in other studies (e.g. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007). Among the adverbs which signal some degree of doubt he identifies a group of items which indicate a low degree of doubt, e.g. *doubtless, presumably, likely* and *probably*, and a high degree of doubt, such as *conceivably*. *Allegedly* and *reportedly* are said to additionally communicate "that what is being said has been stated previously by others" (Greenbaum 1969: 203), while *conceivably* and *arguably* are said to "imply that other people may be convinced of the truth of what is being said" (Greenbaum 1969: 203).

3.6.5. Swan (1988)

In his synchronic and diachronic study of English sentence adverbials, Swan (1988: 42) defines modal adverbs as those which "assign a degree of likelihood or evaluate the truth/probability of the adjoined sentence". He thus uses the concepts of truth and probability in his definition. He distinguishes the following groups of modal adverbs: (1) logical adverbs, expressing conviction which stems from the speaker's inference, such as *undoubtedly, possibly, probably*; (2) distancing adverbs, which indicate that the speaker is distancing himself/herself from the claim, comprising hearsay adverbs such as *supposedly, allegedly*; (3) evidential adverbs, used to indicate that a claim is evidence-based, e.g. *clearly, manifestly, ostensibly*; and (4) performative adverbs, by means of which the speaker assures the hearer about the validity of the claim, e.g. *assuredly, admittedly*. What his account shares with later studies is the identification of evidential adverbs as a separate category (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007), and the association of hearsay adverbs with a non-committal attitude of the speaker (cf. Huddleston and Pullum 2002).

3.6.6. Biber and Finegan (1988)

Biber and Finegan (1988) discuss modal adverbs in their study of stance adverbials, a category which roughly corresponds to stance adverbials as identified by Biber *et al.* (1999). They divide them into six semantic categories using the most characteristic representatives of each category as their headings: (1) *honestly* adverbials, i.e. those which express the manner of speaking; (2) *generally* adverbials, indicating "approximation, generalization, typical or usual case"; (3) *surely* adverbials, i.e. those which express "conviction or certainty"; (4) *actually* adverbials, i.e. those which signal "actuality, emphasis, greater certainty/truth than expected"; (5) *maybe* adverbials, "expressing possibility, likelihood, questionable assertions, hedging"; and (6) *amazingly* adverbials, "expressing attitudes towards the content independent of its epistemological status" (Biber and Finegan 1988: 7-8). Modal adverbs are included in the categories of *surely* adverbials and *maybe* adverbials. Biber and Finegan's (1988) lists contain key words which they used to identify adverbials in their corpus and discussed in the body of their article, and in addition to adverbs, they also contain adjectives and nouns. The modal adverbs excerpted from their lists are as follows:

  – *surely* adverbials: *certainly, clearly, definitely, doubtless, no doubt, without doubt, indeed, obviously, plainly, surely, of course, admittedly, assuredly, avowedly, decidedly, incontestably, incontrovertibly, indisputably, indubitably, undoubtedly, unquestionably, unarguably, undeniably, evidently, manifestly, patently*;
  – *maybe* adverbials: *arguably, allegedly, conceivably, likely, maybe, perhaps, possibly, presumably, purportedly, reportedly, reputedly, supposedly, apparently, seemingly, formally, hypothetically, ideally, officially, ostensibly, outwardly, superficially, technically, theoretically*.

An important element of Biber and Finegan's (1988) study is the identification of some of the discourse functions performed by modal adverbs. The authors observe that their discourse functions are different from those suggested by their literal meanings. They argue that the primary function of *surely* adverbials is not to express certainty but to evoke approval and empathy in the hearer (Biber and Finegan 1988: 19-22). *Surely* adverbials suggest that there exists some shared knowledge between the speaker and

the addressee which makes the presented information seem obvious. In other words, they mark the information presented "as generally accepted by knowledgeable persons" (Biber and Finegan 1988: 22). The addressee is expected to agree with the speaker, with the exception of a situation when the speaker anticipates disagreement and uses an interrogative (e.g. a question tag) thus weakening the force of a *surely* adverbial. Biber and Finegan note the frequent use of *surely* adverbials in dialogic and persuasive genres, such as editorials, interviews, and public speeches. As far as *maybe* adverbials are concerned, depending on the type of text in which they appear, they are said to signal uncertainty, and make texts cautious and tentative, particularly when the presented evidence is not complete. Biber and Finegan's (1988) conclusions mostly concern the functions of the entire classes of adverbials rather than the specific properties of the individual items. Nevertheless, their study provides important insights into the functions of modal adverbials in different types of discourse.

3.6.7. Hoye (1997)

Hoye's (1997) study focuses on collocations of modal adverbs and modal verbs in English, and, to a lesser degree, on their Spanish equivalents. In Hoye's (1997: 141) account, modal adverbs "constitute a fairly limited set of items". They are considered to be markers of subjectivity, as they always function as "tokens of speaker presence" (Hoye 1997: 286). The modal adverbs discussed by Hoye are single-word items expressing modality and degree, which, as he explains, are closely related issues. His central argument is that modality is rarely expressed by isolated carriers of modal meaning. On the contrary, those carriers usually cumulate and "interact dynamically" (Hoye 1997: 3). In Hoye's (1997) view modal verb-adverb collocations play one of the central roles in the expression of modality in English. The importance of such collocations is evidenced by the existence of fixed expressions, such as *can't possibly*, whose integrity suggests that some of such collocations may be treated as "units of modal expression" (Hoye 1997: 285). Not all modal verb-adverb combinations are so highly idiomaticized, but their collocations are nevertheless very frequent. Hoye also argues that "profiles of the modals' behaviour with their various adverb satellites is yet a further defining characteristic of the modals themselves" (Hoye 1997: 4).

Hoye (1997: 240) proposes the same classification for modal verbs and the modal adverbs which collocate with them. He divides modal verbs into: (1) verbs expressing possibility: *might, may, could, can* (in rhetorical questions); (2) verbs expressing probability: *should, ought to, would, will*; (3) verbs expressing certainty: *must, can't*. Likewise, he divides modal adverbs into: (1) adverbs expressing possibility, such as *possibly, conceivably, perhaps,* and *maybe*; (2) adverbs expressing probability: *probably, quite likely, most likely, well* (only after *could* and *might*); (3) adverbs expressing certainty: *certainly, definitely, indeed, presumably, surely, for certain, of course, undoubtedly,* and *necessarily*. Hoye focuses on the ways in which modal adverbs are used to modify, complement and transform the meanings of auxiliary verbs (Hoye 1997: 143). The degree to which they contribute to the overall meaning of the sentence, he argues, depends on their position and function in a sentence.

Hoye distinguishes between modal adverbs modifying clauses (sentence adverbs) and those which modify verb phrases (verb phrase adverbs). He adopts Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) classification of adverbs into adjuncts, conjuncts, disjuncts and subjuncts as the basis for his study. Adjuncts and conjuncts are only marginally used to express modal meanings, which is why Hoye concentrates on disjuncts and subjuncts. He notes, however, that some modal adverbs which are typically used in the functions of disjuncts and subjuncts can also function as conjuncts, e.g. *indeed, certainly, of course, really*. Such adverbs are used to connect clauses, while at the same time appealing to the addressee for a specific attitude towards the content of what is said. Such connective uses of modal adverbs will also be discussed in Chapters 4-10.

The category of sentence adverbs, as discussed by Hoye (1997), comprises those items which Quirk *et al.* (1985) classify as disjuncts, while Hoye's verb phrase adverbs correspond to subjuncts. Hoye argues that sentence adverbs, in this case modal disjuncts, preserve their lexical meanings to a greater degree than adverbs modifying verb phrases. Modal disjuncts are "more lexically loaded and signal speaker-orientation to a greater extent" (Hoye 1997: 151). Subjuncts, in his view, more closely resemble modal particles as distinguished for languages such as German

(Hoye 1997: 212). His views on the relation between the category of epistemic adverbs and modal particles are outlined in section 3.5.2.

3.6.8. Nuyts (2001a)

Nuyts (2001a) refers to modal adverbs as "epistemic modal sentence adverbs". He argues that modal adverbs (and adjectives) are more straightforward in rendering epistemic meanings than other types of modal markers. He groups them according to the degrees of certainty they express, and argues that it is relatively easy (as compared to mental state predicates, such as *I think*) to place them on the certainty scale. Nuyts argues that *certainly, undoubtedly* and *surely* are positive with respect to certainty; *probably* occupies the middle position, while *possibly, perhaps* and *maybe* are neutral. At the same time, he suggests that *maybe* is stronger than *possibly*. Nuyts admits, however, that the level of certainty the adverbs express may vary from context to context. He explains the co-existence of a variety of adverbs on each level of certainty by the need for stylistic and regional variation. He also introduces the category of evidential adverbs, comprising such items as: *seemingly, apparently, clearly* (Nuyts 2001a: 56-57). He treats epistemic modality and evidentiality as distinct notions, but some adverbs, such as *presumably*, are in his view both evidential and epistemic. *Presumably* presents inference from what is known (evidential component) and its epistemic evaluation, though the source of its perceived epistemic meaning is uncertain. Nuyts (2001a: 55) argues that epistemic adverbs (as well as epistemic adjectives) form a closed class, i.e. "they consist of a fairly stable and delimited set of forms". His discussion is not intended to offer a comprehensive account of any of the categories he introduces; it focuses on their most frequent and prototypical representatives.

3.6.9. Wierzbicka (2006)

Wierzbicka devotes one chapter (Chapter 8) of her book *English: Meaning and Culture* (2006) to an analysis of epistemic adverbs. As indicated by the book title, the major focus of her study is on the connection between the use of epistemic adverbs and the cultural heritage of English (which is discussed in more detail in section 2.8.). She argues that the repertoire of epistemic adverbs in English is greater than in other languages because of

the legacy of the Enlightenment in Anglo-American culture, resulting in the need (stronger than in other languages) "to differentiate one's degrees of 'epistemic commitment'" (Wierzbicka 2006: 251). The items she classifies as "common epistemic adverbs" are: *arguably, apparently, allegedly, clearly, certainly, conceivably, evidently, indisputably, likely, manifestly, obviously, probably, presumably, reportedly, seemingly, undoubtedly*, and *unquestionably* (Wierzbicka 2006: 248). She proposes the following criteria for identifying epistemic adverbs:

1. They can be used sentence-initially.
2. They can be used sentence-internally (after the auxiliary if there is one, otherwise before the main verb).
3. They cannot be used in questions.
4. They include in their semantic structure the components 'I think' and 'I don't say I know' (Wierzbicka 2006: 291).

Wierzbicka (2006) does not refer to the morphological form of the items she classifies as epistemic adverbs, as her criteria are semantic, pragmatic and syntactic, but it can be noticed that all the items in her list end in -*ly*; many of them are also polysyllabic words, more frequent in writing than in speech. The syntactic criteria for the identification of epistemic adverbs which she postulates have also been identified by other scholars, e.g. Bellert (1977), though, as noted in section 3.5, they are not watertight, as some adverbs develop dialogic functions and can be used in questions. However, her semantic, pragmatic and cultural-historical analysis brings a new perspective on epistemic adverbs.

Wierzbicka argues that the common association of epistemic adverbs with truth is not accurate. In her view, most of these adverbs do not refer to truth, but to knowledge and thinking, i.e. they refer to opinions (Wierzbicka 2006: 252-253). She argues that truth is a relevant concept in the meaning of some of them, such as *supposedly* and *allegedly*, but generally both epistemic and evidential markers are concerned with the speaker's knowledge. The beginnings of their expansion in English, she argues, coincide with a shift from truth to knowledge in "Anglo" ways of thinking, and the key semantic component of their meaning is "I think, I don't say I know". They signal "an abstention from a claim to knowledge" (Wierzbicka 2006: 256). Another important component of their meaning

is "the place of other people" (2006: 259). While epistemic adverbs are essentially speaker-oriented, they are not as subjective as first person epistemic verbal phrases. They convey the expectation that the speaker's point of view will be shared by the addressee (Wierzbicka 2006: 259). From this perspective they could be considered as intersubjective (cf. Nuyts 2001a), though Wierzbicka does not use this term in her discussion. Wierzbicka's observations concerning epistemic adverbs will be referred to in Chapters 4-10.

3.6.10. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007)

Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) focus on adverbs of certainty, i.e. those which express "a meaning towards the high probability extreme" (2007: 69). An important aspect of their contribution is the emphasis on the pragmatic and rhetorical functions of epistemic adverbs. They analyze the semantic properties of the adverbs, as well as their interpersonal and textual functions; they note the importance of the context in the realization of specific adverbial meanings. The authors argue that speakers do not only use modal markers to express certainty or doubt; they do it "to position themselves in the current discourse, vis-à-vis other voices, with the extent to which they wish to open up or close down the dialogue" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007:33). This rhetorical function is, in their opinion, not additional but "fundamental ... in the explanation of the pragmatic and ultimately the semantic meanings of the adverbs" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 33).

While Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) use the term "adverbs of certainty", they also note that the meanings of such adverbs are highly context-dependent, which makes categorizing them on the basis of their level of certainty rather problematic. The categories of adverbs expressing different degrees of conviction may be taken to refer to prototypical examples, while their actual usage shows that the boundaries between categories delimited on the basis of degrees of certainty tend to be fluid. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 84) divide adverbs of certainty into four semantic categories, which correspond to Chafe's (1986) categories of evidentials:

– epistemic adverbs, i.e. adverbs expressing conviction without "specifically referring to modes, sources and matches of that knowledge": *certainly, definitely, undoubtedly, no doubt, indeed, surely, decidedly, for sure, for certain, assuredly,* and *indubitably*;

– evidential adverbs, i.e. those which refer to certainty coming from available evidence (Chafe's (1986) mode of knowing): *clearly, evidently, manifestly, obviously, patently,* and *plainly*;

– expectation adverbs, which relate the speaker's expectations to the state of affairs: *of course, inevitably, naturally*, and *necessarily*;

– speech act adverbs, which "express certainty through conveying explicitly that the speaker's viewpoint is to be seen in the light of alternative voices which are either subscribed to or countered" (2007: 84): *avowedly, admittedly, arguably, incontestably, incontrovertibly, indisputably, unarguably, unquestionably,* and *undeniably*.

In Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer's (2007) account this classification only "provides a rough framework for treating the adverbs in clusters" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 83). The categories are treated as having fuzzy boundaries. The authors note that because of the variety of functions which modal adverbs perform, some movements between the categories can be noticed.

Their analysis focuses on the most frequent adverbs in the corpus they use (ICE-GB), i.e. *of course, certainly, obviously, indeed, clearly, no doubt, definitely, necessarily, surely, undoubtedly, naturally, inevitably, plainly, evidently, arguably, admittedly, decidedly, undeniably,* and *unquestionably*. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer's (2007) observations concerning the uses and meanings of individual adverbs and groups of adverbs constitute an important point of reference for the analysis of adverbs of certainty conducted further in this work.

3.7. Classifications of English modal adverbs: a summary

As demonstrated in the outline of selected classifications of English modal adverbs presented in section 3.6., most studies divide them on the basis of degrees of certainty they express. Some authors identify two degrees of certainty, which roughly correspond to conviction and doubt, e.g. Quirk *et al.* (1985), and Biber *et al.* (1999); while others identify three or even four levels of certainty, e.g. Greenbaum (1969), and Huddleston and Pullum (2002). Some authors use additional categories to account for the

evidential meanings of some adverbs, e.g. adverbs expressing conviction resulting from perception or observation (Greenbaum 1969), adverbials of source of knowledge (Biber *et al.* 1999). A summary of selected typologies is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Types of modal adverbs distinguished in selected studies

Greenbaum (1969)	Quirk *et al.* (1985)	Swan (1988)	Biber *et al.* (1999)	Huddleston and Pullum (2002)
adverbs of conviction, e.g. *definitely, certainly*	adverbs of conviction, e.g. *admittedly, assuredly*	logical adverbs, e.g. *possibly, undoubtedly*	doubt and certainty adverbials, e.g. *no doubt, maybe*	strong adverbs, e.g. *surely, undoubtedly*
adverbs expressing conviction resulting from perception or observation, e.g. *clearly, evidently*	adverbs expressing some degree of doubt, e.g. *allegedly, arguably*	distancing adverbs, e.g. *supposedly, allegedly*	adverbials of source of knowledge, e.g. *evidently, reportedly*	quasi-strong adverbs, e.g. *apparently, doubtless*
adverbs expressing a low degree of doubt, e.g. *doubtless, presumably*		evidential adverbs, e.g. *clearly, manifestly*		medium strong adverbs, e.g. *arguably, likely*
adverbs expressing a high degree of doubt, e.g. *conceivably*		performative adverbs, e.g. *assuredly, admittedly*		weak adverbs, e.g. *perhaps, conceivably*

3.8. Studies of modal adverbs in Polish

3.8.1. Grzegorczykowa (1975)

Grzegorczykowa's (1975) monograph is devoted to the semantic and syntactic properties of different types of adverbs; one of its sections focuses on modal adverbs (Pol. *przysłówki modalne*). In her view, modal adverbs communicate the same type of information about the speaker's attitude as modal verbs, but the range of epistemic meanings they express is wider. Grzegorczykowa argues that most modal adverbs express certainty. She distinguishes between two types of high confidence adverbs: (1) those indicating a high degree of certainty: *na pewno, niechybnie,* and *niewątpliwie*; (2) those informing that the state of affairs turned out to be what the speaker had expected, e.g. *faktycznie, istotnie, naturalnie, oczywiście,* and *rzeczywiście*. The low confidence adverbs that she lists are: *prawdopodobnie, przypuszczalnie, pewno, zapewne,* and *chyba*. She also identifies a group of reportive adverbs, communicating somebody else's view: *podobno, rzekomo,* and *niby,* and briefly discusses one evidential adverb: *widocznie*. In her examples, *widocznie* is used interchangeably with its superlative form *najwidoczniej,* which is treated as a distinct marker in more recent studies (e.g. Grochowski *et al.* 2014; *WSJP*). In addition to epistemic adverbs, Grzegorczykowa discusses the adverb *koniecznie* 'necessarily', which functions as an emphasizer in sentences expressing necessity. Grzegorczykowa (1975: 121) notes its uses in imperative sentences, e.g. *Przyjedź koniecznie* 'Come here necessarily', and its co-occurrences with the verb *musieć* 'must', e.g. *Musisz koniecznie to załatwić* 'You must necessarily take care of it'.

3.8.2. Bralczyk (1978)

Bralczyk (1978) offers quite a comprehensive treatment of lexical markers of epistemic modality in Polish. In addition to discussing the semantic and syntactic properties of modal markers, he also notes some of their pragmatic functions. Bralczyk separates modal particles from modal adverbs. In his classification particles are more interactional, and more characteristic of colloquial language, e.g. *pewno, pewnie* and *chyba,* while modal adverbs are more formal, e.g. *przypuszczalnie* and *prawdopodobnie* (Bralczyk 1975: 35). Bralczyk (1978) uses four criteria to study epistemic

markers: (1) affirmation and negation, i.e. establishing whether a modal marker signals that the speaker thinks the proposition is likely to be true or whether the speaker does not think it is likely to be false; (2) the degree of certainty which they express; (3) their level of subjectivity; (4) additional information which they express, e.g. inference and reported information (compare: Greenbaum 1969). The first criterion, he argues, has little relevance in the analysis of epistemic adverbs and particles, as it is difficult to establish whether they indicate that the speaker doubts that something will happen or that the speaker believes that something will not happen (Bralczyk 1978: 29). Taking into consideration degrees of certainty expressed by modal adverbs and particles, Bralczyk divides them into 3 groups:

– markers of a high level of certainty: *na pewno, z pewnością, niezawodnie,* and *niewątpliwie;*
– markers of a medium level of certainty: *chyba, pewnie, pewno, zapewne, raczej, przypuszczalnie,* and *prawdopodobnie;*
– markers of a low level of certainty: *może* and *być może.*

Bralczyk (1978) considers modal particles and adverbs to be neutral with respect to subjectivity and objectivity. The additional meanings which he identifies for them include: inference from evidence (*widocznie*), reportive meaning (*podobno, jakoby,* and *rzekomo*), and the speaker's emotional attitude which they show in insistent offers and invitations, such as *A może jednak tych ciasteczek*? 'Maybe/perhaps you will have some more biscuits after all.' Reportive adverbs, in his view, suggest that the speaker does not take full responsibility for the consequences of accepting his/her statement as true, and only informs the receiver about a claim made by someone else. In this sense, such expressions can be treated as non-modal. They do not indicate the speaker's own attitude towards the proposition, but merely signal that the speaker's knowledge is insufficient to mark a given claim as true. A similar treatment of hearsay adverbs is found in Huddleston and Pullum (2002).

3.8.3. Rytel (1982)

Rytel (1982) discusses the semantics of epistemic markers with reference an epistemic scale, similar to the one proposed by Bralczyk (1978). In Rytel's account high certainty adverbs include: *na pewno, niewątpliwie, nie-*

chybnie, faktycznie, rzeczywiście, istotnie, naprawdę, oczywiście, and *naturalnie*. Within the group she distinguishes a set of confirmation markers: *faktycznie, rzeczywiście, istotnie,* and *naprawdę*, which are used to confirm the validity of the proposition. Since their major function is indicating confirmation, their modal character is, in Rytel's (1982: 27) view, problematic. Another set of high confidence adverbs comprises the expectation markers *oczywiście* and *naturalnie*, which are used to communicate that the state of affairs is obvious and expected. Rytel (1982: 27) argues that such adverbs show the highest level of certainty.

The medium level of certainty implies a high degree of probability that the proposition is true. It is expressed by such items as: *pewnie, zapewne, najprawdopodobniej,* and *najpewniej*. In such cases the speaker presents his/her assessment of a situation as a result of inference and reasoning. Expressions showing a low level of certainty signal a lack of knowledge or lack of sufficient information on which a claim could be based. The group includes adverbs which signal a 50% degree of certainty ('maybe yes, maybe no'), such as *może, być może, chyba,* as well as reportive adverbs: *podobno, ponoć, rzekomo,* and *jakoby*. Reportive adverbs signal, Rytel argues, that the speaker does not take full responsibility for the assessment of the truth value of a proposition, but cedes the responsibility on someone else.

Rytel (1982) observes that the primary function of epistemic markers is the expression of the speaker's mental state, while their secondary function is persuasion, i.e. evoking certain reactions and mental states in the receiver. She also notes the context-dependence of many modal meanings (Rytel 1982: 22), like numerous researchers discussing English adverbs (e.g. Nuyts 2001a; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007).

3.8.4. Tutak (2003)

Tutak (2003) examines epistemic modality markers adopting Kiseleva and Pajar's (1998) framework based on the category of *gwarant* 'guarantee'/'guarantor'/'warrant', a concept which goes back to Culioli (1995), and is also discussed in section 2.4.1. A proposition may have an internal guarantor, i.e. the speaker, who 'guarantees' that it true; it may also have an external guarantor, such as the addressee or an external source of information. It is also possible for a proposition not to have a guarantor. High confidence adverbs, such as *niewątpliwie* 'undoubtedly', which express the

speaker's subjective judgement without references to external sources of information indicate that the speaker is responsible for ('guarantees') the truth value of the proposition. Hearsay adverbs, such as *podobno* 'reportedly', point to the 'primary speaker' (in contrast to the 'current speaker') as the guarantor. Low confidence adverbs have no guarantor; the speaker does not take responsibility for the validity of the statements they modify. In the case of adverbs which signal that the claim is obvious to both the speaker and the addressee, e.g. *oczywiście* 'of course, obviously', both the speaker and the external guarantor are held responsible for the validity of the statement. The external guarantee/guarantor corresponds to general knowledge which is shared by the speaker and the addressee (Tutak 2003: 84). The distinctions made by Tutak (2003) within the category of modal adverbs largely correspond to those made by Bralczyk (1978) and Rytel (1982); they are based on degrees of certainty, and the additional meanings expressed by the adverbs.

3.8.5. Wiemer (2006)

Wiemer's (2006) study focuses on evidentiality markers. In addition to evidential adverbs, Wiemer discusses parentheticals, conjunctions, and prepositions which are used to signal the source of information. As indicated in the title of his paper, it offers the "first exploratory study" of evidentiality markers in Polish. It is intended to delimit the field under analysis, and to identify the expressions which signal information source in Polish. Wiemer (2006) examines two groups of evidentials: markers of reported information and markers of inference, but he devotes most of his attention to markers of hearsay, particularly the adverbs *podobno, rzekomo,* and *jakoby.* The three adverbs are also the object of study in Wiemer and Socka (2017a, 2017b). The other markers of hearsay discussed by Wiemer (2006) are: the particle *niby,* the verb *mieć* 'be reported to'/ lit. 'to have', the infinitive *słychać,* and the quotative expressions *według, zdaniem* 'according to'. The group of inferential markers which he discusses is much less numerous, and only contains one inferential adverb: *widocznie* 'apparently'. The other inferentials are the particle *widać,* and the epistemic verbal phrases *zdaje się, wydaje się* 'it seems'. Wiemer examines the semantic properties of the individual markers; he also focuses on the interplay of evidential and epistemic elements in their semantics.

The group of hearsay adverbs he discusses corresponds to the category of reportive adverbs as distinguished in the present study. However, the category of inferential adverbs discussed in this work is more numerous, and also includes such items as *wyraźnie, ewidentnie, jawnie, najwyraźniej, najwidoczniej,* and *najoczywiściej* (cf. Chapter 5).

3.8.6. Danielewiczowa (2008a, 2008b, 2012)

Danielewiczowa (2008a, 2008b, 2012) is one of the few Polish linguists who use the term adverbs to refer to the items under analysis in the present work. Her work on epistemic adverbs (Pol. *przysłówki epistemiczne*) is situated within formal semantics, with the main focus on semantic and syntactic properties of the items in question. The identification of the pragmatic properties of modal markers can, in her view, only be considered as supplementary to a detailed semantic analysis. In her studies Danielewiczowa concentrates on what she calls "genetic adverbs", i.e. those which end in *-e* and *-o,* like most Polish adverbs of manner, and have corresponding modal adjectives, e.g. *przypuszczalnie* 'presumably' and the adjective *przypuszczalny.* Danielewiczowa focuses on the identification of the semantic properties of individual adverbs and groups of adverbs.

Danielewiczowa (2012: 16) argues that the Polish "adverbial field" comprises three groups of items: (1) regular adverbs (those which modify verbs); (2) particles, i.e. units of a metatextual character which comment on the text and help to construct it; (3) quasi-adverbs – a rich and heterogeneous collection of intermediate phenomena which remain largely unexplored. The intermediate phenomena function in the border area between the textual and metatextual levels of language. Danielewiczowa (2012) stresses the dynamic character of adverbs as a category and their tendency to expand into the metatextual level of language, though, unlike Anglophone scholars, she does not use the term grammaticalization to name this process of change.

Danielewiczowa (2012) examines a group of items which she terms 'adverbial metapredicates' (Pol. *metapredykaty przysłówkowe*), i.e. adverbs of manner which have additionally developed metatextual uses, e.g. *jawnie* 'openly'/'manifestly', *spokojnie* 'quietly'/'no doubt'. Their manner and metatextual uses are contrasted in points a. and b.

a. manner: "Nazizm zabijał *jawnie*, a komunizm po cichu." 'Nazism killed people *openly*, while communism did it secretly.'
   metatextual: "Twoja wypowiedź *jawnie* przeczy logice." 'Your answer *manifestly* contradicts logic.' (Danielewiczowa 2012: 169-170).

b. manner: "Koń *spokojnie* patrzył na publiczność." 'The horse was looking at the audience *quietly*.'
   metatextual: "Taka maszyna waży *spokojnie* kilka ton." 'Such a machine *no doubt* weighs a few tons.' (Danielewiczowa 2012: 186-189)

The adverbial developments discussed by Danielewiczowa (2012) correspond to the processes identified by Traugott (e.g. 1995b), and Traugott and Dasher (2002) for English adverbs. Danielewiczowa's findings indicate that Polish adverbs of manner acquire their epistemic meanings in the process of subjectification, but she does not use this term in her studies. Danielewiczowa's (2012) discussion also demonstrates that the class of modal adverbs is an open-ended one (cf. also Simon-Vandenbergen 1996), and may, with time, be enriched with new members.

3.8.7. Grochowski (1984)-(2009); Grochowski *et al.* (2014)

Since the 1980s, Grochowski's works on particles (e.g. 1984, 1986a, 1986b, 1989, 2002, 2008, 2009) have constituted an important point of reference for other studies in the field. In the 1990s, Grochowski broadened his interest to include other types of function words, such as conjunctions and prepositions (e.g. Grochowski 1997), and, after that, under the influence of Wajszczuk's (1997, 2000, 2005, 2010) works, he resumed his studies on particles. His long-time research on particles culminated in the publication of the dictionary of Polish particles by Grochowski *et al.* (2014).

In the 1980s, Grochowski (e.g. 1986a) considered the syntactic properties of particles to be their primary identification criterion. In his works published at that time, he defined particles as items which enter into a syntactic relationship with verbs and nouns (their syntactic relationship with nouns was then considered to be a feature which distinguished them from adverbs), occur in declarative sentences, and are flexible with respect to their syntactic position. Grochowski's (1986a) list of particles originally included 73 items, 21 of which he considered to be homonymic

with items representing other classes. Later, he modified his definition to incorporate Wajszczuk's (1997, 2000, 2005, 2010) findings. Wajszczuk's word-class typology takes into account both the textual and metatextual levels of language. In her view, the textual level comprises relationships on the level of sentence structure (syntactic relations, syntactic functions), while the metatextual level is concerned with an utterance, and involves the relationship of co-occurrence (a function in the Theme-Rheme structure). Wajszczuk's findings brought a different view on the relationship between particles and other sentence elements. Originally, it was thought to be a relationship of a syntactic character, and this is how Grochowski (1986a, 1997) first defined it; Wajszczuk referred to it as a relationship of co-occurrence. A syntactic relationship requires specific grammatical and semantic properties from the elements involved (such as the relationship between a verb and an adverb), while co-occurrence does not; it is a relation of a functional character, involving elements which have a specific function in the Theme-Rheme structure. Once it has been accepted that particles can co-occur with different types of word classes, their co-occurrence with nouns ceased to be their defining characteristic (cf. Żabowska 2014: 107). Since they do not require any specific semantic properties from the items they co-occur with, they are no longer considered to be metapredicative (see section 2.4.3.). They are metatextual, i.e. they comment on what is said in an utterance, and how it is said.

When Grochowski *et al.* (2014) revised Grochowski's earlier classification criteria, the list of particles was extended from 73 to 178 items. The items which were added to the list include the lexemes which were first classified as conjunctions (e.g. *niemniej* 'nevertheless'), adverbs (*doprawdy* 'indeed/really'), adnominal and adverbial operators (e.g. *po prostu* 'simply', *niejako* 'in a way/sort of') and those which Grochowski (1986a) left unclassified, such as *skądinąd* 'on the other hand'. Grochowski *et al.* (2014) group particles into five semantic "nests", which, as they stress, are not to be treated as formal categories but, rather, as a convenient way of presenting the semantics of the items in question. The five nests they distinguish include:
– epistemic particles (Pol. *partykuły epistemiczne*), i.e. items connected with the speaker's awareness of his/her state of knowledge, e.g.

prawdopodobnie 'probably', *niewątpliwie* 'undoubtedly', *na mur be-*
ton 'as sure as concrete', *w gruncie rzeczy* 'as a matter of fact';
– particles commenting on the process of speaking (Pol. *partykuły*
   komentujące mówienie), e.g. *niejako* 'in a sense', *dosłownie* 'liter-
   ally', *w zasadzie* 'actually', *by tak rzec* 'so to speak', *w pełnym tego*
   słowa znaczeniu 'in every sense of the word';
– particles of conclusion (Pol. *partykuły konkluzywne*), i.e. those
   showing relations between elements of an utterance: *zatem* 'there-
   fore', *niemniej* 'nevertheless', *koniec końców* 'all in all', *tak czy inaczej*
   'this way or another', *innymi słowy* 'in other words';
– particles of comparison (Pol. *partykuły porównania*), which com-
   ment on one thing by making reference to other things, e.g. *też*
   'too', *przede wszystkim* 'first of all', *między innymi* 'among others',
   tylko i wyłącznie 'solely and exclusively', *przynajmniej* 'at least',
   nawet 'even';
– complementing particles (Pol. *partykuły uzupełniania*): those
   which introduce additional, originally unplanned information,
   e.g. *co więcej* 'what is more', *nawiasem mówiąc* 'by the way', *między*
   nami mówiąc 'between you and me', *na domiar złego* 'to make
   things worse'.

A comparison of Grochowski *et al.*'s (2014) list with the items given
as examples of English discourse markers (e.g. Lewis 2006) reveals con-
siderable overlaps between the two categories. Both lists include items
which express the speaker's stance, and connect elements of discourse.
Grochowski *et al.* (2014) do not analyze the pragmatic properties of the
particles they include in their dictionary (in some cases, they only provide
information concerning the register in which a given item is used), but
the items they list perform similar functions as their English equivalents.
While the nests are said to be semantic in character, they are also clearly
distinguished on functional grounds, e.g. complementing particles, and
particles of comparison. Some of the nests show functional overlaps with
the categories of subjuncts and conjuncts distinguished by Quirk *et al.*
(1985). For instance, particles of conclusion are functionally similar to
Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) contrastive conjuncts, while particles of comparison
show functional similarity to Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) category of focusing

subjuncts (cf. section 3.6). While Anglophone studies (e.g. Lewis 2006)
treat discourse markers as a functional category comprising items rep-
resenting different classes, such as sentence adverbs, conjunctions, and
parentheticals, recent Polish studies, such as Grochowski *et al.* (2014)
consider particles to be an independent word class.

Grochowski *et al.* (2014) define epistemic particles as those which are
connected with *episteme*, i.e. the speaker's awareness of his/her own and
other people's state of knowledge. Such items express certainty (which
comes from a variety of sources, such as the speaker's own reasoning
and external factors), the speaker's distance towards the proposition or
towards information reported by other people, as well as the speaker's
readiness (or its lack) to accept other points of view. Epistemic particles
form one of the five types of semantic "nests" they distinguish. The nest
of epistemic particles comprises forty-seven items, which they group into
nine semantic categories:
– 'hypothetical'/markers of hypotheses (Pol. *hipotetyczne*), using
   which the speaker communicates that s/he does not know if the
   proposition is true: *pewnie, pewno, prawdopodobnie, przypuszczal-*
   nie, zapewne;
– inferential (Pol. *inferencyjne*), which indicate that the speaker does
   not know if the proposition is true, but s/he is ready to say it is true
   based on available evidence: *najwidoczniej, najwyraźniej, widać,*
   widocznie;
– 'non-eliminating'/'non-excluding' particles (Pol. *niewykluczające*),
   which signal that the speaker is ready to accept alternative views,
   such as *bodaj, bodajże, być może, chyba, może*;
– high confidence particles (Pol. *pewnościowe*), which communicate
   that the speaker excludes the possibility that the proposition is not
   true on the basis of his/her knowledge: *ani chybi, bez wątpienia, jak*
   nic, na bank, na mur beton, na pewno, na sto procent, niechybnie,
   niewątpliwie, z pewnością;
– polemic (Pol. *polemiczne*), which communicate that what the
   speaker says is true whereas another point of view is not (the
   speaker enters into a polemic with another point of view): *de facto,*

tak naprawdę, w gruncie rzeczy, w istocie, w istocie rzeczy, w rzeczy-wistości;

– confirmatory (Pol. *potwierdzające*), using which the speaker confirms that an earlier statement is true: *fakt faktem, faktycznie, istotnie, rzeczywiście, w rzeczy samej*;

– particles of conviction/belief (Pol. *przeświadczenia*), which indicate that based on what the speaker knows, there is no reason to think that what s/he says is not true: *ma się rozumieć, naturalnie, oczywiście, rzecz jasna*;

– referring particles (Pol. *referujące*), which introduce reported information, and signal that the speaker does not know if it is true: *jakoby, podobnież, podobno, ponoć, rzekomo*;

– eliminating particles (Pol. *wykluczające*), which communicate that is not possible to disagree with the statement made by the speaker: *autentycznie, doprawdy, naprawdę*.

The inclusion of polemic particles in the nest of epistemic particles, e.g. *tak naprawdę* 'in fact, as a matter of fact', *w rzeczywistości* 'in reality, in fact' shows that Grochowski *et al.* (2014) adopt a broad view of epistemic modality. Their category of epistemic particles comprises both individual words, such as *niewątpliwie* 'undoubtedly', and more complex items, such as noun phrases, e.g. *rzecz jasna* lit. 'clear thing'/'sure thing', prepositional phrases, e.g. *w istocie rzeczy* lit. 'in the essence of things'/'as a matter of fact', as well as colloquialisms, e.g. *na mur beton* 'sure as concrete'/'100% sure', and *na bank* 'sure as in a bank'. The items listed by Grochowski *et al.* (2014) show a high degree of formal and stylistic heterogeneity.

Grochowski *et al.*'s (2014) list does not contain direct Polish equivalents of such adverbs as *clearly* (*wyraźnie*) and *evidently* (*ewidentnie*), because according to the current criteria, they are classifed as metapredicative operators, not particles (see also *WSJP*). *Wyraźnie* and *ewidentnie* are said to be more closely (than particles) integrated with the clause, and less flexible with respect to the position they occupy in a sentence (see however, Danielewiczowa (2012), who argues that *wyraźnie* can be treated as a particle). In this work *wyraźnie* and *ewidentnie* are classified as epistemic adverbs in analogy to their English equivalents.

3.9. Summary of Polish classifications

Polish studies of modal adverbs use similar classification criteria as Anglophone studies, i.e. they group modal adverbs according to the degrees of certainty they express, and identify additional components characteristic of their semantics, such as their evidential meanings (reportive and inferential). Grochowski *et al.* (2014) offer the most detailed account of Polish modal markers (or particles, as they term the items in question). Many of the types they distinguish for high confidence markers correspond to those identified by Simon Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) for English adverbs of certainty (cf. section 3.6.10). The categories identified in selected studies of Polish adverbs are summarized in Table 2. The summary does not include all the types of epistemic particles distinguished by Grochowski *et al.* (2014), as their understanding of modality is broader than the one adopted in the present study (cf. section 3.8.7).

Table 2. Types of modal adverbs in selected Polish studies

Grzegorczykowa (1975)	Bralczyk (1978)	Rytel (1982)	Grochowski *et al.* (2014)
high confidence markers, e.g. *niechybnie, niewątpliwie*	high confidence markers, e.g. *na pewno, niewątpliwie*	high confidence markers, e.g. *niewątpliwie, na pewno*	high confidence markers, e.g. *niewątpliwie, niechybnie*
high confidence markers expressing expectations, e.g. *faktycznie, istotnie*	markers of a medium degree of certainty, e.g. *chyba, pewnie*	high confidence markers expressing confirmation, e.g. *faktycznie, rzeczywiście*	markers of conviction, e.g. *naturalnie, oczywiście*
low confidence markers, e.g. *przypuszczalnie, chyba*	low confidence markers, e.g. *może, być może*	high confidence markers expressing expectations, e.g. *oczywiście, naturalnie*	confirmatory markers, e.g. *rzeczywiście, istotnie*

Grzegorczykowa (1975)	Bralczyk (1978)	Rytel (1982)	Grochowski *et al.* (2014)
reportive markers, e.g. *podobno, rzekomo*	inferential markers, e.g. *widocznie*	markers of a medium degree of certainty, e.g. *pewnie, zapewne*	inferential markers, e.g. *widocznie, najwyraźniej*
	reportive markers, e.g. *podobno, rzekomo*	low confidence markers, e.g. *może, być może*	non-eliminating markers, e.g. *chyba, być może*
		reportive markers, e.g. *podobno, rzekomo*	markers of hypotheses, e.g. *pewnie, prawdopodobnie*
			reportive markers, e.g. *podobno, jakoby*

The overview of Anglophone and Polish accounts of modal adverbs presented in this chapter demonstrates that most of them express epistemic and evidential meanings; only a handful of them have been observed to occur in the context of deontic modality. In both languages, there are adverbs expressing reported information and inference, as well as adverbs which are used to confirm expectations and prior statements. The categories distinguished in the earlier studies will serve as the starting point for establishing the typology of modal adverbs used in the present work.

3.10. Modal adverbs – classification criteria employed in this work

In this work epistemic adverbs are understood as those which express the speaker's judgement concerning the likelihood that a given proposition is true. They may also be said to express different degrees of certainty concerning the truth value of a proposition. The adverbs whose functions overlap with the functions of epistemic adverbs, but which, at the same time, are not concerned with the likelihood of the state of affairs, such as

quite, really, truly, will not be included in the analysis. The evidential sense will be treated as an additional component of the semantics of some epistemic adverbs. As noted by most scholars with reference to both English and Polish (e.g. Wiemer 2006; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007; Stępień 2010), evidential adverbs usually have an epistemic component in their meaning, either explicit or implied, i.e. they are typically used to indicate some degree of commitment to the proposition. Therefore, in this study evidential adverbs will be considered as a subcategory within the superordinate category of epistemic adverbs. Epistemic adverbs may thus be said to express epistemicity, as it is defined by Boye (2012), i.e. a notion comprising both "epistemic support" and "epistemic justification" (cf. Chapter 2).

My focus in this study is on adverbs, not on adverbials. As noted by Rammat and Ricca (1998: 188), "non-lexicalized expressions with adverbial function may always be created", and by the inclusion of synonymic phraseologisms the category could be extended *ad infinitum*. A cross-linguistic study whose aim is, among others, to establish the repertoires of modal adverbs in two languages, such as this one, requires some formal restrictions to delimit the category in question. Therefore, the analysis conducted in this work is limited to two types of items:

1) one-word adverbs, such as *probably*, *presumably, undoubtedly* (Pol. *prawdopodobnie, przypuszczalnie, niewątpliwie*);
2) two-word units which are treated as adverbs (or particles, in the case of Polish grammars) in reference grammars and studies of modal adverbs, such as *of course, for sure, for certain, no doubt* and Polish *na pewno, bez wątpienia, z pewnością*.

The items which some sources (e.g. Wierzbicka 2006) classify as modal particles, e.g. *perhaps, maybe, surely,* are included in the analysis alongside those which are classified as epistemic adverbs. First of all, the categories of epistemic adverbs and modal particles have fuzzy boundaries. Secondly, both groups express degrees of certainty, and thus fulfill the major classification criterion adopted in this study. Likewise, I do not exclude the items which Polish linguists classify as metapredicative operators, such as *ewidentnie* 'evidently' and *wyraźnie* 'clearly'. The distinction between epistemic adverbs and modal particles, as well the distinction between

metapredicative operators, particles and adverbs made in current Polish grammar, can in many cases be summarized as resulting from different degrees of grammaticalization and subjectification of the items in question. Because of the dynamic nature of language, sharp distinctions of this type are difficult to maintain in practice. When treated as one class, epistemic adverbs can be demonstrated to have a continuum of objective, subjective, intersubjective and textual uses. Such a continuum can also be observed for individual items. A cross-linguistic analysis of the entire class of epistemic adverbs enables a comparison of the degrees to which the different items are grammaticalized in the two languages.

In this work I do not use any syntactic criteria to identify modal adverbs, as I think the semantic criteria are sufficient to identify the group in question. Moreover, the commonly used syntactic criteria are not watertight. For instance, it has been observed that epistemic adverbs cannot be negated or used in interrogative sentences (e.g. Bellert 1977; Nuyts 2001a; Wierzbicka 2006). The ability to occur in questions has also been used to distinguish modal particles from epistemic adverbs. However, those items which are usually classified as epistemic adverbs, such as *presumably* and *obviously,* can be used to ask for confirmation (see examples (1) and (2), quoted in section 3.4.2). I consider their uses in questions to be indicative of some degree of grammaticalization, and a movement along a cline towards greater intersubjectivity, rather than a property which excludes them from the category of epistemic adverbs. While I do not employ any syntactic criteria to identify modal adverbs, I do refer to the occurrences of the adverbs in different sentence positions, as these are connected with their functions.

3.11. The typology of modal adverbs employed in this study

In this study modal adverbs are grouped into seven categories: (1) reportive, (2) inferential, (3) confirmatory, (4) argumentative, (5) epistemic emphasizers, (6) low confidence adverbs, and (7) adverbs of necessity. This classification draws from the typologies employed in other studies, such as Greenbaum (1969), Bralczyk (1978), Rytel (1982), Biber *et al.* (1999), Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007), and Grochowski *et al.* (2014). Some of the earlier studies signal a number of problematic and ambiguous

cases in the typologies they employ, which, combined with my own findings (e.g. Rozumko 2012a, 2012b, 2016c), led me to reconsider the earlier proposals, reclassify some adverbs, and suggest new categories. The identified types of adverbs do not have sharp boundaries, and the distinctions made in this chapter are treated as a working typology. Chapter 11 offers a discussion of its validity, as well as its applicability in cross-linguistic research. The sections which follow explain how the categories were distinguished in both languages.

3.11.1. Reportive and inferential adverbs

Reportive adverbs and inferential adverbs are connected with the notion of evidentiality, i.e. they indicate that a claim is based on speaker-external sources of information, i.e. the evidence that the speaker has at his/her disposal (cf. section 2.3.1). In English and Polish, evidentiality markers are mainly connected with signalling reported information and inference (cf. e.g. Wiemer 2006; Grochowski *et al.* 2014). However, as noted by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 322), "types of evidence are not strictly separated by English adverbs. Perception, reasoning and hearsay tend to be expressed by the same forms, and the exact nature of the evidence is typically to be derived from the context". For instance, the adverb *apparently* can be used to indicate inference, reported information, as well as unspecified evidence. The division into reportive and inferential adverbs is thus not a sharp one. Moreover, as I hope to demonstrate, the types of evidential meaning the adverbs express are closely connected with the degrees of (inter)subjectivity they show in different contexts. As they move towards more (inter)subjective uses, the character of their relation to evidence tends to change. Nevertheless, even though reportive and inferential adverbs do not form neat and uniform categories, the items within each group share some essential properties: reportive adverbs rely on information obtained from other speakers, while the inferential ones rely on the speaker's analysis (synchronous or *a posteriori*) of available data. This distinction will be maintained here as it is a useful starting point to discuss the inventories of English and Polish adverbs referring to evidence.

Based on earlier accounts (Greenbaum 1969; Biber *et al.* 1999; Wierzbicka 2006; Celle 2009), the category of reportive adverbs in English can

be said to include *allegedly, reportedly, supposedly, reputedly,* and *apparently.* I will additionally consider *avowedly* as a potential member of the category, as it also refers to information which comes from other speakers. In Polish, the category of reportive adverbs includes: *podobno, podobnież, ponoć, rzekomo, jakoby,* and *niby* (Wiemer 2006; Grochowski *et al.* 2014). The category of inferential adverbs comprises: *clearly, obviously, evidently, apparently, seemingly, manifestly, plainly,* and *patently* (cf. Greenbaum 1969; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007), and in Polish: *wyraźnie, najwyraźniej, widocznie, najwidoczniej, najoczywiściej, ewidentnie,* and *jawnie* (cf. Danielewiczowa 2012; Rozumko 2012a; Grochowski *et al.* 2014). *Apparently* is placed in both categories as it expresses both reportive and inferential meanings.

3.11.2. Confirmatory adverbs

The point of departure for identifying the group of confirmatory adverbs in English is Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer's (2007) category of expectation adverbs, i.e. those "which express certainty together with according to/in conformity with expectations" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 172). The starting point for the identification of this category in Polish is Grochowski *et al.'s* (2014) category of confirmatory particles, i.e. items which confirm prior statements. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer's (2007) list comprises *of course, naturally, inevitably,* and *necessarily.* However, based on Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer's (2007) observations and my own findings (Rozumko 2016c), I decided to also include *indeed* in the group. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) note that *indeed* is usually used to confirm and strengthen claims, which is what I consider to be the primary function of confirmatory adverbs. On the other hand, I decided to exclude *inevitably* and *necessarily* from the list because they are not unambiguously epistemic in character (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 188). I discuss them under the heading of adverbs of necessity. Overall, the English items included in the category of confirmatory adverbs are *indeed, of course,* and *naturally.*

In Polish, the group of confirmatory adverbs comprises *rzeczywiście, faktycznie, istotnie, oczywiście,* and *naturalnie.* Of these, only *rzeczywiście, faktycznie* and *istotnie* are included in Grochowski *et al.'s* (2014) category of confirmatory particles. *Oczywiście* and *naturalnie* are classified as

particles of conviction/belief (Pol. *partykuły przeświadczenia*). In Grochowski *et al.'s* (2014) account confirmatory particles are said to confirm prior statements, while particles of conviction are said to communicate that it was possible to predict the state of affairs. In other words, as Rytel (1982) notes, *oczywiście* and *naturalnie* signal that the state of affairs was expected by the speaker, and the speaker considers it to be obvious (cf. section 3.7.3.). Some authors, e.g. Tutak (2003), however, put *oczywiście* and *rzeczywiście* in one group. Tutak (2003: 83) argues that both adverbs communicate that the speaker considers the proposition to be true in light of what is known. What the two groups have in common is that they both express confirmation. While *rzeczywiście, faktycznie,* and *istotnie* confirm prior statements, *oczywiście* and *naturalnie* confirm the speaker's expectations concerning the state of affairs.

3.11.3. Argumentative adverbs

The starting point for distinguishing the group of argumentative adverbs is Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer's (2007: 84) category of speech-act adverbs, which includes the following items: *admittedly, arguably, avowedly, incontestably, incontrovertibly, indisputably, unarguably, unquestionably,* and *undeniably.* Each of them has a corresponding illocutionary verb, i.e. *admit, argue, dispute, question,* etc. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 192) argue that speech-act adverbs "refer in a very direct way to the need to defend the proposition in question against alternative propositions", which makes them "most saliently argumentative". In this study, the group is extended to include *assuredly, undoubtedly* and *indubitably.* *Assuredly* has a corresponding illocutionary verb (*assure*), and is classified as a high confidence adverb (Quirk *et al.* 1985; Huddleston and Pullum 2002), and therefore it seems legitimate to include it in the same group. *Undoubtedly* and *indubitably* are not speech-act adverbs; they derive from the verb *doubt,* which may be termed a mental state verb. However, they have a similar morphological structure to speech-act adverbs, and appear to perform similar functions. While the negative speech-act adverbs such as *unquestionably* and *undeniably* signal the speaker's awareness that the proposition may be questioned or denied by other speakers, *undoubtedly* and *indubitably* signal the speaker's awareness that it may be doubted. However, the inclusion of *undoubtedly* and *indubitably* makes it impossi-

ble to maintain the name "speech-act adverbs" to refer to the category. I therefore adopt a name which reflects the rhetorical functions of the adverbs included in the group: argumentative. While *assuredly, undoubtedly* and *indubitably* have been added to Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer's (2007) original list in this study, I decided to omit *avowedly*, and transfer it to the category of reportive adverbs. *Avowedly* is not used to build arguments in acknowledgement of other voices, but to signal the speaker's attitude towards claims made by other people. In sum, the category of argumentative adverbs, as defined in this work, contains the following items: *admittedly, arguably, assuredly, incontestably, incontrovertibly, indisputably, indubitably, unarguably, undeniably,* and *undoubtedly.*

The list of Polish argumentative adverbs is based on the set of Polish speech-act adverbs identified in Rozumko (2012b, 2016c), which comprises *bezsprzecznie, bezspornie, bezapelacyjnie, bezdyskusyjnie, niezaprzeczalnie, niepodważalnie,* and *niekwestionowanie.* Grochowski *et al.* (2014) do not discuss them in their study. The most recent dictionary of Polish, *WSJP* (online), which generally uses the same classification criteria as Grochowski *et al.* (2014), classifies *bezspornie, bezsprzecznie* and *bezdyskusyjnie* as epistemic particles, and *bezapelacyjnie* as an adverb (i.e. a modifier of verbs). *Niezaprzeczalnie, niepodważalnie,* and *niekwestionowanie* are not included in the dictionary. However, they are all speech-act adverbs which are used to defend propositions against potential criticisms, which is why I classify them as argumentative adverbs. As in the case of English argumentative adverbs, the group has been extended to include adverbs which indicate the speaker's awareness that the proposition may be doubted, i.e. *niewątpliwie* and *bez wątpienia.*

3.11.4. Epistemic emphasizers

The category of epistemic emphasizers comprises items which are used to emphasize the speaker's stance towards the various positions signalled in the text as well as those expressed by interlocutors. They are used to add emphasis to the speaker's claims, and to interact emphatically with other voices. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 300) argue that emphatic uses may lead to "the erosion of the meaning of epistemic certainty". While some of those adverbs appear to show the erosion of their epistemic sense, others seem to never have independently developed their epis-

temic meanings. In Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer's (2007) typology such adverbs are classified as "epistemic certainty adverbs", and "defined positively as expressing a high degree of speaker commitment to the truth of the proposition, and negatively as not specifically referring to modes, sources, and matches of that knowledge" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 84). In comparison with Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer's (2007) category, this group is smaller because, as already noted, some adverbs have been placed in other categories (*indeed* – in the category of confirmatory adverbs, while *indubitably, undoubtedly* and *assuredly* – in the category of argumentative adverbs). I have, however, added *doubtless* on account of its closeness to *no doubt.* In sum, in English the category of epistemic emphasizers comprises: *certainly, no doubt, doubtless, definitely, decidedly, surely, for sure,* and *for certain.* In Polish, it comprises: *na pewno, z pewnością, zdecydowanie, zapewne, pewnie,* and *pewno.* The last three items, *zapewne, pewnie* and *pewno,* are usually classified as low confidence adverbs (Grzegorczykowa 1975; Grochowski *et al.* 2014) or adverbs expressing a medium degree of certainty (Bralczyk 1978; Rytel 1982). However, while it is true that they do not express conviction, they emphasize the speaker's belief that the situation will develop according to the speaker's expectations. They also have emphasizing functions in dialogic contexts, e.g. emphatic agreement, which makes them different from the other low confidence adverbs, such as *może* 'maybe' and *prawdopodobnie* 'probably'.

3.11.5. Low confidence adverbs

Items expressing a low degree of confidence are found among both evidential and non-evidential adverbs. Most of the evidential ones express hearsay, and are classified as reportive adverbs in the present work. The non-reportive adverbs expressing a low level of certainty include *maybe, perhaps, probably, likely, possibly, conceivably,* and *presumably.* Most of them are non-evidential, but some, such as *presumably* (see Chapter 9) can also express evidential meanings. In Polish, the category of low confidence adverbs comprises: *prawdopodobnie, przypuszczalnie, bodaj, bodajże, może, być może, chyba,* and *raczej.* Grochowski *et al.* (2014) classify *raczej* as a reformulatory particle, but Bralczyk (1978) discusses its epistemic uses as well, which is why it is included in the present study. Gro-

chowski *et al.* (2014) group low confidence adverbs (or particles, as they classify them) into two categories: (1) markers of hypotheses/'hypothetical' (Pol. *hipotetyczne*): *pewnie, pewno, prawdopodobnie, przypuszczalnie,* and *zapewne*; (2) 'non-eliminating/non-excluding' (Pol. *niewykluczające*): *bodaj, bodajże, może, być może,* and *chyba*. The 'hypothetical' particles communicate that the speaker does not know if the proposition is true (Grochowski *et al.* 2014: 45), while those termed 'non-eliminating/non-excluding' signal that the speaker is open to alternative views (Grochowski *et al.* 2014: 61). As noted in section 3.11.4, *zapewne, pewnie* and *pewno*, which Grochowski *et al.* (2014) classify as 'hypothetical' particles, are subsumed under epistemic emphasizers in this work.

3.11.6. Adverbs of necessity

The category of adverbs of necessity has been proposed in this study to examine the usefulness of this label to classify such adverbs as *necessarily, inevitably, inescapably, ineluctably,* and *unavoidably*. The notion of necessity is associated with both epistemic and deontic modality. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007), who initially classify *inevitably* and *necessarily* as epistemic expectation adverbs, note that they are only marginally epistemic, and present "a state of affairs as 'expected' in the sense of being a necessary, unavoidable consequence of another state of affairs" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 188). *Necessarily*, they argue, "conveys deontic rather than epistemic necessity, expressing that something is necessitated by circumstances" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007). Quirk *et al.* (1985: 589) associate *necessarily* and *inevitably* with the notion of contingency, i.e. the relation of cause and effect, and classify them as adjuncts of contingency. They also note, however, that both adverbs can be used as emphasizers in deontic contexts. Thus, both *necessarily* and *inevitably* seem to be characterized by an interplay of meanings connected with deontic and epistemic necessity, as well as non-modal ones. I have added *inescapably, ineluctably* and *unavoidably* to the list because they are semantically close to *inevitably*. Huddleston and Pullum (2002), who classify them as modal disjuncts, observe that *unavoidably* and *ineluctably* "are concerned with the actualisation of situations rather than the truth of the propositions" (2002: 769). As in the case of *necessarily* and *inevitably*,

Huddleston and Pullum (2002) mark the epistemic status of *unavoidably* and *ineluctably* as uncertain.

The Polish equivalent of *necessarily*, i.e. *koniecznie,* has been reported to express deontic necessity (Grzegorczykowa 1975; Danielewiczowa 2012), while its negative form *niekoniecznie* 'not necessarily' has been said to express epistemic meanings (cf. Danielewiczowa 2012). They are both included in the category of adverbs of necessity in the present study. The other Polish adverbs included in the category are *niechybnie* and *niezawodnie*, which are classified as epistemic markers in most studies (Bralczyk 1978; Danielewiczowa 2012; Grochowski *et al.* 2014). I will additionally consider *nieuchronnie* 'inevitably' and *nieuniknienie* 'inevitably, unavoidably' as potential members of the group, even though they are not classified as modal markers in any Polish studies. They are, however, both used as translation equivalents of *inevitably* in the parallel corpus, which makes their meanings and functions worth examining.

3.12. The procedure adopted in the analysis

The discussion which follows begins with an analysis of the properties of the English adverbs within the identified categories. All the English adverbs are discussed on the basis of their occurrences in the British National Corpus. The corpus is too large to allow a discussion of all their occurrences. Therefore, the analysis is based on two-hundred-item samples of the corpus, compiled for each of the adverbs. Additionally, I examine their functions in different syntactic positions, I look for characteristic patterns in their use, and examine their properties by identifying the items they co-occur with. Subsequently, Polish equivalents of each of the English adverbs are established with reference to bilingual dictionaries and the translation corpus *Paralela*. Three bilingual dictionaries are consulted for the purposes of the study: the *Great English-Polish Dictionary* published by PWN and Oxford University Press (2006 and the online edition); the *Great English-Polish Dictionary* by Stanisławski (1999), and *Collins English Polish Dictionary* edited by Fisiak *et al.* (1996). The translation corpus automatically identifies only the major cross-linguistic equivalents, and identification of the less common ones requires manual analysis. Therefore, the translation equivalents of all the adverbs whose frequency in the

corpus exceeds one hundred are analyzed on the basis of samples consisting of the first one hundred occurrences of each of the adverbs in the corpus. A preliminary study which I conducted demonstrated that a sample of this size enables the identification of the most frequent equivalents of the lexical items in question.

The analysis of the English adverbs and their translation equivalents is followed by a discussion of the Polish adverbs on the basis of their use in the National Corpus of Polish (NKJP). Occasionally, reference is also made to their English equivalents in the translation corpus. As in the case of the BNC, two-hundred-item samples were employed to discuss the tendencies observed in their use, the contexts they appear in, and the functions they perform. Quotations from the NKJP have all been translated into English by the present author. They are presented within single quotation marks to distinguish them from the translations excerpted from the parallel corpus. The translations are used to discuss the contexts in which the adverbs occur, not to identify their English equivalents. The NKJP contains over 240 million words (as compared to 100 million in the BNC); to make the frequencies of adverbs comparable in the two languages, I have normalized them and counted for 100 million words. Tables 26 and 27, included in the Appendix, show the frequencies of the English and Polish adverbs in the monolingual corpora. Table 26 also shows the frequencies of the English adverbs in written and spoken English (per 1 million words); Table 27 shows the frequencies of the Polish adverbs across different registers (per 1 million words). The National Corpus of Polish provides their frequencies in seven registers: spoken language, prose, internet, daily press, weekly magazines, monthly magazines, poetry/drama. Four of them are included in Table 27 to illustrate the distribution of the adverbs across different genres: spoken Polish, prose, daily press, and monthly magazines.

The analysis focuses on the identification of the interpersonal and textual functions of the different groups of adverbs and their individual representatives. Its specific objectives are as follows:

- to discuss the meanings of the English and Polish adverbs on the basis of their dictionary definitions, and in relation to the findings obtained in earlier studies in the field;
- to identify the contexts in which the English and Polish adverbs are typically used, and to establish the interpersonal and textual functions of the individual adverbs on the basis of data obtained from both the monolingual corpora and the parallel corpus;
- to identify the translation equivalents of English adverbs on the basis of the parallel corpus;
- to establish the contexts in which the different Polish equivalents of the English adverbs are used, thus outlining some of the functional differences between the individual items in each group;
- to compare the functions of the identified groups of adverbs in English and Polish.

4. Reportive adverbs in English and Polish

4.1. Introduction

This chapter focuses on establishing and comparing the repertoires and functions of reportive adverbs in English and Polish. Generally speaking, reportive adverbs introduce information reported by other speakers. They are also called reportative or hearsay adverbs (cf. Boye 2018). Many researchers prefer the term hearsay (e.g. Wierzbicka 2006; Wiemer 2006, 2010, 2018; Celle 2009), but if hearsay is to be understood as unofficial information, such as rumour or gossip, not all of them, at least not in English, can be said to only refer to hearsay. The more general name reportive is, therefore, preferred in this study. Reported evidence is usually unverified, and, as such, it tends to be treated with some reservation. In evidential scales it is considered to be the weakest type of evidence (e.g. De Haan 1998), which is why reportive adverbs are classified as markers of low confidence (e.g. Quirk *et al*. 1985). However, their modal status is not agreed on by all scholars. Celle argues that hearsay adverbs can be considered "disassertive rather than epistemic" because they signal "the speaker's lack of commitment to the truth of his/her utterance" (2009: 289), and "introduce a point of view different from the speaker's" (2009: 280). As observed by AnderBois (2014: 245), a claim based on reported evidence is the only type of evidential claim which "can be felicitously denied by the same speaker". Markers of reported information are considered to express "low involvement" (cf. e.g. Cornillie 2018: 164-165), and are often used to express detachment from the content of the proposition.

Information presented as second-hand allows the speaker "to disclaim any responsibility. S/he thereby acts as a mere locutor, leaving it to the

reader to form opinions and judgments of his/her own" (Celle 2009: 282). Rytel (1982: 52) argues that the meanings expressed by reportive markers only partially overlap with those associated with epistemic modality, and claims that the modal meanings of reportive adverbs are not their primary meanings. However, by explicitly disclaiming responsibility for a claim, the speaker often communicates that s/he is not certain if his/her claim is true, thus expressing the epistemic sense of doubt (cf. Rozumko 2019).

Socka (2015), and Wiemer and Socka (2017a, 2017b) identify three components in the semantics of reportive adverbs: (1) the reportive component; (2) the epistemic-agnostic component (lack of knowledge); (3) the proper epistemic component (uncertainty). They suggest that only the reportive component is their coded and stable meaning; the other two are activated in different contexts and to different degrees. Because of the presence of the reportive component in the semantics of all reportive adverbs, the primary interpersonal function they perform is marking attribution (cf. Martin and White 2005), i.e. they attribute the proposition to an external source. Depending on the degree to which the two other semantic components (epistemic agnosticism and uncertainty) are activated in different contexts, they perform different types of attribution, and serve additional interpersonal functions. In Martin and White's (2005) taxonomy, two types of attribution are distinguished: neutral acknowledgement and distancing. The distancing function may involve both the speaker's emphasis on the lack of knowledge and an indication that the validity of the proposition is doubtful.

As delineated in this study, in English, the category of reportive adverbs comprises the following items: *reportedly, allegedly, supposedly, reputedly, apparently,* and *avowedly. Apparently* qualifies claims based on reported information and inference (e.g. Wierzbicka 2006: 278), as well as unspecified evidence, which is why only some of its uses can be classified as reportive. *Avowedly* is not usually classified as a reportive adverb. It is different from the other adverbs in the group as it only expresses one type of reported information; it refers to what other speakers declare to be true about themselves. Like most of the other adverbs in the group (with the exception of *apparently*), it is a speech-act adverb (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007), and indicates that a given piece of information

has been communicated by another speaker. As such, it meets the major criterion for inclusion in the reportive adverbs category employed in this work. In Polish the category of reportive adverbs comprises: *podobno, ponoć, podobnież, rzekomo, jakoby,* and *niby* (cf. Roszko 1993; Tutak 2003; Wiemer 2006; Grochowski *et al*. 2014; Wiemer and Socka 2017a, 2017b).

Table 3 summarizes the frequencies of English and Polish reportive adverbs in the monolingual corpora: the British National Corpus (BNC), and the National Corpus of Polish (NKJP), respectively. In Table 3, the adverbs are ordered from the most frequent to the least frequent in the corpora; they are not placed next to their equivalents.

Table 3. The frequencies of English and Polish reportive adverbs in the monolingual corpora

English reportive adverbs	Freq per 100m (BNC)	Polish reportive adverbs	Freq per 100m (NKJP)
apparently	7,575	*niby*	6,849
reportedly	1,452	*podobno*	6,460
allegedly	1,039	*ponoć*	2,376
supposedly	924	*jakoby*	1,673
reputedly	180	*rzekomo*	1,450
avowedly	37	*podobnież*	49

The most frequent adverbs in the two languages are those which have both reportive and non-reportive meanings (*apparently* and *niby*). In large corpora, such as the BNC and the NKJP, the reportive and non-reportive meanings of the adverbs are difficult to separate, which is why they are all included in the count. In this chapter an attempt is made at identifying the specific types of reported information the adverbs listed in Table 3 refer to, and the contexts in which they typically occur. The discussion begins with *reportedly*, which seems to be a prototypical representative of the category as it explicitly refers to the act of reporting.

4.2. Reportive adverbs in English

4.2.1. *Reportedly*

Due to its relation to the speech-act verb *report*, *reportedly* most explicitly of all the adverbs in the group qualifies the speaker's claim as reported information. Monolingual dictionaries note that *reportedly* means "according to what is said" (*LDOCE*), and "according to what many people say" (*CED*). Its use is quite well evidenced in the BNC (see Table 3). It is the second most frequent reportive adverb in the corpus, after *apparently* (which, as noted earlier, can also refer to other types of evidence than reported information). *Reportedly* occurs in sentence initial and sentence medial positions; it is more common in writing than in speech (see Table 26). Wierzbicka (2006: 284) links its appearance in English with the importance of the media, and discussions of matters of "some public interest". Her observation finds support in the BNC data, as 94% of its occurrences in the corpus come from periodicals.

Wierzbicka (2006: 279) suggests that the source of information qualified by *reportedly* is usually of a professional character, such as "an expert, a professional reporter, an official". In the BNC *reportedly* is often used to refer to statistical data and professional reports, as in (1)-(3).

(1) Notwithstanding, Mr Quiles commissioned a report into strategies for reform and its controversial recommendations, made public at the beginning of last month, immediately drew the wrath of the unions. … While 85 per cent of telephone users are ***reportedly*** satisfied with the service they receive, commercial clients are not. The use of telex machines increased 7 per cent in the year 1987-88 and the demand for fax machines will outstrip that this year. (BNC, A3S 348, 353)

(2) By 1984 every department had ***reportedly*** 'taken steps to introduce a top management system for Ministers and senior managers', enabling these 'to review regularly the department's aims, examine its 'businesses' and the 'customers' they serve, set objectives, and establish priorities' (*Progress in Financial Management in Government Departments*, 1984, p. 3). (BNC, G19 136)

(3) In support of ptx/Clusters Sequent is introducing the QCIC-W high-performance disk controller, an advanced parallel-enabled I/O subsystem connecting 60 SCSI devices (48 disks) with little or no degradation. ***Reportedly*** the industry's first high-performance 16-bit controller, it uses four independent wide fast SCSI-2 channels and achieves I/O rates up to 3200 IOPS per controller. (BNC, CSG 138-139)

As illustrated in (1) and (2), the source of the information qualified by *reportedly* may be specified in the context; it may also be implied, as in (3), where the contextual information indicates that the description of the product comes from its producer.

Reportedly is also used in academic discourse, particularly in the discourse of the natural sciences, such as medicine, to refer to the findings reported by other scholars, as in (4), and reports from patients, as in (5) (cf. also Rozumko 2017).

(4) These consultations were analyzed by TIMER, a methodology which quantifies the time allocated to five physical, nine verbal, and four secondary task activities. Ten unselected consultations are ***reportedly*** sufficiently accurate to characterise an individual doctor's consulting style by using TIMER. (BNC, FT2 942-943)

(5) The data presented were drawn from detailed clinical interview of new patients at the point of initial assessment. Fifty consecutive referrals in 1988 were compared with 50 consecutive referrals in 1990 with respect to demographic characteristics and patterns of drug misuse. These included injecting frequency (past and recent), prescription status at assessment, drugs ***reportedly*** used, and syringe sharing. (BNC, FT3 756-758)

The decision to use *reportedly* instead of the name of the person whose findings are referred to, as in (4) and (5), may be interpreted as a depersonalization and objectivisation strategy. Medical discourse aims at objective and impersonal presentation of data (e.g. Vold 2006), and tends to place emphasis on the findings rather than the people who establish them. Such discourse patterns are characteristic of negative politeness strategies (cf. also Gil-Salom and Soler-Montreal 2009: 183). When *reportedly* is

used to qualify information which comes from a professional or scientific source, it expresses "no epistemic judgement, the speaker being only held accountable for attributing information to other speakers" (Celle 2009: 284). Using Martin and White's (2005: 112) terms, it may be said to function as a marker of acknowledgement in such contexts, as it does not indicate "where the authorial voice stands with respect to the proposition". It is close in such uses to quotative evidentials, which differ from reportive markers in that they specify the source of reported information (cf. Aikhenvald 2018: 12).

However, in the case of less "professional" sources of information, which *reportedly* also qualifies, it functions as a disclaimer of responsibility, and performs a distancing function. For instance, when *reportedly* is used in news reports to refer to information obtained from witnesses or participants of accidents and crimes, such as in (6) and (7), or rumour which comes from an unknown source and concerns personal matters, as in (8), it communicates that the reported situations have not been confirmed and the speaker does not wish to take responsibility for their validity. In such cases the component of epistemic agnosticism is emphasized in its semantics, and the adverb performs a distancing function (cf. Martin and White 2005: 113).

(6) The officers are also anxious to hear from people who noticed any suspicious strangers seeking rented accommodation in the Deal area during the last 18 months. Their latest lead is a white transit van *reportedly* seen near the barracks in the week before the bombing. (BNC, A59 589-590)

(7) Two lorries crammed with riot policemen arrived and fired teargas canisters, rapidly dispersing the small crowd, which included news photographers. A seven-year-old child was *reportedly* hit by one of the canisters and taken, injured in the leg, to hospital. (BNC, A5M 380-381)

(8) So imagine his delight when President Vaclav Havel presented him with a slim volume of Reed's lyrics hand-printed and translated into Czech. 'There were only 200 of them,' Havel *reportedly* told Reed. (BNC, AK4 410-411)

The association of *reportedly* with the lack of knowledge is also noticeable when it qualifies additional information which the speaker inserts into the main claim. Such uses are exemplified in (9)-(11). In each of them the first part is unmodalized, which signals that the speaker has no doubt about it, while the second element is introduced by "(and) *reportedly*", which indicates that the speaker is not absolutely convinced it is true, and thus prefers to disclaim responsibility for its truth value.

(9) Sudan, and *reportedly* Yemen, had also urged the lifting of sanctions while dissenting from a resolution calling for their extension passed by the Islamic Conference Organization (ICO) at its summit in Dakhar on Dec. 9 [see p. 38699]. (BNC, HLE 2433)

(10) On a visit to Italy on Sept. 11, Gramoz Pashko, Deputy Chair of the Council of Ministers and Economy Minister, met with Pope John Paul II and *reportedly* discussed the "intensification of religious activity" in Albania. (BNC, HLB 1914)

(11) Palestinians (*reportedly* members of Hamas) disguised as Israeli soldiers shot dead a suspected collaborator in Gaza City on May 15. (BNC, HLK 2319)

In (9), the speaker is confident that the statement concerns Sudan, but he is not equally sure if it concerns Yemen; in (10), the speaker is certain that Gramoz Pashko met with Pope John Paul II, but whether they discussed the "intensification of religious activity" in Albania is less certain. Likewise, in (11), the speaker is confident that Palestinians were involved in the reported incident, but he is less certain whether they were members of Hamas. The use of *reportedly* enables the speakers to protect their face in case the reported information turns out to be inaccurate. In such contexts the epistemic agnosticism component is combined with the epistemic component of the lack of certainty, both of which allow the adverb to perform a distancing function. The epistemic component is, however, pragmatic, i.e. it is purely contextual. It is not part of the coded meaning of *reportedly*. It is evoked by the placement of an unqualified statement next to a qualified one (cf. also Rozumko 2019). As noted by Fox (2001: 182), overt marking of an evidential source implies some distancing from the claim; zero marking implies taking responsibility for it.

In sum, whether *reportedly* expresses neutral acknowledgement or whether it performs distancing functions appears to depend on the quality of the speaker's information source, and the type of expertise it represents. When speakers report information they do not consider reliable and do not want to be held responsible for, they use *reportedly* as a disclaimer of responsibility to protect their face. *Reportedly* can thus be considered as a marker of negative politeness.

4.2.2. Allegedly

Allegedly is usually used to signal that reported information concerns a "bad or illegal thing" for which there is "no proof" (*CALD*). The meanings and uses of *allegedly* have been discussed, among others, by Ramat (1996), Wierzbicka (2006), Celle (2009), and Rozumko (2019). It has been argued to indicate the highest degree of distance towards the content of the proposition among all English reportive adverbs (Wierzbicka 2006: 282). By using it the speaker dissociates himself/herself from the reported statement (Wierzbicka 2006: 282), and "disclaim[s] responsibility for the proposition until facts are established" (Celle 2009: 289). Thus, the type of attribution it typically expresses is distancing (cf. Martin and White 2005).

Allegedly is the third most frequent reportive adverb in the BNC (see Table 3). Like *reportedly*, it is considerably more frequent in the written than in the spoken section of the corpus (see Table 26). Like *reportedly*, it is attested in sentence initial and medial positions. Unlike *reportedly*, it is used on its own to comment on a prior statement, which signals its potential to perform more interactive functions. My analysis of its uses in a BNC sample reveals that the functions it performs depend to a considerable extent on the position it occupies in a sentence. While it is always used as a marker of attribution, it has additional functions which depend on whether it is used as a disjunct (sentence adverb) or a subjunct (modifier of a sentence element). Celle (2009: 270) argues, quoting after Perkins (1983: 91), that "such 'non-sentential' uses are more apparent than real", and suggests that the same paraphrases can be used for sentential and non-sentential uses of reportive adverbs, which signals that no significant differences between them can be identified. The few examples she discusses do not, however, illustrate their uses with pre-modifying adjectives

in noun phrases, where, as I argue later in this section, some functional differences are noticeable. First, however, I focus on the uses of *allegedly* as a sentence adverb (in the clause initial position, before the main verb, and in its parenthetical uses).

It has been noted that *allegedly* is frequently used in descriptions of criminal cases (Celle 2009: 285), and in references to matters "of public interest" (Wierzbicka 2006: 283). Such contexts are illustrated in examples (12) and (13).

(12) He **allegedly** stole up to $10bn (£6.2bn) of their money, jailed 60,000 of them, and tortured and killed hundreds more. But now they want him back. (BNC, A28 28)

(13) This account was first identified as long ago as 1981 when a ledger was found during a raid on the house of masonic boss Licio Gelli. It included details of payments made by Roberto Calvi, manager of the Banco Ambrosiano who was later found hanged under Blackfriars Bridge in London. **Allegedly** the money was a back-hander to the PSI for helping to arrange loans. (BNC, K5D 841-843)

In both (12) and (13), the speakers distance themselves from the information conveyed, and indicate that they are not the ones to have made the allegations. In such cases two components of the semantics of *allegedly* can be identified: the reportive component and epistemic agnosticism (cf. Socka 2015; Wiemer and Socka 2017a, 2017b). By using *allegedly*, the speakers communicate that they do not know if the situations referred to have taken place; they only report what other people have said. *CED* notes that *allegedly* serves as a protection "from possible prosecution" when the statements are "controversial" or "defamatory". It can thus be used as a protective device both in the pragmatic and legal sense: it protects the speaker's face and the speaker's interests. The more controversial a case is, the more intensely speakers emphasize their distance towards the proposition (cf. also Rozumko 2019).

Negative evaluation, guilt and wrongdoing seem to be typical contexts for *allegedly*, but it can also be used in more neutral contexts to signal hearsay information which the speaker is unable to confirm, and wishes to distance himself/herself from, as in (14) and (15).

(14) ***Allegedly*** Pierremont originally named Pierpont which trans-
    lates as 'the house on the hill overlooking the Cocker Beck' was
    built in the 1830s by John Botcherby who swore that it would be
    the grandest villa in town and that the Peases would never own
    it. It only became the grandest villa when Henry Pease bought it
    and began work. (BNC, K52 4022-4023)

(15) - Oh God I can st-- I can still remember Auntie Edie and her
    mouth full of rotten teeth, - - oh dear, whom I'd never met before
    <-|->
    - <-|-> it was a stranger <-|->
    - and we were well it was somebody who was a stranger to me
    but ***allegedly*** she was related to the family or something. (BNC,
    KGW 368-370)

The epistemic component of uncertainty is activated in the semantics
of *allegedly* in several types of context. One of them is when *allegedly* is
used to express "ironic scepticism" (*CED*). In such cases it tends to follow
the statement on which it comments, as in (16) and (17).

(16) '92 is the year when trade barriers are removed between coun-
    tries in the EC, to form a trading community to rival America
    and Japan. ***Allegedly***. (BNC, CHA 1411-1412)

(17) <laugh>occupation <laugh>like <pause dur="2"> none.
    <unclear> housemaster <laugh>
    Allegedly <laugh>No, <laugh><laugh><unclear>
    Age seventy plus.
    Allegedly <laugh> (BNC, KPF 30-34)

Mushin (2013) and Wiemer (2018) observe that it is quite common
for reportive markers to develop the sense of irony. Wiemer suggests that
such developments are likely to be "pragmatic extensions of the epistemic
extensions" (Wiemer 2018: 95), i.e. they are possible because reportive
markers can be used to express doubt. In such contexts *allegedly* also has
a distancing function.

The epistemic sense of doubt is also activated when *allegedly* performs
countering functions (cf. also Rozumko 2019). Countering is a role which
Martin and White (2005) associate with the functionality of "disclaim". As

they explain, countering utterances "invoke a contrary position which is
then said not to hold" (Martin and White 2005: 120). Such use is illustrat-
ed in (18).

(18) Palaeontologists have typically tried to find particular reasons
    for major changes in the history of life, and in particular to in-
    voke the idea of evolution by natural selection; the idea, crudely
    stated, that 'inferior' creatures are replaced by their superiors.
    Thus they have speculated that the thecodontians replaced the
    synapsids because they were anatomically superior, and that
    they were in turn replaced by the ***allegedly*** superior dinosaurs.
    The modern evidence, of the kind I have presented here, sug-
    gests that such encounters need never have taken place. If the
    dinosaurs and thecodonians were superior to the types that went
    before them, they may never have had to demonstrate that fact.
    (BNC, B7K 495-501)

In (18), *allegedly* is used to challenge and counter the position taken by
other people. The challenged position is "held to be unsustainable" (Mar-
tin and White 2005: 118) in view of "the modern evidence" presented by
the speaker.

In its countering uses *allegedly* has a lowering effect on the force of
the proposition. Lowering "the force of the predication" is a function
which Quirk *et al.* (1985: 597) associate with downtoners, i.e. items such
as *somewhat, hardly, scarcely*. Downtowners are subjuncts, i.e. adverbi-
als which modify sentence elements and their constituents. Quirk *et al.*
(1985: 583) associate the role of subjuncts with high confidence adverbs,
such as *certainly* and *obviously*, which function as emphasizers, and "have
a reinforcing effect" on the force of statements they qualify. There seems
to be no distinct category in Quirk *et al.'s* (1985) classification for low con-
fidence adverbs functioning as subjuncts. I will, therefore, refer to them
as downtoners.

Allegedly can be said to function as a downtoner when it precedes
pre-modifying adjectives in noun phrases, as in examples (19)-(21).

(19) This woman who'd come to complain about an ***allegedly*** dan-
    gerous horse she'd sold her was threatened by stable-hands, and

Central News was told that Mrs Burt was at a funeral and una-
vailable for comment. (BNC, K26 221)

(20)   The Platform began by acknowledging the damage that had been
done to national relations by the repression of the Stalinist years
and by later attempts to accelerate convergence on the basis of an
allegedly full and final resolution of the national question. (BNC,
FYT 380)

(21)   'Better' results will ensue from a 'contest' between partisan advo-
cates, than would follow if the decision were to be reached by an
allegedly unbiased administrator completing a comprehensive
survey. (BNC, GU6 1979)

In (19)-(21), *allegedly* signals scepticism towards the claims it quali-
fies, thus lowering their force. In (19), it is used to counter the claim that
the horse is dangerous; in (20), it challenges the claim that the resolution
is full and final; in (21), it challenges the view that the administrator is
unbiased. In the uses of *allegedly* as a subjunct, the epistemic component
(uncertainty, doubt) seems to be more easily activated than in its uses as
a sentence adverb, and it is more likely to perform challenging functions.

4.2.3. *Supposedly*

According to *CALD*, *supposedly* is "used to show that you do not believe
that something you have been told is true", while according to *LDOCE,*
it means "as is believed, perhaps wrongly; as it appears". Both definitions
link *supposedly* with disbelief, but only *CALD*'s definition links it exclu-
sively with reported information. The *LDOCE* definition suggests that
supposedly can also have a non-reportive meaning: 'as it appears'. Unlike
reportedly and *allegedly*, which derive from past participles of illocution-
ary verbs, *supposedly* derives from a mental state verb, and does not ex-
plicitly refer to the act of transferring information. Its relation to the verb
suppose makes it more predisposed than *reportedly* and *allegedly* to refer
to what people think. The difference is not always apparent because com-
municating what people think usually involves first hearing it from them,
except for cases when the speaker expresses his/her own opinion.

Supposedly* is a relatively infrequent adverb; it is used slightly more
often in writing than in speech, but the discrepancy between its frequency

in written and spoken language is not as great as it is in the case of *report-
edly* and *allegedly* (see Table 26). *Supposedly* is attested in sentence initial,
medial and final positions in the BNC, which signals its ability to relate to
both individual sentence elements and entire sentences.

a. Reportive uses of *supposedly*

In its uses as a reportive adverb, *supposedly* functions both as a marker of
neutral acknowledgement and a distancing marker. Examples (22) and
(23) illustrate its employment as a marker of acknowledgement.

(22)   <u>Word</u> is that IBM Corp showed off a PowerPC-based person-
al digital assistant at the Downsizing Japan Expo earlier this
month. <u>Reports say</u> that the machine includes a pen-input LCD
and a protruding antenna. ***Supposedly*** it should hit the market
by the end of the year. (BNC, CPJ 106-108)

(23)   The software, binary compatible with Solaris 2.0, <u>boasts</u> new
installation, administration, security and internationalisation
features. ***Supposedly*** it incorporates a thousand bug fixes and
product improvements, delivering a maximum 40% increase
in network performance and a maximum 50% improvement in
user interaction over Solaris 2.0. It includes major enhancements
in graphics like XGL libraries providing full 2D-3D capabilities.
Moreover, the release should lay to rest any lingering issues over
Solaris' symmetric multi-processing and multi-threading capa-
bilities. SunSoft president Ed Zander <u>says</u> SMP/MT is very ma-
chine specific and couldn't be fleshed out in Solaris 2.0. (BNC,
CSG 5-9)

In (22) and (23) there are sequences of reported claims introduced by
a variety of reportive and quotative markers: "word is … reports say …
supposedly …", "boasts ... says" with no comment from the speaker con-
cerning their likelihood. Both fragments come from popular science peri-
odicals, and both concern new products to be released in the near future.
The only information the authors have about the new products comes
from their producers. *Supposedly* and the other reportive and quotative
markers used in the context signal that the information they introduce
is the official version, while the actual properties of the new products are

to be discovered after they are released. The example quoted in (24) also illustrates the use of *supposedly* to indicate neutral acknowledgement. Additionally, the information provided in the context suggests that the speaker does not question the validity of the reported claim.

> (24) 'This place is very old, as you know. **Supposedly** there's a network of sewer tunnels running under it,' Robinson explained. 'Most of them have probably caved in by now'. (BNC, G01 3732-3734)

The speaker quoted in (24) seems to think that the information about the network of tunnels is likely to be true as he continues to say that "Most of them have probably caved in". Examples (22)-(24) suggest that *supposedly* signals 'the current version of the story', i.e. the interpretation of events which is generally accepted when the statements are made. They also demonstrate that, contrary to what the monolingual dictionaries say about the usage of *supposedly*, it does not always signal disbelief, and, consequently, it does not always perform the distancing function.

Its distancing function is clear when speakers communicate that a commonly held opinion is wrong, such as in (25) and (26), where the speakers explicitly say that what is believed to have happened did not, in fact, take place.

> (25) You must have heard how Charles died? **Supposedly**, he wandered into a darkened room and banged his head on a cupboard. <u>I know different. He was murdered</u>. (BNC, HH5 627-629)
>
> (26) There's a story also of how I **supposedly** made him do take after take of a scene in which he slides down a rope until he was rope-burned so badly he had blood pouring from his hands. <u>What really happened</u> was that he had to climb a length of rope which had mattresses underneath it so that at the end of each take he could simply drop to the ground in safety. (BNC, CDG 295-296)

In both (25) and (26) the contextual information makes it clear that the speakers do not believe the commonly held views are true: "I know different" in (25), and "what really happened was" in (26). The association of *supposedly* with scepticism and disbelief is clearest when it functions as a subjunct, particularly when it qualifies pre-modifying adjectives in noun phrases. In such cases it is used as a downtoner – a role identified

for *allegedly* earlier in this chapter. When used as a downtoner *supposedly* communicates that things are not what they were supposed or intended to be, in this way diminishing the force of the statements it introduces. As noted by Celle (2009: 288), the utterance qualified by *supposedly* "is viewed as valid in theory, but theory and practice cannot be reconciled". Such use is illustrated in (27)-(29).

> (27) This is very strange behaviour for a **supposedly** left-wing party. (BNC, AC0 237)
>
> (28) This is not really good enough for a **supposedly** authoritative special publication under the RSC's banner and I feel that, overall, a more convincing book might have emerged had all the papers been independently refereed. (BNC, ALW 2573)
>
> (29) 'What do independent experts say about our 10 extra pages?' asks the advertisement. The **supposedly** jokey answers are illustrated by photographs of people sleeping outside covered by copies of The Independent: they look like some of the hundreds of visitors who come to St Botolph's Crypt Centre for homeless people every day. (BNC, A1F 177-178)

In examples (27)-(29) *supposedly* is used to challenge the validity of the claims it modifies. It signals that the party referred to in (27) is not acting in a way which is expected from a left-wing party; that the authority of the publication mentioned in (28) is doubtful; and that the answers referred to in (29) are not necessarily jokey. When used as a downtoner, *supposedly* is similar to *avowedly*, as both adverbs indicate that the state of affairs is different from what it was originally declared or intended to be. Both adverbs are used to challenge the positions represented by other people, thus performing the function which Martin and White (2005) term "disclaim". It involves signalling that prior utterances are "unsustainable" (Martin and White 2005: 118), and replacing them with claims that the speaker considers to be valid.

As in the case of *allegedly*, the epistemic sense of doubt expressed by *supposedly* enables it to express irony. Wierzbicka (2006: 281) argues that *supposedly* often has a "sarcastic ring". Speakers use it to distance themselves from claims which they do not approve of because of the controversial attitude or values they represent, as in (30).

(30)   Another classic bit of government fantasy-think is the Community Care programme. They chuck all these people out of mental hospitals on the excuse that everyone in the community is spontaneously going to start looking after them – and surprise, surprise, they start turning up on the night shelter circuit. It costs a lot in human suffering, but saves money, which is what matters now, **supposedly**. (BNC, A0F 3386)

In (30) *supposedly* offers a sarcastic comment on what appears to be a generally held view, i.e. that money is the most important thing. In its reportive uses, *supposedly* is similar to *allegedly*, as both adverbs are used to express distance towards reported information, and both have countering functions. What makes them different is the type of information they typically qualify. *Allegedly* is frequently used to refer to crimes and wrong-doing, while *supposedly* tends to introduce commonly held opinions.

b. Non-reportive uses of *supposedly*

Non-reportive uses of *supposedly* are relatively infrequent. In a 200-item sample of the BNC, I identified only two occurrences which can be classified as non-reportive. In one of the examples *supposedly* seems to be substitutable with *probably*; in the other it is paraphrasable with *I thought*. The two examples are quoted in (31) and (32), respectively.

(31)   I think there's **supposedly**, a lot of truth in it, really is there. (BNC, JK1 145)

(32)   No, I've got a diary at home the one, cos I lost one, I bought another one and then I found the one I **supposedly** lost so I'll use that one. (BNC, KPG 4794)

The use of *supposedly* in (32) to refer to what the speaker mistakenly thought to be true is clearly related to its uses as a reportive adverb qualifying information whose validity the speaker finds doubtful.

4.2.4. *Reputedly*

LDOCE defines *reputedly* as "according to what people say"; *CED*'s definition is "according to general belief or supposition". The adverb is related to the past participle *reputed*, meaning "said to be the true situation although this is not known to be certain and may not be likely" (*CALD*), and to the

noun *reputation*: "the opinion that people in general have about someone or something, or how much respect or admiration someone or something receives, based on past behaviour or character" (*CALD*). Its closeness to both *reputed* and *reputation* results in the use of *reputedly* to signal common beliefs rather than to report individual pieces of information. It is closer in this respect to *supposedly* than to *allegedly* or *reportedly*.

Reputedly is a low frequency adverb; its frequency is the lowest in the group of adverbs which are usually classified as reportive (*avowedly*, which is classified as reportive in this work, is even less frequent, but it is not usually included in the group). In the BNC, it is attested in sentence initial and medial positions; it is more frequent in written language (see Table 26).

The BNC data suggest that *reputedly* tends to refer to events which took place in the remote past. In the corpus it appears in texts which describe interesting facts and trivia connected with historical places, local attractions, and historical figures. In contrast to *allegedly* and *supposedly*, it seems to primarily serve as a marker of neutral acknowledgement. Examples (33)-(35) provide illustrations of such uses of *reputedly*.

(33)   This is where Bram Stoker **reputedly** completed his novel Dracula, which was published in 1897. (BNC, G1Y 366)

(34)   Equally impressive, and of perhaps even greater historical importance, is the famous Coronation carpet in Rosenborg Castle. Copenhagen. It is knotted in a combination of silk and gold thread, and was **reputedly** presented to Frederik III's queen, Sophie Amalie, by the Dutch East India Company in 1666. (BNC, EX0 243-245)

(35)   Nearby is Tamworth Castle, one of the country's few remaining Norman shell-keeps, which is **reputedly** haunted. (BNC, CJK 1132)

Its sentence initial uses in the corpus are all found in verbless clauses, as illustrated in (36) and (37). In such cases, *reputedly* has a scope over the verbless clause it qualifies. There are no examples in the BNC of *reputedly* modifying entire sentences. It seems to be more frequently used as a subjunct modifying smaller constituents.

(36) ***Reputedly*** the smallest of England's parish churches, it may have developed from an anchorite's cell in the eleventh or twelfth century, and since that time had drawn many pilgrims to its almost inaccessible woodland site. (BNC, B0R 930)

(37) ***Reputedly*** in poor condition when it surfaced last year 'glossed and cleaned up' was one description the painting has been consigned from the Wernher Collection at Luton Hoo, Bedfordshire. (BNC, EBX 1545)

Like *allegedly* and *supposedly*, *reputedly* is used to qualify pre-modifying adjectives in noun phrases. However, in contrast to the other two adverbs, it does not function as a downtoner, and does not have a distancing function. As illustrated in examples (38) and (39), it indicates alignment-neutral attribution.

(38) According to Scott, Marshall was seventeen times lawfully married, and after his hundredth year was the avowed father of four illegitimate children. His ***reputedly*** Herculean virility long remained a byword throughout the district over which he held sway. (BNC, GT4 194-195)

(39) He was, if anything, gentler and more solicitous. He suggested they went out to dinner on the Saturday at a ***reputedly*** excellent roadhouse. (BNC, CDE 694-695)

Of the three semantic components identified for reportive adverbs by Socka (2015), and Wiemer and Socka (2017a, 2017b), *reputedly* seems to express the reportive sense and the sense of epistemic agnosticism. The epistemic agnosticism component is not, however, emphasized in its uses the way it is in the case of *allegedly*, which is why *reputedly* tends not to be used to explicitly disclaim responsibility for claims.

4.2.5. *Avowedly*

Avowedly has not, to the best of my knowledge, been classified as a reportive adverb in any other studies, but I have included it in this category as it derives from the past participle of an illocutionary verb (*avow*), like *reportedly* and *allegedly*, and refers to what "has been asserted, admitted, or stated publicly" (*OD*), i.e. it refers to information obtained from other

speakers. *OD* also notes its manner meaning: 'openly'. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 620), and Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 191) classify *avowedly* as an adverb of certainty; Quirk *et al.* (1985: 620) mark it as formal.

The BNC contains only 37 occurrences of the adverb. They all come from written sources, and are found in the sentence medial position, mostly before adjectives (73%), which suggests that *avowedly* tends not to be used as a disjunct (sentence adverb), but as a subjunct (modifier of individual sentence elements), to use Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) terms. Both the reportive and non-reportive meanings of *avowedly* are attested in the BNC. In its reportive sense, it is similar to *supposedly*, as it is often used to call reported claims into doubt, and to challenge their validity. Its uses as a neutral marker of acknowledgement are not attested in the corpus. It thus seems to have a primarily distancing function, as illustrated in (40).

(40) And the House of Lords reversed the Court of Appeal and decided that the union was responsible for its shop stewards. Immediately the NIRC convened and, ***avowedly*** because of that decision, released the dockers from prison. The difficulty is finding any necessary connection between two cases. (BNC, FRT 872-874)

In (40) the connection signalled by *avowedly* is described as difficult to identify. Its validity is thus put into doubt.

When used before pre-modifying adjectives in noun phrases, *avowedly* is a downtoner signalling a discrepancy between what people and institutions declare and what they actually do, thus challenging the validity of their declarations. Like *supposedly* (cf. Celle 2009), *avowedly* indicates that the qualities declared by other people are only true in theory, while practice shows they are not true, as illustrated in examples (41)-(43).

(41) There is nothing new in this. For many years (and it continues), many right-wing, and even ***avowedly*** apolitical librarians, have excluded left-wing periodical literature from libraries as a matter of course. (BNC, BMH 413)

(42) It also found that some of the ***avowedly*** "green" unit trusts were actually investing in many of the polluting companies. (BNC, J34 58)

(43) Critics of Indian prisons have continued for years to point out the incongruity of attempting to run an *avowedly* 'correctional' prison system with structures, rules and physical conditions created for quite different purposes. (BNC, CRT 534)

In (41) the speaker contrasts the librarians' declaration of an apolitical attitude with their tendency to exclude periodicals representing one political option, which reveals their own political preferences. Likewise, in (42) the organizations which declare themselves to be ecological are said to be investing in polluting companies, which undermines the validity of their declarations, and the prisons, referred to in (43), which are supposed to be correctional, are said to have "structures, rules and physical conditions for quite different purposes". The countering function performed by *avowedly* in such contexts is strengthened by other devices, such as the quotation marks used with the words "green" in (42), the term "correctional" in (43), and the expressions signalling disapproval at the clash between what is declared and what is really the case: "incongruity", "different purposes".

When used in its non-reportive sense *avowedly* shows a continuum of manner and inferential meanings. In those uses where it most clearly has a manner sense ('openly') it is content-oriented, and does not involve any judgement on the speaker's part, such as in (44).

(44) At the moment, though, she has secretly put this aside and, unknown to me, is working on another project entirely – a micro-history of myself. ... I believe she has even phoned an old school friend of mine whom she *avowedly* dislikes and asked him for the manuscript of a symphony we once composed together. (BNC, J17 2926, 2930)

However, *avowedly* is rarely used unambiguously as a manner adverb. In most cases, the claims it qualifies involve some interpretation and judgement. It typically occurs before pre-modifying adjectives in noun phrases, and functions as an emphasizer (subjunct), indicating that the properties it qualifies are easily noticeable, as in examples (45)-(47). The adjectives it co-occurs with often denote ideological stances.

(45) There are no *avowedly* Wycliffite thoughts in the piece; it is not doctrinally polemical; and it eschews comment on the real presence. (BNC, GT8 1066)

(46) Thomas also avoided taking *avowedly* conservative positions on controversial issues such as criminal justice and abortion. (BNC HLC 13)

(47) Socialist governments in Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Nicaragua and Grenada all implemented programmes that were *avowedly* ideological in character. (BNC HH3 509)

In its emphasizing function *avowedly* is similar to inferential adverbs such as *clearly, evidently* (see Chapter 5), which also signal that the properties they qualify are easily perceptible. In such uses *avowedly* seems to function in the border area between the textual and metatextual levels of language; between objective (content-related) and subjective (speaker-related) reference. Using the current Polish word-class classification criteria, *avowedly* could be classified as a metapredicative operator (cf. Chapter 2).

4.2.6. *Apparently*

Apparently can be used to qualify claims based on reported information, inference and unspecified evidence. This section focuses on its reportive uses; the non-reportive ones are discussed in Chapter 5. In its reportive sense *apparently* is "used to say you have read or been told something although you are not certain it is true" (*CALD*). Unlike the other adverbs qualifying reported information, *apparently* does not have a past participle base. It derives from the adjective *apparent*, meaning "able to be seen or understood" (*CALD*), and "manifest to the senses or mind as real or true on the basis of evidence that may or may not be factually valid" (*Merriam-Webster*). *Apparently* is a high frequency adverb; it is the most frequent item in the group (see Table 3). It is used in sentence initial, medial and final positions, and, in contrast to the other adverbs in the group, it has a similar frequency in speech and in writing.

As noted by Wierzbicka (2006), the reportive meaning of *apparently* is particularly clear when it co-occurs with verbs of speaking, such as *say, talk* and *tell*, which explicitly indicate that the information it qualifies was reported to the speaker by another person. The contexts in which it occurs

also communicate that it is used to refer to rumour. Such uses are illustrated in examples (48)-(50).

(48) 'I saw Miss Lofthouse in Thirkett and <u>she told me</u>. ***Apparently*** this person's been going out all hours of the day and night.' (BNC, ABX 2950-2951)

(49) <u>She'd had a talk with him</u> and ***apparently*** <u>he'd said</u> erm \<pause\> he said to her I'm gonna be a good boy this time. (BNC, KP6 519)

(50) Well, ***apparently*** <u>rumour has it</u> that the doctor at the hospital who dealt with these last cases was saying words to the effect that er Jonathan just put Jonathan in a situation and he'd keep the hospital in business for evermore. (BNC, FLY 153)

Apparently functions as a marker of alignment-neutral attribution. It is not used to explicitly distance the speaker from the content of the proposition. Wierzbicka (2006: 279) argues that by using *apparently* "the speaker is not casting doubt on the other person's words but doesn't accept responsibility for their validity either". Two components can be identified in its meaning: the reportive component and epistemic agnosticism. Wiemer and Socka (2017b: 93, footnote 4) argue that "the relation between the reportive component and epistemic agnosticism is conceived of best as a communicative default". However, in the case of some adverbs, such as *allegedly* and *supposedly*, the epistemic agnosticism component is emphasized in some contexts to explicitly signal distance towards the proposition. In the case of *apparently*, no emphasis on the lack of knowledge seems to take place.

In some cases the source of information is not specified, but the context suggests that the speaker has acquired the information introduced by *apparently* from someone or has read about it, as in (51) and (52).

(51) The latest development is a drug called clomipramine which has the endearing quality of reducing the desire to pull your hair out when under stress. The affliction is not as rare as you might think. ***Apparently*** eight million Americans pluck their eyebrows, eyelashes and heads when under pressure. (BNC, A1S 216-218)

(52) This was a short-lived club, but important if only for the fact that it drew up the first Breed Standard in 1901. Very little informa-

tion on this club is available, but ***apparently*** it was first started in 1899. (BNC, AR 5 83-84)

In cases such as (52) it seems possible that the information referred to was reported to the speaker by someone. It is, however, also possible that the speaker deduced it from some data he had access to. As observed by Cornillie (2018: 164), "indirect evidence markers often combine inferential readings with reportative readings" so that in some contexts, it is impossible to disambiguate between the two.

Apparently can also be used to signal contrast between what the speaker originally thought was true and what s/he learnt later, as in (53) and (54), where it is paraphrasable with 'it turns out' and 'it appears'.

(53) Mrs Healy looked a hundred but ***apparently*** she was twenty-seven. (BNC, CCM 797)

(54) But that book gave the astonishing statistic that in nineteen ninety, or nineteen eighty eight in the US, more men died from breast cancer in the US than women died from heterosexually contracted AIDS. I mean I didn't know that many men died of breast cancer but ***apparently*** they do. (BNC, HUL 71)

In (53) and (54) *apparently* expresses surprise at the new information. The sense of surprise is usually associated with the semantic notion of mirativity (cf. DeLancey 2001; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007). As noted by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 36), in English mirativity tends to be expressed by prosodic means (cf. also DeLancey 2001), but some adverbs can be used to signal surprise (*surely*) or its lack (e.g. *of course*). Examples (53) and (54) indicate that the concept of mirativity is also relevant in the study of the meanings expressed by *apparently*.

4.3. Polish equivalents of English reportive adverbs. Evidence from bilingual dictionaries

The Polish equivalents of English reportive adverbs which are suggested by the three bilingual dictionaries consulted for the purposes of this work, i.e. the *Great English-Polish Dictionary* (henceforth abbreviated as PWN), published by PWN and Oxford University Press (2006), the *Great Eng-*

lish-Polish Dictionary (henceforth St) by Stanisławski (1999), and *Collins English Polish Dictionary* (henceforth Col) edited by Fisiak *et al.* (1996), are listed in Table 4.

Table 4. Dictionary equivalents of English reportive adverbs

Reportive adverbs	Polish dictionary equivalents
reportedly	*podobno* (PWN; Col)
allegedly	*rzekomo* (PWN; Col)
supposedly	*ponoć* (PWN), *podobno* (Col, St), *rzekomo* (St), *przypuszczalnie* (St)
reputedly	*podobno* (PWN; Col), *rzekomo* (PWN; Col)
avowedly	*jawnie* (PWN; St), *otwarcie* (PWN; St), *jednoznacznie, zgodnie z własną deklaracją* (PWN)
apparently	*pozornie, z pozoru, widocznie, jak widać* (PWN; St), *najwidoczniej, najwyraźniej* (Col; St)

As shown in Table 4, *podobno* and *rzekomo* are given as equivalents of three English reportive adverbs in the bilingual dictionaries. *Podobno* is suggested as an equivalent of *reportedly, supposedly* and *reputedly,* while *rzekomo* is suggested as an equivalent of *allegedly, supposedly* and *reputedly. Rzekomo* usually expresses some degree of doubt, while *podobno* is more likely to express neutral acknowledgment (cf. Wiemer 2006; Grochowski *et al.* 2014; Wiemer and Socka 2017a, 2017b). The use of both *podobno* and *rzekomo* as equivalents of *reputedly* suggests that the dictionaries link the adverb with both alignment-neutral attribution and distancing. Data from the BNC discussed earlier in this chapter suggest that it tends to express alignment-neutral attribution. *Podobno* is suggested as the only equivalent of *reportedly,* which indicates a high degree of correspondence, but the two adverbs are quite different in their distribution (cf. section 4.4). They are also different on the formal level. *Reportedly* is a speech-act adverb, while *podobno* derives from the adjective *podobny* 'similar'. Polish does not have a speech-act adverb directly corresponding to *reportedly,* as it does not have a verb corresponding to the English verb *report.* As argued later in this chapter, this difference accounts for some of the functional differences between the two adverbs. The dictionaries

give *rzekomo* as the only equivalent of *allegedly,* which, like *reportedly,* is related to a speech-act verb (*allege*). The relation between *rzekomo* and the speech-act verb *rzec* 'to say' (cf. *WSJP*) which it derives from is historical rather than synchronically apparent because the verb is archaic and literary in character.

Supposedly has a number of dictionary equivalents, both reportive (*ponoć, podobno, rzekomo*) and non-reportive (*przypuszczalnie*). Its non-reportive equivalents are connected with its non-reportive uses discussed earlier in this chapter. *Zgodnie z własną deklaracją* 'according to one's own declaration' is the only reportive equivalent of *avowedly* provided by the dictionaries; the other ones are non-reportive. One of them, *jawnie,* is used both as an adverb of manner ('openly') and an inferential adverb ('clearly') in Polish; the other two equivalents, *otwarcie* 'openly, explicitly' and *jednoznacznie* 'unambiguously', are adverbs of manner. The dictionaries do not provide any equivalents of *apparently* used in its reportive sense.

4.4. Polish equivalents of English reportive adverbs. Evidence from the parallel corpus

Reportedly, allegedly, supposedly, and *apparently* have relatively high frequencies in the parallel corpus (see Table 28), which is why their Polish equivalents have been established using corpus samples (consisting of one hundred occurrences of each of the adverbs). *Reputedly* has ten occurrences in *Paralela; avowedly* has only four, which is why all their equivalents identified in the corpus are included in the analysis. Table 5 lists the translation equivalents of English reportive adverbs identified in the parallel corpus. The numbers given in brackets refer to the number of occurrences of each of the equivalents in the analyzed corpus sample.

Table 5. Translation equivalents of English reportive adverbs in *Paralela*

Reportive adverbs	Translation equivalents in the parallel corpus
reportedly	zero equivalent (29), *podobno* (24), *mieć* (17), *według informacji/danych/doniesień/badań* (15), *rzekomo* (7), *mieć + rzekomo* (2), *ponoć* (2), *jak się dowiadujemy* (2), *prawdopodobnie* (1), *wydaje się* (1)

Reportive adverbs	Translation equivalents in the parallel corpus
allegedly	*rzekomo* (47), *mieć* (16), zero equivalent (15), *rzekomy* (8), *podobno* (3), *zdaniem/według* (3), *przypuszczalnie* (2), *podejrzany* (2), *domniemany* (1), *w domniemaniu* (1), *tak zwane* (1), *ponoć* (1)
supposedly	*rzekomo* (26), zero equivalent (21), *podobno* (16), *prawdopodobnie* (12), *przypuszczalnie* (6), *ponoć* (6), *uważa się/sądzi się* (3), *zapewne* (2), *niby* (2), *chyba* (1), *pozornie* (1), *wydaje się* (1), *mieć* (1), *domniemany* (1), *jakoby* (1)
reputedly	*podobno* (4), zero equivalent (3), *uchodzić za* (2), *rzekomo* (1)
avowedly	zero equivalent (3), *pozornie* (1)
apparently	zero equivalent (23), *widocznie* (18), *najwyraźniej* (13), *zdaje się/wydaje się* (13), *pozornie* (6), *na pozór* (6), *widać* (4), *niby* (2), *prawdopodobnie* (2), *jakby* (2), *oczywiście* (1), *faktycznie* (1), *w rzeczywistości* (1), *najwidoczniej* (1), *zdecydowanie* (1), *podobno* (1), *rzekomo* (1), *być może* (1), *chyba* (1), *mieć* (1), *wygląda na to, że* (1)

As shown in Table 5, the English reportive adverbs are often omitted in translation. In the case of *reportedly* and *apparently*, "zero equivalent" is the option most frequently chosen by the translators, which signals a relatively small degree of functional overlap with their Polish equivalents. Moreover, each of the adverbs has a number of translation equivalents, both reportive and non-reportive, which confirms their polyfunctional character, noted earlier in this chapter. The only English adverb whose dictionary equivalent is also regularly used as its translation equivalent is *allegedly*, which indicates a considerable degree of functional overlap between the two items. A relatively frequent translation equivalent of English reportive adverbs is also the reportive verb *mieć* 'be reported to'/lit. 'to have', which has no direct equivalent among English verbs. The translation equivalents of each of the English reportive adverbs are discussed in more detail in sections 4.4.1.-4.4.6.

4.4.1. Translation equivalents of *reportedly*

As indicated in Table 5, the most frequent adverbial equivalent of *reportedly* in the parallel corpus is the item suggested by the bilingual dictionaries, i.e. *podobno*. However, it only appears in 24% of the translations in the analyzed sample; in most cases, *reportedly* is omitted in translation. Omission is typically found in the contexts where *reportedly* qualifies a piece of information which can be considered as official, as in (55) and (56). The Polish versions of such sentences are formulated as statements of fact; they do not include any reportive expressions.

(55) Member States **reportedly** agreed on a EUR 10 thousand million figure to cover the next three to five years.

Państwa członkowskie **(Ø)** zatwierdziły finansowanie na kwotę około miliard EUR na kolejne trzy do pięciu lat. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|30187)

(56) A French company established to exploit the potential of Net-WMS has already used the system and good results have been achieved, with packing solutions **reportedly** improved by between 5% and 15%.

Francuska firma założona w celu wykorzystania możliwości systemu Net-WMS dokonała jego wdrożenia. Osiągnięto dobre wyniki przy wydajności rozwiązań pakowania **(Ø)** zwiększonej o 5-15%. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|31957)

Polish does not have a reportive adverb indicating that the reported information comes from an official or expert source. The employment of any Polish reportive adverb in (55) or (56) would indicate that the statement is unofficial and, as such, it should be treated with caution. One of the strategies used by translators to compensate for the absence of an adverb signalling information reported by an official source in Polish is to employ descriptive equivalents, such as *według doniesień* 'according to the reports', *według danych* 'according to the data', and *wyniki badania wskazują* 'the obtained findings indicate', as illustrated in (57) and (58).

(57) Articles in the international press report that, in recent years in Peru, dozens of peasants in the Huánuco and Pasco regions have been murdered by a gang known as 'Los Pishtacos' in order to

sell their body fat – *reportedly* amounting to 17 kilos – to European cosmetics manufacturers for 15 000 dollars per kilo.

Jak donosi międzynarodowa prasa, w ostatnich latach w Peru gang pod nazwą 'Los Pishtacos' zamordował w regionach Huánuco i Pasco dziesiątki wieśniaków, by sprzedać europejskiemu przemysłowi kosmetycznemu ich tłuszcz, w ilości sięgającej – *według danych* – 17 kilogramów, w cenie 15 000 dolarów za kilogram. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-12-16-012)

(58) Many people, however, *reportedly* feel ill-informed, associate scientific progress with negative consequences, or harbour an underlying mistrust of scientists whose specialised knowledge they feel gives them excessive power.

Wyniki badania wskazują jednakże, że wiele osób czuje się niedoinformowanych, wiąże postęp naukowy z negatywnymi skutkami lub wykazuje brak zaufania do naukowców, gdyż, jak uważa, specjalistyczna wiedza daje tej grupie zbyt dużą władzę. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|25088)

When *reportedly* qualifies hearsay information whose source is not specified in the context, several Polish equivalents are available. The most frequent one is *podobno*, as in (59) and (60).

(59) *Reportedly*, Yanukovych at that time held stakes in fuel and property development firms, predominantly based in the Donetsk Oblast, which were controlled by Anton Pryhodsky, an MP from the Party of Regions, and Rinat Akhmetov.

Janukowycz *podobno* miał wówczas udziały w firmach paliwowych oraz deweloperskich, głównie na terenie obwodu donieckiego, kontrolowanych przez deputowanego Partii Regionów Antona Pryhodskiego oraz Rinata Achmetowa. (*Paralela*, CES Studies_42)

(60) Tukey *reportedly* came up with the idea during a meeting of a US presidential advisory committee discussing ways to detect nuclear-weapon tests in the Soviet Union.

Tukey *podobno* wpadł na pomysł podczas spotkania amerykańskiej prezydenckiej komisji doradczej omawiania sposobów

wykrywania testów broni jądrowej w ZSRR. (*Paralela*, goodwiki 643)

Examples (59) and (60) refer to situations which are difficult or even impossible to verify, particularly the one described in (60), which concerns a moment when the person referred to (Tukey) "came up with the idea". The less frequent equivalents of *reportedly* in such contexts are *rzekomo* 'allegedly' and the reportive verb *mieć*, as illustrated in (61) and (62), respectively. The two reportive markers are sometimes combined, as in (63).

(61) Despite an incomplete European overview of the actual implementation of this legislation, we do, of course, pick up <u>certain rumours</u>, from Austria for example where a local inspector *reportedly* sees many empty lorries drive in the direction of Poland and the Czech Republic, for example, but he does not see the full vehicles returning, heading towards southern Europe.

Pomimo niepełnego europejskiego przeglądu sytuacji w zakresie faktycznego wdrożenia tego prawodawstwa, docierają do nas oczywiście <u>pewne pogłoski</u>, na przykład z Austrii, gdzie lokalny inspektor *rzekomo* widzi wiele pustych samochodów ciężarowych zmierzających w kierunku Polski i Republiki Czeskiej, ale nie widzi załadowanych pojazdów, które jechałyby na południe Europy. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-01-15-002)

(62) In 2011, he *reportedly* bought a luxury flat in London for £136 million.

W 2011 doniecki biznesmen *miał* kupić luksusowy apartament w Londynie za sumę 136 mln GBR. (*Paralela*, CES Studies_42)

(63) Reports have also appeared about his attempts to take over businesses on the electronic media market. He *reportedly* took over a small TV channel called Tonis (although he himself has denied this) and made a proposal to buy out the news TV channel, 5 Kanal.

Pojawiają się również informacje o próbach przejęć na rynku mediów elektronicznych. Syn prezydenta *miał rzekomo* przejąć niewielki kanał telewizyjny Tonis (choć sam temu zaprzecza)

oraz złożyć propozycję odkupienia od Petra Poroszenki telewizji informacyjnej 5 Kanał. (*Paralela*, CES Studies_42)

Rzekomo is typically used to express doubt (cf. Grochowski *et al.* 2014; Wiemer and Socka 2017a, 2017b), and performs distancing functions. Therefore, its use as an equivalent of *reportedly* is possible when the claim it qualifies is questioned in the context. Such is the case in (61), where the statement that the lorries are empty is countered with "he does not see the full vehicles returning". Thus, the parallel corpus data confirm the observation made in section 4.2.1. that the function performed by *reportedly* depends on the reliability of the source of information it qualifies. It may be used to express neutral acknowledgement when the qualified information is presented as coming from a reliable ("expert") source; it may also perform a distancing function when the source of information is unspecified or described as rumour.

4.4.2. Translation equivalents of *allegedly*

As shown in Table 5, the most frequent translation equivalent of *allegedly* in the corpus is *rzekomo*. However, it is employed in 47% of the cases, and the range of the less frequent equivalents is quite high, which indicates that the two adverbs differ in function. Like *allegedly, rzekomo* frequently occurs in descriptions of criminal cases and things considered to be bad or inappropriate (e.g. Socka 2015: 127; Wiemer and Socka 2017a, 2017b), and both adverbs have distancing functions. However, while *allegedly* communicates that the statement may not be true (cf. Wierzbicka 2006: 282), *rzekomo* usually signals that the speaker "does not give any credence to the reported piece of information" (Wiemer 2006: 39; see also: *WSJP*; Stępień 2010: 54; Grochowski *et al.* 2014: 107). As observed by Wiemer and Socka (2017a, 2017b), the epistemic sense of doubt is the default meaning of *rzekomo*. It thus tends to be used as a functional equivalent of *allegedly* in those instances when the context makes it clear that the validity of the claim qualified by *allegedly* is questioned by the speaker, as in (64).

(64) The Thai exporting producers further submitted that the injury endured by the Community industry should be attributed to a lack of competitiveness due to ***allegedly*** outdated production

facilities. However, it should be recalled that the Community industry constantly invested over the period considered in order to replace obsolete machinery and to maintain "state of the art" production facilities. Thus, no outdated non-competitive production technique exists which could have broken the causal link between dumped imports from the countries concerned and their injurious effects on the Community industry. The argument should be therefore rejected and the findings set out in recital 161 of the provisional Regulation concerning the competitiveness of the Community industry are confirmed.

Tajscy producenci eksportujący twierdzili dalej, że szkoda poniesiona przez przemysł wspólnotowy powinna być przypisana brakowi konkurencyjności z powodu ***rzekomo*** przestarzałych zakładów produkcyjnych. Należy jednak przypomnieć, że przemysł wspólnotowy dokonywał ciągle inwestycji w badanym okresie w celu zastąpienia przestarzałych maszyn i dysponowania najnowocześniejszymi zakładami produkcyjnymi. Nie istnieje zatem żadna przestarzała niekonkurencyjna technika produkcji mogąca przerwać związek przyczynowy między dumpingowym przywozem z krajów, których dotyczy postępowanie i ich szkodliwym skutkiem dla przemysłu wspólnotowego. Ten argument należy zatem odrzucić, a ustalenia zawarte w motywie 161 rozporządzenia tymczasowego dotyczące konkurencyjności przemysłu wspólnotowego zostają potwierdzone. (*Paralela*, JRC-Acquis|32005R1890)

By saying that the argument referred to in (64) should be rejected, the speaker communicates that its validity is questionable, which makes *rzekomo* a natural equivalent of *allegedly* in this context. A similar attitude is found in (65), where the reported information is presented as purposely deceitful. A less frequent equivalent of *allegedly* in the context of doubt is *ponoć*, which, as Grochowski *et al.* (2014) suggest, can be used to qualify claims as unsustainable in light of what the speaker knows. In (66), *allegedly* and *ponoć* are used to express ironic scepticism.

(65) Thousands of companies throughout Europe are taken in by ***allegedly*** free advertising in business catalogues, for which they

are in reality required to pay anything from a few hundred to a few thousand euros.

Przecież tysiące firm w całej Europie <u>dają się nabrać</u> na ***rzekomo*** bezpłatną reklamę w katalogach biznesowych, za którą w rzeczywistości przychodzi im płacić od kilkuset do kilku tysięcy euro. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-05-20-012)

(66)   The rapporteurs yesterday boasted about standardisation, and yet this is ***allegedly*** a Union of diversity.

Wczoraj sprawozdawcy chwalili się standaryzacją, choć ***ponoć*** żyjemy w Unii różnorodności. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-01-13-009)

When the reported information qualified by *allegedly* is not questioned anywhere in the context, *rzekomo* is less likely to be used as its equivalent. In such cases, translators opt for more neutral qualifiers, such as the adjective *domniemany* 'presumptive'/'alleged', which indicates that a claim is considered as possible on the basis of indirect evidence until proved otherwise. The other equivalents used in such contexts are the more alignment-neutral adverb *podobno* and the reportive verb *mieć*, as illustrated in examples (67)-(69).

(67)   Zacarias Moussaoui, ***allegedly*** the twentieth terrorist of September 11, 2001.

Zacarias Moussaoui, ***domniemany*** dwudziesty zamachowiec z 11 września 2001 r. (*Paralela*, natolin_43)

(68)   Now to the question on the database ***allegedly*** held by the French Gendarmerie and possibly containing ethnic elements.

Teraz o bazach danych, które są ***podobno*** prowadzone przez francuską gendarmerie i ponoć zawierają dane dotyczące pochodzenia etnicznego. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-10-19-017)

(69)   Compensation in respect of the damage ***allegedly*** caused by the levying by the United States of America of increased customs duty on the applicants' imports of spectacle cases, as authorised by the Dispute Settlement Body of the World Trade Organisation (WTO).

Skarga o naprawienie szkody, która ***miała*** powstać w wyniku wprowadzenia przez Stany Zjednoczone Ameryki na podstawie upoważnienia udzielonego przez Organ Rozstrzygania Sporów Światowej Organizacji Handlu (WTO) dodatkowego cła na przywóz produkowanych przez skarżące etui na okulary. (*Paralela*, JRC-Acquis C2006/048/41)

The analyzed examples indicate that while *rzekomo* is the prototypical equivalent of *allegedly*, the English adverb is more likely to express epistemic agnosticism, and signal that the information referred to has not been confirmed. *Rzekomo* is typically used as its equivalent when the reported information is presented as doubtful. In more neutral contexts, the preferred translation equivalent of *allegedly* is the reportive verb *mieć*.

4.4.3. Translation equivalents of *supposedly*

As shown in Table 5, the most frequent translation equivalent of *supposedly* in the analyzed corpus sample is *rzekomo* – an adverb which typically performs a distancing function and indicates doubt towards the truth value of the reported claim. Thus, the translators' choices confirm the association of *supposedly* with scepticism, signalled in section 4.2.3. *Rzekomo* is employed as the equivalent of *supposedly* both in its uses as a sentence adverb (disjunct), as in (70), and in its uses as a subjunct modifying sentence elements and their constituents, as in (71).

(70)   ***Supposedly***, Azerbaijan is committed to democracy, the rule of law and human rights. The truth is quite different.

Rzekomo Azerbejdżan zaangażowany jest w sprawie demokracji, praworządności i prawa człowieka. Prawda jest zupełnie inna. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-05-12-016-02)

(71)   What did the ***supposedly*** extremely pro-European forces do at that time?

A co wtedy robiły ***rzekomo*** proeuropejskie służby? (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-03-10-003)

In one instance, *supposedly* is rendered with *jakoby* – another Polish adverb which signals the speaker's scepticism towards reported claims. *Jakoby* is characteristic of formal and literary language (cf. Grochowski

et al. 2014: 103); the fragment of a philosophical-political speech quoted in (72), where it is used as an equivalent of *supposedly*, provides a good illustration of these qualities.

(72) It is the ritual sacrifice to the new religion of climate and its new gurus, these partially-minded scientists who pour anathema on all those whose work opposes their untouchable conclusions. It is the systematic stigmatisation of Man as a ***supposedly*** evil entity, especially the Western and European variety.

Jest to rytualna ofiara w imię nowej religii klimatu i nowych guru, tych ograniczonych naukowców, którzy rzucają klątwy na wszystkich, którzy sprzeciwiają się ich niepodważalnym konkluzjom. Jest to systematyczne napiętnowanie Człowieka, który ***jakoby*** jest z natury zły, szczególnie w rozumieniu zachodnim czy europejskim. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-05-21-007)

The parallel corpus provides illustrations of the employment of *supposedly* to signal unconfirmed information, when its epistemic component is suppressed. In such cases, it expresses the reportive sense and the sense of epistemic agnosticism, and is rendered with the more alignment-neutral hearsay adverbs *podobno* and *ponoć*, as illustrated in (73) and (74).

(73) ***Supposedly***, there's surveillance video, but I haven't been able to confirm that yet.

Podobno jest tam nagranie z kradzieży, ale nie potrafię tego potwierdzić. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|227)

(74) In all cases, the samples had been taken from women during the secretory phase of their menstrual cycle, when the endometrium is maintained and nerve-fibre density is ***supposedly*** at its peak.

We wszystkich przypadkach, próbki zostały pobrane od kobiet w fazie lutealnej cyklu menstruacyjnego, kiedy endometrium jest utrzymywane, a gęstość włókien nerwowych jest ***ponoć*** najwyższa. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|31148)

Supposedly is also rendered by the non-reportive epistemic adverbs *prawdopodobnie* 'probably' and *przypuszczalnie* 'presumably'. They are used in the contexts where *supposedly* expresses non-reportive meanings

resulting from its relation to the epistemic verb *suppose* (cf. section 4.2.3). Such use is illustrated in (75).

(75) Certainly, with these three points, it can be said that an instrument will shortly be in the hands of the European citizen that is simpler than expected, clearer than it appears at first sight and ***supposedly*** more effective.

W związku z tymi trzema aspektami można z pewnością stwierdzić, że w rękach obywateli Europy znajdzie się wkrótce instrument prostszy od oczekiwanego, jaśniejszy, niż wydaje się na pierwszy rzut oka, i ***przypuszczalnie*** skuteczniejszy. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-12-15-006)

4.4.4. Translation equivalents of *reputedly*

Reputedly is a low-frequency adverb, with only seven occurrences in the parallel corpus. In four of the seven instances attested in the corpus, *reputedly* is rendered as *podobno*, which is the most semantically and stylistically neutral reportive adverb in Polish. The contexts in which it occurs in *Paralela* are similar to those identified in the BNC: legends and stories about historical places and historical figures, as illustrated in (76).

(76) Now, the Trung-Rom monastery.
Yeah.
Reputedly built from the bones of 9,000 monks. It was dismantled and burned by the Mongols in the 13th century.

Klasztor Trang-Ram. ***Podobno*** był zbudowany z kości 9000 tysięcy mnichów. Został zburzony i spalony przez Mongołów w XIII wieku. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|22955)

There are also several examples of *reputedly* referring to the reputation of people, institutions and facilities, rendered with *podobno* and the verbal phrase *uchodzić za* 'to be considered as'/'to have a reputation for', as illustrated in (77) and (78), respectively.

(77) I should in fairness add that my taste in music is ***reputedly*** deplorable.

Powinienem dodać, że ***podobno*** mam okropny gust, jeśli chodzi o muzykę. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|7239)

(78) Commercial 'terrorism' databases are **reputedly** highly inaccurate, with many of the leading lights fighting terrorism featuring on the lists of terrorists.

Komercyjne 'bazy danych terrorystów' **uchodzą za** wysoce niedokładne, a na listach terrorystów znajduje się wiele znakomitości zajmujących się walką z terroryzmem. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|25862)

The two adverbial equivalents of *reputedly* suggested by the bilingual dictionaries, i.e. *podobno* and *rzekomo,* can be treated as its counterparts only because they also contain the reportive component and the epistemic agnosticism component in their semantics, but they do not share its association with legends or with reputation. Data from the BNC suggest that *reputedly* tends not to be used to express doubt and to explicitly distance the speaker from the content of the proposition. Therefore, *rzekomo*, which is typically used in as a distancing marker, seems a less suitable equivalent of *reputedly* than *podobno.*

4.4.5. Translation equivalents of *avowedly*

The translation corpus contains four sentences with *avowedly*, but in the case of three of them, it is omitted in translation. The only translation equivalent attested in the corpus is *pozornie* 'seemingly, superficially'; it comes from a translation of Charles Dickens's novel *Nicholas Nickleby*, and is quoted in (79).

(79) Thus reasoned Sir Mulberry, and in pursuance of this reasoning he and his friend soon afterwards repaired to Ralph Nickleby's, there to execute a plan of operations concerted by Sir Mulberry himself, **avowedly** to promote his friend's object, and really to attain his own.

W taki sposób rozumował baronet, a w wyniku tego rozumowania obaj panowie udali się do domu pana Ralfa Nickleby, by wykonać plan działania opracowany osobiście przez sir Mulberry'ego i zmierzający **pozornie** do urzeczywistnienia zamiarów lorda Fryderyka, a w istocie – do osiągnięcia celów jego przyjaciela. (*Paralela*, *Nickleby*)

Avowedly indicates a discrepancy between what is declared and what is really true; *pozornie* contrasts what appears to be true with what is really true. The "declaring component" which can be identified in the case of *avowedly* is lost when the adverb is rendered with *pozornie*; the contrast between theory and practice is preserved.

4.4.6. Translation equivalents of *apparently*

As illustrated in Table 5, *apparently* is frequently omitted in translation. Most of its occurrences in the analyzed corpus sample are non-reportive in character, and have non-reportive counterparts: *widocznie* 'clearly'/'apparently', *wyraźnie* 'clearly', *widać* 'clearly'/'as it can be seen', and *najwidoczniej* 'most clearly'/'most apparently'. A systematic equivalent of the adverb is also the verb *zdaje się* 'it appears'/'it seems', used to refer to unspecified evidence. Two of its equivalents are reportive adverbs: *podobno* 'reportedly' and *rzekomo* 'allegedly'. The other equivalents have single occurrences, and include a variety of both low confidence expressions (*chyba* 'probably and *być może* 'maybe'), and high confidence markers (*oczywiście* 'of course' and *zdecydowanie* 'definitely').

The reportive adverbs *podobno* and *rzekomo* are used as equivalents of *apparently* only once each. *Podobno* is used to express alignment-neutral attribution, as illustrated in (80). *Rzekomo*, in contrast, is used to signal disbelief, as in (81), where the reported information is criticized as "absurd" by the speaker.

(80) **Apparently** the DFG's Emmy Noether grantees have a website where they keep a 'blacklist' of faculties and institutions which are less than welcoming to young, independent researchers.

Podobno stypendyści programu Emmy Noether organizowanego przez DFG mają witrynę internetową, w której prowadzą "czarną listę" wydziałów i instytucji nieprzychylnych wobec młodych, niezależnych badaczy. (*Paralela*, CORDIS 26800)

(81) The response was negative and the reasoning absurd. He had **apparently** failed to fulfil the requirement to support sexual and reproductive health in his projects.

Otrzymał odpowiedź odmowną z absurdalnym uzasadnieniem, że jego projekt **rzekomo** nie spełnia wymogu wspiera-

nia zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-10-10-07-013)

The epistemic verbal phrases *zdaje się* and *wydaje się* 'it seems', which are also employed as its counterparts in the parallel corpus, are used to qualify information which results from the speaker's perception and analysis of the situation (Danielewiczowa 2002: 191-193). They express conclusions based on different types of evidence, hearsay being of them. In (82), the source of the information is not explicitly stated, but the context suggests reported information.

(82) **Apparently** at this very moment they are short of 40 English teachers, given the financial problems experienced by Her Majesty's Government.

Wydaje się, że w tym właśnie momencie brakuje w nich 40 nauczycieli angielskiego, biorąc pod uwagę problemy finansowe, z którymi boryka się rząd Jej Królewskiej Mości. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-08-09-25-013)

As most of the translation equivalents of *apparently* in the analyzed sample are inferential in character, they are discussed in Chapter 5.

4.5. Reportive adverbs in Polish

In Polish, the category of reportive adverbs is usually said to include: *podobno, ponoć, podobnież, rzekomo, jakoby,* and *niby* (Roszko 1993; Tutak 2003; Wiemer 2006; Grochowski *et al*. 2014), though Grochowski *et al*. (2014) argue that the reportive sense expressed by *niby* is purely contextual, and exclude it from their category of reportive markers.

Unlike most of their English counterparts (with the exception of *apparently*), Polish reportive adverbs have not been formed from past participles of illocutionary or epistemic verbs. Only *rzekomo* has a verb form as its derivational base: *rzec* 'to say' (*WSJP*), but the verb is archaic and literary in character, and its relation to it is not as straightforward as it is in the case of the English adverbs. Both *podobno* and *podobnież* derive from the adjective *podobny*; they go back to one of its older meanings, i.e. 'probable'/'possible' (cf. Boryś 2006); *ponoć* derives from *podobno* (*WSJP*).

Jakoby and *niby* are compounds consisting of *jak* 'as' (in *jakby*), the negative particle *ni* 'no'/'not' (in *niby*), and the multifunctional formant *by* 'to, in order to'/a form of *być* 'to be' (*WSJP*; Boryś 2006). They seem to have been formed as a result of lexicalization, as they both derive from items of a grammatical character, which, when put together, acquired lexical meanings (see Ramat and Ricca 1998, Traugott 2006, and Brinton 2008 for discussions of lexicalization). None of the Polish reportive adverbs explicitly refers to the speech act of reporting or to holding an opinion.

The uses of Polish reportive adverbs are discussed briefly below, beginning with *podobno*, which is the most semantically neutral and stylistically versatile reportive adverb in Polish. The same section offers a brief discussion of two forms etymologically related to *podobno*: *ponoć* and *podobnież*. The adverbs which indicate disbelief in reported claims, *rzekomo*, *jakoby* and *niby*, are discussed in the subsequent sections.

4.5.1. *Podobno, podobnież, ponoć*

Podobno, *podobnież* and *ponoć* have the same derivational base (adj. *podobny*, cf. 4.5.), and are closely related. Wiemer (2006) treats them as different stylistic variants of the same lexeme. *Podobnie* is a standard form; *podobnież* is nonstandard; *ponoć* is a little archaic and literary (cf. also *WSJP, USJP*). However, Grochowski *et al*. (2014) classify *ponoć* as a distinct marker, and suggest that while all three adverbs usually express alignment-neutral attribution, *ponoć* is more likely to express disbelief than the other two. The three adverbs introduce hearsay information; none of them can be used to refer to a scientific report the way *reportedly* does (cf. section 4.2.). All three items are classified as particles in current Polish grammar (cf. Grochowski *et al*. 2014; *WSJP*), which means that they are flexible with respect to the syntactic position they occupy; they can be used as sentence adverbs, and as modifiers of individual sentence elements. They can also appear on their own as responses to prior utterances. *Podobno, ponoć* and *podobnież* are also used in questions asking for confirmation (Grochowski *et al*. 2014; *WSJP*).

Podobno is the most frequent reportive adverb in the National Corpus of Polish (*NKJP*) (cf. Table 3); it is particularly frequent in spoken language (see Table 27). *Niby* is more frequent, but the count reported in Table 3 also includes its non-reportive uses, which are more frequent than the re-

portive ones. As noted in other studies (e.g. Stępień 2010; Grochowski *et al.* 2014), in its basic sense *podobno* communicates that the speaker does not know if the reported information is true, i.e. it expresses epistemic agnosticism. In some contexts, the epistemic agnosticism component is not emphasized, and can be treated as "a communicative default" of its reportive meaning (cf. Wiemer and Socka 2017b: 93, footnote 4). In such cases *podobno* expresses neutral acknowledgement; i.e. it attributes the proposition to an external voice without indicating the speaker's attitude towards its validity. Such alignment-neutral uses seem to be characteristic of the contexts in which the precision of speech is not particularly important, and the reported claims only provide some additional or background information, as in (83).

(83)   Mój domek jest obecnie jedynym zabudowaniem w Witalniku. Do lat pięćdziesiątych stały tu *podobno* jeszcze dwie chaty poniemieckie, ale zostały rozebrane. (NKJP, fiction, J. Grzegorek, *Chaszcze*, 2009)

'My house is the only building in Witalnik at the moment. Until the 1950s, there had *reportedly* been two other houses here, built by the Germans, but they were demolished.'

There are also contexts in which speakers make it explicitly clear that they do not know if the reported information is true, as in (84).

(84)   Tak elegancko jak ona nie ubierała się tu u nas w mieście żadna kobieta. Przynajmniej wtedy. *Podobno* była sławna. Nie wiem, nigdy nie interesowałem się muzyką. (NKJP, fiction, M. Cieślik, *Śmieszni Kochankowie*, 2009)

'She was dressed more elegantly than any other woman in our town. At least at that time. She was *reportedly* famous. I don't know. I was never interested in music.'

The unreliability of hearsay as a source of claims qualified by *podobno* is sometimes emphasized in the context. The epistemic sense of uncertainty which *podobno* expresses in such contexts seems to be contextual, pragmatic, resulting from the speakers' distrustful attitude towards reported information in general. In contexts where facts are to be established, speakers often find it important to signal that the information they

have has been reported by others and, as such, it is not necessarily true. One of the ways to stress distrust of hearsay information is to use *podobno* with the downtoner *tylko* 'only', as in (85).

(85)   Mam jeszcze możliwość kupna używanej 75-300 nikkora za 1200zł (80-200 za 1000zł), *podobno* jest bardzo dobry, ale tylko *podobno*. (NKJP, internet forum, 1999)

'I can also buy a second-hand 75-300 *nikorra* for 1200 zlotys (80-200 for 1000 zlotys), it is *reportedly* very good, but only *reportedly*.'

The tendency to stress scepticism towards reported information when the precision of data is important can be found in the uses of all reportive adverbs in Polish. In (86) *rzekomo, podobno* and *ponoć* are all used one after another to qualify a piece of information which, as the speaker says, 'nobody believes' to be true.

(86)   Pretekstem, o ile w ogóle potrzebny był pretekst, było *rzekome* obrabowanie przez husytów poborcy podatkowego, dokonane *podobno* trzynastego września. Zagrabiono wówczas *ponoć* półtora tysiąca z górą grzywien... – Ile? – Powiedziałem: *rzekomo, podobno, ponoć*. Nikt w to nie wierzy. (NKJP, fiction, A. Sapkowski, *Narrenturm* 2002)

'The *alleged* robbery of a tax collector by the Hussites which *reportedly* took place on 13th September, was treated as a pretext, if a pretext was at all necessary. They *supposedly* stole over one and a half thousand grzywnas. – How much? – I said: *allegedly, reportedly, supposedly*. Nobody believes that.'

The association of *podobno* with the lack of knowledge makes it possible for the adverb to be used in questions. As noted by Bralczyk (1978: 87), it can be used to ask for confirmation to check the validity of reported information, as in (87) and (8). Such questions may also be used to involve the addressee in conversation, as they refer to things which the addressee is expected to know.

(87)   *Podobno* ukradziono ci płaszcz? (Bralczyk 1978: 87)

'*Reportedly*, your coat has been stolen?'/'I hear that your coat has been stolen, is that true?'

(88)   *Podobno* masz teraz makijaż permanentny? (NKJP, *Cosmopolitan*, 2000)

'*Reportedly* you are wearing permanent makeup now?'/'I hear you are wearing permanent makeup now, is that true?'

Podobno is frequently used with the reportive verb *mieć* 'to be reported to', as illustrated in (89), which is a common collocation for all Polish reportive adverbs.

(89)   Jak mówi legenda, **miał podobno** przed śmiercią wezwać artystów do dokumentowania swymi umiejętnościami życia i gehenny getta. (NKJP, fiction, K. Mórawski, *Kartki z dziejów Żydów warszawskich*, 1993)

'According to the legend, before he died, he **reportedly** called in some artists and asked them to document the life and ordeals of the ghetto in an artistic way'.

Podobnież is usually treated as a stylistic (archaic and nonstandard) variant of *podobno*; *WSJP* marks it as an incorrect form. In the National Corpus of Polish it is attested almost exclusively in spoken language. The corpus data confirm the association of *podobnież* with incorrect usage, as in (90), where the speaker who is using it is told that *podobno* is the correct form.

(90)   Ona była **podobnież** hrabinią. – Hrabiną – poprawił ją ponuro. – I nie **podobnież**, ale **podobno**. Nie można było edukować w nieskończoność dwudziestoletniego arcypodlotka, jeżeli stwór taki wcale sobie tego nie życzył. (NKJP, fiction, P. Zaremba, *Plama na suficie*, 2004)

'She was **reputedly** (*podobnież*) a countess (*hrabinią*). – Hrabiną – he corrected her grimly. – And the correct form is not *podobnież* but *podobno*. How long can you try and educate a twenty-year-old girl if she doesn't want to learn anything.'

Ponoć can be used in the same sense as *podobno*, but, as noted by Grochowski *et al.* (2014: 107), it can also appear in contexts where the

speaker explicitly marks the reported information as untrue. In the National Corpus of Polish it is most frequent in sections comprising weekly and monthly magazines, and spoken language (see Table 27). Both alignment-neutral and distancing uses of *ponoć* are attested in the corpus. In (91) the speaker explicitly marks the reported information as untrue, while in (92) the validity of the proposition is not questioned; it is reported in a neutral way.

(91)   Jakże nieprawdziwa była mądra **ponoć** maksyma wymyślona przez sytych teologów, iż każdy człowiek ma swojego Anioła Stróża. (NKJP, fiction, Z. Smektała, *Chcica* …, 2006)

'How untrue was the **supposedly** wise maxim of satiated theologists that every person has their own guardian angel.'

(92)   … żałował, że nie pali papierosów. One **ponoć** uspokajają nerwy. (NKJP, fiction, M. Krajewski, M. Czubaj, *Róże cmentarne*, 2009)

'…he regretted he was a non-smoker. Cigarettes **reportedly** help to come down anxiety.'

In (91), *ponoć* is used as a subjunct – a downtoner diminishing the force of the claim. It also appears in this function in the translation corpus, as an equivalent of *allegedly* (see 4.4.2), which supports Grochowski *et al.*'s (2014) claim that *ponoć* is more likely to mark the reported information as untrue than *podobno* and *podobnież*.

Like the other reportive adverbs, *ponoć* co-occurs with the reportive verb *mieć*. Such use is illustrated in (93).

(93)   Łakiński **miał ponoć** także przepowiedzieć, że Polska odzyska niepodległość, kiedy drzewka w jego lasku dorosną do wysokości piramidy. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Esensja,* 2008)

'**Reportedly** Łakiński also prophesied that Poland would regain independence when trees in his forest grew to be as tall as his pyramid.'

4.5.2. *Rzekomo*

Rzekomo tends to express doubt towards reported information (Wierzbicka 1969; Bralczyk 1978; Wiemer 2006; Stępień 2010; Wiemer and Socka 2017a, 2017b). As noted by Wiemer and Socka (2017a, 2017b), it seems to

be its default meaning, which can, however, be suppressed in some contexts. *Rzekomo* is functionally close to *allegedly*, as both adverbs often refer to criminal responsibility (cf. Socka 2015, Wiemer and Socka 2017a, 2017b). Like *allegedly, rzekomo* seems to be more frequent in writing than in speech. In the National Corpus of Polish it is particularly frequent in prose and periodicals. However, while *allegedly* expresses distance towards propositions, and signals that they have not been confirmed (e.g. Wierzbicka 2006; Celle 2009), *rzekomo* is more likely to indicate that they are unlikely to be true. In descriptions of criminal cases, it frequently combines with the reportive verb *mieć*, which expresses alignment-neutral attribution. The verb seems to signal that the reported information represents the official version of a situation, while the adverb indicates that the speaker doubts its validity, as in (94). In contexts referring to crimes *mieć* is the most frequent collocate of *rzekomo* in the National Corpus of Polish.

(94) Sądzono go za pobicie milicjanta. Już na pierwszy rzut oka oskarżenie było naciągane: Świtoń – mizernej postury, z ręką na temblaku, a milicjant, którego **miał rzekomo** pobić – ogromne, zwaliste chłopisko. (NKJP, press, *Gazeta Wyborcza,* 1999)

'He was sued for beating a policeman. The allegations were at first sight unconvincing – Świtoń was a short and thin man, his arm in a sling, and the policeman he had ***allegedly*** beaten – a big strong man.'

In (94) the context indicates that the information qualified by *miał rzekomo* is treated by the speaker as highly improbable. The quoted text reports a situation which took place during the communist rule in Poland, when many people were imprisoned under false accusations if they fought with the regime. The attitude of doubt is thus to be expected by anyone who knows how the justice system functioned in communist Poland.

When used on its own, *rzekomo* is less frequent in texts referring to crimes. Out of the first one hundred occurrences of the adverb without the verb *mieć* in the *NKJP* which I examined only two referred to criminal cases. In the majority of the instances, *rzekomo* qualifies statements on different topics which are explicitly qualified as false, as in (95).

(95) To dziwne. Twój stryj istotnie przybył do mnie, **rzekomo** wezwany. Tymczasem wcale po niego nie posyłałem. (NKJP, fiction, A. Sarwa, *Strzyga*, 2006)

'It's strange. Your uncle indeed came to see me, ***allegedly*** at my request, while in fact, I had not sent for him.'

Because of its association with doubt and disbelief, *rzekomo* is used as a downtoner, undermining the validity of the claims it qualifies. In such cases it is similar to *allegedly, supposedly* and *avowedly*. Like the three English adverbs, it performs a countering function in such contexts, i.e. it is used to signal that the claim it qualifies cannot be sustained in view of what the speaker knows about the situation. Such use is illustrated in (96) and (97).

(96) Te głupawe, nowoczesne, wykształcone i tolerancyjne **rzekomo** kobiety do dziś nie wiedzą, dlaczego jestem w stosunku do nich złośliwa. (NKJP, fiction, K. Kofta, *Fausta*, 2010)

'Those silly, modern, educated and ***avowedly*** tolerant women still don't know why I treat them maliciously.'

(97) Ten podstępny, przewrotny hipokryta **rzekomo** zatroskany o poszerzanie wewnętrznej wolności, ubezwłasnowolnił nas przez zagłaskanie, rozbrajającą ufność cielęcia. (NKJP, fiction, T. Zimecki, *Ja Franek*, 2001)

'This deceitful hypocrite ***supposedly*** concerned about the increase of internal freedom, deprived us of our freedom with his exaggerated kindness and childlike trustfulness.'

4.5.3. *Jakoby*

Jakoby functions both as a modal particle and a subordinator. Grochowski *et al.* (2014: 102) consider the modal particle *jakoby* to be a distinct form, homonymic with the subordinator *jakoby*. As a subordinator, it is similar in function to *that*. In the National Corpus of Polish, *jakoby* appears almost exclusively in written language, particularly in prose (see Table 27). Dictionaries mark it as literary and archaic (*USJP, SJPSzym*). *Jakoby* tends to express disbelief, and perform distancing functions, which makes it similar to *rzekomo* (cf. Stępień 2010; Wiemer and Socka 2017a, 2017b),

but the two adverbs occur in different registers, *rzekomo* being more frequent in journalistic prose. *Jakoby* can be used to express distance, as in (98), and sarcasm, as in (99).

(98) Edward, gry wrócił z końmi z Białej, plótł, że zajmują Rawę. ***Jakoby*** Niemcy opuścili ją bez boju, a uprzednio podpalili. Łuna była widoczna na niebie kłębiło się, ale to mogły być chmury. Gdzieżby dym zaszedł tak daleko? To jest ponad dziesięć kilometrów. (NKJP, fiction, T. Bojarska, *Świtanie, przemijanie*, 1996)

'When Edward returned with the horses from Biała, he said that they [the Russians] were in Rawa. ***Allegedly*** the Germans had burnt it, and left without fighting. A glow could be seen in the sky, the sky was rolling. But that could have been because of the clouds rolling in the sky. Could the smoke have possibly got that far? It's over ten kilometers away.'

(99) Nie wezmę udziału w *czymś* podobnym. – A to czemu? Jesteś ***jakoby*** lekarzem. Godzi się pomóc cierpiącemu. (NKJP, fiction, A. Sapkowski, *Narrenturm*, 2002)

'I will not participate in anything like this. – Why not? You are ***allegedly*** a doctor. You should help the suffering.'

When used as a subordinator, it signals disagreement with the claim it introduces or a denial of its truth value. The use of *jakoby* as a subordinator is closely related to its use as a reportive adverb, as in both cases it introduces reported claims. It often follows illocutionary verbs, particularly *zaprzeczać* 'deny', as in (100), and the expressions *nieprawdą jest/to nieprawda* 'it's not true', as in (101).

(100) Co więcej, obydwaj energicznie zaprzeczają, ***jakoby*** chcieli zamordować Bigojana. (NKJP, fiction, M. Tomaszewska, *Zamach na wyspę*, 2001)

'What's more, they both vigorously deny ***that*** they wanted to murder Bigojan.'

(101) Co się tyczy dwóch pozostałych ofiar Ruchu, nieprawdą jest ***jakoby*** oddali życie "z pieśnią na ustach". (NKJP, fiction, C. Skrzyposzek, *Wolna Trybuna*, 1985)

'As far as the other two victims of the movement (Ruch) are concerned, it's not true ***that*** they died "with a song on their lips".'

Like *rzekomo*, *jakoby* is also used as a downtoner when it precedes pre-modifying adjectives in noun phrases, as in (102). In such cases, it has a countering function, as it signals that the view held by other people cannot be upheld in the circumstances referred to.

(102) Ten ***jakoby*** szczęśliwy człowiek popełnił samobójstwo. (Grochowski *et al.* 2014: 101).

'This ***supposedly*** happy man committed suicide.'

Like the other reportive adverbs, *jakoby* co-occurs with the reportive verb *mieć*, as in (103).

(103) Bierze np. na serio jakieś głupstwa Flory Bieńkowskiej, że Ważyk napisać ***miał jakoby*** swój "Poemat dla dorosłych" – "na zamówienie Zambrowskiego". (NKJP, non-fiction literature, R. Matuszewski, *Alfabet*…2004)

'He takes seriously some nonsense he heard from Flora Bieńkowska that Ważyk ***supposedly*** wrote his "Poemat dla dorosłych" at Zambrowski's request.'

4.5.4. *Niby*

Niby performs a number of functions in Polish. Most dictionaries classify it as a colloquial expression (*SJPDor; SJPSzym*). In the National Corpus of Polish, it is frequent in spoken language and fiction, but it is rare in periodicals (see Table 27). Its primary meaning is 'pretending to be'/'only appearing to be' (cf. *WSJP*), and this basic sense can be identified in all its uses, both as a lexical item and as a function word. In its lexical uses it functions as an adverb of manner, an epistemic adverb, and a reportive adverb. As a function word it is used as a preposition and a prefix. All these functions of *niby* are presented below.

a. Manner uses of *niby*

Manner uses of *niby* are connected with the prepositional phrase *na niby* 'not for real' (*WSJP*), illustrated in (104).

(104) Nie lituj się nad tą dziewczynką, jest ona biedna i zziębnięta, ale tylko **na niby**. Przecież to bajka. (NKJP, fiction, J. Brzechwa, *Akademia Pana Kleksa*, 1946)

'Don't feel sorry for this girl. She is poor and cold, but this is **not for real**. It's only a fairy tale.'

b. *Niby* as an epistemic adverb

Most uses of *niby* as an epistemic adverb are found in concessive contexts (cf. Wiemer 2006: 47). A characteristic property of concessive *niby* is the reluctance which accompanies the speaker's agreement with a claim, and his/her sceptical attitude towards it (cf. Wiemer 2006: 48; Bogusławski and Wawrzyńczyk 1993: 220), as illustrated in (105).

(105) Jakiż to las? Gdzie wrzosowiska pszczołami dzwoniące, ciemniejsze od leśnych fiołków? Mech **niby** jest, ale nie szarobiały on, nie torfowy. Wszystko, wszystko **na niby**! (NKJP, fiction, H. Auderska, *Babie lato*, 1974)

'What kind of forest is this? Where are heathlands full of bees and violets? There is, **admittedly**, some moss here, but it isn't white-grey or peaty. All the things, all the things here are **make-believe**.'

In (105), the author expresses her dissatisfaction with the forest she is in for being different from the 'true forests' she used to know. The word *niby* is used twice in this quotation: first as a epistemic adverb expressing conceding concurrence (close to *admittedly*), and then in the phrase *na niby* 'make-believe'/'not for real', which shows the closeness of the two items (*niby* and *na niby*). Another example of *niby* used in a concessive context is given in (106).

(106) Przecież masz podsłuch na telefonie. – Skoro wszyscy o tym wiemy, to nie ma się czego obawiać, prawda? – No **niby** tak. (NKJP, fiction, J. Rębacz, *Zakopane: sezon na samobójców*, 2006)

'There is a wiretap on your phone. – Since we all know that, there is no reason to worry, is there? – Well, **on the face of it/ theoretically**, there isn't.'

In (106), the speaker agrees (reluctantly) with the interlocutor that the things look the way he presents them, but he remains unconvinced.

c. Reportive uses of *niby*

The reportive uses of *niby* are relatively infrequent, which is why not all researchers classify it as a reportive particle. It is classified as a reportive marker by Wiemer (2006), but Grochowski *et al.* (2014: 120) argue that it is primarily used to indicate doubt, while its reportive sense is purely contextual. Its uses as a reportive marker are attested in the *NKJP*, and they do not seem to be only contextual, but they are not frequent; among the first one hundred occurrences of *niby* in the corpus which I analyzed, only twelve referred to reported information. *Niby* is different from the other reportive adverbs used in Polish, as it does not seem to refer to rumour, but it tends to introduce a piece of information reported by a specific person. It performs a distancing function and functions as a downtoner, expressing scepticism towards the truth value of the reported claim. It signals that despite the apparent plausibility of the claim, the speaker remains unconvinced. Such use is illustrated in examples (107)-(109).

(107) Chciał się umówić, **niby** ma dla mnie rolę. Szuka ślicznej amatorki. (NKJP, fiction, M. Gretkowska, *Namiętnik*, 1998)

'He wants to see me; **allegedly** he wants to offer me a part in his movie. He's looking for a pretty amateur.'

(108) Nad ocean jechał **niby** dla poratowania zdrowia, ale miejsce wybrał także, mając w pamięci młodzieńczą lekturę powieści Waltera Scotta *Korsarz*. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Wiedza i Życie* 11/1999)

'He went to the ocean, **supposedly** for health reasons, but one of the reasons why he had chosen that place was his interest in Walter Scott's novel *The Pirate*, which he read when he was young.'

(109) Więc się pan dzierżawca dalej srożąc przysłał mi tu do chałupy żandarma z Kalisza...widzieliście go przecie!... Na egzekucję **niby**, powiada... Już tu siedzi szósty dzień... żywność mu dawać

trzeba i paszę dla konia… (NKJP, fiction, L. Kruczkowski, *Kordian i cham,* 1979)

'The landlord has sent an officer from Kalisz to my house. You've seen him! ***Allegedly*** for enforced collection, he says. He's already been here for six days. I have to feed him, and his horse too.'

In (107)-(109), *niby* signals that the speakers treat the reported information with suspicion. They do not discard it as entirely impossible, but they treat it with caution as they think there might be a hidden agenda behind the other speakers' words. They do not want to appear naïve and credulous – this explanation seems to be particularly true in the case of (107), where a young girl who is offered a part in a film signals her distrustful attitude towards the job proposal – or they want to suggest that they are experienced enough to know better, as in (108) and (109).

Like the other reportive adverbs in Polish, *niby* co-occurs with the reportive verb *mieć,* as shown in (110).

(110) Stopa łże jak pies. Ten Bolesławiec ***miał niby*** pójść do jego Starej Chałupy i tam zniknął. Grubymi nićmi szyte. Nawet zbujać porządnie nie potrafił. (NKJP, fiction, E. Niziurski, *Księga urwisów*, 1954)

'Stopa is lying through his teeth. Bolesławiec ***allegedly*** went to his old house and disappeared there. An obvious lie. He can't even make things up properly.'

d. *Niby* used as a preposition and a prefix

When *niby* functions as a preposition, it signals that there is a misleading similarity between two items, and means 'like, as', as illustrated in (111).

(111) W tej mgle zamajaczyło coś ***niby*** cień peleryny. Przez chwilę wstrzymał oddech. Ale nie, to była budka słomiana, szałas w ogrodzie owocowym. (NKJP, fiction, J. Iwaszkiewicz, *Brzezina i inne opowiadania*, 2006)

'He could see something in the fog, something ***like*** a shadow of a cape. He held his breath for a moment. But no, it was only a straw hut in the fruit garden.'

When used as a prefix, *niby* means 'pseudo/quasi/like', as in *nibynóżki* 'pseudopodia', *niby-drzewo* 'quasi-tree'/'tree-like' (cf. also Wiemer 2006: 47). It signals that things only appear to be true.

4.6. Reportive adverbs in English and Polish: summary and comparison

The most apparent difference between English and Polish reportive adverbs is to be found on the formal level. While the English ones, with the exception of *apparently*, are formed from past participles of illocutionary (*report, allege, avow*), and epistemic verbs (*suppose, repute*), among the Polish reportive adverbs only *rzekomo* derives from a verb (*rzec* 'to say', cf. *WSJP*). The other ones derive from adjectives (*podobno*), or compounds formed from function words (*jakoby, niby*). A characteristic feature of the Polish set of reportive adverbs is also that three of them – *podobno, podobnież,* and *ponoć* – have the same derivational base.

Both languages have reportive adverbs which typically function as markers of alignment-neutral attribution (Eng. *reportedly, reputedly, apparently*; Pol. *podobno, ponoć, podobnież*), and those which are usually used to express distance and indicate disbelief (Eng. *allegedly, supposedly, avowedly*; Pol. *rzekomo, jakoby, niby*). The difference is, however, a matter of degree, as those adverbs which are typically used to express neutral acknowledgement can also be used to signal doubt, and those which typically signal doubt, can be used in a more neutral way. In both languages the ability of reportive adverbs to express doubt allows them to perform countering functions, i.e. they can be used to signal that the claims they qualify cannot be sustained in view of what the speaker knows. Such use is particularly evident when they are used as subjuncts, i.e. modifiers of sentence elements.

As far as the correspondences between individual adverbs are concerned, *allegedly* and *rzekomo* seem to show the highest degree of functional equivalence, as they are both used to refer to criminal cases and wrongdoing, and perform a distancing function. However, *allegedly* seems to be more likely to express the lack of knowledge, while *rzekomo* usually indicates disbelief. *Podobno* can be used to express alignment-neutral attribution, like *reportedly*, but it cannot be used in academic papers to

refer to scientific findings or to official reports. *Podobno* and *rzekomo* are the most stylistically unmarked reportive adverbs in Polish, which is why they are attested as equivalents of all the English reportive adverbs in the translation corpus, with the exception of *avowedly*. *Podobno* seems to be the translators' default choice in contexts requiring alignment-neutral attribution, while *rzekomo* appears to be the default choice in contexts requiring the expression of distance and doubt. In addition to the reportive adverbs, Polish has the reportive verb *mieć*, which expresses alignment-neutral attribution and is often used as a translation equivalent of English reportive adverbs.

5. Inferential adverbs

5.1. Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to compare the inventories and functions of inferential adverbs in English and Polish. Inferential adverbs qualify opinions formed on the basis of evidence and reasoning. I assume, after Plungian (2001), that the analysis of evidence may involve "synchronous" or "retrospective" inference (cf. Chapter 2). Synchronous inference is based on the "signs" that the speaker can observe, while retrospective inference is based on some "traces" of earlier situations (Plungian 2001: 354). My use of the terms introduced by Plungian (2001) is an extension of his idea, adapted to suit the needs of the analysis of English and Polish inferential adverbs. Retrospective, or *a posteriori*, inference involves deduction and analysis of results, which is a more indirect way of reaching an opinion. The difference between the two types of inference, as understood in this study, is illustrated with the uses of *evidently* quoted in (1) and (2).

(1) He was **evidently** in pain.
(2) **Evidently**, the builders had finished and gone home early. (*LDOCE* online)

In (1) *evidently* signals synchronous inference because it refers to what the speaker could see in front of him/her. The speaker's conclusion is based on the interpretation of the appearance and behaviour of the man observed by the speaker. In (2) *evidently* expresses retrospective inference because the speaker's conclusion was formulated *ex post facto*. The fact that the builders were not present where the speaker expected them to be made him/her think that they had finished their work and gone home early. Synchronous inference is more content-related, while retrospective

inference is more speaker-centred. Using Verstraete's (2001: 1506) distinction between subjectivity as "speaker-related" and objectivity as "content-related function", synchronous inference can be considered as more objective, while retrospective evidence as more subjective. The placement of the retrospective inference marker in example (2) in the sentence initial position, which is generally associated with subjective meanings (cf. Traugott 2014), supports this interpretation.

The notion of inference is related to another semantic parameter associated with evidentiality: assumption. Boye's (2012: 20) category of "inferential justification" includes both "inferential evidence" and "assumptive evidentiality". Likewise, Aikhenvald (2006: 324) places assumption in the category of inferred evidentials. In her more recent studies (e.g. Aikhenvald 2018), however, she treats assumption and inference as distinct parameters. According to Aikhenvald (2018: 12), inference is based on results, while assumption involves logical reasoning and knowledge. The analysis of results also involves reasoning and some knowledge, which is why, as argued by Faller (2002: 7), evidential notions seem to form a continuum. Such an evidential continuum can also be observed in the meanings expressed by English and Polish adverbs.

As far as the interpersonal functions of inferential adverbs are concerned, they have been demonstrated to perform both dialogically expansive and dialogically contractive functions. As observed by Martin and White (2005: 133), a conclusion which results from the process of deduction can be considered as "defeatable should new, counter evidence become available". In this sense adverbs expressing inference can be considered as dialogically expansive. However, in some of their uses, inferential adverbs emphasize the speaker's position and are used to limit the dialogic space for alternative views. They have also been shown to be multifunctional (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007; Fryer 2013; Rozumko 2018). The specific functions of the individual adverbs in the group will be outlined later in this chapter.

As delineated in this study, the group of inferential adverbs in English comprises the following items: *clearly, obviously, evidently, apparently, manifestly, seemingly, plainly,* and *patently* (cf. e.g. Greenbaum 1969; Nuyts 2001a; Wierzbicka 2006; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007).

In Polish, the category comprises: *wyraźnie, najwyraźniej, widocznie, najwidoczniej, najoczywiściej, ewidentnie,* and *jawnie* (cf. Bralczyk 1978; Rytel 1982; Tutak 2003; Danielewiczowa 2012; Rozumko 2012a, 2016c; Grochowski *et al.* 2014). The English and Polish inferential adverbs are listed in Table 6, together with their frequencies in the BNC, and the National Corpus of Polish (NKJP), respectively. The adverbs are enumerated according to their frequencies in the respective corpora: from the most frequent to the least frequent.

Table 6. The frequencies of English and Polish inferential adverbs in the monolingual corpora

English adverbs	Freq in the BNC (per 100 m words)	Polish adverbs	Freq in the NKJP (per 100 m words)
clearly	14,992	*wyraźnie*	11,003
obviously	10,651	*widocznie*	2,525
apparently	7,575	*najwyraźniej*	2,347
evidently	1,424	*jawnie*	570
seemingly	1,188	*najwidoczniej*	510
plainly	709	*ewidentnie*	429
patently	212	*najoczywiściej*	14
manifestly	199		

Most of the adverbs listed in Table 4 have both inferential and manner meanings. In the case of large corpora, such as the BNC and the NKJP, separating their inferential and non-inferential meanings is difficult as it requires extensive manual analysis of all their occurrences. Therefore, in the present work their inferential and non-inferential uses have not been separated in the count. This problem concerns both the English and the Polish items.

The analysis presented in this chapter begins with the most frequent adverb in the group, i.e. *clearly*. The discussion of the English inferential adverbs is followed by a section examining their Polish equivalents identified in the translation corpus. The chapter ends with a note on Polish inferential adverbs, and a cross-linguistic comparison.

5.2. Inferential adverbs in English

5.2.1. *Clearly*

Clearly is used both as an adverb of manner and an evidential adverb. When used as an adverb of manner it means "in a clear manner, esp. in a way that is easy to hear, read or understand" (*LDOCE*). When used as an evidential adverb it means "what is conspicuous" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 226). *CED* paraphrases its evidential sense as "it is obvious that"; *CALD* notes that it is "used to show that you think something is obvious or certain". These definitions suggest that *clearly* expresses both evidential meanings and the epistemic sense of certainty. *Clearly* is a high frequency adverb, commonly used both in speech and in writing (see Table 26). It occurs in sentence initial, medial and final positions, which indicates that it can function both as a sentence adverb and a modifier of individual sentence elements. Its evidential and non-evidential meanings are not very distant; they are all related to the notion of clarity.

a. Manner uses of *clearly*

When used as an adverb of manner, *clearly* modifies verbs of perception, such as *see, hear*, and verbs denoting activities involving different forms of verbal expression, such as *speak, write, explain*, and *phrase*, as exemplified in (3)-(4) (cf. also Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 163 for a list of other verbs modified by *clearly*).

(3) There's something wrong with it, and I just can't <u>see</u> it ***clearly***. (BNC, A0L 1024)

(4) He <u>spoke</u> ***clearly***, he explained his ideas carefully, and he listened to what she said. (BNC, GW5 820)

When used as an adverb of manner *clearly* can be graded (*more/most clearly*); it also occurs with a number of degree modifiers, such as *quite, very, so, too, really,* and *extremely*, as exemplified in sentences (5) and (6). Some of the degree modifiers (*quite, very, so, too*) are also attested with its inferential uses.

(5) The Third Law of Aerodynamics states <u>quite</u> ***clearly*** that whatever you do you are knackered. (BNC, A0X 1101)

(6) She's spoken out <u>very</u> ***clearly*** and said that those rumours are baseless. (BNC, A53 19)

b. Inferential uses of *clearly*

The BNC data indicate that *clearly* shows a continuum of manner and inferential meanings (cf. also Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 256). A role which seems to be intermediate between the function of an adverb of manner and an inferential adverb is that of an emphasizer. The use of *clearly* as an emphasizer has been noted by Quirk *et al.* (1985: 583), who associate the emphasizing function with adverbials functioning as subjuncts. Such use seems to constitute a step towards the development of inferential meanings by *clearly* (and other inferential adverbs), and an indication of their movement along a cline towards more subjective meanings. The uses of *clearly* as an emphasizer are particularly clear when it precedes pre-modifying adjectives in noun phrases. In such cases it signals that the qualities denoted by the adjectives are clearly perceptible, as illustrated in examples (7)-(9).

(7) For the visitor, it is scarcely credible that staff can work day after day with such ***clearly*** difficult patients. (BNC, ABU 703)

(8) With a detached air, he wears down his opponents with pure skill and occasional showboating, the flashy moves that a ***clearly*** superior boxer can get away with. (BNC, ACP 2218)

(9) The meal was accompanied by the tinklings of a white jacketed and ***clearly*** talented pianist who was equally clearly bored. (BNC, AE8 821)

Clearly is also used as a modifier of evidential adjectives, such as *evident* and *apparent*. In such cases, its emphasizing function is particularly clear, as the adjectives themselves express evidential meanings, and *clearly* is semantically redundant. Its role is to emphasize the clarity of the evidence available to the speaker. Such use is illustrated in (10) and (11).

(10) It is still ***clearly*** <u>evident</u> that the individual young person is the source of the 'problem'. (BNC, FPJ 948)

(11) The way the police sustain this ideology of action to maintain their hegemony becomes ***clearly*** <u>apparent</u> to the researcher, and he in turn stands revealed. (BNC, A0K 695)

In contrast to intensifiers such as *highly* and *greatly*, which indicate a high degree (cf. Quirk *et al.* 1985: 589-590), *clearly* indicates good perceptibility and clarity of the properties referred to. The effect of using intensifiers and emphasizers is similar as both types of markers add force to claims. Evidential emphasizers like *clearly* signal that there is an evidential base for a claim. Emphasizing uses of *clearly* can be interpreted as a strategy for what White (2003), and Martin and White (2005) term dialogical contraction, i.e. contracting the space for alternative views. One of the functionalities subsumed under the notion of dialogical contraction is "pronouncement", i.e. "intensifications, authorial emphases or explicit authorial interventions or interpolations" (White 2003: 269). The association of *clearly* with "pronouncement" has also been noted by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 307), who argue that it adds authority to the claims it modifies.

In its uses as an emphasizer *clearly* signals synchronous inference, i.e. a conclusion based on the "signs" that the speaker can observe (cf. Plungian 2001). Such reference is particularly evident in the cases where *clearly* qualifies opinions based on the observation of someone's behaviour, such as in (12)-(14).

(12) The boy was going to the boxroom and was ***clearly*** excited at possessing a room of his own for the first time. (BNC, A6N 1294)

(13) Five minutes later and, having shrugged on Armani's uncluttered lines and the sensuous Nicole Farhi knitwear, Yuri was ***clearly*** thrilled with the result. (BNC, A7N 596)

(14) A recent photograph of Kingsley Amis shows him with a cat, which is standing beside his typewriter. The author's face wears a witch's smile of appreciation. He is ***clearly*** familiar with and fond of that cat. (BNC, A05 959-961)

In examples (12)-(14) the speakers interpret the other people's behaviour and appearance, and make conclusions regarding their internal states. The association of the emphasizing uses of *clearly* with observation is also noticeable in (15), where reference is made explicitly to the "observer" who expressed the quoted opinion.

(15) 'Hassan is not serious,' said Malainine Sadik, a member of the political bureau of Polisario, in London this week. 'If he was he would sit down at the negotiating table with us.' This view was reflected by one observer in Rabat, who said: 'He [King Hassan] has so ***clearly*** been playing for time'. (BNC, A57 244-246)

Subjuncts functioning as emphasizers allow a more content-oriented (and thus more objective) interpretation than disjuncts. They attribute the properties identified by the speaker on the basis of some "signs" to the objects they describe. The degree of objectivity (content-orientation) that they signal depends on their position in the clause, and on the position of the constituent they qualify in the structure of the clause. The focus on the content seems to be the strongest when the qualified element is low in the sentence structure, i.e. when *clearly* qualifies a constituent of a sentence element, such as an adjectival pre-modifier in a noun phrase, as in examples (12)-(15). In such positions the adverb is quite closely integrated with the clause (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 86). It is a position characteristic of degree markers. As noted by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 86), "[t]he more to the left, away from the core of the clause, the more marked the position". When *clearly* qualifies units which are higher in the hierarchy of a sentence, i.e. sentence elements (not their constituents), e.g. subject complements ("excited", "thrilled", "preoccupied"), the reading is more speaker- than content-centred. The most subjective uses are those when *clearly* functions as a disjunct, i.e. when it modifies sentences. A good illustration of the different degrees of subjectivity conveyed by *clearly* is example (16), which contains two instances of the adverb used in the same sentence: sentence initial *clearly*, modifying the entire sentence, and sentence medial *clearly*, modifying one if its elements.

(16) An inadequate price for a product leads to bankruptcy. In other cases, however, inadequacy merely means that we have not got as much as we would have liked. An inadequate meal leaves us feeling hungry. Should we remember the hunger or the enjoyment of the meal whilst it lasted? An inadequate return on capital might mean that we are getting less than we would if the money was at work in the money market but whereas the development of the

business is within our control interest rates are not. ***Clearly*** there is a spectrum ranging from "inadequate" that is ***clearly*** wrong to "inadequate" that is only just short of our greedy expectations. There is a trade-off between cost and perfection. (BNC, H0E 1145-1152)

In (16) the sentence initial *clearly* communicates an opinion based on the analysis of the situation from a distance. The conclusion it qualifies involves reasoning and connecting facts. The emphasis is on the process of reasoning, and, in consequence, on the speaker. The sentence medial *clearly* only refers to a single sentence element, and communicates that there is easily perceptible, unambiguous evidence that the factor it qualifies is "wrong". The focus shifts towards the content even though "wrong" is a quality which requires judgement from the speaker. The type of inference expressed by the sentence initial *clearly* may be termed retrospective, using Plungian's (2001) term, though the distance it involves is not temporal but mental. It involves looking at the situation from a broader perspective, like retrospection. The medial *clearly*, in contrast, expresses a judgement which involves a close observation of the item in question. In this sense, the inference it qualifies may be termed synchronous. The two uses of *clearly* in (16) indicate that the process of (inter)subjectification involves a change in the type of inference expressed by the adverb: from synchronous to retrospective. More examples of retrospective inference expressed by *clearly* are given in (17) and (18).

(17) You might anticipate that dust from space accounts for the mare infills, but this is not the case. By the time the mare impacts occurred there would probably have been too little dust available to fill the maria. Moreover, infall alone would not level the mare floors. It is therefore proposed that the mare infills are the result of dust migrating into the mare basins from elsewhere on the Moon. Such migration need not disturb the uniformity of the dust type across the lunar surface. ***Clearly***, the dust must have been far less mobile on the lunar farside. (BNC, GW6 991-996)

(18) John Welsby was appointed as the first Director, Provincial, and he set about evaluating the sources of the sector's costs. Quite ***clearly***, as costs were four times direct revenue, 10 per cent (for

example) saving in costs had much more effect on the balance than did a potential 20 per cent increase in revenue, so energy was at first concentrated on the cost base. (BNC, A11 969-970)

In (17) and (18) *clearly* qualifies opinions which involve analysing the situations from a distance, taking into consideration a number of factors, and evaluating their importance. In its uses as a marker of retrospective inference *clearly* can be considered dialogically expansive. To repeat Martin and White's (2005: 133) explanation quoted at the beginning of this chapter, claims based on deduction can be treated as defeatable because new evidence may appear and prove them wrong. Retrospective inference is not only expressed by sentence initial *clearly*. It is also possible when *clearly* occurs before the main verb, as in (19).

(19) In fact a series of public opinion polls, conducted between February 1938 and January 1939 revealed that between 57 and 78 per cent of those who expressed an opinion favoured sympathy for the Republican government, and even a willingness to take action against Franco's fascists. Only between 7 and 9 per cent expressed sympathy for Franco. The Labour Party quite ***clearly*** underestimated the extent to which the British public was horrified by the rise of fascism in Spain. (BNC, ACH 1447-1449)

The closer *clearly* is to the sentence initial position, the more likely it is to introduce retrospective inference and to be interpreted as subjective. The use of adverbs in the sentence initial position is generally associated with the process of (inter)subjectification and the development of new discourse functions (e.g. Auer 1996; Traugott and Dasher 2002). The evidence on which the speaker's inference is based is often signalled in the context, as in (19). By using *clearly*, speakers guide the addressee through the evidence they have at their disposal, and justify their judgements (cf. Rozumko 2017, 2018). It is an interpersonal function which can be associated with White's (2003) notion of "justification" (cf. also Fryer 2013), in which "the textual voice" is "engaged in persuasion" and the addressee is assumed to take "the role of 'persuadee'" (White 2003: 274). In White's account, the mode of justification is realized by such conjunctions as *therefore, thus, accordingly, because, for this reason,* and *this is why* (White 2003:

274). By using *clearly*, the speaker seems to communicate: 'this is why I think that'.

Inferences expressed by *clearly* may also be used to challenge the addressee, and reproach them, as in (20) and (21).

(20) She felt herself blushing scarlet. 'I see how much of a fool you've made of me!' Miguel finished tuning the guitar and turned to look at her, obviously perturbed at the sudden anger in her voice. 'I thought — "I know what you thought. You *clearly* don't know anything about women's pride. Don't you see — ?' (BNC, JYA 4081-4085)

(21) 'The fact is, Mr Stevens, your father is entrusted with far more than a man of his age can cope with.'
'Miss Kenton, you *clearly* have little idea of what you are suggesting.'
'Whatever your father was once, Mr Stevens, his powers are now greatly diminished.' (BNC, AR3 704-706)

Such reproachful uses are characteristic of the co-occurrences of *clearly* with the second person pronoun (cf. also Rozumko, forthcoming). The use of the inferential adverb suggests that the speaker has evidence for his/her critical remarks, which adds authority to them. In both (20) and (21) *clearly* is used to emphasize the speaker's superiority and a condescending attitude towards the addressee. Such reproachful statements may be used to close a discussion; they demonstrate that *clearly* can function as a dialogically contractive device, i.e. one which acts to "fend off" alternative views (cf. White 2003: 262).

In its inferential uses *clearly* co-occurs with degree modifiers, such as *quite*, as illustrated in (19) above; *all too,* as in (22) and *very*, e.g. (23). As already noted, such modifiers are also attested in its uses as an adverb of manner.

(22) In its attempt to unite the worlds of city and savage, *Sweeney Agonistes* had been all too *clearly* founded on the fertility rite as presented by Comford's investigation. (BNC, A6B 1339)

(23) Sir Adrian cites the example of the army commander who leads his troops over the top of the trenches when it might have been

more prudent to stay put. Reckless heroism, very *clearly*, is not the sort of quality he admires. (BNC, AHL 71-72)

Inferential *clearly* also co-occurs with inferential *must*. In such uses it strengthens the inference signalled by the verb, thus adding authority to statements, as in (24).

(24) Another similar adjective is platonic which equally *clearly* must have been used associatively, to mean having a link with Plato (as indeed it still does in one of its senses) before it came to have an ascriptive value roughly equivalent to chaste. (BNC, HPY 272)

c. *Clearly* as a marker of concurrence

Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) observe that English adverbs expressing inference tend to develop the sense of expectations, and refer to shared knowledge. They argue: "the meanings of inference on the basis of evidence and 'as we know', 'as to be expected' are related" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 256). Such developments indicate a movement towards more (inter)subjective meanings, and a departure from the analysis of perceptible evidence (cf. also Rozumko, forthcoming). In their reference to expectations inferential adverbs signal attention to the addressee's stance, which allows them to function as concurrence markers. Concurrence is a type of dialogical contraction, distinguished by White (2003), and Martin and White (2005) to refer to the use of expressions which indicate that the speaker has "the same belief or attitude or 'knowledge'" as the addressee (White 2003: 269). The uses of *clearly* as a concurrence marker are exemplified in (25)-(27).

(25) However, yesterday's ruling means that only about 10 of those boats will be able to resume operations immediately. The court was considering only a limited application by the European Commission for the suspension of parts of the act considered to be most at odds with EC non-discrimination laws…. British officials sought to play down the significance of yesterday's move. '*Clearly* we regret the court's ruling,' one said. 'But the number of ships affected will be small and we underline the need for the Commission to find a long-term solution.' (BNC, A4H 254-160)

(26) We have had expressions of support from customers and suppliers and, with the workforce also behind us, I am confident that we can sell the businesses. **Clearly** we all hope that this will indeed be the case and we will publish details of any developments as and when they are announced. (BNC, ED6 3725-3726)

(27) Last night David Anderson, of Darlington Health Authority, offered the authority's sympathy to the grieving family. He said: '**Clearly** we are very upset to hear of the death of a patient. There will be no investigation of the gentleman's treatment unless the authority receives a formal complaint.' (BNC, K54 5507-5509)

In (25)-(27) *clearly* can be paraphrased as 'as can be expected in this situation' or substituted with *of course* and *obviously*. The three examples illustrate the use of *clearly* in similar situations: professionals and people in positions of power comment on some events connected with the areas of their professional activities. In (25) and (27), the situations are rather unpleasant; in (26), the situation involves radical changes. The speakers say what they think is expected from them in such situations and try to establish common ground with the addressees to minimise the impression that the events will have negative consequences. Examples such as (25)-(27) confirm the association of *clearly* with authority, noted by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007). When *clearly* functions as a marker of concurrence it is sometimes used together with *obviously*, which often occurs in such contexts (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007), e.g. in (28). The use of the two adverbs in the same context indicates a functional similarity between them.

(28) Leyland DAF's British receivers said they were disappointed with the deal concluded by the Dutch administrators. '**Clearly** we are disappointed,' said a spokesman, James Worsley. '**Obviously** the inclusion of British assets in the new Dutch Trucks NV would have been a fast-track solution.' (BNC, K5D 8018-8020)

In sum, *clearly* has a variety of uses ranging from an adverb of manner, inferential adverb to a marker of shared expectations. It expresses two types of inference: synchronous (based on close observation of people and things), and retrospective (a conclusion made from a distance, involving

deduction). In its uses as a marker of synchronous inference, it is more likely to perform the dialogically contractive function of pronouncement, emphasizing the speaker's position, and limiting the scope for other alternatives (cf. Martin and White 2005). In its uses as a marker of retrospective inference, it is more likely to perform the dialogically expansive function "entertain", and to signal that the speaker's position is valid until counter evidence becomes available. The inferences expressed by *clearly* may also have countering functions. In its more intersubjective uses, it appeals to shared knowledge and shared expectations, and functions as a marker of concurrence. The meanings expressed by *clearly* show different degrees of (inter)subjectivity, and can be arranged on a cline from non-subjective to subjective and (inter)subjective: manner – synchronous inference – retrospective inference – expectations/shared knowledge.

5.2.2. *Obviously*

According to *COBUILD*, *obviously* is used "to indicate that something is easily noticed, seen, or recognized"; it is also used "when you are stating something that you expect the person who is listening to know already". Based on this description, *obviously* can be said to express two notions: evidence and expectations. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) additionally note its uses as an adverb of manner. As shown later in this section, it can also be used to express textual meanings. As in the case of *clearly*, its different meanings form a continuum. *Obviously* is a high frequency adverb, well evidenced in the BNC; it is attested in different sentence positions. In comparison to *clearly* it is more frequent in spoken language (see Table 26).

a. Manner uses of *obviously*

As an adverb of manner, *obviously* refers to the perceptibility of the notions it qualifies. Its meaning in such contexts can be paraphrased as 'in a perceptible way'. When used as an adverb of manner *obviously* occurs with degree modifiers, such as *too* and *more*, as exemplified in (29)-(31); it can also occur within the scope of negation, as in (29).

(29) Her face was made up, though <u>not too</u> **obviously** so, and she wore lipstick. (BNC, ASN 2588)

(30)   After the sale, the dealer Bruno Meissener said: 'The estimate was too high, and collectors want Rembrandts to be later, larger and <u>more</u> ***obviously*** Rembrandt.' (BNC, AKS 25)

(31)   Such a split in self-perception is, I think, more likely to occur in girls than in boys at the time of puberty because the physiological changes which a boy undergoes are likely to be treated as marks of manhood, whereas what happens to a girl is more likely not to be mentioned, although in many ways the signs of her having reached puberty are <u>more</u> ***obviously*** visible. (BNC, CEE 429)

Obviously is often used with verbs indicating connections, such as *relate, connect, link, associate*, as in (32) and (33). It signals that the connections are easily perceptible, or, if negated, that they are not easy to see.

(32)   The disease produced is not necessarily ***obviously*** <u>related</u> to any discernible precipitating cause, which makes the classification of diseases according to the symptoms and with a known list of causes somewhat meaningless and arbitrary. (BNC, C9V 295)

(33)   At about the same time, in Saudi Arabia's Eastern province, there was unrest among the Shiite minority, though not ***obviously*** <u>connected</u> with the Mecca incident. (BNC, HRE 557)

Obviously is rarely unambiguously used as an adverb of manner. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 148-149) argue that the evidential and manner uses of the adverb can be distinguished with the help of the degree modifiers it co-occurs with. The modifiers *so, more* and *too*, they argue, indicate that it is used as an adverb of manner, while *quite* and *most* signal its uses as an evidential marker. However, the BNC data show that even when *obviously* is used with *so, more* and *too*, it often expresses inference. When it refers to material things, such as make-up, as in (29), it is likely to be interpreted as an adverb of manner, but when it refers to more abstract notions, even when preceded by *so*, it seems to signal inference based on observation. *Obviously* communicates, to quote Plungian's (2001: 354) definition of synchronous inference: "P, because I can observe some signs of P". Examples (34) and (35) are cases in point.

(34)   Although he **so *obviously*** loved her, waited on her hand and foot, thought almost entirely of and for her, there was a tiny part of him which eluded her. (BNC, AC7 1014)

(35)   After all, a dog or a cat will come for the rub and tickle it **so *obviously*** enjoys. (BNC, BMY 1063)

In (34) and (35) the speakers express opinions based on their observation of the man and the dog, respectively. *Obviously* communicates that by observing "some signs" the speaker quoted in (34) was certain that the man loved the woman, and the speaker quoted in (35) was convinced that the dog enjoyed the rub and tickle. On the other hand, the degree modifiers which Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) associate with the evidential senses of *obviously*, i.e. *quite* and *most*, are found in contexts where *obviously* can be interpreted as referring to manner, as in (36) and (37).

(36)   I had the attributes of a boy, in that I was flat-chested, hipless and had a small bottom. Notwithstanding, I was <u>quite</u> ***obviously*** female. (BNC, FAT 1347-1348)

(37)   *Echinacea purpurea*, also native to the American prairies, was at one time included with the rudbeckias as *R. purpurea*, differing <u>most</u> ***obviously*** in having purplish-red ray-florets. (BNC, A0G 1642)

The manner meanings of *obviously* seem to be activated when the speaker refers to qualities or states which are accessible to sensory (particularly visual) perception. In such contexts it communicates that the quality it refers to can be seen. When *obviously* refers to more abstract qualities and situations which require the speaker to interpret them, its inferential sense is more likely to be expressed. Generally speaking, the manner meanings of *obviously* are less straightforward than the manner meanings of *clearly* found in such phrases as *to speak clearly* and *to think clearly*. In the case of *obviously* the dividing line between the manner and evidential senses is often difficult to draw, and intermediate uses are more likely to be found.

b. Inferential uses of *obviously*

Obviously can be used to indicate both synchronous and retrospective inference. As in the case of *clearly*, reference to synchronous inference is characteristic of its uses as a subjunct, when it modifies sentence elements and their constituents, and introduces opinions based on observation, as in examples (38) and (39).

(38) 'There's been nothing like it since the Bible,' said an *obviously* excited spokesperson for the book's publishers, Transworld. (BNC, A93 144)

(39) The beached whales are quite *obviously* very distressed, constantly calling out. (BNC, B73 693)

In (38) and (39), the speakers express opinions based on the interpretation of what they can see, i.e. they indicate that the evidence for their claims is easily perceptible. In such cases *obviously* seems to be both content- and speaker-oriented, i.e. it shows a medium degree of subjectivity. By indicating the clarity of the evidence, it focuses on the context; by indicating the interpretation of the evidence, it focuses on the speaker. In its uses as a subjunct, *obviously* is an emphasizer functioning as a marker of pronouncement. It emphasizes the speaker's perspective, and limits the scope for other interpretations.

Obviously is also used to qualify opinions based on retrospective inference, which require looking at situations from some distance, connecting facts, and making conclusions. Expressing retrospective inference is characteristic of its use as a sentence adverb, occurring sentence initially or sentence finally, as these positions indicate some degree of detachment from the content of the proposition. Such uses are illustrated in examples (40) and (41).

(40) I stopped playing just as the church door burst open and a very irate Officer came charging along the pews in my direction, his eyes bulging out of their sockets. *Obviously* he was not very pleased about something. 'Something wrong, Sir?' I asked. (BNC, A61 202-205)

(41) I thought it was really very funny, this long straggly black hair, he looked absolutely miserable, he thought he was now spiritually calm and spiritually sane and he's got this peculiar thing on his head that makes him look so daft. Nobody's told him *obviously*. (BNC, HVE 13-14)

In both (40) and (41) *obviously* is speaker-oriented; it expresses conclusions reached as a result of reasoning and connecting pieces of evidence. In (40) and (41) *obviously* does not relate to the perceptibility of the evidence (the way it does when it expresses synchronous inference), but it qualifies the speaker's opinion based on it. As in the case of *clearly*, when *obviously* signals retrospective inference it is more dialogically expansive than it is in the cases when it signals synchronous inference. The speaker's deductive judgement leaves space for alternative interpretations which will become possible when new evidence appears and makes the speaker's view unsustainable. Retrospective inferences expressed by *obviously*, can, however, also be dialogically contractive. In (42) and (43), they are used to challenge the addressees, and emphasize, or "pronounce", to use Martin and White's (2005) term, the speakers' perspective.

(42) Even if it's just a fantasy … 'Is it? You *obviously* haven't listened. I think it's possible. The times are quite ropy. Things are touch-and-go. You don't believe me? There's a lot of organized suffering in England right now.' (BNC, AB3 135-141)

(43) Rosheen seemed to be revived by his words. Her face hardened. 'Those things happen every day. They would have happened had we withdrawn that credit or not. You *obviously* don't understand economics, Doctor.' (BNC, FR0 2720-2724)

In (42) and (43) *obviously* is used to strengthen the criticisms expressed by the speakers by suggesting that they have an evidential basis. It has a face-threatening function. As noted by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007), *obviously* may sound "patronizing" (2007: 156), "abrasive" (2007: 166), and "dismissive" (2007: 224), in particular when used with the second person pronoun.

c. *Obviously* as a concurrence marker

In addition to marking synchronous and retrospective inference, *obviously* is used to express accordance with expectations. Its ability to signal

expectations allows it to serve as a concurrence marker. By using it the speaker/writer construes the receiver "as having the same belief or attitude or 'knowledge'" (White 2003: 269). Its uses as a concurrence marker have been noted by White (2003), and Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007). Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 155) observe that by appealing to shared attitudes *obviously* has developed the function of solidarity marking. The instances when it refers to expectations and expresses concurrence are most clearly intersubjective, as they explicitly signal the acknowledgement of the receiver. When used to refer to expectations, *obviously* expresses two additional meanings: assumption and self-evidence (cf. Rozumko, forthcoming). Assumption is an evidential notion (cf. Aikhenvald 2018), but, as I suggested elsewhere (Rozumko, forthcoming), self-evidence does not seem to be an evidential meaning as, contrary to 'proper' evidential notions, it does not signal that the speaker is "'becoming aware' of the facts" (cf. Lazard 2001: 362).

The use of *obviously* to express assumption is illustrated in (44). In this specific example, it occurs in a question asking for confirmation.

(44) -That <-|-> stopped ***obviously*** during the war?
       -That stopped, oh yes <-|-> and the last, the last erm scrap iron we loaded was er I think the, the Japanese they bought the ships, these old tr-- old tramps, they bought them. (BNC, H5H 302-303)

Assumption is not based on the analysis of perceptible evidence; it signals a conclusion based on the speaker's empirical knowledge and his/her expectations resulting from it. The notion of self-evidence, in contrast, does not involve connecting facts to form a conclusion. It is used to signal that there is no need to analyze the situation because it is clear both to the speaker and the addressee. When *obviously* expresses self-evidence, it signals that a certain course of events can be expected in a given situation, as in (45)-(47).

(45) After more flying the beginner will learn to recognise and accept that he need not worry about the effects of these bumps. It is ***obviously*** helpful to make the first flights in smooth weather, with a clear horizon. (BNC, A0H 1375-1376)

(46) Many of our existing volunteers have families and jobs and are often very busy. You don't have to make a firm commitment but ***obviously*** we like you to give us some idea of your availability. This is so we can respond effectively to the needs of our clients. (BNC, A00 90-92)

(47) There was some muttering among officials after the game that only nine players had turned up for training on Tuesday, but despite the defeat coach Bruce Liddle remained cheerfully optimistic. 'We saw nothing today to convince us that we can't get out of North One at the first attempt,' he said. 'We are determined to stop the slide. ***Obviously*** we are hoping David Johnson will join us, and we are confident Kevin Westgarth will stay.' (BNC, K4T 4302-4305

The example quoted in (45) shows that *obviously* can be used to indicate the speaker's awareness that what s/he is saying is common knowledge. Its employment may be treated as an excuse for expressing truisms. *Obviously* is close in such cases to the expression *needless to say* (cf. also Rozumko, forthcoming).

In talk-in-interaction, *obviously* can also be employed to signal that the speaker is aware of what is expected from him/her, and that s/he wants to meet those expectations. Such use is illustrated in (48).

(48) - In … it – Oh she enjoys good health.
      - No, no problems at all?
      - No.
      - Fine.
      - ***Obviously*** during the pregnancy she was visiting the doctor so she would get a <-|-> good check up. (BNC, JJP 996-999)

The example quoted in (48) comes from a conversation between an insurance agent and his potential client, who knows that the information about his partner's regular visits to a doctor during pregnancy is expected from him. *Obviously* can be said to perform a face-protecting function in this context. By using it, the speaker tries to present himself and his partner in a favourable light.

d. Textual functions of *obviously*

In addition to its interpersonal functions, *obviously* appears to have also developed textual ones. Such developments support Narrog's (2014) observation that, in the case of some modal markers, the stage of intersubjective meanings is followed by the stage of textual developments. *Obviously* occurs in texts which list arguments according to their importance (cf. also Rozumko, forthcoming). The most important point in a list can be introduced with the expressions *most obviously* and *first and most obviously*, as exemplified in (49)-(51).

(49) For the Labour Party, the inter-war years proved to be successful ones. It was during this period that it became the second major party in British politics, and Britain's leading progressive party. There were clearly many factors for this success. ***Most obviously***, its rising trade-union support ensured that it was to become the party of the working class, a process which was speeded up by the split within the Liberal Party during the First World War (BNC, ACH 851-854)

(50) I said that was a risk most East European writers were going to have to run: Several have already become important figures in the political establishment, Dinescu in Romania and, ***most obviously***, Havel. (BNC, AE8 1903)

(51) Broadly speaking, such considerations refer to two kinds of moral value. First, and ***most obviously***, they depend on the value of some human relationships. (BNC, ANH 872-873)

In (49)-(51), *most obviously* serves as a connective device with similar functions as "enumerative conjuncts", to use a term employed by Quirk *et al.* (1985: 634). It indicates the most important, the most expected and the most evident argument in a list, and is equivalent in such uses to the expression *first of all*. Evidence from the English-Polish parallel corpus discussed in section 5.4.2. shows that its translation equivalents in such contexts are non-modal expressions performing textual functions.

5.2.3. *Evidently*

According to monolingual dictionaries, *evidently* means "in a way that is easy to see" (*CALD*), and can be used "to say that something is obviously

true for example because you have seen evidence of it yourself" or "to show that you think something is true or have been told something is true, but that you are not sure, because you do not have enough information or proof" (*COBUILD*). The quoted definitions suggest that *evidently* can be used to express different types of evidential meaning, not only inference. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer's findings confirm this observation; they argue that *evidently* can express inferential meanings, hearsay or imply that "there is some kind of evidence" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 162).

Evidently is less frequent than *clearly* and *obviously*; most of its occurrences in the BNC are in written texts (see Table 26). It is attested in sentence initial, medial and final positions, which indicates that it can be used to modify both sentence elements and entire clauses. As in the case of the other inferential adverbs, *evidently* shows a continuum of manner and evidential meanings.

a. Manner uses of *evidently*

Evidently is rarely used as an adverb of manner, and few of its uses unambiguously indicate manner meanings. Unlike *clearly*, it does not modify verbs; its manner (or manner-like) sense can be identified in its uses with adjectives. The uses of *evidently* as a manner adverb are more similar to those of *obviously*, i.e. it communicates that a property is easily perceptible. Like *obviously*, it often co-occurs with the degree modifiers *so, more, less,* and *too* in such cases. The manner uses of *evidently* are exemplified in sentences (52)-(54).

(52) The eagle was <u>so</u> ***evidently***, so ferociously beautiful; one would have thought that it could have impressed itself upon the most unwilling beholder. (BNC, EFP 1146)

(53) Most African sculpture is not in this category, as characteristically the masks and ritual objects of Africa are <u>more</u> ***evidently*** human or animal in appearance. (BNC, A04 1535)

(54) He truly possessed the charismatic authority to which they, in their <u>too</u> ***evidently*** institutional collectivity, could do little more than aspire. (BNC, C90 925)

Even in those instances which are quoted here as examples of its manner uses *evidently* is close to its occurrences as an emphasizer (cf. point b). The difference, as understood in this work, is that in its manner uses, *evidently* stresses the conspicuousness of the evidence, not its interpretation, while inference always involves interpretation of evidence. In the examples quoted in (52)-(54), *evidently* is substitutable with *conspicuously*. The clearest cases of its manner meaning are those which refer to visual perception, such as the beauty of the eagle in example (52), and the description of the sculpture in (53). However, indicating the conspicuousness of the evidence is often accompanied by some degree of interpretation, particularly in the case of non-sensory data, such as in (54), which is why manner uses of *evidently* can perhaps be more accurately described as intermediate between the manner proper and the inferential ones.

b. Inferential uses of *evidently*

Like *clearly* and *obviously, evidently* can be used to indicate synchronous and retrospective inference. References to synchronous inference are connected with its use as a subjunct. In such cases, it functions as an emphasizer, and is more content-oriented than in those cases when it modifies clauses and expresses retrospective inference. The clearest uses of *evidently* (or any other inferential adverb) as an emphasizing subjunct are those when it modifies adjectives, as in (55)-(57).

(55) An **evidently** shaken Mr Kaifu returned from Palm Springs convinced that trade relations were not a problem but a crisis. (BNC, ABF 1040)

(56) By mid-afternoon many people were **evidently** hungry, and long queues formed at a field kitchen dispensing cabbage soup and rolls. (BNC, A2N 162)

(57) When you think that the judge has got your point, do not go on repeating it. If you have presented your case to the best of your ability, and the judge is **evidently** unconvinced, accept defeat and sit down. (BNC, FRA 1108-1109)

Like *clearly* and *obviously*, in its emphasizing uses *evidently* is dialogically contractive and functions as a marker of pronouncement. It adds

"evidential force" to the speaker's interpretation, thus indicating that the scope for alternative views is limited.

The expression of retrospective inference is characteristic of the uses of *evidently* in sentence initial and final positions, i.e. when it functions as a disjunct. In such cases, *evidently* qualifies conclusions based on deduction, analysis of results and indirect symptoms. It is more speaker-oriented than in its uses as an emphasizing subjunct, as it does not focus on the clarity of the evidence, but on the speaker's judgement of it. It is also more dialogically expansive than in its uses as an emphasizer; it signals that the speaker's deductive judgement is valid until new evidence proves otherwise. Examples of such use are quoted in (58)-(60).

(58) The committee discussed this suggestion at its routine meeting in November 1981. **Evidently** there was no urgency. (BNC, B73 1323-1324)

(59) He did not answer. His expression was glacial. It was perfectly clear that Alexander Vass considered her remark to be a gross impertinence. **Quite evidently** it was not his habit to discuss his business affairs with strangers. (BNC, H97 250-253)

(60) She took his details, cleaned his face up and put a few butterfly plasters over the cut. 'It'll heal cleanly, so you won't have a scar to ruin your beauty. It was a nice, sharp blade **evidently**.' 'Glass – bastard bottled me.' (BNC, JYB 4125-4128)

Retrospective inference requires looking at a situation from a distance, connecting pieces of evidence and drawing conclusions. Example (59) shows that when *evidently* signals retrospective inference, it can co-occur with the degree modifier *quite*. Like the other inferential adverbs, *evidently* can also indicate retrospective inference when it is used before the main verb, as illustrated in (61) and (62).

(61) Hundreds of Western tourists were again turned away at crossing points in the Berlin Wall yesterday as East Berlin remained sealed off to all but those with regular visas for the fourth day running. The authorities **evidently** feared that Westerners would reinforce protest demonstrators in the city. (BNC, A3U 331-332)

(62) Nowadays, you're never too young to start fretting about calo-
      ries. Last week a psychologist, Andrew Hill, revealed that of 213
      nine-year-old girls interviewed, a third yearned to be thinner;
      some claimed to be dieting. Boys of the same age couldn't wait to
      grow – to look like men. The girls **evidently** dreaded looking like
      women. (BNC, AL3 90-93)

c. Non-inferential uses of *evidently*

In most of its uses in the BNC *evidently* expresses inference. Occasion-
ally it refers to unspecified evidence and expectations based on general
knowledge. In (63) it can be interpreted as referring to hearsay or general
knowledge.

(63) Anyway his uncle had gone off for Christmas with his family, the
      house was empty. He got in through a half-closed larder window.
      Very small **evidently**. Then he bedded down. (BNC, GUD 3992-
      3995)

The use of *evidently* in (63) can be interpreted as signalling that the
information about the window came from the person who told the story
to the speaker or that the speaker thinks it was small because larder win-
dows are usually small. In (64), *evidently* can be understood as signalling
expectations and obviousness.

(64) In sum, the domain specific dictionaries are less reliable, lack
      sufficient coverage and are based on optimistic assumptions
      about domain identification. For this reason, the general collo-
      cation dictionary is suggested as the more appropriate. **Evident-
      ly**, there are a number of limitations to the collocation analysis
      technique. Firstly, it is based on lemmatised (root) forms rather
      than inflections. However, it is clear that some collocations only
      exist in particular inflected forms [Schuetze, forthcoming]. Con-
      sequently, it is intended to acquire inflected versions of the above
      collocation dictionaries and compare these with their lemma-
      tised equivalents (using the same text recognition data). (BNC,
      EES 1986-1991)

In (64) the speaker first uses *evidently* to communicate that there are
limitations to the collocation analysis technique, and then enumerates
them. *Evidently* may be understood as signalling that the limitations are
to be expected or that it is easily perceptible that they occur. Overall, sig-
nalling inference seems to be the primary function of *evidently.* In com-
parison with *obviously* it is less likely to signal shared knowledge and ex-
pectations, and to function as a marker of concurrence.

5.2.4. *Plainly*

Like the other adverbs in the group, *plainly* has both manner and infer-
ential meanings. It expresses two types of manner meaning: (1) "in an
honest and direct manner" (*Merriam-Webster*), and (2) "in a style that is
not elaborate or luxurious; simply" (*OD*), the latter being of little signifi-
cance in the context of its uses as an inferential adverb. As an inferential
adverb it is used "to indicate that something is easily seen, noticed, or
recognized" (*COBUILD*). *Plainly* is a low frequency adverb (see Table 6),
attested mostly in the written sources of the BNC (see Table 26). It occurs
in sentence initial, medial and final positions, which signals its ability to
qualify sentence elements, and to be used as a sentence adverb. However,
in all the instances in the corpus when it occurs in the final position it
functions as a manner adverb.

a. Manner uses of *plainly*

In its uses as an adverb of manner *plainly* is close to *clearly*. Both adverbs
modify verbs of perception, such as *see,* and illocutionary verbs, e.g. *say,
speak*. Unlike *clearly*, *plainly* does not seem to co-occur with mental state
verbs, such as *understand* or *think*. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer
(2007:171) argue that *plainly* and *clearly* primarily refer to visual percep-
tion; this meaning has in some of their uses been extended in the pro-
cess of (inter)subjectification to allow them to refer to mental perception.
When used as an adverb of manner *plainly* can be graded and modified by
degree markers, such as *very, too* (also *all too* and *only too*), *quite,* and *so*.
Such uses are illustrated in examples (65)-(67).

(65) She could see a decision path dividing in front of her as **plainly**
      as if it was real. (BNC, AD9 2780)

(66) To put it even <u>more</u> ***plainly*** (with apologies to John!) … (BNC, C8N 205)

(67) Her grandfather, she remembered, had expressed his feelings about Lowell <u>very</u> ***plainly*** indeed. (BNC, K8R 522)

In addition to verbs of speaking and perception, *plainly* modifies adjectives denoting sensory experience and perception, such as *visible* and *audible* in (68) and (69).

(68) As we were pitching the tents, a herd of buffalo wandered by, this time ***plainly*** <u>visible</u>, less than 500 yards away. (BNC, A15 823)

(69) For example the sport of crown green bowling, which was very little known outside of the north of England, has been shown to a wider public; the greens are often oddly bereft of spectators, and the northern accents of the players are ***plainly*** <u>audible</u> as they urge on their woods or confer solemnly as a pair over the last bowl of an important 'end'. (BNC, A6Y 799)

As in the case of *clearly*, the expression of manner meanings has remained an important function of *plainly* despite the (inter)subjectification process it has undergone and the inferential meanings it has developed.

b. Inferential uses of *plainly*

Like *clearly, obviously* and *evidently*, *plainly* is used to indicate synchronous and retrospective inference. Marking synchronous inference involves close observation and interpretation of the "signs" (cf. Plungian 2001), to emphasize the speaker's viewpoint, and limit the scope for alternatives, as illustrated in (70)-(72). It is thus connected with the dialogically contractive function of pronouncement (cf. Martin and White 2005).

(70) Even after Charles married Princess Diana he kept in close contact with Camilla. They spoke frequently by phone and soon found reasons to meet, often at the homes of friends. At first Diana tolerated the friendship, but soon came to envy the older woman whose company her husband so ***plainly*** enjoyed. (BNC, CEK 6343-6345)

(71) But Annie Huggett was there, alert and bright. She has been a member of the party since 1911, and for 50 years, until a few

weeks ago, collected subscriptions. She addressed the conference. She was ***plainly*** delighted. (BNC, A2J 174-177)

(72) This time he stood in the centre of the room, ***plainly*** unsure as to what had brought him in, his eye searching around for something to fasten on, like someone in mid-speech forgetting what they had to say. (BNC, A6N 227)

As noted in the sections on *clearly, obviously* and *evidently*, some of the emphasizing uses of inferential adverbs are more emphatic, while others are more inferential. Their function is most clearly emphatic when they occupy positions which are typical for degree modifiers, e.g. before adjectives, as in (73)-(75). The adjectives modified by *plainly* include evidential adjectives, such as *obvious* in (75). In such cases, the insertion of *plainly* adds force to statements by emphasizing the existence of an evidential basis for the claims.

(73) That, of course, is a ***plainly*** nonsensical result and, casting myself in the role of the interfering outsider not so familiar with this Act, I ask myself what is the answer to that. (BNC, FC0 98)

(74) As a result, becoming an adult and setting up a household no longer mean the same thing. Yet a surprisingly large proportion of market research is still based on the spending patterns of the baby boomers' parents, and so implicitly assumes that they are all but identical. This is ***plainly*** <u>wrong</u>, though no one is sure just how wrong. Try selling nappies and dogfood to someone who lives alone and never intends to have a baby or a dog. (BNC, ABK 2381-2383)

(75) The reason for Sir Bernard Tomlinson's drastic recommendation is, apparently, that London is overstocked with health care. Yet it is ***plainly*** <u>obvious</u> to anyone who works in central London, or has tried to get admission to hospital there, that this is untrue. (BNC, CAP 692-693)

In (74) *plainly* modifies the adjective *wrong*, which is a frequent collocate of *plainly* in the BNC; it is also found in dictionary examples of its usage (e.g. *CALD, COBUILD*), which signals that the collocation is perceived as characteristic. There are twenty-two such instances in the

corpus, as compared to twenty-one in the case of *clearly*, which is considerably more frequent in the corpus, and twenty in the case of *obviously*, another high-frequency adverb. In addition to its use in general English, *plainly wrong* is a frequent expression in legal discourse. Most of the instances (13) identified in the BNC come from *The Weekly Law Reports*, where it is used with reference to decisions made by judges and justices, as in (76) and (77).

(76)   Thus the judge's exercise of the discretion entrusted to him stands unless he exercised his discretion on some erroneous principle or he misunderstood the evidence or he was **plainly wrong**. The absence of a note of the judge's reasons makes this a difficult exercise. (BNC, FE0 62-63)

(77)   It seems to me that when one looks at the brief findings and reasons of the justices given at the conclusion of the hearing, or even if one were to look at the more elaborate reasons which they have compiled subsequently for the purpose of his appeal, then their decision was **plainly wrong**. It is certainly not a decision that is justified by their findings and their reasons. (BNC, FCX 225-226)

As explained in (77), a plainly wrong decision is a decision which is not justified by the justices' "findings and their reasons". This example offers a good explanation of the inferential meaning of *plainly*: a conclusion based on findings and reasons, i.e. evidence and its interpretation.

Marking retrospective inference is characteristic of sentence initial and sentence final uses of *plainly*, where it signals some degree of distance towards the content of the proposition. The distance is necessary to view situations from a wider perspective. In contrast to the instances when *plainly* indicates synchronous inference, the focus here is more on the speaker's judgement than on the perceptibility and interpretability of the evidence. As in the case of *clearly, obviously* and *evidently*, the retrospective inferences marked by *plainly* are more dialogically expansive than the synchronous ones. They present the speaker's judgement as valid until counter evidence proves it wrong. Such uses are illustrated in examples (78) and (79).

(78)   A sweet young thing from *Smash Hits* isn't going to be after the same kind of material as some cerebral haircut boy from *Melody Maker* or a hack from your local paper. **Plainly**, individual journalists have individual styles but ultimately they have to turn the result of meeting you into the type of article their publication requires. (BNC, A6A 438-439)

(79)   He surveyed the rest of the company. **Plainly** they had interrupted a mourning tea party. The girl on the sofa must be the bride whose nuptials Hatton's death had deferred. (BNC, A73 1579-1581)

Retrospective inference is also expressed by sentence medial *plainly*, when it occurs before the main verb or auxiliary, as in (80).

(80)   I'd been to Rome before, of course, but Naples … well, it's something altogether different. Have you travelled abroad much, Mr McKillop?' Mrs Wilson looked intently at the figure before her and realised how ridiculous her question was. The man had **plainly** not left British shores and London itself was worlds apart from where he came from. (BNC, ASN 794-797)

As noted with reference to the other inferential adverbs discussed so far, the closer the adverb is to the sentence initial position, the more subjective its reading, and the more likely it is to express retrospective inference. In contrast to *clearly* and *obviously*, *plainly* does not seem to express expectations. The BNC data indicate that it is used as an adverb of manner and an inferential adverb.

5.2.5. *Manifestly*

Manifestly means "in a way that is clear or obvious to the eye or mind" (*OD*). Like the other adverbs in the group, it shows a continuum of manner and inferential meanings. *Manifestly* is a low-frequency adverb, characteristic of written language (see Table 26). In the BNC it is found in sentence medial and sentence initial positions; its sentence final occurrences are not attested in the corpus. In almost half of the cases it occurs before adjectives, which seems to be its most characteristic position.

a. Manner uses of *manifestly*

When *manifestly* is used as an adverb of manner, it means 'considerably'/'in a perceptible way'. Its manner meanings are particularly clear when it co-occurs with verbs naming activities and processes. In its uses as an adverb of manner *manifestly* co-occurs with degree modifiers, such as *so, more*, and *most*. Its manner uses are exemplified in (81)-(83).

(81) More than a century ago J. S. Mill argued for universal education on moral grounds, holding that it would ***manifestly*** increase the general balance of pleasure over pain, happiness over unhappiness. (BNC, ASY 8)

(82) One who deviates ***so manifestly*** from these rules as to drive recklessly ought to realize – because the driving test requires a driver to realize – that there is a considerable risk of an accident. (BNC, AC1 557)

(83) It could be the case that version A was perceived as a radically sceptical play and that the B version later came to dominate because the authorities were unhappy with the other version which ***more manifestly*** challenged orthodoxies. (BNC, HH4 1599)

The manner sense of *manifestly* can also be identified in its uses with adjectives. In such cases it refers to the perceptibility of qualities, and means 'visibly, openly', as in (84).

(84) What structuralism studies about cultural phenomena is something not available (or at least **not *manifestly*** available) to the consciousness of people participating in the phenomenon under study. (BNC, CGY 1175)

b. Inferential uses of *manifestly*

Like the other inferential adverbs discussed so far, *manifestly* is used to express both synchronous and retrospective inference. In most of its uses *manifestly* is a subjunct qualifying synchronous inference, and functioning as an emphasizer. As in the case of *clearly, obviously, evidently* and *plainly*, some of its uses are more inferential, while others are more emphatic, but in the case of *manifestly* the emphatic uses seem to prevail. The

difference between its primarily inferential and primarily emphatic uses can be illustrated by comparing examples (85) and (86).

(85) That spring Baldwin became ***manifestly*** deafer. He often could not hear questions in the House of Commons and had to have them repeated to him by Margesson, his Chief Whip. (BNC, EFN 1891-1892)

(86) It is ***manifestly*** unjust that a privileged few should continue to accumulate excess goods, squandering available resources while masses of people are living in conditions of misery. (BNC, A98 270)

In (85), *manifestly* introduces an opinion (Baldwin became deafer) based on the pieces of evidence available to the speaker ("he could not hear questions …"). The speaker relies on synchronous inference when making the claim. In (86), *manifestly* does not express deduction; the evidential element in this case is limited to the implication that the evidence is rich, easily perceptible and accessible to anyone. The adverb is emphatic rather than inferential.

Communicating that there is easily perceptible and accessible evidence for a claim seems to be the primary function of *manifestly*. It is particularly frequent in statements expressing critical opinions. In the BNC, there are numerous (thirty-four) occurrences of *manifestly* with adjectives containing negative prefixes, such as *unjust, unsuccessful,* and *unsuitable.* It also often co-occurs with adjectives expressing pejorative meanings, such as *perverse, tendentious, false, wrong, repressive,* and *absurd.* Some examples are provided in (87)-(89).

(87) How often does it have to be demonstrated that Flower of Scotland is a good pub/folk song but is ***manifestly*** <u>unsuitable</u> as a national anthem? (BNC, K5C 1474)

(88) From the foregoing comes one of the basic facts of modern economic society: the poor in our economy are needed to do the work that the more fortunate do not do and would find ***manifestly*** <u>distasteful</u>, even distressing. (BNC, CAK 498)

(89) Universities are now governed on the principle that it is right and natural for the management of a university to respond to

the opinion of the students – a thing which is ***manifestly*** <u>absurd</u>. (BNC, A69 55)

Manifestly is also used to emphasize claims expressed by evidential adjectives, such as *evident* and *clear*. In such cases it is semantically redundant, and its main function is to add emphasis and confidence to the claims, as in (90) and (91).

(90) This is ***manifestly*** <u>evident</u> in the often quoted passage from a 'Scout's duty as a Citizen' which warned: A house divided against itself cannot stand … (BNC, B1T 74-75)

(91) It is ***manifestly*** <u>clear</u> from a reading of the case law that many believe that a real division can be drawn in analytical terms. (BNC, GU6 719)

As in the case of the other inferential adverbs discussed so far, the expression of retrospective inference is characteristic of sentence initial *manifestly*. The emphasis is more on the speaker's judgement than on the clarity and availability of the evidence. In the BNC there are seven cases of *manifestly* used at the beginning of the sentence, four of which express retrospective inference. Such use is thus relatively infrequent. It is illustrated in examples (92) and (93).

(92) ***Manifestly***, we have no effective deterrent for hooligan crime, or we would not be debating the issue. (BNC, HHX 7496)

(93) They paraded the smart streets of West London, displaying their meagre weekly rations. ***Manifestly*** they were very poor. Equally clearly they were workers, not loafers, and they conducted the strike and the demonstrations peacefully and respectably. (BNC, EE9 190-192)

In both (92) and (93) reference is made to the evidence which allowed the authors to make their inferences: "or we would not be debating this issue" in (92), and "displaying their meagre weekly rations" in (93). As observed in the discussion of the inferences expressed by *clearly, obviously, evidently* and *plainly*, synchronous inference is associated with the dialogically contractive functionality of pronouncement, as it emphasizes the speaker's position and reduces the scope for other alternatives, while retrospective inference is associated with dialogical expansion. It signals

that the speaker's inferences are valid in view of available evidence, but if new evidence is discovered, they may be proved wrong.

c. *Manifestly* as a concurrence marker

In addition to expressing inference, sentence initial *manifestly* expresses expectations, and can be used to establish common ground with the addressee. Like *obviously* and *clearly*, it appeals to shared knowledge and shared beliefs, and as such it can be said to function as a concurrence marker (cf. White 2003; Martin and White 2005). Such uses are illustrated in examples (94) and (95).

(94) The intellectual strength of Catholicism will fade under the pressure of a rather fundamentalist theology imposed upon seminaries and Catholic institutions of all sorts. The Church will then inevitably decline in an increasingly irreversible way, as in some parts of the world it may already be doing. ***Manifestly*** so vast a body does not collapse overnight and much of the decline can be masked for decades. (BNC, CRK 192-197)

(95) The proper approach is to consider what options are open to the court in a proper exercise of its inherent powers and, within those limits, what orders would best serve the true interests of the infant pending a final decision. There can be no question of 'balance of convenience.' There can be no question of seeking, simply as such, to preserve the status quo, although on particular facts that may well be the court's objective as being in the best interests of the infant. There can be no question of 'preserving the subject matter of the action.' ***Manifestly*** there can be no question of considering whether damages would be an adequate remedy. (BNC, FCV 206-210)

In (94) the author makes reference to the common knowledge that big institutions, such as the Catholic Church, do not collapse overnight. The receiver is expected to think the same and accept the author's prognosis concerning the future of Catholicism. The example quoted in (95) comes from a discussion of a legal case, published in *The Weekly Law Reports*, concerning the life-saving measures that should have been given to a child. Since it is a delicate case, a matter of saving a child's life, damages

cannot be expected to be an adequate remedy. Such expectations are assumed to be part of shared knowledge. The fact that a low-frequency adverb such as *manifestly* has developed the sense of expectations indicates that it is a common developmental path for English inferential adverbs.

5.2.6. Patently

LDOCE defines *patently* as "clearly and plainly", and explains that it is used in formal registers to talk of something bad. *Patently* is a low-frequency adverb; it is mostly found in written language (see Table 26). In the BNC, it is attested in sentence initial and medial positions, which signals its ability to modify clauses and their individual elements.

Patently does not seem to function as an adverb of manner. Its typical function is that of an emphasizer expressing synchronous inference. As indicated by the BNC data, a typical position for *patently* is one before an adjective. Such uses are exemplified in (96)-(98), which additionally show that the emphasis expressed by *patently* can be further enhanced by its co-occurrence with the degree modifiers *quite* and *so*.

(96) The image of Constantine as a fervent convert to Christianity is ***patently*** wrong. He was not even baptised until he lay on his deathbed. (BNC, EDY 678-679)

(97) Any attempt to *quantify* the relative intelligences of species – and even of human beings from different cultural backgrounds – is <u>quite</u> ***patently*** misguided: one is trying to apply the same measure to two qualitatively different things. (BNC, CET 870)

(98) It is a terrible image; the child is <u>so</u> ***patently*** dead and cold.(BNC, CD3 958)

Like the other inferential adverbs, in some of its uses *patently* is more inferential, while in others it is more emphatic. For instance, in (97) and (98) the evidence which enabled the claim qualified by *patently* is provided in the context, which indicates an inference-based claim. In (96), however, *patently* merely indicates that the evidence for the claim was easily perceptible, which makes it more emphatic than inferential. In such cases *patently* most clearly functions as a marker of pronouncement; it emphasizes the speaker's claim, and limits the dialogic space for other opinions.

The emphasizing component of *patently* is particularly clear when it is used with inferential adjectives – a pattern which is also characteristic of other inferential adverbs. In such cases the inferential adverb is semantically redundant, as the adjectives themselves carry inferential meaning; the adverb has a primarily emphasizing function. Such use is relatively common, e.g. *patently obvious* appears eighteen times in the BNC, and *patently clear* is used nine times, which confirms the observation that the major role of *patently* is that of an emphasizer. Examples are provided in (99)-(101).

(99) It was ***patently*** <u>obvious</u> to Klepner, now that he had read the plan, that the European trade environment was not as he had been led to believe.(BNC, AC2 56-57)

(100) It seems ***patently*** <u>clear</u> that disruptive pupils need more, not less, interaction with their peers and more, not less, involvement in the whole life of the school. The isolation or bunching together of such pupils only provides them with poor role models and intensive interaction with other disturbed children. (BNC, CMU 1469-1470)

(101) It is ***patently*** <u>apparent</u> that young Georg has forgotten just who owns the Zimmermann farm. He cast about desperately for something to say. Making small talk with Georg was not easy. (BNC J19 1804-1806)

In most cases, *patently* (like *manifestly*) co-occurs with adjectives of opinion, often a negative one (e.g. *absurd, false, unfair, untrue*), and indicates that the opinion is based on easily perceptible and unambiguous evidence, as in (96) and (97). Its occurrences with positive qualities appear to be less common, but they are also attested in the BNC, as illustrated in (102).

(102) Explaining this seemed of no particular concern to those involved with sport: blacks were ***patently*** good at some events and not good at others. When pressed for reasons, they would draw on such 'obvious' facts as blacks are physically equipped or conditioned better for some sports, or reference was made to the explain-all theory of 'natural ability'. (BNC, CL1 606-607)

In addition to being used as an emphasizer, *patently* indicates retrospective inference. Such uses of the adverb are, however, substantially less frequent than those in which it expresses synchronous inference and performs an emphasizing function. As in the case of the other inferential adverbs, the closer it is placed to the sentence initial position, the more likely it is to indicate retrospective inference. Such uses are illustrated in examples (103)-(105).

(103) So that's exactly the position that we have and there had been no proof as far as I can see to to demonstrate that in fact the present situation is not working. **Patently** the present situation is working and therefore that's part of it and what I would say is that that this additional policy if it isn't necessary because there there isn't any development pressure, then what is its purpose. (BNC, J9V 179-180)

(104) Mr Kinnock called on Mrs Thatcher to show her commitment to change in Eastern Europe by launching a public review of Britain's defence policies. 'The Pentagon is advising the president about troop reductions. The Germans **patently** are not going to allow modernisation of short-range weapons. Nato is discussing the mutual withdrawal of short range weapons in Germany'. (BNC, AAC 633-635)

(105) The prospect of changing banks had been discussed before. But changing banks, as Branson was prone to saying, 'is a bit like changing your parents for a new set. When you've been with the same bank since you were thirteen, you somehow feel they will grow up with you.' This was **patently** no longer the case. (BNC, FNX 1746-1749)

Patently does not seem to function as a concurrence marker; such uses are not attested in the BNC. The adverb is primarily used as an emphasizer expressing synchronous inference.

5.2.7. *Seemingly*

CALD provides two definitions of *seemingly*: (1) "appearing to be something, especially when this is not true"; (2) "according to the facts that you know". While the former refers to appearances rather than to evidence,

the latter refers to inference. The adverb is relatively infrequent in comparison with items such as *clearly, obviously* and *evidently* (cf. Table 6). It is more common in writing than in speech (see Table 26). In the BNC, it is attested in sentence initial, medial and final positions, which indicates its ability to qualify both entire sentences and their elements. However, in the majority of its uses evidenced in the BNC (ca. 60%), it occurs before adjectives.

a. *Seemingly* used as a downtoner

Both meanings of *seemingly* noted by *CALD* are documented in the BNC. The claims it qualifies as "appearing to be something" are sometimes marked as untrue in the context, as in (106) and (107); in other cases the fact that they are untrue is assumed to be clear to the addressee, as in (108) and (109).

(106) **Seemingly** meek and self-effacing, she was in fact strong-willed and fiercely passionate. (BNC, GT9 534)

(107) These **seemingly** intelligent interjections are, of course, nothing of the sort. (BNC, AAG 263)

(108) DARREN HALL, **seemingly** able to run forever, won the Oracle English National Championship for the fourth time in five years at Crawley last night. (BNC, AA7 3)

(109) Here, in the **seemingly** endless expanse of clear blue, hundreds of fish hung strangely suspended in the water, the nets that held them all but invisible. (BNC, ABC 1226)

The uses of *seemingly* in (106)-(109) can be described as downtoning, as the insertion of the adverb before the elements it modifies diminishes the force of the statements. "Downtoner" is a term used by Quirk *et al*. (1985: 597) to refer to subjuncts which "have a lowering effect on the force of the verb or predication". Quirk *et al*. (1985: 620) do not classify *seemingly* as a downtowner; they only include it in their category of disjuncts expressing some degree of doubt. However, the term will be adopted here as it seems to be an appropriate label for numerous sentence medial uses of *seemingly* (and other adverbs, e.g. *apparently*) when it qualifies parts of sentences and presents their truth value as potentially questionable. In contrast to such inferential adverbs as *clearly*, which refer to evidence in

support of the claims made by the speaker, *seemingly* qualifies evidence as deceptive.

b. Inferential uses of *seemingly*

Some of the claims qualified by *seemingly* can be interpreted as indicating synchronous inference. However, it tends not to refer to easily noticeable properties of people or things, but rather to situations, tendencies, and behaviour patterns. While most of the other inferential adverbs, such as *clearly* and *evidently*, indicate the presence of visual (or other sensory) signs enabling the inference, *seemingly* signals the existence of facts and findings which enable the speaker to make a claim. Examples (110) and (111) are cases in point.

  (110) CASTLEFORD and Wigan, the Silk Cut Challenge Cup finalists, are experiencing contrasting build-ups to the Wembley match on May 2. While Wigan **seemingly** have no problems, Castleford's are mounting. (BNC, AKV 316-316)

  (111) Clownfish raised in captivity **seemingly** do not undergo the learning process established in the wild, which closely associates them with an anemone for the whole of their lives. This learning process starts when the female of a breeding pair lays her mass of adhesive eggs on a hard surface below the foot of the host anemone. (BNC, C95 2109-2110)

In (110) and (111) *seemingly* signals the familiarity of the speakers with some facts, data, statistics, etc., which enable them to make the claims. They can thus be said to express synchronous inference from facts, or, perhaps more accurately, it can be said to express conjecture. Conjecture has been defined as a type of inference which does not require physical evidence (Thornes 2018). Conjectures are less closely based on external evidence than inferences proper; they rely on the speaker's knowledge and reasoning to a greater extent (cf. Aikhenvald 2006; Rozumko, forthcoming). *Seemingly* expresses judgements which rely less closely on external evidence than the judgements expressed by *clearly*. In numerous cases, the facts which the speaker's claim is based on are not explicitly stated in the context; the speaker only signals their existence, as in (112) and (113).

  (112) The outstanding success of the Tax Faculty illustrates the extent of our members' involvement in taxation work. Formed only 18 months ago, the Faculty has already attracted a membership approaching 7,000 – and rising. **Seemingly** almost every month a new product or service is launched to meet yet another of its members' needs. (BNC, CBW 147-149)

  (113) Hib-E scholars have apparently always been quite happy to accept that the *meat/mate* merger is a true merger (see citations in J. Milroy and Harris, 1980: 200), and Bliss (1979: 208–10) cites evidence to show that these two classes had merged in Hib-E by around 1700. **Seemingly**, they are also happy to accept that the *meat/meet* merger is also a true merger, and that some people alternate between these two merged classes. (BNC, FAD 1311-1312)

In (112) the source of information is not revealed; the speaker merely indicates that he knows that new products are launched almost every month. In (113) reference is made to citations which provide evidence for the claim, but no specific evidence is given. Like the verb *seem, seemingly* is used "to say that someone or something gives the impression of having a particular quality, or of happening in the way you describe" (*COBUILD*).

Seemingly can also be used to indicate retrospective inference, i.e. a conclusion reached as a result of deduction, analysis of results and symptoms. Such uses are particularly clear when *seemingly* occurs in the sentence initial position, as in (114)-(116).

  (114) Luckily for the couple, the Battalions did not come their way. **Seemingly** other foreigners – principally Americans – were less fortunate, as local news media reported kidnappings and hostage-taking. (BNC, AAB 50-51)

  (115) Motabeng means the place of sand. It was a village remotely inland, perched on the edge of the Kalahari desert. **Seemingly**, the only reason for people's settlement there was a good supply of underground water. (BNC, HH3 6185-6187)

  (116) 'When I'm old and grey,' said Leeds manager Howard Wilkinson afterwards, 'and people talk about great individual goals, I'll be privileged to say I was there when Eric Cantona scored

this one. It was a very special goal, and he has got a special talent.' Which made it all the harder to understand why Wilkinson had not begun with Cantona in the side on a summery day that seemed ideally suited to his ball-playing skills. **Seemingly**, the Frenchman's ineffectiveness in the startling 4–0 defeat at Manchester City had something to do with the decision. (BNC, AK6 627-630)

In (114)-(116) reference is made to the evidence which enables the inference: in (114) "kidnappings and hostage-taking" indicate the presence of the Battalions; in (115) the inconvenient location of the village is given as evidence that people would not want to settle there if it did not have a good supply of water; in (116) the player's ineffectiveness is suggested as the reason why he had not been given the chance to play. However, while (114) signals a straightforward connection between the evidence and the conclusion, examples (115) and (116) merely indicate that the evidence they refer to is a likely justification for the claims. *Seemingly* is more open to alternative propositions than *evidently* or *obviously*. It is thus more clearly dialogically expansive. Using Martin and White's (2005) taxonomy, it can be said to represent the functionality "entertain", as it signals that the option suggested by the speaker is "but one of a range of possible positions" (Martin and White 2005: 98). The way *seemingly* refers to evidence makes it similar to *apparently* (see section 5.2.8).

5.2.8. *Apparently*

Apparently qualifies claims based on different types of evidence. Its reportive uses are discussed in Chapter 4; this section focuses on its inferential, and, more generally, non-reportive uses. Among the definitions of *apparently* provided by monolingual dictionaries, one seems to grasp the sense which allows the adverb to qualify different types of evidence: "as far as one knows or can see" (*OD*). As signalled by this definition, *apparently* can be used to qualify claims based on the facts that the speaker knows (from different sources, including hearsay), and on perceptible evidence. In its reliance on knowledge, *apparently* is similar to *seemingly*. The inferential meanings expressed by both adverbs are closer to the notion of conjecture than to evidence-based inference, as they rely less extensively on external

evidence than such adverbs as *clearly*. The similarity between *apparently* and *seemingly* seems to result from their relation to verbs which express similar meanings: *appear* and *seem*. Their dictionary definitions suggest a considerable overlap of meanings: *appear* "give the impression of being"; *seem* "give the impression of being or having a particular quality" (*OD*), which can also be expected to exist in the case of the two adverbs derived from them. *Apparently* is, however, substantially more frequent than *seemingly* (see Table 6), particularly in spoken language. *Seemingly* is more formal (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 620).

a. *Apparently* used as a downtoner

Apparently is used to signal that things appear to be something, particularly when their appearance is deceptive. It is similar in this respect to *seemingly*. Like *seemingly*, it frequently occurs before adjectives (23% of its occurrences in the BNC), and signals that the properties they denote appear to be true, while in fact they are not, or it is not certain if they are, as in examples (117)-(119).

(117) He paid close attention to characteristics in a painting so **apparently** insignificant as the shape of a nostril or the lobe of an ear, arguing that such details were too unimportant for a follower to copy exactly. For example, Morelli wrote: 'In all those works by Raphael in which the *execution is entirely his own,* the ear, like the hand, is always characteristic, and differs in form from the ears of Timoteo Viti, Perugino, Pinturicchio, and others.' (BNC, A04 943-944)

(118) Libet concluded from this that the subjective experience was occurring before the neural events which brought it about. This **apparently** backward causality, if true, would cause problems for identity theories of mind and has been used by dualists like John Eccles to support their position, with the backward step in time made by a non-physical mind. (BNC, A0T 850-851)

(119) Ever dug up a bed of **apparently** flourishing potatoes, only to find the tubers riddled with holes where the slugs have been at them? (BNV, A0G 1800)

As illustrated in (117) and (119), *apparently* can refer to properties for which there is visual evidence; it can also be used with reference to abstract concepts, as in (118). It is frequently employed to contrast what only seems to be true with what is really true. The contrast is emphasized by its co-occurrence with concessive subordinators, such as *but, though*, and *while*, as illustrated in (120) and (121).

(120) The results showed that the orbitosphenoid in amphisbaenians, <u>though</u> **apparently** homologous to the same structure in lizards, is formed in quite a different way. (BNC, B71 916)

(121) Similarly, *The Faerie Queene*, <u>while</u> **apparently** lauding Elizabeth, actually seems severely uncomfortable with her. (BNC, HH4 1335)

The association of *apparently* with contrast between what only appears to be and what really is true results in its employment in contexts which signal paradoxical situations and unexpected turns of events. While in its reportive uses it signals what unexpectedly turned out to be true (cf. Chapter 4), in its non-reportive uses it qualifies the information which seemed to be true, but, unexpectedly, turned out to be wrong. In both cases it is related to the notion of mirativity, which is concerned with the expression of surprise. In such contexts it is preceded by concessive prepositions, such as *despite* and *in spite of*, as in (122) and (123).

(122) <u>In spite of</u> **apparently** incompatible personalities – she is small and shy, he is large and does most of the talking – they have an empathy which is essential to the way they work, a persistent mutual pestering. (BNC, A1L 24)

(123) <u>Despite</u> **apparently** positive indications that the economy had become more efficient and successful in the late 1980s, some analysts were sceptical about how much of this was due to the various deregulating reforms. (BNC, HKV 3218)

When *apparently* is used to signal that things only appear to be true, it can be said to function as a downtoner, as it has "a lowering effect" (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 597) on the force of the claim it modifies. It performs a similar function as *seemingly* (see section 5.2.7.).

b. Inferential uses of *apparently*

Like most English inferential adverbs, *apparently* expresses two types of inference: synchronous and retrospective. Synchronous inference is connected with its use as a subjunct modifying sentence elements. It involves the speaker's interpretation of the evidence which the speaker can observe in front of him/her, as in (124) and (124).

(124) He would never see me unless I moved. He was at the boathouse. A flash of the torch again, as if to check that no boat was there, then he turned to face the causeway, took something from a pocket and raised what were **apparently** night-glasses to his eyes. (BNC, CKF 2580-2582)

(125) A short distance away another cow was grazing, **apparently** unconcerned about some of its intestines trailing in the grass from under its belly. (BNC, A61 1335)

The situation described in (124) took place at night, and the speaker could not see very well what the man was holding in his hands. The claim is based on the speaker's interpretation of the man's behaviour because visual evidence was not fully available in the dark. In a similar way, in (125) the speaker interprets the animal's behaviour as indicating its internal state. There is no straightforward connection between the evidence and the perceived mental state of the animal, which is why, as noted earlier, the evidential meaning expressed by *apparently* can be interpreted as conjecture rather than evidence-based inference.

Sentence initial *apparently* can be used to indicate retrospective inference (or, more precisely, retrospective conjecture). Such use is illustrated in examples (126)-(128).

(126) The tent flap drew back, and David Mitchell entered, cleaned up and resplendent in dog-collar and cardigan. **Apparently** the water supply had been restored. (BNC, A0D 1005-1006)

(127) 'Please don't portray me as some flashy Vegas gambler who's plopping into the White House in Italian suits and expensive watches,' Mr Rogich told a reporter from The New York Times from his car phone. (**Apparently** his life is so fast-paced that he was unable to talk from his office). (BNC, A2M 303-304)

(128)   A young married woman in my office has tried to adopt a baby
        since she had a hysterectomy, and she is still waiting after a year.
        Apparently babies are in short supply. (BNC, ARJ 521-522)

In (126) the person's appearance ("cleaned up", new clothes) enables the speaker to make the inference that "the water supply had been restored"; in (127) the fact that Mr Rogich phoned from his car instead of his office is interpreted, with some irony, as an indication that he was very busy. In (128) the long time the woman must wait before she can adopt a baby is taken as indicative of the fact that "babies are in short supply". In the three examples *apparently* offers a reflection on the situations described in the preceding sentences. However, as in the case of claims based on synchronous inference, *apparently* does not express a straightforward cause-and-result or symptom-and-cause relation, but a conjecture. As in the case of judgements qualified by *seemingly*, *apparently* leaves more dialogic space for alternative interpretations. It is thus dialogically expansive. Examples (127) and (128) show that the conclusions qualified by *apparently* may be ironic or sarcastic.

Apparently is also used to indicate that the speaker's claim is based on some evidence without specifying its type. In such cases *apparently* seems to be equivalent to 'as far as I know' (cf. *CED*), as in (129)-(131).

(129)   He trusts her. That is, as far as he trusts any woman. His wife
        left him – and I don't blame her – but *apparently* since then he's
        gone off women. (BNC, CN3 3940-3942)
(130)   I think the yeti is wonderfully unproven in either direction. I
        mean we did see some strange tracks and we did find this sheep
        which had been completely gutted, but *apparently* that could
        have been done by a snow leopard. (BNC, CHH 741-742)
(131)   God, it's erm absolutely mind-boggling what they do. The speed
        of them and everything you know, you you'd think the film was
        speeded up but *apparently* it's not. They are really that fast.
        (BNC, KPA 1344-1346)

In (129) the speaker may be referring to rumour or some situations he saw or participated in. It is also possible that the evidence comes from a number of sources, and represents different types. In both (130) and (131)

the speakers seem to communicate that, to the best of their knowledge, there is no evidence that the claims are not true. They do not, however, commit themselves entirely to their truth value.

As noted by *COBUILD*, *apparently* is used "to refer to something that seems to be true" although the speaker is "not sure whether it is or not". It expresses a lower level of confidence than *clearly, evidently* or *obviously*. It is also less likely to be used as a marker of "justification" (cf. White 2003), guiding the addressee through the process of data interpretation. It is not used to persuade the addressee that the evidence unambiguously points to a specific conclusion. Rather, it signals that the available evidence (which may be of different types) enables the speaker to form an opinion (a conjecture) on the subject matter, at the same time acknowledging the possibility of the existence of alternative views. Like *seemingly*, it "entertains" other dialogic positions (Martin and White 2005: 98).

5.3. Polish equivalents of English inferential adverbs. Evidence from bilingual dictionaries

The Polish equivalents of English inferential adverbs which are suggested by the three bilingual dictionaries consulted in this work are listed in Table 7.

Table 7. Dictionary equivalents of English inferential adverbs

English inferential adverbs	Polish dictionary equivalents
clearly	*wyraźnie, jasno, najwyraźniej, najwidoczniej* (PWN; St; Col), *najoczywiściej, oczywiście* (St)
obviously	*najwyraźniej, oczywiście* (PWN; Col), *wyraźnie* (Col)
evidently	*widocznie, wyraźnie, najwyraźniej* (PWN), *ewidentnie* (Col)
plainly	*najwyraźniej, w sposób oczywisty* (PWN), *wyraźnie* (Col)
manifestly	*wyraźnie* (PWN)
patently	*wyraźnie, w sposób oczywisty* (PWN), *ewidentnie* (Col)

seemingly	*pozornie* (PWN; Col; St), *na pozór* (PWN; St), *widocznie* (St)
apparently	*pozornie, z pozoru, widocznie, jak widać* (PWN; St), *najwidoczniej, najwyraźniej* (Col; St)

As illustrated in Table 7, the common dictionary equivalent of all the inferential adverbs expressing a high degree of confidence, i.e. *clearly, obviously, evidently, plainly, manifestly,* and *patently,* is *wyraźnie,* while the shared equivalent of the adverbs which express a lower level of confidence, i.e. *seemingly* and *apparently*, is *widocznie.* Another adverb which is suggested as an equivalent of the high confidence adverbs is *najwyraźniej.* The difference between *wyraźnie* and *najwyraźniej* is that *wyraźnie* is more likely to express synchronous inference, while *najwyraźniej* expresses retrospective inference. The suggested equivalent of the adverbs which typically express synchronous inference, i.e. *manifestly* and *patently*, is, therefore, *wyraźnie.* The equivalents suggested by the bilingual dictionaries indicate that there are no direct cross-linguistic counterparts within the group; the equivalents are selected on the basis of the type of inference they express. In the case of *obviously* and *clearly*, one of the suggested equivalents is *oczywiście* – an adverb which expresses accordance with expectations.

5.4. Polish equivalents of English inferential adverbs. Evidence from the parallel corpus

The translation equivalents of the English inferential adverbs identified in the parallel corpus are listed in Table 8. *Plainly* and *patently* are low-frequency adverbs (*plainly* has 29 occurrences in the corpus; *patently* has 34), which is why it was possible to identify all their equivalents appearing in the corpus. The other adverbs are more frequent (see Table 28), which is why their translation equivalents have been established on the basis of 100-item corpus samples.

Table 8. Translation equivalents of English inferential adverbs in *Paralela*

Inferential adverbs	Polish translation equivalents
clearly	zero equivalent (27), *wyraźnie* (15), *oczywiście* (12), *jest oczywiste* (7), *z pewnością* (7), *najwyraźniej* (7), *niewątpliwie* (5), *najwidoczniej* (5), *jest jasne* (4), *rzecz jasna* (2), *ewidentnie* (1), *najoczywiściej* (1), *bezsprzecznie* (1), *bez wątpienia* (1), *widać* (1), *widzę* (1), *wygląda na to* (1), *nie ma wątpliwości* (1), *na pewno* (1)
obviously	*oczywiście* (37), zero equivalent (8), *oczywisty* (8), *najwidoczniej* (8), *widocznie* (6), *rzecz jasna* (4), *najwyraźniej* (4), *niewątpliwie* (3), *ewidentnie* (3), *naturalnie* (3), *przede wszystkim* (3), *widać było* (2), *z pewnością* (2), *wyraźnie* (2), *w widoczny sposób* (2), *jawnie* (1), *na pewno* (1), *najoczywiściej* (1), *nie ulega wątpliwości* (1), *jednoznaczny* (1)
evidently	*najwyraźniej* (21), *oczywiście* (12), *ewidentnie* (11), *widocznie* (11), *wyraźnie* (11), zero equivalent (8), *najwidoczniej* (6), *zdecydowanie* (6), *w sposób oczywisty* (4), *jest oczywiste* (3), *jak widać* (3), *niewątpliwie* (2), *z pewnością* (2)
plainly	zero equivalent (15), *wyraźnie* (5), *najwyraźniej* (3), *widocznie* (3), *w oczywisty sposób* (2), *oczywisty* (1)
manifestly	*wyraźnie* (28), *w oczywisty sposób* (24), *oczywiście* (11), *jest oczywiste* (6), *ewidentnie* (6), zero equivalent (6), *jawnie* (5), *zdecydowanie* (5), *w jaskrawy sposób* (2), *w sposób ewidentny* (1), *w wyraźnym stopniu* (1), *w widoczny sposób* (1), *jednoznacznie* (1), *zupełnie* (1), *zasadniczo* (1), *otwarcie* (1)
patently	zero equivalent (15), *ewidentnie* (6), *wyraźnie* (4), *najwyraźniej* (2), *całkiem* (2), *uderzająco* (1), *jawnie* (1), *otwarcie* (1), *oczywiście* (1), *zdecydowanie* (1)
seemingly	*wydaje się* (42), *pozornie* (18), *z pozoru/na pozór* (17), zero equivalent (12), *najwyraźniej* (4), *rzekomo* (2), *prawdopodobnie* (2), *ewidentnie* (1), *wyraźnie* (1), *wygląda na to* (1)
apparently	zero equivalent (23), *widocznie* (18), *najwyraźniej* (13), *zdaje się/wydaje się* (13), *pozornie* (6), *na pozór* (6), *widać* (4), *niby* (2), *prawdopodobnie* (2), *jakby* (2), *oczywiście* (1), *faktycznie* (1), *w rzeczywistości* (1), *najwidoczniej* (1), *zdecydowanie* (1), *podobno* (1), *rzekomo* (1), *być może* (1), *chyba* (1), *mieć* (1), *wygląda na to, że* (1)

As demonstrated in Table 8, each of the English inferential adverbs has a number of translation equivalents in Polish, both evidential and non-evidential; the adverbs are also frequently omitted in translation. A common equivalent is the expectation marker *oczywiście* 'of course', which confirms the closeness of the notions of inference and expectations in English. The contexts in which the specific equivalents of each of the adverbs are employed and the tendencies observed in their use are discussed in sections 5.4.1-5.4.8.

5.4.1. Translation equivalents of *clearly*

As illustrated in Table 8, *clearly* is often omitted in translation. Its most frequent translation equivalents in the analyzed corpus sample are *wyraźnie* and *oczywiście*. It is also rendered by a number of inferential adverbs, such as *najwyraźniej, najwidoczniej,* and *widocznie,* which are quite numerous when taken as a group, but their individual frequencies as equivalents of *clearly* are rather small.

Wyraźnie is used as an equivalent of *clearly* when it functions as an adverb of manner and an inferential adverb. Its manner uses have, however, been disregarded in the count and will not be referred to further in the discussion. *Wyraźnie* appears as a translation equivalent of *clearly* when it is used as a subjunct, modifying sentence elements and their constituents. Such a distribution is to be expected, as *wyraźnie* tends to modify sentence elements rather than entire sentences, and is classified as a metapredicative operator of gradation in Polish sources (e.g. *WSJP*). As argued in section 5.2.1, such uses rely on synchronous inference, i.e. an observation of clearly perceptible evidence. They are both content- and speaker-oriented, as *clearly* signals that the evidence is clear and perceptible, at the same time indicating the way the speaker perceives and evaluates it. Such uses of *clearly* and its Polish equivalent *wyraźnie* are illustrated in examples (132)-(134).

(132) This is a ***clearly*** neoliberal report that is concerned with the interests of businesses – larger businesses in particular – because in a totally liberalised Internal Market, it is those with power who gain the most, despite the propaganda about defending small and medium-sized enterprises and consumers.

Jest to ***wyraźnie*** neoliberalne sprawozdanie, skoncentrowane na interesach przedsiębiorstw – szczególnie większych – ponieważ to one najwięcej zyskują na całkowicie zliberalizowanym rynku wewnętrznym, mimo całej propagandy wokół obrony małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw oraz konsumentów. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-06-08-007)

(133) Although social protection falls under the competence of the Member States, the lack of harmonisation is ***clearly*** damaging the Internal Market.

Chociaż ochrona socjalna podlega kompetencji państw członkowskich, brak harmonizacji jest ***wyraźnie*** szkodliwy dla rynku wewnętrznego. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-06-08-007)

(134) Lead researcher Lorenzo Alvarez-Filip of the University of East Anglia warned, 'This drastic loss of architectural complexity is ***clearly*** driving substantial declines in biodiversity, which will in turn affect coastal fishing communities'.

Lorenzo Alvarez-Filip, kierownik projektu z Uniwersytetu Wschodniej Anglii przestrzega: 'Ta daleko idąca utrata architektonicznej złożoności ***wyraźnie*** przyczynia się do istotnego spadku różnorodności biologicznej, co z kolei wpłynie na nadbrzeżne społeczności rybackie'. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|30888)

The inferential adverbials *najwyraźniej, najwidoczniej, najoczywiściej* and *widać* are used as equivalents of *clearly* when it expresses retrospective inference, i.e. when it offers a conclusion formulated from a distance, on the basis of results and deduction. *Najwyraźniej, najwidoczniej* and *najoczywiściej* are adverbs, while *widać* is morphologically an infinitive meaning 'it can be seen', which has developed the function of an inferential adverbial. Grochowski *et al*. (2014) classify it as a particle. Their uses as equivalents of *clearly* are illustrated in examples (135)-(137).

(135) Though the content of the first can vary slightly from one year to the next, ***quite clearly*** the same is not true of the second.

Pomimo że treść pierwszego z nich z roku na rok różni się w małym stopniu, to z drugim sprawa wygląda ***najwyraźniej*** inaczej. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-09-03-010)

(136)   Well, anyways, I told Doug to delete it, and he said he would, but *clearly* he didn't because a guy on the debate team just said Doug showed it to him a few hours ago.

Cóż, więc powiedziałem Doug'owi, żeby go skasował, a on powiedział, że to zrobi, ale *najwyraźniej* tego nie zrobił, bo jeden chłopak na spotkaniu zespołu powiedział, że Doug pokazał mu ten film kilka godzin temu. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|156844)

(137)   – So the question is whether I misunderstood you, or you misunderstood the President of Ukraine.
– Yes, I shall gladly clarify this point.
– *Clearly*, that was an inaccurate translation.

– A więc pytanie jest następujące: czy ja źle panią zrozumiałem, czy pani źle zrozumiała prezydenta Ukrainy?
– Tak, chętnie wyjaśnię tę kwestię.
– *Najwidoczniej* tłumaczenie było niedokładne. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-10-10-20-011)

(138)   Katherine wants you dead, there's zero you can do about it. You will be dead. But you're not, so *clearly* she has other plans.

Jeśli Katherine chce cię zabić i tak nic nie możesz zrobić. Ale jeszcze żyjesz, więc *widać* ma inne plany. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|60858)

Another relatively frequent equivalent of *clearly* is the adverb *oczywiście* 'of course' used in the contexts where *clearly* functions as a concurrence marker. As noted in section 5.2.1, such uses appear to be characteristic of people in authority who seek to establish common ground with their audience in order to explain their position to them and ensure their acceptance. *Clearly* signals that the authorities' attitudes and undertakings are to be expected and that they are to be taken for granted. None of the Polish inferential adverbs can be used to indicate expectations, which is why the confirmatory adverb expressing expectations *oczywiście* is employed in translation. The uses of *clearly* and its equivalent *oczywiście* as concurrence markers are illustrated in (139) and (140).

(139)   *Clearly*, we were disappointed that the summit agreement greatly reduced the amounts we had called for to achieve our competitiveness objectives.

Oczywiście byliśmy zawiedzeni, że zawarte porozumienie znacznie obniża kwoty, o które występowaliśmy, a które pozwoliłyby na osiągnięcie naszych celów konkurencyjności. (*Paralela*, EUBooks|NB-AJ-05-007)

(140)   In the Commission, we continue to believe that the ratification of the PCA will be a useful step forward, but *clearly* we will continue to use this as an incentive lever to encourage further moves on the Belarusian side.

Członkowie Komisji nadal wierzą, że ratyfikacja UPiW będzie użytecznym krokiem naprzód, ale – *oczywiście* – nadal będzie stanowić zachętę dla Białorusi do podejmowania dalszych kroków. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-12-16-010)

The parallel corpus data indicate that the equivalents of *clearly* represent three groups: (1) *wyraźnie*, which expresses a similar meaning as an adverb of manner, and is used as a subjunct expressing synchronous inference and functioning as an emphasizer; (2) *najwyraźniej, najwidoczniej, najoczywiściej* and *widać*, which are used as disjuncts expressing retrospective inference; (3) *oczywiście*, which expresses accordance with expectations, and functions as a concurrence marker.

5.4.2. Translation equivalents of *obviously*

As illustrated in Table 8, *obviously* has a wide range of translation equivalents in the parallel corpus, many of them only used once or twice, which indicates its polysemous and polyfunctional character. The most frequent equivalent in the analyzed corpus sample is the adverb *oczywiście* 'of course', which signals accordance with expectations. Most of the other equivalents of *obviously* are adverbs expressing inference (*widocznie, najwidoczniej, najoczywiściej*). When *obviously* is used to indicate synchronous inference, and functions as an emphasizer modifying sentence elements (subjunct), it is usually rendered by the adverbs *wyraźnie* and *ewidentnie*, as illustrated in (141) and (142).

(141) … the dossier is ***obviously*** incomplete since it contains nothing that would justify its consideration by the Commission.

… dokumentacja jest ***wyraźnie*** niekompletna, ponieważ nie zawiera niczego, co by uzasadniało rozpatrzenie sprawy przez Komisję. (*Paralela*, JRC-Acquis|32003R1335)

(142) This is an important step for the European Parliament towards opening the door to nations which are ***obviously*** European, such as the Georgians and the Armenians.

To ważny krok Parlamentu Europejskiego w kierunku otwarcia drzwi dla narodów ***ewidentnie*** europejskich, jakim jest naród gruziński czy ormiański. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-05-20-004)

When *obviously* qualifies a claim based on retrospective inference, requiring deduction and analyzing a situation from some distance, it is rendered with the inferential adverbs *widocznie, najwidoczniej* or *najwyraźniej*, as in (143)-(145).

(143) We ***obviously*** have different interpretations of the law.

Najwyraźniej interpretujemy prawo w odmienny sposób. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-06-18-014)

(144) ***Obviously***, for some reason women in particular feel the EU is somehow alien to them.

Najwyraźniej z jakiegoś powodu zwłaszcza kobiety uważają, że Unia Europejska jest im w jakimś stopniu obca. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-03-23-023)

(145) Did the President count the 40 Members who submitted this earlier on today? ***Obviously***, he did not.

Czy pan przewodniczący policzył wcześniej 40 posłów, którzy złożyli ten wniosek? ***Najwidoczniej*** nie. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-07-10-010)

As already noted, the most frequent translation equivalent of *obviously* in the function of a concurrence marker expressing accordance with expectations is *oczywiście* 'of course'. Another one is *naturalnie* 'naturally'. Such uses are illustrated in examples (146)-(148). *Oczywiście* and *natu-*

ralnie are also used as translation equivalents of *of course* (see Chapter 7), which indicates a functional similarity between *of course* and *obviously*.

(146) It is the Member State that estimates the amount of the premium based on objective criteria such as the market value of the vessel, its turnover, age, power and tonnage. The premium is ***obviously*** lower when the vessel is given a new use, since it retains a residual value.

Wysokość premii jest ustalana przez państwo członkowskie i zależy od obiektywnych kryteriów, takich jak wartość handlowa statku, obroty, jakie generował, jego wiek, moc silnika i tonaż. W przypadku przydzielenia statku do innych zadań wartość premii jest ***oczywiście*** mniejsza, ponieważ zachowuje on pewną wartość. (*Paralela*, EUBooks|KL-30-08-002)

(147) Mr President, we are at a turning point for the European Parliament in the setting up of a genuine area of freedom, security and justice, and the adoption of the Treaty of Lisbon allows us to strengthen democratic and jurisdictional control. ***Obviously*** I wish to support the requests of my fellow Members to come up with a list of priorities we can work on using an early codecision procedure, on the basis of an interinstitutional political agreement.

Nadszedł dla nas, Parlamentu Europejskiego, punkt zwrotny w procesie tworzenia rzeczywistego obszaru wolności, bezpieczeństwa i sprawiedliwości, a przyjęcie traktatu lizbońskiego pozwala nam na wzmocnienie kontroli demokratycznej i jurysdykcyjnej. ***Oczywiście*** chciałabym przychylić się do wniosku moich kolegów o sporządzenie listy priorytetów, nad którymi będziemy mogli pracować wykorzystując wczesną procedurę współdecyzji, w oparciu o międzyinstytucjonalne porozumienie polityczne. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-01-31-004)

(148) The current Community provisions on short-stay and transit visas form part of the Schengen acquis that has been integrated into the framework of the European Union. However, the existing acquis needs to be clarified, developed and supplemented.

This is also the case for the current provisions on airport transit visas. **Obviously**, the existing acquis on short-stay and transit visas and airport transit visas can only be developed by adopting Community measures based on the EC Treaty.

Obowiązujące przepisy Wspólnoty dotyczące wiz krótkoterminowych i tranzytowych stanowią część dorobku Schengen, który został włączony do ram prawnych Unii Europejskiej. Jednakże przepisy istniejącego dorobku prawnego należy objaśnić, rozwinąć i uzupełnić. Dotyczy to również obowiązujących przepisów w dziedzinie wiz lotniskowych. **Naturalnie** dorobek w dziedzinie wiz krótkoterminowych, tranzytowych i lotniskowych można rozwinąć jedynie, przyjmując środki wspólnotowe w oparciu o traktat WE. (*Paralela*, COM/2006/0403)

The translation corpus provides an illustration of the textual functions performed by *obviously*. The corpus data confirm the observation made in section 5.2.2, that *obviously* can be employed as an enumerative conjunct to signal a hierarchy of arguments. In such cases, it co-occurs with the degree modifier *most*, and is rendered as *przede wszystkim* 'first of all'. The connective uses of *obviously* and its Polish counterpart *przede wszystkim* are illustrated in examples (149) and (150).

(149)   The Treaty would give to the EU's democratic institutions, **most obviously** this Parliament, the powers they need.

Traktat dałby demokratycznym instytucjom UE, ***przede wszystkim*** Parlamentowi, uprawnienia, których instytucje te potrzebują. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-05-06-015)

(150)   Everyone agrees that the action taken this year, **most obviously** for Greece and Ireland, is also in the wider interests of the whole European Union and all its Member States.

Wszyscy zgadzają się, że działania podjęte w tym roku, ***przede wszystkim*** w odniesieniu do Grecji i Irlandii, leżą również w ogólniejszym interesie całej Unii Europejskiej oraz wszystkich jej państw członkowskich. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-12-15-005)

In sum, as in the case of *clearly, obviously* has several types of equivalents: (1) those which express synchronous inference and function as

subjuncts (emphasizers), such as *ewidentnie, wyraźnie*; (2) those which express retrospective inference, and function as disjuncts: *najwyraźniej, najwidoczniej, widocznie*; (3) those which express expectations, and function as concurrence markers: *oczywiście, naturalnie*; (4) those which perform textual functions, and signal a priority of arguments: *przede wszystkim*. In comparison with *clearly, obviously* is more often rendered by the expectation adverbs *oczywiście* and *naturalnie*, which indicates a more frequent use of the adverb as a concurrence marker (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 256). It is also more likely to perform textual functions, as markers of this type have not been identified as equivalents of *clearly* in the analyzed corpus sample.

5.4.3. Translation equivalents of *evidently*

As demonstrated in Table 8, the most frequent translation counterparts of *evidently* are the inferential adverbs *najwyraźniej, widocznie, najwidoczniej, wyraźnie* and *ewidentnie*. A relatively frequent equivalent is also the expectation adverb *oczywiście* 'of course'.

Polish has a literal equivalent of *evidently* – *ewidentnie*, but functionally, the two adverbs are only partial equivalents. *Ewidentnie* (and *wyraźnie*) are typically used as subjuncts expressing synchronous inference, and functioning as emphasizers. They are rarely used as disjuncts. The type of correspondence between *evidently* and *ewidentnie* is thus similar to the type of correspondence between *clearly* and its literal equivalent *wyraźnie*. They can be treated as equivalents when the English adverbs are used as subjuncts expressing synchronous inference, functioning as emphasizers, as in (151) and (152).

(151)   If we keep seeing situations in the same country which **evidently** violate human rights, we need to think about the structure and responsibility of that country.

To jest tak, że jeżeli w tym samym państwie co chwilę mamy do czynienia z sytuacjami, które **ewidentnie** łamią prawa człowieka, należy zastanowić się nad strukturą i odpowiedzialnością tego państwa. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-01-20-011-03)

(152)   I only wanted to ask whether this evaluation also takes into account the fact that a large number of people are still **evidently**

dependent upon this food aid programme and that almost 16 % of the European population lives below the poverty line, and whether it also takes account of the current food crisis and the spectacular growth in food prices.

Chcę tylko zapytać, czy ocena ta uwzględnia fakt, że duża liczba ludzi pozostaje ***ewidentnie*** uzależniona od programu pomocy żywnościowej, a niemal 16% populacji europejskiej żyje poniżej granicy ubóstwa, a także, czy uwzględnia on obecny kryzys żywnościowy i ogromny wzrost cen żywności. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-08-05-20-015)

When *evidently* qualifies retrospective inference and introduces a deductive judgement formed from a distance, it is closer to such inferential adverbs as *najwyraźniej* and *najwidoczniej*, as exemplified in (153) and (154).

(153) Small and medium-sized undertakings must be facilitated by reducing administrative burdens and simplifying procedures. ***Evidently***, though, discussions and amendments cannot be proposed at this stage owing to the fact that the report was started under one set of rules and was finalised and voted under another.

Należy ułatwiać działalność małym i średnim przedsiębiorstwom poprzez zmniejszanie obciążeń administracyjnych i upraszczanie procedur. ***Najwyraźniej*** jednak na tym etapie nie ma możliwości zaproponowania dyskusji ani zmian ze względu na to, że za podstawę sprawozdania przyjęto na początku inny zbiór zasad, a zostało ono zakończone i poddane głosowaniu w oparciu o zupełnie inne reguły. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-08-10-09-010)

(154) The much-lauded 'human rights' ***evidently*** stop at the borders of the privileged domains of the eurocracy.

Tak bardzo wychwalane 'prawa człowieka' ***najwidoczniej*** kończą się na granicy uprzywilejowanych domen eurokracji. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-07-10-006)

In those instances when *evidently* is used to appeal to common knowledge and expectations resulting from it, it is rendered by the expectation adverb *oczywiście* 'of course', as illustrated in (155) and (156).

(155) Any such strategy ***evidently*** should fully and coherently take up all policy areas, including critical issues such as food security, development and the environment.

Każda taka strategia powinna ***oczywiście*** objąć w pełni i w sposób jednolity wszystkie dziedziny przedmiotowej polityki, takie jak bezpieczeństwo żywnościowe, rozwój i ochronę środowiska. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-05-19-022)

(156) ***Evidently*** I share some of the considerations and points that have been made, although not all of them, so I will try to focus on the factors that need clarification. Firstly, I clearly agree that solutions cannot be implemented effectively by the European Union alone; that is quite obvious but also rather enlightening.

Oczywiście podzielam niektóre opinie i kwestie, które zostały podniesione, ale nie wszystkie, a zatem spróbuję skupić się na czynnikach, które wymagają wyjaśnienia. Po pierwsze, w pełni zgadzam się, że rozwiązania nie mogą być wdrażane efektywnie przez samą Unię Europejską; jest to oczywiste, ale także raczej jasne. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-04-22-011)

In sum, as in the case of *clearly* and *obviously*, different sets of adverbs are used as translation equivalents of *evidently* when it expresses synchronous inference, and different ones when it expresses retrospective inference and accordance with expectations.

5.4.4. Translation equivalents of *plainly*

As in the case of *clearly, obviously* and *evidently*, the inferential meanings of *plainly* are rendered by two types of equivalents in Polish: (1) those expressing synchronous inference, functioning as emphasizers, such as *wyraźnie*; (2) those expressing retrospective inference, functioning as disjuncts (sentence adverbs), such as *najwyraźniej* and *widocznie*. The use of *wyraźnie* as an equivalent of *plainly* indicating synchronous inference is illustrated in (157) and (158).

(157)   The revised rules are ***plainly*** far too strict, but better that than permitting neglect.

Zmienione zasady są ***wyraźnie*** zbyt restrykcyjne, ale to lepsze rozwiązanie, niż zezwalanie na nadużycia. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-07-11-29-003)

(158)   Well, the king is ***plainly*** in love with you.

Król ***wyraźnie*** jest w tobie zakochany. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|90806)

The uses of *najwyraźniej* as an equivalent of *plainly* qualifying retrospective inference are exemplified in (159) and (160).

(159)   Since it was realistic to expect that the guarantee would be invoked (though, ***plainly***, a precise figure could not be given), its aid intensity would correspond to the nominal amount.

Jeżeli, patrząc bardziej realistycznie, należy się liczyć ze skorzystaniem z gwarancji (choć ***najwyraźniej*** nie można obliczyć jej wysokości), wysokość pomocy z tytułu gwarancji odpowiada jej wartości nominalnej. (*Paralela*, JRC-Acquis|32005D0345)

(160)   Why we try and marry her off to gentry when ***plainly*** she'd prefer an undertaker.

Chcemy ją wydać za mąż arystokracie, podczas gdy ona ***najwyraźniej*** wolałaby grabarza. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|43756)

The translation equivalents of the non-modal uses *plainly* will not be discussed here as they fall outside the scope of the present study.

5.4.5. Translation equivalents of *manifestly*

The parallel corpus contains occurrences of *manifestly* as an adverb of manner and an inferential adverb. Its uses as a concurrence marker, discussed in section 5.2.5., have not been identified in the analyzed sample of the corpus. When used as an adverb of manner, it is rendered as *wyraźnie*. Most of its inferential equivalents identified in the corpus sample express synchronous inference and function as emphasizing subjuncts, i.e. *wyraźnie*, *ewidentnie* and *jawnie*, which confirms the observation made on the basis of its occurrences in the BNC that *manifestly* is typically used

as an emphasizer expressing synchronous inference. The use of *wyraźnie* and *ewidentnie* as equivalents of *manifestly* is exemplified in (161)-(163).

(161)   Commercially available applications such as GPS and Google Earth [...] are ***manifestly*** open to abuse.

Zastosowania dostępne na rynku, takie jak GPS i Google Earth […] są ***wyraźnie*** narażone na nadużycia. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|26460)

(162)   The tone of the report is ***manifestly*** dictatorial and the proposals for cooperation given are presented almost exclusively on the EU's terms and with the EU's own interests in the foreground.

Ton sprawozdania jest ***wyraźnie*** dyktatorski, a przedstawione w nim propozycje współpracy są prawie wyłącznie na warunkach UE i stawiają na pierwszym miejscu własne interesy Unii. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-07-11-15-006)

(163)   But we must also be honest and admit that there is ***manifestly*** no European consensus on a code of conduct as regards dictators.

Jednak musimy także uczciwie przyznać, że ***ewidentnie*** nie ma europejskiego konsensusu co do kodeksu postępowania w sprawie dyktatorów. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-07-11-14-005)

Wyraźnie and *ewidentnie* modify claims which express different types of evaluation: positive, negative, neutral. As noted in section 5.2.5, *manifestly* is typically used to introduce claims which express negative evaluation. Its uses in (161)-(163) represent this type as well. The adverb *jawnie*, which is also attested as its equivalent in the parallel corpus, performs a similar function in Polish (cf. Danielewiczowa 2012). It is not given as an equivalent of *manifestly* in any of the bilingual dictionaries consulted for the purposes of this study, but the contexts in which appears in the translation corpus indicate a functional similarity between the two items. In the parallel corpus, it usually appears as an equivalent of *manifestly* in texts concerning legal matters, as illustrated in (164) and (165).

(164) The application of a provision of the law designated by this Regulation may be refused only if such application is ***manifestly*** incompatible with the public policy of the forum.

Zastosowania przepisu prawa wyznaczonego w oparciu o niniejsze rozporządzenie można odmówić jedynie wówczas, gdyby takie zastosowanie było ***jawnie*** sprzeczne z porządkiem publicznym miejsca siedziby sądu. (*Paralela*, JRC-Acquis|52006PC0399)

(165) …if such recognition is ***manifestly*** contrary to the public policy of the Member State in which recognition is sought.

…jeżeli uznanie byłoby ***jawnie*** sprzeczne z porządkiem publicznym Państwa Członkowskiego, w którym wystąpiono o uznanie. (*Paralela*, JRC-Acquis|32003R2201)

In some cases, *manifestly* is rendered by the phrase *w sposób oczywisty* 'in an obvious way', which is often used to signal obviousness in Polish. Its frequency in the NKJP is 335 instances per 100 million words, as compared to only 1 instance of its literal English equivalent *in an obvious way* in the BNC. The relatively high frequency of the expression seems to result from the absence of an inferential adverb related to the adjective *oczywisty* 'obvious' in Polish. The use of *w sposób oczywisty* as an equivalent of *manifestly* is illustrated in (166).

(166) The criteria for rejecting an ECI are fairly limited and clear, i .e. if it is ***manifestly*** outside the Commission's competence, ***manifestly*** abusive or frivolous or ***manifestly*** against EU values.

Kryteria odrzucenia inicjatywy są dość ograniczone i jednoznaczne – odrzucane są inicjatywy, które wykraczają ***w sposób oczywisty*** poza kompetencje Komisji, są ***oczywistym*** nadużyciem, są oczywiście niepoważne lub ***w sposób oczywisty*** sprzeczne z wartościami Unii. (*Paralela*, RAPID|IP/12/336)

Manifestly also has numerous non-inferential equivalents which are used as emphasizers, such as *zdecydowanie* 'decidedly'/'definitely' and *zupełnie* 'completely'/'entirely', as illustrated in (167) and (168). The employment of such adverbs as translation equivalents of *manifestly* provides

further support for the claim that it is typically used as an emphasizer. Its role as a marker of deductive judgement seems to be minimal.

(167) It is therefore necessary to act immediately using the available mechanisms, and on this issue, I welcome the Commission's decision to release 2.8 million tonnes of cereals, a measure that is positive but ***manifestly*** insufficient.

Dlatego trzeba podjąć natychmiastowe działania z wykorzystaniem dostępnych mechanizmów i w tej kwestii cieszę się z decyzji Komisji o uruchomieniu 2,8 miliona ton zboża; ten środek jest korzystny, ale ***zdecydowanie*** niewystarczający. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-11-11-005)

(168) Of course, our political choices are ***manifestly*** different and are sometimes at odds with one another.

Oczywiście, nasze wybory polityczne są ***zupełnie*** różne i często stoją z sobą w sprzeczności. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-05-06-005)

5.4.6. Translation equivalents of *patently*

As shown in Table 8, *patently* has only thirty-four occurrences in the parallel corpus, fifteen of which are omitted in translation. Most of the omissions concern cases when *patently* is used as an emphasizer of evidential adjectives, such as *obvious* and *clear*, as illustrated in (169) and (170).

(169) It is ***patently*** <u>obvious</u> that the sexual exploitation of children should be brought to an end.

Jest (Ø) <u>oczywiste</u>, że wykorzystywaniu seksualnemu dzieci należy położyć kres. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-02-03-004)

(170) Mr President, it is ***patently*** <u>clear</u> that the Treaty of Lisbon takes a different approach to fundamental rights from that we have previously been used to.

To (Ø) <u>jasne</u>, że w Traktacie z Lizbony przyjęto zupełnie odmienne podejście do praw podstawowych niż to, do którego byliśmy przyzwyczajeni wcześniej. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-12-14-005)

Polish inferential adverbs tend not to be used as emphasizers of inferential adjectives. Such combinations are not attested in the National

Corpus of Polish. In some contexts of this type, the emphasizer *patently* corresponds to various non-evidential intensifiers, such as *całkiem* 'entirely' and *uderzająco* 'strikingly', as in (171) and (172).

(171) The core of the problem is ***patently*** <u>obvious</u>.

Sedno problemu jest ***całkiem*** <u>oczywiste</u>. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-08-03-12-011)

(172) However, it is ***patently*** <u>clear</u> that they are unable to replace the nuclear facilities in the short and medium term.

Jednakże ***uderzająco*** <u>oczywiste</u> jest to, że w krótkim i średnim okresie nie będą one w stanie zastąpić obiektów jądrowych. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-04-06-012)

Like the other inferential adverbs, *patently* has a different set of equivalents when it is used to express synchronous inference and a different one when it expresses retrospective inference. The adverbs which are used as its equivalents in the contexts when it expresses synchronous inference and functions as an emphasizer are *ewidentnie, wyraźnie*, and, less often, *jawnie*. As noted earlier (cf. section 5.4.5), *jawnie* tends to qualify negative opinions, often concerning legal matters; in (175), it qualifies the adjective *nielegalne (illegal)*. The uses of the three items as equivalents of *manifestly* are illustrated in examples (173)-(175).

(173) The so-called respect for the democratic decision of the voters is ***patently*** false.

Tak zwane poszanowanie dla demokratycznych decyzji głosujących jest ***ewidentnie*** fałszywe. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-08-10-22-007)

(174) Looking at these paragraphs, such negative positions clearly clash with our fundamental rights and freedoms and ***patently*** infringe the principle of subsidiarity.

Patrząc na te ustępy, widzimy, że tak negatywne stanowiska są jednoznacznie sprzeczne z podstawowymi prawami i swobodami i ***wyraźnie*** naruszają zasadę pomocniczości. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-03-24-004-17)

(175) This fund was designed for natural disasters such as earthquakes and floods. It has been reinterpreted to mean an economy that has run out of money. It is ***patently*** illegal.

Fundusz ten został stworzony na potrzeby klęsk żywiołowych, takich jak trzęsienia ziemi i powodzie. Dokonano jego reinterpretacji w taki sposób, że obejmuje gospodarkę, której skończyły się pieniądze. Jest to ***jawnie*** nielegalne. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-11-04-06-009)

In those cases when *patently* qualifies retrospective inference, it is rendered by the adverb *najwyraźniej*, which is also commonly used as an equivalent of the other inferential adverbs in such contexts. Its uses as an equivalent of *patently* are exemplified in (176) and (177).

(176) Firstly, without delay, it must open an independent investigation and look into the role of the army, which has ***patently*** failed to afford citizens effective protection.

Po pierwsze musi niezwłocznie wszcząć niezależne dochodzenie i przyjrzeć się roli wojska, które ***najwyraźniej*** nie potrafiło zapewnić mieszkańcom skutecznej ochrony. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-10-05-06-004)

(177) I had asked for comments concerning the Minutes. I would have expected the chair of the IND/DEM Group to understand what the President was saying and to focus his remarks on the Minutes. He ***patently*** failed to do that, and so we can now move on.

Poprosiłem o uwagi dotyczące protokołu. Należałoby oczekiwać, że przewodniczący grupy IND/DEM zrozumie, co mówi przewodniczący obradom, i w swoich uwagach skoncentruje się na protokole. ***Najwyraźniej*** nie miało to miejsca, możemy zatem przejść dalej. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-01-30-009)

5.4.7. Translation equivalents of *seemingly*

As illustrated in Table 8, in most of the instances *seemingly* is rendered by the verbal phrase *jak się wydaje/zdaje* 'it seems'. The other frequent equivalents include the items suggested by the bilingual dictionaries, *pozornie*

and *na pozór*, which are non-inferential adverbials expressing one of the meanings of *seemingly*: "appearing to be something, especially when this is not true" (*CALD*). Its inferential equivalents include *najwyraźniej, ewidentnie* and *wyraźnie*.

Pozornie and *na pozór/z pozoru* are used to signal that something appears to be true. Like *seemingly*, they are used in contexts which explicitly indicate that the claims they qualify are deceptive, as illustrated in (178) and (179).

(178) New approaches to these ***seemingly*** impossible questions will lead to unimaginable refinements in the world around us.

Nowe podejście do tych ***pozornie*** nierozwiązywalnych problemów pozwoli wprowadzić nieprawdopodobne wręcz udoskonalenia w otaczającym nas świecie. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|26387)

(179) For this study, the team used polypropyleneimine dendrimers as carriers for the genes and noted this specific dendrimer forms stable complexes with DNA that only ***seemingly*** break when inside tumour cells.

Na potrzeby badania zespół wykorzystał dendrymery PPI jako nośniki genów i zauważył, że właśnie ten dendrymer tworzy stabilne związki z DNA, które jedynie ***na pozór*** rozrywają się w środku komórek rakowych. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|30718)

Wydaje się 'it seems' is employed as an equivalent of *seemingly* when the adverb communicates that there is some evidence supporting the speaker's claim, but no reference to the evidence is given in the immediate context. Danielewiczowa (2002: 191-193) argues that *wydaje się* qualifies information which results from perception and reasoning. The examples attested in the corpus indicate that *seemingly* communicates that the speaker's claims are based on the facts and findings that the speaker is familiar with. Such uses are illustrated in examples (180) and (181).

(180) In plants, we show that the processes of extinction and speciation [the evolutionary process by which new species arise] are linked – ***seemingly*** the most vulnerable species are often the youngest.

W przypadku roślin wykazujemy, że procesy wymierania i specjacji [ewolucyjny proces powstawania nowych gatunków] są powiązane – ***wydaje się***, że najbardziej zagrożone gatunki są często najmłodsze. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|33450)

(181) With developments ***seemingly*** speeding up, there is an increasing relevance and need for mobile learning research focused on pedagogically meaningful approaches to mobile learning and systematically evaluated with appropriate data collection and analysis tools.

Wraz z postępami, które ***wydają się*** coraz szybsze wzrosły rola i zapotrzebowanie na badania nad mobilnym nauczaniem, ukierunkowane na istotne pod względem pedagogicznym podejścia do tej kwestii i systematycznie oceniane za pomocą odpowiedniego zbioru danych i narzędzi analitycznych. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|34209)

Najwyraźniej is employed as an equivalent of *seemingly* when it expresses retrospective inference, typically in those cases when the evidence for a claim or the source of the information given by the speaker is provided in the context, as in (182) and (183).

(182) We are hearing about the harassment of journalists and the intimidation of human rights activists, who are facing criminal charges. In addition, there were 200 arrests made in the wake of the recent protests in Baku in March and April. … The Azeri authorities have ***seemingly*** failed to understand that dialogue needs to be established between them and civil society, and not pressure being exerted by the authorities on society.

Słyszymy o szykanowaniu dziennikarzy i zastraszaniu działaczy na rzecz praw człowieka, którym stawiane są zarzuty karne. Ponadto w następstwie ostatnich protestów w Baku w marcu i kwietniu dokonano 200 aresztowań. … Władze azerskie ***najwyraźniej*** nie zrozumiały, że powinny nawiązać dialog ze społeczeństwem obywatelskim i że nie wolno im używać przemocy w stosunku do społeczeństwa. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-11-05-12-016-02)

(183) In these latest studies, the researchers from Duke University in North Carolina and Harvard University in Massachusetts found that while bonobos have **seemingly** never learnt to be selfish, chimps will do whatever it takes to get what they want – even if it means having to show a nasty side of themselves – as they get older.

W ramach ostatnich badań, naukowcy z Uniwersytetu Duke w Północnej Karolinie i Uniwersytetu Harvarda w Massachusetts odkryli, że podczas gdy bonobo **najwyraźniej** nigdy nie uczą się samolubności, to szympansy wraz z wiekiem zrobią wszystko, aby dostać to co chcą, nawet jeżeli oznacza to pokazanie się od tej gorszej strony. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|31722)

In the parallel corpus, *seemingly* frequently occurs in texts reporting scientific findings (e.g. CORDIS). It is not used to qualify inferences based on specific evidence, but it signals that a claim is rooted in empirical knowledge, and communicates that a case has been well documented.

5.4.8. Translation equivalents of *apparently*

The reportive equivalents of *apparently* are discussed in Chapter 4; this section focuses on its non-reportive counterparts. In its non-reportive uses, *apparently* functions as a subjunct: a downtoner, signalling that things are not necessarily what they appear to be; it is also used as a disjunct expressing retrospective inference and judgements based on unspecified evidence. When used as a subjunct, *apparently* is rendered as *pozornie* and *na pozór*. The two words have a similar etymology to *apparently*, as they are related to the noun *pozór* 'appearance, in particular when misleading' (Boryś 2006, translation mine: A.R.). In contrast to *apparently*, however, they have not developed reportive or inferential uses. Like *apparently*, both items are used to contrast what seems to be true with what is actually true, as in (184) and (185).

(184) In the 1980s, researchers began to realise that these **apparently** disparate specimens were in fact parts of the same animal.

W latach 80. XX w. naukowcy zaczęli sobie zdawać sprawę, że te **na pozór** odmienne okazy, były w rzeczywistości częściami jednego zwierzęcia. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|30599)

(185) Its transition to democratic rule and better times for its people appeared a promising prospect after the 2008 legislative elections were carried out in an **apparently** fair and peaceful manner.

Po **pozornie** uczciwych i pokojowych wyborach do parlamentu przeprowadzonych w roku 2008, wydawało się, że istnieje obiecująca perspektywa przemiany w państwo demokratyczne i nadejścia lepszych czasów dla narodu. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-03-12-013-01)

When *apparently* expresses retrospective inference, it is rendered as *najwyraźniej, widocznie*, *widać*, and *najwidoczniej*, as illustrated in (186) and (187).

(186) **Apparently** somebody else must've had something against him ... because we're not talking about a 9 mm here.

Najwyraźniej ktoś musiał mieć coś przeciwko niemu, bo nie mówimy o kalibrze 9mm. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|27291)

(187) The abelisaurids arms appear to be much weaker and simply vestigial remnants. Their finding however has allowed researchers to make a clearer picture of how these arms evolved. The trend **apparently** set in early on, and began at the distal end, says Rauhut.

Ramiona abelizaurów wydają się znacznie słabsze i są po prostu pozostałością szczątkową. Odkrycie umożliwiło jednak naukowcom nakreślić wyraźniejszy obraz ewolucji ramion. Trend wykształcił się **widocznie** dosyć wcześnie i rozpoczął się od końca odsiebnego – mówi dr Rauhut. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|34641)

In those cases when the type of evidence is unspecified, *apparently* is rendered by the epistemic verbs *wydaje się, zdaje się* 'it seems'/'it appears', which are also used as equivalents of *seemingly*. Another equivalent is the verbal phrase *wygląda na to* 'it looks as though', which is also used to sum-

marize situations on the basis of different types of evidence. The uses of the verbal phrases as equivalents of *apparently* are illustrated in examples (188) and (189).

(188)   The EESC proposes that the year of intercultural dialogue should be used to ensure that differences, inequalities, contradictions and conflicts which are **apparently** due to economic, social, environmental and political causes should not only be seen in ethnic or cultural terms; rather, by becoming familiar with and accepting the diversity of our cultures and using intercultural dialogue as an instrument we should avoid conflicts by identifying the causes underpinning them.

EKES proponuje, by Europejski Rok Dialogu Międzykulturowego został wykorzystany do zapewnienia, że różnicom, nierównościom, sprzecznościom czy konfliktom, które **zdają się** wynikać z przyczyn ekonomicznych, społecznych, środowiskowych czy politycznych, nie będzie się nadawać wyłącznie charakteru etnicznego czy kulturowego, oraz do podjęcia starań, by unikać konfliktów dzięki wykrywaniu ich powodów, jednocześnie uświadamiając sobie i w pełni akceptując różnice pomiędzy naszymi kulturami i korzystając z dialogu międzykulturowego jako odpowiedniego po temu narzędzia. (*Paralela*, JRC-Acquis|52006AE0590)

(189)   I may be taking a minute more than I usually do, but for Mr Ai Weiwei, it will take ten years longer, **apparently**.

Być może będę przemawiał o minutę dłużej, niż to robię zazwyczaj, ale **wygląda na to**, że Ai Weiwei będzie czekał dziesięć lat. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-04-07-010-01)

In sum, the analysis of the translation equivalents of *apparently* identified in the parallel corpus confirms the semantic and functional similarity between *apparently* and *seemingly*, noted earlier in this study. Both adverbs tend to indicate that the speaker's claim is based on evidence, but the existence of the evidence is often merely signalled. The speaker's conclusion does not result in a straightforward way from the analysis of available evidence. The epistemic component is stronger in such judgements than in the case of "inferences proper". The type of inference *apparently* and *seemingly* express can thus be termed conjecture (cf. Thornes 2018).

5.5. Inferential adverbs in Polish

As delimited in this study, the category of inferential adverbs in Polish comprises the following items: *wyraźnie, ewidentnie, jawnie, widocznie, najwyraźniej, najwidoczniej,* and *najoczywiściej* (see also Table 6 in section 5.1). A characteristic feature of the category is its formal diversity. The group comprises positive degree forms: *wyraźnie, ewidentnie, jawnie,* and *widocznie*, as well as three forms which are morphologically superlative: *najwyraźniej* (<*wyraźnie*), *najwidoczniej* (<*widocznie),* and *najoczywiściej* (<*oczywiście).* The superlative forms have developed a range of uses which are independent from their basic forms. *Najwidoczniej* and *najwyraźniej* are classified as distinct inferential markers in Polish linguistics (e.g. Grochowski *et al.* 2014; *WSJP*). *Najoczywiściej* is a low frequency adverb; it is not usually included in Polish studies of evidential markers. I suggested it as a potential member of the category in my earlier studies (Rozumko 2012a, 2016c), and to make this study complete, I have included it here as well.

In current Polish grammar the inferential adverbs are classified into two groups: (1) inferential particles, comprising *widocznie, najwyraźniej* and *najwidoczniej*; (2) metapredicative operators of gradation: *wyraźnie, ewidentnie* and *jawnie* (e.g. *WSJP*; Grochowski *et al.* 2014). The division is largely based on their degrees of syntactic flexibility: particles are flexible with respect to their syntactic position, while metapredicative operators tend to be used with items possessing specific semantic properties. The greater flexibility of particles allows them to be used as sentence adverbs, while metapredicative operators tend not to be used in this function, and usually modify sentence elements and their constituents. As argued earlier in this work, the category of metapredicative operators roughly corresponds to the category of subjuncts as identified by Quirk *et al.* (1985). However, while in English most inferential adverbs functioning as subjuncts can also be used as disjuncts, in Polish the two functions are typically performed by separate sets of adverbs. While this strict division adopted in Polish linguistics suggests that the two categories are entirely

distinct and have well-defined boundaries, data from the National Corpus of Polish suggest that some of the items classified as metapredicative operators (*wyraźnie* and *ewidentnie*) have uses which indicate that they could be classified as particles. Likewise, Danielewiczowa (2012: 171) argues that *wyraźnie* shows the syntactic properties of particles. In addition to their syntactic properties, the two sets differ with respect to the type of inference they qualify. The metapredicative operators of gradation (*wyraźnie, ewidentnie, jawnie*) typically (though not always) qualify synchronous inference, while the inferential particles (*widocznie, najwyraźniej, najwidoczniej, najoczywiściej*) usually express retrospective inference. In the sections which follow, the inferential adverbs are divided into two sets, as outlined above, and discussed accordingly.

5.5.1. *Wyraźnie, ewidentnie, jawnie*

a. *Wyraźnie*

Wyraźnie is a literal equivalent of *clearly*. The two adverbs can usually be considered as equivalents in their uses as adverbs of manner and in their uses as subjuncts qualifying synchronous inference, functioning as emphasizers. Occasionally, *wyraźnie* can be used to express retrospective inference, but *clearly* performs this function more often.

In its uses as an adverb of manner, *wyraźnie* modifies verbs, e.g. verbs of speaking, such as *mówić* 'speak', and verbs of perception, such as *słyszeć* 'hear' and *czuć* 'smell', as in (190).

(190)   ***Wyraźnie*** słyszałem, że jedna strona wydała nieco bardziej przytłumiony dźwięk niż druga. (NKJP, fiction, M. Olszewski, *Chwalcie łąki umajone*, 2005)

'I heard ***clearly*** that the sound on one side was a little more subdued than on the other.'

Unlike *clearly*, *wyraźnie* does not modify mental verbs, such as *myśleć* 'think' or *rozumieć* 'understand'. It can be graded: *wyraźniej, najwyraźniej*. *Najwyraźniej*, which in other contexts functions as an inference marker, is also used as the superlative form of *wyraźnie* in its manner sense, and modifies verbs of perception, as in (191).

(191)   Ten spadek wartości spółki ***najwyraźniej*** było widać w spadającym kursie spółki. (NKJP, proceedings of a parliamentary inquiry committee, 2004)

'The decrease in the company's value was ***most clearly*** visible in its falling position on the stock market.'

In its use as an inferential marker, *wyraźnie* usually qualifies synchronous inference, and relates to sentence elements, such as subject complements, and their constituents. Such uses are illustrated in examples (192)-(194).

(192)   Ostatnio matka była ***wyraźnie*** zmęczona. – Dlaczego nie wyjdziesz gdzieś czasem? – zagadnęła ją Beata. – Może spotkasz się ze znajomymi? (NKJP, fiction, G. Plebanek, *Dziewczyny z Portofino*, 2005)

'Mother has ***clearly*** been tired lately. – Why don't you go out some time? – Beata asked her. – Why don't you see your friends?'

(193)   Zaraz, zaraz, bo się pogubię. – Pani profesor była ***wyraźnie*** zainteresowana całą historią. – W listopadzie minionego roku mamy zbrodnię imitację a la Marchwicki, a w maju bieżącego roku mamy zbrodnię imitację a la Staniak, tak? Czyżby ich obu dokonał ten sam morderca naśladowca? (NKJP, fiction, M. Krajewski, M. Czubaj, *Róże cmentarne*, 2009)

'Hold on a second or I will get confused. – The Professor was ***clearly*** interested in hearing the whole story. – Last November someone committed a crime imitating the crime earlier committed by Marchwicki, and in May someone committed a crime à la Staniak, is that right? Could both crimes have been committed by the same murderer-imitator?'

(194)   Znudzony żonglerką, zaczął rzucać we mnie, przy aprobacie kolegów. ***Wyraźnie*** mnie prowokował. (NKJP, E. Białołęcka, *Tkacz iluzji*, 2004)

'Bored with juggling, he started throwing the ball at me, much to his friends' approval. He was ***clearly*** provoking me.'

In (192)-(194), *wyraźnie* qualifies opinions formed as a result of observation and analysis of easily perceptible evidence, i.e. the behaviour and appearance of the people about whom the claims are made. The speakers provide comments on what they see (or saw), and draw conclusions on the basis of "the signs" (cf. Plungian 2001) they observe.

While in most cases *wyraźnie* qualifies synchronous inference, there are also cases in the NKJP when it signals retrospective inference, i.e. a conclusion formed as a result of deduction, connecting facts, analysis of symptoms and results, as in (195) and (196).

(195) Zamiast niego wpadło dwóch ubranych po cywilnemu policjantów. Zabrali włosy i zadawszy każdemu po zaledwie kilka standardowych pytań, wyszli. Nie byli zbyt rozmowni, wszelkie skierowane do nich uwagi zbywali krótkim 'zobaczymy' lub 'nie wolno nam o tym rozmawiać'. ***Wyraźnie*** kazano im się pospieszyć. (NKJP, fiction, M. Kaszyński, *Rytuał*, 2008)

'Two policemen in civilian clothes came instead of him. They took the hair, asked everyone several routine questions and left. They weren't very talkative. They dismissed all our questions with 'we'll see' or 'we are not allowed to talk about it'. ***Clearly***, they had been told to hurry.'

(196) Nadine skłoniła się ku niej przez poręcz krzesła. – Nie mogę jeść – poskarżyła się. ***Wyraźnie*** podczas swojej nieobecności musiała wznieść się na wyższy poziom odbioru. (NKJP, fiction, I. Filipiak, *Magiczne oko. Opowiadania zebrane*, 2006)

'Nadine leaned towards her over the chair. – I can't eat – she complained. ***Clearly***, during her absence she must have raised herself to a higher perception level.'

Both (195) and (196) are examples of *a posteriori* (retrospective) inference, made on the basis of the results of past time events. In both of them *wyraźnie* functions as a sentence adverb. The statements are more emphatic when qualified by *wyraźnie* than they would be if an inferential adverb such as *najwyraźniej* were used instead. While the role of an emphasizer seems to be the primary function of *wyraźnie*, some of its uses indicate its ability to express retrospective inference.

b. *Ewidentnie*

Ewidentnie is a literal equivalent of *evidently*, but, as in the case *clearly* and *wyraźnie*, they are close equivalents mostly when they are used as subjuncts expressing synchronous inference and functioning as emphasizers. The *WSJP* does not include any uses of *ewidentnie* as an adverbial of manner; it classifies it as a metapredicative operator of gradation. Some of the instances identified in the National Corpus of Polish can perhaps be considered as intermediate between the manner and the inferential sense, as in (197), where it modifies the verb *widać* 'it can be seen', and in (198), where it modifies the verb *słychać* 'it can be seen'.

(197) Jest gorącym fanem swojej drużyny i nawet podczas meczu, gdy ***ewidentnie*** widać, że jego drużyna słabo gra (a on potrafi to ocenić), mimo wszystko wierzy w zwycięstwo. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Gazeta Krakowska*, 2004)

'He's a great fan of his team; even when it can be ***clearly*** seen during a match that they are playing badly (he knows when this is the case) he believes in their victory.'

(198) Nie wiem, co prawda, w jakim stopniu muzycy Kawałka Kulki inspirowali się twórczością takich kapel jak Sztywny Pal Azji, Róże Europy czy Malarze i Żołnierze, ale ***ewidentnie*** słychać ich wpływy w większości numerów na płycie. (NKJP, fiction, *Esensja*, 2008)

'I don't know to what extent the musicians of Kawałek Kulki were inspired by the work of such bands as Sztywny Pal Azji, Róże Europy and Malarze i Żołnierze, but their influence can be ***clearly*** heard in most of the songs on their album.'

Słychać and *widać* are non-finite forms; *ewidentnie* is not attested with finite verbs in the NKJP. Such uses seem to function in the border area between the propositional and non-propositional content, i.e. between the textual and metatextual levels of language. In the NKJP, there are also instances of *ewidentnie* used with the verb *widać* 'it can be seen', where its superlative form is employed, as in (199).

(199) Tu nie chodzi o dokopywanie, tylko o pewne proste prawdy, które nie trafiają do ludzi broniących religii tak, że tylko jeszcze

bardziej jej szkodzą, co na tej grupie widać już *najewidentniej* (NKJP, Usenet, 2008)

'This is not about kicking anyone's ass, but about some simple truths which are overlooked by people who try to defend religion but instead they act against it. It can be **most clearly** seen in this group.'

As already noted, in most of its uses, *ewidentnie* functions as an emphasizer, modifying sentence elements and their constituents, and expressing synchronous inference. It communicates that the evidence the speaker has for a claim is clear, unambiguous and easily perceptible. Such uses are illustrated in examples (200)-(202).

(200)   Dłoń miała szczupłą, poznaczoną żółtymi plamami, paznokcie połamane i nierówne, *ewidentnie* obgryzione. (NKJP, fiction, A. Sapkowski, *Chrzest ognia*, 2001)

'Her hand was slim, with yellow spots, her nails broken and uneven, *evidently* bitten.'

(201)   To postmodernistyczne podejście autora, klejącego opowieść ze skrawków naszej kultury i strzępków najdawniejszych legend fantasy, może się podobać. Guzek ma do tego *ewidentnie* talent. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Esensja*, 2007)

'The author's postmodernist way of making a story from fragments of our culture and the remains of the oldest fantasy legends may be considered attractive. Guzek *evidently* has a talent for that.'

(202)   Duńczycy pierwszego gola w ogóle nie strzelili. *Ewidentnie* był słupek. (NKJP, *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 02.04.1993)

'The Danes did not score the first goal at all. They *evidently* hit the goalpost.'

Some of the uses of *ewidentnie* identified in the NKJP indicate that in addition to functioning as an emphasizer, the adverb can also be used to express retrospective inference, e.g. (203) and (204).

(203)   Oddamy konia prawowitemu posiadaczowi. Pod warunkiem, że go napotkamy. Przed czym niechaj, błagam, ustrzegą nas

bogi. Błaganie *ewidentnie* nie dotarło do adresatów lub nie zostało wysłuchane, albowiem przesieka zaroiła się nagle od pieszych, zdyszanych i wskazujących konia palcami... (NKJP, fiction, A. Sapkowski, *Narrenturm*, 2002)

'We'll return the horse to its lawful owner. Provided that we meet him, which, with gods' help, will not happen. The gods *evidently* did not hear him or did not want to comply with his request as the clearing suddenly filled with people pointing their fingers at the horse…'

(204)   Ta biedaczka miała na nodze opatrunek, a zabito ją z broni kalibru 5,56 mm. W dodatku bardzo nieprofesjonalnie, nie tak jak się tu zabijało po tylu latach praktyki. *Ewidentnie* komuś puściły nerwy. No a potem ją pochował, zamiast porzucić w jakimś rowie. (NKJP, fiction, A. Baniewicz, *Góra trzech szkieletów*, 2003)

'The poor woman had a bandage on her leg; she'd been killed by a 5.56 mm firearm. In a very unprofessional way, by the way. Here, after so many years of practice, no one killed like this. *Evidently* someone had got carried away. And then buried her, instead of leaving her body in some ditch.'

Najewidentniej, the superlative form of *ewidentnie*, is also used to express inference, as illustrated in (205).

(205)   Wszyscy higieniści i uzdrowiciele, sam Kaszpirowski nawet, usilnie zalecali w celu uniknięcia zagrożenia skażeniem bakteryjnym wodę tę przed spożyciem przegotować. Ksiądz sąsiad *najewidentniej* wziął sobie te rady i ostrzeżenia do serca, bardzo akuratnie stosował się do zaleceń. Nie zestawiał czajnika z fajerek, woda tam u niego gotowała się i jeszcze raz gotowała. (NKJP, fiction, M. Pilot, *Na odchodnym*, 2002)

'All hygienists and healers, even Kaszpirowski, strongly advised that the water should be boiled before drinking. Our neighbour, the priest, *evidently* took those suggestions and warnings to his heart. His kettle was always on the cooker, the water was boiling again and again.'

In examples (203)-(205), *ewidentnie* qualifies inferences concerning prior events, based on the analysis of circumstantial evidence. It is substitutable in such contexts with adverbs expressing retrospective inference, such as *najwyraźniej*, *widocznie* and *najwidoczniej*.

c. *Jawnie*

Jawnie derives from the adjective *jawny* 'open, overt', and this sense is retained in its uses as an adverb of manner: e.g. *działać jawnie* 'act openly', *głosować jawnie* 'vote openly', as illustrated in (206).

(206) Ze względu na wagę wczorajszej decyzji parlamentarzyści głosowali ***jawnie***, jeden po drugim. (NKJP, *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 1996)

'Because of the importance of yesterday's decision, the MPs voted ***openly***, one after another.'

In its inferential use *jawnie* is an emphasizer qualifying claims based on synchronous inference. As noted by Danielewiczowa (2012: 176-177), it is characteristically used to introduce disapproving comments and negative opinions.

(207) Pułkownik przestał się hamować i rzucił mu ***jawnie*** nienawistne spojrzenie.(NKJP, A. Baniewicz, *Drzymalski przeciw Rzeczpospolitej*, 2004)

'The colonel ceased to control himself, and gave him an ***evidently*** hateful look.'

(208) Przykuse, staroświeckie, ***jawnie*** niewystarczające definicje. (NKJP, fiction, M. Pilot, *Na odchodnym*, 2002)

'Short, outmoded, ***evidently*** insufficient definitions.'

(209) Dotąd z łatwością ferowaliśmy sądy o tym, co jest ***jawnie*** niemoralne. (NKJP, fiction, M.Miller, *Pierwszy milion*…, 1999)

'So far, we have eagerly formulated judgements concerning things which are ***manifestly*** immoral.'

The tendency to emphasize critical opinions makes *jawnie* similar to *manifestly* and *patently*. In the parallel corpus, it is employed as a translation equivalent of the two adverbs in such contexts. In contrast to both *manifestly*, and *wyraźnie* and *ewidentnie*, *jawnie* does not seem to be used to qualify retrospective inference. In the NKJP, it is only attested as an adverb of manner and an emphasizer.

5.5.2. *Najwyraźniej, widocznie, najwidoczniej, najoczywiściej*
a. *Najwyraźniej*

As already noted, *najwyraźniej* is the superlative form of the adverb *wyraźnie* 'clearly', which has developed into a distinct inferential marker. In its inferential uses *najwyraźniej* is typically used to qualify retrospective inference, i.e. it introduces conclusions based on the analysis of results and symptoms, as in (210)-(212).

(210) Po ponownej lekturze fragmentów tego komiksu rozsianych po różnych zinach przyznaję, że jest w nim wyraźna nić fabularna, łącząca większość epizodów we w miarę spójną całość, której ***najwyraźniej*** wcześniej nie dostrzegłem. Co nie zmienia faktu, że komiks jakoś mnie specjalnie nie porywa. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Esensja*, 2008)

'Having read some fragments of this comic book for the second time, I do admit that there is a common thread linking most of the episodes into quite a coherent whole which I ***clearly*** did not notice before.'

(211) Ludmiła ***najwyraźniej*** zdążyła skoczyć do domu, bo jej makijaż był jak zwykle perfekcyjny, strój zaś pasował do świątecznego poranka. (NKJP, fiction, I. Matuszkiewicz, *Czarna wdowa atakuje*, 2009)

'Ludmiła had ***clearly*** managed to stop at home as her makeup was perfect as usual, and her clothes were appropriate for the occasion.'

(212) Teraz ***najwyraźniej*** <u>musiał</u> go obudzić jakiś szmer, bo zerwał się półprzytomny... (NKJP, fiction, Anna 'Cranberry' Nieznaj, *Przed burzą*, 2007)

'Some rustle <u>must</u> have ***clearly*** woken him up, as he jumped out of his bed, half-conscious…'

As illustrated in (212), *najwyraźniej* co-occurs with the inferential verb *musieć* 'must'. The two markers reinforce each other's meanings, and both qualify retrospective inference. In contrast to English inferential markers, *najwyraźniej* has not developed the sense of expectations, and is not used as a concurrence marker.

b. *Widocznie*

Widocznie can be used as an adverb of manner and an inferential adverb. In its inferential sense, it is not used as an emphasizer; it always functions as a sentence adverb expressing retrospective inference. When used as a manner adverb, *widocznie* means 'in a perceptible way', but such instances are infrequent in the NKJP (cf. also Grochowski *et al.* 2014). I have identified only one such case, quoted in (213).

> (213)   Z radością zauważył, że światełko zaczęło się powiększać. Powoli oczywiście, ale ***widocznie***. (NKJP, fiction, M. Sieniewicz, *Czwarte niebo*, 2003)
>
> 'He noted with joy that the light started getting bigger. Slowly, of course, but ***in a perceptible way***.'

In its uses as an inferential adverb it expresses a lower level of confidence than the inferential markers *najwyraźniej* and *najwidoczniej*. The type of inference it expresses can be referred to as conjecture (compare: *seemingly* and *apparently*), as its reliance on evidence is less strong than in the case of those adverbs which express inference proper. In its definition of *widocznie*, the *WSJP* suggests that the adverb signals some degree of uncertainty and lack of knowledge.

Widocznie qualifies retrospective inference, and, like *najwyraźniej*, it often co-occurs with the inferential verb *musieć* 'must', as illustrated in (214). *Widocznie* typically refers to past time situations which the speaker attempts to explain from his/her current (*a posteriori*) perspective, as illustrated in (214), or present-time situations for which only indirect circumstantial evidence is available, as in (215).

> (214)   Właściwie nie opłaca się siać, w zbożu, więcej jest plastikowych śmieci i innych odpadów niż czego innego. Dzisiaj nie widać

ich tak dużo, ***widocznie*** <u>musiał</u> je rozmyć deszcz, a część wyzbierali. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Mazowieckie To i Owo*, 2007)

'In fact, sowing crops doesn't pay anymore. There are more plastic bottles and other waste in the crops than anything else. Today it doesn't look so bad. ***Apparently*** the rain must have moved some of it away or someone collected it.'

> (215)   Znowu brzęk narzędzi, ***widocznie*** ojciec wyjmuje je z wrzątku i rozkłada na szklanej płytce. (NKJP, fiction, I. Jurgielewiczowa, *Ten obcy*, 1961)
>
> 'Another clink of the [medical] instruments, ***apparently*** father is taking them out of the hot water and placing them on a glass plate.'

In (215) *widocznie* signals that the speaker has no visual access to evidence; she cannot see and is not sure what her father is doing. The evidence is not easily perceptible, which makes it impossible for the speaker to make a more confident statement. The inference is made from a distance, on the basis of the sounds she hears and the knowledge she has of what her father may be doing in this situation.

c. *Najwidoczniej*

Najwidoczniej expresses retrospective inference; it does not function as an emphasizer or an adverb of manner. Its uses are illustrated in examples (216)-(218). Like the other markers of retrospective inference, *najwidoczniej* often co-occurs with the inferrential verb *musieć* 'must', as in (218).

> (216)   Wilhelm Kleibömer ubrany był wieczorowo. ***Najwidoczniej*** wracał z opery. (NKJP, fiction, M. Krajewski, *Koniec świata w Breslau*, 2003)
>
> 'Wilhelm Kleibömer was wearing his evening clothes. ***Clearly***, he was returning from the opera.'

> (217)   Z jednej strony ciągnęły się stacyjne zabudowania, dość porządne, nie uszkodzone ***najwidoczniej*** w czasie działań wojennych… (NKJP, J. Andrzejewski, fiction, *Noc i inne opowiadania*, 2001)

'On one side, there were railway buildings, quite decent; ***apparently*** they were not destroyed during the war ….'

(218) … trujący wywar zakupiła u mistrza Witelona we Wrocławiu, lecz w dobrej wierze, była bowiem przekonana, iż nabywa lekarstwo. Wrocławski medyk <u>musiał</u> ***najwidoczniej*** pomylić flaszki… (NKJP, fiction, W. Jabłoński, *Metamorfozy*, 2004)

'She bought the poisonous potion from master Witelon in Wrocław; she did it in good faith, as she was convinced that it was some medication. The physician must have ***clearly*** confused the bottles.'

d. *Najoczywiściej*

Najoczywiściej is the superlative form of the adverb *oczywiście* 'of course'. It is the least frequent item in the group. In the NKJP, it is only attested in written sources (see Table 27); some of them excerpted from early 20th-century literature. The adverb *oczywiście*, which *najoczywiściej* derives from, does not usually express inferential meanings in contemporary Polish. The superlative form is semantically closer to the adjective *oczywisty* 'obvious', which both adverbs go back to. Grochowski *et al.* (2014: 97) note that Polish speakers occasionally use the adverb *oczywiście* to express an evidential sense. In their opinion such uses appear as a result of analogy to other adjective-adverb pairs existing in Polish, like adj. *wyraźny*/adv. *wyraźnie* ('clear/clearly'). The use of *najoczywiściej* may perhaps also be interpreted as an attempt made by native speakers to fill what is perceived as a void in the repertoire of inferential adverbs in Polish. Its uses are illustrated in examples (219) and (220).

(219) Po raz drugi Polska sugerowała podobną reakcję, gdy Hitler naruszył natępne postanowienie traktatowe, o demilitaryzacji Nadrenii. To działanie bezpośrednio zagrażało Francji i było w nią ***najoczywiściej*** wymierzone ... (NKJP, fiction, A. Anonimus, *Nie nadaje się, przecież to jeszcze szczeniak*, 1999)

'Poland suggested a similar reaction again when Hitler violated another point of the treaty, concerning the demilitarization of the Rhineland. That action directly threatened France and was ***evidently*** aimed against France…'

(220) Była to ***najoczywiściej*** przyjezdna – z miasta czy z daleka – … gdyż w sposób wielkomiejski wszystkiemu się dziwiła (NKJP, fiction, S. Żeromski, *Przedwiośnie*, 1925 [1997])

'She was ***evidently*** a newcomer – from the city or from far away – … as she reacted to everything with amazement, the way city dwellers do.'

5.6. Inferential adverbs in English and Polish: summary and comparison

In English, inferential adverbs form a rich category which is both semantically and functionally varied. They can be divided into two types, based on the nature of their relation to evidence:

– adverbs expressing evidence-based inference: *clearly, evidently, obviously, patently, plainly,* and *manifestly*;

– adverbs expressing conjecture, i.e. a type of inference which is less directly based on evidence: *seemingly* and *apparently.*

Adverbs expressing conjecture signal that the speaker has access to some information on which his/her claims are based. Their reliance on evidence supporting a claim is not as strong and straightforward as in the case of adverbs expressing "inference proper". In most cases they signal that there is some evidence, which, when combined with the speaker's knowledge, enables the speaker to make a given claim. In comparison to adverbs expressing evidence-based inference, *seemingly* and *apparently* leave more space for alternative positions, and, as such, they are more dialogically expansive.

Both types of adverbs can be used to indicate two types of judgement: synchronous, i.e. based on close observation and analysis of easily perceptible evidence available to the speaker, and retrospective, i.e. resulting from an analysis of results, symptoms, and deduction (cf. also Plungian 2001). Expressing synchronous inference is characteristic of the use of inferential adverbs in the function of subjuncts, i.e. modifiers of sentence elements and their constituents. In such cases, adverbs expressing inference proper function as emphasizers, i.e. they emphasize the clarity and perceptibility of evidence, thus adding force to the qualified elements. In

Martin and White's (2005) terms, they can be said to function as markers of pronouncement, as by emphasizing the speaker's position they limit the dialogic space for other alternatives. They can thus be classified as dialogically contractive. Adverbs expressing conjecture, i.e. *seemingly* and *apparently*, in contrast, function as downtoners, i.e. they signal that the easily perceptible evidence is deceptive, thus diminishing the force of the qualified claims. When used as disjuncts, adverbs in both groups express retrospective inference, i.e. they summarize situations from some distance. Markers of retrospective inference tend to be dialogically expansive, because opinions formulated as a result of deduction can be treated as valid until counter evidence appears (cf. Martin and White 2005). The BNC data indicate that all the English inferential adverbs can be used to express both synchronous and retrospective inference, but the less frequent ones, i.e. *patently* and *manifestly*, are mostly used as markers of synchronous inference, and as emphasizers.

English inferential adverbs show the tendency to develop the sense of expectations, and are used as concurrence markers (cf. White 2003; Martin and White 2005). In such uses, they appeal to the common ground between the speaker and the addressee. The sense of expectations is particularly clear in the semantics of *obviously*; it is also expressed by *clearly*, *evidently* and *manifestly*. References to expectations have not been identified in the uses of *plainly* and *patently* in the analyzed corpus data. Adverbs expressing conjecture do not indicate accordance with expectations.

In Polish, the category of inferential adverbs comprises: *wyraźnie, ewidentnie, jawnie, widocznie, najwyraźniej, najwidoczniej*, and *najoczywiściej*. *Najoczywiściej* is infrequent; it is a marginal member of the category, usually omitted from Polish grammars and dictionaries. The superlative forms *najwyraźniej* and *najwidoczniej* are treated as distinct markers in Polish linguistics (distinct from the positive degree forms *wyraźnie* and *widocznie*) in contrast to the superlative forms of the English adverbs, such as *most clearly* and *most evidently*. Such treatment results from the fact that the superlatives have developed their own range of meanings and functions, but to some extent, it also reflects the theoretical assumptions of most of the recent Polish studies of modal adverbs, which show preference for a strict separation of synchrony and diachrony (see Chapter 3).

Like their English equivalents, Polish inferential adverbs can be divided into two types depending on the nature of their relation to evidence:
- adverbs expressing evidence-based inference: *wyraźnie, ewidentnie, jawnie, najwyraźniej, najwidoczniej, najoczywiściej;*
- adverbs expressing conjecture: *widocznie.*

Like their English counterparts, most of the Polish inferential adverbs signal strong and direct reliance on evidence. Polish inferential adverbs also express two types of inference: synchronous and retrospective. However, while in English the same items tend to express both types of inference in different contexts, in Polish each of them typically expresses only one type. *Wyraźnie, ewidentnie* and *jawnie* are markers of synchronous inference, and function as emphasizers, while *widocznie, najwyraźniej* and *najwidoczniej* qualify retrospective inference. The two groups tend to be separated in Polish studies, and classified as different word classes. The adverbs expressing synchronous inference are classified as metapredicative operators, while those expressing retrospective inference are classified as particles, though it is not the type of inference they express, but their syntactic flexibility that serves as the major classification criterion (cf. Grochowski *et al.* 2014; *WSJP*). However, the distinctions are not absolutely clear-cut, and adverbs representing one set can occasionally be found to behave like those representing the other set. Unlike their English equivalents, Polish inferential adverbs do not appear to express accordance with expectations, and do not function as concurrence markers. Only the low frequency adverb *najoczywiściej*, which is related to the expectation adverb *oczywiście*, seems to be able to express expectations in some of its uses; it is, however, rarely used and poorly evidenced in the corpus.

As far as the cross-linguistic correspondences are concerned, only *clearly* and *evidently* have literal equivalents in Polish (*wyraźnie* and *ewidentnie*), but the two English adverbs are substantially more frequent as markers of retrospective inference than their Polish counterparts. *Obviously* does not have a close equivalent among Polish inferential adverbs; as indicated by the data from the parallel corpus, its most frequent translation equivalent is the expectation adverb *oczywiście*. Generally speaking, data from the parallel corpus indicate that the English adverbs expressing

synchronous inference and functioning as emphasizers are rendered as *wyraźnie* and *ewidentnie*. If the emphasized quality is negative, *jawnie* is also used. In those cases when the English adverbs express retrospective inference, they are rendered as *najwyraźniej, najwidoczniej,* and *widocznie*. *Seemingly* and *apparently* often correspond to the verbal phrases *wydaje się/zdaje się* 'it seems/it appears' in the parallel corpus.

6. Confirmatory adverbs in English and Polish

6.1. Introduction

As defined in this work, confirmatory adverbs are those which confirm prior statements and prior expectations. In this study the term is only used to refer to the epistemic adverbs which function as markers of confirmation; the non-epistemic adverbs which perform similar functions (e.g. *quite, absolutely*) are not taken into consideration. In English, the category comprises: *indeed, of course,* and *naturally*; in Polish: *rzeczywiście, faktycznie, istotnie, oczywiście,* and *naturalnie*. *Of course* and *naturally* are included in Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer's (2007) category of expectation adverbs. However, since the sense of expectations is also expressed by inferential adverbs in English (see Chapter 5), it does not seem to be a sufficiently distinctive feature to be used as a label for this set of adverbs. *Of course*, *naturally,* and *indeed* all have confirmatory functions which distinguish them from other epistemic adverbs. The category of confirmatory adverbs as recently distinguished in Polish linguistics (Grochowski *et al*. 2014) only comprises those items which are used to confirm prior statements, i.e. *rzeczywiście, faktycznie,* and *istotnie*. Grochowski *et al.* (2014) place *oczywiście* and *naturalnie* in the category of particles of conviction (Pol. *przeświadczenia*). *Oczywiście* and *naturalnie* signal that the situation is in agreement with prior expectations, and as such they also have confirmatory functions. In this book the two sets are subsumed under the same category.

Since all the adverbs discussed in this chapter are engaged in confirmation, they explicitly acknowledge the existence of different voices, and signal a heteroglossic nature of discourse (cf. White 2003; Martin and

White 2005). In addition to indicating the speaker's perspective, they perform important interpersonal and textual functions. They signal positions adopted by the speaker towards the addressee and towards other voices acknowledged in the text; they help to establish common ground between discourse participants and, to varying degrees, they help to organize the flow of discourse. Because of their dialogic and rhetorical usefulness, they are frequently used in both English and Polish. Biber *et al.* (1999: 867) report that *of course* is one of the three most common epistemic stance adverbials in all registers, as evidenced by the *Longman Spoken and Written English Corpus*, the other ones being *perhaps* and *probably*. The frequencies of the English and Polish confirmatory adverbs in the British National Corpus (BNC) and the National Corpus of Polish (NKJP), respectively, are provided in Table 9.

Table 9. The frequencies of English and Polish confirmatory adverbs

English adverbs	Freq per 100 m words (BNC)	Polish adverbs	Freq per 100 m words (NKJP)
of course	29,641	*oczywiście*	35,176
indeed	18,391	*rzeczywiście*	14,979
naturally	4,124	*faktycznie*	4,605
		istotnie	2,915
		naturalnie	1,854

The discussion which follows begins with the analysis of the most frequent English adverb in the group, i.e. *of course*, and then moves to the analysis of the functions of *naturally* and *indeed*. The discussion of the English confirmatory adverbs is followed by a study of their equivalents in Polish, and a cross-linguistic comparison of the category.

6.2. Confirmatory adverbs in English

6.2.1. *Of course*

Of course is "used to introduce an idea or action as being obvious or to be expected" (*OD*). This basic sense allows the adverb to be used in a variety of contexts, and perform a number of discourse functions. *Of course* has received considerable attention from a number of scholars, e.g.

Holmes (1988), Simon-Vandenbergen (1992), Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2003, 2007), Lewis (2003), Simon-Vandenbergen *et al.* (2007), and Aijmer (2013). Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 173) note the relation of *of course* to the Latin word *cursus* 'run, race, course', and its change "from the noun to a circumstantial adverb and then to a sentence adverb". Its structure is similar to that of *indeed*: preposition plus noun, but Quirk *et al.* (1985: 621-622) classify *indeed* as an adverb, and *of course* as a prepositional phrase. They list it as one of the prepositional phrases which perform the function of content disjuncts, and convey "some evaluation of or attitude towards what is said" (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 621). As the meanings and functions of *of course* have been discussed extensively in other studies, this work makes an attempt at systematizing the different roles it performs to facilitate a cross-linguistic comparison with its Polish equivalents.

Simon-Vandenbergen *et al.* (2007) argue that the rhetorical functions of *of course* generally fall into two categories: 1) marking solidarity and politeness; 2) marking an opposition. The two types of functions largely correspond to the roles identified by Wierzbicka (2006: 287) for modal particles: building bridges between the speaker and the addressee (solidarity marking), and exercising pressure on the addressee (opposition marking). I will first focus on the solidarity marking functions of *of course*, and then on its opposition-marking uses.

I. *Of course* as a marker of solidarity and politeness
a. *Of course* as a marker of shared views and empathy

In its solidarity-marking uses *of course* signals the existence of some common ground between the speaker and the addressee, and the speaker's belief that the addressee shares his/her attitudes and assessment of the situation. It thus functions as a marker of concurrence. As noted by White (2003: 269), by using *of course,* "the textual voice actively and explicitly presents itself as aligned with the construed reader, as having the same belief or attitude or 'knowledge'". Example (1), which is a fragment of a conversation about a football game, illustrates how *of course,* together with other linguistic devices, is employed to establish common ground and solidarity between the discourse participants.

(1) – So erm yes <u>I think everybody's very very disappointed</u> as I think we probably heard with Paul Simpson because United certainly in my books, played some of the best football I've seen them play since they've been back in the second division in the erm first half, but really did let things slip away a little bit in the second. They used up all their goals against Oldham <u>didn't they</u>, two weeks ago when they didn't force any corners at all in the match; scored five goals nevertheless. Today, had lots of corners, scored actually from a corner, or after a corner but couldn't make their possession tell.
– <u>That's right</u> erm and ***of course*** and they didn't have that little bit of luck perhaps. I wouldn't say they were lucky against Oldham, but everything ran for them today, the underside of the crossbar and the post saved Charlton on a couple of occasions and as Simpson said I think 'Bolder on a couple of occasions really knew nothing about the saves he'd made, they were point blank, and he just happened to be there.'
But that's the way the game goes and erm I think as we said '<u>as the game went on, you always had the feeling</u> that in fact Charlton, although they had very little pressure, would sneak a goal,' and ***of course*** that's exactly what they did. (BNC, KS7 583-588)

In (1) both speakers use a number of expressions indicating that their opinion on the game is similar ("that's right"), and that they also expect other people to share it ("I think everybody's very very disappointed", "you always had the feeling"). *Of course* is one of the indicators of their shared views and expectations ("you always had the feeling … and *of course* that's exactly what they did"). It confirms the existence of a set of beliefs and attitudes shared by the interlocutors.

Of course may also be used to show empathy and understanding for the interlocutor's problems, by indicating that these can be expected in the circumstances described, and are inevitable, as in (2).

(2) I believe he was lost from time to time, but that ***of course*** is inevitable in a down-market operation. We had no positive indication that he was aware of our interest until yesterday morning. (BNC, H86 415)

Other situations where *of course* signals solidarity with the addressee include those when it is used to offer comfort and reassurance to the addressee. Such use is illustrated in examples (3)-(5).

(3) Victoria nodded, her lower lip quivering, puzzled by the sudden drama around them. 'I was frightened. But I'm always all right with Richard, aren't I, Marie?'
'Yes, love, ***of course*** you are.' She stroked the child's hair and Tory, suddenly babyish, held up her arms to be carried. (BNC, APU 524)

(4) 'You mean … I could make myself attractive enough to him?' Ruth was fairly sure she could, but she had another question in mind of greater importance. '***Of course*** you could,' Mrs Carson assured her. 'And you would make him a good wife.' (BNC, CB5 3155-3159)

(5) 'You don't have to come if you don't want to, Mum. I'll be all right.' '***Of course*** you will, darling, enjoy yourselves.' (BNC, H9G 2390)

In examples (3)-(5) the speakers address their interlocutors directly, trying to reassure them and make them feel better. As noted by Lewis (2003), by using *of course*, the speaker signals that the state of affairs referred to is in agreement with what is "normally" and "naturally" true. In other words, it presents information as to be taken for granted (Simon-Vandenbergen *et al.* 2007). The implication, conveyed by *of course,* that it is obvious to the speaker that everything is (or will be) all right has a comforting effect. It offers an emphatic confirmation that there is no need to worry.

b. *Of course* in responses to requests

Of course is used to respond positively to requests, and to give permission (*CALD*). Responses to requests provide a particularly clear illustration of the use of *of course* to signal that things are to be taken for granted. *Of course* provides confirmation that the request is welcome, and can be easily fulfilled. Such is the case in (6) and (7).

(6) – 'Mummy, can I have my St Margaret picture?'
– 'Now?'

'Please.'
'***Of course*** you can, sweetie.' (BNC, A6J 1520)

(7) 'I'll find out tomorrow.' I paused for a moment, then added, 'Would you mind if I had some pudding?'
'No, ***of course*** not. What do you fancy?' (BNC, A0F 2669)

c. *Of course* as a response to thanks

Of course is used in responses to thanks to indicate that the favour done by the speaker is to be taken for granted. I have not identified any such examples in the BNC; the exchange quoted in (8) comes from a TV series.

(8) D.S.: Thanks for coming over.
L.M.: ***Of course***. (*House of Cards*, episode 51, 0:41)

In (8), by using *of course* in response to thanks, the speaker confirms both his readiness to help and the expectations placed upon him. *Of course* is thus used to confirm solidarity with the interlocutor.

d. *Of course* as an apology for saying something obvious

As observed by Simon-Vandenbergen *et al.* (2007: 39-40), *of course* may be used to confirm that the speaker is aware that the claim s/he is making is not new to the addressee. In such cases, it functions as an apology for saying something obvious, for using a cliché. It is a strategy to protect one's own face and prevent the addressee's irritation (Holmes 1988; Simon-Vandenbergen *et al.* 2007: 39-40). Such use is particularly clear when *of course* precedes or follows expressions such as *nothing new* and *obvious*, as in (9) and (10).

(9) Pets as Therapy is, ***of course***, nothing new. But Joan ventures where few other dog owners would dare to tread and her marvellous Labrador, Beth, has scars to prove it. (BNC, ACM 1236)

(10) The simple fact that pianos with and without checks existed side by side in the Vienna of Mozart, Haydn and Beethoven also shows that at least two different schools of playing the piano co-existed around 1800. There was no single way of playing the piano then, <u>a fact which of itself is obvious</u> ***of course***. But it may be of interest to note, simply through the observation of some important early in-

struments, that different ways of playing the piano can be shown to have existed at the same time. (BNC, GWM 40)

As noted by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 205), the function *of course* is "to redress the power balance between the speaker as giver of information and hearer as receiver of information". The addressees are "given full credit for their own background knowledge" and the speakers "play down" their "superior knowledgeability" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 204). In this way, both the speaker's and the addressee's face needs are accounted for. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 205) observe that there is a sense of superiority in such uses of *of course*, as it "implies that the information is 'basic knowledge'". The superiority is, however, disguised in a useful rhetorical strategy for indicating that basic knowledge is also likely to be shared knowledge.

e. *Of course* in making introductions

Of course is also used to make introductions. It may be used when the speaker thinks the introduced people have already met, as in (11), or when they are strangers, as in (12). In such cases, *of course* conveys the implication that they may have met before, which seems to be intended as acknowledgement of the interlocutors' face needs, i.e. an indication that they both belong to the same circle of acquaintances or the same social group, even if in fact they do not.

(11) 'I must say, Alice really has made something of herself! I simply didn't recognize her at first, and to tell you the truth, I was a bit embarrassed when Uncle Félix came over to talk to me with this perfectly stunning girl on his arm. I just stood there like a goof waiting for him to introduce her. I supposed she was one of his mannequins, although her face did look extraordinarily familiar, and then Uncle Félix said, 'You know Alice, ***of course***,' and the penny dropped. Harry laughed.' (BNC, FS1 2608-2612)

(12) 'You know Leith, ***of course***.' Travis, when she would rather he hadn't, was equally well mannered and had decided introductions were in order. (BNC, JY1 713-414)

When used to make introductions, *of course* expresses assumption. This notion is also expressed by inferential adverbs, such as *obviously* and *clearly,* and results from their ability to express expectations (cf. Rozumko, forthcoming). The two groups of adverbs share the intersubjective function of appealing to the common ground between the speaker and the addressee.

II. *Of course* as a marker of opposition

When *of course* functions as a marker of opposition, it expresses some degree of superiority of the speaker over the addressee (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 205). It indicates that the speaker knows best, and may imply "that the interlocutor has overlooked something obvious" (Wierzbicka 2003: xi). The situations where such functions of *of course* are activated include emphasizing disagreement, expressing annoyance with the interlocutor, and asking questions which exercise some pressure on the addressee or reveal their ignorance.

a. Emphasizing disagreement: *of course not*

The most obvious instances of opposition-marking uses of *of course* are those when it emphasizes disagreement with a prior claim or adds force to a negative answer. In such cases, it often co-occurs with *no/not* and *but*, such as in (13)-(15). The emphasis is strengthened by the use of exclamation marks.

(13) 'There is a deal of social activity now for the hunting season. It is an excellent opportunity to introduce you.' Theda drew back in her chair, seeming to shrink within herself. 'No! No, I cannot.' – 'Nonsense, *of course* you can. Even if you marry Benedict, you cannot skulk in hiding at the Lodge, you know.' (BNC, HGV 4398)

(14) 'Forty Who? Miss Quinn? Oh, really, Marjorie! How can you say that? Was she impertinent?' – 'No, *of course* not. But she did dislike me, really she did.' (BNC, AN8 1772)

(15) Do men hate women? *Of course* they don't! They respect, admire, like, and often love them! (BNC, FL7 1-3)

b. *Of course* in expressions of impatience

Of course can be used to express impatience if a statement made by the interlocutor is perceived by the speaker as annoyingly obvious. The annoyance results from the impression that the speaker's knowledge or feelings are underestimated or ignored by the interlocutor. Such use is found in examples where *of course* is followed by arguments containing such expressions as *always* and *everyone*, which signal that the situation should, in the speaker's view, be obvious to the interlocutor, e.g. (16) and (17).

(16) At last, the man who had done all the talking said that while he, speaking for the I.R.A., was grateful for the support offered, they Bert and Jasper – must realise that the I.R.A. did not operate like an ordinary political organisation, and recruitment was done very carefully, and to specific requirements. Jasper had cut in to say that *of course* he understood this: "Everyone did." (BNC, EV1 1944-1946)

(17) 'You're very quiet,' said my mother. I thought with sudden exasperation that *of course* I was quiet. I always had been. (BNC, G06 2298)

In (16), the speaker is offended that the interlocutor suggested it was possible that he did not know the things that are known to everyone. *Of course* performs a face-saving function in this context. In (17), the speaker uses the word "exasperation" to describe how she felt when, in her view, she was not given enough attention by her mother. In both (16) and (17), *of course* carries the implication that the interlocutor has overlooked something obvious and did not pay sufficient attention to the speaker's face needs.

c. *Of course* in questions

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 882) note that *of course* can be used as a reinforcing marker in declarative questions which have "epistemic bias towards a positive answer". Such questions are used to ask for confirmation, but they have a variety of additional functions. They can be used to exercise some pressure on the addressee, and to signal that the interlocutor was expected to have done something, as in (18).

(18) – You have these standard conditions of service ***of course***?
       – Oh.
       – Already because they've been approved by the board.
       – Has everyone got one now? (BNC, F7A 769-772)

In (18), the addressee turned out not to have the "standard conditions of service" which he was expected to have. "Oh" indicates some degree of embarrassment on his part. *Of course* constitutes a threat to the addressee's face.

When used in questions, *of course* can also indicate assumptions about the interlocutor's knowledge. The expression "you know *of course*" is very frequent in the BNC. It is often used to signal that the speaker knows better, as in (19) and (20).

(19) 'You do know, ***of course***, that you're pointing in the wrong direction,' Gabriel stated.
       Woodruffe stared. 'You mean that's the way back to camp? Back through the town?'
       'Unless you want to make a fifty-mile detour.' (BNC, HRA 1255-1259)

(20) 'Use your wipers,' he said, 'it's beginning to rain,' I started fiddlin' all over again. I signalled left, I signalled right, I couldny get they wipers tae wipe! He leaned over coldly and flicked on a switch, (I knew he was thinking – silly old bitch …) The car got all steamed up and misty, He wanted to stop for a smoke, I was just parched and thirsty – Desperate for a coke. 'You know, ***of course***, about gears, dear? Most cars are fitted with four. Give me your hand a minute … ' I panicked and reached for the door. (BNC, CAV 534-545)

d. *Of course* in concessive uses

Concessive uses of *of course* have been noted by a number of scholars, e.g. Simon-Vandenbergen (1992), Lewis (2003), Simon-Vandenbergen (2007), and Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007). While concession involves agreement, Quirk *et al.* (1985: 1469) note that *of course* "commonly expresses superficial agreement with what has preceded while at the same time hinting at a more fundamental disagreement". The empha-

sis on "a more fundamental disagreement" is the reason why such uses are classified as opposition-marking in the present discussion. In Martin and White's (2005) taxonomy, concession is described as involving two interpersonal functions: concur and counter. First, the speaker/writer gives up "the argumentative ground … only for that ground to be retaken in the subsequent counter move" (Martin and White 2005: 124). Martin and White (2005: 125) observe that the concurrence involved in concession is somewhat reluctant, which is why, to distinguish it from other cases of concurrence, they term it "conceding concurrence". Such concessive uses of *of course* are exemplified in (21)-(23).

(21) Swindon have their hopes ***of course*** but for Oxford its perhaps too high a climb (BNC, K1C 1043)

(22) ***Of course***, this is possible but there is good reason to suppose that it is not the case. (BNC, AD2 1057)

(23) The local authority has issued a writ after receiving complaints about the shops at 17th century Blickling Hall, Norfolk. 'We must act on the complaints,' said a spokesman for the council. '***Of course*** we have sympathy, but the Sunday trading laws are still in force and we have to take action. The law is the law.' (BNC, AKR 168-171)

What *of course* indicates in (21)-(23) is the confirmation of the speakers' awareness of their interlocutors' opinions and expectations, rather than their agreement with those opinions. Its use may thus be viewed as a strategy for accounting for the interlocutor's face needs in situations when the speaker's actual aim is to communicate opposition.

III. Combining solidarity and opposition

The expressions of solidarity and opposition are combined in numerous uses of *of course*. The combination was already noted with reference to its uses to "redress the power balance" between the speaker and the addressee, exemplified in (22) and (23), where the speaker both apologizes for referring to basic knowledge, and implies that the addressee is expected to possess that knowledge. A combination of the two notions may also take other forms. The example quoted in (24) is a case of opposition employed to express solidarity.

(24) 'I'll never see my brother again,' she moaned, hating herself for sounding so foolish when her grief was so vast.
'Don't be silly, **of course** you will. He's coming back next year, isn't he?' (BNC, APU 784)

In (24) the speaker opposes the pessimistic opinion expressed by the interlocutor only to comfort her and show solidarity. In contrast, (25) illustrates a situation where the expression of solidarity is combined with imposition and an indication of superiority.

(25) Beware of adverse suggestions! Sometimes a sympathetic friend can be a constant source of discouragement, all unknowingly. Discouragement may be given in small doses, but the cumulative effect, like dripping water, leaves its mark. 'My dear, you must feel absolutely awful. Of course you won't be able to cope tomorrow. If I were you, I should put off that interview until next week. You should have an early night, but I don't suppose you will sleep. I know you just feel you can't face tomorrow. **Of course** you feel very depressed. You can't fool me. You are depressed aren't you?' By that time you are! Make a note to strengthen your defences against future encounters, speculate on the likely result of introducing your 'sympathetic' friend to Mrs P, then make yourself a cup of tea. (BNC, C9R 2000-2010)

The situation described in (25) comes from a self-help guide offering advice on how to protect one's self-confidence. It shows how *of course* can be used to impose sympathy and solidarity on people who do not want it, thus undermining their self-confidence.

The wide range of functions performed by *of course* demonstrates that the sense of obviousness and conformity with expectations is an important notion in interpersonal communication. Essentially, *of course* is used to establish common ground between the speaker and the addressee, but the common ground may be used as a starting point for both the expression of solidarity and superiority. *Of course* can be used to confirm solidarity with the addressee; it may also be used to indicate that the speaker knows best, and thus confirm the speaker's superiority.

6.2.2. *Naturally*

Naturally is used as an adverb of manner, meaning: (1) "happening or existing as part of nature and not made or done by people", and (2) "normally" (*CALD*), as well as an epistemic adverb, meaning "as you would expect" (*CALD*). The sense of expectations expressed by *naturally* makes it close to *of course* (cf. Quirk *et al.* 1985: 624; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 236). *Naturally* is, however, considerably less frequent than *of course* and more characteristic of written language (see Table 26) .

a. Manner uses of *naturally*

In its uses as a manner adverb, *naturally* refers to the natural order of things and the natural or normal properties of people and things. Such uses are illustrated in (26) and (27).

(26) Many early pigments are **naturally** occurring and brightly coloured minerals, usually metal salts, and often only minute traces remain. (BNC, AC9 334)

(27) Although she was astute enough to understand this on a logical basis, it took several sessions of counselling and therapy to convince Myra's subconscious mind that she was in no way to blame and that she had behaved **naturally** and in total innocence. (BNC, C9W 739)

The epistemic meaning of *naturally* is an extension of its manner sense, where 'natural' is reinterpreted as 'predictable' and 'expected' (cf. also Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 235).

b. Epistemic uses of *naturally*

When *naturally* is used in its epistemic sense, it signals that the state of affairs is to be expected in the situation described, as in (28)-(30). Quirk *et al.* (1985: 624) note that *naturally* is paraphrasable by "as might have been expected". More precisely, it seems paraphrasable by 'as might have been expected in the circumstances'.

(28) Santa Claus probably got more letters than the Queen or Margaret Thatcher this year. But then he's cuddlier. The Post Office, who handle his mail, say there were 600,000 letters for the

plump, red-cheeked old fellow. **Naturally** he couldn't answer them all himself, so Post Office staff lent a hand and every kid who wrote to him got a reply, postmarked Reindeerland or Santaland. (BNC, AA6 12)

(29) **Naturally** I was sleeping badly. My insomnia became chronic whenever Dana stayed the night, simply because I could not take my eyes away from his sleeping form beneath the bedside lamps. (BNC, AC6 1507)

(30) 'Petty Officer Grant picked this up in Andropulos's cabin. Haven't opened it yet.' Not without difficulty he undid two spring clips and lifted the lid. 'Waterproof, by Jove.' He looked at the contents. 'Means nothing to me.' Hawkins took the box from him, lifted out some sheets of paper and a paperback book, examined them briefly and shook his head. 'Means nothing to me, either. Denholm?'
Denholm shuffled through the papers. 'In Greek, **naturally**. Looks like a list of names, addresses and telephone numbers to me. But I can't make sense of it.' (BNC, CKC 2618-2630)

In (28) the speaker explains that considering the circumstances (Santa Claus received 600,000 letters), Santa cannot be expected to answer them all himself; in (29) the speaker explains that her sleeplessness was normal and expected in her situation; in (30) *naturally* signals that it is natural and predictable that the notes made by a Greek person are in Greek. *Naturally* signals that the speakers think there is nothing unusual in the situations and the addressees are expected to share this view. The situational context seems to be particularly important in the case of *naturally*, as it grounds claims in the natural order of things.

Naturally can also be used to signal the speaker's assumptions about other people, resulting from the specific circumstances they are in. It shares the ability to express assumption with *of course* and some inferential adverbs, such as *obviously* and *clearly*. Assumption is one of the semantic parameters distinguished in research on evidentiality (cf. Chapter 2), involving reasoning and general knowledge (cf. Aikhenvald 2018). In the case of *naturally*, general knowledge involves the things which are

usually true in certain situations, which makes them predictable, as in (31) and (32).

(31) Artists' writing on art can **naturally** be more practical or technical, even in defining their own aims. The virtue of artists' writings for the reader of criticism is that it can often serve as a touchstone for judging the worth of mediators, particularly those presenting views of what the artist intended; what the artist said may be more to the point. (BNC, A04 856-857)

(32) Any potential student will **naturally** wish to see what is offered by the different drama schools and a concise summary of the aims and policies of the seventeen main schools can be found in Appendix B on p 119. (BNC, A06 177)

The speaker quoted in (31) thinks it is natural that artists have a more practical and technical view on art than critics, as this attitude results from their practical experience. Likewise, it is natural and predictable, in the speaker's view, that potential students would like to see the schools they are interested in. The expectations towards artists in (31), and towards the potential students in (32) are based on what the speakers consider to be the natural order of things. *Naturally* is also used to confirm the expectations placed upon the speaker, and to emphasize his/her readiness to comply with them, and co-operate, as in (33). In such cases, *naturally* functions as a marker of concurrence, like *of course*.

(33) 'We would like to ask you a few questions about Andrew Livesey. You knew him, I believe.'
'Yes, officer.' He motioned them to chairs. '**Naturally**, I will do what I can. It was quite incomprehensible.' (BNC, ANL 3522-3526)

The confirmatory functions of *naturally*, and its closeness to *of course* in its uses as a concurrence marker, are most apparent when it occurs in responses to questions asking for confirmation, as in (34)-(36). In such cases, the two adverbs often go together.

(34) 'I suppose Edward is attending this bean feast?' – '**Naturally**.' (BNC, ASE 1313-1314)

(35) 'And the consultant wanted to know what she'd had to eat, of course … '

'*Of course*.' Tom Witherington looked very solemn.

' … And whether anyone else had been taken ill.'

'*Naturally*,' said Henry. (BNC, A0D 2689-2694)

(36) 'I'm quiet, I have few dirty habits that would trouble you. Economically, it makes perfect sense.'

'Oh. You.'

'*Of course* me. *Naturally*. I wasn't expecting to come back to England, not for years, maybe never.' (BNC HWA 1821)

The use of *naturally* and *of course* in the same contexts signals a close affinity between their meanings. Their occurrences in the same context are also illustrated in examples (37) and (38), where they are both used to emphasize the prior statements.

(37) She said: 'There was Marius Durance, *naturally*, and Sabine, *of course* and … but you wouldn't know of the others.' (BNC, GV2 2427)

(38) 'Apologise for the intrusion, to be on the safe side.' '*Naturally*.' 'Humbly ask if you may search the premises, and that due recompense will be made for the inconvenience, at my expense.' '*Of course*.' Reynard bowed and turned to leave. (BNC AD 9 2565-2568)

Such cumulative uses of adverbs which perform similar functions make statements more emphatic. This rhetorical strategy may also be motivated by stylistic reasons, and the intention to avoid repetition.

Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 236) suggest that *naturally* "does not have the implication that the hearer knows or should know", which makes it different from *of course*. The BNC data also suggest that *naturally* tends to focus more on the speaker, and signals that it is the speaker who should know and expect a specific course of events. In some contexts it is paraphrasable with 'I should have known'/'I should have expected/guessed it', as in (39) and (40).

(39) He was already inside and sitting himself down by the time I spoke. 'I hear you're all set to pick up Bonanza's five grand,' was his greeting. I grinned. '*Naturally*. The entire city police force is baffled, but J. Preston the super sleuth solves mystery. That the way it reads?' (BNC, FAP 1813-1818)

(40) Manny Jackson was the smooth-talking lawyer who kept Bonanza's business enterprises one step in front of the law. I'd been wondering when he'd pick up cards in this game. 'What did Jackson say?' I asked.

'Well, he made like he wanted no part of me at all. Said I'd got his number by mistake. He'd never heard of Vecchi and wasn't interested in finding anybody by that name'.

'*Naturally*.' (BNC, FAP 2943-2950)

In both (39) and (40) *naturally* expresses resignation and acceptance of the inevitable. The speakers realize that they cannot do anything to change the situations they found themselves in, and are convinced that they should have predicted such a course of events. The unfavourable turns of events are presented as belonging to the natural order of things.

6.2.3. *Indeed*

The basic meaning of *indeed* is "actually, certainly" (*OD*), "in fact, in reality, in truth" (*DC*). As noted by Traugott and Dasher (2002), the adverb goes back to the prepositional phrase *in dede* ('in action'/'in practice'), which has developed an epistemic sense ('in truth'), and the post-epistemic functions of a discourse marker ('what's more'). The polyfunctionality of *indeed* has been discussed by a number of scholars, most notably Traugott and Dasher (2002), Aijmer (2007b), and Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007), whose findings provide a point of reference for the present discussion.

Indeed is a high-frequency adverb, typically found in those types of discourse which combine interaction with formality. Biber *et al.* (1999: 562) note its high frequency in academic discourse; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 218), and Rozumko (2017) observe that it is particularly common in the academic writing of the humanities and social sciences. Other "formal, structured argumentative types of discourse" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 218) where *indeed* is frequent include parliamentary debates and non-broadcast speeches.

Indeed is flexible with respect to the syntactic position it occupies. In the BNC it occurs in sentence initial, medial and final positions. The initial position is characteristic of its uses as a discourse marker, showing relations between parts of discourse; in the medial position its epistemic meaning is more pronounced (Aijmer 2007b; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007). *Indeed* is used as an emphasizer and a confirmatory adverb; it also performs textual functions.

a. *Indeed* as an emphasizer

The use of *indeed* as an emphasizer has been noted in a number of studies, including reference grammars (e.g. Quirk *et al.* 1985; Huddleston and Pullum 2002); it is also well documented in the BNC. The emphasizing function of *indeed* is particularly clear when it is used in the post-head position, the modified head being an adjective, adverb or a noun phrase. Some of such uses have become formulaic, and the epistemic sense of *indeed* in such formulas has been marginalized (cf. also: Traugott and Dasher 2002: 163; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007). The formulaicization is particularly clear when *indeed* emphasizes the phrase *thanks/thank you very much*, as in (41), and *to like sth very much*, as in (42).

(41) Thank you all **very, very much indeed** for coming. (BNC, JNG 447)

(42) 'Oh.' I felt apprehensive. 'What did he say?'
'He says he likes *Long Way Home* **very much indeed**. He will gladly take it on, and he is certain he can place it with a good publisher.' (BNC, ADY 1355)

In contrast to inferential emphasizers, such as *manifestly* and *patently*, *indeed* seems typically to emphasize names of positive qualities. In the BNC, the adjectives which are most frequently modified by *indeed* are *good* (45x), and *nice* (18x). By way of comparison, *bad* co-occurs with *indeed* 11 times, and *sad* – 7 times. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 449) note that *indeed* "usually goes with *very*". The BNC data confirm this observation: out of forty-five occurrences of *indeed* with *good* in the corpus, forty-four are with *very*. The emphasizing function of *indeed* is most unambiguous when it is used in the vicinity of other, sometimes multiple, emphasizers. Such sequences are primarily emphatic, as exemplified in (43)-(45).

(43) The statistics show it to be **very very good indeed**. (BNC, FUG 156)

(44) Jim has made some enquiries through Italian legal colleagues and by all accounts the man does come from a very good family — **very good indeed** — so at least he hasn't told her a tissue of lies about his background. (BNC, CEY 3373)

(45) 'What a wonderful memory you have, my dear,' he said. 'Yes, that would be **very nice**, **very nice indeed**.' (BNC, CCA 749)

The emphasizing function is related to Martin and White's (2005) functionality of pronouncement. *Indeed* adds force to the claims it modifies, and indicates, as Martin and White (2005: 129) put it, the speaker's "maximal investment in the current proposition".

b. *Indeed* as a confirmatory adverbial

As noted by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 106), the use of *indeed* as an emphasizer tends to be related to its other meanings, in particular that of confirmation. In some cases, it is paraphrasable both with 'really', which reveals its emphasizing function, and 'it's true', which indicates its confirmatory character, as in (46).

(46) The doctor turned his attention back to the carving. He was **indeed** good at it. (BNC, A0D 2643)

In (46) *indeed* may be understood as both emphasizing ('he was really good'), and confirming a prior statement (or a prior assumption) concerning the doctor's skills ('it's true he was good'). The combination of the confirmatory and emphasizing functions of *indeed* is also evident when it emphasizes a confirmatory response, as in (47).

(47) 'Profitable business,' commented Julia. 'Yes **indeed**.' (BNC, FSC 1407)

In addition to combining emphasis with confirmation, *indeed* combines confirmation with the expression of expectations. More specifically, it confirms the expectations signalled in a prior statement, as in (48)-(49).

(48) 'I expect to continue to make the same kind of pictures.' **Indeed** he did. (BNC, ACS 1194-1195)

(49) Reunification need not, and probably will not, come overnight. But it could start overnight, and ***indeed*** it has already started. The GDR's borders are now open, and the Government in Bonn poised to jump in with massive economic support for the process of political reform as it develops. The West has money and know-how, the East has greenfield sites in plenty: the GDR is 60 per cent less densely populated than the FRG. In a few years time the two German states could be virtually a single economic area. (BNC, A8D 114)

It is quite characteristic that the statements prior to the ones with *indeed* are modalized ("need not", "probably") or explicitly marked as expected ("I expect"). *Indeed* seems to transfer the situations from the realm of modality to the realm of facts by confirming that they have taken place.

The confirmation signalled by *indeed* often serves as the first step in the process of structuring an argument. This discourse strategy has been observed by Traugott and Dasher (2002: 164), who note that *indeed* "signals that what follows is not only in agreement with what precedes, but is additional evidence being brought to bear on the argument". Such use is illustrated in (50).

(50) Mrs Thatcher herself claimed to have 'renewed the spirit and solidarity of the nation'. There was, ***indeed***, some truth to this. Her varied responses in the North Atlantic alliance, in the European community, in Irish affairs, and in attempting to mediate in the Middle East as broker between the Arabs and Israel added to this impression. (BNC, A66 1392)

The sentence which follows the confirmatory statement qualified by *indeed* contains a description of the evidence which supports the speaker's claim. As noted by Lewis (2011: 418), "the evidential clause acts to support the main idea".

Indeed is also used in questions. In the analyzed corpus sample, it occurs in questions asking for confirmation, as in (51), and in rhetorical questions (cf. also Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 108), as in (52).

(51) 'Oh, Benedict, are you *real*? Is it ***indeed*** you? Lord help me, I love you so very much!' (BNC, HGV 5324)

(52) The trade union leadership remained unmoved but to quote Race and Class (Winter 1977): Where ***indeed*** can they move to? Their 'procedures' – ACAS, tribunals, industrial courts of enquiry have been revealed as powerless and inadequate. (BNC, A6V 1548)

c. Concessive uses of *indeed*

As noted by Traugott and Dasher (2002: 162), *indeed* often combines "confirmation" with "adversativity", and suggests that the statement made by the speaker contrasts with a prior one. Like *of course*, it is used to signal conceding concurrence (cf. Martin and White 2005) only to prepare the ground for a counter statement, which diminishes the importance of the prior one. Concessive uses of *indeed* are illustrated in examples (53)-(54).

(53) The chances were slim ***indeed but*** now she really wanted to go (BNC, HGK 222)

(54) The beef was tender, the sauce delicious and it came with all the expected accompaniments. The Cajun Chicken too was ***very good indeed although*** the portion would have disappointed an American. (BNC, HP6 838)

Such rhetorical moves from confirmation to a new argument, and from agreement to challenge are common in persuasive discourse. As demonstrated later in this book, most epistemic adverbs are used to express concession to enable the speaker/writer to formulate his/her arguments in a convincing way. Example (55) illustrates how *indeed* and *certainly*, as well as the conjunctions *though* and *but,* are used together to create a piece of persuasive talk.

(55) The work of a drama school is necessarily highly disciplined – and ***indeed*** self discipline is an essential requirement in all acting. It is possible, <u>though</u>, that in the early stages of training you may feel that all your creative skill is being stripped from you, and that the whole system is ganging up on you. It's ***certainly*** true that the pressure on you builds up as the terms go on – <u>but</u> training is *not* designed to destroy you, but to challenge you. Remember this when the pace hots up! (BNC A06 1388)

d. Textual (connective) functions of *indeed*

Indeed has developed a number of connective functions. Traugott and Dasher (2002), and Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) summarize its meaning in such contexts as 'what's more'. While the general meaning of 'what's more' can be maintained for most of its occurrences of this type, more specific meanings can also be identified for the different textual functions of *indeed*. The different meanings often arise from the co-occurrence of *indeed* with specific conjunctions, i.e. *and, or, but. Indeed* strengthens the analogy and contrast expressed by these conjunctions. As indicated by the types of non-epistemic connective equivalents of *indeed* in Polish (see section 6.4), at least four textual functions of *indeed* can be distinguished: (1) indicating analogy, (2) reformulation, (3) reinforcement, (4) introducing antithesis. They correspond to four types of conjuncts distinguished by Quirk *et al.* (1985: 634-636): equative, reformulatory, reinforcing and antithetic. Equative and reinforcing expressions are the subtypes of a broader type of additive conjuncts, while reformulatory and antithetic conjuncts belong to contrastive conjuncts in Quirk *et al*.'s (1985) taxonomy. The four textual functions of *indeed* are summarized below.

i. Indicating analogy: 'likewise, in the same way'

Indeed can be used to introduce an additional (usually parenthetic) statement which signals an analogy between the discussed issue and another one, thus placing it on a broader plane, and making the statement more emphatic. Its meaning in such contexts can be summarized as 'likewise, and also, just like, similar to, as in the case of'. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 635) refer to conjuncts which perform this function as "equative", though they do not use this term with reference to *indeed*. The items they list include: *correspondingly, likewise, equally, similarly, in the same way*, and *by the same token. Indeed* as an emphasizer of analogy frequently co-occurs with *and* and *or*, where it plays a similar role to the function it performs when emphasizing contrast: it strengthens the meanings of the conjunctions it co-occurs with. Such uses are exemplified in (56)-(58).

(56) Within every institution (and ***indeed***, individual) may be found the polarised views of the pedant and the pragmatist. (BNC, AC9 1563)

(57) The intentionality of perceptions – and ***indeed*** of other mental phenomena – makes them non-analogous to material phenomena outside of the nervous system. (BNC, A0T 1480)

(58) The final and the greatest problem of the neurophysiological version of the CTP (or, ***indeed***, any version of the CTP), is that it cannot explain the *intentionality or 'aboutness'* that connects the neural events with the object they are supposed to be perceptions of. (BNC, A0T 1473)

In examples (56)-(58) the writers use *indeed* to generalize the applicability of their claims, thus making them more universal and stronger.

ii. Reformulatory uses of *indeed*: 'or better, more precisely'

In some of its "additive" uses, *indeed* introduces a statement which provides more precise information than a prior one. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 635) use the term "reformulatory" to refer to conjuncts which are used to rephrase a statement in a more precise way, such as "*better, rather, more accurately, more precisely, alias, alternatively, in other words*". They note that reformulatory conjuncts are similar to additive conjuncts, but instead of adding a statement, they are used to "replace what has been said by a different formulation" (Quirk *et al*. 1985: 638). Such uses indicate that the speaker is reflecting on his/her choice of words, and attempts to select the words which describe the state of affairs in a precise way, as in (59)-(61).

(59) The consultant, Dr Peter Brunt, is the Queen's official doctor in Aberdeen. His assessment would determine the time – 'or ***indeed*** the date' – of the Queen Mother's discharge, Mr Reid said. (BNC, HJ4 2859)

(60) There are, in fact several others but, for various reasons which I shall attempt to explain, I do not feel that they are always quite as effective – or ***indeed*** as safe – as the use of the hypnotic state. (BNC, C9W 1315)

(61) Her [M. Thatcher's] apparent cry of anguish last week that John Major has treated her legacy without due reverence is not convin-

cing; the old bat cares nothing for the well-being of the Conservative Party or *indeed* Conservative government. (BNC, CAJ 951).

iii. Reinforcement: strengthening a prior statement: 'or even, and even'

Indeed is also used to add a strengthening statement. As in the case of reformulatory statements, the speaker is looking for a more appropriate formulation, but in this case, the statement which follows is a stronger one. *Indeed* introduces a stronger item than the one first selected by the speaker, such as "should not" after "need not" ("need not, *indeed* should not") in example (62), and "actively, *indeed* aggressively" in example (63). Aijmer (2007b: 341) refers to the concept of a rhetorical scale to explain such usage. The second element is stronger than the first one, thus making the whole statement more forceful (cf. also Schwenter and Traugott 2000: 21). Such strengthening uses of *indeed* partly overlap with the functions of reinforcing conjuncts as distinguished by Quirk *et al.* (1985: 635), such as *moreover, what is more, in addition*, though these items tend to introduce clauses, while *indeed* introduces individual words and phrases. Such uses are exemplified in (62)-(64).

(62) The conveying need not, *indeed* should not, be done in an authoritarian way (BNC, A1A, 769)
(63) Mirrored glass is actively, *indeed* aggressively, mediocre. (BNC, A2W 404)
(64) It is in fact a purely physical problem associated with excessive amounts of gas (usually atmospheric oxygen and nitrogen) dissolved in the water in which the fish finds itself, be that an aquarium, pond or *indeed* lake. (BNC, C96 224)

iv. Antithetic uses of *indeed*: 'on the contrary, quite the opposite'

Indeed is used to confirm disagreement, and strengthen it with an additional argument. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 105) paraphrase its meaning in such contexts as "contrary to expectations". Its role in such cases corresponds to the function of conjuncts which Quirk *et al.* (1985: 636) term "antithetic", i.e. those which contrast one item with another "by introducing a direct antithesis" (1985: 639), or, as Lewis (2014: 416) puts it, by introducing mutually exclusive states of affairs. Quirk *et*

al.'s (1985: 636) examples include: *by contrast, on the contrary, by comparison, on the other hand*, etc. Lewis (2014) discusses analogous constructions with such discourse markers as *instead* and *rather*. The antithetic uses of *indeed* are illustrated in (65)-(67).

(65) Against such theories, Tredell sets those which emerge from other disciplines, and which have lately been more commanding and influential. Such theories, he remarks, 'are not centrally concerned with literature; *indeed*, they may marginalize or abandon it as a category', and he instances their source in such fields as philosophy, psychology, sociology, anthropology, linguistics. (BNC, A1A 433-434)
(66) This in effect is the behaviourists' approach. They do not deny – *indeed* they insist – that what an animal does is influenced by past experiences as well as present ones. (BNC, AE7 1138-1139)
(67) The stories themselves do not, however, recount an exceptional event, *indeed* they seldom focus on a single event at all. (BNC, APS 1067)

Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) suggest that *indeed* may be losing its epistemic character and acquiring a primarily textual one. Its textual functions form a considerable part of its uses in the analyzed corpus data.

6.3. Polish equivalents of English confirmatory adverbs: evidence from bilingual dictionaries

The bilingual dictionaries provide numerous equivalents of *of course, naturally* and *indeed*. They are listed in Table 10.

Table 10. Dictionary equivalents of English confirmatory adverbs

Confirmatory adverbs	Polish dictionary equivalents
of course	*oczywiście* (PWN; St; Col), *naturalnie* (PWN; St), *rzecz jasna, rozumie się, ma się rozumieć* (PWN)
naturally	*naturalnie* (PWN; St; Col), *oczywiście* (PWN; St), *rzecz jasna* (St)

Confirmatory adverbs	Polish dictionary equivalents
indeed	*istotnie* (PWN; Col), *rzeczywiście* (PWN; St), *faktycznie* (PWN; St), *oczywiście* (Col); *bardzo* (St; Col), *ogromnie* (St), *naprawdę* (St), *bynajmniej!* (St), *jeszcze jak!* (St), *w samej rzeczy* (St), *a nawet* (St; Col), *mało tego, co więcej, wprawdzie* (PWN; St; Col)

As shown in Table 10, the dictionary equivalents of *of course* and *naturally* are in most cases the same items, which indicates a semantic and functional closeness of the two adverbs. All their equivalents express accordance with expectations. The equivalents suggested for *indeed* range from the confirmatory adverbs *istotnie, rzeczywiście,* and *faktycznie,* through the intensifiers *bardzo* 'very', *ogromnie* 'greatly', *naprawdę* 'really, truly', the exclamations *bynajmniej!* 'by no means', *jeszcze jak!* 'it is indeed' to a number of discourse markers with connective functions, such as *w samej rzeczy* 'as a matter of fact', *a nawet* 'and even', *mało tego, co więcej* 'what's more', and *wprawdzie* 'while'.

6.4. Polish equivalents of English confirmatory adverbs: evidence from the parallel corpus

Of course, naturally and *indeed* are high-frequency adverbs, richly evidenced in the translation corpus (see Table 28). Their translation equivalents identified in 100-item corpus samples are listed in Table 11.

Table 11. Polish equivalents of English confirmatory adverbs in the parallel corpus

Confirmatory adverbs	Translation equivalents in *Paralela*
of course	*oczywiście* (46), zero equivalent (14), *naturalnie* (7), *ma się rozumieć* (5), *rozumie się* (5), *pewnie* (4), *to prawda* (2), *rzecz jasna* (2), *rzecz oczywista* (2), *owszem* (2), *jasne* (2), *zapewne* (1), *dobrze* (1), *chyba* (1), *istotnie* (1), *wprawdzie* (1), *z drugiej strony* (1), *nie ma za co* (1), *z pewnością* (1)

Confirmatory adverbs	Translation equivalents in *Paralela*
naturally	*naturalnie* (56), zero equivalent (12), *oczywiście* (19), *rozumie się* (2), *rzecz zrozumiała* (2), *rzecz oczywista* (2), *rzecz jasna* (2), *ma się rozumieć* (1), *jak łatwo zrozumieć* (1), *to oczywiste* (1), *zawsze* (1), *bezsprzecznie* (1)
indeed	zero equivalent (24), *rzeczywiście* (15), *faktycznie* (10), *w istocie* (6), *tak naprawdę* (6), *w rzeczywistości* (4), *istotnie* (3), *ponadto* (3), *co więcej* (2), *ba* (2), *w ogóle* (2), *także* (1), *zresztą* (1), *serdecznie* (1), *chętnie* (1), *w rzeczy samej* (1), *właśnie* (1), *oczywiście* (1), *to oczywiste* (1), *nawet* (1), *i tak* (1), *iście* (1), *istny* (1), *doprawdy* (1), *bo* (1), *też* (1), *jak* (1), *to prawda* (1), *zgadza się* (1), *dokładnie* (1), *jak by nie patrzeć* (1), *uwzględniając powyższe* (1), *z całego serca* (1), *bardzo* (1)

The range of translation equivalents of the three adverbs attested in the analyzed corpus samples provides evidence for their polyfunctionality. Both *of course* and *naturally* have their prototypical counterparts in the corpus: *oczywiście* and *naturalnie*, respectively. Additionally, they have a number of less prototypical equivalents performing different interpersonal functions. *Indeed* does not have one dominant equivalent in Polish. Overall, 33 different equivalents of the adverb have been identified in the corpus sample. This result is similar to Aijmer's (2007b) findings based on an English-Swedish parallel corpus, which revealed 42 different translation equivalents of *indeed* in Swedish. In the English-Polish corpus, it is most frequently rendered with the confirmatory adverbs *rzeczywiście* and *faktycznie*, but it is also frequently omitted in translation. The other equivalents illustrate its numerous interpersonal and textual functions. The contexts in which the different equivalents of the three adverbs are employed are discussed in sections 6.4.1.-6.4.3.

6.4.1. Translation equivalents of *of course*

The most frequent equivalents of *of course* identified in the parallel corpus, *oczywiście, naturalnie, rzecz jasna*, and *ma się rozumieć,* belong to the category of particles of conviction, as delimited by Grochowski *et al.* (2014). The four items signal that the state of affairs was to be expected by the speaker, i.e. they are used to confirm expectations. Only two of

them are adverbs: *oczywiście* and *naturalnie*. *Rozumie się* is a short version of the phrase *rozumie się samo przez się* 'it is understandable in the nature of the thing itself', roughly: 'it goes without saying, it's quite natural' (Stanisławski 1999). The phrase itself could be used as a paraphrase of the meanings of both *of course* and *oczywiście*.

The most common adverbial equivalents of *of course* are *oczywiście, naturalnie* and *pewnie*. The most frequent one, *oczywiście*, is at the same time its most universal equivalent, as it can be used both in formal and informal registers; *naturalnie* occurs in more formal ones, while *pewnie* is preferred in informal contexts. *Pewnie* is only used to express conformity with expectations in dialogic genres, in responses to prior claims. In monologic genres *oczywiście* and *naturalnie* are used. The three items have solidarity-building functions similar to those performed by *of course*, and function as markers of concurrence. They can be used to establish common ground with the addressee, as in (68), where the speaker uses *of course* to signal that he expects the addressee to interpret the story in the same way, and in (69), where reference is made to a generally known fact that the sporting system needs money.

(68)   At some point, Jean-Louis came up with a really silly idea… The whole idea would be that Jean-Louis would, you know, send the arrow from one building to another. Then, ***of course***, whenever we tried it … it just didn't work.

W pewnym momencie Jean-Lois wyszedł z głupim pomysłem. … cały pomysł polegał na tym, że Jean-Louis miał posłać strzałę z jednego budynku na drugi. I ***oczywiście*** za każdym razem kiedy próbowaliśmy, po prostu nie działało. (*Paralela*, Open-Sub|40378)

(69)   Given that it is a significant way to promote social inclusion and intercultural dialogue, sport must be regulated at last so as to safeguard young people and protect them from dangers inherent in the sector: commercial pressure, fraud, the exploitation of minors and violence. ***Of course***, the entire sporting system cannot survive without funding.

Biorąc pod uwagę, że jest to ważny sposób promowania integracji społecznej i dialogu międzykulturowego, należy wreszcie

wprowadzić regulacje dotyczące sportu w celu ochrony młodych ludzi przed związanymi z nim niebezpieczeństwami: presją komercyjną, oszustwami, wykorzystywaniem nieletnich i przemocą. ***Oczywiście*** cały system sportu nie przetrwa bez środków finansowych. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-05-08-009)

Like *of course*, *oczywiście*, *naturalnie* and *pewnie* can be used to give permission and to emphasize and confirm the speaker's readiness to comply with a request, as in (70). They are also used to offer consolation and to signal that it is obvious to the speaker that the situation will change for the better, as in (71), or that it is not as bad as the interlocutor believes it to be, as in (72).

(70)   Mama, can I sleep with you tonight? – ***Of course*** you can, sweetheart. Come on.

Mamusiu, mogę z Tobą dzisiaj spać? – ***Oczywiście***, kochanie, wskakuj. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|46520)

(71)   She's saying everything is gonna be all right. – ***Of course*** everything is gonna be all right.

Ona mówi … Mówi, że wszystko będzie dobrze. – ***Pewnie, że*** wszystko będzie dobrze. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|11791)

(72)   I can't believe she's dead. I wasn't a very good friend to her. – Aw, don't say that, Teeny. ***Of course*** you were.

Nie mogę uwierzyć, że umarła. Nie byłam dla niej dobrą przyjaciółką. – O, nie mów tak, Teeny. ***Naturalnie, że*** byłaś dobra. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|2780)

Examples (70)-(72) illustrate the use of the Polish confirmatory adverbs with the subordinator *że* 'that'. Not all epistemic adverbs in Polish allow this construction; it seems to be characteristic of dialogic, addressee-oriented uses of adverbs expressing expectations (cf. Grochowski *et al.* 2014: 99).

Of the three Polish adverbs, *oczywiście* is most frequently employed as a marker of opposition. It is used to oppose an opinion expressed in a prior statement, and to suggest an option or a solution which differs from the one proposed by the addressee. In such cases it is used with the

subordinator *że* 'that', as in (73). It is also the most frequent equivalent of *of course* signalling annoyance with the addressee if s/he says something obvious, as exemplified in (74).

(73) I cannot go back out there. – ***Of course*** you can. You're going to face the music, eat some humble pie, hug it out, play opossum.

Nie mogę tam wrócić. – ***Oczywiście, że*** możesz. Wypijesz piwo, którego naważyłaś, przełkniesz goryczkę, wyczekasz, poudajesz Greka. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|152255)

(74) – Are they suing?
– No, they're not suing. We're suing them for low resistance to tainted meat.
– Walter!
– ***Of course*** they are suing! What do you expect from poisoned people?
– Pozywają?
– Nie, nie pozywają. My ich pozywamy za małą odporność na zatrute mięso.
– Walter!
– ***Oczywiście, że*** nas pozywają. Czego się spodziewałaś po otrutych ludziach? (*Paralela*, OpenSub|30202)

In sum, *oczywiście* and *of course* are both used to indicate that things are to be taken for granted; both of them can be used to express solidarity and superiority. *Oczywiście* is the most common adverb referring to conformity with expectations in Polish. Since the Polish inferential adverbs have not developed the sense of expectations, *oczywiście* is also used as a translation equivalent of *obviously* and other English inferential adverbs when they function as expectation markers.

6.4.2. Translation equivalents of *naturally*

As shown in Table 11, *naturalnie* is the most frequent equivalent of *naturally* in the analyzed corpus sample. It is also its literal equivalent. The two items have similar origins and morphological structures (adv. *naturally* < adj. *natural*; adv. *naturalnie* < adj. *naturalny*). They can be treated as equivalents in their uses as adverbs of manner and as epistemic markers.

In their manner senses, both adverbs can be used to refer to naturally occurring phenomena. Their use as cross-linguistic equivalents in such contexts is illustrated in (75).

(75) 'Blood oranges contain ***naturally*** occurring pigments associated with improved cardiovascular health, controlling diabetes and reducing obesity,' said Professor Cathie Martin from the John Innes Centre on Norwich Research Park.

'Czerwone pomarańcze zawierają ***naturalnie*** występujące pigmenty łączone z poprawą stanu zdrowia sercowo-naczyniowego, kontrolą cukrzycy i zmniejszeniem otyłości.' – stwierdziła profesor Cathie Martin z Centrum im. Johna Innesa w Norwich Research Park. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|34492)

When *naturally* indicates conformity with expectations, it is rendered by *naturalnie* and *oczywiście*, as illustrated in examples (76)-(78).

(76) The Council decided that measures in 12 policy areas were to be checked for consistency with development policy. These policy areas are always part of the remit of other committees. This ***naturally*** keeps causing institutional conflicts.

Rada zadecydowała, że środki z 12 obszarów polityki powinny zostać sprawdzone pod względem spójności z polityką rozwoju. Te obszary polityki są zawsze w gestii innych komisji, co ***naturalnie*** przyczynia się do kolejnych konfliktów pomiędzy instytucjami. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-06-16-027)

(77) I therefore propose that the European Union should organise a monitoring mission [in Sudan] as quickly as possible, along the lines of the work we did in the Balkans. ***Naturally***, this mission could be carried out with the help of the African Union, and there is no reason why third countries could not be involved also.

Dlatego proponuję, żeby Unia Europejska zorganizowała misję obserwacyjną [w Sudanie] najszybciej jak to możliwe na tych samych zasadach, jak zrobiliśmy to na Bałkanach. ***Naturalnie*** misja ta mogłaby zostać przeprowadzona z pomocą Unii Afrykańskiej i nie ma powodu, żeby państwa trzecie również nie mogły w niej uczestniczyć. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-06-07-014)

(78) As the previous speaker said, if people pour into a small town in southern Sweden, for example, we do not expect them to remain there. They will, **naturally**, be relocated around the country pending legal examination of their case.

Jak powiedział mój przedmówca, jeżeli ludzie napływają na przykład do małego miasteczka w południowej Szwecji, nie oczekujemy, że tam zostaną. Zostaną oni **oczywiście** przeniesieni do innych miejsc w całym kraju w trakcie oczekiwania na rozpatrzenie ich sprawy. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-02-03-012)

As noted in section 6.4.1., *oczywiście* is more register neutral and more frequent in Polish than *naturalnie*, which has a more literary character. Hence the frequent use of *oczywiście* as a translation equivalent of both *of course* and *naturally*.

6.4.3. Translation equivalents of *indeed*

The equivalents of *indeed* identified in the parallel corpus sample can be grouped into three categories: (1) emphasizers and intensifiers; (2) confirmatory markers; and (3) items performing textual functions. The range of emphasizing expressions and connectives used as equivalents of *indeed* is particularly rich, which signals the multifunctionality of *indeed* as a discourse marker.

The confirmatory adverbs *rzeczywiście, faktycznie,* and *istotnie* are used as confirmatory emphasizers, i.e. in their emphatic uses they also signal confirmation. They can be used as equivalents of *indeed* if the emphasized element is not new in the context, as in (79).

(79) But, yes, the problem is still there: many executions are still being carried out by a small number – Iran on the one hand, unfortunately China, and there are many others. We have to go on fighting against that by raising it in every dialogue. It is most important that we do that: every person who is executed is one too many. Let me say in this context that we were all working against the execution of Wo Weihan. Sadly, he was executed on the very day of the EU human rights dialogue with China. This was a terrible example of not listening to each other. Second, let

me say to Mr Agnoletto that human rights clauses are **indeed** very important.

Jednak prawdą jest, że problem ten wciąż jeszcze istnieje: nieliczne państwa dokonują wielu egzekucji – z jednej strony Iran i niestety także Chiny, a także wiele innych. Musimy kontynuować naszą walkę z karą śmierci przez podnoszenie tej kwestii w każdym dialogu. Jest rzeczą pierwszorzędnej wagi, byśmy tak postępowali, bo każda stracona osoba to o jedną osobę za dużo. Niech mi wolno będzie powiedzieć w tym kontekście, że wszyscy pracowaliśmy przeciwko egzekucji Wo Weihana. Niestety został on stracony właśnie w dniu, w którym odbywał się dialog UE z Chinami na temat praw człowieka. To był straszny przykład na to, jak dwie strony mogą nie słuchać siebie wzajemnie. Po drugie pragnę powiedzieć panu Agnolettowi, że zapisy dotyczące praw człowieka są **istotnie** bardzo ważne. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-12-17-013)

When the emphasis does not involve confirmation, *indeed* is rendered by a variety of expressions. Its formulaic uses correspond to functionally equivalent formulas in Polish, such as *bardzo serdecznie* 'very warmly'/'heartily' and *z całego serca* 'with all my heart', as in (80) and (81).

(80) Madam President, Mr Tajani, thank you **very much indeed** for your initiative.

Chciałbym Panu naprawdę **bardzo serdecznie** podziękować za Pańską inicjatywę. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-03-08-019)

(81) Thank you **very much indeed**.

Z całego serca Państwu dziękuję. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-11-25-007)

In its emphasizing uses it is rendered by the emphasizers *naprawdę* 'really, truly' and its more literary variant *doprawdy* 'really, truly'. Their uses are illustrated in examples (82) and (83) respectively.

(82) Madam President, it is very good **indeed** that Parliament and the Commission have decided that the situation of Liu Xiaobo

should be discussed at a plenary sitting of the European Parliament.

To *naprawdę* dobrze, że Parlament Europejski i Komisja uznały, że sytuacja pana Liu Xiaobo powinna zostać omówiona na sesji plenarnej Parlamentu Europejskiego. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-11-23-017)

(83) Mr President, it was very good *indeed* to hear the Commissioner say that the Commission has every intention of moving forward on this before the summer.

Panie przewodniczący, *doprawdy* miło mi było usłyszeć deklarację pani komisarz, według której Komisja ma zamiar kontynuować działania w tej sprawie jeszcze przed rozpoczęciem lata. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-05-20-019)

A number of items are used as equivalents of *indeed* in its confirmatory sense, e.g. *w rzeczy samej* 'indeed', *właśnie* 'exactly, precisely', *to prawda* 'it's true', *zgadza się* 'it's correct', and *dokładnie* 'exactly'. The closest adverbial equivalents of *indeed* are *rzeczywiście, faktycznie,* and *istotnie. Rzeczywiście* and *faktycznie* are the most systematic counterparts of *indeed* in the analyzed section of *Paralela*; *istotnie* is less frequent because of its formal and literary character. All three adverbs are used to confirm the validity of prior statements, and to introduce additional information; they can also be used to signal that a prior statement needs to be confirmed. Such uses are illustrated in examples (84)-(86).

(84) *Indeed*, you made your desire for this charter very clear, and I believe you did so, Mrs Jiménez-Becerril Barrio, by drawing on all the painful first-hand experience you have had. We have analyzed, and we will continue to analyse, in 2010, all the gaps that exist today with regard to the protection of victims of terrorism in the various Member States. *Indeed*, you are right: one way or the other, we need to succeed in harmonising our laws on terrorism, on victims of terrorism.

Istotnie bardzo jasno wyraziła pani swoje pragnienie wprowadzenia takiej karty, i sądzę, że uczyniła to pani w oparciu o wszystkie własne bolesne doświadczenia osobiste, jakie były pani udzia-

łem. Przeanalizowaliśmy, i nadal będziemy analizować w roku 2010, wszelkie istniejące dziś luki w zakresie ochrony ofiar terroryzmu w różnych państwach członkowskich. Ma pani *istotnie* rację: w ten czy inny sposób musi się nam udać zharmonizować nasze ustawy dotyczące terroryzmu, ofiar terroryzmu. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-12-15-019)

(85) 'Until now, everything has been about collecting data and showing off their potential. Now, at last, we can begin the discoveries,' says Jan Tauber, ESA project scientist for Planck. And *indeed*, from the closest neighbours of the Milky Way to the distant reaches of space and time, the all-sky Planck images represent an extraordinary treasure chest for astrophysicists.

'Do tej pory wszystko obracało się wokół zbierania danych i pokazywania ich potencjału. Teraz w końcu możemy przystąpić do odkryć' – mówi Jan Tauber, naukowiec z ESA pracujący nad projektem Planck. I *rzeczywiście*, od najbliższych sąsiadów Drogi Mlecznej po odległe krańce przestrzeni i czasu, zdjęcia sondy Planck obejmujące całe niebo to niezwykły skarbiec dla astrofizyków. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|32951)

(86) As for Mayotte, since 2007, we have known that the nominal capacity of the Pamandzi centre has been exceeded. It became known that 204 people, generally minors, were being housed there, while the maximum capacity is for 60 people. The current conditions are catastrophic: the men are sleeping on the floor; there is no distribution of any bedding or toiletries and men, women and children have to use the same lavatories. The detention conditions are degrading and an affront to human dignity. The pressure of migration is *indeed* felt more strongly in these territories, but the dignity of each person must be ensured and each case should be investigated in accordance with the law.

Co się tyczy Mayotte, od 2007 roku wiemy o tym, że nominalna przepustowość ośrodka Pamandzi została przekroczona. Wiadomo, że mieszkają tam 204 osoby, ogólnie nieletnie, podczas gdy maksymalna przepustowość to 60 osób. Obecne warunki są katastrofalne: mężczyźni śpią na podłodze, nie rozdaje się żadnej

pościeli ani przyborów toaletowych, a mężczyźni, kobiety i dzieci muszą korzystać z tych samych łazienek. Warunki przetrzymywania są poniżające i stanowią policzek dla godności człowieka. **Faktycznie**, presja migracji jest bardziej odczuwalna na tych terytoriach, ale godność każdego człowieka musi być zapewniona i każdy przypadek należy rozpatrywać zgodnie z prawem. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-02-03-012)

Of all Polish confirmatory adverbs, only *faktycznie* has connective functions which are similar to those of *indeed*. Both *indeed* and *faktycznie* can be used to mean 'in fact' (cf. Aijmer 2007b), which enables them to signal a relationship between two statements. *Faktycznie* can be used as a marker of analogy and extension ('as well as'), as in (87); it also has reinforcing functions, as in (88). *Faktycznie*, however, is rather colloquial (*ISJP*; *USJP*), which makes it a less likely equivalent of *indeed* in formal registers.

(87) Mr President, these reports lay down the rules for Europol gathering and exchanging information between EU Member States – and, **indeed**, third-party nations – of the most personal kind about EU citizens.

Panie przewodniczący! Sprawozdania te regulują gromadzenie najbardziej osobistych informacji o obywatelach UE przez Europol i ich wymianę między państwami członkowskimi, **a faktycznie** także z krajami trzecimi. *(Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-11-23-018)

(88) Coal is a major factor that plays an important role – one reason, of course, being that it is one of the few energy sources, or **indeed** the main energy source, that we possess in Europe, even if its availability varies between Member States.

Węgiel jest głównym czynnikiem, odgrywającym znaczącą rolę – oczywiście jednym z powodów takiej sytuacji jest to, że jest on jednym z nielicznych źródeł energii, a **faktycznie** głównym źródłem energii, którym dysponujemy w Europie, nawet jeżeli jego dostępność w poszczególnych państwach członkowskich jest zróżnicowana. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-07-10-22-017)

The most frequent equivalents of *indeed* in its connective uses are non-epistemic markers. When it signals analogy it is rendered by *a także* 'as well as', as in (89); in its reformulatory function it corresponds to *a tak naprawdę* 'or in fact, more specifically', as in (90); as a marker of reinforcement it is rendered by *a nawet* 'and even', as in (91); in its antithetic uses it corresponds to the emphatic marker *ależ* 'but' performing countering functions, as in (92).

(89) Whilst I believe that the EU's Member States should retain control over their own taxation systems, it is clear that there must be cooperation across the EU and **indeed** with third countries in order to counter tax evasion.

Choć moim zdaniem państwa członkowskie UE powinny odzyskać kontrolę nad własnymi systemami podatkowymi, to niewątpliwie w celu zwalczania zjawiska uchylania się od płacenia podatków potrzebna jest współpraca w ramach UE, **a także** z państwami trzecimi. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-02-10-010)

(90) I await a comparable announcement from the Commission or, **indeed**, from President Barroso.

Oczekuję porównywalnego oświadczenia Komisji Europejskiej, **a tak naprawdę** pana przewodniczącego Barroso. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-03-10-007)

(91) The European Union's competence is constantly being questioned, but Europe should and **indeed** must be the motive force for development.

Kompetencje Unii Europejskiej są ciągle podważane, lecz Europa powinna, a **nawet** musi być siłą napędową dla rozwoju. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-07-09-04-020)

(92) And they lived happily ever after! **Indeed** they did not!
I żyli długo i szczęśliwie! **Ależ** nie! (*Paralela*, OpenSub|1509)

6.5. Confirmatory adverbs in Polish

In Polish, confirmatory adverbs are of two types: (1) adverbs which signal conformity with expectations: *oczywiście, naturalnie*, and (2) adverbs

which confirm the validity of prior claims: *rzeczywiście, istotnie,* and *faktycznie. Oczywiście* and *naturalnie* correspond in their meanings to *naturally*, while *rzeczywiście, istotnie,* and *faktycznie* represent the same category as *indeed*. The two groups are discussed briefly in sections 6.5.1 and 6.5.2, respectively.

6.5.1. *Oczywiście* and *naturalnie*

Oczywiście and *naturalnie* express conformity with expectations. *Oczywiście* is used in both formal and informal registers, hence its high frequency in Polish (see Table 27). In the National Corpus of Polish its frequency is particularly high in spoken language. *Naturalnie* is more formal and literary in character, which is why its frequency is lower. In the National Corpus of Polish it is most frequent in literary works.

Oczywiście derives from the adjective *oczywisty* 'obvious', but, in contrast to *obviously*, it does not have inferential meanings. It expresses conformity with expectations, and marks claims as obvious. *Naturalnie* derives from the adjective *naturalny*, and like its English equivalent *naturally*, it can be used both as an adverb of manner (cf. section 6.4.2) and a confirmatory adverb.

The confirmatory character of both adverbs is particularly evident when they occur in confirmatory answers, as illustrated in (93) and (94).

(93)   Czy mógłby mi pan dać berliński numer Knüfera? – ***Oczywiście***, proszę chwilę poczekać. (NKJP, fiction, M. Krajewski, *Koniec świata w Breslau*, 2003)

   'Sir, could you, please, give me Knüfer's phone number in Berlin? – ***Of course***, hold on a moment, please.'

(94)   Komara, Ledera, znał pan? – ***Naturalnie***. (NKJP, fiction, T. Torańska, *Oni*, 1985)

   'Did you know Komar, Leder? – ***Of course***, I did.'

In more emphatic answers, *oczywiście* and *naturalnie* are preceded by *ależ* (emphatic 'but'), as in (95).

(95)   Tę chwilę wybrała Alina Fajtówna, żeby jej szepnąć parę słów, o które bracia nieustannie dawali jej znaki. Grodzicka, zaskoczona, patrzyła na nią z początku jakby nie rozumiejąc, wreszcie

ocknęła się: – ***Ależ naturalnie***, moje dziecko! Bardzo się cieszę. (NKJP, fiction, J. Parandowski, *Niebo w płomieniach*, 1988)

'Alina Fajtówna chose that moment to tell her the few words that her brothers had constantly been urging her to say. Grodzicka looked at her in surprise, as if she could not understand, and finally she came to herself: – ***But of course***, my child! I'm very happy.'

The two adverbs can also be combined for emphasis, like *of course* and *naturally* in English, as illustrated in (96).

(96)   Jeżeli pana posła nigdy nikt w życiu nie wykiwał, to ja mogę tylko zazdrościć. Mnie? ***Naturalnie że tak***, ***oczywiście***. (NKJP, parliamentary enquiry committee, 2003)

   'If you have never been cheated in your life, I can only envy you. Me? Yes, ***of course***, ***naturally***.'

The example quoted in (96) illustrates the tendency of Polish adverbs expressing expectations to be used with the subordinator *że* 'that'. Such uses are found in statements which confirm the information given in a prior sentence, e.g. (97).

(97)   Pytają, czy go znam. Popiela? ***Oczywiście, że*** znam.(NKJP, fiction, T. Torańska, *Oni*, 1985)

   'They ask me if I know Popiel. Do I know him? ***Of course***, I do.'

The two adverbs can also be used to give permission, as in (98) and (99), at the same time indicating that it is obvious to the speaker that the permission will be granted.

(98)   A możemy zobaczyć tę kozę?! – ***Ależ oczywiście***, że możesz ją zobaczyć! – roześmiała się babcia Halinka. (NKJP, fiction, M. Pałasz, *Dziwne przypadki Ferdynanda Szkodnika*, 2010)

   'Can we see the goat? … – ***But of course*** you can! – said Grandma Helenka, laughing.'

(99)   Piotr, ten z góry, przyszedł zapytać, czy mogą dziś bawić się razem. – ***Naturalnie***, że możecie – zgodziła się od razu mama. (NKJP, fiction, M. Krüger, *Karolcia*, 1959)

'Piotr, the boy from the flat above, has come to ask if they can play together. – *Of course*, you can – Mum agreed immediately.'

Oczywiście is also used to make assumptions about the interlocutor's knowledge, in a similar way as *of course* (see section 6.2.1).

(100) Wiesz *oczywiście*, że Anka wychodzi za mąż? (NKJP, Z. Milska--Wrzesińska, *Bezradnik*, 2009)

'You know *of course* that Anka is getting married?'

(101) Rozumiesz *oczywiście*, jeśli zainwestujesz 50 dolarów, to z pewnością szybko bogaczem nie zostaniesz. (NKJP, P. Obmiński, *HYIP. Najszybsza droga do bogactwa*, 2008)

'You understand *of course* that if you invest 50 dollars, you will not become rich very quickly.'

The NKJP data suggest that *naturalnie* is not used to indicate that some knowledge is expected from the addressee. The absence of such uses may suggest that, like *naturally*, it is less likely to signal that things should be obvious to the addressee (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007; cf. section 6.2.2). *Naturalnie* is also similar to *naturally* in its reference to what is expected (and natural) in specific circumstances, as in the examples quoted in (102) and (103).

(102) Udało mu się skończyć … list do Ani …. Skończył, wysłał i *naturalnie* spodziewał się odpowiedzi. (NKJP, fiction, M. Tomaszewska, *Tego lata w Burbelkowie*, 2000)

'He managed to finish his letter to Ania, posted it, and *naturally* he expected an answer.'

(103) Prawdziwy szczur. Tyle że biały i do myszy podobny, bo taki wypielęgnowany. Położyła go na stole, przed moją filiżanką, jakby to cukiernica była, a sama krząta się po kuchni, ciasteczka jakieś na stół położyła i tak dalej. Szczurzysko *naturalnie* od razu do ciasteczek i nażera się za wszystkie czasy. (NKJP, fiction, Christian Skrzyposzek, *Wolna Trybuna*, 1985)

'A real rat. It was white and similar to a mouse, well groomed. She put it on the table, in front of my cup, as if the rat was a sugar-bowl, and continued to busy herself in the kitchen. She put some biscuits on the table. *Naturally*, the rat immediately headed for the biscuits and started devouring them.'

When one sends a letter to someone, it is natural to expect an answer. Likewise, it seems quite natural and predictable for a rat to eat the biscuits placed in front of it. The speaker's expectations result from the predictability of re-occurring situations. Overall, the meanings and functions of *oczywiście* and *naturalnie* are similar to those identified for *of course* and *naturally*. *Naturally* and *naturalnie* signal what is expected and natural in specific situations, while *of course* and *oczywiście* signal that the speaker expects things to be equally obvious to the addressee as they are to him/her.

6.5.2. *Rzeczywiście, istotnie, faktycznie*

Rzeczywiście, istotnie, and *faktycznie* are used to confirm prior claims and hypotheses. All three adverbs are de-adjectival formations. *Rzeczywiście* derives from the adjective *rzeczywisty* 'real', and is related to the noun *rzeczywistość* 'reality'; *faktycznie* derives from the adjective *faktyczny* 'actual, true' and the noun *fakt* 'fact'; *istotnie* comes from the adjective *istotny* 'significant', and ultimately the noun *istota* 'essence', from Proto-Slavic 'certainty, truthfulness, reality' (Boryś 2006). Thus, in their basic senses, all three adverbs confirm that a hypothesis or an opinion held by someone turned out to be true in reality. Like *indeed*, they transfer a claim from the realm of possibility to the realm of reality. When used as confirmation markers, *rzeczywiście, istotnie,* and *faktycznie* are in many contexts interchangeable. They differ with respect to the types of register which they are used in: *istotnie* is formal and literary; *faktycznie* is rather colloquial (*ISJP*; *USJP*); *rzeczywiście* is the most register neutral of the three adverbs. The subtle semantic and syntactic differences between them are outlined below.

Rzeczywiście is the most frequent item in the group (see Table 9). It is used in confirmatory responses to questions, as in (104), and in statements confirming prior claims, as in (105).

(104) Prawda, że wyśmienite? – *Rzeczywiście* – potwierdziłem. (NKJP, fiction, W. Myśliwski, *Traktat o łuskaniu fasoli*, 2007)

'It's delicious, isn't it? – *Indeed* it is. – I confirmed.'

(105) Ulica Piękna była **rzeczywiście** piękna. Brodawki i oparzeliny gruzów zostały w śródmieściu. Tutaj, mimo późnej jesieni, panowała harmonia i spokój. Domy nienaruszone, o oryginalnej architekturze, dużo bezlistnych teraz drzew. (NKJP, fiction, Z. Smektała, *Chcica…*, 2008)

'*Beautiful* Street was **indeed** beautiful. The rubble so characteristic of the inner city was nowhere to be seen. Even though it was late autumn, everything was harmonious and calm there. The houses were intact, their original architecture preserved, lots of leafless trees.'

In (105) *rzeczywiście* is used to confirm the implication conveyed in the name of the street: a street called beautiful turned out to really be beautiful. Adamska (2004) argues that *rzeczywiście* expresses evidential meaning because it requires access to "direct evidence from perception" (Adamska 2004: 11); the speaker must have some grounds to confirm prior statements or expectations. Adamska (2004: 10) observes that *rzeczywiście* often expresses surprise (mirativity), and signals that the state of affairs turned out to be different from the speaker's prior expectations. Such use is illustrated in (106).

(106) Trochę z nim rozmawiałam. – Rozmawiała z nim i nic nie mówi! – oburzył się Julek. Pestka i Marian również byli zdziwieni. – Powiedział mi, że przebił sobie nogę… – rzekła Ula niepewnie. I więcej nic? – zakrzyknął Julek. Nie spytałaś go, skąd przyszedł? I jak tu trafił? Nie… – Dopiero teraz przyszło Uli na myśl, że jej rozmowa z tym obcym była **rzeczywiście** jakaś dziwna. Nie mogąc się przyznać, jak było naprawdę, dodała dla usprawiedliwienia: – On ma gorączkę. (NKJP, fiction, Irena Jurgielewiczowa, *Ten obcy*, 1961)

'I talked to him a little. – She's talked to him but she will not say anything! – said Julek reprovingly. Pestka and Marian were also surprised. – He told me he'd hurt his leg. – Ula said hesitantly. – And nothing else? – cried Julek. You didn't ask him where he'd come from? How he got here? You didn't … – It then occurred to Ula that her conversation with the stranger had **indeed** been

rather weird. She didn't want to admit that, and looking for an excuse for her behaviour, she said: – He has a fever.'

In (106) the speaker uses *rzeczywiście* to confirm that the situation referred to was strange, as suggested by her friends. By doing that, she also signals that her own judgement was wrong. In this specific situation, *rzeczywiście* means: 'contrary to what I thought'. It thus conveys the meaning of surprise, 'contrary to expectations', which has been reported by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) for *indeed*. *Rzeczywiście* can also be used in questions asking for confirmation, as in (107).

(107) Twierdzi, że od swoich zwierzchników dostał ścisłe wytyczne, aby zachować całkowitą tajemnicę, i nie ma zamiaru nikogo powiadamiać o terminie rozprawy. A teraz proszę nam powiedzieć, panie sędzio, czy **rzeczywiście** on nikogo nie musi powiadamiać? (NKJP, M. Krajewski, *Dżuma w Breslau*, 2007)

'He maintains that he received instructions from his supervisors that the information should be kept secret, and he has no intention of informing anyone about the time of the trial. And now, your honour, can you tell us whether it is **indeed** true that he does not have to inform anyone?'

Rzeczywiście can be used to signal both the superiority of the speaker and solidarity with the addressee. Rytel (1982: 65) notes the sense of superiority it expresses in rhetorical questions, such as the one in (108).

(108) Czy ta Szeherezada **rzeczywiście** taka trudna?

'Is Scheherezade **indeed** so difficult?'

Skowronek (1993), in turn, suggests that *rzeczywiście* and the other adverbs in the group signal sincerity and honesty, which is why they are frequently used in advertising. The adverbs are used to confirm that the advertised product really works, and meets the expectations of the customers.

Istotnie shares some of its confirmatory functions with *rzeczywiście*, but it tends to function as a sentence adverb, and rarely modifies individual sentence elements (cf. Grochowski *et al*. 2004: 89). It tends to occur sentence initially, as in (109), or before the main verb, as in (110).

(109) Może jednak powinienem sprowadzić jakiegoś lekarza? – Lekarza? – zdziwiła się. – Miałaś gorączkę. – Nic mi nie jest. – Dotknąłem jej czoła. ***Istotnie***, było chłodne. (NKJP, fiction, J. Głębski, *Droga do Ite*, 2006)

'Perhaps I should get a doctor? – A doctor? – she was surprised. – You had a fever. – I'm fine now. – I touched her forehead. ***Indeed***, it wasn't hot anymore.'

(110) Dyrektor generalny festiwalu Lidia Geringer d'Oedenberg, zapowiadając występ włoskiej śpiewaczki, nie ukrywała przed pełną salą (ponad 700 osób), że będzie to wydarzenie. I ***istotnie*** było. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Gazeta Wrocławska*, 2001)

'When the Director general of the festival, Lidia Geringer d'Oedenberg introduced the Italian singer to the audience gathered in the hall (over 700 people), she said that her concert was going to be a big event. And ***indeed*** it was.'

Istotnie is semantically closer to *rzeczywiście* than to *faktycznie*. All three adverbs can be paraphrased as 'it's true', but *faktycznie* has an additional meaning: 'in fact, in reality' (cf. Żabowska 2013). When *faktycznie* is used to mean 'it's true', it performs a confirmatory function, like *istotnie* and *rzeczywiście*, as illustrated in (111).

(111) Był tam taki jeden bydlak, mówili na niego 'Czarny' i ***faktycznie*** był czarny, opalony jak smoła. (NKJP, fiction, M. Soból, *Mojry*, 2005)

'There was a brute there, people called him 'Black', and ***indeed*** his skin was so tanned that he was pitch black.'

When *faktycznie* is used to mean 'in fact', it may be employed to indicate contrast between what appears or is officially held to be true, and what is in fact (*faktycznie*) true. Such use is connected with the etymology of the word *faktycznie* – 'based on facts' (*WSJP*); it is illustrated in examples (112) and (113).

(112) Oficjalnie są niepodlegli ***a faktycznie*** niekoniecznie. (NKJP, forum.historia.org.pl, 2008)

'They are officially independent, but ***in reality*** not necessarily so.'

(113) W okresie PRL każde przedsiębiorstwo działało na podstawie planu rocznego, a nawet planu kwartalnego, zatwierdzanego formalnie przez KSR, *a **faktycznie*** przez organa nadrzędne nad przedsiębiorstwami (NKJP, non-fiction literature, W. Kuczyński, *Burza nad Wisłą: dziennik 1980-1981*, 2002)

'In communist Poland every company operated on the basis of a yearly or even quarterly plan which was formally approved by KSR, while ***in fact*** it was approved by institutions which were superior to them.'

The ability to mean 'in fact' has led *faktycznie* to develop a number of textual functions which are similar to those performed by *indeed*. It is frequently employed to signal reformulation ('more specifically'), as in (114) and (115), and reinforcement ('or even'), as in (116) and (117).

(114) Kobieta mogła przysiąc, że minęło pół godziny, ale stary casio na ścianie nie kłamał. Sześćdziesiąt sekund, ***a faktycznie*** nawet nieco mniej – dokładnie tyle minęło od chwili, gdy poprzednio patrzyła na tarczę. (NKJP, fiction, M. Kaszyński, *Rytuał*, 2008)

'The woman could have sworn that at least half an hour had passed but the old Casio on the wall wasn't lying. Sixty second, or ***indeed*** even a little less than that – exactly that much time had passed since she last looked at the clock.'

(115) Serbia dostała się pod wpływ, a ***faktycznie*** protektorat, Austro-Węgier. (NKJP, non-fiction literature, H. Wereszycki, *Koniec sojuszu trzech cesarzy*, 1977)

'Serbia was under the influence, or ***indeed*** under the protectorate, of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.'

(116) Specyfiką naszej sceny politycznej jest to, że na ten moment, główną, a ***faktycznie*** jedyną, opozycją wobec Platformy jest PiS. (NKJP, www.borowski.pl)

'A characteristic feature of our current political scene is that the main, or ***indeed*** the only, opposition to Platforma is PiS.'

(117) Od kilku lat staram się przekonać władze uniwersytetu o celo-
wości, a ***faktycznie*** o konieczności prowadzenia kursu etyki dla
całego uniwersytetu. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Zielone Brygady.
Pismo Ekologów*, 1992)

'For the last few years, I have been trying to persuade the univer-
sity authorities that it is reasonable or ***indeed*** necessary, to offer
a course in ethics to all our students'.

In sum, Polish has three adverbs which are used to confirm prior
claims. Two of them, *rzeczywiście* and *istotnie*, are used as confirmatory
adverbs, meaning 'it's true'. A third one, *faktycznie*, is used both as a con-
firmatory adverb and a connective discourse marker meaning 'in fact'.

6.6. Confirmatory adverbs in English and Polish: summary and comparison

In both English and Polish confirmatory adverbs represent two types:
1) adverbs which signal conformity with expectations (Eng. *of course, nat-
urally*; Pol. *oczywiście, naturalnie*; 2) adverbs which confirm the validity
of prior claims (Eng. *indeed*; Pol. *rzeczywiście, istotnie, faktycznie*). The
adverbs which signal conformity with expectations form small and com-
parable sets in the two languages. As indicated by data from the parallel
corpus, *oczywiście* is a close equivalent of *of course*, and *naturalnie* is a
close equivalent of *naturally*. *Of course* and *oczywiście* mark claims as ex-
pected and obvious both to the speaker and the addressee, while *naturally*
and *naturalnie* mark claims as predictable in specific situations. In addi-
tion to signalling conformity with expectations, confirmatory adverbs are
used to confirm the speaker's readiness to comply with requests, to offer
consolation to the addressee, etc. In English, conformity with expecta-
tions and the implication of obviousness are also found in the seman-
tics of inferential adverbs (*obviously, clearly, manifestly*). Polish inferential
adverbs do not express the sense of expectations. Therefore, the Polish
adverb *oczywiście* is employed as a translation equivalent of *of course, ob-
viously, manifestly*, and the other inferential adverbs if these are used to
signal that a given claim is obvious.

While the small set of adverbs signalling conformity with expectations
is similar in English and Polish, the category of adverbs indicating con-
firmation of a prior claim is different in the two languages. English has
one polyfunctional adverb, *indeed*, which performs all the functions (and
more) which are characteristic of its three Polish equivalents: *rzeczywiście,
istotnie, faktycznie*. *Indeed* is an emphasizer, a confirmation adverb, and a
discourse marker with connective functions. The three Polish adverbs all
function as markers of confirmation; *faktycznie* is additionally used as a
reformulatory and reinforcing conjunct.

7. Argumentative adverbs

7.1. Introduction

Argumentative adverbs are used to build arguments in acknowledgement of other, potentially critical, voices. They signal the speaker's awareness that the claim s/he is making may be questioned, denied or doubted by other speakers. They are thus intrinsically connected with the heteroglossic nature of discourse (cf. Bakhtin 1981 [1935]; White 2003; Martin and White 2005). As noted in Chapter 3, the category of argumentative adverbs has been distinguished in this study on the basis of Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer's (2007) category of speech-act adverbs, comprising such items as: *admittedly, arguably, avowedly, incontestably, incontrovertibly, indisputably, unarguably, undeniably,* and *unquestionably*. In this work, the category has been extended to include *assuredly*, *undoubtedly,* and *indubitably*. At the same time, *avowedly* has been transferred to the category of reportive adverbs. In contrast to Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer's (2007) category, the group has thus been delimited on functional grounds rather than on the basis of the relation of the items to speech-act verbs. In Polish, the category of argumentative adverbs comprises: *bezsprzecznie, bezspornie, bezapelacyjnie, bezdyskusyjnie, niekwestionowanie, niepodważalnie, niezaprzeczalnie, niewątpliwie,* and *bez wątpienia*. It is based on the set of Polish speech-act adverbs identified in Rozumko (2012b, 2016c), and subsequently enriched with two adverbs which signal that the proposition does not raise doubts: *niewątpliwie* and *bez wątpienia*.

On the morphological level, argumentative adverbs can be divided into positive and negative ones. The positive ones include: *admittedly, arguably*, and *assuredly*; and the negative ones: *incontestably, incontrovert-*

ibly, indisputably, unarguably, unquestionably, undeniably, undoubtedly, and *indubitably.* The division is, however, only applicable to English adverbs, as Polish does not have any positive adverbs of this type; all the Polish argumentative adverbs are morphologically negative. Table 12 provides the list of English and Polish argumentative adverbs, together with their frequencies in the British National Corpus (BNC) and the National Corpus of Polish (NKJP), respectively.

Table 12. Argumentative adverbs in English and Polish

English adverbs	Freq per 100 m words (BNC)	Polish adverbs	Freq per 100 m words (NKJP)
positive			
admittedly	708		
arguably	627	-	-
assuredly	57		
negative			
undoubtedly	2,340	niewątpliwie	4,538
unquestionably	219	bez wątpienia	1,611
undeniably	157	bezsprzecznie	203
indisputably	47	bezapelacyjnie	137
indubitably	33	bezspornie	77
incontrovertibly	14	bezdyskusyjnie	68
unarguably	14	niezaprzeczalnie	43
incontestably	4	niepodważalnie	14
		niezaprzeczenie	5
		niekwestionowanie	5

As shown in Table 12, only *undoubtedly* and its Polish equivalent *niewątpliwie* have relatively high frequencies in the monolingual corpora, while the other adverbs in the group, particularly the speech-act adverbs, all have low frequencies. In this chapter I will analyze all the English adverbs in the group on the basis of their occurrence in the BNC, beginning with the ones which are morphologically positive, i.e. *admittedly, arguably,* and *assuredly.* Subsequently, I will identify their most frequent Polish equivalents in the translation corpus, and then discuss briefly the Polish

set of argumentative adverbs. Finally, I will compare the uses of the English and Polish adverbs in the category.

7.2. Argumentative adverbs in English

7.2.1. *Admittedly*

Admittedly is used to agree (admit) "that something is true" (*OD).* It is the most frequent argumentative adverb among the morphologically positive ones; it is attested in initial, medial and final positions in the BNC, which signals its ability to modify both clauses and clause elements. It is a little more common in the written sources of the corpus than in the spoken ones (see Table 26).

Quirk *et al.* (1985: 620), and Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 193) classify *admittedly* as an adverb of certainty. It expresses a high degree of confidence when it is used in non-concessive contexts, i.e. those where it is used to admit that something is true, without performing any additional rhetorical functions, as in (1) and (2).

(1) It is, **admittedly**, refreshing to meet the occasional non-slippery politician. (BNC, A7Y 219)

(2) It is argued that there will be no discounts only surcharges, on original prices, and this will be inflationary. This seems highly unlikely at a time when high street stores are holding sales before Christmas. **Admittedly**, it's a nuisance in going into crowded banks to obtain cash. That could be resolved if financial institutions were willing to invest a little more in cash dispensers in shopping centres. (BNC, AAJ 219-222)

Such neutral agreement-marking uses of *admittedly* are, however, infrequent in the corpus. It is more often used to weaken "the importance or force of a statement" (*CED*) than to emphasize it. In examples (3) and (4), it signals some weak points of the claims made by the speaker.

(3) In the (**admittedly** unlikely) event of consecrated wine soaking into the oiled wood, the credence table must (if my memory of canonical law is correct), be either burnt or eaten. (BNC, A0X 1421)

(4) And third, if – and **admittedly**, this is a huge if – the next decade sees a retreat from the brash consumerism of the mid-1980s, one

cannot resist the thought that it is small, local businesses which will better cope with, pander to and profit from the change in mood. (BNC, A9D 737)

In most cases, however, *admittedly* expresses commitment to a proposition only to move to a "counter-proposition". As noted by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 193), its main function is to signal concession (cf. also Szczyrbak 2014). By using *admittedly*, the speaker "concedes that something is true, while at the same time expressing that the proposition is less important in the argumentation than another one" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 193). In Martin and White's (2005: 98) terms, *admittedly* can be said to express "conceding concurrence", i.e. reluctant agreement. Such use is illustrated in examples (5)-(8).

(5) He was glad he had got rid of her. **Admittedly**, she had been the one who left, <u>but</u>, in the end, he had been the one to do the getting-rid-of. Poor Judi. (BNC, ALJ 815-8816)

(6) Armscott Manor was vast and rambling, **admittedly**. <u>But</u> it was their home … inviting Guy Sterne to use it as a convenient guesthouse was like flinging open the drawbridge to the enemy … (BNC, JY3 2300-2301)

(7) Not content with converting the craft's very considerable hold – it was, after all, originally constructed as a cargo vessel – into cabins and bathrooms, he had constructed on the deck a bridge, saloon and galley which, <u>while</u> **admittedly** functional, detracted notably from the overall aesthetic effect. (BNC, CKC 3179)

(8) <u>Though</u> **admittedly** inconclusive, the evidence suggests that the annulment was uppermost in Henry's mind until early 1532, but was then overtaken by thoughts of the supremacy. (BNC, CLM 593)

Szczyrbak (2014: 36) observes that concession allows speakers to make their claims "sound more convincing and better substantiated". The reluctant agreement signals acknowledgement of the weak points of the claim, which creates the impression that the speaker has considered the issue carefully. In this way, it adds credibility to the speaker's position. The counter-claim which follows functions as a rebuttal of anticipated chal-

lenges and objections. The example quoted in (8) illustrates the strengthening function of the concession signalled by *admittedly*. The writer first signals his awareness that the evidence he has at his disposal is inconclusive, but the fact that he decides to present his conclusion based on the same evidence indicates that he considers it to be valid. As illustrated in (5)-(8), the relation between the concession and the counter-claim is often signalled by the conjunctions *but*, *while,* and *though*.

7.2.2. *Arguably*

Arguably means "as may be argued or shown by argument", and is "used to say that a statement is very possibly true even if it is not certainly true" (*Merriam-Webster*). Like the illocutionary verb *argue*, it is used to present and defend arguments. *Arguably* is usually described as expressing a medium degree of certainty. It is used to indicate that a certain argument is "plausible or persuasive" (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 769), "while at the same time recognizing the possibility of disagreement or alternative viewpoints" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 192). In Martin and White's (2005) typology, it is associated with the functionality "entertain", as it openly acknowledges the availability of other dialogistic positions.

Like the other speech-act adverbs, *arguably* typically occurs in writing. In the BNC it is attested in the sentence intitial and medial positions; its uses in the sentence final position are not evidenced in the corpus. *Arguably* often introduces an argument which is subsequently justified and supported with some additional information or evidence, as in (9) and (10). Such justifications seem to be characteristic of its uses in the sentence initial position.

(9) **Arguably**, cycling is one of the best ways of really appreciating the beauty of Austria. You don't even have to be super-fit, as apart from one optional part of the route, the area is very flat! We also follow specially prepared bike routes, with little or no traffic. All the bikes we hire are in excellent condition, and we can offer smaller cycles for children. (BNC, AMD 145)

(10) **Arguably** the modern play with a limited cast is more effective in drawing in professional agents and casting directors since there are fewer 'bit' parts for students to get lost in. (BNC, A06 1438)

In both (9) and (10) the writers first make claims using *arguably*, and then provide some evidence substantiating their claims. In (9), the "specially prepared bike routes," "no traffic", and bikes "in excellent condition" are said to make cycling "one of the best ways of really appreciating the beauty of Austria". In (10), a limited cast is said to be more effective, as "there are fewer 'bit' parts" to get lost in. When used in the medial position, as a modifier of sentence elements, *arguably* expresses the speaker's stance towards a claim, but evidence supporting it does not necessarily follow, as illustrated in (11)-(13).

(11)   Sport may be taken too seriously; high-performance spectator sport is ***arguably*** too central to our lives already. But the friendliness and common sense of ordinary players, the humour, excitement, and the fun it affords offer reasonable grounds for hope. (BNC, A6Y 1316)

(12)   For the same price the 164-miles West Highland line threads its way from the heart of Glasgow past Loch Lomond to the pretty fishing port of Mallaig. Crossing desolate Rannoch Moor and glimpsing Ben Nevis, it is ***arguably*** the most beautiful in Britain. Other scenic areas include Wales, the South West, the Borders, Settle-to-Carlisle, the Heart of England, East Anglia, and the Peak district. (BNC, AHX 1461)

(13)   The same even goes for the JP233, ***arguably*** the most useful offensive weapon of the war so far. (BNC, ABH 1903)

In (11)-(13) *arguably* signals that while the writers are quite certain that their opinions are legitimate, they still acknowledge the possibility of alternative opinions. The examples quoted in (12) and (13) additionally illustrate the use of *arguably* with superlative adjectives, which is quite frequent in the corpus. There are also contexts which signal that the commitment expressed by *arguably* is scalar in character. In such cases, it is preceded by the degree modifier *more*, as in (14) and (15).

(14)   An increase in seventy may betoken – even, more ***arguably***, may occasion – a salutary change in the climate of opinion. (BNC, A69 684)

(15)   Needless to add, these processes (and, more ***arguably***, the forms of behaviour to which they give rise) have a far longer history than any particular society or mode of production. (BNC, HRM 460)

In (14) and (15) *arguably* is similar to *probably*; both adverbs indicate that probability is a notion which can be graded. There are, however, contexts where *arguably* cannot be substituted with *probably*. In (16), *arguably* refers to the plausibility of an interpretation of the claim, and means 'it can be argued, one could say'. A similar paraphrase, i.e. 'can be said' is possible in (17) and (18).

(16)   I went down to find out what had gone wrong. Apparently, because my employment had officially been terminated by me, I had ***arguably*** made myself voluntarily unemployed and was therefore entitled to benefit money only after a certain period. They weren't sure if this applied in my case but they were investigating the matter. (BNC, A0F 1056)

(17)   Animals suffer and die for a plethora of reasons; many are ***arguably*** trivial. One clear fact is that those reasons relate entirely to human interests. (BNC, B7K 1385)

(18)   One possible reason could be that in addition to a general sense of guilt associated with the organs of sex and reproduction, there is the added fact that most surrogate mothers belong to the economically disadvantaged classes; and it is ***arguably*** a case of exploitation if a woman is driven to use her reproductive organs to escape from a state of poverty. (BNC, BNE 1077)

Arguably seems to have two major meanings: (1) 'probably', (2) 'it can be argued/said'. In the case of the former, it indicates a degree of probability; in the case of the latter, it is more closely related to the verb *argue*, i.e. it signals that the proposition can be interpreted in a specific way.

7.2.3. *Assuredly*

Assuredly functions both as an adverb of manner and an epistemic adverb. In its manner sense, it means 'confidently', as in (19).

(19) After a disappointing first set, Nadal played ***assuredly*** and went
      on to win the match. (*CALD*)

The manner uses of *assuredly* are, however, rather infrequent; they are
not attested in the BNC. When used as an epistemic adverb, *assuredly*
expresses "the speaker's certainty that something is true" (*OD*). Quirk *et
al.* (1985: 621), and Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 768) classify *assuredly*
as a high confidence adverb. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 620) mark it as rare and
formal. In the BNC it only appears in written sources (see Table 26); it is
attested in sentence initial and medial positions. It is also used on its own,
as a response to a prior utterance.

Assuredly seems to express confidence which stems from the speaker/
writer's experience and empirical knowledge. Examples quoted in (20)-
(22) demonstrate that the opinions which the adverb qualifies are pre-
sented as resulting from the speaker/writer's familiarity with situations of
a similar type and the speaker/writer's world knowledge.

(20) Past precedents indicate that conflict will ***assuredly*** arise, if state-
      ments about God are used to fill the gaps in scientific explana-
      tion. (BNC, EEM 188)
(21) Evans (1989) proposes that co-authorship should be restricted
      to those who have made more than 50% of the contribution to
      the Ideas, Experimental, or Publication phases of research. …
      He ignores the fact that the major argument for including the su-
      pervisor's name in papers to which he or she has not made such
      a contribution is that it is the supervisor's reputation which has
      attracted the research grant or ensured publication. Such a con-
      tribution cannot be assessed, but ***assuredly***, the research could
      not take place without it. (BNC, HJ9 1495, 1498-1499)
(22) As this book goes to press (1979) these recommendations feed
      into the process of curriculum development in Lesotho. ***Assur-
      edly*** some will prove more valuable, some less so, some unwork-
      able. They are all part of that continuing process of gaining expe-
      rience in rational curriculum planning which forms the theme of
      this book. (BNC, BLY 1678-1680)

In (20) the writer explicitly refers to "past precedents" which influence
his opinion. In (21) and (22) the writers signal that they are familiar with
the mechanisms of the fields they refer to, i.e. the importance of the super-
visor's reputation in applications for grants and publications of scholarly
papers in (21), and the general knowledge that some recommendations
turn out to be more valuable than others in (22).

Assuredly can be used with the degree modifiers *more* and *most*, as
illustrated in (23) and (24), respectively. The insertion of the degree mod-
ifiers adds more emphasis to the already confident statements qualified by
assuredly.

(23) But let me just tell you this; self-pity will destroy you far <u>more</u>
      assuredly than Ryan could ever have done. (BNC, H9V 2240)
(24) Further to a letter forwarded to me by my colleagues in the Ork-
      ney Seven Action Group, I have now confirmed to my local MP,
      Jim Wallace, that such representations as he can make on my
      behalf <u>most</u> ***assuredly*** have my consent. (BNC, K5L 760)

Assuredly can be used in concessive contexts, though only one such in-
stance is attested in the BNC. It is quoted in (25), where *assuredly* appears
in the clause final position. As in the case of its non-concessive uses, it sig-
nals that the speaker's claim is based on familiarity with similar situations,
and communicates that 'such things have happened before'.

(25) Such rulers could defend the social order by force ***assuredly***; <u>but</u>
      by replacing the moral authority of the totem-father with the
      force of arms and the ingenuities of police control they ran the
      risk of invalidating the purely psychological and religious prohi-
      bitions which had supported the old order and had so success-
      fully promoted human social advancement. (BNC, HTP 498)

The relation of *assuredly* to the verb *assure* and the speech act of assur-
ing is most apparent when the adverb is used in response to the address-
ee's question or statement. In such cases, its meaning is paraphrasable
with 'you can be sure, I assure you', as in (26) and (27).

(26) 'Why not? Forgive me, but we *are* friends, are we not?'
      '***Assuredly***.' (BNC, HGV 4342)
(27) 'It's been a pleasure seeing you again, Officer,' said Melissa.

'*Assuredly*, we shall meet again soon!' he said meaningfully and marched out, bowing to Iris as he passed. (BNC, GVP 253)

In sum, the BNC data suggest that the major function of *assuredly* is to signal certainty resulting from the speaker/writer's experience. The speaker is certain that something will happen because s/he knows that similar things have happened before. *Assuredly* seems to function as a marker of pronouncement; it adds force to the speaker's claims, and signals the speaker's conviction that his/her claims cannot be doubted.

7.2.4. *Undoubtedly*

Monolingual dictionaries define *undoubtedly* by providing its synonyms: *certainly, definitely, without doubt, unquestionably,* and *indisputably* (*CED*). In contrast to most argumentative adverbs, it does not have a corresponding speech-act verb. It is, however, related to the mental verb *doubt,* which, like speech-act adverbs, signals the existence of alternative opinions. *Undoubtedly* is the most frequent adverb in the group. It is attested in initial, medial and final positions, which signals its ability to modify both entire clauses and their individual elements.

When *undoubtedly* modifies sentence elements and their constituents, i.e. when it is used as a subjunct, it functions as an emphasizer, or a marker of pronouncement, to use Martin and White's (2005) term. Like inferential adverbs, it typically occurs before adjectives in such cases. It signals that the property they name does not raise any doubts, as in (28)-(30).

(28) As a means of providing news, information and entertainment, television has an **undoubtedly** powerful role in both reflecting and reinforcing ideas. (BNC, C9S 7)

(29) She had explained to him about Flora, thinking that his **undoubtedly** benevolent heart would be touched. (BNC, CMJ 1480)

(30) The passengers looked horrified. The Mountie's impressive presence dominated the whole place and he sounded **undoubtedly** authentic. (BNC, BP9 1974-1975)

The closer *undoubtedly* is to the sentence initial position, the more judgemental and less content-oriented it becomes. When it occurs sentence-initially and before the main verb, it is less content-oriented, and

more clearly provides the speaker's opinion of the situation. It offers a wider perspective on the content of the proposition than it does in its sentence medial uses. It is similar in this respect to the inferential adverbs expressing retrospective inference (see Chapter 5). However, the opinion qualified by *undoubtedly* results from the speaker's knowledge concerning the subject matter referred to, not from inference. Such uses are illustrated in examples (31)-(33).

(31) As Wimbledon again approaches, the arguments about why British tennis is so poor still rage on, and are getting even more heated… **Undoubtedly**, the public interested in tennis has declined. They would rather watch American football on television; at least we import success. (BNC, A0V 558)

(32) The explanation is as follows. The palladium cathode was charged with dissolved hydrogen. More 'nascent' hydrogen was being liberated by the electrolysis. A few millimetres away 'nascent' oxygen was also being liberated. **Undoubtedly**, the bubbling oxygen would have come into contact with palladium. Both platinum and palladium are excellent catalysts, so the reaction most probably observed was $H_2 + O = H_2O$, a well-known liberator of heat. One would expect this to occur most readily when the anode and cathode spacing was small. (BNC, ANX 102-108)

(33) The tumult of war had **undoubtedly** touched Leonard, though his immediate family were spared its direct horrors. Indeed, he seems to have been more influenced by the adventure of war: '*Que la guerre est jolie!*' (BNC, A0P 459-460)

The examples quoted in (31)-(32) show that sentence initial *undoubtedly* is used to introduce an opinion which is subsequently supported with data. The speaker formulates a claim, communicates that s/he has no doubt it is true, and then explains what has led him/her to form the opinion. Sentence final *undoubtedly* has a similar function. It introduces a comment summarizing a situation, followed by additional, more specific information, as in (34).

(34) However, on these occasions they invariably slept together. An odd relationship, **undoubtedly**. Not a marriage, not a living-to-gether, not an affair. (BNC, ANY 823-825)

Undoubtedly is also found in concessive contexts. It often refers to two aspects or elements of the same situation, and signals that they are not necessarily true at the same time, or that they do not necessarily occur together; while one is true, the other one is not necessarily true. Such uses are illustrated in examples (35) and (36).

(35) You might think that after a year like this, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be older and wiser. Older he **undoubtedly** is, but he is not a jot wiser. (BNC, CBS 3708-3709)

(36) It was then, after a storm that had blown for seven days at speeds exceeding seventy knots, that the Ramapo encountered the biggest wave ever reported by a ship at sea. Lieutenant Margraff estimated it to be 112 feet from base to crest. The vessel survived. Bigger waves **undoubtedly** occur, but those who witness them do not return to tell the tale. (BNC, ASV 2205-2208)

Undoubtedly is also used to formulate confident predictions based on the speaker's knowledge. The grounds which the prediction relies on are often specified in the context, as in (37) and (38).

(37) Monica Seles is an excellent player. She has the best ground-strokes in the women's game and she is still only 17. She has a great future ahead of her and will **undoubtedly** improve as her serve and volleys do. (BNC A0V 447-449)

(38) The judge's ruling will **undoubtedly** have a substantial impact on the foreign tuna fleet, numbering more than 100 boats, because they are now required to have dolphin-protection regulations comparable to those of the US if they want to export tuna to the US. (BNC, ABC 1119)

In sum, *undoubtedly* signals that, based on what the speaker knows, there is no doubt that the proposition is true. The potential doubts are discouraged by references to data which support the speaker's claim and justify his/her position.

7.2.5. *Unquestionably*

Unquestionably means "in a way that cannot be disputed or doubted; without question" (*OD*). In addition to its epistemic sense, it also has a manner meaning ('without question'), which is found in its uses with such verbs as *support*, *accept*, and *reject*. Such uses are not, however, attested in the BNC; the examples quoted in (39) and (40) come from other sources.

(39) They suffered an acute conflict of loyalties, and no longer **un-questionably** supported British rule in India. (Mc Pherson 2010: 83)

(40) In evaluating generalizations, be cautious, but not cynical; you should neither **unquestionably** accept them nor **unquestionably** reject them. (Mitchell *et al*. 2013: 189)

Like the other speech-act adverbs, *unquestionably* is a low frequency item, characteristic of written language (see Table 26). In the BNC it is attested in sentence initial and medial positions; it can be used to qualify both sentence elements and entire sentences.

When it is used to refer to sentence elements, it functions as an emphasizer, and signals that a given part of the proposition raises no questions or doubts in the speaker, as illustrated in examples (41)-(43).

(41) Since the stonemasons were usually allowed to create their own designs, they were also given the freedom to crack good jokes. Some are **unquestionably** crude. (BNC, A7D 1112-1113)

(42) The possessor of what is **unquestionably** the world's largest and finest collection of contemporary art, Saatchi has sold before – but never, according to the rumours, on anything like this scale. (BNC, A5R 152)

(43) In 1960 the Club had its best financial year (pound for pound) since 1931, **unquestionably** helped by the installation of 'fruit machines' which were instantly popular with a section of members and a good source of income. (BNC, AMY 1085)

When used as a sentence adverb, *unquestionably* tends to qualify statements which summarize a discussed point, as in (44) and (55).

(44) But I also have in mind the massive destruction of delicate, irre-placeable ecosystems (the rain forests of the world are the most obvious example), the massive pollution of the waters of the earth, the massive loss of top soil, the massive contribution to the greenhouse effect, and – lest we forget – the massive assault on human health that can be attributed directly and indirectly to the massive production and consumption of so-called 'food' an-imals that characterise our times. ***Unquestionably***, this pattern of massive production and consumption is bad for the earth, bad for humans, and bad for the other animals. (BNC, B04 683-684)

(45) So in December 1177 in exchange for 15,000 livres angevines (roughly £4000) and forty pack animals – clearly intended to be used for the long pilgrimage to Jerusalem – Henry acquired the whole county of La Marche. Since it was believed to be worth over £13,000 it was an amazing bargain, but one which was avail-able only to a purchaser with immense cash reserves. It trans-formed the entire structure of power in eastern Aquitaine. Inev-itably it was a transaction which disturbed many of Audebert of La Marche's neighbours, and especially his distant kinsmen, the Lusignans and Taillefers. But there was nothing they could do. Henry took the homage of the barons and knights of La Marche and then returned to Angers to celebrate Christmas. It was one of the greatest feasts of his reign. His sons were there and so was a concourse of knights so huge that it reminded men of his Coronation. ***Unquestionably*** there was a great deal to celebrate. (BNC, EFV 902-910)

In both (44) and (45), the authors first describe the situations, and present their arguments: the influence of massive production and con-sumption on the environment; the achievements of king Henry, and then summarize their points using *unquestionably*. *Unquestionably* closes the discussion, and discourages any alternative views. The role *unquestionably* serves in the process of building arguments can be contrasted with the functions of *undoubtedly*. While *unquestionably* tends to close the discus-sion after a presentation of arguments, *undoubtedly* is used to introduce a new point to be subsequently supported with evidence. Another differ-ence is that *undoubtedly* often refers to the future, and qualifies the speak-er's predictions based on his/her current knowledge, while *unquestionably* tends to only refer to the past or the present. The difference seems to result from the semantics of the two adverbs; if something has not occurred, it cannot be questioned. The speaker may, however, have no doubts that it will occur.

Based on the BNC data, *unquestionably* appears to be rare in conces-sive contexts. Occasionally, it is used to concede that two claims are not mutually exclusive. The speaker agrees that one claim is true ('on the one hand'), and signals that ('on the other hand') the other one is true as well, as in (46) and (47).

(46) By observation we can probe this world and attempt to discern the laws which regulate it. The observer has to submit himself to the way things are. ***Unquestionably*** such a view corresponds to the motivation of science and the way that scientists talk about their discoveries. <u>However</u> we have seen that quantum theory places considerable restraint on a plain man's objectivist view of the natural world. (BNC, EW6 1494-1497)

(47) At best, she had what could be described as deuterocanonical status; she was ***unquestionably*** outside the usual canon of poets, <u>but</u> occasionally she was rediscovered and even admired. In all, it seems that Leapor has, at last, been recognized as a poet worthy of serious consideration. (BNC, AN4 695-696)

Unquestionably does not seem to undermine the validity of the claim it qualifies; the concessive constructions it occurs in are used to signal that the problems discussed need to be analyzed from different perspectives.

7.2.6. *Undeniably*

Undeniably is "used to emphasize that something cannot be denied or disputed" (*OD*). Like *unquestionably*, it also has manner uses indicating that something has been confirmed or established in a way which cannot be denied, as in (48).

(48) Ongoing advances in neuroscience now confirm **undeniably** that addiction involves the neural activity of the brain. (Vidrine 2016: n.p.)

Like the other speech-act adverbs, *undeniably* is infrequent, and characteristic of written language. In the BNC it is attested in sentence initial and medial positions, which signals its ability to relate to entire clauses as well as their elements. However, regardless of its position in a sentence, the major function of *undeniably*, as evidenced in the BNC, is to balance claims. It is used both to indicate concession, and to introduce counter-claims.

Concessive uses of *undeniably* are very frequent in the analyzed corpus sample. The adverb is often used in contexts where the speaker discusses the advantages and disadvantages of a situation, its strong and weak points, the arguments for and the arguments against. *Undeniably* is used to confirm that a certain situation has its advantages, but enables the speaker to present its weak points; it is also used to agree that a certain weakness exists, but enables the speaker to focus on the strong points of the situation. As observed by Antaki and Wetherell (1999: 10), concession contributes to "bolstering" the speaker's argument and "weakening, or even dismissing, the counter case" (cf. also Szczyrbak 2014: 36).

(49) Microchip warfare is **undeniably** impressive, <u>but</u> it is clearly not flawless. (BNC, ABH 3226)

(50) This is an **undeniably** gifted, <u>but</u> enigmatic, composer, who stands – as E. M. Forster said of Cavafy – at a slight angle to the rest of the universe. (BNC, BMC 1672)

(51) **Undeniably** naïve, he <u>nonetheless</u> loved the magic which was beyond the grasp of record companies. (BNC, ART 80)

As illustrated in (49)-(51), the speaker's move to a counter-claim is signalled by the conjunctions *but* and *although,* and the conjunct *nevertheless*. The example quoted in (52) shows that a counter-claim may also be introduced by *and*, as in (52).

(52) York is **undeniably** pretty and can be pretty expensive too if you are not careful. (BNC, BPJ 287)

The counter-claims introduced by *undeniably* usually begin with *yet* and *however*, which explicitly signal that the speaker moves to a counter-claim, as in examples (53)-(55).

(53) He says, 'I've settled down to my own lyrical thing': small, free-standing, autonomous stained glass panels, whose figuration recalls medieval glass and Renaissance painting, and whose brushwork has a timeless, flourishing spontaneity. <u>Yet</u> these are **undeniably** contemporary works. (BNC, CC0 745-756)

(54) *Rasbora daniconius* has few devotees, often being dismissed as 'too ordinary'. <u>Yet</u> the bright golden lateral line, emphasized by a black area below, is **undeniably** striking. (BNC, CGH 1441-1442)

(55) The book leads the reader through a very thorough and practical taildragger conversion syllabus, covering preparation, theory, ground handling, take-offs and landings, with a vital chapter on crosswinds. … Although perhaps a little detailed and daunting for the potential trainee, reading (and understanding) it will certainly speed the conversion process and consequently save time, money and unnecessary sweat. <u>However</u> it is **undeniably** expensive for a paperback with simple line diagram illustrations and no colour. (BNC, CAU 559, 563-564)

In those contexts where *undeniably* introduces a counter-claim, it functions as a marker of pronouncement, as it adds emphasis to the speaker's claim, and signals that, in the speaker's view, it cannot be denied. Thus, in both cases – indicating concession and marking pronouncement – it serves as a tool for strengthening the speaker's argument.

7.2.7. Indisputably

Indisputably means "in a way that cannot be challenged or denied" (*OD*). In addition to its uses as an epistemic adverb, *indisputably* functions as an adverb of manner, indicating (like *unquestionably* and *undeniably*) that something has been established or proved in a way which cannot be denied. Such use is illustrated in (56).

(56) 'The Hieroglyphs, cosmological monuments and institutions of the Peoples of Central and South America prove **indisputably**

the existence of communication between America and India.' (BNC, CB9 89)

In the BNC it only occurs in written sources; it is attested in sentence initial and medial positions. In its uses as an epistemic adverb, *indisputably* signals that there is absolutely no doubt that a claim it qualifies is true. When it modifies nouns and adjectives functioning as subject complements, and pre-modifying adjectives in noun phrases, it indicates that the qualities they denote are unambiguous, and allow no other interpretation than the one offered by the speaker, as in (57)-(59). The confidence expressed by *indisputably* can be further emphasized by the degree modifier *so*, as illustrated in (57).

(57) She had of course questioned the decision that had left her heiress to Tara, while Fergus, <u>so</u> ***indisputably*** a leader, so plainly possessing the natural authority Grainne believed she lacked, was relegated to the command of the Fiana. (BNC, G10 1545)

(58) Well, we could make the censorship work for us. If I were playing an ***indisputably*** virtuous character, then cliché dictates that I would at least be spared death, imprisonment or degradation. (BNC, GVL 654-656)

(59) The well proportioned portico is three columns deep and shows Greek influence in its simplicity but the plan, with engaged columns on the sides of the cella, is ***indisputably*** Roman (102, 112 and 113). (BNC, HWB 423)

Indisputably is also used to indicate that one point is more certain than others. While the other ones may be somewhat controversial and raise some doubt, the one qualified by *indisputably* is presented as entirely uncontroversial. Such use is illustrated in (60) and (61).

(60) Reverting to the situation we find ourselves in at this moment, there are four facts that can be regarded as certainties or near-certainties. Santorini is about as stable as the proverbial blancmange. It's sitting on top of a thermal plume. Thirdly, the chances are high that it is sitting atop an ancient tectonic boundary that runs east-west under the Mediterranean – this is where the African and Eurasian plates are in contention. Lastly, and ***indisputably***,

we are sitting atop the equivalent of roughly 200 million tons of TNT. If that goes up I would say it is highly probable – in fact think I should use the word inevitable – that both the thermal plume and the temporarily quiescent earthquake zone along the tectonic fault would be reactivated. (BNC, CKC 1878-1883)

(61) Of the seven wars with France that can be counted between 1690 and 1815, only one was ***indisputably*** a war about colonies, but of course all of them affected the colonies and their inhabitants. (BNC, CS5 655)

In its sentence initial uses, *indisputably* introduces a conclusion, and signals that among numerous problematic aspects of a situation, there is one which is uncontroversial, and raises no doubt. It thus functions as a marker of pronouncement, i.e. it adds emphasis to the speaker's opinion. The sentence initial position involves looking at a situation from a distance and considering various arguments. Such use is exemplified in (62), where the writer discusses various problems connected with courses in art and design, concluding that only one thing is uncontroversial: "art and design education occupies an important place" both in life and education.

(62) Thus, to a considerable extent, the pattern of courses in art and design has been 'rationalized' and brought more in line with the rest of further education. Whether this rationalization improves the quality of the courses, still less solves the problems of the art and design world, is another matter altogether. It will certainly do nothing to resolve the philosophical doubts of those who regard art and design as essentially different or yet others working in the art and design faculties of polytechnics who fear that the technological and scientific ambiance of the institution is inimical to the needs and style of high-level art education. ***Indisputably***, however, art and design education occupies an important place both in the life of the country at large and also in further education in particular, and its practitioners are only too well aware of the difficulties which they face. (BNC, GUV 677-178)

Like most argumentative adverbs, *indisputably* is used in concessive contexts. By using it, the speaker signals agreement with a claim whose

value is subsequently diminished with a counter-claim. It thus signals "conceding concurrence" (cf. Martin and White 2005). As observed earlier with reference to Antaki and Wetherell (1999), and Szczyrbak (2014), such concessive uses may serve as a strategy to strengthen the speaker's own claim. They are illustrated in examples (63) and (64).

(63) He was ***indisputably*** a loyal servant of Edward II, but he was not the will-less, visionless opportunist which his skillful pragmatism may suggest. (BNC, F9L 850)

(64) I realise I'm in a minority of one when I say I'm bored with Beres Hammond's ***indisputably*** soulful voice, but many of his records seem to lack the sheer excitement of ragga. (BNC, CK6 1226)

In sum, *indisputably* is used to mark claims as uncontroversial, and to signal that they are entirely clear to the speaker and, potentially, to anyone. In some cases, it merely indicates that a claim is unambiguous and raises no doubt; in others, it is used to signal that it is the most uncontroversial and unambiguous point of the situation which is being considered.

7.2.8. *Indubitably*

Indubitably derives from the adjective *indubitable*, meaning "too evident to be doubted" (*Merriam-Webster*). This sense is also clearly present in the semantics of the adverb, which is used to communicate that a claim it qualifies is evident to everyone, and is not likely to arouse any controversy. In the BNC it is only attested in written sources (see Table 26). In many contexts, *indubitably* is similar to *indisputably*, as both adverbs qualify claims which refer to well-known facts and situations which can be objectively verified. Such uses of *indubitably* are illustrated in (65) and (66).

(65) Constitutions are not, of course, confined to democratic states. Indeed, the vast majority of the 159 member states comprising the United Nations possess codified constitutions, although less than a third of these can fairly claim democratic credentials. The latter can, declares S E Finer with pardonable exaggeration, be counted on one's fingers and toes. Conversely, three countries which are ***indubitably*** democracies Britain, Israel and New Zealand – lack … codified constitutions. (BNC, FP8 213-216)

(66) It is a real pleasure to answer these letters, because I know that here are serious fishkeepers [orig: fishkepers] who are doing their best to ensure the long, healthy, and contented existence of their pets. Often the species involved are quite (or even very) unusual, and I am sent scurrying off to flick through books and scientific papers, increasing my own knowledge in the process. Then there are the would-be breeders – who have a pair (or think they have) but no fry, or who are looking for a mate for a much-loved large cichlid (usually an Oscar or Severum). Where they ***indubitably*** have a pair, then it is often only patience that is required, though sometimes incorrect pH may be causing problems. (BNC, C96 1016-1019)

In (65) *indubitably* refers to the generally recognized fact that Britain, Israel and New Zealand are democratic states. It is an uncontroversial statement which few people would object to. In (66) the adverb refers to an empirically verifiable situation (checking whether two fish form a pair). In both cases, it qualifies claims which arouse no controversy, and for which objective evidence can be found. Consider also the examples quoted in (67) and (68).

(67) This month's Esquire magazine is devoted to an account of the Ten Best-Dressed Men in Britain. Chief amongst these is the ***indubitably*** elegant Terence Stamp, who gives a moving account of his first biker jacket and his love of fine fabric. (BNC, CAS 127-128)

(68) 'Lucifer?' Rory resolutely schooled her features to remain impassive, but couldn't quite mask the glint in her tawny, almond-shaped eyes. Candy gave a delighted shout of laughter. 'You know perfectly well who I'm talking about. That's what the girls in the bar call him – tall, dark, ruthless as a pirate, handsome as Lucifer, and ***indubitably*** twice as wicked.' (BNC, JY5 15-19)

In (67) the speaker refers to a magazine article about elegant men; their appearance can be verified by looking at their photographs. In (68) the man's wickedness is presented as predicable considering what is known

about him. Both speakers use *indubitably* to communicate that they have sufficient grounds and good reasons to formulate their opinions.

Indubitably is also used in concessive contexts. It links arguments which present different aspects of the same issue. By using *indubitably*, the speaker signals that nobody doubts that one of the arguments is true, and then communicates that there are other aspects of the situation which are also true and need to be considered, as in (69)-(71).

(69) The classical tradition, as in Italy itself, never died and the churches of this region, <u>though</u> **indubitably** Romanesque, have a classical interpretation of the style and use classical columns, capitals, mouldings and decoration often, as in Italy, incorporating actual Roman fragments from ruined buildings. (BNC, HR1 353)

(70) Thomas Sachs was **indubitably** a hedonist. <u>But</u> he was as much a voluptuary of the intellect as of the senses. (BNC, FNT 1026-1027)

(71) The abuses of the latifundia had been recognized before the systematic criticism of the later eighteenth century and the case against the great estate remained as the emotional drive behind all land reform. **Indubitably**, too much land was concentrated in too few hands <u>though</u> the agricultural reasons for extensive farming were not always appreciated. Many latifundia were, no doubt, 'abusive'; but many were on poor land suited only for extensive and occasional cereal production and ranching. (BNC, FB7 274-276)

In concessive contexts *indubitably* indicates that the speaker/writer is trying to consider different aspects of a situation. It is used to agree that generally held views are true and uncontroversial, and to signal that the situation is more complex than it may appear. By marking views held by other people as true and uncontroversial, it situates the speaker/writer's claims within the existing knowledge and signals the recognition of other people's contributions to that knowledge. It thus functions as a marker of conceding concurrence. In (71) the concession qualified by *indubitably* signals that the writer builds on the works of other people. In the claims which follow, he adds his own opinions and interpretations. Thus, while

the negative speech-act adverbs essentially discourage alternative voices (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007), they are not necessarily employed to explicitly emphasize and defend the speaker's claims. They may also be used to acknowledge the importance of other voices to help the speaker/writer to convincingly build his/her own arguments.

7.2.9. *Incontrovertibly*

Incontrovertibly derives from the adjective *incontrovertible*, meaning "incapable of being contradicted or disputed; undeniable" (*COBUILD*). *COBUILD* notes its use with reference to evidence which is "absolutely certain and cannot be shown to be wrong". *Incontrovertibly* is one of the least frequent adverbs in the group. It occurs only 14 times in the BNC; all its occurrences are attested in written texts (see Table 26). *Incontrovertibly* is used both as an adverb of manner and an epistemic adverb.

In most of its uses evidenced in the BNC, *incontrovertibly* modifies verbs denoting activities connected with substantiating claims and establishing facts, such as *identify, demonstrate, recall, establish,* as well as those referring to communicating knowledge, such as *say, present.* Such uses of the adverb are illustrated in (72) and (73).

(72) Recent and current work demonstrates **incontrovertibly** that if a child is adept at segmenting heard speech into sub-word constituents before tackling the task of learning to read, this task will be accomplished much more easily. (BNC, HHY 6175)

(73) The enemy to pride and honour through strength had been clearly and **incontrovertibly** identified; it was communism, meaning socialism, which ran from Medicaid through welfare cheques to tax rises. (BNC, CAM 1595)

There are only a handful of examples in the corpus illustrating the use of *incontrovertibly* as an epistemic adverb. Two of them are quoted in (74) and (75).

(74) English, like England, is presented within this discourse as essentially and **incontrovertibly** a matter of culture without politics, the self-evident and natural servant of a spiritual fellowship embodying all that is true, good, and free. (BNC, EWR 504)

(75) In a moment I will produce the recipe – and please, will readers
      do their best to suspend disbelief until they have tried it? – but
      one of the main points about this recipe is that it taught me (for
      after all, one does not buy lobsters all that often) that anisette is,
      improbably but ***incontrovertibly***, a quite magical ingredient in
      fish dishes and sauces. (BNC, EFU 559)

In both (74) and (75), *incontrovertibly* marks the claims it modifies as
absolutely and undeniably true. However, the few instances evidenced in
the corpus provide insufficient material to risk any generalizations about
the functions of *incontrovertibly*. It seems to be primarily used as an ad-
verb of manner, indicating that a claim has been well argued, well docu-
mented and supported with convincing evidence.

7.2.10. *Unarguably*

Unarguably is related to the adjective *unarguable*, which is used to signal
that a claim "is obviously true or correct and that nobody could disagree
with it" (*COBUILD*). *Unarguably* is a low frequency adverb; it has only
14 occurrences in the BNC, all of them in written texts. It is attested in
sentence medial and initial positions. Like most speech-act adverbs, *un-
arguably* can be used as an adverb of manner and a modal adverb. The
BNC has one instance of *unarguably* modifying a verb, where the adverb
is substitutable with *unambiguously*. It is quoted in (76).

(76) 'I must emphasize,' said Acheson, 'that the present scientific evi-
      dence on the ill effects of nitrate on human health does not point
      unarguably to a precise standard.' (BNC, AM4 89)

The remaining occurrences of *unarguably* in the BNC are all epistem-
ic in character. In some contexts, *unarguably* is used as an antonym of
arguably. Such is the case in (77), where *arguably* signals that the claim
it qualifies can be questioned, while *unarguably* indicates that there is no
doubt that the claim it modifies is true.

(77) His starting-point is La finta giardiniera which he regards, per-
      haps ***arguably***, as a descendant of Richardson's novel Pamela and
      also, ***unarguably***, as the first time we hear, dramatically, Mozart's
      individual voice. (BNC, AK4 657)

Like the other adverbs in the group, e.g. *indisputably* and *indubitably*,
unarguably tends to signal agreement with claims which are uncontro-
versial and easily verifiable, such as the statement concerning the size of a
property in (78). It also qualifies generally held views, as in (79) and (80).

(78) Though ***unarguably*** a large property – with 11 bedrooms, three
      staff cottages and a gate lodge – Stackallan retains the atmos-
      phere of a family house. (BNC, AHB 769)

(79) Peter Greenaway, ***unarguably*** one of Britain's major directors,
      often engenders extremes of enthusiasm and antipathy. (BNC,
      KS8 1110)

(80) Jenkins is revealed as a master, ***unarguably*** one of the finest
      composers Britain has produced. (BNC, BMC 1564)

The claims qualified by *unarguably* in (78)-(80) are formulated in a
very uncontroversial and neutral way: Peter Greenaway is said to be one
of Britain's major directors, not the major one, and Jenkins is said to be
one of the finest composers, but not the finest one. Opinions formulated
in this way are difficult to disagree with. Such examples suggest that the
adverb is used to signal that there is no objective reason to disagree with
a claim, rather than to explicitly mark a claim as confident. *Unarguably* is
also used in concessive contexts to express "conceding concurrence", to
use Martin and White's (2005) term, as in (81).

(81) Mrs Castle's argument, and an argument in which she sincerely
      believed, was that the retention of private medicine meant a re-
      duction in the quality of service available to the National Health
      patient. <u>To some extent</u> this was ***unarguably*** true, but not in my
      view to a sufficient extent to cause the furore. However, it was
      possible to invoke a strong emotional reaction by drawing atten-
      tion to the obvious fact that the paying patient could get a better
      and faster service than his National Health counterpart. (BNC,
      FPN 883-885)

In (81) *unarguably* signals partial agreement with a view held by an-
other speaker, which is subsequently followed by a counter-claim: "but not
in my view to a sufficient extent to cause the furore". The context in which
it appears contains mitigating phrases ("to some extent"); the speaker's

opinion is formulated in a non-threatening way, showing attention to the face needs of the person whose view is opposed.

7.2.11. *Incontestably*

Incontestably derives from the adjective *incontestable*, defined as "impossible to question because of being obviously true" (*CALD*). It is the least frequent adverb in the group; it has only four occurrences in the BNC, two of which come from the same short exchange. All the four instances come from written texts, and occur in the sentence medial position. The example quoted in (82) illustrates its use with reference to a claim which can be described as uncontroversial, verifiable and generally accepted.

> (82)   Their [the Picts'] language has survived only in fragments of place names, and many of those are arguable. No written records exist. What they did ***incontestably*** leave were remarkable examples of those hard-wearing memorials which we have already observed from prehistoric times: stones. (BNC, EF2 174)

The claim quoted in (83) turns out not to be obvious and uncontroversial to the addressee, but the context makes it clear that it is treated as such by the speaker, who is "surprised that the matter needed checking".

> (83)   We sat facing across a desk in a rather denuded office in Carlos Lott's building which resembles an unravelling hat box. I sought clarification on a point he had made at the press conference. Did you actually say that the Paris opera ballet was the best in the world? 'Yes,' Mr Berge retorted, <u>surprised that the matter needed checking</u>. 'You said it was ***incontestably*** the best?' 'It is ***incontestably*** the best.' Moscow? 'No, no.' New York? 'No, no.' (BNC, AA1 215-224)

The speaker's surprise that the matter qualified as *incontestably* true needed checking indicates that such a qualification is reserved for claims which are perceived as generally agreed upon and uncontroversial.

7.3. Polish equivalents of English argumentative adverbs. Evidence from bilingual dictionaries

The Polish equivalents of English argumentative adverbs as suggested by the bilingual dictionaries are listed in Table 13. *Incontestably* is not recorded in any of the dictionaries consulted for the purposes of this work; *incontrovertibly* has a descriptive equivalent: *ponad wszelką wątpliwość* 'beyond all doubt'.

Table 13. Dictionary equivalents of English argumentative adverbs

Argumentative adverbs	Polish dictionary equivalents
admittedly	*wprawdzie, co prawda, rzeczywiście* (PWN), *trzeba przyznać* (Col)
arguably	*prawdopodobnie, być może* (Col), *zapewne* (PWN)
assuredly	*niechybnie, z całą pewnością* (PWN), *zapewne* (St)
undoubtedly	*bez wątpienia* (PWN; Col), *z pewnością, zapewne* (St)
unquestionably	*bezsprzecznie, niewątpliwie* (PWN; Col; St), *z pewnością, niechybnie* (St)
undeniably	*bezsprzecznie, niewątpliwie* (PWN), *niezaprzeczalnie* (Col)
indisputably	*bezspornie* (PWN)
indubitably	*niewątpliwie* (PWN; Col), *bez wątpienia* (PWN)
incontrovertibly	*ponad wszelką wątpliwość* (PWN)
unarguably	*bezsprzecznie, niewątpliwie* (PWN)
incontestably	-

As demonstrated in Table 13, the same three adverbs (*niewątpliwie, bez wątpienia, bezsprzecznie*) are suggested as equivalents of most of the argumentative adverbs which are morphologically negative (*unquestionably, undeniably, unarguably, undoubtedly, indubitably*). The equivalents of *arguably* are mostly low confidence adverbs (*prawdopodobnie, być może*). The equivalents of *assuredly* express a high level of certainty (*z całą pewnością* 'with all certainty/certainly'), while the equivalents of *admittedly* all express confirmation.

7.4. Polish equivalents of English argumentative adverbs. Evidence from the parallel corpus

The frequencies of argumentative adverbs in the parallel corpus are relatively low. Only four adverbs have frequencies exceeding 100 occurrences: *admittedly, unquestionably, undoubtedly*, and *undeniably* (see Table 28); their equivalents have been established using 100-item corpus samples. The remaining ones have lower frequencies: *arguably* (98), *indisputably* (28), *indubitably* (16), *incontrovertibly* (5), *unarguably* (5), *incontestably* (4), which is why it was possible to examine all their translation equivalents attested in the parallel corpus. All the identified equivalents are listed in Table 14.

Table 14. Translation equivalents of English argumentative adverbs in *Paralela*

English argumentative adverbs	Polish translation equivalents
admittedly	zero equivalent (29), *wprawdzie* (22), *trzeba przyznać* (10), *faktycznie* (5), *przyznaję* (5), *co prawda* (5), *bez wątpienia* (4), *istotnie* (3), *oczywiście* (2), *prawdę mówiąc* (2), *wyraźnie* (2), *najwyraźniej* (1), *w istocie* (1), *siłą rzeczy* (1), *podobno* (1), *owszem* (1), *choć* (1), *fakt* (1), *oczywisty* (1), *zdecydowanie* (1), *będąc szczerym* (1), *niewątpliwie* (1)
arguably	zero equivalent (33), *prawdopodobnie* (22), *zapewne* (19), *być może* (6), *niewątpliwie* (2), *z pewnością* (2), *bezspornie* (2), *bezdyskusyjnie* (1), *bezsprzecznie* (1), *najpewniej* (1), *najwyraźniej* (1), *zdecydowanie* (1), *bez wątpienia* (1), *może* (1), *możliwe* (1), *rzekomo* (1), *moim zdaniem* (1), *można by powiedzieć* (1), *jak się uważa* (1)
assuredly	*z (całą) pewnością* (6), *na pewno* (4), zero equivalent (3), *jestem pewien* (2), *wyraźnie* (1), *jak najbardziej* (1), *zdecydowanie* (1)

English argumentative adverbs	Polish translation equivalents
undoubtedly	*niewątpliwie* (35), *bez wątpienia* (27), zero equivalent (11), *niezawodnie* (6), *z pewnością* (6), *niechybnie* (3), *zapewne* (3), *na pewno* (2), *pewnie* (1), *niezaprzeczenie* (1), *bezsprzecznie* (1), *widocznie* (1), *bez najmniejszej wątpliwości* (1), *w pewnym stopniu* (1), *w dużym stopniu* (1), *to niepodważalne* (1)
unquestionably	*niewątpliwie* (22), *bezsprzecznie* (17), zero equivalent (14), *bez wątpienia* (13), *niepodważalnie* (3), *niezaprzeczalnie* (3), *bezdyskusyjnie* (3), *z całą pewnością* (2), *bez dwóch zdań* (2), *bezwzględnie* (2), *na pewno* (2), *nie ulega wątpliwości* (2), *niekwestionowany* (2), *zdecydowanie* (2), *niezawodnie* (1), *absolutnie* (1), *bezapelacyjnie* (1), *ponad wszelką wątpliwość* (1), *w żadnym razie* (1), *najpewniej* (1), *doprawdy* (1), *w sposób niepodważalny* (1), *oczywiście* (1), *bezsprzeczny* (1), *jednoznaczny* (1)
undeniably	zero equivalent (24), *bezsprzecznie* (23), *niewątpliwie* (21), *bez wątpienia* (13), *niezaprzeczalnie* (3), *niezawodnie* (2), *niepodważalnie* (2), *bezdyskusyjnie* (2), *niepodważalny* (2), *niekwestionowany* (2), *z pewnością* (2) *bez dwóch zdań* (2), *absolutnie* (2), *na pewno* (1), *najpewniej* (1), *bezwzględnie* (1), *bezapelacyjnie* (1), *zdecydowanie* (1), *ponad wszelką wątpliwość* (1), *nie ulega wątpliwości* (1), *oczywiście* (1), *jednoznaczny* (1), *w żadnym razie* (1)
indisputably	*bezspornie* (6), *niewątpliwie* (6), *bezsprzecznie* (5), zero equivalent (4), *bezsporny* (2), *bezdyskusyjnie* (1), *bez wątpienia* (1), *zdecydowanie* (1), *oczywiście* (1), *niezaprzeczalny* (1)
indubitably	*niewątpliwie* (6), zero equivalent (6), *bez wątpienia* (3), *to prawda* (1)
incontrovertibly	*bezspornie* (1), *w sposób niepodważalny* (1), *nie pozostawia wątpliwości* (1)
unarguably	*bezsprzecznie* (2), *bez wątpienia* (1), *bezdyskusyjne* (1), *oczywiste* (1)
incontestably	*bezsprzecznie* (2), *niezaprzeczalnie* (1), *bez wątpienia* (1)

As noted earlier (cf. section 7.1), Polish does not have positive speech-act adverbs, which is why *admittedly, arguably* and *assuredly* do not have straightforward equivalents in Polish. *Admittedly* and *arguably* are frequently omitted in translation, while *assuredly* is rendered by means of high confidence markers, the same ones as the items suggested by the bilingual dictionaries, such as *z (całą) pewnością* 'with (all) confidence', *na pewno* 'for sure, certainly'. *Niewątpliwie* is used as a translation equivalent of most of the morphologically negative adverbs in the group, which confirms its affinity with the negative speech-act adverbs, and supports the rationale for including it in the same category. It also signals functional similarity among the adverbs belonging to this category. The translation equivalents of each of the adverbs are discussed in sections 7.4.1-7.4.11.

7.4.1. Translation equivalents of *admittedly*

As illustrated in Table 14, *admittedly* has numerous equivalents in the analyzed corpus sample. Its most frequent equivalent is the concession marker *wprawdzie* 'while'. Some sources classify it as a conjunction (*SJP*), while others classify it as an epistemic particle (*WSJP*). The word derives from the prepositional phrase *w prawdzie* 'in truth' (Boryś 2006). It seems likely that its frequent use in concessive contexts ('while it's true') has led to the development of its connective functions. A similar development has probably taken place in the case of *co prawda* (lit. 'what [is] truth') – another equivalent of *admittedly* which derives from the word *prawda* 'truth', and which functions as a concessive conjunction (the *WSJP* classifies it as an epistemic particle). The uses of *wprawdzie* and *co prawda* as equivalents of *admittedly* are illustrated in examples (84) and (85).

(84) Today Moldova is an independent state, which **admittedly** has many problems, but which is following the road to European integration.

Obecnie Mołdawia jest niepodległym państwem, które **wprawdzie** boryka się z wieloma problemami, ale podąża drogą integracji europejskiej. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-10-21-008)

(85) It seems to me that this agreement – which, **admittedly**, is a positive agreement and has extremely positive content – has more of

an academic value; it is almost a textbook treaty, but one that is not in touch with reality.

Wydaje mi się, że ta umowa, choć **co prawda** jest korzystna i zawiera niezwykle przydatne uregulowania, ma wartość bardziej akademicką; to nieomal książkowy przykład umowy, ale nie ma ona związku z rzeczywistością. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-09-14-022)

Wprawdzie and *co prawda* are always used in concessive contexts, i.e. they always connect two arguments and perform textual functions. When only one argument is discussed in the context, and *admittedly* is used to confirm its validity, it is rendered by the confirmatory adverbs *faktycznie* and *istotnie*, which are also used as translation equivalents of *indeed* (see Chapter 6). The agreement expressed by *admittedly* involves confirmation, which is why some of the functions performed by *faktycznie* and *istotnie* overlap with those of *admittedly*: by confirming a claim, the speaker admits that s/he thinks it is true, and vice versa, by admitting that a claim is true, the speaker confirms its truth value. The correspondence between *admittedly* and the two confirmatory adverbs is illustrated in examples (86) and (87).

(86) This is because the so-called Western world, which **admittedly** was provoked in an unprecedented way by the events of 11 September, was, to a certain extent, unable to influence what happened and therefore had to accept the fact that a president of the United States of America disregarded fundamental human rights because he considered this to be an appropriate response to this provocation.

Dzieje się tak dlatego, że tak zwany świat zachodni, który **faktycznie** został sprowokowany w bezprecedensowy sposób przez wydarzenia 11 września, do pewnego stopnia nie miał wpływu na to, co się wydarzyło i dlatego musiał zaakceptować fakt, że prezydent Stanów Zjednoczonych Ameryki zlekceważył podstawowe prawa człowieka, ponieważ uważał, że była to właściwa reakcja na taką prowokację. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-02-03-011)

(87) **Admittedly**, BE needs some flexible source of electricity generation to compensate for its nuclear stations' inflexibility.

BE *istotnie* potrzebuje jakiegoś elastycznego źródła do wytwarzania energii elektrycznej, które pozwoliłoby zrekompensować brak elastyczności elektrowni jądrowych. (*Paralela*, JRC--Acquis|32005D0407)

The other translation equivalents of *admittedly* include a number of confirmatory expressions containing the Polish equivalent of the verb *admit* (*przyznać*): *trzeba przyznać* 'it needs to be admitted', *przyznaję* 'I admit', *muszę przyznać* 'I must admit'. The remaining ones are high confidence markers such as *bez wątpienia* 'no doubt', *niewątpliwie* 'undoubtedly', and *oczywiście* 'of course'. The employment of high confidence adverbs as equivalents of *admittedly* indicates that confirmation is associated with a high degree of commitment to the proposition.

In sum, *admittedly* has two main types of equivalents in Polish: (1) the concessive conjunctions *wprawdzie* and *co prawda*, and (2) the confirmatory adverbs *faktycznie* and *istotnie*. When it is used to indicate a relation between two claims, the two concessive conjunctions are employed as its equivalents. When it is used to admit that a given claim is true without preparing the ground for a counter-claim, it is rendered by the confirmatory adverbs *faktycznie* and *istotnie*. The analysis of the Polish translation equivalents of *admittedly* conducted in this section demonstrates its affinity with confirmatory adverbs, as they are also used to signal agreement.

7.4.2. Translation equivalents of *arguably*

Polish does not have a speech-act adverb corresponding to *arguably*. In fact, the verb *argue* does not have a straightforward equivalent in Polish, either. *Arguably* has two relatively frequent adverbial equivalents in the parallel corpus: *prawdopodobnie* and *zapewne*, which are used in those cases where *arguably* is substitutable with *probably* (cf. section 7.2.2), e.g. when it is used with superlative adjectives, such as in (88)-(90).

(88)   The next issue of Panorama will be on climate change – *arguably* the biggest challenge facing us at this time.

Tematem kolejnego wydania Panoramy będą zmiany klimatyczne – *prawdopodobnie* największe wyzwanie naszych czasów. (*Paralela*, EUBooks|KN-LR-09-030)

(89)   I'm *arguably* the most powerful man on the planet, and I am being brought to my knees by my wife and my …

Jestem *prawdopodobnie* najpotężniejszym człowiekiem na naszej planecie i jestem rzucany na kolana przez moją żonę i moje … (*Paralela*, OpenSub|139217)

(90)   The same bullet that tied Barr's gun to the killings. And *arguably* the prosecution's single most important piece of evidence.

Ta sama kula, która wiąże Barra z zabójstwami. I *zapewne* jest najważniejszym dowodem prokuratury. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|141529)

However, the meanings of *prawdopodobnie* and *zapewne* do not always overlap with those of *arguably*. When *arguably* means 'it can be argued', and indicates the speaker's belief that it is possible to interpret things in a specific way, *prawdopodobnie* and *zapewne,* which express probability, cannot be used as its equivalents. A variety of translation equivalents are employed in such contexts. Interestingly, some of them are the negative speech-act adverbs *bezspornie*, *bezdyskusyjnie* and *bezsprzecznie*, as illustrated in (91) and (92).

(91)   Mr President, as you are well aware, British Conservatives normally take the view that we abstain on questions to do with the euro or with Schengen because we are outside both, and therefore *arguably* it is none of our business.

Panie Przewodniczący! Jak Panu dobrze wiadomo, brytyjscy konserwatyści zazwyczaj wstrzymują się od głosowania w sprawach dotyczących strefy euro czy strefy Schengen, ponieważ jesteśmy poza tymi strefami i *bezspornie* to nie są sprawy, które by nas dotyczyły. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-06-08-007)

(92)   While oil *arguably* generates exploitation, dependence, wars and dictatorships, nuclear energy is historically much safer.

Podczas gdy ropa naftowa *bezsprzecznie* jest przyczyną wyzysku, zależności, wojen i dyktatur, to – historycznie rzecz ujmując – energia jądrowa jest zdecydowanie bezpieczniejsza. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-04-07-007)

The employment of the negative speech-act adverbs as equivalents of *arguably* seems to indicate that its function in such contexts is primarily argumentative, i.e. it is not used to indicate a degree of probability, but to signal that the state of affairs can be interpreted in a specific way. However, while *arguably* explicitly signals that other opinions are possible, the negative speech-act adverbs discourage them. The rhetorical effect of the English and Polish versions of the sentences quoted in (91) and (92) is thus different.

7.4.3. Translation equivalents of *assuredly*

Most of the occurrences of *assuredly* in the parallel corpus come from 19th- and early 20th-century literary classics, and since this work focuses on the current usage of the adverb, such occurrences are not included in the analysis. Only 18 occurrences are from modern sources (see Table 14). The equivalents of *assuredly* in the parallel corpus are high confidence expressions, such as *z (całą) pewnością* 'with (all) certainty', *na pewno* 'certainly, for sure', *jestem pewien* 'I'm sure'. Their use is illustrated in examples (93)-(95).

(93) I can only affirm that we shall of course continue our programmes, and shall also continue to conduct our ***assuredly*** critical dialogue with Mexico, but I readily admit that, as Mr Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra said, Mexico itself must be prepared to tackle this issue and take up the cause.

Mogę tylko potwierdzić, że będziemy oczywiście kontynuować nasze programy i będziemy także kontynuować nasz ***z pewnością*** krytyczny dialog z Meksykiem, ale bez trudu przyznaję, że, jak powiedział pan Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra, sam Meksyk musi być przygotowany do podjęcia tej kwestii i zajęcia się tą sprawą. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-07-10-10-020)

(94) Today, the police have apprehended the Tarot Card Serial Killer. And it most ***assuredly*** is not Peter Lyman.

Dzisiaj policja schwytała Tarotowego Mordercę. I ***na pewno*** to nie Peter Lyman. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|19651)

(95) You said you'd bring sprouts. – I most ***assuredly*** did not.

Mówiłeś, że ty przyniesiesz brukselki. – ***Jestem pewien***, że nie. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|6052)

The few equivalents of *assuredly* identified in the parallel corpus seem to support the observation made on the basis of its uses in the British National Corpus that the adverb signals a high degree of certainty which results from the speaker's prior experience and familiarity with the subject matter. The specific choices made by the translators seem to depend on the stylistic and syntactic requirements of the texts where *assuredly* is used.

7.4.4. Translation equivalents of *undoubtedly*

Undoubtedly has two major equivalents in the analyzed sample of the parallel corpus: *niewątpliwie* and *bez wątpienia*, i.e. adverbs signalling the absence of doubt (*wątpić* 'doubt'). Their uses are illustrated in examples (96)-(98).

(96) ***Undoubtedly***, both at EU level and in the individual Member States, we should concentrate more on long-term health protection.

Niewątpliwie zarówno na szczeblu UE, jak i poszczególnych państw członkowskich powinniśmy bardziej koncentrować się na długoterminowej opiece zdrowotnej. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-10-09-010)

(97) This directive will enable all patients to benefit from a certain number of rights which have already been recognised by the Court of Justice of the European Union. This is ***undoubtedly*** a step forward in the process of European integration, in strengthening solidarity, and in a Europe which is focused on its citizens.

Przedmiotowa dyrektywa da wszystkim pacjentom szansę skorzystania z szeregu praw, które zostały już uznane przez Trybunał Sprawiedliwości Unii Europejskiej. To ***niewątpliwie*** postęp w procesie integracji europejskiej w zakresie wzmacniania solidarności oraz w odniesieniu do Europy, która koncentruje się na swoich obywatelach. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-01-19-007)

(98) During this time, it has recorded a clear reduction in the growth rate in the consumption of, amongst other things, electricity by those departments, a development which is **undoubtedly** positive.

W tym czasie odnotowała znacznie obniżenie w zakresie stopy wzrostu zużycia między innymi energii przez te departamenty i jest to **bez wątpienia** pozytywna zmiana. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-08-01-15-017)

Bez wątpienia is more characteristic of formal argumentative discourse than *no doubt*, and as such, it is closer to *undoubtedly*. The other equivalents of *undoubtedly* in the corpus sample are high confidence adverbs of different types: the speech-act adverbs *niezaprzeczenie* and *bezsprzecznie*, the adverbs which are classified as epistemic emphasizers in the present work: *na pewno* and *zapewne*, as well as the adverbs expressing epistemic necessity: *niezawodnie* and *niechybnie*. The employment of different types of high confidence adverbs as its translation equivalents indicates that the adverb is primarily associated with a high degree of certainty and the function of pronouncement (cf. Martin and White 2005).

7.4.5. Translation equivalents of *unquestionably*

Unquestionably has three major translation equivalents in the corpus sample: *niewątpliwie*, *bezsprzecznie* and *bez wątpienia*. In comparison with *undoubtedly*, the speech-act adverb *bezsprzecznie* is more often employed as its equivalent; the other two adverbs, *niewątpliwie* and *bez wątpienia*, are used as equivalents of both *undoubtedly* and *unquestionably*. The three equivalents are used in similar contexts, which indicates a considerable degree of semantic and functional overlap. Their uses are illustrated in examples (99)-(101).

(99) This report represents the third contribution in recent months towards combating violence against women, following the European Protection Order and the directive on combating human trafficking. Violence against women is **unquestionably** a serious problem in all sections of society.

Przedmiotowe sprawozdanie stanowi trzeci, po europejskim nakazie ochrony i dyrektywie w sprawie walki z handlem żywym towarem, element walki z przemocą wobec kobiet, przyjęty w ostatnich miesiącach. Przemoc wobec kobiet jest **niewątpliwie** poważnym problemem we wszystkich segmentach społeczeństwa. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-04-04-017)

(100) There can be no doubt that we need to set high standards for nuclear power stations in order to ensure that they can gain greater public acceptance than to date, since they are **unquestionably** an important source of energy for Europe.

Bez wątpienia potrzebujemy wyznaczać wysokie standardy dla elektrowni atomowych tak, aby mogły one uzyskać większe niż dotychczas zaufanie społeczeństwa, gdyż są **bezsprzecznie** ważnym źródłem energii dla Europy. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-05-10-017)

(101) Employment is **unquestionably** the best way of preventing poverty and social exclusion. It is, <u>however</u>, a curious fact that 20 million working people live in poverty in the EU today, most of them women. To my mind, in addition to tackling the problems of poverty and social exclusion in vulnerable sections of the population, greater attention must be focused within the EU on poverty among working people, particularly among women.

Zatrudnienie jest **bez wątpienia** najlepszym sposobem zapobiegania ubóstwu i wykluczeniu społecznemu. Dziwne jest jednak to, że dziś w UE w ubóstwie żyje 20 milionów ludzi pracujących, w większości kobiet. Moim zdaniem, oprócz rozwiązywania problemów ubóstwa i wykluczenia społecznego wśród zagrożonych grup populacji, należy skupić więcej uwagi w obrębie UE na ubóstwo wśród ludzi pracujących, szczególnie kobiet. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-10-08-028)

The other equivalents of *unquestionably* include the speech-act adverbs *niezaprzeczalnie*, *bezdyskusyjnie*, and a range of high confidence adverbs, such as *na pewno*, *oczywiście*. As in the case of *undoubtedly*, the employment of a wide range of high confidence adverbs as the translation

equivalents of *unquestionably* indicates that it is primarily associated with the function of pronouncement.

7.4.6. Translation equivalents of *undeniably*

As shown in Table 14, three of the translation equivalents of *undeniably* appear quite regularly in the corpus sample: *bezsprzecznie, niewątpliwie,* and *bez wątpienia*. They are also the most common translation equivalents of *unquestionably*, which may be interpreted as an indication of a considerable semantic and functional overlap between them. *Undeniably* is, however, more frequently omitted in translation. *Undeniably* has a literal equivalent in Polish, i.e. *niezaprzeczalnie*, but it is substantially less frequent in the National Corpus of Polish than both *niewątpliwie* and *bezsprzecznie* (see Table 12), which is probably why it is also less frequently employed as a translation equivalent of *undeniably*. The three most frequent equivalents of *undeniably*, i.e. *bezsprzecznie, niewątpliwie,* and *bez wątpienia*, are used in concessive contexts which are characteristic of *undeniably*, as illustrated in (102)-(104). Its literal equivalent *niezaprzeczalnie* is also attested in such contexts, as in (105).

(102) Aside from this aid, which is **undeniably** useful, the European Union must also take steps to promote a more robust and creative European market that will generate investment and jobs.

Oprócz tej pomocy, która **bezsprzecznie** jest przydatna, Unia Europejska powinna również podjąć kroki wspierające silniejszy i bardziej kreatywny rynek europejski, który będzie źródłem inwestycji i miejsc pracy. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-10-20-008)

(103) This new agreement **undeniably** marks an important step forward in terms of relations with the Commission. Although the agreed compromise falls short of all that Parliament was aiming for, we have an agreement that ensures a coherent and sensible implementation of the Treaty of Lisbon.

To nowe porozumienie **niewątpliwie** stanowi ważny krok naprzód w stosunkach z Komisją. Chociaż w uzgodnionym kompromisie nie uwzględniono wszystkich celów Parlamentu, to mamy porozumienie zapewniające spójne i rozważne wdrażanie traktatu z Lizbony. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-10-20-007)

(104) This legislative initiative on the control of 'executive instruments' by the Commission has been imposed by the Treaty of Lisbon, which includes this under the legislative powers of the European Parliament. It is also **undeniably** a positive piece of legislation overall, taking account of the existing situation. But several aspects fall short of full compliance with the Treaty of Lisbon.

Inicjatywa prawodawcza w sprawie kontroli instrumentów wykonawczych Komisji jest wymagana traktatem lizbońskim, na mocy którego włącza się taką kontrolę w zakres uprawnień legislacyjnych Parlamentu Europejskiego. **Bez wątpienia** jest to również wartościowy element prawodawstwa w ogóle, zważywszy na aktualną sytuację. Lecz pewne aspekty pozostają nie w pełni zgodne z traktatem lizbońskim. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-12-15-019)

(105) While studying the properties of individual exoplanets is **undeniably** valuable, a much more basic question remains: how commonplace are planets in the Milky Way?

Jednak o ile poznawanie własności indywidualnych planet pozasłonecznych jest **niezaprzeczalnie** wartościowe, to znacznie bardziej podstawowym pytaniem pozostaje: na ile powszechne są planety w Drodze Mlecznej? (*Paralela*, ESO|eso1204)

The parallel corpus also contains examples of the use of *undeniably* as an adverb of manner. Its Polish equivalent in such contexts is *niepodważalnie* 'irrefutably', as illustrated in (105).

(106) We can confirm **undeniably** that the painting was done by da Vinci himself at around the age of 5.

Możemy potwierdzić **niepodważalnie**, że to dzieło było wykonane przez Leonarda da Vinci. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|36526)

7.4.7. Translation equivalents of *indisputably*

Indisputably has a literal equivalent in Polish: *bezspornie*. It is used as its translation equivalent along with *bezsprzecznie* and *niewątpliwie*. While *niewątpliwie* and *bezsprzecznie* are commonly employed as equivalents

of the other negative speech-act adverbs, *bezspornie* is rarely used as an equivalent of other adverbs in the parallel corpus. Both *indisputably* and *bezspornie* indicate that the claims they introduce are unlikely to be disputed. They often qualify claims which the speaker assumes to be uncontroversial and clear to everyone. Such use is illustrated in (107) and (108).

(107) We are concerned not just with the building work, but also with its overall integration into the surrounding area. In other words, when calculating whether the threshold area is reached, one must include areas in which no building works are actually taking place, but which are **indisputably** part of the project and part of the impact of the project.

Zajmujemy się nie tylko pracami budowlanymi, ale również integracją projektu z otaczającym terenem. Innymi słowy, kiedy oblicza się, czy została osiągnięta progowa wielkość obszaru, musi się włączyć obszary, na których nie są w rzeczywistości prowadzone prace budowlane, ale które **bezspornie** stanowią część projektu i jego oddziaływania. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-11-06-09-003)

(108) The Danube Region is a very specific and **indisputably** vast territory.

Region naddunajski to bardzo specyficzne i **bezspornie** ogromne terytorium. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-01-20-015)

The examples quoted in (107) and (108) illustrate that both *indisputably* and *bezspornie* can be used to refer to claims which most people are likely to agree with. Establishing whether some areas are part of the project or whether the Danube region is large does not involve subjective judgement, and is not expected to raise any problems. By indicating the issues which are likely to be understood in the same way by other speakers, the two adverbs may be used to signal the common ground between the speaker and the addressee.

7.4.8. Translation equivalents of *indubitably*

Indubitably is a low frequency adverb, poorly evidenced in the translation corpus. Its translation equivalents are the adverbs *niewątpliwie* and *bez*

wątpienia, which are also used as equivalents of *undoubtedly*. Like *indubitably*, the two adverbs qualify claims which, in the speaker's view, raise no doubts. *Niewątpliwie* is used as its equivalent slightly more often than *bez wątpienia*. Its use is illustrated in examples (109) and (110).

(109) Policies capable of supporting and spreading a culture that heightens district experience can, **indubitably**, do much to enable districts throughout the enlarged EU to compete with countries where low labour costs go hand in hand with a lack of dialogue between the social partners and a disregard for health and safety standards at the workplace.

Polityka będąca w stanie wspierać i szerzyć kulturę zwiększającą doświadczenia okręgów mogłaby **niewątpliwie** znacznie ułatwić okręgom w całej rozszerzonej Unii konkurowanie z krajami, w których wprawdzie koszty pracy są niskie, ale brakuje dialogu pomiędzy partnerami społecznymi i nie ma poszanowania dla norm bezpieczeństwa i higieny pracy. (*Paralela*, JRC-Acquis|52005IE0374)

(110) The international community is being called up to strengthen the validity of the institution and to safeguard the protection and further strengthening of the independence and efficacy of international criminal justice. Within the framework of the review process, various proposals have already been presented, of which the most important is **indubitably** that relating to the crime of aggression.

Wzywa się społeczność międzynarodową do wzmocnienia mandatu instytucji oraz do zabezpieczenia i dalszego wzmacniania niezawisłości i skuteczności międzynarodowego wymiaru sprawiedliwości. W ramach tego procesu przeglądowego przedstawiono różne propozycje, z których najważniejsza **niewątpliwie** dotyczy zbrodni agresji. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-05-18-013)

7.4.9. Translation equivalents of *incontrovertibly*

The parallel corpus contains three sentences with *incontrovertibly*. In one of them, it is used as an adverb of manner, and modifies the verb *demon-*

strate. Its Polish equivalent in that context is *w sposób niepodważalny* 'in an irrefutable way'; it is quoted in (111).

(111) Furthermore, the Commission has not **incontrovertibly** demonstrated that the common aspects of actions to be carried out under the two policies can only be achieved through a single integrated programme, or even that this is the most appropriate or beneficial way.

Ponadto Komisja nie wykazała **w sposób niepodważalny**, że wspólne aspekty działań do wykonania w tych dwóch politykach można zrealizować wyłącznie poprzez opracowanie i wdrożenie jednego, zintegrowanego programu, czy nawet, żeby było to najwłaściwsze lub najkorzystniejsze rozwiązanie. (*Paralela*, RC-Acquis)

The remaining two instances are epistemic. The Polish equivalents of *incontrovertibly* in the two contexts are: *nie pozostawia wątpliwości* 'it leaves no doubt' and *bezspornie* 'indisputably'. The use of its adverbial equivalent *bezspornie* is illustrated in (112).

(112) It is important for Member States and the Union to avail themselves of the opportunities they have until this is **incontrovertibly** the duty of the Agency, after the entry into force of the Reform Treaty.

Dla państw członkowskich i Unii ważne jest, aby korzystały z możliwości, jakie posiadają, chyba że, po wejściu w życie zreformowanego Traktatu, jest to **bezspornie** obowiązek agencji. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-01-15-014)

Data from the parallel corpus and bilingual dictionaries suggest that Polish has no direct equivalent of *incontrovertibly*, while the Polish adverb *niepodważalnie* seems to perform similar functions to those identified for *incontrovertibly* in section 7.2.9. They are both low-frequency adverbs, primarily used as adverbs of manner. In their epistemic uses, they both indicate that a given claim has been shown to be true beyond all doubt.

7.4.10. Translation equivalents of *unarguably*

The parallel corpus contains five occurrences of *unarguably*; two of its equivalents are adverbs: *bezsprzecznie* and *bez wątpienia*. It is also rendered with expressions containing the adjectives *bezdyskusyjne* 'unarguable' and *oczywiste* 'obvious'. As in the monolingual data discussed in section 7.2.10, the instances of *unarguably* attested in *Paralela* refer to matters which the speaker perceives as uncontroversial and clear to everyone. Such use is illustrated in (113), where its Polish equivalent is *bezsprzecznie*.

(113) Only time will tell whether this turns out to be a marginal issue or whether the **unarguably** positive impacts of the directive will prevail.

Dopiero z czasem się okaże, czy będzie to zjawisko marginalne, czy też przeważą **bezsprzecznie** korzystne skutki dyrektywy. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-01-18-013)

7.4.11. Translation equivalents of *incontestably*

Incontestably occurs four times in the parallel corpus. Its translation equivalents are the negative speech-act adverbs *bezsprzecznie* (2x), *niezaprzeczalnie*, and *bez wątpienia*. Their uses are illustrated in examples (114) and (115). *Incontestably* and its equivalents are used to qualify claims which the speaker considers unproblematic and generally accepted.

(114) Linguistic diversity is **incontestably** one of the most characteristic features of the EU, affecting the social, cultural and professional lives of its citizens as well as the economic and political activities of its Member States.

Różnorodność językowa jest **bezsprzecznie** jedną z najbardziej charakterystycznych cech Unii, wpływającą na życie społeczne, kulturalne i zawodowe obywateli, a także na działalność gospodarczą i polityczną państw członkowskich. (*Paralela*, RAPID|IP/07/1395)

(115) In this context, I would also like to remind the Commission that we need to be effective in selling these successes that we have **incontestably** achieved in the field of European environmental policy, and especially water policy.

W związku z tym chciałbym również przypomnieć Komisji, że musimy w sposób skuteczny dzielić się osiągnięciami, które **bez wątpienia** stały się naszym udziałem jeżeli chodzi o europejską politykę ochrony środowiska, a szczególnie politykę wodną. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-06-16-020)

7.5. Argumentative adverbs in Polish

In Polish the category of argumentative adverbs comprises *niewątpliwie, bez wątpienia, bezsprzecznie, bezapelacyjnie, bezspornie, bezdyskusyjnie, niezaprzeczalnie, niepodważalnie, niezaprzeczenie,* and *niekwestionowanie*. Morphologically, *bez wątpienia* lit. 'without doubt' is very close to *no doubt*, which is classified as an epistemic emphasizer in this work, and discussed in Chapter 8, but the Polish adverb is more formal and more characteristic of written language than its English equivalent. It is more often used to build arguments than to emphasize claims or respond to the addressee in dialogic contexts. It is also regularly used as a translation equivalent of English argumentative adverbs. In the National Corpus of Polish *bez wątpienia* is only attested in written sources (though it does appear in dialogues in literary works), while *no doubt* is common both in speech and in writing.

As already noted, the Polish argumentative adverbs are all morphologically negative. Two of them, *niewątpliwie* and *bez wątpienia*, derive from the verb *wątpić* 'doubt', while the other ones are speech-act adverbs. *Bezsprzecznie, niezaprzeczalnie* and *niezaprzeczenie* are related to the verb *zaprzeczać* 'deny'; *bezspornie* derives from *spierać się* 'dispute, argue', *bezdyskusyjnie* from *dyskutować* 'dispute, discuss', *bezapelacyjnie* from *apelować* 'call for, appeal', *niepodważalnie* from *podważać* 'question, refute', *niekwestionowanie* from *kwestionować* 'question, contest' (cf. *WSJP*). The two adverbs indicating the absence of doubt are discussed in section 7.5.1.; section 7.5.2 focuses on the speech-act adverbs.

7.5.1. *Niewątpliwie* and *bez wątpienia*

Grochowski *et al*. (2014) classify *niewątpliwie* and *bez wątpienia* as high confidence particles. In their account high confidence particles signal that, in the speaker's view, the claim they modify cannot be questioned or

denied (Grochowski *et al*. 2014: 68). Both items are formal and literary in character. *Niewątpliwie* and *bez wątpienia* are substantially more frequent in the National Corpus of Polish than the speech-act adverbs; their affinity with adverbs deriving from illocutionary verbs is confirmed by data from the translation corpus where they are frequently employed as their equivalents. *Niewątpliwie* and *bez wątpienia* do not have manner uses; they are used exclusively as epistemic adverbs. Like *undoubtedly*, they are often used to introduce claims which are subsequently supported with some evidence explaining why the speaker considers them to be true, as in examples (116) and (117).

(116)   Był to **niewątpliwie** bardzo stary człowiek, stary i bardzo chudy, jakby wysuszony. Ale w jego twarzy, pomarszczonej niczym pień stuletniej palmy, oczy były żywe, a teraz, kiedy patrzył na chłopca, zadziwiająco przenikliwe. (NKJP, fiction, M. Tomaszewska, *Zamach na wyspę*, 2001)

'He was **undoubtedly** very old, very thin and dried up. His face was wrinkled like the trunk of a hundred-year-old palm tree, but his eyes were surprisingly bright and now, when he was looking at the boy, he gave him a penetrating look.'

(117)   Kapłan musiał jednak **bez wątpienia** należeć do którejś z nowszych sekt religijnych. Te starsze zajmowały się rzeczami pożyteczniejszymi niż chwytanie dziewcząt. (NKJP, fiction, A. Sapkowski, *Chrzest ognia*, 2001)

'The priest **undoubtedl**y belonged to one of the newer religious sects. The older ones did more beneficial things than capturing young girls.'

The two adverbs also have confirmatory functions. The example quoted in (118) illustrates the use of *bez wątpienia* and *niewątpliwie* to confirm the same claim.

(118)   Każde miasteczko ma swoje obyczaje. – Włożył do herbaty dwie kostki cukru i zakręcił łyżeczką. – **Bez wątpienia** – przytaknął z szacunkiem siedzący naprzeciw, gładko przylizany. – **Niewątpliwie** tak. (NKJP, fiction, J. Głowacki, *Rose Café i inne opowieści*, 1997)

'Every town has its own ways. – He put two cubes of sugar into his tea and stirred it with a spoon. – ***No doubt***. – a man sitting in front of him nodded respectfully in assent. – ***Undoubtedly***.'

7.5.2. Speech-act adverbs: ***bezsprzecznie, bezapelacyjnie, bezspornie, bezdyskusyjnie, niezaprzeczalnie, niepodważalnie, niezaprzeczenie, niekwestionowanie***

The most frequent speech-act adverb, *bezsprzecznie*, and the two least frequent ones, *niezaprzeczenie* and *niekwestionowanie*, seem to express only epistemic meanings, but the other ones, *bezapelacyjnie, bezspornie, bezdyskusyjnie, niepodważalnie* and *niezaprzeczalnie*, are used as epistemic adverbs and adverbs of manner. When used as adverbs of manner, they signal that a certain act was performed in a way which raises no doubts or questions. Each of them has its own characteristic distribution as an adverb of manner, i.e. each of them refers to different types of activities, and modifies different verbs. *Bezapelacyjnie* often co-occurs with the verbs *dominować* 'dominate', *pokonać* 'defeat', and *wygrać, zwyciężyć* 'win' (cf. *WSJP*), when reference is made to a decisive victory – a victory which no one can question, e.g. (119).

(119) Leszek Kuzaj ***bezapelacyjnie*** <u>zwyciężył</u> w 29. Rajdzie Kormoran powtarzając tym samym sukces sprzed roku. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Express Ilustrowany*, 2002)

'Leszek Kuzaj won ***a decisive victory*** in the 29. Kormoran Rally, thus repeating his success from a year ago.'

Bezdyskusyjnie modifies such verbs as *poprzeć* 'support', *akceptować* 'accept', and *odrzucić* 'reject'. It is thus similar in its distribution to *unquestionably*. When used as an adverb of manner, *bezdyskusyjnie* co-occurs with degree modifiers, such as *niemal* 'almost', as in (120).

(120) Tymczasem radni … niemal ***bezdyskusyjnie*** poparli projekt. (NKJP, press article 2007).

'Meantime, the councilors supported the project almost ***unquestionably***.'

Bezspornie, niezaprzeczalnie and *niepodważalnie* modify verbs referring to ways of gaining and communicating knowledge, such as *ustalić* 'es-

tablish', *udowodnić* 'prove', *potwierdzić* 'confirm', and *pokazywać* 'demonstrate'. They are similar in this respect to *incontrovertibly*. Their manner uses are illustrated in examples (121)-(123).

(121) Ostatnie wypadki ***bezspornie*** udowodniły wyższość marynarki wojennej nad innymi rodzajami wojsk. (NKJP, fiction, G. Mathea, *IV Rzeczpospolita*, 2005)

'Recent events have ***incontrovertibly*** proved the superiority of the navy over other types of military formations.'

(122) Mimo ujawnienia dowodów ***niezaprzeczalnie*** potwierdzających winę koncernu, po dzień dzisiejszy Yahoo! odpiera zarzuty, jakoby przyczynił się do uwięzienia obu mężczyzn. (NKJP, electronic press, Dziennik internautów 2007)

'Despite the disclosure of evidence confirming ***incontrovertibly*** the company's guilt, Yahoo! still denies being involved in the imprisonment of the two men.'

(123) Naukowe opracowania z tych właśnie lat, poparte konkretnymi wyliczeniami ***niepodważalnie*** wskazują, że prawdopodobieństwo pokonania ówczesnej obrony powietrznej było znikome. (NKJP, fiction, J. Gotowała, *Najkrócej żyją motyle*, 1996)

'Scholarly sources from those years, supported by convincing calculations, demonstrate ***incontrovertibly*** that the probability of defeating the air defence at the time was very low.'

Bezapelacyjnie and *niepodważalnie* are primarily used as adverbs of manner. The National Corpus of Polish contains only a handful of examples of *bezapelacyjnie* used as an epistemic adverb, and a single instance of *niepodważalnie*; the uses of both adverbs are illustrated in examples (124) and (125).

(124) ***Bezapelacyjnie*** najlepszym, niemal w pełni satysfakcjonującym dla odbiorcy (a i zapewne dla autorów) albumem cyklu jest zamykająca go „Zdrada" (NKJP, fiction, M. Zucholl, *Parowski i Polch na wiedźmińskiej „Mordowni"*, 2007)

'*Unquestionably* the best album in the cycle, almost entirely satisfying for the addressee (and probably also for the authors) is the final one – *Zdrada*.'

(125) *Niepodważalnie* był to jeden z najlepszych dni w moim życiu! (NKJP, newspaper, *Gazeta Ubezpieczeniowa*, 2010)

'*Incontestably*, it was one of the best days in my life!'

Bezdyskusyjnie, bezspornie and *niezaprzeczalnie* are more often used as epistemic markers, as in (126)-(128). By using them, the speakers signal that they have no doubts that their claims are true. In the context, they communicate what grounds they have for making the claims.

(126) *Bezdyskusyjnie* najlepszy na boisku był Grzegorz Żmija, który uratował nas przed stratą bramek. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Trybuna Śląska*, 2003)

'*Unquestionably*, the best player on the pitch was Grzegorz Żmija, who prevented the opponents from scoring goals.'

(127) Bo jej obrazy są *bezspornie* dojrzałe. Pągowska wie, co pragnie powiedzieć widzowi, i wie dobrze, jakimi środkami to uczynić. (NKJP, fiction, T. Konwicki, *Wiatr i pył*, 2008)

'Her paintings are *indisputably* mature. Pągowska knows what she wants to tell her audience and she knows how to do it.'

(128) Wojenne losy rodziny Aleu zostały przezeń przedstawione tak przejmująco, że żaden czytelnik nie będzie się dziwił jego politycznym wyborom i postępowaniu. Baulenas *niezaprzeczalnie* ma spory talent. (NKJP, fiction, S. Chosiński, *Ten okrutny XX wiek* … 2008)

'The war experiences of Aleu's family have been presented so convincingly that the reader will not be surprised at his political choices and his behaviour. *Undeniably*, Baulenas has a considerable talent.'

Bezsprzecznie, niezaprzeczenie and *niekwestionowanie* seem to always be used as epistemic markers. They qualify claims which, in the speaker's view, arouse no controversy, are generally believed to be true, and can easily be verified. Their uses in the NKJP are illustrated in (129)-(133).

(129) W firmie był *bezsprzecznie* najważniejszą osobą (NKJP, fiction, I. Matuszkiewicz, *Czarna wdowa atakuje*, 2009)

'He was *unquestionably* the most important person in the company.'

(130) Jest to szkoła *niezaprzeczenie* niemiecka. (NKJP, fiction, S. Dygat, *Jezioro Bodeńskie*, 1946)

'This school is *unarguably* German.'

(131) Znowu był *niekwestionowanie* najszybszy (NKJP, fiction, A. Anonimus, *Nie nadaje się, przecież to jeszcze szczeniak*, 1999)

'Again, he was *unquestionably* the fastest.'

7.6. Argumentative adverbs in English and Polish: summary and comparison

The major function of argumentative adverbs is to construct arguments in persuasive discourse. They are used to acknowledge the existence of alternative views, either those which have already been expressed or those which may potentially be expressed in response to the speaker/writer's claims. Both languages have argumentative adverbs which are related to the verb *doubt* (Pol. *wątpić*), as well as those which derive from speech-act verbs. Thus, in both languages argumentative adverbs are used to signal that the speaker is aware that a certain position may be doubted or that other speakers may formulate contrasting views. They can also be used to signal agreement with and criticism of other views. They often function as markers of concession.

English has both morphologically positive (e.g. *arguably*) and morphologically negative argumentative adverbs (e.g. *unquestionably*), while Polish only has morphologically negative ones (e.g. *bezdyskusyjnie*). The repertoire of negative argumentative adverbs is rich in both languages, but most of these adverbs have very low frequencies. Each of the English positive adverbs has its specific rhetorical functions. *Admittedly* is primarily used to signal concession, or, "conceding concurrence", as Martin and White (2005) put it, i.e. it is used to indicate agreement with a view which is different from the one argued by the speaker. Its rhetorical function is to balance claims: if a prior claim emphasizes the positive aspects of a

situation, *admittedly* introduces a note on its negative sides; if the focus is first on the negative sides, it signals the acknowledgement of the positive ones. *Arguably* implies that the claim it modifies is just one of the possible ways of viewing a problem, while other interpretations are also possible; in some contexts it is substitutable with *probably*. *Assuredly* discourages alternatives voices; it communicates that the speaker's view is rooted in experience. Neither of them has a direct adverbial equivalent in Polish. The most frequent translation equivalent of *admittedly* is the concessive conjunction *wprawdzie* 'while'; *arguably* corresponds to *prawdopodobnie* 'probably'; *assuredly* is rendered by a variety of high confidence markers.

The morphologically negative adverbs also perform a variety of functions. While their primary role, directly connected with their semantics, is to signal that the claim they modify is not to be doubted, questioned or denied, the specific rhetorical functions which they perform often have different purposes. *Undoubtedly* tends to introduce a claim which is subsequently supported with evidence substantiating the speaker's view. Unlike the negative speech-act adverbs, such as *unquestionably*, it is commonly used to modify claims referring to the future (predictions based on current knowledge). While it is impossible to question things if they have not occurred yet (which is why speech-act adverbs tend not to modify claims concerning the future), it is possible to have no doubts that they will occur. *Unquestionably* summarizes a number of points, and qualifies a conclusion based on them. *Undeniably* is used to balance claims; it signals concession and emphasizes counter-claims. *Indubitably* can be used to situate claims within existing knowledge; it indicates that the speaker/writer agrees with claims made by other people, and builds on them when forming his/her own views. Generally speaking, *indubitably, indisputably, unarguably* and *incontestably* tend to qualify claims which, in the speaker's view, arouse no controversy, and represent generally held opinions. The attitude they convey, i.e. that the claims are not to be questioned, seems to primarily result from the speaker's belief that they are uncontroversial rather than from the speaker's conviction that s/he knows best.

All the negative argumentative adverbs have concessive uses, which shows that they all play a role in balancing agreement and disagreement, thus helping the speaker/writer to construct convincing arguments. *Un-*

questionably, undeniably, indisputably, unarguably and *incontrovertibly* are used as both adverbs of manner and epistemic markers. In the case of *incontrovertibly*, the manner uses are more frequent; the adverb is only marginally epistemic. It usually modifies verbs such as *demonstrate* and *establish*, signalling that the claims they refer to have been well argued and are well documented.

The Polish equivalents of the negative argumentative adverbs show a considerable functional overlap with their English counterparts. Three Polish adverbs, *niewątpliwie, bez wątpienia* and *bezsprzecznie*, are used as translation equivalents of most of the English negative adverbs, with the exception of the poorly evidenced ones, such as *incontestably*. They are the most frequent adverbs in the Polish set and, because of their relatively high frequency, they seem to be the translators' default choices when rendering all the adverbs in the group.

As far as the correspondences on the level of the individual adverbs are concerned, *undoubtedly* has two close equivalents in Polish: *niewątpliwie* and *bez wątpienia*. *Bez wątpienia* is morphologically close to *no doubt*, but it is more characteristic of formal and written language and thus closer to *undoubtedly* (see also Chapter 8, where *no doubt* is discussed). *Indubitably* is also related to the notion of doubt, and corresponds to *niewątpliwie* and *bez wątpienia* in the translation corpus. *Incontrovertibly* corresponds to *niepodważalnie*; *indisputably* is close to *bezspornie*. *Unquestionably* and *undeniably* have the same major translation equivalents: *niewątpliwie, bezsprzecznie* and *bez wątpienia*. *Unarguably* does not seem to have a close equivalent in Polish; *incontestably* is omitted from English-Polish dictionaries, and is too poorly evidenced in the translation corpus to allow identification of its equivalent.

Like their English equivalents, Polish argumentative adverbs are used in concessive contexts; they signal agreement with generally held views and easily verifiable claims; they are used to introduce claims which are later substantiated with evidence, and to summarize claims for which evidence has been given. In both languages, argumentative adverbs are used to build arguments by interacting with other voices, and defending the speaker's position.

8. Epistemic emphasizers

8.1. Introduction

The category of epistemic emphasizers, as distinguished in this book, comprises adverbs which are used to emphasize the speaker's stance towards the various positions which are signalled in the text or expressed by interlocutors. They are used to focalize the speaker's claims, to emphasize agreement and disagreement with other voices, to signal solidarity with interlocutors, and to challenge them. In English, the category is comprised of the following items: *certainly, no doubt, doubtless, definitely, decidedly, surely, for sure,* and *for certain*. In Polish, it is comprised of: *na pewno, z pewnością, zdecydowanie, zapewne, pewnie,* and *pewno* (see section 3.12 for the classification criteria).

Adding emphasis to claims is the primary function of adverbs belonging to this group. This function is also stressed in their dictionary definitions. For instance, *COBUILD*'s definitions of *certainly* and *definitely* make reference to emphasis when explaining their usage, and inform that the adverbs are used to formulate statements in "a strong way":

- "You use *certainly* to emphasize what you are saying when you are making a statement"; "you say *certainly not* when you want to say 'no' in a strong way";
- "You use *definitely* to emphasize that something is the case, or to emphasize the strength of your intention or opinion" (*COBUILD*).

As noted by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 300), some of the emphasizers, such as *certainly,* show "the erosion of the meaning of epistemic certainty". Others, however, such as *definitely* and *decidedly*,

seem never to have fully developed the sense of epistemic certainty, and primarily function as emphasizers.

In contrast to argumentative adverbs, which are characteristic of written language, most epistemic emphasizers are frequent in speech (see Tables 26 and 27). *Certainly* and *definitely* are more frequent in speech than in writing; the same is true about the Polish adverb *na pewno*. *Surely* has comparable frequencies in the written and spoken sections of the BNC. Only *doubtless* and *decidedly* are relatively infrequent in spoken English. The frequent use of epistemic emphasizers in talk-in-interaction has resulted in the development of numerous interpersonal functions connected with expressing the speaker's attitude towards the addressee and attention towards the addressee's stance. Such intersubjective uses distinguish most of the items in the group from argumentative adverbs.

The list of English and Polish epistemic emphasizers, together with their frequencies in the British National Corpus and the National Corpus of Polish (NKJP), is presented in Table 15. Some of the adverbs in the group also have manner meanings which are difficult to separate in the BNC and the NKJP. Therefore, the counts include their uses in both senses.

Table 15. Epistemic emphasizers in English and Polish

English adverbs	Freq per 100 m words (BNC)	Polish adverbs	Freq per 100 m words (NKJP)
certainly	18,090	*na pewno*	21,548
surely	6,022	*pewnie*	14,420
no doubt	5,938	*zapewne*	10,397
definitely	3,055	*z pewnością*	7,440
doubtless	843	*zdecydowanie*	7,344
for certain	731	*pewno*	968
for sure	442		
decidedly	421		

The discussion which follows begins with the most frequent adverb in the English set, i.e. *certainly*. Subsequently, the less frequent adverbs are discussed in the following order: *for sure, for certain, surely, no doubt, doubtless, definitely,* and *decidedly*. Their functions are analyzed with ref-

erence to their occurrences in the BNC. After that, their Polish equivalents are identified on the basis of bilingual dictionaries and the translation corpus *Paralela*. The chapter closes with an overview of the Polish set, and a summary of the repertoires and functions of epistemic emphasizers in both languages.

8.2. Epistemic emphasizers in English

8.2.1. *Certainly*

Monolingual dictionaries define *certainly* as: "without doubt, of course" (*LDOCE*), "very likely to happen", "extremely likely" (*CALD*), and note that it is "used to emphasize the speaker's belief that what is said is true", and "to express complete agreement with something that has just been said" (*OD*). It is usually classified as a marker of certainty (e.g. Quirk *et al.* 1985; Huddleston and Pullum 2002; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007). *Certainly* is a high frequency adverb, more frequent in spoken language than in written registers (see Table 26). In the BNC it is attested in sentence initial, medial and final positions, which indicates its ability to modify sentence elements, and to function as a sentence adverb. The meanings expressed by *certainly* can be arranged along a cline, from less to more (inter)subjective and textual. The discussion which follows begins with an overview of its semantics, and then it focuses on its discourse functions.

a. A note on the semantics of *certainly*

Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 85) argue that the current epistemic sense of *certainly* goes back to its earlier manner meaning: "in a manner that is certain; in a way that may be surely depended on; with certainty" (*OED*). This sense can still be identified in some of its uses, such as those when it occurs within the scope of negation, as in (1) and (2), which is a common type of context for adverbs of manner, but an infrequent one for epistemic adverbs (cf. Bellert 1977; Nuyts 2001a).

(1) Nevertheless, it is <u>not</u> **certainly** fictitious, for the paucity of English sources on the later years of Cnut's reign makes their silence inconclusive, and Robert may have been moved not only by feel-

ing for the æthelings and his apparent friendship for their sister Godgifu's husband, Count Dreux of the Vexin, but also by memories of his rift with Cnut's sister Estrith. (BNC, HXX 1133)

(2) How long he survived his restoration is <u>not</u> ***certainly*** known for Northumbrian regnal tradition retained no memory of Eardwulf's second reign, but there is a possibility that it lasted some three or four years. (BNC, G0G 1154)

In some of its uses in negative clauses, *not certainly* is similar to *not necessarily*, i.e. it indicates that a situation did not go exactly as planned or intended, e.g. (3) and (4).

(3) Well it was ludicrous. It was all right for big removals but ***not certainly*** for three-piece suites and the like. (BNC, KNC 28-29)

(4) She did not know why she had come. ***Not certainly*** to reassure her mother, but … to boast of her new self! To show off? (BNC, A6J 49-51)

The basic function of *certainly* in its epistemic sense is to indicate a high degree of probability that a statement it qualifies is true. The uses of *certainly* as a marker of confidence are particularly clear when it is contrasted with adverbs expressing lower degrees of certainty, such as *probably* and *possibly*, as in (5) and (6).

(5) *Probably* if not ***certainly*** she would have rejected his intervention. (BNC, FD3 313)

(6) The most recent records were of single birds at Sidlesham Ferry on 6 and 16 May 1961; *possibly*, but not ***certainly***, only one bird was involved. (BNC, B31 1785)

In the corpus, *certainly* is attested with the degree modifiers *more*, *most* and *almost*. *More* and *most* add force to the claims modified by *certainly*, while *almost* diminishes their strength. The most frequent degree modifier it co-occurs with is *almost*: there are 1,488 instances of the collocation in the BNC, as compared to 260 instances with *most*, and 10 instances with the modifier *more*. The addition of *almost* may be interpreted as a face-protection strategy. In situations when responsibility for words is particularly important, and when caution is needed, e.g. in legal contexts, *almost* may be added to *certainly* as a safety measure, as a disclaimer of re-

sponsibility, which may prove useful if things turn out to be different than expected. Such seems to be its function in (7). The use of *certainly* with the degree modifiers *more* and *most* signals that the degree of certainty it expresses can be graded, as illustrated in (8) and (9).

(7) The text of the appeal court judgement, where trained judges form the majority, will not be made public until 2 November. But it is safe to assume that the lack of technical evidence – no weapon connected to the murder has been found – and a valid motive will be cited. <u>Almost</u> ***certainly***, Mrs Palme's testimony will be put in doubt. Mr Liljeros has maintained that too much time has passed to make it possible for Mrs Palme to point out her husband's murderer. Mrs Palme was first confronted with Christer Pettersson in December 1988, more than two years after the death of Olof Palme. (BNC, A57 509-513)

(8) One reason must be that it is the only staging halt within thirty miles; another, <u>more</u> ***certainly***, is the excellence of the seaward views and, in particular, the glorious sweep of the silver sands of Sango Bay and Balnakeil Bay, both exquisitely charming in kind weather. (BNC, CJH 55)

(9) Yes, I enjoyed certain moments very much indeed but other moments were <u>most</u> ***certainly*** not fun. (BNC, B0H 1316)

b. *Certainly*: emphasizer and focalizer

Certainly functions as an emphasizer with a focalizing function, i.e. it is used to emphasize what is certain in otherwise uncertain situations. In other words, it is used to "single out what is certain in contrast with what is not" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 90). The contexts in which the claims emphasized by *certainly* are used often contain expressions signalling that the speaker does not know or is not sure how to evaluate the situation in question. Such focalizing and emphasizing uses of *certainly* in the context of uncertainty are illustrated in examples (10)-(13).

(10) It is possible, he tells me, that the pass over the mountain to the falls will be open now, but <u>he is not sure</u>. ***Certainly*** it was not open two days ago. (BNC, A6T 253)

(11) So what made us persist with John? <u>It's difficult to say. Maybe</u> that very quickly he started coming up with lyrics and that he and I got on well right from the off, Well, not quite from the off. To begin with, he thought I was as close to Steve and Paul as they were to each other — and they were like a single amoeba that won't let anyone else into its world. But, once he realised that I was a bit apart from them, we started to get on well and wrote a lot together, coming up with new lyrics for 'Did You No Wrong' and beginning to find cover versions that would really establish our identity.
From Steve and Paul's point of view, I reckon they thought he was a real card and that it would be a big laugh having him around. ***Certainly*** John's arrival changed our attitude. Before he came along we'd mess around with songs like 'Build Me Up Buttercup', with me fiddling around on a little clavinet that we'd found knocking around somewhere and Steve singing. With John in the band we began to search out songs which were really us. (BNC, A6E 1239-1247)

(12) – Did you recognise <pause> the chap?
– I'm afraid sir, <u>I have <pause> no knowledge</u>, I haven't ***certainly*** myself spoken to anybody <pause> with regard to that, I would of thought the normal procedure would be for him to be committed <pause> to Preston Crown Court and for the Crown Courts thereafter <pause> to sort out the final venue. I ***certainly*** have no knowledge of <pause> of any contact <pause> with regard to the ultimate venue and nothing has been marked on my file. (BNC, F7W 214-215)

(13) '<u>I don't know about real</u>,' Alexandra said, 'but less frightening ***certainly***'. (BNC, H8X 668)

In examples (10)-(13) there are overt references to the lack of certainty: "It's difficult to say", "I have no knowledge", "he is not sure", "I don't know", "Maybe". Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 212) argue that the type of certainty expressed by *certainly* is characterized by "relativity", as the adverb does not present claims as "absolute truths", but as the speaker's own opinions. *Certainly* often co-occurs with expressions sig-

nalling personal opinions, such as "personally", "I think", "I'm not sure", as in the exchange quoted in (14).

(14) – <u>Personally I'm not</u> sure that highly detailed reality is what the theatre is truly about. The film does that so much better.
– The theatre is always larger than life, isn't it?
– Much. Which is why <u>I think</u> naturalistic plays with domestic situations need very careful handling. They are so like the television it's sometimes hard to see why they are being done on a stage. Yes, the stage is larger than life and it is about emotions that are big enough to wrap round you. The theatre is at its best being spectacular and for experimental new plays – I ***certainly*** don't think the theatre should be like television. (BNC, A06 1866-1875)

Certainly is also used as a focalizing emphasizer in deontic contexts. It co-occurs with deontic *must, should* and *need*, as in (15); it is found with the mandative subjunctive, as in (16), and occurs in imperative sentences, as in (17).

(15) If the system changed every five minutes nobody would know what was going on, he said. 'You will get to a point, if we have not got there already, when exam passes will be meaningless. We should never have scrapped the O-level and we <u>must</u> ***certainly*** keep the A-level.' (BNC CFB 885-887)

(16) So, what I would suggest is that you ***certainly*** have a word with the police and draw their attention to it and if anybody listening has parked their car there, do please consider just how safe it is where you're parking and think of other people. (BNC, KRL 454)

(17) Joan: there isn't, there isn't, there is nothing wrong with the way that you are.
Unknown speaker: Yeah.
Joan: so <u>you</u> ***certainly*** <u>don't</u> try to change it. (BNC, K71 831-833)

In deontic contexts *certainly* emphasizes the option which the speaker thinks the addressee should take. While the speaker does not claim s/he knows how to deal with the entire situation, s/he is confident that one option is worth taking.

c. Emphasizing (dis)agreement

One of the interpersonal functions of *certainly* is marking agreement (cf. Wierzbicka 2006: 285). In talk-in-interaction, the agreement expressed by *certainly* is often emphatic (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 92), as illustrated in (18) and (19).

(18) – 'Oh, I'm sure she would have wanted children too. She lost one, you know, and after that it just wasn't possible. I think Simon blamed her for this.'
- 'More than a trifle unreasonably, I would say.'
- 'Oh, *certainly*. I don't excuse him, I'm just trying to find reasons.' (BNC, ASN 904-908)

(19) McLeish instantly understood the man's nightmare but realized he could give only qualified reassurance. 'She was probably killed by a blow on the head, Minister. We have not had the autopsy result.'
– 'Can you let me know?'
– '*Certainly*.' (BNC, AB 9 1611-1615)

In (19), the emphasis seems to result from the speaker' awareness of his interlocutor's expectation of the agreement. By using *certainly*, the speakers signal their willingness to meet those expectations. The adverb can thus be interpreted as a solidarity marker in such contexts.

Agreement-marking uses of *certainly* are also evident in concessive contexts (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 263-265). *Certainly* is used to agree with a prior statement, and then a new claim, often beginning with *but* or *however*, is introduced, which indicates that the agreement is conditional. Martin and White (2005: 125) associate *certainly* with conceding concurrence, but they note that the concession it indicates is less reluctant than the type of concession signalled by *admittedly*. Even though the speaker soon dismisses the claim introduced by *certainly*, the adverb signals a relatively high degree of commitment to it. Such concessive uses are illustrated in (20) and (21).

(20) I *certainly* agree that I would not be wholly confident of the conclusion about tunnelling if I did not know that rigorous calculations with the Schrödinger equation lead to the same conclusion.

However one should not despise too hastily such hand-waving discussions. (BNC, EW6 963-964)

(21) Indeed, it is a central assumption of deconstruction that the distinction between literature and philosophy is exaggerated, or arbitrary, or even meaningless. **Certainly**, some of Derrida's later work, such as The Post Card, looks more like 'experimental' literature than philosophy in the normal sense. But provisionally granting the premiss that philosophical texts should be interpreted like literature, with careful attention to their textuality, then the question of language intervenes. Arguments in anglophone circles about Derrida's possible meanings are usually based on translations, without reference to the French originals. (BNC, A1A 533-536)

In both (20) and (21), the authors signal their agreement with other voices by using *certainly* and such markers as: "I agree" in (20), "indeed" in (21). The concession helps the writers to establish solidarity with their readers, and suggests that the point which is subsequently countered "is understandable and has a rational basis" (Martin and White 2005: 125). As noted in Chapter 7, by acknowledging the rationality of other positions, even only to rebut them, the speaker/writer makes his/her own claims more convincing.

In talk-in-interaction, *certainly* is also used to emphasize disagreement, as in (22); in more monologic genres, it is employed to counter (emphatically) some dialogistic positions, as illustrated in (23) and (24).

(22) Did you think of yourself as a classical actor in those days?
– **Certainly** not. In fact I found Shakespeare very difficult to get on with and wasn't at all sure that I wanted to. (BNC, A06 2053-2056)

(23) He is not communist. Perhaps he is socialist out of convenience, but *certainly* not out of conviction. (BNC, HP0 3058-3059)

(24) Cold was the last thing she felt right now. Confused, maybe, but *certainly* not cold. (BNC, JXW 2273-2274)

In (23) and (24), the speakers first use the low confidence adverbs *perhaps* and *maybe* to signal partial agreement (conceding concurrence) with

a certain dialogistic position, and then they use *certainly* to emphasize disagreement with other positions. As in the case of the focalizing uses of *certainly* discussed earlier in this section, its countering uses focus on individual elements of the proposition, and contrast the things that are certain with those that are not.

d. Textual functions of *certainly*

The focalizing uses of *certainly* sometimes have a "scalar" character (cf. Byloo *et al.* 2007; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 91), i.e. the adverb situates the element it modifies higher on the certainty scale than the preceding items. In such cases, it is close in meaning to non-epistemic adverbs such as *particularly,* which is why Byloo *et al.* (2007) argue that *certainly* is non-epistemic in such contexts. Such use is illustrated in (25) and (26).

(25) Secondly, there was relatively low inflation abroad, **certainly** in the main holiday destinations in Europe. (BNC, F88 91)

(26) But nothing, and **certainly** not articulating his words 'cheerfully and artlessly', can muffle Tikhon's diagnosis which is that Stavrogin suffers from 'indifference'. (BNC, A18 1026)

Quirk *et al.* (1985: 604) use the term "particularizer" to refer to items which "restrict the application of the utterance predominantly to the part focused". Particularizers belong to the category of focusing subjuncts. In Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) taxonomy, they comprise non-epistemic adverbs and prepositional phrases, such as *chiefly, especially, particularly, notably, primarily, in particular,* and *at least.* In both (25) and (26), *certainly* is substitutable with *particularly* and *in particular*, but at the same time, it signals that the speaker is particularly certain about one element of the proposition. Its epistemic sense is thus at least partly retained in these contexts. Like the other high-frequency adverbs discussed in this study, such as *obviously* and *indeed*, *certainly* seems to combine its interpersonal functions, i.e. signalling the speaker's stance towards a specific position, with the textual ones.

8.2.2. *For sure*

For sure is an informal expression; monolingual dictionaries paraphrase it as "definitely true" (*COBUILD*), and "without doubt" (*CALD*). It is used both as an independent modal marker, and a constituent of longer expressions, such as *that's for sure, one thing is for sure.* It also functions as an adverb of manner in expressions such as *to know for sure, to say for sure, to find out for sure, to think for sure.* In this study, I focus only on its uses as an independent epistemic adverbial. Such uses constitute about 30% of its occurrences in the BNC. *For sure* is attested in both written and spoken sources of the corpus. It seems to have two major functions: an emphasizer and an agreement marker in concessive contexts.

a. *For sure* as an emphasizer

As noted by Quirk *et al.* (1985: 585), *for sure* typically functions as an emphasizer and focalizer. Like *certainly*, it emphasizes a claim which the speaker perceives as more certain than other claims. Such use is illustrated in (27)-(29).

(27) 'What does it matter? It's over. I have to leave this place while I have an ounce of pride and sanity left.'
'But you can't! If you leave now, you'll look guilty **for sure**.' (BNC, JY6 3647-3650)

(28) But what was in the mind of this fat wee lass? More than mead, **for sure**. (BNC, APW 3070-3071)

(29) Consider an ad. in the various publications that swamp the event or, more expense, renting an exhibition space (or, as many companies did, hiring a yacht moored to a pier just by the festival building), and you're obviously talking serious investment. Beyond SNUB's limited budget **for sure**. Getting there, getting in, and expenses, that's as much as we could manage. (BNC, ARD 760-762)

In examples (27)-(29), *for sure* emphasizes the thing that is particularly certain in the speaker's view. As noted by Quirk *et al.* (1985), *for sure* usually follows the item it emphasizes. It can, however, also occur before it, as in (30) and (31). Example (32) illustrates a parenthetic use of *for sure*, inserted in the middle of an argument.

(30) 'And what did you love? Tell me that. *For sure*, not Sally-Anne McAllister, but some doll of your imagination you took to bed to comfort yourself.' (BNC, HGE 33490-3342)

(31) Davey Philips of Clan Skates: 'You can totally scam it or you can be committed and go for it. But *for sure* it's a scam: the government get their figures down, and they can say there are all these new businesses, the country is blooming. Which isn't true.' (BNC, ACP 1230-1232)

(32) These are the best teams in Wales and as such given the best chance – better, *for sure*, than Wales – of upsetting the New Zealanders. (BNC, A3L 440)

b. *For sure* as a concession marker

Like most epistemic adverbs, *for sure* is common in concessive contexts. It signals agreement with a claim which is subsequently said to only partly account for the problem in question. The counter-claim which follows signals that some additional factors need to be considered. As in the contexts where it functions as an emphasizer, *for sure* tends to follow the claims it qualifies, as illustrated in (33)-(35).

(33) The Labour government 1964–1970 did not abolish capitalist relations of production in Britain, *for sure*, but it did not merely serve a pre-defined capitalist class interest either. (BNC, FB5 1016)

(34) 'Oh I doubt he's that bad, sir. Wiry *for sure*, but well fitted together and agile enough, I'd say.' (BNC, C85 441-442)

(35) Weird *for sure* but, erm … not unusual. (BNC, CHB 1123)

Examples (34) and (35) demonstrate that the counter-claim following the statement confirmed with *for sure* is sometimes presented in a mitigated, hesitant way, as indicated by such expressions as "I doubt", "I'd say", and the hesitation marker "erm…". Such uses indicate that *for sure* can be used in the context of uncertainty, like *certainly* (cf. 8.2.1). Generally speaking, *for sure* seems close to *certainly*, but it is more colloquial. The affinity between the two adverbs is confirmed by evidence from the English-Polish translation corpus, where the same Polish adverbs (*z pewnością* and *na pewno*) are used as their equivalents.

8.2.3. *For certain*

For certain is in many ways similar to *for sure,* both structurally and functionally. *CED* defines it as "definitely; without a doubt". Most of its occurrences in the BNC are with the verbs *know (to know for certain), say (to say for certain),* and *be (that is for certain).* Its uses as an epistemic adverb constitute only 26% of its occurrences in the BNC (62 instances). As indicated by the contexts in which it is contrasted with low confidence adverbs, such as *perhaps*, e.g. in (36), *for certain* expresses a high degree of confidence. It is also used to ask whether a claim is certain, and to confirm its validity, as in (37).

(36) 'You are too young to know this. You are still becoming. Not being.'
'Perhaps.'
'Not perhaps. *For certain*.' (BNC, G13 1332-1337)

(37) 'The French are already in Charleroi,' Sharpe told the German. Blasendorf gaped at Sharpe in shocked silence for a moment. '*For certain*?' '*For certain*!' (BNC, CMP 723-726)

Like *certainly* and *for sure*, *for certain* has focalizing functions. It signals that the speaker is certain about one thing, and does not know what else is true. In its focalizing uses, *for certain* appears in the context of uncertainty, which is also a property it shares with *certainly* and *for sure*. Such use is illustrated in examples (38)-(40).

(38) While waiting I tried to imagine what she might have been thinking. *For certain* she would be hungry, like me. (BNC, G02 3504-3505)

(39) 'Cold and forbidding, according to Uncle Jack. Tall and thin with a hooked nose. And a touch of the Nazi about him.'
'A Fascist by the sound of it,' murmured Frank. 'Not Vicente, *for certain*. Your Uncle Jack would have been all over him.' (BNC, G0N 3086-3091)

(40) I felt sorry for Wales, but why the hell did they let Bodin take the penalty. What's wrong with Saunders/Rush/Giggs? If one of them took it it would have been a goal *for certain*. (BNC, J1H 2681-2683)

In (38)-(40), the speakers use *for certain* to qualify the options which they think are more likely than other alternatives. Like *for sure*, *for certain* tends to follow the element it modifies, as illustrated in (41) and (42).

(41) The final £5bn tranche of the Government's BT holding will be sold off next year ***for certain***. (BNC, CBD 992)

(42) 'Yesterday I phoned the police and now, if we don't get Liam out by two o'clock, he'll die ***for certain***.' (BNC, AC4 2941)

8.2.4. *Surely*

The basic function of *surely* is "to express that you are certain or almost certain about something" (*CALD*). It also has a manner meaning: "without fail" (*CED*), which is mostly connected with its use in the phrase *slowly but surely*, as exemplified in (43).

(43) French law works ***slowly but surely***. (BNC, HGD 1852)

Surely is a high-frequency adverb, commonly used in speech and in writing (see Table 26). It is frequent in intersubjective contexts, and has a number of pragmatic functions in talk-in-interaction. *Surely* has received comprehensive treatment from a number of linguists, in particular Downing, who has devoted a number of studies to analyzing its functions (e.g. Downing 2001, 2006, 2009a, 2009b). Important contributions have also come from Wierzbicka (2006), Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007), Bromhead (2009), and Traugott (2014). The researchers note the primarily dialogic character of the adverb, and its ability to index attitudinal stances, such as "surprisal, challenge and persuasion" (Downing 2001: 277). As observed by Downing (2001: 274), "*surely*, whether initial, medial or final always signals a positioning of the speaker vis-à-vis another interlocutor, or the speaker vis-à-vis him/herself, in a dialogue which is basically argumentative".

Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 229-235) report that *surely* is most frequent in texts which are dialogic in nature: press editorials, social letters, dialogues in novels, and football commentaries. It is also relatively frequent in some types of argumentative discourse, e.g. broadcast discussions, but it is rare in academic discourse. Like the other adverbs in the group, it is used as an emphasizer. It also has a number of discourse func-

tions, which will be systematized in this section to facilitate a comparison with its Polish equivalents.

a. *Surely* as an emphasizer

The emphasizing functions of *surely* are characteristic of its use in the sentence medial position. Downing argues that medial *surely* is "persuasive" (Downing 2001: 273). In contrast to *certainly*, which often appears in the context of uncertainty and doubt, *surely* tends to appear in contexts indicating the speaker's confidence, as illustrated in examples (44)-(46).

(44) <u>Beyond the slightest doubt</u> the new technology is helping reshape politics here far more dramatically than pious talk of the 'socialist market economy'. The old fears of Russia's autocratic, ultra-centralised state were ***surely*** right. Today, though, it is too late. (BNC, A2X 455-457)

(45) Randy <u>loved himself and everything he stood for</u>. It was ***surely*** great to be an American going up in <u>the greatest company</u> in the world and in <u>the greatest country</u> in the world. God bless America, and piss on the rest. (BNC, AC2 225-227)

(46) <u>It must be remembered</u> that children are termed 'severely' handicapped if they have an IQ below 50. Many children grow up to enjoy satisfactory lives who are clinically termed severely handicapped, yet they would apparently be at risk of being allowed to die due to the severity of their handicap. It is ***surely*** wrong to draw a line between the right of another to live or die. On this issue, the decision of the parents should carry far less weight than it does. (BNC, ANA 901-904)

The statements quoted in (44)-(46) do not contain any hesitation markers or hedges. The speakers are confident, and stress their confidence by using expressions such as "beyond the slightest doubt" in (44), "it must be remembered" in (46), and appreciative phrases signalling a high degree of confidence, such as "the greatest company", "the greatest country", "loved himself" in (45). The three speakers express opinions from the position of authorities who are competent in the issues they discuss. By adding authorial emphasis to the claims, *surely* functions as a marker of pronouncement (cf. Martin and White 2005: 98).

Surely is also used to emphasize confident speculations. It frequently co-occurs in such contexts with the epistemic modal verbs *would* and *must*, as illustrated in examples (47) and (48). The addition of *surely* makes such claims more confident and, at the same time, more subjective. The subjective component introduced by *surely* is particularly clear in its uses with inferential *must*, which qualifies claims based on evidence, as in (47). Without *surely*, the statement would have the appearance of an objective inference concerning the strength of the medication; *surely* adds an element of subjective opinion to it.

(47) '…I used my house key, the same as I did yesterday. Hers was on the floor by the bedside table – she'd probably knocked it off when she had a glass of water, or when she took the veronal.' 'That veronal <u>must</u> be strong,' said Mary. 'Otherwise she'd have ***surely*** woken up, with someone coming in through her window.' (BNC, A0D 2226-2228)

(48) They don't play cricket in Sweden. If they did, however, then Stefan Edberg, the world's leading tennis player, <u>would</u> ***surely*** be a candidate for opening batsman for the test team. (BNC, A0V 854-855)

Surely is also found as an emphasizer in deontic contexts, e.g. with deontic *must, should* and *need to*. It adds emphasis to statements and, when they are directed at the addressee, as in (49), it makes them more persuasive.

(49) To be the best you <u>must</u> ***surely*** play against the best. (BNC, AKE 883)

(50) You ***surely*** <u>must</u> realize that I couldn't take the responsibility … if anything should have happened to his daughter … (BNC, CJX 2102)

In (50) the speaker attempts to justify his behaviour, and uses *surely* to defend his position. Its function is clearly persuasive and self-protective. *Surely* is often used to express critical opinions. In such cases, *surely* conveys the suggestion that the speaker knows best, and is qualified to offer advice, as exemplified in (51) and (52).

(51) What possible sense can there be in a legal rule, for example, which has it that a woman is presumed fertile even though she is past menopause or has undergone a hysterectomy operation? The area of medical jurisprudence is replete with such absurdities, which date from an earlier age when superstition was a substitute for knowledge. Attention <u>should</u> ***surely*** be directed towards eliminating such anomalies, rather than entrenching them further into the law. (BNC, ASK 152-154)

(52) Thus the entire top management process – preparation, testing, succession – will become even more problematic than it already is. There will be a growing need for experienced businesspeople to go back to school. And business schools will ***surely*** <u>need</u> to work out what successful, professional specialists must know to prepare themselves for high-level positions as business executives and business leaders. (BNC, FA8 1109-1111)

In some cases, in addition to emphasizing a particular point, *surely* expresses surprise. This is why Downing (2001) associates it with the notion of mirativity. *Surely* indicates that the situation is unusual and different from what the speaker expected, e.g. in (53) and (54).

(53) Murder, he felt, was a winter occupation – dark deeds were suited to dark months. Not now, and ***surely*** not here, in these gaudy summer surroundings. (BNC, A0D 1043-1044)

(54) Then, as if they'd recovered from the surprise, they began to laugh, snorting and giggling in delight at the water being thrown at them, like two children playing a game. I had to be dreaming. What I was seeing was ***surely*** the opposite of what was actually happening. In reality they should have been dumbfounded and embarrassed, wishing the floor would open up and swallow them. (A0U 1432-1435)

In (53) the fact that the murder took place in the summer is presented as unexpected, as events of this kind are more "suited to dark months". In (54) the speaker is surprised at the behaviour of the men described.

Surely can also be used to emphasize a claim, which, as noted by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 140), is presented in opposition to

an argument put forward by someone else, or a claim which the speaker believes to be contestable. As noted by Martin and White (2005: 128), "insistings or emphasisings imply the presence of some resistance, some contrary pressure of doubt or challenge against which the authorial voice asserts itself. It is only necessary to insist when there is some counter viewpoint against which the insistence is directed". Such use is illustrated in (55) and (56). In (55), the speaker explicitly states that a claim qualified by *surely* is formulated "against" a prior one.

(55) There would be no distinction between the thinker and the reality he was thinking about. You may say, <u>against this</u>, that there can **surely** be some form of appearance/reality distinction so long as the input systems can deliver up information about such objective facts as occlusion. (BNC, A0T 493-494)

(56) Therefore I bid you to put away anxious thoughts about food and drink to keep you alive, and clothes to cover your body. **Surely** life is more than food, the body more than clothes. (BNC, ALH 480-481)

Like the other emphasizers in the group, sentence initial *surely* is almost never followed by a comma in the BNC sources. Only five instances in a 200-item corpus sample analyzed for the purposes of this study are with a comma. In most of its sentence initial uses, it is confrontational and emphatic, while the use of a comma signals a more detached and summarizing claim.

b. *Surely* as a question tag

Traugott (2014: 18) observes that *surely* is "used increasingly for intersubjective agreement-seeking and challenging", and maintains that in contrast to most epistemic adverbs, whose meaning has the semantic component of 'I think', *surely* says "please agree with me" (cf. Traugott 2014: 18). The "agreement-seeking" function is particularly clear in the case of sentence final *surely*, used as a question tag, as illustrated in (57) and (58).

(57) 'Anyway, where's he going? Not retiring, **surely**?' 'Far from it. He's been appointed to a splendid living in one of the Kensington parishes.' (BNC, ASE 2141-2144)

(58) 'I mean, there's not enough evidence there, **surely**?' 'No, no, there isn't. You're quite right.' (BNC, ASN 964-966)

Generally speaking, the sentence final position is characteristic of intersubjective uses, signalling attention to the stances of the addressee (cf. Traugott 2014).

c. Challenging uses of *surely*

The challenging character of *surely* is connected with its use in the sentence initial position, where, according to Downing (2001: 265), it is most likely to exercise power and indicate superiority over the addressee, in particular when used with the second person pronoun, in face-to-face interaction. The sentence initial position is characteristic of subjective meanings, i.e. the expression of the speaker's view (cf. Traugott 2014). Sentence-initial *surely* is challenging and confrontational (cf. Quirk *et al.* 1985; Downing 2001, 2009b); it implies authority and superiority. Such uses are illustrated in examples (59)-(61).

(59) She gave us parties and disapproved of me teaching: Jennifer darling, **surely** you can get a job in a nice private girls' school. (BNC, A0U 718)

(60) 'I said an A, dear. The first letter of the alphabet. **Surely** you can remember *that* much?' And she reached up and rubbed out the two upright strokes, replacing them with diagonal ones leaning in and touching each other at the top. 'That's better!' (BNC, AEB 2156-2160)

(61) 'Well … ' began Leonard. 'If somebody will give me a small coin …'
'Oh, **surely** you aren't going to do stupid things with disappearing coins?' said Clovis. 'We want to see something really surprising.' (BNC, FSK 717)

In (59)-(61), the context makes it clear that the speakers are critical of their interlocutors' behaviour, as indicated by the use of "disapproved" in (59), "you can remember *that* much" in (60), and "you aren't going to do stupid things" in (61). By using *surely*, the speakers signal that they know better; they show little regard for other people's feelings.

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 207) observe that *surely* is "used with persuasive intent, inviting agreement". The persuasive intent accompanying utterances containing *surely* is also noticeable in the expressions it co-occurs with, such as sentence initial *but*, which, as noted by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 139) "announces denial". *But* signals a denial of alternative views, while *surely* is used to persuade the addressee that the speaker's arguments are more convincing. As Quirk *et al.* (1985: 624) put it, *surely* "is commonly used to challenge the addressee and implies disbelief or disagreement as to previously expressed assumptions as well as the self-evident plausibility of what is being said" (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 624). Examples of such uses are provided in (62) and (63).

(62) What is it that you are trying to tell me? Have I understood correctly? That your sister, Faith, left a large sum of money, which belonged to the three of you, to a hospital, that the money would have supported Kathleen and yourself in the years to come? That you are now almost penniless? But *surely*, in that case, your solicitor can invalidate the will? If the money can clearly be proven to belong to you all, and to be your only means of support, it cannot be let out of the family, casually, at the whim of one member. I assure you of that. (BNC, AD1 3323-3329)

(63) Their hands lay laced together on the chair arm, but Lisa did not look at him as he put to her, 'Of course you have to think of Emily, but *surely* there must be a couple of men out there who are capable of being a good father to your daughter?' (BNC, H97 3562)

In (62), the strength of the arguments introduced by *surely* (in opposition to the prior ones rejected with *but*) is further reinforced by "I assure you", while in (63), it is enhanced by the modal verb *must*.

Surely is often used in emphatic and emotional statements, exercising some pressure on the addressee. It occurs in sentences which end with exclamation marks, as in (64); it co-occurs with *oh*, as in (65). It is also repeated for emphasis, either in the same sentence, as in (65), or in the one which follows, as in (66).

(64) The news came as a complete surprise. Belinda Buckle? Me? *Surely* there must be some mistake! Whatever could Belinda Buckle see in me? (BNC, C8N 689-693)

(65) *Surely*, oh *surely*, there would be something here that would rescue Nuadu and the other poor creatures … 'Only,' she said aloud, 'only, we do not really know what we are looking for.' (BNC, G1L 2281-2282)

(66) 'They're not even supposed to have them. The other four were shot by the Tans. Just shot without trial or question. By my men, Eric. Men supposed to be under my command.'
'But *surely* you reported *that*? *Surely* you told London?'
'Oh, yes. I reported it. I *certainly* reported it. Names, places, time, every detail.' (BNC, FRJ 124)

The example quoted in (66) illustrates a contrast between the discourse roles of *surely* and *certainly*. *Surely* is used to ask the question; *certainly* is used to answer it. More specifically, *surely* makes the question more insistent; *certainly* makes the confirmation more emphatic. *Surely* is addressee-oriented; *certainly* is less intersubjective and more speaker-oriented.

8.2.5. *No doubt*

No doubt appears to have developed from the existential construction *there is no doubt about it* (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 127). It is used "to emphasize that something seems certain or very likely" (*CED*). *No doubt* frequently appears in such constructions as *there is/was no doubt, there being no doubt, there can be no doubt, I have no doubt, to be in no doubt, to leave no doubt, no doubt about it,* but the present work only focuses on its uses as an independent epistemic adverb.

No doubt is relatively frequent in both written and spoken English (see Table 26). In the BNC it is attested in the sentence initial, medial and final positions, which signals its ability to modify different units of syntactic structure. It also occurs on its own, as a response to a prior statement. The BNC data indicate that *no doubt* can be used to express two major meanings: (1) 'I expect', i.e. an expectation (or prediction) resulting from the speaker's knowledge and experience; (2) 'I admit', i.e. a confirmation that

the proposition is true. Both meanings of *no doubt* are discussed briefly in the sections which follow.

a. Expectation marker

No doubt expresses expectations, resulting from the speaker's general knowledge and prior experience, that something will happen or is true. It is similar in meaning to *I expect* and *I suppose*. Such uses are exemplified in (67)-(69).

(67) I do not understand the motives, beliefs and values of terrorists. I do understand intense misery and sorrow after losing a child to a terrorist's bomb. I feel sure all mothers worldwide will understand my grief. ***No doubt*** I will shed many tears today, as I do every day. (BNC, A5K 381-384)

(68) Two French Commandos take over and carry their wounded comrade the remaining part of the way; he manages a smile as they pick him up. ***No doubt*** he feels safer in their presence. (BNC, A61 2132-2133)

(69) She pictured Richard von Krafft-Ebing slitting open the letter in his office. It would be a very neat, slightly stuffy office. Nothing would suggest the man who had collected the material for *Psychopathia Sexualis*. She could imagine what kind of material was in that book, and her nape prickled. She wanted to read it. But even if one of her husband's western friends sent it, it would never reach them… (Prof.) Richard von Krafft-Ebing girl is obviously fairly intelligent, and so will find it hard to find a man worthy of her among the servant classes; and how will she meet anyone else? She probably has one half day free per week, and then she will have to visit her parents, ***no doubt***. In any case she'll be too exhausted to do much with her half day. (BNC, AE0 1386-1391, 1399-1401)

In (67) reference is made to a situation which happens everyday; the speaker's certainty results from experience. In (68) the speaker's certainty results from basic psychological knowledge that soldiers feel safer with their comrades, particularly when they are wounded. The speaker's certainty is also supported by evidence: the soldier manages to smile. In

(69) the speaker is imagining Richard von Krafft-Ebing and his daughter, trying to picture how she spends her days; *no doubt* corresponds to *I imagine* in this context. The image of the daughter and her daily routine results from the speaker's knowledge and expectations of how people of her social class spend their days. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 122) note that *no doubt* is rarely followed by a comma when used in the sentence initial position. The BNC data suggest that it is even less often followed by a comma than *certainly*; only about 5% of its sentence initial uses are with a comma, as compared to about 25% in the case of *certainly*, and 40% in the case of sentence initial *clearly*. Such use suggests a greater orientation towards the content than towards the speaker. The avoidance of the comma after *no doubt* may also be motivated by the association of the adverb with the expression *there is no doubt*, after which it is not used.

In some of its uses *no doubt* combines expectations with irony and sarcasm, as in the extract quoted in (70), expressing an ironic attitude towards descriptions of ants which present them as if they were human beings.

(70) If sociobiologists have tended sometimes to describe higher societies (such as man's) too much as if they were simpler ones, some entomologists have been guilty of the reverse. Here is William Wheeler, the last great encyclopediast of ants (1910), describing Amazon ants at home: they sit about in stolid idleness, or pass the long hours begging the slaves for food or cleaning themselves and burnishing their ruddy armour. ***No doubt*** they also do crossword puzzles when it rains. (BNC, ABF 3215-3217)

In the parenthetic use of *no doubt* exemplified in (71), the speaker is making a sarcastic prediction concerning the increasing importance of statistics in schools.

(71) The biggest danger of Mr MacGregor's decision is that he perpetuates a system that fails to reward good classroom teaching. At present, promotion decisions in teaching are based on evidence from bland references, stilted interviews and lists of in-service training courses attended. Information on a teacher's classroom ability is almost entirely lacking. In future, ***no doubt***, interview-

ers will look at test scores attained by teachers' pupils and every school governing body will have a statistician capable of producing appropriate graphs. (BNC, A4V 130-133)

As noted by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 132), *no doubt* also occurs "in hearer-oriented statements, inviting confirmation". In such intersubjective uses it expresses what Palmer (2001 [1986]: 24) terms "assumptive judgement". More specifically, it signals the speaker's assumptions concerning the addressee's knowledge, ways of thinking or behaviour, as in the examples quoted in (72)-(74).

(72) 'Those,' he said significantly, 'were the Pyglings.' 'Oh yes?' 'Very well connected,' he informed her. '***No doubt*** you know of them?' 'Oh no,' said Jane, 'I'm not connected at all.' (BNC, ABW 749-753)

(73) If you are happy to go on living under the constant threat of war, if you are prepared to see the discoveries of science perverted by inadequate people to the creation of foul weapons, what can I do? What can any scientist do? I know perfectly well that certain of my colleagues have made some attempt to concern themselves with these questions. ***No doubt*** you have heard of the Pugwash conferences. (BNC, AN8 2311-2314)

(74) ***No doubt*** you're wondering who our new reviewer is. Well, we can now officially welcome to the team the one and (hopefully) only, James Price! (BNC, C87 309-310)

Orientation towards the addressee seems to be one of the properties which distinguishes *no doubt* from *undoubtedly*. Such intersubjective and addressee-oriented uses of *no doubt* can be associated with the functions that Wierzbicka (2006) distinguishes for interactional particles, i.e. "build[ing] bridges between the speaker and the addressee" as well as "exercise[ing] more or less subtle pressure on one's interlocutor" (Wierzbicka 2006: 287). In examples (72) and (73), the assumptions about the addressees' knowledge expressed by *no doubt* have a pressurizing effect, as they imply that certain knowledge is expected from the addressees. In (74), *no doubt* expresses concurrence, as it signals the assumption that the speak-

er's way of thinking is similar to that of the addressees. It is thus used to establish common ground and solidarity with the addressees.

b. Concession marker

When *no doubt* is used to mark concession, it indicates that the speaker "accept[s] the truth of a particular point" (*CED*), but s/he thinks it has little value or is of no importance in the current situation, as in (75) and (76).

(75) When the history of our times comes to be written, They Organized Themselves to Death will be the only possible epitaph. ***No doubt*** they mean well where the arts are concerned, he wrote, <u>but</u> for that reason they are the biggest menace. ***No doubt*** they think they have the interests of the artist at heart, he wrote, <u>but</u> for that reason they must be avoided like the plague. ***No doubt*** they see themselves as devoted middlewomen, bringing the truly important work of the time to the avid masses, <u>but</u> all they are really doing, wrote Harsnet (typed Goldberg) is fucking up the lives of both sets of people. (BNC, A08 2614-2617)

(76) Education is not the whole of life and there is much information that men must acquire and many skills they must learn which are no part of education. ***No doubt*** people must learn hairdressing; <u>but</u> until the subject crosses into physiology – and ceases therefore to be hairdressing – it is not education. ***No doubt*** people must study management or business; <u>but</u> until they cross the boundaries of the social or economic sciences – until the knowledge becomes such as is sought for its own sake and organised to illuminate human life and history – management and business studies are not education; and then they are management and business studies no longer. (BNC, A69 380-382)

In (75) and (76), *no doubt* signals agreement with statements which are subsequently said to be of no value in the speaker's judgement of the situation. As in the case of other epistemic adverbs used in concessive contexts, the function of *no doubt* is to disavow the objections anticipated by the speaker to enable him/her to express his/her own position in a more convincing way. Such sequences of concessions illustrate a discourse

strategy which Antaki and Wetherell (1999: 7) refer to as "making a show of conceding", thanks to which the speaker's position becomes "less liable to challenge" (1999: 11).

8.2.6. *Doubtless*

Doubtless is in many ways similar to *no doubt*. Both adverbs express expectations and predictions resulting from the speaker's experience and knowledge. Dictionaries differ in their assessment of the degree of confidence expressed by *no doubt*. *CALD* notes that *doubtless* is "used to mean that you are certain that something will happen or is true", while *CED* suggests that it signals that something is "probably or almost certainly the case". Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 768) note that it is weaker than its morphological structure may suggest, and, like Quirk *et al.* (1985: 620), they associate it with some degree of doubt.

Doubtless is a low frequency adverb; it is more common in writing than in speech (see Table 26). In the BNC it is used in sentence initial, medial and final positions; it is also used on its own as a response to a prior statement.

a. Expectation marker

CALD's definition of *doubtless* quoted above signals that the adverb tends to refer to future events ("you are certain that something will happen"). The BNC data indicate that *doubtless* is primarily used to express a confident prediction made by a speaker who has some knowledge in the field. The "quasi strong" (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 768) character of *doubtless* seems to result from the fact that it typically refers to the future, as in (77)-(78), and expresses speculations about the past and present, as in (79)-(80).

(77) Mr Cash is convinced he knows where this is all leading. I am not aware of any preconceived plan. Proposals for economic and monetary union are just another phase of the journey. **Doubtless**, <u>in time, we will consider</u> adjusting the democratic framework to suit new circumstances. In an interdependent world, the inability of a national state to exercise effective control of its own affairs has long been apparent. (BNC, A1F 208-212)

(78) There are a few areas where descriptions are skimped (for instance of Doppler effect) and I found a few small errors. The abbreviation for computer display is surely wrong; VGA stands for video, not virtual, graphics array. The references to 'kilo' and 'mega' in the context of computer technology are misleading simplifications; kilo is 2 to the power of 10, not 1000, and mega is 2 to the power of 20, not a million. **Doubtless** others with specialist knowledge <u>will</u> spot similar mistakes. (BNC, ANX 2372-2375)

(79) The final decision, it is believed here, was made by Erich Honecker, the East German leader. West German officials imagine that the Russians were particularly keen for an end to the crisis because President Gorbachev would have disliked attending East Germany's 40th anniversary celebrations on Saturday while this spectacular testimony to his hosts' illiberalism continued. Mr Honecker **doubtless** also wanted no unpleasantness to cloud the great event. Pressure on East Germany to solve the problem of its fleeing population by reform has redoubled. (BNC, A1V 917-920)

(80) In essence, Labour is proposing the Swedish model in which the state controls the economy – rather than owning it – and taxes it ferociously to pay for a ballooning public sector. This schema has led to the collapse of the Swedish system, and <u>would</u> **doubtless** have the same sorry result in this country. (BNC, AHN 1853-1854)

Like *no doubt* and the other adverbs in the group, *doubtless* tends not to be followed by a comma when used in the sentence initial position; only 9% of its sentence initial uses in the BNC are with a comma. In some contexts, *doubtless* is used together with *no doubt* and *undoubtedly*. *No doubt* and *doubtless* signal the speaker's expectations towards the development of the situation, while *undoubtedly* indicates the speaker's judgement of the current situation, as in (81) and (82).

(81) The Education Standards Commission would **doubtless** be manned by members of the old educational establishment. It would be a way of fostering the corporatist education ideology from which we are beginning to escape. **No doubt** it would com-

bine with the proposed Ministry for Women to inflict 'anti-sexist' and 'equal opportunities' dogmas on teachers and pupils alike, and, with the re-centralised inspectorate, to enforce questionable notions of good practice in teaching. (BNC, AJ8 420-422)

(82) Sir: The Vice Chancellors' proposal (29 September) to charge students full-cost fees will **doubtless** create protests. But these protests should not be aimed at the Vice Chancellors. They are **undoubtedly** right that it has now become clear that the Government will not pay for the expansion it desires at a level which will protect high quality. (BNC, A1F 127-129)

Like *no doubt*, *doubtless* is used intersubjectively to signal the speaker's expectations towards the addressee, and to express assumptions about the addressee's knowledge, as illustrated in (83) and (84). Such assumptions are also used to ask the addressee for confirmation, as in (85).

(83) Now, **doubtless** you are aware, that the CEC is opposing both. (BNC, KM0 563)

(84) When Mr Hatton began paying large sums in I did attempt to persuade him to open one, the rate of interest being so desirable, you understand. Five per cent, as you **doubtless** know. (BNC, A73 1778-1779)

(85) '**Doubtless** you were insured?' – 'Not the second time, not in March when they knocked it off at Stamford. I had to stand the loss myself.' (BNC, A73 1746-1748)

Assumptions about the addressee's knowledge and behaviour are potentially threatening to the addressee's face, as they imply that the addressee should know, and may be associated with the attitude of superiority on the speaker's part. Similar uses are also characteristic of other adverbs expressing expectations, such as *of course* and *no doubt*, in addressee-directed talk. 'In accordance with expectations' is thus a meaning which can be employed to exercise some pressure on the addressee.

b. Concession marker

Quirk *et al.* (1985: 1469) note that *doubtless* is particularly frequent in concessive uses, where it expresses superficial agreement followed by an expression of "a more fundamental disagreement". Its function in concessive sentences is similar to the functions of *no doubt,* as both adverbs introduce claims whose value is presented as insignificant in light of the claims which follow. The concession they signal adds confidence to the speaker's claims, as it indicates that the speaker has considered various aspects of the situation, and his/her opinion is well grounded. As noted by Martin and White (2005: 125), by agreeing that contrastive positions have a rational basis, the speaker creates a point of solidarity with the addressee, which helps him/her "to win the reader over", and make his/her counter argument more convincing. Such use is illustrated in examples (86) and (87).

(86) In his TV statement as dawn broke over Washington, the President maintained that the invasion had been prompted by the weekend of harassment of US soldiers in Panama City. **Doubtless** that was the trigger, but an operation of 24,000 men is not thrown together in a few days. (BNC, AAF 498-499)

(87) A picket at the hospital claimed that 'emergency' services were being maintained. They **doubtless** were, but 'urgent' cases were being turned away. (BNC, ABU 830-831)

The BNC data indicate a significant degree of semantic and functional similarity between *no doubt* and *doubtless*. Both adverbs are used to express certainty resulting from knowledge and experience, both are used interactively to elicit confirmation from the addressee, and both have concessive uses in which they mark "superficial agreement" (cf. Quirk *et al.* 1985: 1469).

8.2.7. *Definitely*

Definitely functions both as an adverb of manner and an epistemic marker. As an adverb of manner, it is used to mean "in a definite manner" (*COBUILD*); as an epistemic adverb, it is employed "to emphasize that something is the case, or to emphasize the strength of your intention or opinion" (*CED*). The *OD* paraphrases it as "without doubt". *Definitely* is a relatively frequent adverb; the BNC data indicate that it is more common in spoken language than in writing (see Table 26). When used as an adverb of manner, *definitely* modifies such verbs as *say, state, prove, know,*

and *identify* (cf. also Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 99). Such use is illustrated in (88) and (89).

(88) The letter had *definitely* stated that she was to be met. (BNC, HGV 664)

(89) Tests of the head do not *definitely* identify its age and Oxford has asked for a second sample. (BNC, A59 563)

Its epistemic uses result from the extension of its manner sense. As Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 101) put it, "If you say/prove/decide something definitely (manner) then it is definitely the case (epistemic)". In its epistemic sense, *definitely* is typically used as a marker of pronouncement, as illustrated in examples (90)-(92). It is used to add force to the speaker's claims, thus reducing the dialogic space for other alternatives (cf. Martin and White 2005: 128). In contrast to *certainly*, it tends to occur in contexts which indicate that the speaker is confident about his/her interpretation of events. The emphatic character of the statements which it modifies is often underlined by the use of the exclamation mark, as in (91) and (92).

(90) It was not too far away and he would *definitely* find a rope there. (BNC, AMB 1189)

(91) *Definitely* more luck than judgement! (BNC, AM5 1077)

(92) Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, line after line closed. Many were main or arterial routes. Some were duplicated by other routes, a legacy of the pre-Grouping days (1923) when companies competed for business. (If ever there was a lesson to be learnt in today's world, competition *definitely* did not work!) (BNC A11 1368-1371)

Like the other emphasizers, such as *certainly*, it co-occurs with the degree modifier *most;* the confidence it expresses can also (though less often) be weakened by *almost* (cf. also Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007). The two uses are illustrated in (93) and (94).

(93) He is one of the finest hairdressers we have and there is nothing he can't do with hair; whether it's chignons for Princess Alexandra, wigs for Cher of shoots for vogue. He is <u>most</u> *definitely* the best. (BNC CDJ 168-169)

(94) If used, it will <u>almost</u> *definitely* start a nuclear world war, and if not, it is just a waste of resources and a treacherous device to disarm. (BNC, HPG 1453)

Sentence initial *definitely* rarely modifies full sentences and finite clauses; it typically occurs before noun phrases and verbless or non-finite clauses, where it is used in responses to questions, or as a reinforcement of a prior statement made by the speaker, as illustrated in (91) above, and in (95)-(97).

(95) 'And he wouldn't have done that?' '*Definitely* not, on the evidence of what happened.' (BNC, CN3 1540-1541)

(96) But how could the building be used today? *Definitely* not as a library. (BNC, EBU 217-218)

(97) Another outing we enjoyed was to Mayell's Chocolate Factory, where for $2 you can tour the factory and eat as many of the products as you want. Most of them are pretty yukky but the chocolate cookies are superb. *Definitely* the place to go after a good bike ride. (BNC, HPP 1499-1501)

The tendency to modify clause elements rather than entire clauses suggests that the primary function of *definitely* is that of an emphasizer. Occasionaly, *definitely* occurs at the beginning of finite sentences, but these are usually sentences with marked word order, where *definitely* modifies a fronted element rather than the entire sentence. The modified element is thus emphasized in two ways: with *definitely* and by its placement at the beginning of the sentence. Such use is illustrated in (98)-(100).

(98) *Definitely* not on the missing list, we hear, is the elusive BLACK FRANCIS who is currently well on his way to finishing a solo album which is scheduled for release early in the New Year. (BNC, CK6 3044)

(99) *Definitely* to be avoided, are the general purpose, one day, cheap trips. These take you, plus snorkellers and sightseers, on a very limited excursion which is unlikely to suit a serious diver. (BNC, ARE 1092-1093)

(100) ***Definitely*** out is Leeds full-back Tony Dorigo, and Garry Parker of Aston Villa has withdrawn from the stand-by squad with a stomach problem. (BNC, CEP 4953)

The BNC contains only ten sentence-initial occurrences of *definitely* modifying entire clauses, most of them without a comma, as in (101) and (102). It is used in situations which are not entirely clear to the speaker, with *definitely* introducing a claim which the speaker is certain of. It has a focalizing function in such contexts, like *certainly*. Such focalizing uses of *definitely* are illustrated in (101) and (102).

(101) Comments from a teacher who had been at the school for two years added credence to the points raised in the above dialogues stating that there is 'racism' amongst staff within the school:
Teacher: ***Definitely*** I have come across incidents where I have actually seen teachers pick on children for no other reasons than the colour of their skin.
Researcher: What evidence have you to support this claim?
Teacher: Mr Y (year head) for example, I had a great verbal battle with him over a West Indian girl called June Green who I teach. She was a bit troublesome and still is to some teachers. (BNC, GUR 1547-1551)

(102) 'Now I'm going to concentrate on my music and give my career more focus being with a company that understands what I'm doing.' '***Definitely*** I have some ideas. There's things that I want to try that haven't been tried.' (BNC, CK 4 1547-1548)

Like *certainly, definitely* also occurs as an emphasizer in deontic contexts. It co-occurs with the modal verbs *should, must* and *have to*, as illustrated in (103)-(104). It emphasizes the speaker's conviction that something must be done.

(103) A lot of information has been crammed into this guide and if you intend going to the Continent, then this is one item you should ***definitely*** put on your list of things to take. (BNC, A15 1367)

(104) Not putting '673' or '700' or 'c. 700' instead of '600' hardly seems to qualify as a Mistake to me. The shakiness of Golding's optics,

on the other hand, must ***definitely*** be classed as an error. (BNC, G1A 541-542)

The emphasizing function of *definitely* is also clear when it is used to express confirmation. While *certainly* is used to indicate emphatic agreement, *definitely* is used to signal emphatic confirmation of a prior statement. This difference can probably be attributed to the more addressee-oriented character of *certainly*, noted by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 119). The role of *definitely* is to emphasize the speaker's view. Its confirmatory uses take different forms in different contexts. In talk-in-interaction, it is used in confirmatory answers; in monologic genres, it is used to confirm an earlier claim, and to signal concession. Its use in confirmatory answers is illustrated in (105) and (106).

(105) Are they that good? – ***Definitely***. Only band I want to see playing <pause> in the world. (BNC, KP5 3618-3620)

(106) Was some families rougher than others? – ***Definitely***. (BNC, KEB 144-145)

In contrast to *certainly*, *definitely* is not used to respond to the interlocutor's expectations; neither does it signal any expectations on the part of the speaker. If the speaker uses *definitely* to confirm someone else's statement, s/he does it not to express solidarity with the interlocutor, but to signal his/her own point of view, as in (107).

(107) – Love, light, full of light.
– Dream like.
– Dream like <-|-> ***definitely*** <-|->
– <-|-> Confused <-|-> .
– Confused, ***definitely***.
– Mad.
– Mad ***definitely***, yes.
– All those things, yeah. (BNC, JST 504-511)

Confirmation is also expressed by *definitely* in concessive contexts. Such uses of the adverb do not seem to be very frequent, most probably because it tends to be used to emphasize the speaker's statements rather than to interact with other voices. Its concessive uses are illustrated in (108) and (109).

(108) – But I mean, were led to believe that some of the people that you see sitting on the streets of Edinburgh begging are actually making <voice quality: laughing>a good living out of it<end of voice quality>!
– Yes! ***Definitely***, they're making far better living, <u>but</u> they're also getting all their benefits, they're getting er fringe benefits off the government. (BNC, FX5 379-381)

(109) 'Percy can play anything from the triangle to the tambourine. He can also whistle.' Percy took her hand, saying, '***Definitely*** my art is diffused, <u>but</u> I have never stooped so low as to even touch a guitar.' (BNC, HWE 1367-1369)

8.2.8. *Decidedly*

According to *CED*, "*decidedly* means to a great extent and in a way that is very obvious". *CALD* defines it as: "certainly and obviously". The two dictionary definitions suggest that the adverb combines the function of an emphasizer with the function of an evidential adverb. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 620) mark it as rare and formal. *Decidedly* is a low frequency adverb; it is more frequent in the written section of the BNC (see Table 26). *Decidedly* is used both as an adverb of manner and an epistemic marker. When used as an adverb of manner, it refers to ways of speaking: 'categorically'. In the BNC it is attested with the verbs *say* and *protest*, as illustrated in (110) and (111).

(110) 'The whole house is delightful,' Theda <u>said</u> ***decidedly***. (BNC, HGV 3217)

(111) 'I don't want a doctor,' <u>protested</u> the patient, weakly but ***decidedly***. (BNC, H8L 1207)

As indicated by the BNC data, in its uses as an epistemic marker, *decidedly* typically functions as a subjunct. It often precedes adjectives (70% of its occurrences in the BNC), which is a typical position for degree modifiers, and marks the qualities they denote as perceptible "to a great extent" (*CED*), as illustrated in (112).

(112) Something approaching international humour has been achieved by Asterix, whose popularity in France is surpassed by sales figures in Finland. It is the universal appeal of the character that convinces Uderzo the stories must be kept ***decidedly*** apolitical. 'If we had made political statements, Asterix would be too French. That would detract from his worldwide appeal…' (BNC, A5V 27-30)

In some cases, the context provides evidence for the judgement qualified by *decidedly*, which makes it similar to inferential adverbs, such as *clearly* and *evidently*. Such is the case in (113) and (114), where the statements following *decidedly* provide the grounds for the speakers' judgements.

(113) For Jarvefelt, opera needed to be illustrated like a children's story-book of fables. He was ***decidedly*** not a deconstructionist. His gentle, conservative aim was to support the singers and make the story clear. (BNC, A9C 4)

(114) New issues in London are taking on a ***decidedly*** international feel, with the 75m share offering by Waste Management International being the latest example. (BNC, AJ9 538)

In (113), the speaker's claim that Jarvefelt was "not a deconstructionist" is supported with reference to his "conservative aim"; in (114), the "international feel" of new issues in London is exemplified with the activities of Waste Management International. However, while there is some evidential basis in the speaker's judgement emphasized by *decidedly*, in contrast to adverbs such as *clearly*, it does not express inference; it signals evidence-based confidence rather than a judgement based directly "on signs" (cf. Plungian 2001). The judgements qualified by inferential adverbs are usually made with the intention of establishing facts and "becoming aware" of the state of affairs (cf. Lazard 2001: 362). Claims qualified by *decidedly* focus more on the speaker's impression than on deduction and establishing facts.

Less often, *decidedly* appears in front of verbs. It indicates that the states or processes they denote occur to a significant extent and are easily perceptible, as in (115) and (116).

(115) For the first time, Bragg noticed that his hair was ***decidedly*** thinning at the temples. (BNC, ANL 2823)

(116) India in those days (round about 1963) was much in the air and I found that as a background it ***decidedly*** fired my imagination. So, I thought, how about a murder puzzle set in India? (BNC, FF0 450-451)

Despite the apparent similarity of the statement quoted in (115) to the contexts where inferential adverbs are used, *decidedly* does not signal synchronic inference (cf. Chapter 5). The speaker communicates that he "noticed" his hair was thinning; he does not make a judgement based on signs; but signals the extent of the problem. In the case of *decidedly*, the evidence which the speaker has at his/her disposal leads to certainty, not to inference. Similar evidence-based statements are illustrated in examples (117) and (118).

(117) In March he was forced to contemplate the spectacle of direct Italian fascist intervention in Spanish affairs, and in April he responded with a feeling of impotent outrage at the pitiless bombing of Guernica, yet another example of brutal fascist inhumanity. ***Decidedly***, Republican hopes for a successful outcome in Spain were on the wane. (BNC, FTV 704-705)

(118) She looked up and saw the high, gleaming shape of a Rolls-Royce double parked beside a taxi. Thomas Sachs was looking out of the back window. 'Can I give you a lift anywhere?' Katherine nodded gratefully. ***Decidedly*** this man was her good angel. (BNC, FNT436-441)

In sum, *decidedly* expresses confidence which stems from the fact that the qualities or states it refers to are richly evidenced, and leave no doubt as to their character. There is an evidential component in its semantics, as it signals evidence-based certainty. However, in contrast to adverbs such as *clearly* and *evidently*, it does not indicate inference. The judgement it qualifies does not involve a close observation of signs or deduction.

8.3. Polish equivalents of English epistemic emphasizers. Evidence from bilingual dictionaries

The Polish equivalents of English epistemic adverbs which primarily function as emphasizers are listed in Table 16.

Table 16. Dictionary equivalents of English epistemic emphasizers

English adverbs	Polish dictionary equivalents
certainly	*na pewno* (PWN; Col), *rzeczywiście* (PWN), *oczywiście, naturalnie* (PWN; Col; St), *z pewnością* (Col), *zdecydowanie* (PWN)
for sure	*na pewno, z pewnością* (PWN; St)
for certain	*na pewno* (PWN)
surely	*z pewnością, na pewno* (PWN; Col), *chyba* (PWN; St), *pewnie, oczywiście* (PWN; St)
no doubt	*bez wątpienia* (PWN)
doubtless	*niewątpliwie* (PWN)
definitely	*zdecydowanie* (PWN; Col), *z pewnością, na pewno* (PWN)
decidedly	*zdecydowanie, stanowczo* (PWN; Col; St), *wyraźnie* (PWN; Col)

As shown in Table 16, the dictionaries provide the greatest number of equivalents in the case of the most frequent and polyfunctional adverbs in the group, i.e. *certainly* and *surely*. The other ones have from one to three equivalents each. On the basis of their dictionary equivalents, the English adverbs can be grouped into three sets: the counterparts of *na pewno* (*certainly, for sure, for certain, surely*); the counterparts of *zdecydowanie* (*definitely, decidedly*); the counterparts of *bez wątpienia* and *niewątpliwie* (*no doubt, doubtless*). The functional correspondences between the English and Polish adverbs in the group are discussed in more detail in section 8.4 on the basis of their occurrences in the translation corpus.

8.4. Polish equivalents of the epistemic emphasizers. Evidence from the parallel corpus

With the exception of *for certain*, the translation equivalents of the English adverbs in the group have been established using 100-item samples of the parallel corpus. They are listed in Table 17. *For certain* has only four occurrences as an independent epistemic adverb outside such phrases as *to know for certain*; all its translation equivalents are presented in Table 17.

Table 17. Translation equivalents of English epistemic emphasizers in *Paralela*

English adverbs	Translation equivalents in Polish
certainly	*z pewnością* (54), *oczywiście* (15), *na pewno* (12), zero equivalent (8), *zdecydowanie* (4), *jak najbardziej* (1), *zwłaszcza* (1), *szczególnie* (1), *rzeczywiście* (1), *naturalnie* (1), *bez wątpienia* (1), *istnieje duże prawdopodobieństwo* (1)
for sure	*na pewno* (54), zero equivalent (24), *z pewnością* (18), *jak najbardziej* (2), *zapewne* (2)
for certain	zero equivalent (4), *na pewno* (1), *z pewnością* (1)
surely	*z pewnością* (49), zero equivalent (12), *na pewno* (12), *oczywiście* (7), *przecież* (4), *chyba* (4), *bez wątpienia* (4), *niewątpliwie* (3), *zdecydowanie* (3), *prawda?* (2)
no doubt	*bez wątpienia* (54), *niewątpliwie* (14), *zapewne* (8), zero equivalent (8), *z pewnością* (6), *na pewno* (4), *pewnie* (3), *oczywiście* (1), *prawdopodobnie* (1), *zdecydowanie* (1)
doubtless	*niewątpliwie* (47), *bez wątpienia* (36), zero equivalent (9), *na pewno* (2), *pewnie* (2), *nie ma wątpliwości* (2), *niewątpliwy* (2)
definitely	*zdecydowanie* (52), *z pewnością* (21), zero equivalent (8), *niewątpliwie* (4), *na pewno* (4), *bez wątpienia* (2), *bezwzględnie* (2), *oczywiście* (2), *jak najbardziej* (2), *koniecznie* (1), *zapewne* (1), *absolutnie* (1)
decidedly	*zdecydowanie* (66), zero equivalent (17), *stanowczo* (10), *kategoryczny* (2), *stanowczy* (2), *zupełnie* (2), *znacząco* (1)

As indicated by the corpus data, the epistemic emphasizers are rarely omitted in translation. Most of them seem to have prototypical equivalents which are used as their counterparts in about 50 per cent of the translations in the analyzed corpus samples, and correspond to their dictionary equivalents. Some of the Polish adverbs are used as translation equivalents of two or more English adverbs in the group, e.g. the most frequent Polish adverb in the category, *na pewno*, is used as an equivalent of most of them; the only exception is *decidedly*. Another shared equivalent is *zdecydowanie*. The use of shared equivalents indicates a considerable degree of functional overlap within the group. The contexts in which the different translation equivalents are used are discussed in sections 8.4.1.-8.4.8.

8.4.1. Translation equivalents of *certainly*

As shown in Table 17, the most frequent translation equivalent of *certainly* in the analyzed corpus sample is *z pewnością*. Grochowski *et al.* (2014) classify it as an epistemic particle. Two other relatively frequent equivalents are *na pewno* and *oczywiście*. In Grochowski *et al.*'s (2014) account, *z pewnością* and *na pewno* are classified as members of the same "semantic nest" of high confidence particles communicating that the speaker excludes the possibility that the proposition is not true. *Oczywiście* expresses conformity with expectations (see Chapter 6).

Z pewnością is a rather formal adverb, relatively infrequent in spoken Polish (see Table 27). Most of its occurrences in the parallel corpus come from EU parliamentary proceedings, where a rather formal type of language is employed. *Na pewno* is less formal and more register neutral than *z pewnością*. Both adverbs are used as equivalents of *certainly* when it functions as an emphasizer, as in (119), when it is used as an agreement marker in concessive contexts, as illustrated in (120), and when it serves as a focalizer indicating the most confident part of a claim, as in (121) and (122).

(119) My colleague, Mr Arif, will not mind, I think, if I say that to suggest that I would sacrifice any industry, I find alarming or perhaps a little depressing, because that is **certainly** not the approach that I would take.

Mam nadzieję, że mój kolega, pan poseł Arif, nie będzie miał mi tego za złe, jeżeli uznam sugestie, jakobym była w stanie poświęcić jakikolwiek przemysł, za niepokojące czy może nieco przygnębiające, ponieważ *z pewnością* nie takie podejście przyjęłabym. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-09-14-022)

(120)   I accept the work done by the rapporteur, and *certainly* she has taken out a great many of the concerns we would have, but it does leave me wondering why we need this at all.

Doceniam pracę, którą wykonała sprawozdawczyni, i *z pewnością* uwzględniła ona wiele naszych obaw; mimo to wciąż zastanawiam się, po co nam to wszystko. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-07-11-12-020)

(121)   Our green policies are probably unnecessary, *certainly* ineffectual and ruinously expensive.

Nasza zielona polityka jest prawdopodobnie zbędna, a *z pewnością* nieskuteczna i rujnująco droga. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-10-11-24-014)

(122)   Their closure several years ahead of time was not necessary; it was *certainly* not on safety grounds.

Zamykanie ich kilka lat wcześniej nie było konieczne, a *na pewno* nie ze względów bezpieczeństwa. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-10-05-19-012)

Oczywiście is employed as an equivalent of *certainly* in contexts involving reference to expectations, as both adverbs can be used to signal the speaker's readiness to conform to the addressee's expectations (cf. section 8.2.1). Such uses are found in concessive contexts. The parallel corpus contains numerous instances of concessive uses of *certainly* which come from EU parliamentary debates, where it signals the speakers' willingness to co-operate, make concessions and reach a compromise, which (ideally) seems to be the essence of parliamentary discourse. The fragment quoted in (123) contains five instances of *certainly*, used together with other devices signalling agreement and partial agreement. The Polish version employs *oczywiście* in four of the five instances; in one case, no equivalent is used.

(123)   Today we discussed the first version of the Council's budget, although I very often hear from Parliament that we – the Commission – are given so many tasks.

I *certainly* accept this and agree with it; we are ready to react and provide any information that is required. As regards the first draft of the Council budget, I would like to mention that the Commission, when it presented its version, referred to the forecasts of the Member States using our analysis. We therefore believe that our proposal was fully economically and politically sound. Therefore, the Commission cannot fully agree with many aspects of the Council's first negotiated budget.

Certainly, we agree with the opinion already presented by MEPs that the biggest horizontal cuts... I would like to repeat that the method of horizontal cutting was applied again in all categories. The Commission, *certainly*, considers that this approach and methodology is unsound, particularly in categories 1a and 1b, where we talk about innovation and research, even more so as we have an additional problem with the European Institute of Technology and the Galileo programme, which has to be solved as an additional parallel problem of the annual European budget procedures.

Certainly, this means that it is necessary to return to discussions on quantities and sizes and not to consider arithmetical reductions. The same applies to agriculture and the category of foreign affairs policy where, in my opinion, the Council's approach of putting funds in reserve is rather conservative and, surely, we will all have to return to it soon. Over the coming fortnight the Commission will be presenting its proposal to Parliament and the Council on the adjustment of the budget as regards Kosovo and Palestine. *Certainly*, as always, we worry about the Council's approach to administrative expenditure and I agree that the budget has a certain Finnish colouring, especially in the European Parliament.

Dziś omawialiśmy pierwszą wersję budżetu Rady, chociaż bardzo często słyszę od Parlamentu, że my – Komisja – otrzymu-

jemy tak wiele zadań. [Ø] <u>Akceptuję to i zgadzam się</u>: jesteśmy gotowi odpowiedzieć i dostarczyć wszelkich niezbędnych informacji. Jeśli chodzi o pierwszy projekt budżetu autorstwa Rady, chciałabym wspomnieć, że Komisja, przedstawiając swoją wersję mówiła o tym, że państwa członkowskie użyły w swoich prognozach naszych analiz. Dlatego też wierzymy, że nasz projekt był w pełni wiarygodny z gospodarczego i politycznego punktu widzenia. Dlatego też <u>Komisja nie może całkowicie zgodzić się</u> z wieloma aspektami pierwszego negocjowanego budżetu Rady. <u>Zgadzamy się</u> *oczywiście* z opinią, którą wyrazili już posłowie, że największe cięcia horyzontalne … Chciałbym powtórzyć, że metoda cięć horyzontalnych została ponownie zastosowana w stosunku do wszystkich kategorii. *Oczywiście* Komisja jest zdania, że takie podejście i metodologia jest błędna, zwłaszcza w stosunku do kategorii 1a i 1b, w których jest mowa o innowacji i badaniach, tym bardziej, że mamy dodatkowy problem z Europejskim Instytutem Technologii i programem Galileo, który musi zostać rozwiązany jako dodatkowe, równoległe zagadnienie w ramach europejskich rocznych procedur budżetowych. Oznacza to *oczywiście*, że należy powrócić do dyskusji na temat ilości i wielkości i nie rozważać obniżek arytmetycznych. To samo dotyczy rolnictwa oraz kategorii spraw zagranicznych, w których, moim zdaniem, zastosowana przez Radę metoda w postaci lokowania środków w rezerwie jest raczej konserwatywna. Na pewno będziemy musieli do tego powrócić. W ciągu najbliższych 2 tygodni Komisja przedstawi Parlamentowi i Radzie projekt dotyczący dostosowania budżetu w odniesieniu do Kosowa i Palestyny. *Oczywiście*, jak zawsze, martwimy się o podejście Rady do wydatków administracyjnych i <u>zgadzam się</u>, że ten budżet posiada pewne zabarwienie fińskie, szczególnie w Parlamencie Europejskim. <u>Zgadzamy się</u> z tym i zawsze będziemy na to odpowiadać. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-07-09-04-013)

In (123), the speaker is clearly doing her best to formulate her opinion in a way which allows her to account for the face needs of all the discourse participants. The frequent use of *certainly* in this context indicates the speaker's readiness to co-operate, and signals the need to balance the positions of the speaker and the addressees. The speaker is ready to make concessions to the addressees, at the same time indicating that they are expected to make concessions to the speaker. *Oczywiście* appears to be the translators' first choice when translating items which express conformity with expectations. It is regularly used as a translation equivalent of *certainly, of course* and *obviously*.

When *certainly* functions as a focalizer, it also has a number of non-epistemic equivalents, which indicates that it performs textual functions in such contexts (cf. section 8.2.1). Examples (124) and (125) illustrate the use of *certainly* to introduce an item which is situated higher on the certainty scale than the other elements referred to in the context. Its non-epistemic equivalents include *zwłaszcza* 'especially' and *szczególnie* 'particularly'.

(124)   I see some changes, certainly in tone, but also considerable continuity with the politics of the 'detested' Bush, given that President Obama has not abandoned the programme of extraordinary renditions and CIA prisons in foreign countries.

Widzę pewne zmiany, ***zwłaszcza*** w zakresie tonu, ale widzę również kontynuację w znacznym stopniu polityki „znienawidzonego" Busha, choćby w fakcie, że prezydent Obama nie zrezygnował z programu wydawania więźniów w trybie nadzwyczajnym ani z więzień CIA za granicą. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-02-03-011)

(125)   Nonetheless, the balance is in fact positive, ***certainly*** in the non-tropical regions.

Niemniej jednak ogólne skutki zachowywania lasów byłyby pozytywne, ***szczególnie*** w strefach nietropikalnych. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-04-23-011)

The employment of non-epistemic equivalents of *certainly* in (124) and (125) may be interpreted as evidence for the "erosion" of its epistemic meaning, which is a process Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer's (2007: 300) associate with epistemic emphasizers. The sentences quoted in (121) and (122) demonstrate that the Polish epistemic markers *na pewno* and

z pewnością can also be used in such contexts, which may suggest that they also show some degree of "erosion" of their epistemic meanings.

8.4.2. Translation equivalents of *for sure*

As shown in Table 17, the literal equivalent of *for sure*, *na pewno*, is also its most frequent equivalent in the analyzed corpus sample. It occurs in similar types of phrases, e.g. *wiedzieć na pewno* 'to know for sure', *twierdzić na pewno* 'state for sure', and *to na pewno* 'that's for sure'. Another relatively frequent equivalent, *z pewnością*, is more formal. *Na pewno* and *z pewnością* are also used as translation equivalents of *certainly*, but in the case of *certainly*, the more formal adverb *z pewnością* is used more often; in the case of *for sure*, the less formal *na pewno* prevails. In the analyzed sample of the parallel corpus, *for sure* is often omitted in translation, which may, perhaps, be attributed to the fact that many of its occurrences are found in subtitles, which must be short and carry the most important informational content. In some cases, the omissions may thus result from the need to make the utterances as short as possible.

Both *for sure* and *na pewno* function as emphasizers when the speaker signals the existence of several alternatives (or answers to a question), and wishes to stress his/her confidence about one of them. *Na pewno* tends to precede the item it qualifies, while *for sure* tends to follow it, as in (126).

(126) We must also acknowledge that the region is part of our common neighbourhood with Russia, and we have to try to find ways of promoting common policies in that common neighbourhood. The security issues *for sure*, and perhaps some issues related to energy, could be dealt with in a trilateral format.

Musimy także uznać, że ten region stanowi część naszego wspólnego sąsiedztwa z Rosją i postarać się znaleźć sposób na promowanie wspólnej polityki w tym wspólnym sąsiedztwie. ***Na pewno*** kwestiami bezpieczeństwa i może także pewnymi kwestiami związanymi z energią można by zająć się w formacie trójstronnym. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-05-20-004)

In concessive contexts, the phrase *to na pewno* 'that's for sure' is used as an equivalent of *for sure*, as illustrated in (127).

(127) He was an intimidating presence, ***for sure,*** but he had very kind eyes.

Miał przerażającą osobowość, to ***na pewno***, ale miał bardzo miłe spojrzenie. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|37339)

Na pewno is more neutral with respect to the types of register it occurs in than *for sure*. It is less colloquial, and can also be used on formal occasions. When *for sure* is rendered as *z pewnością*, the statement becomes more formal than its original English version, such as in (128).

(128) You'll lose ***for sure*** in this case.

Z pewnością przegrasz tę sprawę. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|3167)

Na pewno is also considerably more frequent than *for sure* (see Table 15). The formal similarity between *for sure* and *na pewno* results in the overuse of *for sure* by Polish learners of English, who transfer their native habits connected with the use of *na pewno*, wrongly assuming that the formal likeness results in functional similarity (cf. Rozumko 2015). In more formal contexts, *na pewno* is closer to *certainly*.

8.4.3. Translation equivalents of *for certain*

The analyzed sample of the parallel corpus contains six instances of *for certain* used as an independent epistemic adverb, one translated as *na pewno*, and one as *z pewnością*; the remaining four are omitted in translation. The uses of both equivalents are illustrated in examples (129) and (130).

(129) Things would be different from now on. They didn't know if they would be better or worse, but ***for certain*** things would change.

Od tamtej pory miały zajść zmiany. Nie wiedzieli, czy na lepsze, czy też na gorsze, ale ***z pewnością*** miały zajść zmiany. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|63697)

(130) – What kind of backwater are you from?
– Some place far from here.
– ***For certain***.
– Zza jakich wód pochodzisz?

– Z bardzo daleka.
– **Na pewno**. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|42452)

In both (129) and (130), *for certain* is used in the context of uncertainty to emphasize one thing which appears to be certain in a given situation. The adverbs used as its equivalents (*z pewnością* and *na pewno*) are also employed as the translation equivalents of *certainly* and *for sure,* which indicates the affinity between the three items. The infrequent use of *for certain* as an independent adverb in the parallel corpus confirms the observation made on the basis of the BNC that it mostly appears in fixed expressions, such as *to know for certain*.

8.4.4. Translation equivalents of *surely*

The most frequent translation equivalents of *surely* identified in the analyzed corpus sample are the adverbs *z pewnością* and *na pewno*, which are also used as the translation equivalents of *certainly* (see section 8.4.1). Another common equivalent is *oczywiście*, which is used as an equivalent of all the English adverbs expressing conformity with expectations, such as *of course* and *obviously*. Additionally, *surely* is rendered by the question tag *prawda*, and the polemic particle *przecież* 'but'. It thus appears to combine the discourse functions performed by a number of items in Polish.

The most frequent translation equivalent of *surely* in the corpus sample, *z pewnością*, is used in contexts where *surely* emphasizes an opinion presented in opposition to another claim, as illustrated in examples (131) and (132).

(131) Will Turkey and the European Union no longer have anything to say to one another?
That **surely** cannot be the case!

Czy Turcja i Unia Europejska nie będą miały sobie nic więcej do powiedzenia?
Z pewnością nie powinno tak być! (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-03-08-014)

(132) We want the EU to have a strong voice in the world, <u>but</u> this **surely** does not require a bloated administrative apparatus that will cost EU citizens billions as a result of duplicated structures

and members of staff who will enjoy a very lucrative source of income.

Chcemy, aby głos UE był donośnie słyszany na całym świecie, ale to **z pewnością** nie wymaga rozbuchanego aparatu administracyjnego, który będzie kosztował obywateli europejskich miliardy z uwagi na powielanie się struktur i pracowników, którzy będą korzystać z niezwykle lukratywnego źródła dochodów. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-10-20-007)

Z pewnością is a rather formal adverb, which partly explains its frequent use in the EU parliamentary debates. Its frequent use as an equivalent of both the solidarity marker *certainly* and the superiority marker *surely* suggests that its pragmatic functions do not correspond very closely to the functions performed by either of the two adverbs. Its semantic properties (a marker of certainty) and a rather neutral attitude expressed in interpersonal uses seem to account for its employment as a translation equivalent of both English adverbs.

In its uses as an emphasizer, *surely* corresponds to *na pewno* and *zdecydowanie*, as illustrated in (133) and (134).

(133) In such a period of uncertainty, consumer awareness of credit, debt and finance in general is **surely** more important than ever.

W okresie takiej niepewności wiedza konsumentów na temat kredytu, długu i innych kwestii finansowych jest **na pewno** ważniejsza niż kiedykolwiek wcześniej. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-11-18-008)

(134) If ever there was an example of bureaucracy at European level, this **surely** is it.

Jeżeli możemy mówić o przykładzie biurokracji na szczeblu europejskim, to **zdecydowanie** jest to ten przypadek. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-06-07-016)

In its confrontational uses, *surely* is rendered with the adverb *chyba* and the polemic particle *przecież* 'but'. Both items frequently occur in confrontational contexts in Polish, and qualify claims formulated in opposition to other views. They are also used to exercise pressure on the address-

ee. The uses of *chyba* and *przecież* as equivalents of *surely* are illustrated in examples (135)-(138).

(135) Mr President, I have great respect for you, but **surely** it is up to the speaker the speed at which he chooses to speak, and that should be the choice of the speaker.

Mam dla Pana dużo szacunku, ale to **chyba** do mówcy należy decyzja, jak szybko będzie mówić i to powinno być kwestią wyboru dokonanego przez mówcę. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-11-06-09-012-01)

(136) What's wrong with you, Arthur? **Surely** you're not scared of a wee bit sheet weather.

Co jest z tobą, Arturze? **Chyba** nie boisz się małego ochłodzenia. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|5986)

(137) This is good, but **surely** in the short term, this hinders development, which is an area where we continue to spend too little.

To dobrze, ale **przecież** w krótkiej perspektywie hamuje to rozwój, na który ciągle przeznaczamy mało środków. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-12-15-007)

(138) But **surely** to give a dying baby food is not just a question of logic?

Przecież gdy umierającemu dziecku daje się jeść … to nie może być tylko kwestia logiki! (*Paralela*, OpenSub|19739)

Sentence final *surely*, whose function corresponds to that of a question tag, has several equivalents in Polish. One of them is *prawda?* 'is that true?', which, however, is a neutral tag, lacking the insistent and challenging qualities of *surely*. One of the corpus examples is quoted in (139).

(139) But you've left him, **surely**?

Zerwałaś z nim, **prawda**? (*Paralela*, OpenSub|7997)

In some instances, sentence final *surely* is rendered by sentence initial *chyba*. It is used to challenge a prior statement, as in (140) and (141). Even though *chyba* does not appear in the final position in such challenging uses, it is pragmatically closer to *surely* than the neutral tag *prawda*.

(140) – You will all have to come straight with me.
       – Not my grandson, **surely**?
       – All.
       – Wszyscy udacie się ze mną.
       – **Chyba** nie mój wnuk.
       – Wszyscy. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|47777)

(141) You're not goin' missus **surely**?
       Chyba się nigdzie pani nie wybiera? (*Paralela*, OpenSub|47617)

Chyba seems to be the most confrontational epistemic adverb in Polish. It also has non-confrontational uses, but, in contrast to *surely*, in its basic sense it is a low confidence adverb, and as such, it is discussed in Chapter 9.

8.4.5. Translation equivalents of *no doubt*

As shown in Table 17, the most frequent translation equivalent of *no doubt* in the analyzed corpus sample is *bez wątpienia*. As observed in Chapter 7, *bez wątpienia* is also commonly used as a translation equivalent of English argumentative adverbs, such as *undoubtedly, unquestionably,* and *undeniably*. In the National Corpus of Polish, *bez wątpienia* is only evidenced in written language, which makes it close to argumentative adverbs, while *no doubt* is quite frequent in spoken English (see Tables 26 and 27). *Undoubtedly* and *no doubt* as well as the negative argumentative adverbs, such as *unquestionably* and *undeniably*, signal that there is no reason to doubt or question the validity of a claim. *No doubt* is, however, less likely to be used to build arguments in persuasive discourse. It is more often used as an emphasizer in dialogic contexts.

Most of the occurrences of *no doubt* in the parallel corpus come from EU parliamentary debates and EU books, which represent a rather formal type of discourse. Their formal character partly explains the frequent employment of (the rather formal) *bez wątpienia* as its equivalent. Sentences (142)-(144) are cases in point. The examples quoted in (142) and (143) illustrate the use of *no doubt* to qualify predictions based on the speaker's knowledge (both specialist and general knowledge) and experience, which is a common function of the adverb.

(142) This represents one of the oldest dates in this area and, ***no doubt***, among the best-preserved since they still maintain some joining ropes, manufactured with vegetable fibres.

Są jednymi z najstarszych znalezisk na tym obszarze i ***bez wąt-pienia*** jednymi z najlepiej zachowanych, gdyż nadal posiadają część wiązań z włókien roślinnych. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|34304)

(143) Given a change in the substantive legal basis and in view of the forthcoming European elections, a considerable length of time might ***no doubt*** have elapsed before the appropriate legislation could be enacted.

Ze względu na zmianę w materialnej podstawie prawnej oraz wobec nadchodzących wyborów do Parlamentu musiałby ***bez wątpienia*** upłynąć pokaźny okres czasu do wdrożenia odpowiedniego aktu prawnego. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-05-19-020)

(144) The future will ***no doubt*** change in many unexpected ways and we can't afford to gamble too early, he warned participants.

Przyszłość ***bez wątpienia*** będzie się zmieniać na wiele niespodziewanych sposobów, a my nie możemy pozwolić sobie na zbyt wczesne ryzykowanie, ostrzegł uczestników. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|23305)

The parallel corpus provides illustrations of the uses of *no doubt* and *bez wątpienia* in talk-in-interaction, such as the one quoted in (145).

(145) If you drive your car, Mr Barroso, down the road, and the brakes only work 79 % of the time, you will ***no doubt*** at some point crash.

Jeśli jedzie pan samochodem, a hamulce działają tylko w 79% to ***bez wątpienia*** w którymś momencie będzie pan miał wypadek. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-10-20-011)

When *no doubt* expresses expectations and assumptions about the addressee's knowledge, it is more likely to be rendered with *zapewne* and *pewnie*, which also express expectations. *Bez wątpienia* does not refer to expectations, and is not usually used to express assumptions about the addressee. Grochowski *et al.* (2014) classify *zapewne* and *pewnie* as 'hy-

pothetical' particles. The two items signal that the speaker has some background knowledge which enables him/her to think that the claim is true or that the situation will develop in a specific way (Grochowski *et al.* 2014: 45). They share this sense with *no doubt*, which also refers to expectations and predictions based on the speaker's knowledge. Their use as equivalents of *no doubt* is illustrated in examples (146)-(148).

(146) As you ***no doubt*** know, seals are hunted both inside and outside the Community.

Jak państwu ***zapewne*** wiadomo, na foki poluje się na terytorium Wspólnoty, jak i poza nim. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-05-04-021)

(147) You ***no doubt*** know of his older brother Sirius. Died a few weeks ago.

Pewnie wiesz, że jego starszy brat, Syriusz, zginął parę tygodni temu. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|4590)

(148) As you ***no doubt*** have guessed … I am Morpheus.

Jak ***pewnie*** się domyślasz … Jestem Morpheus. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|887)

In sum, while *bez wątpienia* is the most frequent translation equivalent of *no doubt* in the analyzed corpus sample, the Polish adverb is more formal, and does not perform the interpersonal functions characteristic of *no doubt*. It does not express expectations towards the addressee, and is not usually used to make assumptions about the state of affairs. *Bez wątpienia* appears to be closer to *undoubtedly* than to *no doubt*, even though, probably because of its reference to the absence of doubt, it is used as a translation equivalent of both English adverbs.

8.4.6. Translation equivalents of *doubtless*

Most of the occurrences of *doubtless* in the analyzed sample of the parallel corpus come from the proceedings of the EU parliament, and occur in statements expressing declarations and assurances that things are going (or will go) according to plan. In such contexts, *doubtless* seems to signal confirmation that everything is the way it should be and the way it is expected by the speaker and by the addressees. In the Polish versions of such

declarations, *niewątpliwie* and *bez wątpienia* are used as its equivalents, as exemplified in (149) and (150).

(149)   This definition is the epicentre of the proposal and will ***doubtless*** be a matter for discussion with the Council.

Definicja ta stanowi centralny punkt wniosku i ***niewątpliwie*** będzie kwestią do dyskusji z Radą. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-09-04-21-021)

(150)   Fourth, I would like to say that the Treaty of Lisbon – about which, as has been said today, there is good news that it may be ratified soon – will ***doubtless*** be a much greater and much better tool in his hands and in those of the European Union to turn the Union into what it should be: a global actor, in the full sense of the word.

Po czwarte, chciałbym nadmienić, że traktat lizboński – na temat którego, jak już powiedziano dzisiaj, dotarły do nas dobre wieści mogące zapowiadać jego rychłą ratyfikację – będzie ***bez wątpienia*** znacznie potężniejszym i doskonalszym narzędziem w rękach wysokiego przedstawiciela oraz Unii Europejskiej, pozwalającym przekształcić Unię w podmiot, którym powinna być: gracza globalnego w pełnym znaczeniu tego słowa. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-02-18-019)

As noted in section 8.4.5, *bez wątpienia* does not express the speaker's expectations towards the addressee. In addressee-directed uses, *doubtless* corresponds to *pewnie* and *na pewno*. *Pewnie* expresses expectations and assumptions about the addressee, as in (151), while *na pewno* is used to offer reassurance, as in (152).

(151)   Well, we were working a placer claim 300 miles up a branch of the Orinoco. ***Doubtless***, you've never been there, sir.

Pracowaliśmy w kopalni złota, 300 mil od ujścia Orinoko. ***Pewnie*** pan tam nigdy nie był. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|24826)

(152)   – The shaking of the bed.
– That's ***doubtless*** due to muscular spasms.
– Oh, no, no, that was no spasm.

– Trzęsienie łóżka.
– To ***na pewno*** wynik skurczu mięśni.
– Nie, to nie był skurcz. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|1669)

English has four adverbs which signal the absence of doubt: *undoubtedly, indubitably*, *no doubt* and *doubtless*, while Polish has two: *niewątpliwie* and *bez wątpienia*. The two Polish adverbs are used as translation equivalents of each of them, even though only some of their functions overlap. *Niewątpliwie* and *bez wątpienia* do not express conformity with expectations; their use as equivalents of *no doubt* and *doubtless* is only possible in contexts where the expression of expectations is of secondary importance. In addressee-directed utterances, where the two adverbs signal that something is expected from the addressee, *zapewne* and *pewnie* are closer equivalents of *no doubt* and *doubtless*. *Undoubtedly* and *indubitably* are argumentative adverbs; they are less dialogic and less addressee-oriented. Therefore, their discourse functions show a greater degree of overlap with the functions of *niewątpliwie* and *bez wątpienia*.

8.4.7. Translation equivalents of *definitely*

The most frequent translation equivalent of *definitely* in the analyzed sample of the parallel corpus is *zdecydowanie*. In current Polish grammar (e.g. *WSJP*), it is classified as a metapredicative operator, or, more specifically, as an operator of gradation – a category which roughly corresponds to emphasizing subjuncts as distinguished by Quirk *et al.* (1985). The *WSJP* explains that *zdecydowanie* signals that a state or property is so evident that the speaker has no doubt it is true. In the parallel corpus, *zdecydowanie* is often used as an equivalent of *definitely* in the context of deontic meanings, such as necessity. It appears in EU parliamentary debates, when speakers make emphatic statements concerning what they think should be done about some problematic issues, as illustrated in (153) and (154).

(153)   There is also the Treaty modification, which brings with it the risk of break up, and the competitiveness pact, which ***definitely*** needs further discussion.

Jest również omawiana tu zmiana Traktatu, która wiąże się z ryzykiem rozłamu, a także pakt na rzecz konkurencyjności,

który **zdecydowanie** wymaga dalszej dyskusji. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-11-02-15-012)

(154) This must **definitely** be prohibited and penalised.

Takie działania muszą być **zdecydowanie** zakazane i karane. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-12-13-021)

In the Polish version of (154), *zdecydowanie* is placed before the participles *zakazane* and *karane* (*prohibited* and *penalised*), even though it is also possible to place it before the modal verb *muszą* (*must*), where it would more clearly express the speaker's stance towards the content of the proposition. The change of the position of the adverb to a less marked one (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 86), makes it more integrated with the clause and more content oriented than *definitely* is in the English version. The scope of the emphasis shifts from the speaker's conviction that "this must be prohibited" to the need for the prohibition to be definite and the penalty to be significant. The translator's decision to use *zdecydowanie* to qualify the content rather than the speaker's stance suggests the priority of the deontic sense of the statement over the epistemic one. It also indicates that *definitely* is primarily an emphasizer; the epistemic component in the Polish version of the sentence is minimal. Deontic contexts are also characteristic of the emphasizers *koniecznie* 'necessarily' (see Chapter 10) and *bezwzględnie* 'absolutely, definitely', which are attested as translation equivalents of *definitely*. Their uses are illustrated in (155) and (156).

(155) We must **definitely** keep the information gathered to a certain degree of relevance, otherwise it will lose its purpose under a massive amount of data.

Musimy **koniecznie** zachować pewien poziom istotności zbieranych informacji, w przeciwnym razie cel rozporządzenia się zatraci w ogromnej ilości danych. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-02-24-022)

(156) Our aim should therefore **definitely** be to combat discrimination against the smaller, less-populated and often poorer Member States.

Należy zatem **bezwzględnie** dążyć do przeciwdziałania dyskryminacji mniejszych, mniej licznych i często uboższych krajów członkowskich. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-02-15-009)

In the Polish version of (156), "our aim should be" becomes *należy dążyć* 'it is necessary to strive for', which makes it possible for *bezwzględnie* to modify the verb *dążyć* 'strive', and to activate its manner meaning: 'categorically, uncompromisingly, ruthlessly'. As in the case of (154), the translator's choice gives priority to the deontic sense of the statement. *Bezwzględnie* emphasizes the need for determination rather than the speaker's judgement.

Zdecydowanie is the preferred equivalent of *definitely* when the adverb has a potentially scalar interpretation, i.e. when it may be interpreted as meaning 'significantly' or 'greatly', as in (157).

(157) My own artist's experience allows me to say that devoting European Years to certain themes **definitely** helps increase public awareness and involvement.

Moje własne doświadczenia pozwalają mi na stwierdzenie, że poświęcanie kolejnych Lat Europejskich określonej tematyce **zdecydowanie** pomaga w podniesieniu poziomu publicznej świadomości i zaangażowania. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-09-22-021)

In (157), reference is made to helping – an activity whose effects can be described in scalar terms. *Zdecydowanie* can be interpreted as referring to the speaker's assessment of whether "devoting European Years to certain themes helps increase public awareness" ('I'm convinced it helps') or the extent to which the help works ('it helps significantly'). It allows both interpretations, which is why it seems to be intermediate between speaker-related and content-related reference. Such intermediate uses are characteristic of items which Polish linguistics classifies as metapredicative operators, i.e. items which show a medium degree of subjectification. Similar uses are possible in the case of inferential adverbs, such as *clearly* and *evidently*, functioning as emphasizers (see Chapter 5).

The epistemic adverbs *z pewnością* 'certainly' and *na pewno* 'certainly, definitely' are used as equivalents of *definitely* in contexts where it express-

es the speaker's conviction that something is or will be the case. Examples are provided in (158) and (159).

(158) Those of you who are going to vote in favour tomorrow are probably thinking that you will be striking a blow for patients, but that will ***most definitely*** not be the case.

Tym z państwa, którzy zamierzają zagłosować jutro za przyjęciem tego wniosku, wydaje się pewnie, że będzie to korzystne dla pacjentów, ale ***z pewnością*** tak się nie stanie. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-01-18-013)

(159) I can say only two things: this ethical space is a common space – if something happens in one institution, it ***definitely*** has an immediate effect on other institutions.

Mogę jedynie powiedzieć dwie rzeczy: ta przestrzeń etyki jest wspólną przestrzenią – jeśli coś dzieje się w jednej instytucji, ***na pewno*** ma bezpośredni wpływ na inne instytucje. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-02-18-021)

Zdecydowanie tends not to introduce claims concerning the probability of future events or speculations about the present, which is why it is an unlikely equivalent of *definitely* in contexts illustrated in (158) and (159). The use of *definitely* in statements expressing probability may be interpreted as an indication that the epistemic component in its semantics is stronger than in the case of *zdecydowanie*.

8.4.8. Translation equivalents of *decidedly*

As shown in Table 17, the most frequent translation equivalent of *decidedly* is *zdecydowanie*. It is a literal equivalent of *decidedly* and a functional equivalent of both *decidedly* and *definitely*. *Definitely* and *decidedly* are primarily used as emphasizers, and the employment of the same translation equivalent to render their meanings indicates a considerable degree of functional similarity between the two items. *Decidedly* is more formal and literary, while *definitely* is more colloquial. In both the BNC and *Paralela*, *decidedly* usually appears in front of adjectives, as illustrated in (160) and, less often, before verbs, as in (161). *Zdecydowanie* is used as its equivalent in both positions.

(160) Since I am innocent of this crime … I find it ***decidedly*** inconvenient that the gun was never found.

Ponieważ jestem niewinny tej zbrodni … uważam za ***zdecydowanie*** niedogodny fakt, iż nie znaleziono broni. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|2047)

(161) Russia has ***decidedly*** departed from democratic standards.

Rosja ***zdecydowanie*** oddala się od standardów demokratycznych. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-03-13-009-02)

Unlike *definitely*, *decidedly* is in some cases rendered by non-epistemic emphasizers, such as *zupełnie* 'entirely', as illustrated in (162), which indicates that it is more likely to emphasize degree than to indicate the speaker's certainty.

(162) But while Hooks became a music legend, the journey took a ***decidedly*** different direction for former band mates Floyd Henderson and Louis Hinds.

I tak jak Hooks stał się muzyczną legendą, tak przygoda objęła ***zupełnie*** inny kierunek dla pozostałych muzyków, Floyda Hendersona i Louis'a Hinds'a. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|40152)

The Polish translations of claims modified by *decidedly* are formulated in such a way that its equivalent *zdecydowanie* is more content-oriented than *decidedly*, e.g. in (163). The same is true about the Polish translations of the sentences modified by *definitely* discussed in section 8.4.7.

(163) However, if these are the so-called 'positive priorities' and the 'overall multiannual and strategic objectives' (as they effectively are), then we are ***decidedly*** against.

Jednak jeżeli są to tak zwane "pozytywne priorytety" oraz "ogólne wieloletnie i strategiczne cele" (a nimi w rzeczywistości są), wtedy ***zdecydowanie*** się temu sprzeciwiamy. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-03-25-004)

In the Polish version of (163) "we are *decidedly* against" becomes "*zdecydowanie* się sprzeciwiamy" ('we decidedly oppose'), where *zdecydowanie* can be interpreted as modifying the verb, and functioning as a manner adverb. The English version of the sentence emphasizes the certainty

of opinion, while the Polish version stresses the firmness of the opposition. The fact that such translations are attested suggests that the sense of epistemic certainty is perceived by the translators as being of secondary importance in the semantics of *decidedly*; its emphasizing function is perceived as more important.

8.5. Epistemic emphasizers in Polish

In Polish, the category of epistemic emphasizers comprises *na pewno, z pewnością, zdecydowanie, zapewne, pewnie,* and *pewno.* The literal equivalent of *no doubt, bez wątpienia,* is functionally closer to *undoubtedly,* which is why it is classified as an argumentative adverb in this work and discussed in Chapter 7. It typically occurs in written Polish (see Table 27), and is used as a translation equivalent of almost all English argumentative adverbs in the parallel corpus. As already noted, two of the adverbs included in the category of epistemic emphasizers, *na pewno* and *z pewnością,* are classified as high confidence particles in Polish linguistics (e.g. Grochowski *et al.* 2014); *zdecydowanie* is classified as a metapredicative operator of gradation (*WSJP*); *zapewne, pewnie,* and *pewno* are classified as 'hypothetical particles' (Grochowski *et al.* 2014). The last three adverbs all derive from the adjective *pewny* 'certain, confident' (*WSJP*), but they can be used to express both high and low degrees of confidence. They indicate emphatic agreement, emphasize the speaker's expectations towards the development of the situation, and are used to make assumptions about the state of affairs and the addressee. All the Polish adverbs classified as epistemic emphasizers are discussed briefly below.

8.5.1. *Na pewno*

Na pewno is a literal equivalent of *for sure.* Its functions overlap with the functions of *for sure, certainly* and *surely;* in some contexts, it is also close to the phrase *to be sure.* Like *for sure,* it is used in expressions such as *wiedzieć na pewno* 'to know for sure' and *to na pewno* 'that's for sure'. *Na pewno* is frequently used in spoken Polish. Conversational Polish is the section of the National Corpus of Polish where its frequency is the highest (see Table 27).

Na pewno occurs both in the context of certainty, which is characteristic of *surely,* as well as in the context of doubt, which is characteristic of *certainly* and *for sure,* which partly explains why it is used as a translation equivalent of all three adverbs. Its use in the context of certainty is illustrated in (164) and (165). In both examples *na pewno* qualifies opinions which are formulated in opposition to other claims.

(164)   A teraz prowadzi ją [firmę] z tym ... Andrzejem? – skrzywiłem się z lekkim niesmakiem.
– Właśnie. … Zna go pan?
– Kiedyś miałem okazję go poznać – przyznałem, demonstrując specjalnie dla niej brak sympatii wobec Piontka. – Ale to było dawno, inne czasy…
– No, Andrzej **na pewno** się nie zmienił! Daję za to głowę! To pasożyt! (NKJP, fiction, M. Bielecki, *Osiedle prominentów,* 1997)
'He runs the company together with … Andrzej? – I winced with disgust.
– Yes, that's right… Do you know him?
– I used to know him. – I admitted, demonstrating my dislike for Piontek, especially for her sake. – But it was a long time ago. Different times.
– Oh, **surely** Andrzej hasn't changed. I swear blind! He's a parasite!'

(165)   – Ale ja chcę, żebyś poszedł.
– To niemożliwe, **na pewno** tego nie chcesz. (NKJP, fiction, H. Samson, *Pułapka na motyla,* 2000)

'– But I want you to go.
– It's impossible, **surely** you don't want that.'

In (164), the speaker opposes the view that all things change, and expresses the opinion that the man referred to (Andrzej) is certain to have remained as bad as he once was. In (165), *na pewno* is used to object to the interlocutor's suggestion that the speaker should leave. Both examples illustrate the use of *na pewno* to express confidence and to emphasize opposition. Its use in the context of doubt, signalled by "nie pamiętam" 'I can't remember', is illustrated in (166).

(166) – A tego też chyba gdzieś widziałem.

– Kiedy?

– Nie pamiętam, ale **na pewno** nie w ostatnich dniach. Może jest tylko do kogoś podobny. (NKJP, fiction, M. Bielecki, *Osiedle prominentów*, 1997)

'– I think I saw this man somewhere.

– When?

– I can't remember, but it **certainly** wasn't recently. Perhaps he only resembles someone I once knew.'

Like *certainly* and *for sure*, *na pewno* is used as a focalizer, indicating the most certain element of a claim, as in (167).

(167) Jej bliskość sprawiła, że poczuł się pewnie i wiedział już, że cała historia nie może skończyć się źle. **Na pewno** nie dla nich. (NKJP, fiction, W. Jabłoński, *Dzieci nocy*, 2001)

'Her presence made him feel confident; he realized that the whole story could not end badly. **Certainly** not for them.'

Na pewno has developed a number of intersubjective functions. It is commonly used to ask for confirmation. The example quoted in (168) comes from the parallel corpus, and illustrates its use as a translation equivalent of *Are you sure?*; (169) provides a similar illustration from the National Corpus of Polish.

(168) Mr. Peterson, **are you sure** Mom wrote all this?

Czy **na pewno** mama to napisała? (*Paralela*, OpenSub|3116)

(169) Aha, on już wrócił, skąd pani wie? **Na pewno**? (NKJP, fiction, M. Cieślik, *Śmieszni kochankowie*, 2004)

'Oh, he's back already. How do you know? **Are you sure?**'

In its dialogic uses *na pewno* tends to express solidarity with the addressee. It indicates the speaker's readiness to comply with the interlocutor's expectations, as in (170), and signals encouragement, as in (171).

(170) – Zadzwonisz do mnie jeszcze? – Tak, **na pewno.** Dobranoc, tato. (NKJP, fiction, M. Musierowicz, *Dziecko piątku*, 1993)

'Will you call me again? – Yes, **certainly**. Goodnight, Dad.'

(171) Skacz, Tere – mówi Dzidzia ciepłym tonem – zobaczysz, **na pewno** ci się uda. (NKJP, fiction, Z. Chądzyńska, *Przez ciebie, Drabie*, 1969)

'Jump, Tere – said Didzia in a soft voice. – **I'm sure** you can make it.'

8.5.2. *Z pewnością*

Z pewnością is more formal than *na pewno*. Data from the National Corpus of Polish indicate that it is very common in prose and periodicals, but less common in spoken Polish (see Table 27). Grochowski *et al.* (2014: 77) suggest that *z pewnością* tends to qualify claims which are formulated in opposition to other claims, which explains why it is more frequently employed as a translation equivalent of *surely* than *na pewno*. Such uses are illustrated in examples (172) and (173).

(172) Jego śmierć, w kraju cywilizowanym niewytłumaczalna, **z pewnością** jednak uratowała życie kilku jego chorym współwięźniom. (NKJP, non-fiction literature, J. Rolicki, *Edward Gierek: życie i narodziny legendy*, 2004)

'In a civilised country, his death would have been unthinkable, but it **surely** helped to save the lives of some of his ill cellmates.'

(173) Najgorsze, że w Rosji ludzie milczą, chociaż **z pewnością** jest tam wielu, którzy myślą rozumnie. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 1997)

'The worst thing is that people in Russia remain silent, even though there are **surely** many people there who think in a reasonable way.'

Z pewnością is also used in concessive contexts. It is used to agree with a claim which is subsequently dismissed as less important than the counter-claim which follows, as in (174) and (175).

(174) Kompleks? **Z pewnością**. Ale było to też coś więcej niż tylko freudowska zależność, z której obaj nie potrafili się wyzwolić. (NKJP, fiction, M. Saramonowicz, *Siostra*, 1996)

'Some kind of complex? *Certainly*. But there was more to it than just a Freudian type of dependence which they could not free themselves from.'

(175) Wiesz, Andrew ma pomysł, żeby kupić dom pod Nowym Jorkiem. Spojrzał na nią szybko. – I wtedy mógłbym mieć psa? – *Z pewnością*, ale to nie jest *chyba* najważniejsze. (NKJP, fiction, M. Nurowska, *Powrót do Lwowa*, 2008).

'You know, Andrew is thinking of buying a house in New York. He looked at her. – Could I have a dog then? – *Certainly*, but it *surely* isn't the most important thing.'

The example quoted in (175) may serve as an illustration of the pragmatic difference between *z pewnością* and *chyba*, both of which are attested as translation equivalents of *surely*. The quoted fragment comes from a conversation between a mother and son. The mother uses *z pewnością* to confirm that the boy would be allowed to have a dog when they move to a new house. The employment of this rather formal adverbial indicates distance and an attitude of superiority, but it is not confrontational. The confrontation is expressed by *chyba*, which appears in the statement which follows, and is used to reprimand the boy for thinking about something so trivial as having a dog when his mother suggests that they move to another place.

8.5.3. *Zdecydowanie*

Zdecydowanie is the only adverb in the group which Polish sources (e.g. *WSJP*) classify as a metapredicative operator of gradation, and not a particle. It also functions as an adverb of manner meaning 'without hesitation' (*WSJP*), e.g. *postępować zdecydowanie* 'to act determinedly' (PWN). Its uses as a marker of degree and an epistemic marker seem to show a continuum. When it is used with such degree markers as *mniej* 'less' and *więcej* 'more', its epistemic sense is minimal; it is more content- than speaker-oriented, as in (176) and (177).

(176) *Zdecydowanie* mniej pieniędzy wydawałem, niż zarabiałem. (NKJP, fiction, M. Miller: *Pierwszy milion, czyli Chłopcy z Mielczarskiego*, 1999)

'I spent *decidedly* less money than I earned.'

(177) Po trzech latach produkowali już *zdecydowanie* więcej, niż sami potrzebowali… (NKJP, J. Ringo, *Tam będą smoki*, 2005)

'Three years later they were producing *decidedly* more than they needed themselves…'

However, when it appears before the main verb, as in (178), it is more subjective and more clearly epistemic.

(178) Oboje smutni i jakby zagubieni, *zdecydowanie* nie wyglądali na parę kochanków. (NKJP, Michał Bielecki, *Siostra Komandosa*, 1997)

'They both looked sad and lost; they *decidedly* did not look like lovers.'

The example quoted in (178) illustrates that the opinion emphasized by *zdecydowanie* may have an evidential basis, as in the case of *decidedly*. Both *decidedly* and *zdecydowanie* express certainty resulting from clearly perceptible evidence, but they do not express inference from signs or traces. In dialogic contexts *zdecydowanie* is used for emphatic agreement, as illustrated in (179).

(179) Nie trzeba być fanem gryzoni, by polubić „Squirrel Attack!". Nie trzeba też wydawać na niego zbyt wiele pieniędzy, by móc cieszyć się zdobywaniem orzechów pana Jonesa. Czy zatem warto? *Zdecydowanie* tak. (NKJP, fiction, M. Cybowski, *Ku chwale Annut, Pierwszej Wiewiórki!*, 2008)

'You don't need to be a great fan of rodents to like 'Squirrel Attack!'. You don't have to spend a lot of money to start collecting Mr Jones's nuts. Is it worth buying then? It *definitely* is.'

Zdecydowanie is used as a translation equivalent of *definitely* and *decidedly*. The literal equivalent of *definitely* in Polish, *definitywnie*, has not developed an epistemic sense; it is used to mean 'conclusively, radically, once and for all' (PWN).

8.5.4. *Zapewne*

Like its English dictionary equivalents *probably* and *no doubt* (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 127)*, zapewne* expresses probability rather than certainty. Like *no doubt, zapewne* has "confident appearance"; it derives from the adjective *pewny* 'confident, certain', but it does not express absolute certainty. It signals that the speaker has some knowledge which allows him/her to have some expectations towards the development of the situation, and make assumptions about it. Grzegorczykowa (1975) and Grochowski *et al.* (2014) associate *zapewne* with low confidence, while Bralczyk (1978) and Rytel (1982) argue that it expresses a medium degree of certainty. In this work, it is included in the category of epistemic emphasizers on account of its functional similarity to *no doubt*. Polish dictionaries classify *zapewne* as a literary expression (PWN; *ISJP; USJP*). Data from the National Corpus of Polish indicate that it is particularly frequent in literary sources and journalistic prose (see Table 27).

Zapewne can be used to express evidence-based judgement. The basis for the speaker's claim (evidence) is often referred to in the context, as illustrated in (180), where it is introduced with the conjunction *skoro* 'if'.

(180) Czy należy przez to rozumieć, że wkracza Pan na grunt działalności filozoficzno-estetycznej? Odpowiedź: 'Skoro właśnie w ten sposób zostałem zrozumiany, to **zapewne, zapewne**...' (NKJP, C. Skrzyposzek, *Wolna Trybuna*, 1985)

'Does this mean you are entering the field of philosophical-esthetic considerations?
– If this is how I have been understood, then **probably** I am.'

In some of its uses *zapewne* is substitutable with inferential adverbs, such as *najwyraźniej*, e.g. in (181), where the speaker hypothesizes about the people who once lived in the street he is walking down. His claim is clearly based on the evidence he has at his disposal – the shape of the houses and their ornaments.

(181) **Zapewne** w przeszłości Okrzei i Jagiellońska były ulicami bogaczy. Widziało się to choćby w smukłości kamienic i ich bogatym zdobnictwie. (NKJP, Mariusz Sieniewicz, *Czwarte Niebo*, 2003)

'**Most probably** Okrzei and Jagiellońska were once the streets of the rich. It shows in the slender and richly ornamented tenements.'

While both inferential adverbs and *zapewne* rely on evidence, they do so in different ways. The evidential meaning expressed by *zapewne* is assumption, not inference. The two types of evidential meaning are related, as they both involve reasoning (cf. Aikhenvald 2006, 2018; Boye 2012). However, inferences involve the analysis of evidence and deduction, while assumptions rely more extensively on the speaker's knowledge, which allows him/her to make some generalizations and conclusions. The ability of epistemic adverbs to express assumptions is related to their ability to express expectations. In both cases the speaker relies on his/her knowledge and experience. The example quoted in (182) is another case in point.

(182) Opierając się na danych archeologicznych, stwierdzić można, że klasztor powstał najwcześniej w połowie V wieku. **Zapewne** już w tym czasie istniały dwa odrębne zespoły klasztorne. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 1998)

'On the basis of archeological evidence it is possible to argue that the monastery was built no earlier than in the mid 5th century. There were **probably** two distinct complexes of monasteries at the time.'

Zapewne frequently appears in dialogic contexts, in utterances directed to the addressee. In such cases, it expresses assumptions about the addressee's knowledge, and is used in such expressions as *jak zapewne wiesz* (sg)/*wiecie* (pl) 'as you probably/no doubt know', *zapewne pamiętasz/pamiętacie* 'you probably/no doubt remember', as illustrated in (183).

(183) Nazwa ta [Erytrea], jak **zapewne** wiesz, pochodzi od łacińskiej nazwy Morza Czerwonego. (NKJP, Tomasz Mirkowicz, *Pielgrzymka do Ziemi Świętej Egiptu*, 1999)

'This name [Eritrea], as you **no doubt** know, comes from the Latin name of the Red Sea.'

In such instances, it is functionally similar to *no doubt*, which is also used to make assumptions about the addressee's knowledge (cf. section 8.2.5). *Zapewne* is also used in statements inviting confirmation, as in (184) and (185).

(184) ***Zapewne*** chciałbyś wiedzieć, jak zmarła twoja siostra, Zeena? (NKJP, Rafał Nowakowski, *Rdza*, 2008)

'You would ***probably***/***no doubt*** like to know how your sister Zeena died?'

(185) ***Zapewne*** Ty, Czytelniku, także masz za sobą takie doświadczenia! (NKJP, *Gazeta Ubezpieczeniowa*, 2001)

'You, reader, ***probably***/***no doubt*** have had similar experiences.'

In (183)-(185) *zapewne* functions as a marker of concurrence: the addressees are expected to think in the same way as the speakers/writers. By indicating the speaker's expectations towards the addressee, *zapewne* can be used to signal solidarity, as in (185), but it can also be used to challenge the addressee and provoke them, as in (186).

(186) Jeździsz samochodem? Podejrzewam, że tak. A więc ***zapewne*** zdajesz sobie sprawę z tego, że prawdopodobieństwo zabicia przez Ciebie niewinnej osoby w wypadku jest kilkukrotnie razy większe niż skazanie owej osoby na karę śmierci w wyniku pomyłki (jeżeli takowa kara zostałaby w Polsce wprowadzona). Czy w wyniku tej wiedzy przestaniesz prowadzić auto? (NKJP, www.forumowisko.pl, 2005)

'Do you drive? I suppose you do. Then you ***no doubt*** realize that the chances that you will kill an innocent person in a car crash are several times higher than the chances that the same person will be sentenced to death by mistake (if capital punishment was introduced in Poland). Knowing that, will you give up driving?'

In (186) *zapewne* is used to suggest that the addressee has overlooked something which the speaker thinks is obvious, i.e. that the number of people killed in road accidents is higher than the number of innocent people who are sentenced to death. It is thus confrontational in character.

Zapewne is frequent in concessive contexts. It is used to express reluctant agreement with some statement only to allow the speaker to dismiss it, and offer one which is presented as more important or more realistic, as illustrated in (187) and (188). In such cases, *zapewne* functions as a marker of conceding concurrence, to use Martin and White's (2005: 125) term.

(187) ***Zapewne*** można było zrobić więcej, <u>ale</u> po tym, jak ministrem został Zdzisław Podkański, kierowanemu przeze mnie departamentowi po prostu zabrakło czasu. (NKJP, *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 1996)

'We could ***no doubt***/***probably*** have done more, but when Zdzisław Podkański was elected minister, my department simply did not have enough time.'

(188) Antoni Pawlak napisał: 'Andrzej Szczypiorski pisał głupstwa w latach 50'. ***Zapewne*** tak, ale kto ich nie pisał? (NKJP, *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 1992)

'Antoni Pawlak wrote: Andrzej Szczypiorski wrote foolish things in the 1950s. He ***probably*** did, but who didn't?'

In (187) the speaker admits that his department could have done more, but then he adds that they did not have time, so in fact there was nothing they could do. In (188) *zapewne* is used to agree that the writer Andrzej Szczypiorski wrote 'foolish things' ("głupstwa") in communist times, only to undermine the importance of the observation. The author tries to excuse the writer by saying that other people did the same. The implication is that in totalitarian systems people cannot be expected to always behave in the right way. In both cases *zapewne* is used in contexts where speakers try to justify their own or other people's behaviour, and suggest that even though they did nothing to be proud of, there were some objective reasons which made them behave in that way. As observed by Martin and White (2005: 126), such concede-counter pairings "can be seen as gestures towards solidarity in contexts where the writer anticipates, at least initially, disagreement on the part of the reader". The concession helps the speaker/writer to establish common ground with the addressee, as it indicates that the contrary position which the receiver may potentially support is to some extent valid.

8.5.5. *Pewnie*

Like *zapewne*, *pewnie* derives from the adjective *pewny* 'confident, certain', which suggests its association with certainty rather than with probability. However, the adverb can be used to express both probability and certainty. The bilingual dictionaries list three epistemic equivalents of *pewnie*: *probably*, which is used to express probability, as well as *of course* and *sure*, which are used to express certainty. *Pewnie* is aditionally used as an adverb of manner meaning 'confidently, without hesitation', as in *odpowiadać pewnie* 'to answer confidently'. In comparison with *zapewne*, it is more colloquial. Data from the National Corpus of Polish indicate that it is most frequent in spoken language (see Table 27).

Pewnie expresses expectations resulting from the speaker's world knowledge and familiarity with the situation. It is found in both monologic and dialogic types of discourse. In monologic genres, it expresses expectations concerning the state of affairs; in dialogic contexts, it expresses the speaker's assumptions about the addressee's knowledge and behaviour. The two uses are illustrated in examples (189) and (190).

(189) To był piękny instrument i ***pewnie*** bardzo drogi. (NKJP, *Śmieszni kochankowie*, Mariusz Cieślik, 2004)

'It was a beautiful instrument and ***probably*** very expensive.'

(190) A co mówiła policja? – ***Pewnie*** wiesz już tyle samo co ja. (NKJP, M. Bielecki, *Siostra Komandosa*, 1997)

'What did the police say? – You ***probably*** know as much as I do.'

Like *zapewne*, *pewnie* is used in concessive contexts to agree with claims which are subsequently dismissed as having no influence on what the speaker thinks or does, as in (191) and (192).

(191) Robię tyle, ile mogę. Jeżdżę po kraju i spotykam się z tymi, którzy chcą się ze mną spotkać. Czy można zrobić coś lepszego dla kraju? ***Pewnie*** tak, ale robię to, co robię. (NKJP, spoken Polish, onet.pl, 2004)

'I do as much as I can. I travel across the country and talk to people who want to talk to me. Could one do more? ***Probably***, but I do what I do.'

(192) ***Pewnie*** mógłbym zarabiać więcej, kupić sobie lepszy samochód, realizować nowe zamówienia, przenieść się do Warszawy, być lepszy od innych, ale po co? – zastanawia się Paweł Giernat, prowadzący własną firmę. – Żeby żyć w większym stresie? Rzadziej bywać z rodziną? (NKJP, *Dziennik Łódzki*, 2003)

'I could ***probably*** make more money, buy a better car, get more orders, move to Warsaw, and do better than others, but why would I do it? – says Paweł Giernat, who runs his own firm. – To live under more stress? To spend less time with my family?'

In both (191) and (192) the speakers try to defend their positions and justify their choices. *Pewnie* is similar in such uses to *zapewne*. The conceding concurrence signalled by *zapewne* and *pewnie* helps speakers to establish solidarity with their addressees to ensure a better understanding of the counter-claims which follow.

The emphatic uses of *pewnie* are primarily attested in dialogic contexts, particularly in short confirmatory answers, where it signals that the speaker's agreement is to be taken for granted, such as in (193).

(193) Mogę do ciebie wpaść gdzieś za godzinkę? – ***Pewnie***. (NKJP, fiction, A. Barczyński, *Ślepy los*, 1999)

'Can I drop in, in an hour or so? – ***Of course.***'

In its emphatic uses, *pewnie* is often preceded by the intensifier *no*, which signals that the answer is obvious (cf. Bralczyk 1978; *WSJP*; PWN), as in (194).

(194) Wiesz, kto to był Greiser? – ***No pewnie*** – roześmiała się. (NKJP, fiction, J. Grzegorczyk, *Chaszcze*, 2009)

'Do you know who Greiser was? – ***Of course/certainly*** – she laughed.'

Pewnie is also used to confirm a prior statement or expectations expressed in a prior statement. In such cases it co-occurs with the subordinator *że* 'that', as in (195) and (196), after which the confirmed statement is repeated.

(195) Obiecał kupić obraz. Za dwa kawałki. W ogóle fajny facet. Trochę śmieszny.

– Kupi, kupi. ***Pewnie***, że kupi. (NKJP, M. Sieniewicz, *Czwarte niebo*, 2003)

'He promised to buy the painting. For two thousand. He's a nice guy, a bit funny. – He will buy it. ***Of course*** he will.'

(196)   – Szwecja! – Zgadł pan – skłamał Walerian. – ***No pewnie***, że Szwecja, od razu wiedziałem. (NKJP, fiction, M. Idczak, *Słony wiatr*, 2007)

'You're from Sweden! – Yes, you got it right. – Walerian lied. – ***Of course*** you're from Sweden, I knew it from the start.'

The confirmation expressed by *pewnie* in (195) and (196) indicates concurrence. In (195), *zapewne* is used to reassure the addressee and confirm his expectations that the situation will develop favourably for him; in (196), it is used to signal common ground between the speaker and the addressee, and a common point of reference. As in the case of *zapewne*, the sense of expectations which the adverb expresses enables it to indicate that the speaker shares some knowledge and attitudes with the addressee.

8.5.6. *Pewno*

Pewno is semantically close to *pewnie*, but it is even more colloquial and characteristic of spoken Polish (see Table 27). Like *pewnie*, it can be used to express both probability and certainty. When used as a low confidence adverb, it signals that the speaker has some knowledge related to the subject matter, and makes an assumption based on it or expresses expectations resulting from what s/he knows, as in (197).

(197)   Szedł za nami, bo ***pewno*** bał się zgubić. (NKJP, *Piołun i miód Kroniki Drugiego Kręgu Księga III*, Ewa Białołęcka, 2003)

'He walked right behind us, as he was ***probably*** worried he would get lost.'

In addressee-directed talk, it expresses assumptions about the addressee's knowledge in a similar way as *zapewne* and *pewnie* do, as illustrated in (198). Such assumptions may function as prompts, encouraging the addressee to provide some information to the speaker.

(198)   Ale ty, Kosma, ***pewno*** wiesz, gdzie to? (NKJP, Marta Tomaszewska, *Zorro, załóż okulary!*, 2001)

'But you, Kosma, ***no doubt*** know where it is?'

Its emphatic uses are typically found in short confirmatory responses, as in (199).

(199)   Naprawdę chcesz mnie zabrać?... – ***Pewno***! (NKJP, fiction, M. Tomaszewska, *Zorro, załóż okulary!*, 2001)

'Do you really want to take me with you? – ***Certainly***!'

Pewno is also used to confirm a prior statement. Like *pewnie*, it is often preceded by the intensifier *no* indicating the obviousness of the answer, and followed by the subordinator *że* 'that', after which the confirmed claim is repeated, as illustrated in (200) and (201).

(200)   No latem to nie ma co chodzić tak smutno ubranym przecież. – ***No pewno*** że nie. (NKJP, spoken Polish, 2000)

'It makes no sense to wear such sad clothes in the summer. – ***Of course/certainly*** not.'

(201)   Niezupełnie – poprawił Marian. – ***Pewno*** że niezupełnie – zgodził się Julek. (NKJP, fiction, I. Jurgielewiczowa, *Ten obcy*, 1990)

'Not exactly that – Marian corrected him. – ***Of course/certainly***, it's not exactly that – Julek agreed.'

Pewno seems to be a synonym of *pewnie* in highly informal registers. Functionally, the two forms are very close.

8.6. Epistemic emphasizers in English and Polish: summary and comparison

Epistemic emphasizers tend to add force to a single element of a proposition rather than express the speaker's stance towards the entire claim. When used in the sentence initial position, they are rarely followed by a comma, which suggests that adding emphasis to parts of the proposition is a more important function in their case than the expression of the speaker's epistemic stance. Of all the English adverbs in the group, *certainly* is most frequently followed by a comma, which might be interpreted as an indication that the sense of epistemic certainty is more pronounced in its semantics than in the case of the other adverbs in the group. *Surely,*

definitely, and *decidedly* are only exceptionally followed by a comma when used sentence-initially, which indicates that they are primarily employed as emphasizers.

The epistemic emphasizers do not form a homogeneous group. In English, they can be divided into four types: (1) focalizers and agreement markers: *certainly, for sure, for certain*; (2) emphasizers of degree: *definitely, decidedly*, (3) expectation markers: *no doubt, doubtless*; (4) the confrontational emphasizer *surely*. *Certainly, for sure* and *for certain* tend to be used when the speaker's knowledge of a situation is limited, but there is one thing which seems certain. They are used to emphasize the point which appears to be more certain than the alternative ones. They are also used to emphasize agreement with other claims, often in concessive contexts. *Definitely* and *decidedly* are primarily emphasizers of degree; they signal that a certain quality is evidenced 'to a great extent'. In dialogic contexts they are used to confirm prior claims. *No doubt* and *doubtless* communicate that the speaker has certain assumptions about the state of affairs or about the addressee, and express expectations regarding the development of a situation. They are also used to confirm claims and to ask for confirmation. *Surely* forms a category of its own. In most of its uses it is confrontational and challenging. It is used to emphasize claims formulated in opposition to other statements; it signals criticism, and is used to offer advice from the position of someone who knows best.

In Polish, the epistemic emphasizers can be subdivided into three types: (1) focalizers and agreement markers: *na pewno, z pewnością*; (2) the emphasizer of degree *zdecydowanie*; (3) expectation markers: *zapewne, pewnie, pewno*. There are no direct equivalents of *surely* in Polish. Its opposition-marking and challenging functions are performed by a number of adverbs in Polish. Data from the parallel corpus indicate that *na pewno* and *z pewnością* roughly correspond in their uses to *certainly, for sure* and *for certain*. *Z pewnością* can be used to express superiority, and in some contexts it can be used as a relatively close equivalent of *surely*, but it is not as confrontational as its English equivalent. *Zdecydowanie* is a close equivalent of *definitely* and *decidedly*. *Zapewne, pewnie* and *pewno* signal (like *no doubt* and *doubtless*) that a certain course of action is expected by the speaker; they are also used to express assumptions. *Zapewne* is literary in character, while *pewnie* and *pewno* are colloquial.

9. Low confidence adverbs

9.1. Introduction

Low confidence adverbs are, by definition, dialogically expansive, to use White's (2003), and Martin and White's (2005) term, i.e. by using them, the speaker/writer "indicates that alternative propositions are possible or even likely" (White 2003: 267). Some of them indicate that, based on the speaker's knowledge of the subject matter, a specific alternative is particularly likely to be true, while others signal that it may well not be true at all. In other words, they differ regarding the degree of certainty they express and the degree of openness towards alternative views, but they do not contract the space for discussion and negotiation. In Martin and White's (2005) taxonomy, they are essentially associated with the functionality "entertain", as by using them, the speaker "entertains" different "dialogic alternatives".

The acknowledgement of alternative propositions, which is inherent in the semantics of all low confidence adverbs, makes them well disposed to develop interpersonal functions connected with politeness. A lack of certainty is associated with non-imposition and the need for confirmation, which is why low confidence adverbs are used to encourage a response from the receiver, and to make polite requests, invitations, and offers.

In English the category of low confidence adverbs comprises the following items: *maybe, perhaps, probably, likely, possibly, presumably,* and *conceivably* (cf. Quirk *et al.* 1985; Biber *et al.* 1999; Huddleston and Pullum 2002). In Polish it comprises *może, być może, chyba, raczej, bodaj, bodajże, prawdopodobnie,* and *przypuszczalnie* (Bralczyk 1978; Grochowski *et al.* 2014; *WSJP*). Grochowski *et al.* (2014) classify *raczej* as a reformulation

mulatory particle, but Bralczyk (1978) discusses its epistemic uses as well, which is why it is included in the present study. As already noted, some Polish sources (e.g. Grzegorczykowa 1975; Grochowski *et al.* 2014) additionally classify *zapewne, pewnie* and *pewno* as low confidence adverbs, but these have emphasizing uses, analogous to those of *no doubt*, which is why they are classified as epistemic emphasizers in this study (cf. Chapter 8). They indicate the speaker's expectations that the situation will develop in a specific way, and express assumptions about the state of affairs, which makes them different from such low confidence adverbs as *może* 'maybe' and *prawdopodobnie* 'probably'.

The English and Polish adverbs expressing a low degree of confidence are listed in Table 18, together with their frequencies in the British National Corpus (BNC) and the National Corpus of Polish (NKJP), respectively. They are ordered according to their frequencies in the monolingual corpora.

Table 18. Low confidence adverbs in English and Polish

English low confidence adverbs	Freq per 100 m words (BNC)	Polish low confidence adverbs	Freq per 100 m words (NKJP)
perhaps	33,510	*może*	49,345
probably	26,467	*chyba*	37,970
maybe	10,012	*raczej*	20,468
possibly	7,035	*być może*	14,686
presumably	3,197	*prawdopodobnie*	13,394
likely	539	*bodaj*	1,525
conceivably	265	*bodajże*	667
		przypuszczalnie	370

As demonstrated in Table 18, most low confidence adverbs have high frequencies in both languages. *Perhaps* is the most frequent epistemic adverb in the BNC, and *może* is the most frequent epistemic adverb in the National Corpus of Polish. In this chapter each of the English low confidence adverbs is examined on the basis of its uses in the BNC, beginning with the most frequent one, i.e. *perhaps*. The Polish equivalents of all the English adverbs in the group are established with reference to bilingual

dictionaries and the translation corpus *Paralela*. Subsequently, the Polish low confidence adverbs are discussed on the basis of their occurrences in the National Corpus of Polish. Occasionally, reference is also made to their English equivalents in the parallel corpus. The chapter ends with a comparison of the uses of low confidence adverbs in the two languages.

9.2. Low confidence adverbs in English

9.2.1. *Perhaps*

Perhaps is used to signal "that something is possible", and to communicate that the speaker is "not certain about something" (*CALD*). It expresses the speaker's subjective judgement of a situation (Ernst 2009: 512, 515), and functions "as part of the conventional linguistic implementation of politeness" (Hoye 1997: 123). It is used in polite requests, offers, suggestions, invitations, and statements of opinion (Hoye 1997: 123; *CALD*). *Perhaps* is more frequent in speech than in writing (see Table 26). It is attested in sentence initial, medial and final positions; almost one third of its occurrences are sentence initial, which indicates its frequent use as a discourse marker.

a. "Entertaining" alternative views

Like all markers of the functionality "entertain" (cf. Martin and White 2005), *perhaps* is used to indicate that a certain alternative is possible, at the same time acknowledging the possibility that other alternatives are true. The subject matter is presented as open to discussion, and the speaker does not commit himself/herself in any way to the claim. The lack of commitment is signalled by the use of *perhaps* with the diminishers *just* and *only*, as illustrated in (1) and (2). In some contexts, the speaker explicitly says that s/he does not know if the alternative or interpretation s/he offers is true, as in (3).

(1) Because ***perhaps*** – just ***perhaps*** – he was the one who'd come to rescue her from the clutches of Spiderglass. (BNC, FP0 251)
(2) For it had come, and ***perhaps***, but only ***perhaps***, she could build on that. (BNC, HE 2922)

(3) I'd been so busy I'd had no time to think. Just the next ticket, the next hotel. I preferred not to think, ***perhaps***. <u>I don't know.</u> (BNC, C8S 1838-1841)

Perhaps can be used to qualify two contradictory alternatives, presenting them as equally likely (or unlikely), as in (4). It is also used to introduce a number of equally possible alternatives, such as in (5).

(4) ***Perhaps*** it is, ***perhaps*** it is not; our ignorance shows that what we mean when we speak of personal identity is continuity of consciousness, not of substance. (BNC, ABM 1152)

(5) ***Perhaps*** ten, ***perhaps*** fifteen, ***perhaps*** twenty minutes passed. (BNC, CDX 1085)

The tendency displayed by *perhaps* to signal the availability of several options rather than to focus on a single issue is particularly evident in its co-occurrences with the co-ordinator *or* (1,345 instances in the BNC), which explicitly indicate the speakers' openness to alternative views. Such use is illustrated in (6) and (7).

(6) First, take time to talk to your husband or wife, <u>or</u> ***perhaps*** your family doctor, other parents or teachers (BNC, A0J 884)

(7) Reynard cannot help but be cautious about this information, despite its apparent supernatural origin, <u>or</u> ***perhaps*** because of it. (BNC, AD9 2477)

Perhaps signals that an opinion or interpretation is offered to the addressee(s) for consideration. The opinions expressed by *perhaps* are sometimes formulated as questions, which helps the speaker to avoid imposing his/her views on the addressee. Such uses are illustrated in examples (8)-(10).

(8) Why were they gambling? Was it ***perhaps*** partly that Mr Mandela, did she get the feeling, was pulling strings, leading the government along? (BNC, A57 323-324)

(9) 'Could Beatrice ***perhaps*** be getting a bit old in herself,' I had suggested, 'or could it *perhaps* be something to do with the accident she had as a child?' (BNC, AC7 903)

(10) Is it ***perhaps*** not more difficult for a disabled student even with a degree to get employment in order to be able to repay that loan? (BNC, KRT 712)

b. Concessive uses of *perhaps*

Like most epistemic adverbs, *perhaps* is used to express concession, or, as Martin and White (2005) put it, "conceding concurrence". A characteristic feature of the concessions marked by *perhaps* is that the claims it confirms often contain some criticism, which is later dismissed by the speaker with more positive, complimentary or optimistic statements, as illustrated in (11)-(13).

(11) Roth says to Levi in the course of the interview embodied in his article: 'Your other books are ***perhaps*** less 'imaginary' as to subject-matter but strike me as more imaginative in technique.' (BNC, A05 1446)

(12) 'There aren't any other jobs.'
'Well, not at this moment in time, ***perhaps***. But you never know, something may turn up later in the year.' (BNC, ANY 962-964)

(13) ***Perhaps*** a little too active but he did achieve his goal! (BNC, ADK 713)

The concessions marked by *perhaps* emphasize the positive aspects of the situations, and signal solidarity with the addressee. In dialogic contexts concessions of this type may be used to offer consolation to the interlocutor. The statement quoted in (12) is used to reassure the addressee, to make him think positively, and to persuade him that sooner or later he will find some employment.

c. *Perhaps* as a politeness marker

The non-committal and non-imposing character of *perhaps* is very useful in interpersonal communication, and makes it an important marker of politeness. The adverb is used to diminish the potential threat to the interlocutor's or the speaker's face involved in requests, offers and suggestions, etc. As already noted by Hoye (1997: 123), it typically co-occurs with modal auxiliaries in such contexts. Its uses in polite requests are illustrated in (14)-(16).

(14)   – Yes, could you, ***perhaps*** you could find out which school she's at.
   – Yes, okay. (BNC, DCH 1029-1030)

(15)   Well now er, if you've got some <pause> critical comments about the management of it ***perhaps*** you could write and we have a look at them. (BNC, F7V 274)

(16)   Elaine: Can I, can we ask you to, can I move you forward, forward, that way or would you like to stand up, stand up and come round <-|->
   Audrey: <-|-> ***Perhaps*** if you would like to go round the <-|->
   Elaine: come round <-|-> yeah <-|->
   Audrey: <-|-> Stand at <-|-> the back or something (BNC, F8D 413-416)

Perhaps is also used to make suggestions. It co-occurs with the modal auxiliary *should* in such cases, as illustrated in (17) and (18).

(17)   ***Perhaps*** you should try and find out a little more about her before admitting your feelings. (BNC, A70 1236)

(18)   ***Perhaps*** we should advertise again in the paper. (BNC, KSR 1356)

It is also used to suggest a meeting, and to offer help, as in (19) and (20).

(19)   ***Perhaps*** we can meet and talk about it all one of these days. (BNC, A08 1435)

(20)   '***Perhaps*** I could teach him some of the things I know instead?' suggested the Bookman. (BNC, AMB 1766)

In all its uses as a marker of politeness, *perhaps* suggests an alternative which the addressee may accept or reject. It signals respect for the autonomy of the addressee, and gives the addressee the possibility to decline the speaker's offer or suggestion. In polite offers and suggestions, it is usually used in the sentence initial position. The addition of *perhaps* at the beginning of a sentence changes a statement into an offer or suggestion, thus giving the addressee an alternative to consider. The use of *perhaps* as a marker of politeness reveals its performative character. Nuyts (2001a) argues that modal adverbs are always used performatively, i.e. they "cannot

be used to express epistemic modal qualifications descriptively" (2001a: 72) the way adjectives can. In dialogic forms of discourse the non-descriptive nature of *perhaps* is particularly evident.

d. Textual and rhetorical functions of *perhaps*

The ability of *perhaps* to introduce a number of available alternatives allows it to combine its interpersonal functions with textual ones. In some contexts, *perhaps* is substitutable with *for example* and *such as*, and performs the textual functions which Quirk *et al.* (1985: 635) associate with appositive conjuncts. Such use is illustrated in examples (21)-(23).

(21)   Eleanor told him she understood, kissed him and then left to start the long journey home. Nigel believed she would assume he had something incurable with a shade of film glamour to it – leukaemia, ***perhaps***. (BNC, AC3 2777-2778)

(22)   One source of interest can be a description of where the interview has taken place, ***perhaps*** a studio, or maybe the artist's home. (BNC, A04 1255)

(23)   In truth, the camera is a ruthless editor of visual information; this can be made plain by looking at a picture, say of the eighteenth century, and comparing it with a contemporary print, ***perhaps*** an aquatint, and a modern photograph. (BNC, A04 1547)

Quirk *et al.* (1985) define appositive conjuncts as expressions which are intended to "express the content of the preceding item or items in other terms", such as *namely, for example, for instance, that is,* and *in other words*. This is also the function *perhaps* serves in (21)-(23). It signals that a specific option is available, at the same time indicating its relation to the other options presented in the sentence.

Perhaps is also a useful rhetorical device in spoken forms of discourse, such as lectures. It helps speakers to organize their talk and to interact with the audience. The extract quoted in (24), which is a fragment of an A-level history lecture, reveals how frequent *perhaps* is in monologic genres, and illustrates the variety of functions it performs.

(24)   <pause> By the way erm are we relatively clear what's meant by liberalism and nationalism within this context?

<pause> Should I **perhaps** digress and say a little word erm er about this? **Perhaps** I will.

<pause dur="10"> It's **perhaps** of some interest to us that erm these to great -isms, liberalism and nationalism <pause> I think we can see them as products of the French revolution. Or indeed products of **perhaps** <pause> enlightened attitudes, certainly with the case of liberalism. <pause> In a sense, if we think of the context of say the late <pause> eighteenth early nineteenth century <pause> **perhaps** more, **perhaps** more specifically we think of the er, of the er <pause> erm early nineteenth century. (BNC, DCJ 146-151)

The speaker quoted in (24) uses *perhaps* to ask his addressees a question, to make an offer ("Should I *perhaps* digress"), to signal what he intends to talk about ("*Perhaps* I will"), and to indicate careful consideration of the opinions made and the words used to formulate them, as well as some degree of detachment from the subject matter. The fragment quoted in (24) illustrates how modal adverbs of various types are employed for rhetorical purposes: they emphasize claims (*indeed*), focalize and balance them (*certainly*), and signal that alternative interpretations are possible (*perhaps*). *Perhaps* frequently occurs in the context of pauses and hesitation markers, which suggests that it may function as a gap filler. The fragments quoted in (25) and (26), which also come from A-level history lectures, provide more examples of this type.

(25)   There's a couple of points **er er perhaps** worth making about it. (BNC, DCK 103)

(26)   Metternich said that he signed it to please the Tsar. <pause> Erm and yet **perhaps** erm it's <unclear>. **Perhaps** it was important erm because as as as erm, as I'm Im fond of saying that in history **perhaps** <pause> what you believe is more important than what actually happened. (BNC, DCK 127-129)

Perhaps seems to adds a subjective element to the lectures, at the same time allowing the speaker to remain detached. The lecturers discuss historical events, but they enrich their accounts with personal comments: "I think we can see them", "I'm fond of saying", "*Perhaps* it was important",

"a couple of points er er *perhaps* worth making". By doing so, they seem to signal that there is room for interpretation and subjective opinions in historical discourse. *Perhaps* is a useful rhetorical and pragmatic device signalling thoughtful consideration, respect for interlocutors and their autonomy, readiness for a discussion and openness to alternative points of view.

9.2.2. *Probably*

In its basic sense *probably* is "used to mean that something is very likely" (*CALD*). It also has a number of pragmatic functions connected with the linguistic manifestations of politeness, such as making opinions "sound less forceful or definite" (*COBUILD*). *Probably* is a high frequency adverb. Like *perhaps*, it is more frequent in spoken English than in written genres (see Table 26). This section compares the ways in which *probably* and *perhaps* express the notion of probability; it also looks at the functions of *probably* in dialogic contexts.

a. "Entertaining" alternative options

In contrast to *perhaps*, which indicates that the speaker is tentatively considering one of several options and is ready to accept other alternatives, *probably* is more concerned with the likelihood of one specific proposition. It also expresses a greater degree of certainty than *perhaps*. The *OD* glosses it as "almost certainly". It is less likely than *perhaps* to co-occur with the diminisher *just*, which is used to signal the speaker's openness to other alternatives. No such occurrences are attested in the BNC. However, two instances of *only probably* are evidenced in the corpus, indicating that it is associated with a low level of certainty; one of them is quoted in (27).

(27)   'Is there a potential on the Earth now,' Tooley asked, 'for catastrophic, subglacial floods raising sea level by 23cm in a few weeks or several metres in a few years?' **Probably** not. But <u>only **probably**</u>. (BNC, AAG 146-148)

Probably tends to co-occur with degree modifiers which add force to the claims it qualifies, such as *most* and *quite*, as illustrated in (28) and (29). It is also used to compare the degree of likelihood of two propositions; in such cases it is preceded by the modifier *more*, as illustrated in (30).

(28) In defence of an ideal she would <u>quite</u> ***probably*** be willing to suffer death, and she didn't discard ideals easily. (BNC, ACE 1668)

(29) Meanwhile, the old building will come down. It has always looked a bit ramshackle, with its claustrophobic nets, which were gas-lit until the 1960s. It will be replaced, <u>most</u> ***probably***, by a modern sports centre which will have no room for cricket. (BNC, AAN 197-199)

(30) Alcoholism and other forms of addictive disease are <u>more</u> ***probably*** born rather than made. (BNC, G3D 569)

Unlike *perhaps* (or *maybe* and *possibly*), *probably* is not used to qualify two opposite or different views in one statement (compare: *perhaps it is, perhaps it is not* in section 9.2.1). It is rarely used with the co-ordinator *or* (31 occurrences in the BNC, as compared to 1,345 occurrences in the case of *perhaps*). While *probably* does not close the door to debate and is dialogically expansive, it indicates that the speaker considers one option to be the preferred alternative. This difference between *perhaps* and *probably* emerges clearly when one compares (31) and (32).

(31) Customers are also invited to travel evenings where films, lectures or ***perhaps*** foreign cookery lessons are staged. (BNC, AAV 83)

(32) 'Well, you'd better drop it [a goat's collar] in, hadn't you? If I'm out, leave it in the porch. Or ***probably***, since you can't trust anybody any more, you'd better put it through the letter box.' (BNC, HA2 2850-2852)

In (31), *perhaps* introduces one of the several attractions available at "travel evenings", while in (32), *probably* introduces the best alternative available in the situation. *Probably* often qualifies alternatives which are referred to as "the best" and "right" in the situations described, as illustrated in (33) and (34).

(33) There wasn't a lot of choice. <u>The best thing</u> would ***probably*** be just to walk around to keep warm and then to snatch a little rest in a doorway somewhere if need be. (BNC, A0F 1652-1653)

(34) Because the bulk of the work was supervised by the owner, the overall cost is difficult to assess, but a figure of £50,000 at 1979

prices ***probably*** <u>represents the right order of expense</u>. (BNC, A79 388)

Probably communicates that the speaker is making an assessment of the truth value of the proposition based on his/her best knowledge; it signals that the proposition is true, as far as the speaker can tell (cf. *OD*). Such is its role in (35), which is a fragment of a health promotion and education leaflet, where *probably* appears in a description of a standard procedure. It signals that with a high degree of probability, unless something extraordinary happens, the procedure will be as described in the leaflet.

(35) What will they want to know about my health? You will ***probably*** be asked some questions about your health, and you will need to have a routine chest X-ray if you haven't had one lately. (BNC, A0J 285-286)

b. Concessive uses of *probably*

When *probably* expresses concession, it is used to admit that a certain option has its disadvantages. The claim which follows communicates that despite its disadvantages, the option will or should be pursued. Such use is illustrated in (36)-(38).

(36) ***Probably*** a waste of time <u>but</u> try to get that photograph anyway. (BNC, CKC 165)

(37) I'm going to try something. It ***probably*** won't work <u>but</u> it might. If it does, we'll almost certainly lose the mast, but we won't sink. (BNC, AMU 1536-1538)

(38) 'I don't like it much,' I said, 'but I think there's a chance.' 'Yes, I think there's a chance, too. Of course, I must be honest: I think some people will ***probably*** get hurt, <u>but</u> I suppose that's a risk which everyone's got to take in war.' (BNC, B0U 2677-2679)

In its use to agree on the negative aspects of a situation in concessive contexts, *probably* resembles *perhaps*, but it does not have the solidarity marking function of *perhaps*. The concessions it is involved in are used to balance the advantages and disadvantages of a situation rather than to signal that its negative aspects can be dismissed as unimportant or as temporary.

c. Intersubjective uses of *probably*

In addressee-directed talk *probably* expresses the speaker's expectations and assumptions concerning the addressee's knowledge (*as you probably know/remember/realise*), as in (39) and (40).

(39) You ***probably*** don't remember it but there used to be a bowl and a big jug for washing you in the bedroom. (BNC, FY5 520)

(40) Martin: Erm well if if we I mean you're you're ***probably*** fairly clear about the archaeology <-|-> area <-|->
Ian: <-|-> Yeah.
Martin: and you ***probably*** know more about that than I do so I won't <-|-> you know
Ian: <-|-> Yeah. (BNC, FMD 51-54)

It is close in such uses to *no doubt*, which also expresses assumptions about the addressee's knowledge. *Probably* is also used to make suggestions; it diminishes the strength of deontic *should* and *need*, as in (41) and (42).

(41) The doctor re-focused his eyes and returned to his paperwork. 'Well – er from yes – er, on that subject – I think you should ***probably*** have a mammography.' (BNC, H9Y 554-555)

(42) Look, what you ***probably*** need is some fresh air. Would you like to come and sit out the back with me for a minute? (BNC, A0F 2413-2414)

Probably seems to be less intersubjective and less addressee-oriented than *perhaps*. Its intersubjective character results from contextual factors, such as its use in utterances directed to the addressee, but the meaning it expresses in such contexts is, in fact, subjective, as it focuses on the speaker's judgement of the situation. Unlike *perhaps*, it is not used sentence-initially in intersubjective contexts; it does not invite the addressee to consider any alternatives. *Probably* is used to signal that the speaker believes a certain alternative is likely to be true or that it is worth pursuing.

d. Textual functions of *probably*

Probably is used to strengthen an argument by introducing a stronger or a more decisive statement, as in (43)-(45).

(43) On the other hand, if you feel your debtor is making a reasonable effort to reduce his debt, then enter into an agreement with him for the payment of the remaining balance. If he then varies or strays from the agreement in an unsatisfactory way you are only asking for trouble if you don't act promptly for full recovery. Also, while he is paying and after he has paid, don't add to your worries by giving him more credit. If you do the chances are good that you will only have the same situation all over again or ***probably*** even worse. (BNC, CD0 874-877)

(44) But MacGregor, the only person in the Cabinet who is, or ***probably*** ever has been, a member of the Magic Circle, is not what he seems. (BNC, K5D 8966)

(45) Being a writer of course, being the data problem, er, this is a big problem in psychoanalysis, because whereas erm, in an analysis, the analyst has er hundreds or ***probably*** thousands of hours' data from the pre-associations of the patient, at the end. (BNC, HE2 253)

In examples (43)-(45) *probably* is functionally similar to additive disjuncts with a reinforcing function (cf. Quirk *et al*. 1985: 635), as the statements it adds to the main arguments have a reinforcing function: "the same … or *probably* even worse"; "is, or *probably* ever has been"; "hundreds or *probably* thousands". In its reinforcing uses, *probably* resembles *indeed* (cf. Chapter 6). Such uses confirm Biber and Finegan's (1988) observation that the discourse functions of modal markers are different from those suggested by their literal meanings, i.e. low confidence adverbs are not necessarily used to express doubt.

9.2.3. *Maybe*

Maybe signals uncertainty, and communicates "that something is possible or that something might be true" (*CALD*). In addition to evaluating the degree of likelihood of a proposition it has a number of pragmatic functions connected with politeness. *Maybe* is a high frequency adverb, particularly common in spoken English (see Table 26). In the BNC it is attested in sentence initial, medial and final positions. About one third of

its uses are in the sentence initial position, which is characteristic of discourse markers (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007).

Maybe has different functions in monologic and dialogic forms of discourse. In monologic genres, it is more likely to express probability; in dialogic uses, which seem to be central to its functioning, it is directly involved in the interaction between the speaker and the addressee, and performs a number of functions connected with politeness, in particular with face-saving strategies. Both types of functions are discussed briefly below.

a. *Maybe* as an epistemic stance marker

When used as an epistemic stance marker, *maybe* expresses a low level of probability. In the BNC it is attested with the modifier *just*, which signals that it only offers a tentative suggestion with no commitment on the speaker's part, as in (46) and (47).

(46)   She knew she couldn't do that. But maybe, just **maybe**, with sweet and sparkly Mrs Malloy smiling her way, she had the right to dump it. (BNC, HGF 1094-1095)

(47)   Or maybe, just **maybe**, what is called a woman's intuition is really based on man's transparency. (BNC, BN3 1904)

Like *perhaps*, *maybe* indicates that the proposition it qualifies is merely one of the available alternatives, and signals that the matter is open to verification and debate. The speaker does not give preference to any of the possible views. This non-committal attitude is particularly visible in contexts where *maybe* qualifies two opposite statements, presenting them as equally possible, as in (48) and (49). Similar uses are also possible in the case of *perhaps* (cf. 9.2.1). In (50) *maybe* co-occurs with *perhaps*, which illustrates the semantic and functional similarity between the two adverbs. *Maybe* signals one alternative, *perhaps* another one; both alternatives are presented as equally possible.

(48)   When asked about the dishes on the menu, Salah shrugged. "**Maybe** yes. **Maybe** no. **Maybe** tomorrow." (BNC, FEM 629-632)

(49)   If I've nowhere to go. Well, **maybe** I have and **maybe** I haven't. (BNC, H9G 875-876)

(50)   I quickly ordered a second cup and the dreams returned. I would work for one of the major charities, **perhaps**, or **maybe** go for a job in publishing. That seemed like the most sensible idea. (BNC, A0F 160-162)

Speakers use *maybe* to speculate about events from the past, present or future; to suggest that something is possible to happen in the future, and to offer "a possible explanation" (*CALD*) for why something happened. Such use is attested for sentence initial, medial and final *maybe*, as illustrated in (51)-(53).

(51)   It was along ago, young Angus thought. **Maybe** he has forgotten. (BNC, A0N 246-247)

(52)   **Maybe** there will one day be a novel from Amis which portrays the Patrick Standish of the Eighties – more baleful, no doubt, on certain subjects, nicer to his cat, surrounded by the monuments of the New Right and by the debris of the swinging past to which he had once been a contributor. (BNC, A05 1100)

(53)   Or he could be following a highway of pheromonal signals laid down by fellow members of his species – a trail leading to food, **maybe**. (BNC, BMY 1105)

Maybe is more colloquial than *perhaps* and more characteristic of spoken language; it is less frequent in formal registers, such as academic discourse (cf. e.g. Rozumko 2017). However, in its uses as a marker of probability, "entertaining" alternative dialogic positions, it performs similar functions as *perhaps*.

b. Intersubjective uses of *maybe*

Maybe performs a number of functions in talk-in-interaction. It is used to ask questions; it also plays a role in the expression of politeness. Like *perhaps*, it offers the addressee an alternative to consider, without imposing any specific view or behaviour. *Maybe* appears in questions which are used to maintain a conversation and to involve the addressee, as in (54) and (55). As in the case of *perhaps*, the addition of *maybe* to a declarative sentence, changes it into a question.

(54) *Maybe* you've seen the gorge in the cliffs? That's what gave this district the name. (BNC, BMU 1909-1910)

(55) 'Lots of people. I tried being John Carradine earlier this evening, but it didn't get me anywhere. *Maybe* you remember that?' 'Carradine, sure. The crazy guy.' (BNC, GFL 2356-2360)

The ability of *maybe* to indicate the existence of alternative options is useful in politeness strategies: it is used in requests, offers and suggestions. Its role in such cases is to lessen the threat to the addressee's face which is usually involved in directives. It introduces an option for the addressee to consider, and invites a response. Its use in offers and suggestions is exemplified in (56) and (57). Examples (58) and (59) illustrate its use in requests and utterances offering advice.

(56) *Maybe* I can give one of you a lift? (BNC, CEC 1167)

(57) Yes, yes *maybe* you and I can sit down. (BNC, J8B 747)

(58) Could you, could you *maybe* gather Linda's and Alex's and anybody else's that they've got. (BNC, F7C 654)

(59) *Maybe* you just need to give her time. (BNC, A0L 3187)

9.2.4. *Possibly*

Possibly indicates "doubt or hesitancy" (*OD*); it is also used for emphasis, and performs a number of discourse functions connected with politeness. It has been reported to indicate objective judgements (Ernst 2009: 515), and to signal "a cautious, detached, quasi-scientific attitude" (Wierzbicka 2006: 276). In the BNC *possibly* is less frequent than *perhaps, probably* and *maybe*, but, like these three adverbs, it is more frequent in speech than in writing (see Table 26). It is used in sentence initial, medial and final positions, which signals its ability to perform different functions in discourse. It is used as a marker of epistemic stance signalling the possibility that a claim is true; it functions as an emphasizer and diminisher; it is also used as a politeness marker. The functions of *possibly*, as established on the basis of the BNC data, are discussed briefly below.

a. *Possibly* as a marker of epistemic stance

When used as a marker of the speaker's epistemic stance, *possibly* signals that the proposition is logically possible (cf. Ernst 2009: 515), but

the speaker does not know if it is true. As noted by Wierzbicka (2006: 276), "[i]t reflects the speaker's desire not to say more than what one has grounds for saying". *Possibly* occurs in contexts where speakers admit they have no knowledge concerning the truth value of the claim, that their knowledge is incomplete, and that it is "hard to say" whether a given claim is true. Such cases are illustrated in examples (60) and (61).

(60) He went upstairs. There he would remove his jacket, his waistcoat and his tie, roll up his sleeves and wash his hands. *Possibly* he also washed his face, she did not know, never having asked him. Until bedtime, no further kiss would be offered in which, had it been, she might, or might not, have detected the scent of soap. (BNC, A0R 280-283)

(61) His age? He could have been fifty but *possibly* thirty. It was hard to say, even hazard a guess. (BNC, BNC 448-450)

In (60) and (61) *possibly* is used to qualify claims which, at the moment of speaking, cannot be confirmed by any evidence. In the speakers' view, there are no objective reasons to consider them invalid, but the claims are not certain enough for the speakers to take responsibility for their truth value. Uncertainty and incomplete knowledge on the part of the speaker are also signalled in the uses of *possibly* in questions communicating doubt and hesitation, as in (62), and the employment of additional epistemic phrases indicating that the speaker is not entirely certain, such as "I recall I think" in (63).

(62) I have been, for 70 years, the proud owner of a spinning wheel, stamped with the name 'Foster'. It has been in our family since 1850. I have done certain repairs over the years, but much is still original, and though the marquetry is lifting it remains a beauty. The main parts are of mahogany, but the spindles are lighter wood, *possibly* ash or yew? (BNC, A0X 1546-1549)

(63) I recall I think we *possibly* planned to use strings right from the word go and David, without my knowledge, went to Paul Buckmaster and asked whether he was interested in writing the string parts. (BNC, AB5 729)

Possibly signals that a certain alternative is likely and logically possible, but it does not imply that it is more likely than any other alternatives. In its openness to other alternatives *possibly* is similar to *maybe* and *perhaps*. Like the two adverbs, it can be used to introduce two opposite or alternative views in the same sentence, signalling that they are both equally possible, as in (64)-(66).

(64)   You had to be 'circumspect in identifying where such people that are aspiring to democracy … are … important to us.' ***Possibly*** the contras were in that category, but ***possibly*** not. (BNC, ADL 1207-1208)

(65)   She saw a flicker of something cross his eyes. ***Possibly*** amusement. ***Possibly*** something else. (BNC, JXS 2243-2245)

(66)   Botanists now think the angiosperms arose in the Cretaceous, <u>or</u> ***possibly*** in the early Mesozoic era, say about 200 million years ago, <u>although</u> ***possibly*** much earlier. (BNC, C9A 1104)

The speaker's openness to alternative views expressed by *possibly* is evidenced in its relatively frequent co-occurrences with the conjunctions *or, but*, *although*, and *though*, which signal the availability of other dialogistic options. Such use is illustrated in (66). It is a property it shares with *maybe* and *perhaps*, and one which distinguishes all three adverbs from *probably*, which is more concerned with indicating the most likely option. This difference between *possibly* and *probably* is illustrated in (67), where *probably* introduces the alternative which the speaker considers to be the most probable in the situation (the most likely recipient of the letter referred to), while *possibly* signals the availability of another one.

(67)   Most of what is known about Leapor derives from a letter by her friend and mentor, Bridget Freemantle, to a gentleman in London, ***probably*** John Duncombe <u>though</u> ***possibly*** John Blencowe. (BNC, AN4 46)

While *possibly* is similar to *perhaps* and *maybe* in signalling that other alternatives are also possible, the degree of certainty expressed by *possibly* can be increased with the degree modifier *quite*, which *maybe* and *perhaps* do not occur with. Such use is illustrated in (68).

(68)   Would an effective theory of how advertising works have helped? <u>Quite</u> ***possibly***, it would have made little difference. (BNC, F9D 186-187)

b. Concessive uses of *possibly*

In its concessive uses *possibly* signals the speaker's acknowledgement of the disadvantages or weaknesses of a situation, which are subsequently dismissed as being less important than its advantages. In its agreement with the negative aspects of a situation it is similar to *perhaps*. Examples (69)-(71) illustrate such use.

(69)   It was hard – might ***possibly*** have been cruel <u>but</u> with most pupils it worked. (BNC, B22 119)

(70)   An old adage, ***possibly*** even a cliché, <u>but</u> not a bad philosophy if you want the sort of holiday where you can get involved, meet local people, be an individual rather than part of a package. (BNC, ECF 3)

(71)   She had bought me a hardback. ***Possibly*** it was secondhand, <u>but</u> it still looked like five bucks' worth of book, I reckoned. (BNC, H0M 1630-1631)

The employment of a low confidence adverb to refer to the weak points of a situation suggests that the weaknesses are not entirely certain and even if they do occur, they are easily dismissed as insignificant.

c. *Possibly* as an emphasizer

The 'lack of knowledge' component can also be identified in emphatic uses of *possibly*. The adverb is used to emphasize surprise and confusion on the part of the speaker, and to signal that the speaker cannot understand how it was possible for the situation to occur, as in (72) and (73). The emphasis expressed by *possibly* is sometimes reinforced by other emphasizers, such as the informal expressions *in the world* and *on earth*, as illustrated in (74).

(72)   Mungo wondered why the old man kept his voice down. Who could ***possibly*** overhear them in a garden? (BNC, ACV 323-324)

(73)   I thought 'how can he ***possibly*** behave like that with a wound that would lay low any other soldier?' (BNC, A61 1156)

(74) What was he doing here, now, at this hour of the night? What <u>in the world</u> could he ***possibly*** want? (BNC, HGT 1121-1122)

d. *Possibly* as a maximizer ('to a great extent') and minimizer ('not to any extent')

In addition to being used as an emphasizer, *possibly* functions as an intensifier. The difference between emphasizers and intensifiers is, according to Quirk *et al.* (1985: 583), that emphasizers "do not require that the constituent concerned should be gradable", while intensifiers are concerned with degree, and indicate "a point on an abstractly conceived intensity scale" (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 589). Intensifiers may indicate both a high and low degree of intensity, i.e. they may be used as maximizers or minimizers. *Possibly* is used to perform both roles. When used as a maximizer, *possibly* means 'to a great extent'; when it serves as a minimizer, it means 'not to any extent'; it is thus a "negative maximizer", as Quirk *et al.* (1985: 597) put it. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 600) note the use of *possibly* as a minimizer; they do not associate it with the category of maximizers. However, as demonstrated below, its uses as a maximizer are also attested in the BNC. In both cases *possibly* tends to co-occur with the auxiliaries *can* and *could*. The uses of *possibly* as a maximizer are illustrated in examples (75) and (76); its uses as a minimizer are exemplified in sentences (77) and (78).

(75) Er we we have warmed it up as much I would have said this on the phone, we've warmed it up as much as we ***possibly*** can. (BNC, J9Y 400)

(76) The great majority, however, carried on working as long as they ***possibly*** could. (BNC, AP7 518)

(77) He might assert that he experienced Cortés within him, that he communed personally with Cortés, that Cortés appeared to him in visions, that through Cortés he approached oneness with God or with the sacred. How could we ***possibly*** challenge such assertions? (BNC, EDY 202-203)

(78) 'But how can we ***possibly*** … trust … after …' The idea of friendship with Charity was so daunting, she shook her head and dried up. (BNC, ACE 1791-1792)

When used as a maximizer, *possibly* emphasizes a high degree of intensity ("as much as we *possibly* can"; "as long as they *possibly* could"); as a minimizer, it emphasizes a low degree of probability. The role of a maximizer is characteristic of its uses in affirmative sentences, while its uses as a minimizer are attested in non-affirmative sentences, where it forms part of implicit negation, expressed, among others, by rhetorical questions. "How could/can we *possibly*" in (77) and (78) anticipate a negative answer, and signal a lack of possibility.

e. *Possibly* as a marker of politeness

Possibly plays an important role in the linguistic expression of politeness (cf. Hoye 1997). It combines with the auxiliary *could* to make polite requests. In its uses as a politeness marker, the sense of possibility is also activated. By using it in requests, speakers ask whether it is possible for their requests to be fulfilled. Such uses are illustrated in examples (79)-(81).

(79) 'Could I ***possibly*** ring home?' he asked the headmaster. 'I'll pay for the call of course.' (BNC, AC3 2286-2287)

(80) 'Could I ***possibly*** borrow some money?' she asked, turing in her seat to look at him. (BNC, JYC 1835)

(81) Could we ***possibly*** have a quick look inside? I want Peck to see the staircase. (BNC, H9U 1878-1879)

In sum, in addition to being used as a marker of the speaker's epistemic stance, *possibly* also functions as an emphasizer, an intensifier, a minimizer, and a politeness marker. In all its uses it refers to the notion of possibility, but it does so in different ways. In its epistemic sense, *possibly* indicates that the speaker does not know if a proposition is true, but s/he thinks it is logically possible. As an emphasizer, it can be used to indicate the speaker's confusion resulting from the fact that a seemingly impossible situation has taken place. It is also used as a maximizer indicating a high degree (as high as possible), and a minimizer indicating a low degree (almost too low for a situation to be possible). In polite requests, it is used to ask if the requested favour is possible.

9.2.5. *Presumably*

Presumably indicates that a situation "is very likely" though "not certain" (*COBUILD*). It is related to the mental verb *presume*, which manifests itself in its reference to the process of thinking and reaching a conclusion – a property which *perhaps, maybe* and *possibly* lack. Like most adverbs in the group, *presumably* is more frequent in the spoken than in the written sections of the BNC, and in addition to indicating probability, it performs some interpersonal functions in talk-in-interaction.

a. *Presumably* as an epistemic stance marker

Presumably signals that the speaker assesses the probability of a claim on the basis of some evidence; it thus has an evidential component in its semantics. Like *probably*, it focuses on the likelihood of one particular alternative; in contrast to *perhaps, maybe,* and *possibly*, it does not indicate that other alternatives are equally possible. Its relation to the verb *presume* is evident in contexts which reveal the speaker's way of thinking and provide grounds for the speaker's judgement, as exemplified in (82).

(82) Having done the climb in this manner, Dave thought the route unjustified in this state, feeling that as the pegs deteriorated with age no-one would repeat it. **Presumably** this was important to him (it always was to me and I can fully understand this) <u>for</u> he wrote the route up in the new routes books asking how others would feel if he subsequently went back and placed a single bolt runner to protect the route. (BNC, A15 1210-1211)

In (82) the speaker is making a conclusion based both on what Dave did ("for he wrote the route up…"), and on the speaker's own experience ("it always was [important] to me and I can fully understand this"), but he is not entirely sure whether his judgement is correct. In Wierzbicka's (2006: 257) view, *presumably* "signals a conclusion that goes beyond what the speaker can know". Nuyts (2001a: 57) argues that *presumably* expresses inference "from what is known". The type of inference expressed by *presumably* is, however, different from the type of inference expressed by such inferential adverbs as *clearly, obviously* and *evidently. Clearly, obviously* and *evidently* express judgements which are closely based on evidence and involve deduction; they are all high confidence adverbs. *Pre-sumably* qualifies opinions which are based on the speaker's empirical knowledge, familiarity with situations of a similar type and the analysis of available data. The epistemic component is stronger in its semantics than in the case of inferential adverbs. The type of evidential meaning it expresses can perhaps be most accurately described as conjecture. As noted in Chapter 2, Aikhenvald (2006) treats conjecture as an epistemic extension of inference. Some scholars, e.g. Thornes (2018), consider it to be a type of inference which does not involve physical evidence. Conjectures are more subjective and leave more space for interpretation than inferences proper (cf. also Rozumko, forthcoming).

The evidence which serves as the basis for claims qualified by *presumably* is not necessarily introduced explicitly with the conjunction *for*, as in (82). In many cases, the situation is first described, often in detail, and then the speaker formulates a conclusion based on it, as illustrated in (83). The evidence is usually indirect, circumstantial, and does not necessarily lead in a straightforward way to the conclusion made by the speaker. To form an opinion based on it, the speaker additionally needs some background knowledge, such as in (84).

(83) ON WEDNESDAY, Christies' two star lots are Canaletto's view of the Old Horse Guards, wonderfully fresh and the most significant of the artist's London paintings, while Rembrandt's jewel-like Daniel and Cyrus before the Idol of Bel has never had the slightest sniff from the Rembrandt Research Project, which has whittled 1,000 'Rembrandt's' down to 300 and whittles on remorselessly. However, its estimates have roller-coastered since they were first unveiled. In March, the Picture department, when pushed, warily quoted Canaletto's world record of £1.2 million to the press, while Daniel and Cyrus was put 'in the Mantegna league', which translated as £7–8 million. Since then, their fortunes have changed spectacularly. Canaletto has shot up to £8–10 million, which seems high even considering the undisputed quality of the painting, while the Rembrandt has plunged to £5 million. **Presumably** Christie's knows something that we don't. (BNC, AKB 58-63)

(84) When she finally turned over a page and saw his name, it seemed oddly unreal. – Lucas Sales Ltd – contact Mr L Hunter or secretary. And underneath was a list of names and addresses – his regular clients, **presumably**. (BNC, H8S 2363-2365)

In (84) the list of names and addresses found by the speaker is interpreted as a list of regular clients because the speaker knows that the person who made it was a salesman. In some cases, *presumably* expresses assumption – another semantic parameter connected with evidentiality (cf. Aikhenvald 2018: 12). Assumptions are based on the speaker's knowledge; the speaker's reliance on evidence is minimal in such cases. Both inference and assumption involve reasoning, and in some accounts assumption is subsumed under inferred evidentials (Aikhenvald 2006) or inferential justification (Boye 2012). The use of *presumably* to express assumption is illustrated in (85).

(85) – We provide a service not only for the six thousand odd people that are on the <-|-> campus.
      – Six thousand odd people! That's a heck of a lot of people.
      – Oh, it is.
      – They're not all students, **presumably**.
      – No, we've got about four thousand five hundred students.
      (BNC, KRH 2077-2082)

The conclusion made in (85) is possible thanks to the familiarity of both speakers with the organization of the campus. *Presumably* expresses a conclusion which results from the speaker's knowledge and the expectations resulting from it.

b. Intersubjective uses of *presumably*

Intersubjective uses of *presumably* are connected with its ability to express assumptions. In talk-in-interaction, the assumptions are made with the intention to elicit confirmation from the addressee. Such use is illustrated in examples (86) and (87).

(86) '**Presumably** the tool kit does still live in the cupboard under the stairs?' He nodded. (BNC, A0R 2011-2012)

(87) 'I gather Dominic only recently joined the Circle … **Presumably** Meryl invited him…?' 'You're wrong there. She wasn't keen on the idea at all.' (BNC, C8D 2952-2955)

The intersubjective functions of *presumably* are particularly clear when it occurs with the second person pronoun. It is used to confirm the speaker's assumptions and expectations concerning the interlocutor's knowledge, opinions, behaviour, etc., as in (88)-(90).

(88) The, the normal family of two point four children, or whatever, is not the normal family nowadays, you've got lone parent families, you've got step parent families, reconstituted families, policies and services should take account of all the different needs of those different sorts of families, and very complex lives they lead these days?
      – Should, you're saying, and therefore, you **presumably** think they don't? (BNC, FLD 194-195)

(89) '**Presumably** you have friends – outside of business?' Her eyes narrowed against the smoke from her cigarette. 'Naturally.' (BNC, HWP 3296-3298)

(90) **Presumably** you took those chicken <pause> things downstairs for me <pause> yesterday? (BNC, KE2 9574)

Inferential adverbs such as *obviously* and *clearly* are also used to express assumptions (cf. Rozumko, forthcoming), but the assumptions expressed by *presumably* are less confident than the ones expressed by *clearly* and *obviously*. The difference seems to be related to the types of inference expressed by the three adverbs: confident and evidence-based in the case of *clearly* and *obviously*; tentative and involving a greater degree of subjective judgement in the case of *presumably*.

9.2.6. *Likely*

Likely is used "to indicate that something is probably the case or will probably happen in a particular situation" (*COBUILD*). Most dictionaries treat is as a synonym of *probably* (*CALD; OD, COBUILD*). *Likely* functions both as an adverb and an adjective. In British English, it is mostly an adjective, but its adverbial uses are also attested in the BNC. When used as an adverb, it often occurs with degree modifiers. The *Collins English Dictionary*

notes that "its use without an intensifier, as in *it will likely rain* is regarded as unacceptable by most users of British English, though it is common in colloquial US English". There are, however, numerous occurrences of *likely* without intensifiers in the BNC.

When used without degree modifiers, *likely* typically follows the auxiliaries *will* and *would*. In its occurrences with *will* it refers to the likelihood of a future event, as in (91), and in its uses with *would* it qualifies predictions based on data analysis, as in (92).

(91) 'The break from constitutional monarchy is almost certain to see Elizabeth II as the last Queen of Australia,' it added. 'The move <u>will</u> *likely* see the Governor-General [the Queen's representative] replaced by a president.' (BNC, K5M 1739-1740)

(92) The report concluded that private investment options in the consultation paper <u>would</u> *likely* lead to increases in household charges, mirroring the experience in England and Wales. (BNC, GXJ 2175)

The adverb can also be negated, as in (93) and (94).

(93) 'You'd best be getting down to those hens of the old lady's,' he said to Philip. 'She'll <u>not</u> *likely* be doing them for a while.' (BNC, ABX 4277-4278)

(94) Blackwall was only a miner but <u>not</u> *likely* a fool – few miners are. (BNC, H0B 403)

In its uses with degree modifiers, *likely* seems to be close to *probably* (as suggested by the dictionaries). It focuses on the likelihood of one specific alternative, and expresses a relatively high degree of probability. The speaker's judgement results from his/her world knowledge and experience. Based on what the speaker knows, s/he has some expectations regarding the development of the situation. *Likely* is frequent with degree modifiers which intensify its meaning: *most* (20% of its occurrences), *more* (16%), *very* (9%). Its co-occurrences with *quite* are less common (1,5%). *More likely* is used to compare the degree of likelihood of two propositions, as in (95); *most likely* and *very likely* are used to express a high level of probability, as illustrated in (96) and (97).

(95) For all its speed, the hunter's learning process is not particularly pleasant for the prey animal providing the education. At best it will be severely prodded and nipped. ***More likely***, it will be mauled and mangled. (BNC, BLX 789-791)

(96) There was silence. Philip watched her smoking her cigarette. ***Most likely*** when she'd finished that, they'd go. (BNC, ABX 1455-1457)

(97) And she wondered how he spoke to his wife and children. ***Very likely*** he used the same precise manner; she couldn't imagine him doing otherwise. (BNC, AT7 840-841)

Likely is used in short responses to offers and questions; it is also used to confirm a prior statement. In responses to offers, it usually appears in its negative form, which is functionally close to *certainly not* (cf. *CALD*). Such use is illustrated in (98).

(98) 'And if you're feeling tired, what about a dose or two of that tonic you make up for the patients?'
'That stuff?' exclaimed her husband. '***Not likely***! It tastes appalling.' (BNC, ASE 1288-1291)

In (98) *likely* is decisive, and indicates a relatively high degree of certainty. It expresses emphatic disagreement, which makes it functionally similar to high confidence adverbs, such as *certainly* and *definitely*. *Likely* has the same decisive ring when it appears in negative responses to questions asking for confirmation, as illustrated in (99).

(99) 'You didn't tell him you were meeting me, though?' Merrill said, alarmed.
'***Not likely***! He never exactly encouraged our friendship.' (BNC, HA7 3856-3859)

In its ability to qualify confident statements *likely* resembles *probably*. Its emphatic uses provide support for Biber and Finegan's (1988) observation that modal markers often have discourse functions which cannot be predicted form their literal meanings. *Likely* also occurs in positive responses to questions and confirmatory statements. In such cases, it is used with the degree modifiers *very* and *quite*, and also signals a relatively confident attitude, as illustrated in examples (100)-(102).

(100) You've hardly eaten this week. And what's more, scarce a word out of you. Are you sickening for something?'
'***Very likely***; and I think it would come under the heading of overwork.' (BNC, AT7 755-758)

(101) 'I'm afraid, Mr Sikes,' he said, 'the boy may say something which will get us into trouble.'
'***Very likely***,' said Bill Sikes, smiling unkindly. 'You've got problems, Fagin.' (BNC, FRK 672-674)

(102) 'I see. So the landlord's holding an after-hours booze-up as usual!'
'***Quite likely***!' (BNC, JY3 1398-1400)

In sum, *likely* is semantically close to *probably*. The similarity is particularly clear in monologic genres; in talk-in-interaction the two adverbs have different functions. *Likely* is used to express emphatic disagreement and emphatic confirmation; *probably* is used to make suggestions and signal the speaker's expectations concerning the addressee's knowledge. Because of its frequent use with the degree modifiers *most, more, very,* and *quite,* it tends to express a relatively confident attitude.

9.2.7. *Conceivably*

Conceivably means "it is conceivable or imaginable that" (*OD*). Like *presumably*, it is related to a mental state verb. Its relation to *conceive*, i.e. "to imagine something" (*CALD*), "to think of it and work out how it can be done" (*COBUILD*), suggests that the judgement is qualifies results from reasoning and imagining a situation in which the claim is true. Monolingual dictionaries note its similarity to *possibly* (e.g. *Merriam-Webster*). *Conceivably* is a low-frequency adverb; in the BNC it is more frequent in the written sources (see Table 26). It is attested in sentence initial, medial and final positions, which indicates its ability to modify clauses as well as clause elements. *Conceivably* is for the most part monologic and subjective. In the BNC it rarely occurs in dialogic contexts or direct references to the addressee. It performs two major functions: a marker of the speaker's epistemic stance, and an intensifier (in non-assertive contexts).

a. *Conceivably* as an epistemic stance marker

When used as an epistemic stance marker, *conceivably* signals that while the speaker does not know if a proposition is true, s/he can conceive of circumstances in which it is true. In the majority of cases *conceivably* appears with the modal auxiliaries *could*, *might*, *may*, *can*, and *would*. Wierzbicka (2006: 277) argues that its frequent use with the weak modals indicates that the adverb expresses a very low level of certainty. However, its use with the modal auxiliaries may also be interpreted as resulting from the presence of the components of 'ability' and 'capability' in the semantics of both the adverb and the modal auxiliaries it co-occurs with. Modal adverbs tend to collocate with the modal auxiliaries which are semantically close to them, e.g. evidential adverbs tend to collocate with the modal auxiliaries which express evidential meanings (Hoye 1997). In the same way, *conceivably* can be said to collocate with the modal auxiliaries which express ability and capability. The adverb itself seems to primarily signal that a situation is imaginable and theoretically possible; the degree of confidence conveyed by the statements it qualifies seems to depend on the context. Consider the example quoted in (103).

(103) To say that men exist, or rather "actually exist", strictly, is not to say anything either about living creatures or the nature of men. That men are living creatures is a contingent fact. ***Conceivably*** they might not be. Equally ***conceivably*** I might not be aware that they are. I might not even know what "living creature" means. (BNC, FTV 314-318)

In (103) *conceivably* introduces two claims which are said to be equally imaginable. The speaker does not commit himself to either of them; he communicates that they are both potentially true. The ability of *conceivably* to qualify two alternative claims in one statement makes it similar to *possibly*, *perhaps* and *maybe*. By using the four adverbs, speakers communicate that they are ready to consider alternative views. However, in contrast to *possibly, perhaps* and *maybe*, *conceivably* seems to introduce an alternative option which is theoretically available, conceivable, and potentially true, but, in practice, less likely to be true than the other options. Examples quoted in (104) and (105) provide illustrations of such uses.

(104) The line of descent may be further restricted by making the estate an estate in tail-male, i.e. one descendible only to males and only in the male line, or **conceivably** (though in practice this appears never to be done) in tall-female descendible only to and through females. (BNC, ABP 845)

(105) Obviously the detailed nature of these checks depends on the material submitted, but we found it invaluable to look at the output from these checks before looking at the coursework itself. For example if the style check showed that the student had an unusual balance in the use of facilities, it made us curious as to why: *perhaps* the work was just plain bad, or **conceivably** it was an unusual and original approach that was highly successful. (BNC, CG9 357-358)

In (104) the context makes it clear that *conceivably* refers to what is only possible in theory, as the speaker notes that the claim it qualifies appears never to apply "in practice". In (105) it qualifies a proposition which is potentially true or sometimes true. It can be contrasted with *perhaps*, which is also used in this sentence and qualifies the option which comes to the speaker's mind first. *Perhaps* qualifies the option which is often true (it is not unusual), while *conceivably* signals an alternative which can also be imagined as occurring, but it is less typical, and consequently, less likely to be true.

The degree of confidence expressed by *conceivably* can be increased with the degree modifier *quite*, which signals that the situation *conceivably* refers to is not just imaginable, but easily imaginable, as in (106) and (107).

(106) A legislature may <u>quite</u> **conceivably**, by oversight or even design, exceed what an international tribunal (if such existed) might hold to be its international rights. (BNC, FP8 1260)

(107) 'There are no engineering obstructions to IBM putting it [CICS/6000] on other platforms', Data Logic says. In addition, it believes Encina could have <u>quite</u> **conceivably** gone on to the ES/9000 mainframe instead of Tuxedo, but thinks IBM's deal with USL for that technology is effectively a spoiler for Amdahl Corp's Tuxedo TP system offering on its IBM-compatible Unix mainframes. (BNC, CSC 288-289)

The examples quoted in (106) and (107) demonstrate that *conceivably* is used to refer to hypothetical situations, i.e. situations which 'can be imagined to be true' (in contrast to *possibly*, which signals that claims are logically possible). In its references to hypothetical situations it also qualifies alternatives which may be imagined as happening if some conditions are fulfilled. Such uses are illustrated in examples (108) and (109).

(108) Even in the event of Israel's relinquishing the occupied territories this political problem is likely to continue, partly because the absorptive capacity of the West Bank is limited but also because the vast majority of refugees in Lebanon come from Galilee, Haifa and Acre, and consider these places to be home. <u>If</u> the West Bank could absorb them, these refugees might **conceivably** settle and call it home. But if the West Bank cannot accommodate them, will they accept a political settlement which does not allow at least a substantial proportion to return to Galilee? (BNC, APD 860-862)

(109) After half a century, the Hashemite adventure in Palestine seems to be drawing to its close. <u>Unless</u> the Palestinians suffer a dramatic reverse Jordan cannot **conceivably** negotiate for them. (BNC, APD 681-682)

In (108) and (109) reference is explicitly made to the conditions which make it possible for the claims qualified by *conceivably* to become possible ("if the operations were protracted", "unless the Palestinians suffer a dramatic reserve"). The possibility qualified by *conceivably* is thus purely theoretical, and concerns the situations which the speakers can imagine as happening.

b. Concessive uses of *conceivably*

Conceivably is rarely used in concessive contexts. In the few instances in the BNC when it is used concessively, *conceivably* signals partial agreement. It indicates that some elements of a situation can be imagined to

work well, while others are more problematic. Such use is exemplified in (110) and (111).

> (110) Piecemeal reform makes the tax system more complicated, and is not the best way to promote saving. Ideally income tax would be replaced by an expenditure tax: all saving would then be tax-deductible, and all spending would be taxed. It would take a bold, reforming chancellor and an economy where everything was going right. Mr Major is *conceivably* the chancellor, but Britain in 1990 is certainly not the economy. (BNC, ABF 1882-1885)
>
> (111) Yet this generalisation will not bear too much weight. Weedy strains already exist in at least six of Keeler's 20 randomly chosen crops – notably oats, sunflowers, rice and sweet potatoes. This is despite the fact that they carry only a minority of the 13 stigmata of weediness. Small genetic changes might *conceivably* aggravate their nuisance value. The tomato and the strawberry are more problematic. (BNC A92 241-245)

In (110) the authors agree that it is possible to conceive of Mr Major as "a reforming chancellor", but they do not think Britain is "the economy". In (111) the author agrees that small genetic changes can be imagined to work for some crops but not for others.

c. *Conceivably* as a minimizer

The use of *conceivably* as a minimizer, i.e. an intensifier in non-assertive contexts, has been noted by Quirk *et al.* (1985: 600) and Hoye (1997: 175-176). *Conceivably* emphasizes the impossibility of a certain opinion or interpretation. In such cases, it commonly co-occurs with the auxiliaries *can* and *could*, as in (112) and (113).

> (112) That at a given moment I seem to be seeing a brown patch – this I cannot *conceivably* doubt. You can be sceptical about everything else, but not about one's immediate sense experiences. (BNC, KS3 173-174)
>
> (113) Research showed that both infant mortality rates and malnutrition tended to be higher among girls than boys, a fact which

could not *conceivably* be ascribed to the occupation but reflected traditional attitudes that damaged the health of the community. (BNC, BNC 1258)

Conceivably shares its ability to function as a minimizer with *possibly*; in some cases the two adverbs are used together thus reinforcing each other's meanings, as in (114). The two intensifiers communicate that the proposition is not possible under any circumstances. It is both logically impossible and unimaginable.

> (114) I cannot *possibly* and *conceivably*, and no good other individual officer, actually handle all those and some them have to be delegated. (BNC, HUE 350)

In interrogative sentences *conceivably* is used to mean 'can it be imagined?', and qualifies claims as surprising, as in (115), or shocking and unacceptable, as in (116) and (117).

> (115) Yet the proposals for the 12 major development opportunities still include large numbers of parking spaces, and one wonders how this can be compatible with the strategic aims. Is it not possible to think in terms of the central area becoming virtually car-free? Could the 12 sites *conceivably* include NO parking provision at all? This seems not unreasonable in view of the provision for public transport, present and proposed (ie the metro). (BNC, HPP 1121-1124)
>
> (116) How can the Government *conceivably* justify the untruth of claiming that they are maintaining an aid programme when, according to their own figures, they have halved that provided by Labour? (BNC, HHV 99)
>
> (117) How can the Secretary of State *conceivably* claim that Her Majesty's inspectorate is to be strengthened when its numbers are to be cut by two thirds and it is to be subject to clear and specific direction from the Secretary of State? (BNC, HHV 1343)

The questions quoted in (116) and (117) are rhetorical; they signal that no reasonable answers can be provided to the problems referred to. Unlike *possibly*, *conceivably* tends not to be used as an intensifier in positive

sentences. Its reinforcing properties seem to be limited to non-assertive contexts.

d. Intersubjective uses of *conceivably*

Conceivably is characteristic of monologic genres, and rarely appears in utterrances directed at the addressee, such as requests or offers. The only request made using *conceivably* which I have identified in the BNC represents the voice of an imagined reader speaking to the author. It is quoted in (118).

(118) Part of the trick of a successful television documentary is to make each comment delivered within it sound spontaneous: they are rarely anything of the sort. The likelihood, indeed, is that they would have been repeated and rehearsed many times ('now that's a very good point you're making there – I wonder if you could ***conceivably*** contrive to put it a little more precisely'). I am not seeking to suggest that there is anything sinister about such a process. (BNC, A3A 328-330)

The request quoted in (118) is a polite form of criticism, suggesting that the point made by the speaker was not clearly explained. It is ironic and its form is overly elaborate. It is, however, an isolated example, which does not allow any generalizations to be made. Another example of this type occurs in the parallel corpus, and is discussed, together with its Polish equivalent, in section 9.4.7.

The BNC data also offer some sociolinguistic information concerning the perception of "*conceivably* users". The example quoted in (119) reveals its association with the speech of the upper classes.

(119) As you can imagine, I've been along to Mattlock's. They're twice as polite now since that review in the Observer. They ask about the short stories as if they really want them – none of that <u>toffee-nosed</u> 'we might ***conceivably***' stuff we had last time. They took me out to dinner too – lunch they called it. All sorts of things I didn't know how to eat. (BNC, H9D 2517-2521)

The speaker quoted in (119) associates the phrase *we might conceivably* with snobbish upper class speech and a superior, impolite attitude.

This association may partly explain the low frequency of the adverb in the BNC.

In sum, *conceivably* is typically used in monologic genres to indicate that a certain state of affairs can be imagined as occurring, usually in specific circumstances, when certain conditions are fulfilled. In other words, it signals that a proposition is theoretically possible or potentially true. It is also used as a minimizer in non-assertive contexts to express surprise or signal that a situation referred to is unacceptable. In some contexts, it is similar to *possibly* as both adverbs function as minimizers, and they both indicate that a certain state of affairs is possible, at the same time signalling the speaker's readiness to consider alternative propositions. However, while *possibly* signals that a situation is objectively possible, *conceivably* indicates that it is theoretically possible.

9.3. Polish equivalents of English low confidence adverbs. Evidence from bilingual dictionaries

The dictionary equivalents of English adverbs expressing a low degree of certainty are listed in Table 19. Most of the adverbs in the group have adverbial equivalents in Polish; the only exception is *conceivably*, which is rendered with the phrase *niewykluczone, że* 'it cannot be excluded'/'it is not inconceivable that'.

Table 19. Dictionary equivalents of English low confidence adverbs

English adverbs	Polish dictionary equivalents
perhaps	*może, być może* (PWN; Col; St)
probably	*prawdopodobnie* (PWN; Col), *pewnie* (PWN)
maybe	*może, być może* (PWN; St; Col)
possibly	*być może* (PWN; St; Col), *możliwie* (St), adj. *możliwe* (St)
presumably	*prawdopodobnie* (PWN), *przypuszczalnie* (PWN; Col)
likely	*prawdopodobnie, pewnie* (PWN; St)
conceivably	*niewykluczone, że/nie jest wykluczone, że* (PWN; Col; St)

Based on the dictionary equivalents listed in Table 19, the English low confidence adverbs can be grouped into two sets: (1) those which

correspond to the Polish adverb *być może*: *perhaps, maybe, possibly*; (2) those which correspond to *prawdopodobnie: probably, presumably, likely*. Those corresponding to *być może* introduce an option which is presented as equally possible as alternative views; those corresponding to *prawdopodobnie* introduce the option which the speaker thinks is the most likely. *Conceivably*, for which no adverbial equivalents are provided in the dictionaries, forms a category of its own.

9.4. Polish equivalents of English low confidence adverbs. Evidence from the parallel corpus

With the exception of *conceivably*, which has only 65 occurrences in the parallel corpus, all the translation equivalents of the English adverbs in the group have been identified using 100-item samples of the corpus. They are listed in Table 20.

Table 20. Translation equivalents of English low confidence adverbs in *Paralela*

Low confidence adverbs	Polish translation equivalents
perhaps	*być może* (59), *może* (21), zero equivalent (6), *raczej* (3), *zapewne* (2), *przypadkiem* (2), *prawdopodobnie* (2), *chyba* (1), *ewentualnie* (1), *możliwe* (1), *na przykład* (1), *bodaj* (1)
probably	*prawdopodobnie* (62), *zapewne* (11), zero equivalent (8), *pewnie* (6), *przypuszczalnie* (4), *chyba* (4), *być może* (3), *wydaje się* (1), *prawie na pewno* (1)
maybe	*może* (45), *być może* (42), zero equivalent (9), *chyba* (2), *prawdopodobnie* (1), *ewentualnie* (1)
possibly	zero equivalent (22), *być może* (22), *prawdopodobnie* (15), *ewentualnie* (14), *może* (6), *możliwe* (5), *w miarę możliwości* (4), *przypuszczalnie* (4), *niby* (3), *co w czyjejś mocy* (2), *możliwie* (1), *zapewne* (1)
presumably	*prawdopodobnie* (29), *przypuszczalnie* (27), *pewnie* (11), zero equivalent (9), *zapewne* (8), *można przypuszczać* (6), *być może* (2), *chyba* (2), *przyjmuję* (2), *bez wątpienia* (1)

Low confidence adverbs	Polish translation equivalents
likely	*prawdopodobnie* (68), zero equivalent (19), *zapewne* (4), *pewnie* (4), adj. *prawdopodobne* (2), *na pewno* (2), *raczej* (1)
conceivably	zero equivalent (48), *nie można wykluczyć* (4), *możliwe* (3), *niewykluczone, że* (2), *być może* (2), *prawdopodobne* (1), *niby* (1), *wyobrażalne* (1), *potencjalnie* (1), *faktycznie* (1), *najprawdopodobniej* (1)

As illustrated in Table 20, most of the English low confidence adverbs have a number of equivalents in the analyzed sample of the parallel corpus; the most frequent ones are in most cases those provided by the bilingual dictionaries. They can thus be considered their prototypical equivalents. Two adverbs are often omitted in translation: *conceivably* and *possibly*. The omission is particularly frequent in the case of *conceivably*, which does not appear to have a close equivalent in Polish. Only one of its translation equivalents, *być może*, is an adverb (or a particle, as it is classified in Polish linguistics); it is only used as its equivalent twice in the corpus. The relatively frequent omission of *possibly* in the analyzed sample of the translation corpus seems to result both from the lack of a close equivalent of the adverb in Polish and its polyfunctionality. The contexts in which the different equivalents of English low confidence adverbs are used in the parallel corpus are discussed in sections 9.4.1-9.4.7.

9.4.1. Translation equivalents of *perhaps*

As demonstrated in Table 20, the most frequent equivalent of *perhaps* in the analyzed corpus sample is *być może*. It appears in rather formal monologic genres, when *perhaps* is used to qualify a claim which the speaker thinks might be true, such as a possible explanation of a problematic situation, as in (120). It is also used in concessive contexts to agree that a situation has its weak points, which are subsequently dismissed by the speaker as less important than the advantages of the situation, as in (121).

(120) It would seem that we in the EU are incapable of talking to Iran.
       Perhaps it is because of cultural differences, as Shiite theolo-

gy and European humanism, PostEnlightenment thinking, are pretty much at odds with one another.

Wygląda na to, że UE nie potrafi rozmawiać z Iranem. ***Być może*** jest to spowodowane różnicami kulturowymi, ponieważ nurty takie, jak teologia szyizmu i europejski humanizm, filozofia myślenia postoświeceniowego są w stosunku do siebie sprzeczne. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-02-10-010)

(121) ***Perhaps*** not all the progress that many would like to see, <u>but</u> something has been done and is being done if the Member States so desire.

Być może nie są to postępy tak duże, jak chciałoby tego wielu z nas, <u>ale</u> wiele zostało zrobione i jest robione, o ile taka jest wola państw członkowskich. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-07-09-05-013)

Another (though considerably less frequent) translation equivalent of *perhaps* in monologic forms of discourse is the rather formal and literary particle *bodaj*, as illustrated in (122).

(122) The most striking example is ***perhaps*** its silence on NATO/USA/EU initiatives in relation to Africa, such as the creation of specific military commands (USA/AFRICOM), the holding of military manoeuvres (NATO), or the growing military presence of the major EU powers ('peace support mechanisms', military missions).

Bodaj najbardziej uderzającym przykładem jest milczenie w prawie inicjatyw podjętych w sprawie Afryki przez NATO/STANY ZJEDNOCZONE/UE, takich jak stworzenie specjalnych dowództw wojskowych (STANY ZJEDNOCZONE/AFRICOM), przeprowadzenie manewrów wojskowych (NATO) lub zwiększanie obecności militarnej największych potęg UE (mechanizmy wspierania pokoju, misje wojskowe). (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-07-10-25-008)

In dialogic contexts and addressee-directed utterances, such as requests, suggestions, and offers, *perhaps* is rendered as *może* and, less frequently, *przypadkiem* 'by (any) chance'. *Może* is more informal and more likely to express intersubjective meanings in contexts which involve direct interaction between the speaker and the addressee. Examples are provided in (123) and (124).

(123) ***Perhaps*** you could mention to at least one of your colleagues that we would also like to see something on needle-stick injuries as part of that safety package.

Może mógłby pan przekazać choćby jednemu z pańskich współpracowników, że w naszym odczuciu pożądane byłoby uzupełnienie przedmiotowego pakietu w sprawie bezpieczeństwa o temat, jakim są skaleczenia igłami do zastrzyków. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-01-13-016)

(124) ***Perhaps*** you could put a supplementary to another question?

Może zada Pan pytanie uzupełniające? (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-06-07-01)

Przypadkiem 'by (any) chance' is a non-epistemic equivalent of *perhaps*. It is used in questions containing some criticism towards the situations which the addressee is reponsible for, and has a challenging function. Examples of its use as an equivalent of *perhaps* are provided in (125) and (126).

(125) But does it ***perhaps*** not relate, I wonder, to a world that is ideal rather than realistic, a world in which prisons should indeed function not just for punishing sentenced individuals but mainly for rehabilitating them?

Jednak zastanawiam się, czy nie odnoszą się one ***przypadkiem*** do sytuacji idealnej, a nie do rzeczywistości. Czy nie mówią o świecie, w którym zadaniem zakładów karnych jest nie tylko karanie obywateli, lecz również ich rehabilitacja? (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-03-12-019)

(126) Could it ***perhaps*** be that there is something fundamentally wrong with the EU?

Czy ***przypadkiem*** nie dlatego, że zdecydowanie źle się dzieje w UE? (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-03-09-018)

The employment of *perhaps* (and *przypadkiem*) in (125) and (126) allows the speakers to formulate their criticisms in a mitigated way, but the utterances they occur in are confrontational.

Some of the other non-epistemic equivalents of *perhaps* identified in the analyzed corpus sample confirm its ability to perform textual functions. As noted in section 9.2.1, *perhaps* can be used as an appositive conjunct to introduce examples of the notions discussed in prior statements. It is rendered in such cases as *na przykład* 'for example'. Such use is exemplified in (127).

(127)   Madam President, Baroness Ashton, my question relates to the forms of cooperation, in your view, that we, the European Union, should develop in Yemen, for example, in the area of small and medium-sized enterprises, or ***perhaps*** in the area of the provision of energy and water supplies, as communication and building up connections could play a special role in future.

Moje pytanie odnosi się do form współpracy, jakie pani zdaniem powinniśmy jako Unia Europejska rozwijać w Jemenie, na przykład w dziedzinie małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw, lub ***na przykład*** w zakresie zaopatrzenia w energię i wodę, ponieważ w przyszłości komunikacja i tworzenie połączeń może odegrać szczególną rolę. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-01-19-006)

The parallel corpus also provides evidence for the use of *perhaps* as a reformulatory conjunct, when statements are rephrased to express the speaker's view in a more accurate way. In Quirk *et al.*'s (1985: 625) typology, reformulatory conjuncts include such expressions as *in other words, more accurately, more precisely,* and *alternatively*. In such contexts, *perhaps* corresponds to the Polish particle *raczej* 'rather', which Grochowski *et al.* (2014) classify as a reformulatory particle. Such use is illustrated in (128) and (129).

(128)   The paradox, or ***perhaps*** the hypocrisy of the European Parliament, is that it goes about preaching democratic principles and values but flouts them by refusing to apply them when it is inconvenient to do so.

Paradoksalny czy ***raczej*** obłudny ze strony Parlamentu Europejskiego jest fakt, że wciąż głosi kazania na temat zasad i wartości demokracji, które jednak lekceważy, nie przestrzegając ich wówczas, gdy jest to dla niego kłopotliwe. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-07-12-13-008)

(129)   The final point I have is on the famous, or ***perhaps*** infamous, paragraph 22 of this report.

Ostatni punkt dotyczy sławnego, lub też ***raczej*** cieszącego się złą sławą, ust. 22 tego sprawozdania. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-08-02-18-021)

In both (128) and (129) *perhaps* is used to signal that the speakers are reflecting upon their choice of words, and are looking for words which most accurately express what they want to communicate.

9.4.2. Translation equivalents of *probably*

As shown in Table 20, the most frequent translation equivalent of *probably* in the analyzed corpus sample is *prawdopodobnie*. Like *probably*, it is a de-adjectival adverb, deriving from the adjective *prawdopodobny* 'probable' (*WSJP*). Grochowski *et al.* (2014) classify it as a 'hypothetical' particle. *Prawdopodobnie* appears to be a relatively straightforward equivalent of *probably* in monologic and formal genres. Its translation equivalents in more colloquial language and in more dialogic contexts include *zapewne, pewnie* and *chyba*. Wierzbicka (2006: 263) argues that the German and French equivalents of *probably* are less likely to be used in informal registers than the English adverb. She links its use in different types of registers with the influence of the scientific concept of probability on "Anglo" ways of thinking and speaking. Its Polish equivalent *prawdopodobnie* is also more formal and literary (cf. *USJP*). While *probably* is more frequent in spoken language, *prawdopodobnie* typically occurs in written texts (compare the data in Tables 26 and 27). It is a long, polysyllabic word, more suited to formal discourse. Its frequency in the National Corpus of Polish is almost three times lower than the frequency of *probably* in the BNC (see Table 18). In the parallel corpus, *prawdopodobnie* is common in EU parliamentary debates, while *zapewne, pewnie* and *chyba* are more frequently used as equivalents of *probably* in film subtitles.

Like *probably*, *prawdopodobnie* is used to signal that a specific proposition is highly probable. Its use is illustrated in examples (130) and (131).

(130) Granting the right to hold the Olympic Games in Moscow in 1980 was ***probably*** an artful plan designed by Jimmy Carter's administration and his national security adviser, Zbigniew Brzezinski, to open the Soviet Union, at least for a short period, to the West and its democratic influence.

Przyznanie prawa do organizacji igrzysk olimpijskich w Moskwie w 1980 r. było ***prawdopodobnie*** zręcznym planem, przygotowanym przez administrację prezydenta Jimmy'ego Cartera i jego doradcę ds. bezpieczeństwa narodowego, Zbigniewa Brzezińskiego, służącym otwarciu Związku Radzieckiego, przynajmniej na krótki okres, na Zachód i jego wpływy demokratyczne. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-04-09-020)

(131) Lack of jobs could conceivably generate an exodus of young people from Europe, but the vast majority of young people who change countries to find work will ***probably*** choose to move to another Member State.

Brak miejsc pracy mógłby być może wywołać exodus młodzieży z Europy, ale znakomita większość młodzieży, która zmienia kraj, aby znaleźć pracę ***prawdopodobnie*** zdecyduje się na wyjazd do innego państwa członkowskiego. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-06-07-016)

Prawdopodobnie also occurs in dialogic contexts, in direct references to the addressee, though, as revealed by data from the National Corpus of Polish, it is less frequent in such contexts than *probably*. By way of comparison, while *you probably know* has 76 instances per 100 million words in the BNC, its Polish equivalent *prawdopodobnie wiesz/wiecie* has only 1 occurrence per 100 million words in the NKJP. Therefore, when *probably* is used to make assumptions about the addressee's knowledge, it tends to be rendered as *zapewne* and *pewnie,* as in (132) and (133).

(132) Madam President, as you are ***probably*** aware, the second round of voting took place this weekend in the local elections in Chişinău, in the Republic of Moldova.

Jak Pani ***zapewne*** wiadomo, w ubiegły weekend odbyła się druga runda głosowania w wyborach lokalnych w Kiszyniowie w Republice Mołdowy. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-06-22-020)

(133) If you're a Perl hacker, you can ***probably*** skim the bits about dictionaries and lists, but you should still pay attention to tuples.

Jeśli choć trochę umiesz programować w Perlu, to ***pewnie*** masz już pewną wiedzę na temat słowników, czy list, ale pewnie nie wiesz, czym są krotki. (*Paralela*, diveinto|dive_into_python 3)

The translation equivalents of *probably* in colloquial texts, largely represented by film subtitles in the corpus, are the adverbs *pewnie* and *chyba*. Examples are provided in (134) and (135).

(134) I'm ***probably*** just overreacting …

Pewnie przesadzam … (*Paralela*, OpenSub|148989)

(135) Any idea why all the traffic? – Construction, ***probably***.

Skąd te korki? – ***Chyba*** jakiś remont. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|45746)

In sum, *probably* appears to have different Polish equivalents in monologic and dialogic (usually informal) forms of discourse. Its major equivalent in monologic genres is *prawdopodobnie*, while its common equivalents in dialogic contexts and colloquial language are the adverbs *zapewne* and *pewnie*.

9.4.3. Translation equivalents of *maybe*

As shown in Table 20, the most frequent translation equivalents of *maybe* in the analyzed sample of the corpus are *może* and *być może*. *Być może* is also the most frequent equivalent of *perhaps*. The semantic closeness of *być może* and *może* is illustrated in example (136), where they appear as equivalents of *maybe* one after the other.

(136) ***Maybe***, just ***maybe***, there is at last some movement in the right direction.

Być może, ale tylko ***może***, obserwujemy nareszcie pewien krok w dobrym kierunku. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-04-07-010-03)

As in its uses as a translation equivalent of *perhaps*, *być może* is employed as an equivalent of *maybe* in monologic forms of discourse, as in (137).

(137)   These five main indicators are relevant and applicable, even if there will, over time, be a need to further develop and improve them and **maybe** also to include some new categories.

Powyższe pięć głównych wskaźników jest istotnych i odpowiednich, nawet jeżeli wraz z upływem czasu pojawi się potrzeba dalszego ich rozwinięcia lub udoskonalenia lub, **być może**, także włączenia jakichś nowych kategorii. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-08-11-17-026)

In dialogic contexts, such as questions, suggestions and requests, the translation equivalent of *maybe* is *może*, as illustrated in examples (138)-(140).

(138)   **Maybe** you remember the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease?

Może pamiętacie wybuch pryszczycy? (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-09-03-24-010)

(139)   **Maybe** some marketing in order to make those who are excellent visible would be appropriate, in other words "support the quality", Mr Sedo said.

Może odpowiednia byłaby pewna forma marketingu, by pomóc uwidocznić tych, którzy są doskonali, innymi słowy – „wspieranie jakości" – sugeruje Sedo. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|34045)

(140)   **Maybe** the Commissioner might outline the timescale when a decision will be made by the Commission on this matter.

Może komisarz nakreśli ramy czasowe, w jakich Komisja udzieli odpowiedzi w tej kwestii. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-01-15-017)

9.4.4. Translation equivalents of *possibly*

As shown in Table 20, *possibly* has a number of translation equivalents in Polish; it is also frequently omitted in translation. Its most frequent equivalent in the analyzed corpus sample (and the one suggested by the bilingual dictionaries) is *być może*. However, *być może* does not refer to

possibility, but to probability, and as such, it is semantically closer to *perhaps* and *maybe*. It is also used as a translation equivalent of the two adverbs. *Być może* is used as an equivalent of *possibly* when it signals the availability of additional options, as in (141) and (142).

(141)   There is no doubt that the involvement of the European institutional legislative system in this area will provide an impetus for the improvement of legislation that is being put in place in many countries, by giving it a coherent framework that is supported by European regulation, and **possibly** European resources.

Nie ma wątpliwości, że zaangażowanie europejskiego systemu legislacyjnego w ten obszar znacząco ulepszy ustawodawstwo, które jest obecnie wprowadzane w wielu państwach poprzez nadanie mu spójnych ram wspartych europejskimi regulacjami i **być może** również europejskimi środkami. (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-07-11-12-020)

(142)   It's something very big and **possibly** quite dangerous.

Coś bardzo dużego i **być może** niebezpiecznego. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|129475)

Both *być może* and *possibly* signal the speaker's readiness to accept other options, and when the primary intention of the speaker is to indicate his/her openness to alternative views, they can be used as functional equivalents.

A relatively frequent translation equivalent of *possibly* which is not noted by the bilingual dictionaries, but is attested in the parallel corpus is *ewentualnie*. *Ewentualnie* refers to an alternative which is possible in specific circumstances. The adverb does not have a straightforward equivalent in English; bilingual dictionaries suggest three counterparts of *ewentualnie*: *perhaps*, *if necessary*, and *alternatively* (PWN). Danielewiczowa (2009) argues that all the uses of *ewentualnie* have one property in common: the adverb always signals that a specific alternative is available if some condition is fulfilled. The condition is not specified, but it is clear from the context, both to the speaker and to the addressee. The existence of some conditions which are clear to the speaker and the addressee can

be identified in most of its uses as a translation equivalent of *possibly*, e.g. in (143) and (144).

(143) Is the Commission already planning which countries could ***possibly*** become members in future?

Czy Komisja określiła już, które państwa mogłyby ***ewentualnie*** w przyszłości stać się członkami Eurogrupy? (*Paralela*, EP-Proc|ep-09-01-13-015)

(144) We could then ***possibly*** add financial assistance to facilitate reception in some Member States.

Wtedy moglibyśmy ***ewentualnie*** dodać wsparcie finansowe, tak aby ułatwić przyjmowanie więźniów w niektórych państwach członkowskich. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-02-03-011)

The sentence quoted in (143) makes reference to the conditions that European countries need to fulfill to become EU members; (144) signals the need for financial assistance in some Member States. *Ewentualnie* is also used to indicate the existence of several alternatives, and is similar in such uses to the conjunction *lub* 'or'. However, as also noted by Danielewiczowa (2009: 80), it communicates that a specific alternative is only available if another one turns out to be impossible. *Ewentualnie* can be used with the conjunction *lub* 'or', as in (145), or without it, as in (146).

(145) They say he was expecting a mountain lion, or ***possibly*** a bear.

Mówią, że spodziewał się pumy, lub ***ewentualnie*** niedźwiedzia. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|70888)

(146) Accordingly, the total costs of the restructuring amounted to DEM 16.46 million, of which State bodies contributed DEM 9.707 million or 58.9 % and the investor DEM 1.679 million or 10.2 % (or ***possibly*** only DEM 0.5 million or 3%).

Łączne koszty restrukturyzacji wyniosły w związku z tym 16,49 mln EUR, z czego na instytucje publiczne przypada 9,707 mln DEM, tj. 58.9%, a na inwestora 1,679 mln DEM, tj. 10,2% (***ewentualnie*** tylko 0,5 mln DEM, czyli 3%). (*Paralela*, JRC-Acquis|32005D0564)

When *possibly* functions as a maximizer, it is sometimes rendered by its literal equivalent in Polish, i.e. the adverb *możliwie*, which derives from the adjective *możliwy* 'possible', but functions as a marker of degree (*WSJP*), and is not an epistemic stance marker. It can only be used as an equivalent of *possibly* in phrases such as *as quickly as you possibly can* (Pol. *możliwie szybko*). Such use is illustrated in (147).

(147) I will not comment on what currently is being dealt with specifically because I want to present this when we finish the work, but we are talking to human rights activists and to organisations, as well as considering across the 27 Member States what might be a more effective way of being able to address this issue and to put as much pressure as we ***possibly*** can.

Nie będę komentować tego, czym teraz konkretnie się zajmujemy, ponieważ chciałabym to zaprezentować, kiedy skończymy już naszą pracę, ale rozmawiamy z aktywistami w dziedzinie praw człowieka oraz z organizacjami, jak też zastanawiamy się w 27 państwach członkowskich, jaki może skuteczniejszy sposób zajmowania się tymi zagadnieniami i jak można wywierać ***możliwie*** największą presję. (*Paralela,* EPProc|ep-11-03-09-014)

In its uses as a minimizer *possibly* is rendered with *niby* (roughly: 'supposedly'). Such uses involve implicit negation, i.e. the use of *possibly* in rhetorical questions biased towards a negative answer. *Possibly* indicates the speaker's confusion, anger and exasperation resulting from the perceived impossibility of managing a situation. The Polish adverb *niby* (discussed in more detail in Chapter 4) signals disbelief in the validity of the interlocutor's claim. It is also a reportive adverb; it functions as an equivalent of *possibly* when the speaker refers to a statement made by his/her interlocutor. Its use as a translation equivalent of *possibly* is illustrated in (148) and (149).

(148) – We have different ways of solving problems.

– Yes. You ignore them.

– How could I ***possibly*** ignore them?

– Mamy inne metody rozwiązywania problemów.

– Tak … ty je po prostu ignorujesz.

– Jak **niby** mogę je ignorować? (*Paralela*, OpenSub|5255)

(149) I don't want you embarrassing him.

What could I **possibly** do to embarrass him?

Nie chcę, żebyś go zawstydzał. – Czym miałbym go **niby** zawstydzić? (*Paralela*, OpenSub|30866)

Niby is rather colloquial, which is why it is unlikely to be used as an equivalent of *possibly* in formal registers. In the parallel corpus it is only used as its equivalent in film subtitles. In its uses as a maximizer and minimizer, *possibly* is also frequently omitted in translation. Such cases are illustrated in (150) and (151).

(150) I wonder how anyone can **possibly** think of blocking these funds, and I call on the Italian Members in particular – who were, moreover, elected by the people of Campania – not to fly into an ideological rage or penalise their fellow citizens.

Zastanawiam się, jak ktokolwiek może **(Ø)** myśleć o blokowaniu tych środków, i apeluję w szczególności do posłów z Włoch – którzy ponadto zostali wybrani przez mieszkańców Kampanii – aby nie popadali w ideologiczny szał ani nie karali swoich rodaków. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-01-18-017)

(151) In the face of this horrific crime, what can we **possibly** do to right the wrong?

W obliczu tak przerażającego przestępstwa, co możemy **(Ø)** zrobić, aby naprawić zło? (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-11-20-012-01)

Omission is also a frequent translation strategy when *possibly* is used in requests. Requests are generally less mitigated in Polish than in English (e.g. Marcjanik 1997; Jakubowska 1999; Lubecka 2000; Wierzbicka 2003; Ogiermann 2009), which partly explains the absence of a Polish adverbial equivalent of *possibly* in such contexts. Examples from the parallel corpus include (152) and (153).

(152) Could I **possibly** see her?

Czy mógłbym **(Ø)** się z nią zobaczyć? (*Paralela*, OpenSub|4720)

(153) Could I **possibly** have another bag?

Mogę prosić **(Ø)** o drugą torbę? (*Paralela*, OpenSub|2757)

In sum, *possibly* has a number of functional equivalents in Polish. When it is used to indicate the availability of alternative options, it is rendered as *być może* and *ewentualnie*. In its uses as a maximizer, it corresponds to *możliwie*; in its uses as a minimizer, it is rendered as *niby*. When used in polite requests, it tends to be omitted in translation.

9.4.5. Translation equivalents of *presumably*

As shown in Table 20, the most frequent translation equivalents of *presumably* identified in the analyzed corpus sample are those suggested by the bilingual dictionaries, i.e. *prawdopodobnie* 'probably' and *przypuszczalnie* 'presumably, probably'. *Przypuszczalnie* is semantically closer, as it derives from the mental state verb *przypuszczać* 'suppose', while *prawdopodobnie* derives from the adjective *prawdopodobny*, and is also used as a translation equivalent of *probably*. Both *presumably* and *probably*, as well as their Polish equivalents *prawdopodobnie* and *przypuszczalnie*, qualify the alternatives which the speaker considers to be the most likely ones. Both adverbs are used as equivalents of *presumably* in monologic genres and rather formal contexts, e.g. scientific reports explaining the causes of chemical processes or discussing some medical cases, as illustrated in examples (154)-(156).

(154) Inhibitors/competitors of active renal elimination pathway Cimetidine reduced the renal clearance of pramipexole by approximately 34%, **presumably** by inhibition of the cationic secretory transport system of the renal tubules.

Leki hamujące/konkurencyjne w aktywnej eliminacji nerkowej Cymetydyna zmniejsza klirens nerkowy pramipeksolu o około 34%, **prawdopodobnie** poprzez hamowanie wydzielniczego systemu transportu kationów w kanalikach nerkowych. (*Paralela*, EMEA|000133)

(155) Inhibition of carbonic anhydrase in the ciliary processes of the eye decreases aqueous humour secretion, **presumably** by slowing the formation of bicarbonate ions with subsequent reduction in sodium and fluid transport.

Hamowanie anhydrazy węglanowej w wyrostkach rzęskowych oka powoduje zmniejszenie wydzielania cieczy wodnistej, **przy-**

puszczalnie poprzez spowolnienie wytwarzania jonów wodo-rowęglanowych i w następstwie tego zmniejszenie transportu sodu i płynów. (*Paralela*, EMEA|000267)

(156) Some 65 per cent of the freelancers surveyed complained of *presumably* work-related musculoskeletal disorders, while 52 per cent made reference to mental problems that the research-ers assume can be traced back to work.

Około 65 procent pracowników niezależnych, których objęto badaniami, skarży się na dolegliwości mięśniowo-szkieletowe *przypuszczalnie* związane z pracą, a 52 procent wskazało na problemy psychiczne, których źródłem może być – zdaniem naukowców – praca. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|32602)

When *presumably* expresses assumptions, it is rendered as *pewnie, zapewne* and *chyba*. In the analyzed corpus sample, such uses are attested in dialogic and rather informal contexts. *Chyba* is more confrontational than *presumably*; it is used to exercise some pressure on the interlocutor, and aditionally functions as an equivalent of *surely* (see Chapter 8). The uses of the three adverbs as equivalents of *presumably* are illustrated in examples (157)-(159).

(157) *Presumably* he uses the method on his patients.

Zapewne stosuje tę metodę u swoich pacjentów. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|71401)

(158) I like her. – *Presumably* that's why you married her.

Ja ją lubię. – *Pewnie* dlatego ją poślubiłeś. (*Paralela*, Open-Sub|141047)

(159) *Presumably* you're intending to let us land somewhere. – Ooh, yes.

Chyba dacie nam gdzieś wylądować. – Owszem. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|1657)

In sum, like *perhaps* and *probably*, *presumably* has different equiva-lents in formal and monologic types of discourse: *przypuszczalnie* and *prawdopodobnie*, and different ones in dialogic and informal contexts: *pewnie, zapewne* and *chyba*.

9.4.6. Translation equivalents of *likely*

The most frequent translation equivalent of *likely* in the analyzed corpus sample is *prawdopodobnie*. The use of *prawdopodobnie* as an equivalent of both *probably* and *likely* confirms the semantic and functional similarity between the two adverbs, noted in section 9.2.6. *Prawdopodobnie* is asso-ciated with rather formal registers and monologic genres. Its frequent use as an equivalent of *likely* seems to be connected with the prevalence of quotations from EU parliamentary proceedings in the parallel corpus, as these represent a rather formal variety of language. Its use is illustrated in examples (160) and (161).

(160) This will *likely* not make much sense to classic Mac OS users, or even Windows users unless you were ever fluent on the MS-DOS command line.

Prawdopodobnie nie jest to zrozumiałe dla klasycznych użyt-kowników Mac OS-a lub nawet dla użytkowników Windows, którzy nie mieli za wiele do czynienia z linią poleceń MS-DOS--a. (*Paralela*, dive_into_python 10)

(161) We shall make our assessment in the coming autumn in the en-largement package, which will *most likely* be presented in early November.

Na jesieni sporządzimy naszą ocenę w ramach pakietu rozsze-rzeniowego, który *prawdopodobnie* zostanie przedstawiony na początku listopada. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-04-09-019)

When *likely* occurs with the degree modifier *most*, it corresponds to *najprawdopodobniej*, which is the superlative form of *prawdopodobnie*, as illustrated in (162). The adverb *prawdopodobnie* is rarely used in the com-parative degree, therefore, when *likely* is used with the degree modifier *more*, it corresponds to the adjectival phrase *co bardziej prawdopodobne* 'what is more likely' in translation, as exemplified in (163).

(162) The system will *most likely* be used in villages, where a single receiver and modem, with a cost of 150 to 225 euro will provide enough broadband for several homes, making the costs com-petitive with existing solutions.

Najprawdopodobniej system będzie użytkowany przez mieszkańców wsi, gdzie jeden odbiornik i modem, których cena wyniesie od 150 do 225 euro, zapewni szerokopasmowy dostęp o wystarczającej przepustowości dla kilku domów. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|25669)

(163) Either they believe you and think they're crazy, or, far ***more likely***, they don't believe you and they think you're crazy.

Albo ci uwierzą i pomyślą, że zwariowałeś, albo, ***co bardziej prawdopodobne***, nie uwierzą ci i pomyślą, że zwariowałeś. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|121578)

The less informal and more dialogic equivalents of *likely* include *pewnie* and *raczej*. *Pewnie* signals expectations that the situation will develop in a specific way, as in (164). *Raczej* 'rather', or more precisely, *raczej nie* 'rather not'/'I don't think so' occurs in negative responses to questions, as illustrated in (165). However, it expresses a lower degree of certainty than *likely*.

(164) Clyde will *likely* outlive both of us.

Clyde ***pewnie*** przeżyje nas oboje. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|145148)

(165) Think she'll come out today? – ***Not likely***.

Myślisz, że dzisiaj wyjdzie? – ***Raczej nie***. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|122112)

9.4.7. Translation equivalents of *conceivably*

Conceivably does not have a straightforward equivalent in Polish. As shown in Table 20, the adverb is often omitted in translation. The omission is frequent when *conceivably* co-occurs with the modal auxiliaries *could* and *might*, as in (166). In such cases, the omission does not deprive the sentences of their epistemic meaning, which partly explains the motivation for the employment of this translation strategy.

(166) Therefore, I join the calls for Hungary, and also the Commission and the other Member States where this could ***conceivably*** also occur, to ascertain whether the directives on waste, not least in the field of industrial waste, and the environmental safety requirements are being properly implemented.

Przyłączam się więc do apeli pod adresem Węgier, a także Komisji i innych państw członkowskich, w których takie zdarzenie mogłoby **(Ø)** mieć miejsce, by upewniły się, czy odpowiednio wdraża się dyrektywy odpadowe, zwłaszcza dotyczące odpadów przemysłowych, a także czy spełniane są wymogi z zakresu bezpieczeństwa środowiska. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-10-19-016)

When *conceivably* is used without the modal auxiliaries, it has descriptive equivalents in Polish, such as *nie można wykluczyć* 'it cannot be ruled out'/'it is not inconceivable', and *niewykluczone, że* 'it is not inconceivable that'. The use of the two equivalents is illustrated in examples (167) and (168).

(167) '***Conceivably***, this same strategy could be applied in engineered polymers and composites,' said Dr Fratzl.

"***Niewykluczone***, że taką samą strategię można by zastosować w opracowywaniu polimerów i kompozytów" – stwierdza dr Fratzl. (*Paralela*, CORDIS|31846)

(168) A combination of factors has led to a disaster that could perfectly ***conceivably*** happen in our part of the world, too.

Połączenie różnych czynników doprowadziło do katastrofy, jakiej ***nie można wykluczyć*** również w naszej części świata. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-04-06-012)

Occasionally, *conceivably* is translated by means of low confidence adverbs, such as *być może*, as in (169), and the adjectival phrase *możliwe, że* 'it is possible that', as in (170).

(169) Excuse me, sir, but you're talking rot. – ***Conceivably***.

Proszę wybaczyć, ale to wszystko bzdura. – ***Być może***. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|5945)

(170) How long do you think it's been there? – A week or so. Quite ***conceivably*** left the night of the killing.

Ile to tu może leżeć? – Około tygodnia. Całkiem ***możliwe***, *że* od nocy zabójstwa. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|150139)

As noted in section 9.2.7, *conceivably* is rarely used in requests. There is only one example of this kind in *Paralela*, quoted in (171), but the context in which it appears is not very polite. It is a request to turn down loud music, where *conceivably* signals irritation with the addressee.

(171) <u>Could</u> you ***conceivably*** turn down that blasted ...?

Czy <u>mógłbyś</u> **(Ø)** ściszyć tę cholerną …? (*Paralela*, Open-Sub|6347)

9.5. Low confidence adverbs in Polish

Grochowski *et al.* (2014) divide Polish low confidence adverbs (which they term particles) into: (1) *hipotetyczne* 'hypothetical', which signal that to the best of the speaker's knowledge the proposition is likely to be true, and include such items as *pewnie, pewno, prawdopodobnie, przypuszczalnie*, and *zapewne*; and (2) *niewykluczające* (lit. 'non-excluding/non-eliminating'), i.e. those which signal that the proposition may not be true, i.e. *może, być może, chyba, bodaj,* and *bodajże*. In this work, *pewnie, zapewne* and *pewno* are classified as epistemic emphasizers, and discussed in Chapter 8. This section focuses on the remaining items listed by Grochowski *et al.* (2014), beginning with those which they categorize as 'hypothetical' particles, i.e. *prawdopodobnie* and *przypuszczalnie*. Subsequently, the discussion focuses on the group which Grochowski *et al.* (2014) classify as 'non-excluding/non-eliminating' particles, i.e. *może, być może, chyba, bodaj,* and *bodajże*. The analysis additionally includes *raczej*, which is classified as an epistemic particle by Bralczyk (1978). *Raczej* is a multifunctional item; Grochowski *et al.* (2014) only note its reformulatory functions.

9.5.1. *Prawdopodobnie*

Prawdopodobnie is a literal equivalent of *probably*; it derives from the adjective *prawdopodobny* 'probable'. In addition to its use as an epistemic adverb, *prawdopodobnie* functions as an adverb of manner, meaning 'plausibly'. It is used in contexts where English employs copular verbs followed by adjectives, which is why its dictionary equivalent in such cases is the adjective *plausible*, as illustrated in (172).

(172) Zeznania świadka brzmiały ***prawdopodobnie***.

The witness's deposition sounded ***plausible***. (PWN)

In its use as an epistemic adverb *prawdopodobnie* is more formal than its English equivalent *probably*, and less frequent, particularly in spoken language. It tends to be used in monologic genres. In the National Corpus of Polish, it is most frequent in the section of journalistic prose (see Table 27). Like *probably*, it is used to qualify an alternative which is highly probable, but not absolutely certain. About one third of its uses in the corpus are in the superlative form *najprawdopodobniej*, which indicates that, like *probably*, it tends to qualify the alternatives which speakers consider to be the most likely ones (cf. section 9.2.1). The comparative form *prawdopodobniej* is less frequent; only a few instances of the form are evidenced in the National Corpus of Polish. Examples (173)-(175) illustrate the use of *prawdopodobnie* and its superlative from *najprawdopodobniej*.

(173) Ptaki gnieżdżące się na drzewach są ***prawdopodobnie*** stosunkowo późnym osiągnięciem ewolucji. (NKJP, non-fiction literature, J. Dzik, *Dzieje życia na ziemi: wprowadzenie do paleobiologii*, 1992)

'Birds nesting on trees are ***probably*** a relatively late achievement of evolution.'

(174) Nazwa miasta [Mikołajki] wywodzi się ***najprawdopodobniej*** od patrona miejscowego kościoła św. Mikołaja. (NKJP, non-fiction literature, J. Bałdowski, *Warmia, Mazury, Suwalszczyzna*, 1996)

'The town's name [Mikołajki] ***most probably*** goes back to the patron of the local church, St. Nicholas (Pol. Mikołaj).'

(175) Turek? Nie, ***najprawdopodobniej*** Grek – stwierdziła okiem doświadczonej policjantki. (NKJO, fiction, B. Świderski, *Słowa obcego*, 1998).

'Are you Turkish? No, ***most probably*** Greek. – She said looking at him with the confidence of an experienced police officer.'

As illustrated in examples (173)-(175), *prawdopodobnie* modifies claims which the speakers consider highly probable on the basis of their knowledge and prior experience. It signals that the speakers' opinions re-

sult from a careful analysis of the situation and a thoughtful consideration of the issue in question.

As already noted, *prawdopodobnie* is rather infrequent in dialogic contexts. It does not occur in questions. In the National Corpus of Polish, it is attested in short affirmative answers, as in (176).

> (176) Czy porwie młodą widownię? – ***Prawdopodobnie*** tak. Jest bardzo dobry, a na takie filmy ludzie chodzą. (NKJP, *Gazeta Wrocławska*, 2002)
>
> 'Will it appeal to the young audience? – It ***probably*** will. It's a very good film. People usually watch such films.'

9.5.2. *Przypuszczalnie*

Przypuszczalnie derives from the mental state verb *przypuszczać* 'suppose'. It is rather formal. In the National Corpus of Polish, it is most frequent in literary sources and journalistic prose (see Table 27). It is not attested in the section of spoken Polish in the corpus. *Przypuszczalnie* is also the least frequent item in the group. Some of the examples excerpted from the National Corpus of Polish, such as the one quoted in (177), suggest that the adverb is associated with old-fashioned ways of speaking.

> (177) Piękne słowo, *przypuszczalnie*. Zauważyłem to któregoś dnia przy śniadaniu. Takie eleganckie, nienarzucające się; młodzi ludzie mówią w ostrych kategoriach: *nigdy, zawsze, wszędzie*. Ja sam często piszę *wszystko, ostatni*. A babcia: ***przypuszczalnie***. Nikt teraz tak nie mówi… (NKJP, fiction, J. Dehnel, *Lala*, 2008)
>
> '*Przypuszczalnie* – what a beautiful word. I realized that one day during breakfast. It is so elegant, non-imposing; young people use more direct terms: 'never', 'always', 'everywhere'. I do it myself. I often write 'everything', 'final'. And Grandma says *przypuszczalnie*. No one speaks like that today…'

The example quoted in (177) suggests that both the word *przypuszczalnie* and indirect ways of speaking belong to the past. In the speaker's view, young people use more direct terms.

Like *prawdopodobnie*, *przypuszczalnie* is used to indicate what the speaker thinks is the most probable (though not certain) alternative or in-

terpretation in a given situation (cf. also Grochowski *et al*. 2014: 49). The speaker's judgement is based on his/her experience and familiarity with situations of a similar type, as exemplified in (178) and (179).

> (178) Przejście trzymano oczywiście w największej tajemnicy. Nie wiemy, jak dowiedział się o nim Joab. ***Przypuszczalnie*** wymusił informacje od jeńców albo też jeden z wojowników izraelskich usłyszał przypadkowo głuchy łoskot naczynia do wody, obijającego się o skałę. (NKJP, fiction, Z. Kosidowski, *Opowieści biblijne*, 1963)
>
> 'The passage was, of course, kept secret. We do not know how Joab learned about it. ***Presumably*** he forced the captives to tell him or one of the Israeli warriors heard the sound made by a water utensil bumping into the rock.'

> (179) Staszek zginął, ***przypuszczalnie*** rozstrzelany w ruinach getta, w lutym 1944 roku. (NKJP, non-fiction literature, M. Iwaszkiewicz, *Z pamięci*, 2006)
>
> 'Staszek got killed; he was ***probably/presumably*** shot in the ruins of the ghetto in February 1944.'

The hypothesis made by the speaker in (178) results from his analysis of the situation, i.e. his analysis of the possible ways in which the man could learn about the secret passage. The speaker does not know if his hypothesis is correct, but based on his knowledge, he thinks it offers the most plausible explanation. In a similar way, the most plausible explanation of the man's death, referred to in (179), is that he was shot, as such situations were common in Poland during World War II.

In dialogic contexts *przypuszczalnie* functions in a similar way as *prawdopodobnie*, i.e. it can be used in short answers, affirmative as well as negative, as illustrated in (180). It is not used in questions.

> (180) Czy więc Amerykanie będą następnie bombardować Izrael? – Nie, ***przypuszczalnie*** nie. (NKJP, *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 1993)
>
> 'Will Americans subsequently start bombing Israel? – No, ***probably*** not.'

9.5.3. *Może*

Może is the most frequent epistemic adverb in Polish. It is used to express the speaker's epistemic stance; it is also common in polite offers, invitations and requests. It is one of the most important adverbial markers of politeness in Polish. Data from the National Corpus of Polish indicate that it is particularly frequent in spoken language (see Table 27). My analysis of its English equivalents in the parallel corpus reveals that it is used both in contexts where English employs modal adverbs and those where it uses modal auxiliaries, particularly *may*, as illustrated in (181) and (182).

(181) You **may** find this difficult to accept, but I'm terrified.

Może trudno ci to zaakceptować, ale jestem przerażona. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|2544)

(182) There is a wrong figure there, and it **may** well not be as bad as that figure suggests.

A więc to niewłaściwa liczba i **może** nie jest tak źle, jak ona sugeruje. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-09-03-11-017)

Such examples confirm the observation made by Fisiak *et al.* (1978: 130) that the functions performed by modal adverbs in Polish often overlap with the functions of English modal auxiliaries.

a. *Może* as a marker of the speaker's epistemic stance

When used as an epistemic stance marker, *może* qualifies an alternative which the speaker thinks is probable, but no more probable than other available alternatives. In the same way as *maybe* and *perhaps*, *może* can be used to qualify two opposite views in one sentence and present them as equally likely, as in (183) and (184).

(183) A jak ty teraz będziesz zmieniał pracę, nie, y powiedzmy, to będą od ciebie wymagać jakiś tam papierów z tej pracy? – **Może** tak a **może** nie. (NKJP, spoken Polish, 2000)

'When you, say, decide to change jobs. Will they ask you for some documents from you present job? – **Maybe** or **maybe** no.'

(184) A zatem – powiedział stryj – na imię wam Jan, prawda? – A co to ma do rzeczy? – spytał Pyść, unosząc się i nieco skrzypiąc.

– **Moż**e ma, a **może** nie ma – powiedział stryj Mietek. (NKJP, fiction, M. Ławrynowicz, *Diabeł na dzwonnicy*, 1998)

'Then – said Uncle – your name is Jan, is that right? – What does it have to do with that? – asked Pyść, rising from his squeaky chair. – **Maybe** it does, **maybe** it doesn't – said Uncle Mietek.'

Grochowski *et al.* (2014: 67) argue that *może* is the only Polish adverb which can be used to qualify two mutually exclusive alternatives in one statement (in English such use is possible in the case of *maybe, perhaps* and *possibly*). Bralczyk (1978: 37) notes that statements qualified by *może* may be followed by statements which introduce a contrasting and a more probable view. The more probable option is introduced by *chyba* or *prawdopodobnie*, as illustrated in (185).

(185) **Może** przyjdzie, ale *chyba/prawdopodobnie* nie. (Bralczyk 1978: 37)

'**Maybe** he will come, but *probably* not.'

The openness to alternative views signalled by *może* enables it to be used in questions. It invites the interlocutor to consider an alternative which the speaker thinks may be true. Such questions often begin with the particle *a*, which signals that they refer to prior utterances (cf. *WSJP*), as in (186) and (187).

(186) A **może** i on ma samochód? (NKJP, fiction, Z. Nienacki, *Księga Strachów*, 1987)

'**Maybe** he also has a car?'

(187) A **może** on jest z Warszawy? (NKJP, fiction, I. Jurgielewiczowa, *Ten Obcy*, 1990)

'**Maybe** he's from Warsaw?'

The expression *a może* is characteristic of interactional uses of the adverb. It encourages a response from the addressee. It is also used as a marker of politeness, equivalent to *how about, why not, why don't you/we*?

b. *Może* as a marker of politeness

Może is an important marker of politeness in Polish. It is used in polite requests, offers and invitations (cf. Lubecka 2000). The requests in which

może occurs may take the form of imperative or interrogative sentences, as illustrated in examples (188)-(190).

(188) Władek, *może* zrób kawkę. (NKJP, spoken Polish, 2009)

'Władek, *maybe* make us some coffee.'

(189) Tytułu [filmu] nie pomnę (*może* pomożesz?) (NKJP, P. Dobry, *Esensja*, 2007)

'I can't remember the [fim] title, *maybe* you can help?'

(190) A *może* mógłbyś streścić? (NKJP, internet forum, 2001)

'*Maybe/perhaps* you could summarise it?'

As already noted, requests tend to be rather straightforward in Polish; the use of imperatives to make requests is not uncommon. The potential threat to the addressee's face is reduced by the addition of *może* and the use of diminutive forms (e.g. Jakubowska 1999; Lubecka 2000: 90; Wierzbicka 2003), which are very frequent in colloquial patterns of polite speech in Polish. Polish culture is associated with positive politeness, where directness is more acceptable than in negative politeness cultures, such as English culture (Marcjanik 2008; Ogiermann 2009). There is more emphasis on creating bonds and connectedness in Polish communication patterns. The diminutive forms in (188), i.e. the diminutive form of the name *Władysław* (*Władek*) and the diminutive form of the noun *kawa* 'coffee' (*kawka*), have precisely this function; they indicate closeness and a low level of social distance between the discourse participants. *Może* is also used in offers and invitations, as illustrated in (191) and (192).

(191) *Może* trzeba ci pomóc? (NKJP, fiction, I. Jurgielewiczowa, *Ten obcy*, 1990)

'*Maybe* you need help?'

(192) *A może* chciałbyś zostać na śniadanie? (NKJP, M. Pinkwart, *Dziewczyna z Ipanemy*, 2003)

'*Maybe* you would like to stay for breakfast?'

Bralczyk (1978: 68) notes that *a może* combines with *jednak* 'after all' when an offer is repeated, e.g. *A może jednak tych ciasteczek*? ('Maybe you will have some more biscuits after all?'). The addition of *jednak* makes the

offer insistent. Such insistence is intended to demonstrate one's readiness to do something good for the addressee (even if they do not appear to be entirely happy about it), which seems to be a traditional trait of Polish culture (cf. Wierzbicka 2003: 52; Lubecka 2000: 137; Marcjanik 2008: 24, 2009: 8), and an indication of its closeness to collectivist cultures, which put emphasis on positive politeness.

9.5.4. *Być może*

Być może is more formal and literary than *może* (*USJP*). It is also considerably less frequent (see Table 18). In the National Corpus of Polish it is most frequent in written sources, particularly in journalistic prose, and relatively infrequent in spoken language (see Table 27). In the parallel corpus it is often employed as an equivalent of both *perhaps* and *possibly*. Like *może*, it is used in contexts where English uses modal verbs, thus illustrating the tendency observed by Fisiak *et al.* (1978) for Polish modal adverbs to express some of the meanings which in English are expressed by modal verbs. Such use is illustrated in example (193), excerpted from the parallel corpus.

(193) In the situation today, due to political and economic pressure and measures taken to relieve this, the Single Market **may** not be at all popular with citizens, enterprises and institutions.

Dzisiaj – w związku z sytuacją polityczną i gospodarczą oraz krokami podejmowanymi w celu jej złagodzenia – jednolity rynek **być może** nie jest wcale popularny wśród obywateli, przedsiębiorstw i instytucji. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-04-06-004)

Być może is more characteristic of monologic forms of discourse than its translation equivalents *perhaps* and *possibly*. It typically functions as a marker of the speaker's epistemic stance. It indicates that the speaker considers a proposition as probable, without at the same time signalling his/her commitment to it. Such use is illustrated in examples (194) and (195).

(194) Po przerwie na posiłek praca zwykle szła już z górki, **być może** przez świadomość, że widać już jej koniec. (NKJP, fiction, A. Barczyński, *Ślepy los*, 1999)

'After the meal break, the work went smoothly, ***perhaps/possibly*** because we knew it was to end soon.'

(195)   Niedawno znalazł się w armii i ***być może*** jeszcze nie strzelał do żadnych istot żywych poza szczurami. (NKJP, fiction, M. Krajewski, *Festung Breslau*, 2006)

'He has joined the army recently and he ***probably*** hasn't shot any living beings yet except for rats.'

Unlike *może*, *być może* cannot be used to introduce two mutually exclusive statements in one sentence and suggest that they are equally probable (cf. Grochowski *et al.* 2014: 67). It is also rarely used to express intersubjective meanings. Unlike *może*, it is not used in questions, polite offers or requests.

9.5.5. *Chyba*

Chyba is the second most frequent adverb in the group, after *może*. Its frequency is the highest in spoken Polish (see Table 27). *Chyba* was originally a noun meaning 'failure, loss, mistake' (Buttler 1978: 175), but it has lost this sense in modern Polish. Its older meaning survives in the verb *chybić* 'to miss (the target),' and the adverb *niechybnie* 'without fail, assuredly' (see Chapter 10). *Chyba* is a polyfunctional item. It is used to express the speaker's stance; it also has intersubjective meanings, and performs some textual functions.

a. *Chyba* as a marker of epistemic stance

According to bilingual dictionaries, in its uses as an epistemic stance marker, *chyba* corresponds to 'I think' (PWN; St). *I think* is also used as its equivalent in the parallel corpus. Data from the National Corpus of Polish indicate that *chyba* is used to qualify opinions and predictions which are based on some evidence, as in (196)-(198).

(196)   Powietrze w bezruchu, ***chyba*** będzie burza. (NKJP, fiction, M. Dajnowski, *Promieniowanie reliktowe*, 2004)

'The air is still, ***I think/it looks like*** there is going to be a storm.'

(197)   Pan ma ***chyba*** krew na płaszczu! (NKJP, fiction, A. Szczypiorski, *Początek*, 1986)

'Sir, ***I think/it looks like*** you have blood on your coat!'

(198)   Wiesz, że zmienił jej się kolor oczu? Miała moje niebieskie, a teraz ma twoje czarne. I ***chyba*** będzie do ciebie podobna. (NKJP, fiction, M. Nurowska, *Powrót do Lwowa*, 2008)

'Do you know that her eyes changed colour? They were blue, like mine, but now they are black, like yours. And ***I think*** she will look more like you.'

In (196) the speaker predicts a storm on the basis of what the air is like; in (197) the speaker can see something which looks like blood on the addressee's coat; and in (198) the prediction concerning the girl's future appearance is made on the basis of what she looks like at the moment of speaking. *Chyba* seems closer to *probably* than to *perhaps* and *maybe*, as it tends to focus on the probability of one alternative without signalling the speaker's readiness to consider other alternatives as equally possible. *Probably* is used as one of its equivalent in the parallel corpus, as illustrated in (199) and (200).

(199)   On ***chyba*** wie najlepiej, iż nie było to łatwe zadanie.

He ***probably*** knows better than anyone that it was not an easy task. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-03-23-020)

(200)   Można ***chyba*** uznać, że tradycyjna pomoc rozwojowa w dużej mierze nie spełniła swojego zadania.

Traditional development aid can ***probably*** be considered to have largely failed in its purpose. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-03-24-021)

b. Intersubjective uses of *chyba*

In dialogic contexts *chyba* is close to *surely*. It is often used to exercise pressure on the addressee, to signal disapproval, and to challenge the addressee, as illustrated in examples (201)-(203).

(201)   O dziewiątej wieczorem mój samolot odlatuje do Salonik. Jak nie wierzycie, sprawdźcie moje nazwisko na liście pasażerów. To ***chyba*** umiecie zrobić? (NKJP, fiction, M. Krajewski, M. Czubaj, *Róże cmentarne*, 2009)

'At 9 p.m. I take a plane to Saloniki. If you don't believe me, check the passenger list. You can do that much ***surely***?'

(202) *Chyba* umiesz wyrazić jakieś swoje nie spapugowane zdanie? (NKJP, internet forum, 2005)

'***Surely*** you can express your own opinion instead of repeating someone else's view?'

(203) Sypiałem z nią czasami, chociaż wiedziałem, że była prostytutką – odpowiedział spokojnie inżynier S. – To ***chyba*** nie jest karalne? – zapytał wyzywająco. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Detektyw* nr 1(149), 1999)

'I slept with her from time to time, even though I knew she was a prostitute – engineer S. answered calmly. – It is not illegal, ***surely***? – he asked provocatively.'

In (201) and (203) *chyba* is used to challenge the addressees in self-defence. Both speakers are being examined by the police as witnesses and potential perpetrators in criminal cases. They adopt a confrontational attitude to protect their own positions. In (201) the speaker suggests that the police officers are incompetent. In (203) the context makes it clear that the speaker is behaving provocatively (*wyzywająco*). He does not want to co-operate with the police. In (202) the speaker is annoyed with the addressee because he does not seem to be able to express his own opinion on the subject matter. *Chyba* signals impatience and disapproval of the addressee's behaviour.

c. Textual functions of *chyba (chyba że)*

Chyba performs textual functions when it co-occurs with the sobordinator *że* 'that'. *Chyba że* is used as a conjunction, meaning 'unless', as illustrated in (204) and (205).

(204) Wieczorami nie wychodzę z domu, ***chyba że*** muszę.

I don't go out at night, ***unless*** I have to. (PWN)

(205) W knajpie tobym pogadał, ale w środkach komunikacji nie zawieram znajomości. ***Chyba że*** mam ochotę. (NKJP, M Cieślik, *Śmieszni Kochankowie*, 2004)

'I could talk to you in a bar, but I don't make new acquaintances in public transport. ***Unless*** I feel like doing it.'

9.5.6. *Raczej*

Raczej is a multifunctional item. Bralczyk (1978: 35-36) classifies it as an epistemic particle expressing a medium degree of certainty, but its uses as an epistemic marker seem to be primarily characteristic of colloquial speech (Bralczyk 1978). In formal registers, it is more likely to serve textual functions. Grochowski *et al.* (2014) classify it as a reformulatory particle. The most frequent counterpart of *raczej* in the parallel corpus is the reformulatory conjunct *rather*. Data from the National Corpus of Polish indicate that *raczej* serves three major functions: (1) an epistemic marker, (2) a compromiser, and (3) a contrastive conjunct.

a. *Raczej* as a marker of epistemic stance

When used as an epistemic marker, *raczej* introduces an option which the speaker considers to be more probable than others, which makes it close to *probably*. Such use is illustrated in (206) and (207).

(206) Jedynym ministrem finansów, który nic o reformie nie mówił, był Mirosław Gronicki – przypomina Bratkowski. – Tylko jemu udało się poważnie ograniczyć wydatki. Rostowski ***raczej*** pójdzie jego śladem. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Polityka* 2629, 2007)

'The only minister of finance who did not talk about any reforms was Mirosław Gronicki – Bratkowski reminds us. – He was the only minister who managed to cut the expenses. Rostowski will ***probably*** follow in his footsteps.'

(207) Rosja w Radzie Europy? ***Raczej*** tak, ale dopiero w przyszłym roku. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 1994)

'Russia in the Council of Europe? – ***Probably*** yes, but not until next year.'

Bralczyk (1978) observes that *raczej* tends to occur in contexts where two options are considered to signal which of the two is more probable. Such use is illustrated in (208).

(208) Chyba siedem, może osiem. Nie, ***raczej*** siedem. (NKJP, fiction, M Cieślik, *Śmieszni Kochankowie*, 2004)

'Probably seven, maybe eight. No, ***more probably*** seven.'

It is also used to communicate that the speaker does not know which of the two options s/he is considering is more probable, as in (209). In such contexts, it is closer to *perhaps* and *rather* than to *probably*.

(209) Z miny dziewczyny nie mógł odgadnąć, czy ją pocieszył, czy **raczej** zmartwił. (NKJP, fiction, B. Świderski, Słowa obcego, 1998)

'He could not figure from the girl's facial expression whether he had comforted or **perhaps/rather** upset her.'

b. *Raczej* used as a compromiser

In Quirk *et al.*'s (1985: 597) classification, compromisers are downtoners which "have only a slight lowering effect". In its uses as a compromiser, *raczej* resembles *rather* and *quite*. It typically occurs in front of adjectives in such cases, as in (210) and (211).

(210) Statystyczny uczeń jest **raczej** zadowolony ze szkoły. Stosunki z kolegami układają mu się zwykle dość dobrze (50 proc. odpowiedzi), a nawet bardzo dobrze (29 proc.). (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 1996)

'Statistically, pupils are **quite** pleased with their schools. Their relations with classmates are usually quite good (50% of the answers) or even very good (29% of the answers).'

(211) Jedna osoba stwierdziła, że w wolnym czasie za dużo się myśli. Hm... Sądzę, że to **raczej** dobry objaw, gdy człowiek myśli.' (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Lokalna*, 2002)

'One person said that people think too much when they have free time. Hm… I think it is **quite** good when people think.'

c. Textual functions of *raczej*

In addition to its uses as an epistemic marker and a compromiser, *raczej* functions as a contrastive conjunct, to use Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) term. It has reformulatory functions, similar to those performed by *rather* in English; it is also used as an antithetic conjunct, functionally close to *instead*. When used as a reformulatory conjunct, it introduces a statement which provides a reformulation of a point introduced earlier in the sentence. In the parallel corpus it corresponds to *rather* and *perhaps* in such contexts.

(212) Miałem przyjaciela, a raczej Znajomego, który leciał na Boskim trzy razy tygodniowo. (NKJP, fiction, C. Skrzyposzek, *Wolna Trybuna*, 1985)

'I had a friend, or **rather** an acquaintance, who used to fly Boski three times a week.'

In its uses as an antithetic conjunct, *raczej* introduces an option which is an antithesis of the preceding one. Its translation equivalent in such contexts is *instead*, as illustrated in (213).

(213) Nie potrzebujemy zawyżonego budżetu UE, który prawdopodobnie jest dziesięciokrotnie wyższy niż to konieczne; nie potrzebujemy budżetu finansowanego przez podatnika europejskiego, w którym zatracono jakiekolwiek poczucie konieczności oszczędnego gospodarowania; nie potrzebujemy dalszego rozbudowywania brukselskiej biurokracji, która ograbia płatników netto. Powinniśmy **raczej** nieustannie wykorzystywać każdą okazję do oszczędzania.

We do not need a bloated EU budget that is perhaps up to ten times higher than necessary; we do not need a budget funded by the EU taxpayer that has lost any sense of the need to economise; we do not need a further bloating of Brussels bureaucracy that robs the shirts from the backs of the net contributors. ***Instead***, we should consistently pursue every opportunity to make savings. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-06-08-007)

Like its uses as an epistemic marker, the textual functions of *raczej* involve a choice between two alternatives. It marks one of them as more accurate or more appropriate than the other one in a given situation.

9.5.7. *Bodaj* and *bodajże*

Bodaj and *bodajże* belong to literary language; *bodajże* is also rather archaic (*USJP*). The two items have a more restricted distribution than the other low confidence adverbs in Polish; they never appear on their own, e.g. in responses to prior utterances; they are not used in questions (Grochowski *et al.* 2014: 61-62). Additionally, *bodaj* (in contrast to *bodajże*) is not used parenthetically or as a sentence adverb (Grochowski *et al.* 2014:

61). The PWN dictionary places the two adverbs in one entry, and suggests that they correspond to the epistemic verbal phrases *I think* and *it seems,* as well as their combinations with the adverbs *probably* and *perhaps*, as in (214)-(216).

(214)   Miał **bodaj(że)** jakieś kłopoty.

　　　　It seems he had some problems. (PWN)

(215)   Był wtedy **bodaj(że)** nauczycielem.

　　　　I think he was a teacher at the time. (PWN)

(216)   To **bodaj** najlepszy jego film.

　　　　I think it's probably/I think perhaps it's his best film. (PWN)

In the parallel corpus *bodaj* is sometimes used as an equivalent of *perhaps* (cf. section 9.4.1), while *bodajże* is used as an equivalent of *I think*, as in (217).

(217)   **I think** they call that "evolution."

　　　　Na to **bodajże** mówią "ewolucja." (*Paralela*, OpenSub|33412)

Both adverbs can be used in contexts where two alternative views are presented as equally probable, with *bodaj* or *bodajże* qualifying one of them (Grochowski *et al.* 2014: 61-62), as in (218)-(220). The two adverbs often refer to past time events and signal that the speaker's hesitation results from the fact that s/he does not remember when, where or how exactly something happened because it was a long time ago.

(218)   Tym razem mowa o igraszkach miłosnych nie w socjalistycznym hotelu, tylko w mieszczańskiej kwaterze prywatnej, to znaczy w wynajętym gdzieś pod Warszawą, w Świdrze **bodaj**, a może Grójcu, pokoju. (NKJP, fiction, A. Bojarska, M. Bojarska, *Siostry B.*, 1996)

　　　　'This time we are talking about a tryst in private bourgeoise lodgings, not in some socialist hotel; we are talking about a room rented in some place near Warsaw, Świder **perhaps**, or maybe Grójec.'

(219)   Poznałam go **bodajże** u Jana albo u Piotra. (Grochowski *et al.* 2014: 62)

　　　　'I **probably** met him at Jan's or at Piotr's place.'

(220)   **Bodajże** w czterdziestym szóstym czy czterdziestym siódmym roku wróciłem do Polski z Włoch, bo chciałem odszukać matkę, która zaginęła po powstaniu warszawskim. (NKJP, N. Terentiew, *Zwierzenia kontrolowane*, 2004)

　　　　'I think/perhaps in 1946 or 1947 I returned from Italy to Poland because I wanted to find my mother who had been missing since the Warsaw Uprising.'

Additionally, *bodaj* has some textual and pragmatic functions which *bodajże* does not perform. Like *perhaps*, it is used as an appositive conjunct, similar in function to *for example*, as in (221); it is also used as a focusing subjunct meaning 'at least', as in (222). Additionally, *bodaj* occurs in (rather archaic) curses, where the speaker wishes something bad to happen to the addressee, such as in (223).

(221)   Masz coś do czytania, *bodaj* gazetę?

　　　　Have you got anything to read, **say/like** a newspaper? (PWN)

(222)   … każde z nas wierciło się, chcąc **bodaj** na chwilę oszukać ból (NKJP, fiction, M. Sokołowski, *Gady*, 2007)

　　　　'We all moved restlessly, trying to relieve the pain **at least** for a moment.'

(223)   **Bodaj** go cholera wzięła!

　　　　Damn him! (PWN)

9.6. Low confidence adverbs in English and Polish: summary and comparison

In both English and Polish low confidence adverbs can be divided into two groups: (1) those which mark a certain position as equally probable as its alternatives; (2) those which mark a given position as more likely than its potential alternatives. In English, the adverbs which indicate the speaker's readiness to accept other alternatives are: *perhaps, maybe, possibly,* and *conceivably;* in Polish, they are: *może, być może, bodaj,* and *bodajże.* The adverbs which signal that a given alternative is more probable than others

include: Eng. *probably, likely,* and *presumably*; Pol. *prawdopodobnie, przypuszczalnie, chyba,* and *raczej*. Both groups are dialogically expansive, to use White's (2003), and Martin and White's (2005) term, and signal that other dialogistic positions are available, but those adverbs which signal no preference on the speaker's part as to the validity of alternative positions, are more dialogistically expansive than the items which signal that one dialogistic position is particularly likely.

Those adverbs which signal the speaker's openness to all dialogistic positions tend to perform important interpersonal functions in talk-in-interaction. Interpersonal communication involves negotiation, mediation and compromise. Openness to alternative views is essential if one wants to negotiate, mediate and reach a compromise. *Perhaps, maybe* and *possibly* show a high degree of intersubjectivity, and perform numerous functions in interactive talk. They are also important markers of politeness. They can be used to ask questions, make polite requests, offers, suggestions, etc. In Polish, only one low confidence adverb is commonly used as a politeness marker, i.e. *może*. The other adverbs in the group, i.e. *być może, bodaj* and *bodajże* are more formal, literary, and tend to occur in monologic genres. *Może* is the only Polish adverb which can be used to introduce two mutually exclusive statements in one sentence and mark them as equally possible. It is a property it shares with *perhaps*, *maybe* and *possibly*, and one which seems to play a role in the development of intersubjective meanings.

The adverbs which mark a given dialogistic position as the most likely one are less open to alternative views and, in consequence, they are less likely to perform intersubjective functions and to serve as markers of politeness. They are also less frequent in questions. The Polish adverb *chyba* is an exception, but its intersubjective functions correspond to those of the confrontational adverb *surely*. *Probably, likely, presumably*, as well as *prawdopodobnie, przypuszczalnie,* and *chyba* are used to qualify the speaker's subjective opinion rather than to make a request or an offer. They are, however, more likely to have reinforcing functions, like the adverbs expressing certainty.

Generally speaking, the English adverbs in the group show a greater tendency to be used in dialogic contexts and to develop intersubjective meanings. Polish has two low confidence adverbs which are common in dialogic contexts (*może, chyba*), while the other ones typically occur in monologic genres. The most frequent low confidence adverbs in Polish, *może* and *chyba*, are often used in contexts where English uses modal auxiliaries and lexical verbs. Data from the parallel corpus indicate that in numerous cases *może* corresponds to the modal auxiliary *may*, while *chyba* corresponds to *I think*.

10. Adverbs of necessity

10.1. Introduction

The notion of necessity is associated with both epistemic and deontic modality. In the epistemic sense, it refers to what is logically necessary or what is necessarily true based on available evidence (cf. Hoye 1997; Papafragou 2000). In the deontic sense, it refers to the necessity of doing something. The semantics of the adverbs which are discussed in this chapter seems to show an interplay of deontic, epistemic, as well as non-modal meanings. This chapter aims to test the explanatory potential of the notion of necessity in discussing their meanings and functions.

The English adverbs discussed in this chapter are: *necessarily, inevitably, inescapably*, *ineluctably,* and *unavoidably*. The reference grammars and studies of modal markers which classify them as epistemic adverbs usually note that they are only marginally epistemic or that they in fact express notions other than epistemic modality. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) associate *necessarily* and *inevitably* with the epistemic notion 'in accordance with expectations'. They also note that the two adverbs "present a state of affairs" as "being a necessary, unavoidable consequence of another state of affairs" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 188), which indicates that they can also express the deontic sense of circumstantial necessity. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 589) associate *necessarily* and *inevitably* with the notion of contingency, i.e. the relation of cause and effect. Huddleston and Pullum's (2002: 769) grammar is the only reference grammar which classifies *ineluctably, inescapably* and *unavoidably* as modal markers. However, the authors also write that "*unavoidably* and *ineluctably* are concerned with the actualisation of situations rather than the truth of the

propositions" (2002: 769). Their modal status is thus uncertain. Huddleston and Pullum (2002) do not discuss *inescapably*, but considering its semantic closeness to *unavoidably* and *ineluctably*, this observation can probably be extended to *inescapably* as well.

The Polish adverbs discussed in this chapter are: *koniecznie, niekoniecznie, niechybnie, niezawodnie, nieuchronnie,* and *nieuniknienie*. The modal character of the first four is generally acknowledged in Polish studies. *Koniecznie* has been observed to occur in deontic contexts (Grzegorczykowa 1975; Danielewiczowa 2012); *niekoniecznie, niechybnie,* and *niezawodnie* are classified as epistemic markers (Bralczyk 1978; Danielewiczowa 2012; Grochowski *et al.* 2014). *Nieuchronnie* and *nieuniknienie* have not, to the best of my knowledge, been classified as modal markers in any Polish studies. The six Polish adverbs have never been discussed as members of the same subset of adverbs, as they form a less uniform group than the English adverbs examined in this chapter. In this study they are subsumed under the same heading because they are used as translation equivalents of the English adverbs in the group. *Koniecznie* and *niekoniecznie* correspond to *necessarily* and *not necessarily*; *nieuchronnie, nieuniknienie, niechybnie,* and *niezawodnie* are used as translation equivalents of *inevitably*. All the English and Polish adverbs discussed in this chapter are listed in Table 21, together with their frequencies in the British National Corpus (BNC) and the National Corpus of Polish (NKJP), respectively.

Table 21. Adverbs of necessity in English and their Polish equivalents

English adverbs	Freq per 100 m words (BNC)	Polish adverbs	Freq per 100 m words (NKJP)
not necessarily	3,251	*koniecznie*	2,529
necessarily	2,349	*niekoniecznie*	2,390
inevitably	3,049	? *nieuchronnie*	550
? *inescapably*	68	*niechybnie*	274
? *unavoidably*	58	*niezawodnie*	171
? *ineluctably*	14	? *nieuniknienie*	6

As shown in Table 21, with the exception of (*not*)*necessarily, inevitably* and their Polish equivalents (*nie*)*koniecznie* and *nieuchronnie*, the adverbs discussed in this chapter have very low frequencies in the monolingual

corpora. The uncertain status of *inescapably, unavoidably, ineluctably, nieuchronnie,* and *nieuniknienie* is indicated by question marks. Their ability to express modal meanings will be examined in sections 10.2. and 10.3. The discussion which follows begins with the analysis of (*not*)*necessarily*, and then it moves to the other four English adverbs and their Polish equivalents.

10.2. Adverbs of necessity in English

10.2.1. (*Not*)*necessarily*

Necessarily signals that "something is necessitated by circumstances" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007), or that it is "a logical result or consequence" (*Merriam-Webster*). According to monolingual dictionaries, its synonyms include *inevitably* (*OD*) and *unavoidably* (*Merriam-Webster*). The "circumstantial necessity" expressed by *necessarily* may be considered a deontic notion, while logical necessity is an epistemic one (cf. also Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 768). Quirk *et al.* (1985: 589), however, include the causal relation expressed by *necessarily* in the realm of "contingency" rather than modality, and refer to *necessarily* as "an adjunct of contingency". *Necessarily* is used both in the positive and negative form (*not necessarily*). The negative form is more frequent in the British National Corpus (see Table 21), as the adverb generally favours negative contexts; it is frequently used with negative auxiliaries (*don't, doesn't, isn't*, etc.), *without*, and *nor*.

a. The uses of *necessarily* as an epistemic adverb

Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 188) argue that the epistemic meaning of *necessarily* is typically expressed by its negative form: *not necessarily*. *Not necessarily* indicates the speaker's awareness that the situation referred to is not always true or that a causal relation between two phenomena or situations does not always exist. The meaning 'not always true' often refers to prior expectations, which *not necessarily* cancels, "though not completely" (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 190). Such use is exemplified in (1) and (2), where the speakers explicitly signal that the claims which *necessarily* cancels concern things which can be expected.

(1) One might expect a docile or sensible horse, or even a friendly one, to be willing. Don't believe it! This is only true sometimes. <u>Or one might expect</u> an aggressive horse to be mean and uncooperative, but this is ***not necessarily*** true either. (BNC, ADF 1176)

(2) Getting older does ***not necessarily*** mean losing independence. Though <u>people expect</u> illness to become more frequent in old age, you should not assume that nothing can be done, but should consult your doctor if you think you have a health problem. (BNC, BN7 990-991)

In (1) *not necessarily* communicates that the causal relation between the aggressive and uncooperative behaviour of horses does not always exist, while in (2) it suggests that getting older does not always involve losing independence. In both cases the implication is that the claims whose validity is questioned by means of *not necessarily* are generally expected to be true. *Not necessarily* frequently occurs in the expressions *it does not necessarily mean*, *it is not necessarily the case* and *it is not necessarily true*, which signal that its function is to undermine the validity of the claims it modifies. Such uses are illustrated in (3) and (4).

(3) This result implies that domain-specific collocations may be superior to general collocations in analysing documents from the same domain. However, ***it is not necessarily the case*** that these characteristics will be exhibited within other domains. (BNC, EES 1821)

(4) Even if real output per capita rises, ***it is not necessarily true*** that actual economic welfare will have improved. If changes in the distribution of income have also occurred, the improvement may only be a potential one. (BNC, K92 170)

Not necessarily and *without necessarily* are also used as hedges, allowing the speaker/writer to express an opinion in a non-straightforward way, particularly if it contains criticism. Such uses are illustrated in (5) and (6).

(5) My niece is only little, but already she is susceptible to it, wearing T-shirts and baseball caps. The whole atmosphere of thinking in the West is that Britain and America have defined what being young is all about. That's ***not necessarily*** right. I feel there are a

lot more important things in life than looking good, and in countries where life is harder you don't have time to worry about such things, you're too busy working or preparing the next meal. (BNC, ADG 600-6003)

(6) Questions of genre, central to any theory of television, are inextricably bound up with questions of repetition and difference, and television raises these questions in quite specific ways. Adorno seems to me to situate the problem, ***without necessarily*** being the solution to it. While attentive to the spirit of his reproach, it is not enough to retreat into the security of a duality – even a dialectic duality – in which difference is always already valorized against the corrosiveness of repetition; but nor is it enough simply to reverse the poles and allow the current to run the other way. (BNC, ARD 88-90)

Mitigated criticism is a strategy for attending to the face needs of both the speaker and the addressee. The speakers protect themselves against the objections which might potentially be raised by their critics. At the same time, the face needs of the receivers who support the criticized views are also attended to. The criticism formulated with *not necessarily* leaves space for discussion and negotiation; the statements it modifies are dialogically expansive.

b. Deontic meanings of *necessarily*

In its deontic sense *necessarily* signals necessity resulting from the circumstances, or, if it appears in the negative form, its lack. The deontic interpretation of *necessarily* is particularly clear when it co-occurs with the deontic verbs *must* and *have to*, both in affirmative and non-affirmative contexts, as in (7) and (8), respectively. It functions as an emphasizer of the deontic meanings expressed by the verbs.

(7) The balance of payments is a circular identity of inflows and outflows, which ***must necessarily*** match each other. (BNC, A1E 184)

(8) Poets do not ***necessarily have to*** be commentators on the historic present; there is a world within as well as a world without. (BNC, A0P 1778)

Deontic uses of *necessarily* are also found in questions. In (9) it is substitutable with *does it have to be.*

 (9) Why **necessarily** one? (BNC, A0P 795)

In some contexts, the deontic sense of *necessarily* is combined with the sense of expectations, which is characteristic of its epistemic meaning. Consider examples (10) and (11).

(10) Witnessing should never become an excuse for a heated argument; if things are moving in that direction it's better to end the conversation sooner rather than later. You can always respect someone else's viewpoint **without necessarily** agreeing with it. (BNC, C8N 489-490)

(11) This chapter, like Chapter 7 (which deals with some current ideas of how homoeopathic remedies may work), is **necessarily** of a more scientific nature than most of the book. While every effort has been made to express the ideas in everyday language, it has been impossible to dispense with some scientific terms. (BNC, C9V 1128)

In (10) "*without necessarily* agreeing" means 'it's not necessary to agree', but it implies that agreement may be expected in such circumstances. In (11) it can be paraphrased as 'out of necessity', but, at the same time, it may be interpreted as implying that it is to be expected that some parts of the book are of a more scientific nature than others.

In sum, *necessarily* can express both epistemic and deontic meanings. When used as an epistemic marker, it is typically negative in form and signals that a causal relation between two phenomena or situations does not always exist. It is substitutable with 'not always' in such contexts. It may also be employed as a hedge; it is used to formulate opinions in a mitigated way, and signal that while the speaker disagrees with a claim, the matter is still open to discussion. In its deontic interpretation *necessarily* is more frequent in the positive form, and expresses circumstantial necessity, i.e. it signals that the circumstances make a specific state of affairs unavoidable.

10.2.2. *Inevitably*

Inevitably is related to the verb *avoid* (from Lat. *inevitabilis* < *evitare* 'avoid'). It is used to mean "in a way that cannot be avoided" (*CALD*). Some dictionaries offer definitions which suggest a more epistemic interpretation of its meaning: "as one would expect; predictably; as is certain to happen" (*OD*). Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 173) consider *inevitably* to be "marginally epistemic", but they also note that some of its uses might be interpreted as indicating a change towards a more clearly epistemic meaning. *Inevitably* is the most frequent of the four adverbs expressing the impossibility of avoiding something. It is quite frequently used in the sentence initial position (16% of its uses in the BNC) and parenthetically, which signals its potential to be used as a sentence adverb and a discourse marker.

Inevitably indicates the impossibility of avoiding something, and since people usually try to avoid something unpleasant, it can be expected to occur in contexts describing negative consequences of the state of affairs. Such uses are common in the BNC, e.g. (12) and (13).

(12) It's the patients who suffer, stranded on the waiting-lists, nursing their pain and their justified anxiety till they get to see the specialist. **Inevitably**, some will have diseases that go undiagnosed and therefore untreated. (BNC, ABS 1990)

(13) Of those pubs which are listed – and there are still dismally few – such an attitude **inevitably** leads to a total disregard for those special qualities which distinguish the pub interior. (BNC, A0B 66)

In (12) the negative consequence signalled by *inevitably* is the occurrence of "diseases that go undiagnosed", and in (13) it is "a total disregard for those special qualities". Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 191) observe, however, that while such contexts are indeed frequent, *inevitably* is also "used to qualify neutral or even positive propositions", which they see as indicative of semantic bleaching and loss of content. Such changes may suggest that the adverb is undergoing (inter)subjectification. Both the BNC examples and the Polish translation equivalents of *inevitably* attested in the parallel corpus confirm this observation. The extract quoted

in (14) provides an illustration of the different positions it occurs in, and the variety of propositions (negative, neutral, positive) it qualifies.

(14) This research at home is primarily about the society of the self and the self in that society. It encompasses an internal exploration of a personal history within a culture and **inevitably** differs in scale from much of the 'anthropology at home' which has become one of *the* genres of the 1980s. **Inevitably** it has qualitative differences and is not easily written or smoothly integrated into the 'isms' or historical categories of the discipline. Material obtained in such circumstances **inevitably** contains the seeds of a special inside knowledge, avoiding problems described by Liebow (1967: 232–56), who was still separated by cognitive barriers while pursuing research in what was ostensibly his own society, and who found an insider's language, education, and 'social membership' all helped to retain boundaries he was unable to penetrate. (BNC, A0K 97-100).

In the first instance ("*inevitably* differs") the context is quite neutral; in the next one it is negative ("*inevitably* it has qualitative differences and is not easily written"), while in the last one the evaluation is positive ("*inevitably* contains the seeds of a special inside knowledge, avoiding problems"). In many cases, such as both its occurrences in (15), *inevitably* simply refers to what can be expected in a given situation.

(15) Carla, **inevitably**, did get her job in publishing. It was through a family connection, I think – anyway, as expected, she never had to ask me for a reference. I (again **inevitably**) decided to leave job-hunting until after I had actually left SIS. My final term there seemed rather uneventful after the previous two, and only Renaissance Anne showed any signs of concern about my impending departure. (BNC, A0F 307-309)

In (15) *inevitably* is similar in function to *of course* and *naturally*; it signals conformity with expectations. The speaker makes it clear that the state of affairs turned out to be "as expected". In such cases its epistemic character is particularly clear: the meaning 'as expected' signals certainty.

Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) note a number of similarities between *inevitably* and *necessarily*. *Inevitably* seems to be particularly close to *necessarily* when it is used in non-affirmative contexts, as these are typical for *necessarily*. *Not inevitably* signals that the state of affairs referred to might prove to be different in character from the one which is expected, in a similar way as *not necessarily* does. Such use is illustrated in examples (16) and (17).

(16) It might also become dominated by Marxists and cultural materialists, but **not inevitably** so; academic sociology offers points of comparison here. (BNC, A1A 13 77)

(17) Associated status can be a means of fulfilling the right to self-determination, and limitations upon treaty-making and other foreign affairs powers can be a recognition of the limited economic and political capacities of micro-States. However this is **not inevitably** the case. (BNC, EF3 989)

In both (16) and (17) the statements preceding *inevitably* contain modal verbs (*can* and *might*), which are used to formulate hypotheses. *Inevitably* signals that the hypotheses are only partly true. Thus, like *not necessarily*, it means 'not always', and, by extension – 'it is not certain'. Like *not necessarily*, it is used with the noun *case*, as in: *this is not inevitably the case* (compare: *this is not necessarily the case*). Both adverbs can thus be used to raise doubts, or as Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 190) put it in their analysis of the uses of *not necessarily*, to "rule out certainty". It seems legitimate to treat such uses of *inevitably* as epistemic.

Inevitably is also similar to *necessarily* in its ability to function as an emphasizer in deontic contexts. It is used to express necessity resulting from the circumstances; a natural consequence of a specific state of affairs. Like *necessarily*, it frequently co-occurs in such cases with *must*, as in (18) and (19).

(18) Under this article, foreign exchange is allocated on a system of priorities… The application of such a system **must inevitably** be arbitrary. (BNC, 496-500)

(19) Most people who have experienced the loss of a parent or a part-
    ner have suffered bereavement, and **must inevitably** go through
    a mourning process. (BNC, B3G 102)

10.2.3. *Inescapably*

Inescapably derives from the adjective *inescapable*, meaning "incapable
of being avoided, ignored, or denied" (*Merriam-Webster*). It is a low fre-
quency adverb, but despite its low frequency, it is attested in sentence in-
itial, medial and final positions in the BNC. *Inescapably* seems to refer
to the inevitability of the natural order of things and the impossibility
of changing it. In the corpus it is often used to signal that some notions
are inseparable. It co-occurs with words naming connections, such as the
verbs *link, associate*, *intertwine*, and the noun *relationship*, and signals
that the connections cannot be avoided, as in (20) an (21).

(20) There are advances, as we've already talked about, in the mi-
    croelectronics industry, because as computers become smaller
    and smaller, then they approach molecular dimensions and gain
    the realm of molecular reactions is the realm of chemistry, so
    physics and chemistry there <u>intertwine</u> absolutely **inescapably**.
    (BNC, KRF 449)

(21) How we live is **inescapably** <u>linked</u> to what we think about our
    origin and our destiny, even if we only discuss these mysteries
    late at night in the company of a few friends. (BNC, ACA 11)

The impossibility of avoiding a relation between two items or phe-
nomena may lead to the perception that this relation can be expected. In
such cases, the epistemic reading of *inescapably* is also possible. Consider
the example quoted in (22).

(22) Authorities are concerned to delegate powers, as far as is prac-
    tical and efficient to do so. **Inescapably**, they must retain such
    things as overall financial control, a determination of the size
    of a school's teaching and ancillary staff, and major decisions
    about buildings, although many conclusions on these matters
    are reached only after an ebb and flow of consultation and rep-
    resentation. (BNC, HPX 616)

In (22) *inescapably* implies that authorities cannot escape being re-
sponsible for finances and for taking major decisions. It may, however,
also be understood as meaning that it is expected, and thus obvious and
certain, that authorities cannot delegate responsibility for the finances
and major decisions.

Inescapably is also used as an emphasizer in epistemic contexts. It em-
phasizes the validity of claims and communicates that it is impossible to
deny them. Such is its function in (23), where the speaker says that a claim
is "inescapably true", and in (24), where the adverb is used to communi-
cate that a claim is "inescapably correct".

(23) The evangelical and puritan strands vigorously opposed the dou-
    ble standard, and by the last decades of the century were able to
    pose a significant challenge to its easy acceptance. Nonetheless,
    it is **inescapably** true that the familial ideology was accompanied
    by, and often relied on, a vast underbelly of prostitution, which
    fed on the double standard and an authoritarian moral code.
    (BNC, EEN 441)

(24) Mr. Wildblood makes the comment, which in my judgment is
    inescapably correct, that the justices have approached their de-
    cision in this case on general welfare principles. (BNC, FBX 120)

In sum, there are contexts where *inescapably* can be interpreted as
expressing epistemic meanings: 'undeniably' and 'as expected'. However,
such uses are infrequent. In contrast to *inevitably* and *unavoidably*, *in-
escapably* does not seem to express the deontic sense of circumstantial
necessity. Such uses are not attested in the BNC.

10.2.4. *Unavoidably*

Like *inevitably, unavoidably* is related to the verb *avoid*, and means "in a
way that cannot be avoided, prevented, or ignored" (*OD*). It is, however,
substantially less frequent in the BNC than *inevitably* (see Table 21). Hud-
dleston and Pullum (2002: 769) classify *unavoidably* as a modal marker,
but they also note that, like *ineluctably*, it is "concerned with the actualis-
ation of situations rather than the truth of the propositions".

Like *inevitably*, *unavoidably* usually refers to unwanted consequences of some situations, and signals that they cannot be avoided in the circumstances referred to. Such is the case in (25) and (26).

(25) '*Unavoidably*, there will be further job losses – around 250 – in the UK and worldwide, at all levels,' Mr Ashwell explained. (BNC, HBC 21)

(26) For the rest of Europe this assertion of German nationhood has its *unavoidably* bitter dimension. (BNC, A88 153)

Unavoidably is also used to refer to unpleasant and difficult situations which cannot be prevented, such as an absence caused by an illness, being late, or being detained in traffic. Phrases such as *unavoidably absent, unavoidably delayed,* and *unavoidably detained* suggest the existence of some objective reasons for the problems. Such uses are, however, non-modal in character. They are illustrated in examples (27) and (28).

(27) Where any Member is *unavoidably* absent from the House on that day, through sickness or by being abroad, the scrutineers will make arrangements to receive their votes. (BNC, HRJ 49)

(28) *Unavoidably* detained in a traffic snarl-up in Park End Street, Dennis couldn't be with us in person, but he was present in spirit, and the result was quite literally indescribable. (BNC, BMR 1351)

The modal sense expressed by *unavoidably* is circumstantial necessity. It signals the necessity resulting from the specific conditions referred to, as in (29)-(31).

(29) In this chapter I shall be considering some of the great historical Western moral philosophers of the past, confining myself, however, to the period of modern philosophy, which is usually conceived of as starting in the seventeenth century. (I regret the omission of ancient philosophy, but that could not be decently treated without doubling the historical part of this book.) The treatment will be *unavoidably* brief. (BNC, CS2 1055-1057)

(30) Pak was imprisoned by the Japanese but was released early in 1939. He then endeavoured to coordinate activities through an underground body called the Communist Group. Progress was

unavoidably slow but they set up and directed most of the subversive organisations. (BNC, EDP 134-136)

(31) As soon as he is shipped on board of a man-of-war he becomes as insignificant as a midshipman must *unavoidably* be from his humble situation. (BNC, EC8 377)

In (29) the writer explains that his treatment of modern philosophers is unavoidably brief because a more detailed one would be beyond the scope of his book. The progress referred to in (30) is slow because it could not be faster in the circumstances. In (31) reference is made explicitly to the "humble situation" of a midshipman which makes him insignificant. In the three examples, *unavoidably* is substitutable with *necessarily* and *inevitably*. It expresses the deontic sense of circumstantial necessity. There is no evidence in the BNC for its uses as an epistemic marker.

10.2.5. *Ineluctably*

Ineluctably derives from the adjective *ineluctable*, which is used "to describe something that cannot be stopped, escaped, or ignored" (*COBUILD*). It is the least frequent adverb in the group (see Table 21), and its low frequency makes it difficult to make any generalizations about its meanings or functions. None of its occurrences in the corpus are in the sentence initial position, which suggests that it is unlikely to express subjective meanings and be used as a sentence adverb. In most cases, it refers to developments and processes which cannot be stopped. It collocates with such verbs as *move towards, continue*, *lead to*, adjectives such as *gradually*, and nouns such as *developments*. Such uses are illustrated in examples (32)-(34).

(32) If there are some brute facts, perhaps social, but founded in biological difference, which separate the lives and experience of women from those of men, may these not continue *ineluctably* to affect the moral ideals they may hold? (BNC, ECV 745)

(33) But they completely accepted that human history is purposeful or 'teleological' (Lowith, 1949), moving dialectically but *ineluctably* towards an end-point where social conflicts are completely eradicated by the arrival in power of a universal class. (BNC, CS3 851)

(34) The historian, Geoffrey Hudson, once wrote that 'no factor leads to war ***more ineluctably*** than the steady decline of relative power'. (BNC, CMT 439)

In (32)-(34) *ineluctably* modifies verbs and is used as a manner adverb; in (34) it is graded like a regular adverb of manner ("more *ineluctably* than"). The examples quoted in (32) and (33) suggest that it has some potential to express the deontic sense of circumstantial necessity, like the other adverbs in the group. However, the corpus data do not provide sufficient evidence for its use as a modal adverb.

10.3. Polish equivalents of English adverbs of necessity. Evidence from bilingual dictionaries

The three bilingual dictionaries consulted for the purposes of this work list only the most frequent adverbs in the group, i.e. *necessarily, not necessarily, inevitably,* and *unavoidably*. They do not have entries for *inescapably* or *ineluctably*. Stanisławski (1999) and the PWN-Oxford dictionary include only the adjectives *ineluctable* (glossed as: *nieuchronny, nieunikniony*), and *inescapable* (glossed as: *nieunikniony, nieodparty*). The dictionaries provide adverbial equivalents for three adverbs in the group: *not necessarily (niekoniecznie), necessarily (koniecznie),* and *inevitably (nieuchronnie)*; *unavoidably* has descriptive equivalents. The Polish dictionary equivalents of English adverbs of necessity are listed in Table 22.

Table 22. Polish dictionary equivalents of English adverbs expressing necessity

Adverbs of necessity	Polish dictionary equivalents
not necessarily	*niekoniecznie* (PWN; St; Col)
necessarily	*koniecznie, z konieczności* (PWN; St; Col), *siłą rzeczy* (PWN), *niezbędnie, nieodzownie* (St)
inevitably	*nieuchronnie* (PWN; Col), *jak było do przewidzenia* (PWN)
unavoidably	*z całą pewnością, z przyczyn obiektywnych* (PWN)
inescapably	-
ineluctably	-

10.4. Polish equivalents of English adverbs of necessity. Evidence from the parallel corpus

Only three adverbs in the group, i.e. *necessarily, not necessarily* and *inevitably*, are well evidenced in the parallel corpus (see Table 28). Their translation equivalents have been established on the basis of 100-item corpus samples. The frequencies of the other adverbs are considerably lower. *Unavoidably* has 33 occurrences in the corpus, and *inescapably* has only 4. All their equivalents identified in the parallel corpus are listed in Table 23. The least frequent item in the group, *ineluctably*, is not evidenced in *Paralela*.

Table 23. Translation equivalents of English adverbs of necessity in *Paralela*

English adverbs of necessity	Polish equivalents in the translation corpus
not necessarily	*niekoniecznie* (74), zero equivalent (14), *nie musieć* (5), *nie zawsze* (3), *nie do końca* (2), *niezupełnie* (2)
necessarily	*koniecznie* (45), zero equivalent (22), *z konieczności* (11), *musi* (3), *nieuchronnie* (3), *bezwzględnie* (3), *w sposób nieuchronny* (2), *bez wątpienia* (2), *siłą rzeczy* (2), *w sposób nieunikniony* (1), *absolutnie* (1), *będzie konieczne* (1), *z pewnością* (1), *bezsprzecznie* (1), *oczywiście* (1), *naprawdę* (1)
inevitably	zero equivalent (40), *nieuchronnie* (17), *w sposób nieunikniony* (10), *musi* (7), *niechybnie* (4), *na pewno* (2), *z pewnością* (2), *nieuniknienie* (1), *niezawodnie* (1), *bezwzględnie* (1), *nieodwołalnie* (1), *niewątpliwie* (1), *bez wątpienia* (1), *bezsprzecznie* (1), *prawdopodobnie* (1), *najprawdopodobniej* (1), *nieodłącznie* (1), *nieomylnie* (1), *nieubłaganie* (1), *siłą rzeczy* (1), *z konieczności* (1), *nie da się uchronić* (1), *nie da się uniknąć* (1), *często* (1), *jest i będzie* (1)
unavoidably	*to nieuniknione* (8), zero equivalent (6), *w sposób nieunikniony* (6), *niechybnie* (5), *z przyczyn niezależnych* (2), *z przyczyn obiektywnych* (2), *nieuchronnie* (1), *nieodparcie* (1), *z pewnością* (1), *uparcie* (1)
inescapably	*nieodwołalnie* (1), *nierozerwalnie* (1), *nie do uniknięcia* (1), zero equivalent (1)
ineluctably	-

As shown in Table 23, *not necessarily* has one major equivalent in the analyzed corpus sample: *niekoniecznie*; its other equivalents are used considerably less often. *Necessarily* is usually rendered by its literal equivalent *koniecznie*, but it also has a number of epistemic and deontic equivalents which are employed less often in the corpus. The other adverbs in the group do not seem to have close adverbial equivalents in Polish. *Inevitably* is usually omitted in translation; *unavoidably* is rendered by means of expressions containing the adjective *nieunikniony* 'unavoidable'. Because of the low frequency of *inescapably* and the absence of *ineluctably* in the parallel corpus, the two adverbs will not be discussed in separate sections. *Inescapably* appears four times in *Paralela*, and has three different translation equivalents: *nieodwołalnie* 'irrevocably', *nierozerwalnie* 'inseparably' and *nie do uniknięcia* 'not to be avoided'. In one case, it is omitted in translation. It does not seem to have an established equivalent in Polish. The contexts in which the different translation equivalents of *not necessarily, necessarily, inevitably* and *unavoidably* are employed are discussed in sections 10.4.1-10.4.4.

10.4.1. Translation equivalents of *not necessarily*

In the majority of instances *not necessarily* is translated as *niekoniecznie*, which seems to be its prototypical equivalent. *Niekoniecznie* is primarily used as an epistemic marker (cf. Danielewiczowa 2012: 138). It is used as an equivalent of *not necessarily* when it signals partial disagreement with an opinion which is said or implied to be expected, and is paraphrasable as 'not always', as illustrated in (35) and (36).

(35) 'A further problem is that cryptosporidia are often present in faeces in very low numbers so it is easy to miss them in a single test,' lead author Barbara Richter comments. 'We are working to make our method more sensitive but it is very important to test the reptiles repeatedly. A negative result does ***not necessarily*** mean that the animal is really free of the parasite.'

'Kolejnym problemem jest często bardzo mała liczba kryptosporydii w odchodach, przez co można je łatwo pominąć w pojedynczym teście' – zauważa naczelna autorka Barbara Richter. 'Pracujemy nad zwiększeniem czułości naszej metody, ale nie-

zwykle istotne jest wielokrotne testowanie gadów. Ujemny wynik ***niekoniecznie*** oznacza, że zwierzę jest naprawdę wolne od pasożyta.' (*Paralela*, CORDIS|33471)

(36) 'The temptation is to see this as bad news, that these results mean the virus is winning the battle', he said. 'That's ***not necessarily*** the case.'

'Pojawia się jakiś wewnętrzny sygnał, aby ocenić te wyniki jako złą nowinę, jak gdyby miały oznaczać, że wirus wygrywa bitwę' – powiedział. 'Ale ***niekoniecznie*** tak jest.' (*Paralela*, CORDIS|30511)

Niekoniecznie is also employed as a translation equivalent of *not necessarily* when it is used to negate a prior opinion in a non-straightforward way. It is paraphrasable in such contexts as 'not really'. Such use is illustrated in (37).

(37) Erosion is a big problem, but ***not necessarily*** in the European Union.

Erozja jest dużym problemem, ale ***niekoniecznie*** w Unii Europejskiej. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-07-11-12-020)

Most of the other equivalents of *not necessarily* in the analyzed sample of the corpus are non-epistemic expressions used to express partial disagreement, such as *nie zawsze* 'not always', *nie do końca* 'not entirely', and *niezupełnie* 'not entirely, not exactly'. One of its equivalents, *musieć* 'must', expresses the deontic sense of circumstantial necessity. It is used to signal that the necessity does not always occur, as in (38).

(38) The realisation that there is a great deal of life in relations between the United States and the European Union, aside from third-country issues (although, even in these, the disagreement is ***not necessarily*** insurmountable), is vitally important.

Uświadomienie sobie, że stosunki pomiędzy Unią Europejską a Stanami Zjednoczonymi są bardzo ożywione, obok spraw dotyczących krajów trzecich (chociaż nawet w tym przypadku brak zgody ***nie musi*** być nie do przezwyciężenia), ma istotne znaczenie. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-08-05-08-009)

10.4.2. Translation equivalents of *necessarily*

The correspondence between *necessarily* and its most frequent translation equivalent *koniecznie* is not as straightforward as in the case of the negative forms *not necessarily* and *niekoniecznie*, which is why it has a number of additional equivalents in the corpus. Both *necessarily* and *koniecznie* express necessity. However, *koniecznie* expresses the necessity which comes from external deontic sources (obligation) and the speaker himself/herself; it does not usually express circumstantial necessity the way *necessarily* does. It is employed as an equivalent of *necessarily* when it functions as an emphasizer of deontic meanings. Such uses are exemplified in (39) and (40).

(39) I support the conclusions of the report by the Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, but they <u>must</u> ***necessarily*** be followed up by a detailed analysis of the plans.

Popieram wnioski Konfederacyjnej Grupy Zjednoczonej Lewicy Europejskiej/ Nordyckiej Zielonej Lewicy dotyczące sprawozdania, ale <u>musi</u> za nimi ***koniecznie*** iść szczegółowa analiza planów. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-06-22-021)

(40) I would suggest that it is up to the other 18 Member States to put legislation in place to protect the soil and we <u>should not</u> ***necessarily*** bring forward another directive.

Proponuję, aby to od pozostałych 18 państw członkowskich zależało wprowadzenie ustawodawstwa dotyczącego ochrony gleby; <u>nie musimy</u> ***koniecznie*** wprowadzać nowej dyrektywy. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-07-11-12-020)

When *necessarily* is used to express necessity resulting from the circumstances and specific conditions in which people and institutions operate, it is rendered as: *z konieczności* 'out of necessity' and *w nieuchronny sposób* 'in an unavoidable way', as illustrated in (41) and (42).

(41) The economic governance carried out by the Union within the euro area will thus constitute the basis on which the future stability mechanism will ***necessarily*** have to rest.

W związku z tym nadzór gospodarczy realizowany przez Unię Europejską w strefie euro będzie stanowił podstawę, na której ***z konieczności*** będzie musiał się opierać przyszły mechanizm stabilności. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-02-15-012)

(42) A common foreign policy conducted in the sole interest of the European Union will ***necessarily*** find itself, sooner or later, in contradiction with the fundamental interests of one, several or all Member States.

Wspólna polityka zagraniczna, prowadzona wyłącznie w interesie Unii Europejskiej, ***w nieuchronny sposób*** wcześniej lub później stanie w sprzeczności z podstawowymi interesami jednego, kilku lub wszystkich państw członkowskich. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-10-20-007)

In (41) and (42) *necessarily* signals that the situations referred to cannot be avoided. It thus expresses circumstantial necessity – a meaning which its most frequent translation equivalent *koniecznie* does not express.

10.4.3. Translation equivalents of *inevitably*

As shown in Table 23, *inevitably* has a variety of translation equivalents in Polish, some of them modal, some non-modal, but in the majority of the instances it is omitted in translation. Its most frequent translation equivalent is *nieuchronnie*. *Nieuchronnie* is related to the verb *chronić* 'protect', and is typically used to signal that something unpleasant is about to come, something that people would rather avoid and protect themselves from. In the National Corpus of Polish the adverb is usually used to refer to such consequences as illness, death, a fall, troubles, sadness, terror, conflict, etc. The contexts in which it occurs in the parallel corpus are similar, e.g. in (43), where it introduces the prediction that fishermen "will be doomed". Such uses are, however, non-modal in character.

(43) Ensuring the survival of a doomed energy system will not help fishermen; they, too, will ***inevitably*** be doomed as a result of it.

Zapewnienie przetrwania systemu energetycznego skazanego z góry na przegraną nie pomoże rybakom; wskutek takiego ru-

chu oni również będą **nieuchronnie** skazani na przegraną. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-11-05-09-017)

Some of the occurrences of *nieuchronnie* in the National Corpus of Polish indicate that it has some potential to express the sense of circumstantial necessity and conformity with expectations (see section 10.5). Such uses are, however, less frequent than in the case of *inevitably*, and have not been noted in any other studies. In the analyzed sample of the translation corpus, *nieuchronnie* is employed as an equivalent of *inevitably* when it is used as an adverb of manner.

In several cases, the circumstantial necessity expressed by *inevitably* is rendered by the deontic verb *musieć* 'must', as in (44).

(44)   The Constitution, as a compromise that had to be acceptable to all Member States, **inevitably** left out some proposals, notably of the European Parliament and of the Convention, that would have, in the view of their authors, brought further improvements to the Union, many of which remain possible in the future.

Konstytucja, będąca kompromisem, który musiał być do przyjęcia dla wszystkich Państw Członkowskich, **musiała** odrzucić niektóre propozycje, zwłaszcza te pochodzące od Parlamentu Europejskiego i Konwentu, które przyniosłyby, zdaniem ich autorów, dalsze pozytywne skutki dla Unii, i spośród których wiele wciąż możliwych jest do wprowadzenia w przyszłości. (*Paralela*, JRC-Acquis|52004IP0004)

The sense 'out of necessity' tends not to be expressed by adverbs in Polish. In the parallel corpus, the English adverbs expressing circumstantial necessity correspond to structures with the verb *musieć* 'must' in Polish, and have a number of descriptive equivalents.

10.4.4. Translation equivalents of *unavoidably*

Unavoidably is usually rendered by descriptive expressions containing the adjective *nieunikniony* 'unavoidable': *to jest/było nieuniknione* 'it is/was unavoidable', *w sposób nieunikniony* 'in an unavoidable way'. Such paraphrases are mostly found in sentences containing the phrase *unavoidably detained,* which is quite frequent in the corpus, and has no direct equiv-

alent in Polish. The phrase has numerous *ad hoc* contextual equivalents, such as *zatrzymało go coś ważnego* 'detained by something important', as in (45) or *zatrzymany z przyczyn obiektywnych* 'detained for objective reasons' in (46).

(45)   Mr. Hall has been **unavoidably detained**.
        Pana Halla **zatrzymało coś ważnego**. (*Paralela*, OpenSub|4537)

(46)   He was **unavoidably detained**. – He stood you up?
        Zatrzymany **z przyczyn obiektywnych**. – Wystawił cię? (*Paralela*, OpenSub|2496)

In some cases, the necessity resulting from circumstances is interpreted as implying certainty, which is why some of the translation equivalents of *unavoidably* are epistemic in character, such as *z pewnością* 'certainly, with certainty', and *niechybnie* 'without fail, assuredly'. Such interpretation is possible because if something cannot be avoided, it can be expected to happen. Example (47) illustrates the use of *z pewnością* as an equivalent of *unavoidably*.

(47)   In order to avoid the negative impact of these processes, the Commission and the Member States must cooperate by preparing a sustainable EU strategy on biodiversity preservation, which would be reconciled with the objectives of combating poverty, managing waste sustainably and reducing climate change. Adequate financing will **unavoidably** be required to implement the planned actions and strategies.

Aby uniknąć negatywnych skutków tych procesów Komisja i państwa członkowskie muszą współpracować w celu przygotowania zrównoważonej strategii UE na rzecz ochrony różnorodności biologicznej, którą należy pogodzić z celami zwalczania ubóstwa, zrównoważonej gospodarki odpadami i ograniczeniem zmian klimatu Wdrożenie zaplanowanych działań i strategii będzie **z pewnością** wymagało odpowiedniego finansowania. (*Paralela*, EPProc|ep-10-10-07-013)

In (47) the speaker refers to negative consequences of some processes, and tries to find ways to avoid them. He is convinced that in the circum-

stances, "adequate financing" will be required. In this case *unavoidably* can be interpreted as referring to both certainty and circumstantial necessity. The speaker talks about future developments, and expresses the expectation that the financing will be necessitated by the circumstances.

10.5. Adverbs of necessity in Polish

10.5.1. *Koniecznie* and *niekoniecznie*

Koniecznie expresses both deontic and dynamic modality, while *niekoniecznie* is predominantly epistemic (cf. Danielewiczowa 2012: 138). *Koniecznie* is used as an emphasizer of deontic meanings. In declarative sentences it co-occurs with verbs denoting (or implicating) obligation, necessity and volition, i.e. verbs expressing deontic and dynamic modality, such as *musieć* 'must', *powinien* 'should', *potrzebować* 'need', *żądać, wymagać* 'demand', *nalegać* 'insist', and *chcieć* 'want' (Danielewiczowa 2012: 133). Such use is illustrated in examples (48) and (49).

(48) Muszę **koniecznie** porozmawiać z nią wieczorem. (NKJP, fiction, Cz. Kuriata, *Spowiedź pamięci, Próba światła*, 1985)

   lit. 'I must **necessarily** speak to her this evening.'

(49) Chcę, chcę **koniecznie** zostać tancerką. (NKJP, fiction, A. Zaniewski, *Król tanga*, 1997)

   lit. 'I want, I want **necessarily** to become a dancer.'

Koniecznie is frequent in dialogic contexts. It is used to add emphasis to suggestions and requests formulated with the deontic verb *musieć* 'must', as in (50); as well as those formulated as imperatives, as illustrated in (51).

(50) Musisz **koniecznie** obejrzeć ten film. (NKJP, internet forum, onet.pl, 2000)

   lit. 'You must **necessarily** watch this film.'

(51) Jeśli nie wykonałeś poprzednich ćwiczeń, **koniecznie** zrób to teraz. (NKJP, coursebook, B. Danowski, *Komputer PC. Ćwiczenia praktyczne*, 2006)

lit. 'If you haven't done the previous exercises yet, **necessarily** do them now.'

The employment of *koniecznie* in suggestions and requests makes them more insistent. In positive politeness languages like Polish, such use tends to indicate a low degree of social distance between interlocutors. Recommendations of books and films emphasized with *koniecznie*, such as the one illustrated in (50), reflect the Polish cultural trait which Wierzbicka (2003: 52) summarizes as doing what the speaker thinks is good for the addressee. The aim of such behaviour is to show solidarity with the addressee. Solidarity-marking functions can also be identified in the use of *koniecznie* to express emphatic agreement and confirmation. It occurs in responses to requests for permission and suggestions, as in (52) and (53).

(52) Mamo, *możemy* dorysować Julkę? – **Koniecznie**. (NKJP, TV series transcript, *Magda M*, 2006)

   lit. 'Mum, can we also draw Julka? – **Necessarily**.'

(53) Muszę tu przywieźć kumpli z kancelarii! – **Koniecznie**. – Grzecznie uśmiechał się Klucha. (NKJP, fiction, J. Rębacz. *Zakopane: sezon na samobójców*, 2006)

   lit. 'I must bring some friends from my office! – **Necessarily**. – Klucha smiled politely.'

In both (52) and (53) *koniecznie* expresses approval for the suggestions included in the prior statements, and signals that it is obvious to the speakers that the actions should be carried out. It indicates that the speaker thinks in the same way as the addressee, and can thus be said to function as a marker of concurrence.

Niekoniecznie is used to communicate that an expected state of affairs or relation between two objects or phenomena does not always occur. Data from the National Corpus of Polish indicate that *niekoniecznie* often co-occurs with the verb *musieć* 'must' (like the positive form *koniecznie*). Such uses are illustrated in (54) and (55).

(54) Lecz film i literatura to dwa różne media, co pasuje do jednego, **_niekoniecznie musi_** pasować do drugiego. (NKJP, journalistic prose A. Kańtoch, … *i tylko cień został żywy (do filmu go!)*, 2008)

'Film and literature are two different media. What looks good in one does **_not necessarily_** have to look good in the other.'

(55) To, co jest dobre dla partii, **_niekoniecznie musi_** być dobre dla Polski. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 1995)

'What is good for the party does **_not necessarily_** have to be good for Poland.'

Like *not necessarily*, *niekoniecznie* can be used to soften an opinion, particularly when it is critical. It is used to formulate critical comments in a mitigated way to avoid offending people. It thus has face-protective functions. Such use is illustrated in (56).

(56) Adam usiłuje ją nauczyć paru europejskich potraw. Max jada więc w Mayapur pyszne kajzerki i **_niekoniecznie_** udane pączki. (NKJP, non-fiction literature, M. Cegielski, *Masala*, 2002)

'Adam has been teaching her to cook some European dishes, which is why Max has been offered some delicious bread rolls and some **_not necessarily_** good doughnuts.'

10.5.2. *Nieuchronnie* and *nieuniknienie*

Nieuchronnie and *nieuniknienie* are not classified as modal markers in Polish studies. They are usually used to signal the impossibility of escaping negative situations and changing the natural order of things, such as the passing of time, falling ill, or becoming old, as in (57) and (58).

(57) **_Nieuchronnie_** zbliża się zima. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Kot*, 2007)

'The winter is **_inevitably_** coming.'

(58) Wszystko się starzeje, **_nieuniknienie_** zdąża ku entropii, możliwości ewolucyjne gatunku homo sapiens wyczerpują się i nie ma na to rady. (NKJP, fiction, T. Konwicki, *Wiatr i pył*, 2008)

'All things become old; everything **_inevitably_** moves towards entropy; the evolutionary possibilities of homo sapiens are coming to an end and nothing can be done about it.'

In the case of *nieuniknienie*, only such non-modal uses seem to be possible. It has only a handful of occurrences in the National Corpus of Polish (see Table 21), and they all refer to unpleasant consequences which cannot be avoided. *Nieuchronnie* is more frequent, and some of its uses evidenced in the corpus signal its potential to develop a modal sense. In (59) it is used to express necessity resulting from circumstances, while in (60) it can be interpreted as an epistemic adverb.

(59) Zaawansowane ewolucyjnie ssaki mają słabo umięśniony ogon … **_Nieuchronnie_** więc funkcję płetwy ogonowej musiały przejąć tylne kończyny. (NKJP, J. Dzik, *Dzieje życia na ziemi: wprowadzenie do paleobiologii*, 1992)

'Highly developed mammals tend not to have strong tails … **_Inevitably_** then, their hind legs had to take over the functions of the tail fin.'

(60) Wydaje się, że rosnąć będzie także uznanie i wartość nie docenianego dziś malarstwa o tematyce religijnej (oto paradoks arcykatolickiego kraju) oraz orientalnej. **_Nieuchronnie_** też wzrośnie ranga – dziś ciągle jeszcze zbyt niska – malarstwa portretowego. (NKJP, P. Sażyński, *Przewodnik po rynku malarstwa*, 1999)

'It seems that the value of religious and oriental painting will grow. Today, religious painting is significantly underestimated (it's a paradox in such a religious country). **_Inevitably,_** the value of portrait paintings will grow too. At the moment, it is still too low.'

In (59) *nieuchronnie* refers to an evolutionary development which was necessitated by the circumstances. It can thus be said to express deontic meaning. However, unlike the English adverbs in the group, it only expresses necessity when it is used with the modal verb *musieć* 'must'. In (60) it signals the writer's confidence that portrait paintings will be valued more highly in the future. The writer says that it is unavoidable, but he does not provide any grounds for his opinion. *Nieuchronnie* expresses a

confident prediction, based on the writer's experience and professional knowledge. The two examples identified in the corpus signal that the adverb shows some tendency to develop modal meanings, like its English equivalent *inevitably*.

10.5.3. *Niechybnie*

Niechybnie is used to indicate that some negative situations or consequences cannot be avoided; it can also be used to express certainty that something will or would happen, with reference to both negative and neutral situations. It is a low frequency adverb. In the National Corpus of Polish it appears only in written sources, particularly in books and journalistic prose (see Table 27). Its use with reference to bad things which cannot be avoided is illustrated in examples (61)-(63).

(61) Sądzi, że następstwem grzechu jest katastrofa, która go **niechybnie** czeka. Katastrofą tą może być nieuleczalna, skryta choroba. (NKJP, fiction, A. Kępiński, *Melancholia*, 1974)

'He thinks that his sin will result in a catastrophy which **inevitably** awaits him. Perhaps some hidden incurable illness.'

(62) Gdyby próbował wydobyć się z pułapki – **niechybnie** by zginął. (NKJP, non-fiction literature, M. Jagiełło, *Wołanie w górach: wypadki i akcje ratunkowe w Tatrach*, 1979)

'If he had tried to free himself from the trap, he would have **inevitably/surely** died.'

(63) I gdyby gwardziści natychmiast nie ustawili się w szpaler, spychając tłum ku budynkowi stacji, połowa ludzi **niechybnie** dostałaby się pod koła. (NKJP, fiction, W. Horwath, *Ultra Montana*, 2005)

'Had the guardsmen not pushed the crowd towards the station building, half of the people would have **inevitably/no doubt** got under the train.'

Grochowski *et al.* (2014) classify such uses as epistemic, and do not distinguish them from the uses of *niechybnie* to refer to neutral qualities, where it more unambiguously signals certainty. In its epistemic sense *niechybnie* seems to primarily express logical necessity, i.e. logical conse-

quences of actions and processes in specific situations. Its use with reference to logical consequences seems to be an extension of its use to refer to bad consequences which cannot be avoided. Bad consequences can often be predicted, which is why in some contexts they can be considered logical, expected and thus certain. The use of *niechybnie* with reference to a semantically neutral situation which is expected to happen is illustrated in (64).

(64) Sondaże wskazują, że zwycięstwo w dzisiejszych wyborach prezydenckich w USA **niechybnie** odniesie Bill Clinton. (NKJP, journalistic prose, *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 1996)

'The polls indicate that Bill Clinton will **inevitably win/is sure to win** today's presidential election in the USA.'

The uses of *niechybnie* to refer to neutral consequences are, however, relatively infrequent in the analyzed corpus sample. In most cases it refers to negative consequences, and marks them as logical and expected.

10.5.4. *Niezawodnie*

Niezawodnie is used as an adverb of manner and an epistemic adverb. In its manner uses it means 'reliably, dependably, unfailingly', as in: *działać niezawodnie* 'to operate unfailingly'. As an extension of this meaning (if something does not fail, it is certain), it has developed the sense of epistemic certainty. *Niezawodnie* is a low frequency adverb. In the National Corpus of Polish it occurs only in written sources; most of its occurrences come from books and journalistic prose (see Table 27). It is discussed in this section because like the other adverbs examined in this chapter, it usually refers to negative developments which cannot be avoided. Examples of its use are provided in (65) and (66).

(65) Rzecz jasna, na pokład statku nie miała wstępu żadna niewiasta, **niezawodnie** bowiem przyniosłoby to żeglarzom nieszczęście. (NKJP, W. Jabłoński, *Metamorfozy*, 2005)

'Of course, no women were permitted on board the ship, as they would **inevitably** bring bad luck.'

(66) Zawsze kiedy zabierał się do roboty na łące, **niezawodnie** przychodziła ulewa. (NKJP, M. Ziomecki, *Lato nieśmiertelnych*, 2002)

'Every time he started working in the meadow, it **inevitably/un-failingly** began to rain.'

In (65) and (66) *niezawodnie* signals the impossibility of escaping bad luck. It may perhaps be said to express "quasi-logical" necessity, as people who believe in superstitions may consider it logical that good luck only comes if some rituals are performed, and bad luck comes if they are not performed. *Niezawodnie* is only loosely connected with the notion of necessity, and because of its low frequency, it is a marginal member of the category of epistemic adverbs.

10.6. Adverbs of necessity in English and Polish: summary and comparison

All the English adverbs discussed in this chapter are used to signal that some developments or consequences cannot be avoided. This primary sense can be extended to mean that the consequences are necessitated by the circumstances, which enables some of them to express deontic meanings. It may also be extended to signal that the consequences they refer to can be expected and are certain to happen, which enables some of them to express epistemic meanings.

Of all the adverbs discussed in this chapter, *not necessarily* and its Polish equivalent *niekoniecznie* are most clearly epistemic in character. They both indicate that an opinion which is expected is not always true; they can also be used as hedges enabling the speaker to formulate opinions in a non-imposing way. They are typically used to express critical views in a mitigated way, thus leaving space for negotiation. In their morphologically positive forms, *necessarily* and *koniecznie* express deontic meanings. They are both used as emphasizers in deontic contexts, where they add force to claims qualified by deontic verbs, such as *must* (Pol. *musieć*). However, the two adverbs do not express the same types of deontic meaning. *Necessarily* expresses necessity resulting from the circumstances ('out of necessity'), while *koniecznie* expresses obligation and necessity which comes from external and speaker-internal sources. It is also used in requests and suggestions (including those expressed by imperative sentences) to make them more insistent.

The other adverbs discussed in this chapter, *inevitably, unavoidably, inescapably,* and *ineluctably*, all primarily function as adverbs of manner, and only some of their uses suggest that they have additionally developed modal meanings. Such developments are particularly clear in the case of the most frequent adverb in the group, i.e. *inevitably*. It can be used to express circumstantial necessity (deontic meaning), and, less often, conformity with expectations (epistemic meaning). *Unavoidably* appears to have developed the ability to express circumstantial necessity, but there is no evidence for its use as an epistemic marker in the BNC. *Inescapably* allows for an epistemic reading in some contexts, most clearly when it functions as an emphasizer of other markers which express epistemic meanings. *Ineluctably* is the least frequent adverb in the group; the corpus data do not provide convincing evidence for its use as a modal marker.

The Polish equivalents of *inevitably,* i.e. *nieuchronnie* and *nieuniknienie,* show a smaller tendency to develop modal meanings. *Nieuniknienie* is only used as a non-modal adverb. *Nieuchronnie* is sometimes used to express circumstantial necessity and epistemic certainty, but this tendency is less pronounced than in the case of *inevitably*. *Niechybnie* expresses logical necessity and functions as an epistemic marker. *Niezawodnie* is used both as an adverb of manner and an epistemic adverb. In its epistemic sense it mostly signals that bad luck is associated with specific situations and rituals, and cannot be avoided if the rituals are not performed. It is only marginally related to the notion of necessity. Overall, the present findings indicate that Polish adverbs are less likely to express circumstantial necessity than their English counterparts.

11. Summary and conclusions

11.1. Introduction

To conduct a cross-linguistic comparison of a lexical category, one needs that category to be clearly delineated in the languages compared. In the case of modal adverbs, which form a large and heterogeneous set, it is a not a simple task. A contrastive study, such as this one, inevitably builds upon prior studies of modal markers in both languages. Anglophone research into modality is extensive, while Polish studies in the area are considerably less numerous. Some of the concerns of Anglophone studies of modal markers, such as the distinction between epistemic modality and evidentiality are merely touched upon in Polish studies. On the other hand, contrastive studies of Polish and other Slavonic languages have brought into focus the category of imperceptive modality, which is concerned with reported information. The major difference, however, regards the methodological frameworks within which modal adverbs have been examined in English and Polish. Recent years have witnessed the publication of numerous studies of English adverbs written from functionalist and cognitive perspectives (e.g. Nuyts 2001a); increased attention has also been given to their interpersonal functions (White 2003; Martin and White 2005; Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007). The processes involved in the development of modal adverbs from adverbs of manner, and the processes involved in the development of modal adverbs into discourse markers have been studied within the grammaticalization framework (e.g. Traugott 1995b; Traugott and Dasher 2002). Overall, the tendency has been to view modal adverbs as dynamic entities undergoing continuous change towards more (inter)subjective meanings.

The Polish studies of modal markers have taken a different path. Most of the recent studies of modal adverbs (Bogusławski 2003; Danielewiczowa 2008a, 2008b, 2009, 2012; Żabowska 2006, 2013; Grochowski *et al.* 2014) adopt a synchronic perspective, and focus on a detailed semantic analysis of selected items. Little attention has been given to the pragmatic properties and interpersonal functions of modal adverbs. With the exception of a few studies written in English (e.g. Hansen 2009; Hansen and Drobnjaković 2010), the development of modal adverbs has not been discussed within the grammaticalization framework. The focus on synchrony has important consequences for the treatment of modal adverbs as a category and the categorization of lexical items into parts of speech in Polish linguistics. Beginning with Wajszczuk's (e.g. 2000, 2005) works, word-class division takes as its starting point the distinction between the textual and metatextual levels of language. Adverbs which function on the textual level, e.g. manner adverbs, are classified as belonging to a different word class from the adverbs which operate on the metatextual level of language. More precisely, the items which have a metatextual character, i.e. those which comment on the content of the proposition, are not classified as adverbs, but as particles or metapredicative operators, depending on the degrees to which they are integrated with the clause. In consequence, the adverb of manner *wyraźnie* 'clearly' is considered to be distinct from and homonymic with the metapredicative operator of gradation *wyraźnie* 'clearly' (cf. Grochowski *et al.* 2014; *WSJP*). In this way, the relationship between the manner sense of *wyraźnie* and its epistemic meaning is blurred; the two meanings are studied in isolation. What is more, the superlative form of *wyraźnie*, i.e. *najwyraźniej*, has developed an inferential meaning which is different from the meaning expressed by the metapredicative operator *wyraźnie*, and, in consequence, it is classified as a distinct unit: an epistemic particle. Thus, from a synchronic perspective, *wyraźnie* (adverb of manner), *wyraźnie* (metapredicative operator of gradation), and *najwyraźniej* (epistemic particle) are three distinct items. This approach has been adopted, among others, in the most recent dictionary of Polish (*WSJP: Wielki Słownik Języka Polskiego* online). The aims and concerns of Anglophone and Polish research into modal adverbs are thus quite different, and the findings obtained are often difficult to compare.

11.2. The inventories of modal adverbs in English and Polish

To compare the repertoires of modal adverbs in English and Polish, I proposed a division based on their semantic and functional properties. It draws from a number of existing typologies and was intended as a compromise between the classifications and terminological distinctions used in Anglophone and Polish studies. Modal adverbs are divided into seven categories: reportive, inferential, confirmatory, argumentative, epistemic emphasizers, low confidence adverbs, and adverbs of necessity. The resulting typology is summarized in Table 24. The adverbs are listed according to their frequencies in the British National Corpus and the National Corpus of Polish.

Table 24. The inventories of modal adverbs in English and Polish

English adverbs	Polish adverbs
REPORTIVE ADVERBS	
reportedly	*podobno*
allegedly	*ponoć*
supposedly	*jakoby*
reputedly	*rzekomo*
avowedly	*podobnież*
apparently	*niby*
INFERENTIAL ADVERBS	
clearly	*wyraźnie*
obviously	*widocznie*
evidently	*najwyraźniej*
plainly	*jawnie*
seemingly	*najwidoczniej*
manifestly	*ewidentnie*
patently	*najoczywiściej*
apparently	
CONFIRMATORY ADVERBS	
of course	*oczywiście*
indeed	*rzeczywiście*
naturally	*faktycznie*
	istotnie
	naturalnie

English adverbs	Polish adverbs
ARGUMENTATIVE ADVERBS	
admittedly	niewątpliwie
arguably	bez wątpienia
assuredly	bezsprzecznie
undoubtedly	bezapelacyjnie
unquestionably	bezspornie
undeniably	bezdyskusyjnie
indisputably	niezaprzeczalnie
indubitably	niepodważalnie
unarguably	niezaprzeczenie
incontrovertibly	niekwestionowanie
incontestably	
EPISTEMIC EMPHASIZERS	
certainly	na pewno
surely	pewnie
definitely	zapewne
no doubt	z pewnością
doubtless	zdecydowanie
decidedly	pewno
for sure	
for certain	
LOW CONFIDENCE ADVERBS	
perhaps	może
maybe	chyba
probably	być może
likely	prawdopodobnie
possibly	przypuszczalnie
conceivably	bodaj
presumably	bodajże
	raczej
ADVERBS OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL AND/OR LOGICAL NECESSITY	
(not)necessarily	(nie)koniecznie
inevitably	niechybnie
unavoidably	nieuchronnie
inescapably	niezawodnie

The rather neat and orderly appearance of the typology presented in Table 24 may suggest that all the categories are homogeneous and have clearly defined boundaries. This, however, is not the case. Most modal adverbs are polysemous and polyfunctional; items representing different categories can be observed to express similar meanings, and perform similar discourse functions. However, there are also considerable semantic and functional similarities within the groups.

The first six categories comprise markers of epistemic modality; some of them additionally express evidential meanings. The last group, i.e. adverbs of necessity, is the least uniform one. It comprises items which express epistemic necessity as well as those which have deontic meanings (circumstantial necessity); some of them are only marginally modal in character. It is also the least uniform category from a cross-linguistic perspective. The English and Polish adverbs which have been placed in this category express different types of necessity. The seven categories of modal adverbs are summarized briefly below.

a. Reportive adverbs

Of all the categories of modal adverbs discussed in this work, reportive adverbs show the most considerable cross-linguistic differences with respect to their forms and etymology. In English, most reportive adverbs (with the exception of *apparently*) derive from past participles, while in Polish only one reportive adverb, *rzekomo,* derives from a verb: *rzec* 'to say' (*WSJP*). The same type of difference has been observed by Celle (2011: 24) regarding English and French adverbs, which may suggest that it concerns more languages. What is more, the relation between *rzekomo* and *rzec* is less apparent than in the case of the English adverbs because the Polish verb has become archaic. *Reportedly, allegedly* and *avowedly* derive from past participles of illocutionary verbs: *report, allege* and *avow*; *supposedly* and *reputedly* derive from past participles of epistemic verbs: *suppose* and *repute*. Thus, the English adverbs explicitly communicate that the claims they qualify report what other people say or think. The relation to a semantically neutral verb of reporting enables the adverb *reportedly* to qualify information which comes from official and scientific reports – a function which none of the Polish adverbs can perform. With the exception of *apparently*, all the English reportive adverbs are primarily attested

in the written sections of the BNC. Data from the National Corpus of Polish suggest that Polish reportive adverbs, with the exception of *rzekomo* and *jakoby*, are more frequent in speech or have similar frequencies in speech and in writing.

In both languages reportive adverbs can be divided into those which tend to express alignment-neutral attribution (Eng. *reportedly, reputedly, apparently*; Pol. *podobno, podobnież, ponoć*), and those which usually perform distancing and countering functions (Eng. *allegedly, supposedly, avowedly*; Pol. *rzekomo, jakoby, niby*). In Polish, reported information is additionally expressed by the reportive verb *mieć*, which expresses alignment-neutral attribution and is used as a translation equivalent of most English reportive adverbs in the parallel corpus. All the reportive adverbs are used to disclaim responsibility for reported information and thus protect the speaker's face in case it turns out not to be true.

b. Inferential adverbs

Both English and Polish have adverbs which express "inferences proper", i.e. conclusions which are directly based on available evidence, as well as those which express conjectures, i.e. conclusions which are loosely based on evidence, and involve more subjective judgements. Adverbs expressing evidence-based inferences are more numerous in both languages. In English, they include: *clearly, evidently, obviously, patently, plainly,* and *manifestly*; in Polish: *wyraźnie, ewidentnie, jawnie, najwyraźniej,* and *najwidoczniej*. Conjectures are expressed by *seemingly* and *apparently* in English, and by *widocznie* in Polish.

In both languages inferential adverbs express two types of inference: synchronous and retrospective. The two terms have been adapted from Plungian (2001). As understood in this work, synchronous inference is an opinion based on close observation of easily perceptible evidence. It refers to "the signs" which the speaker can see in front of him/her. Retrospective inference is a conclusion involving deduction; it results from an analysis of results and symptoms, and is formulated from a temporal or mental distance. The two evidential meanings are characterized by different degrees of subjectivity. Synchronous inference is more content-oriented, while retrospective inference is more speaker-oriented and is thus more subjective. The two meanings are illustrated in examples (1) and (2),

earlier quoted in Chapter 5. The sentence in (1) exemplifies synchronous inference; the example quoted in (2) illustrates retrospective inference.

(1) He was ***evidently*** in pain.
(2) ***Evidently***, the builders had finished and gone home early. (*LDOCE* online)

Data from the BNC indicate that all English inferential adverbs can be used to express both types of inference, but the less frequent ones, i.e. *patently* and *manifestly,* are usually used to indicate synchronous inference. In Polish, however, each adverb typically expresses one type of inference. *Wyraźnie, ewidentnie* and *jawnie* are typically markers of synchronous inference, while *widocznie, najwyraźniej, najoczywiściej* and *najwidoczniej* qualify retrospective inference. Most adverbs indicating synchronous inference function as emphasizers, or markers of pronouncement, to use Martin and White's (2005) term: by communicating that the evidence is clearly perceptible and unambiguous, they add force to the claims they modify. *Seemingly* and *apparently* function as downtoners, i.e. they signal that the easily perceptible evidence is deceptive, thus diminishing the force of the qualified claims.

In English, inferential adverbs tend to develop the ability to express conformity with expectations, and function as markers of concurrence, i.e. they are used to establish common ground with the addressee, and signal that the speaker expects the addressee to share his/her view. This function is particularly clear in the case of *obviously*. Such use is exemplified in (3), quoted earlier in Chapter 5 as (46).

(3) Many of our existing volunteers have families and jobs and are often very busy. You don't have to make a firm commitment but ***obviously*** we like you to give us some idea of your availability. This is so we can respond effectively to the needs of our clients. (BNC, A00 90-92)

Clearly and *evidently* also show such developments, but in their case, the tendency is less pronounced. In Polish, inferential adverbs do not exhibit the tendency to develop the sense of expectations; they do not function as concurrence markers.

c. Confirmatory adverbs

Both languages have confirmatory adverbs which signal conformity with expectations (Eng. *of course, naturally*; Pol. *oczywiście, naturalnie*); and adverbs which confirm the validity of prior claims (Eng. *indeed*; Pol. *rzeczywiście, istotnie, faktycznie*). The adverbs which signal accordance with expectations perform similar functions in English and Polish. *Of course* and *oczywiście* mark claims as expected, obvious and to be taken for granted, while *naturally* and *naturalnie* signal that a state of affairs is expected in a specific situation because it is in agreement with the natural order of things.

Adverbs used to confirm prior claims are more numerous in Polish; English has one such adverb, *indeed*. However, *indeed* is polyfunctional and shows a high degree of grammaticalization. It functions as an emphasizer, a confirmatory adverb and a discourse marker with connective functions. Its textual functions include marking analogy, reformulation, reinforcement and antithesis (compare Quirk *et al.* 1985: 634-636). *Rzeczywiście, faktycznie* and *istotnie* are used to confirm prior claims; *faktycznie* additionally performs reformulatory and reinforcing functions.

d. Argumentative adverbs

Argumentative adverbs are used to construct arguments in persuasive discourse; they are mostly found in written monologic genres. English has argumentative adverbs which are morphologically positive (*admittedly, arguably, assuredly*), as well as those which are morphologically negative (*undoubtedly, unquestionably, undeniably, indisputably, indubitably, unarguably, incontrovertibly, incontestably*). In Polish, all argumentative adverbs are negative in form (*niewątpliwie, bez wątpienia, bezsprzecznie, bezapelacyjnie, bezspornie, bezdyskusyjnie, niezaprzeczalnie, niepodważalnie, niezaprzeczenie, niekwestionowanie*). The construction of persuasive arguments involves the acknowledgement of alternative views, which is why argumentative adverbs are often used to express "conceding concurrence", as Martin and White (2005) put it, i.e. they signal agreement with a view which is different from the one argued by the speaker/writer, only to prepare the ground for a counter-claim. Data from both monolingual corpora indicate that argumentative adverbs are usually used to signal agreement with claims which are uncontroversial, easy to verify and those which represent generally held views. The negative argumentative adverbs are numerous in both languages, but they are all low-frequency items.

e. Epistemic emphasizers

In monologic genres epistemic emphasizers are used to add emphasis to a part of a proposition; in dialogic contexts, they express emphatic agreement and disagreement, signal solidarity with addressees or are used to challenge them. *Definitely, decidedly* and their Polish equivalent *zdecydowanie* are primarily markers of degree. The other adverbs in the group, i.e. *certainly, for sure, for certain, surely, no doubt,* and *doubtless* (and *na pewno, z pewnością, zapewne, pewnie, pewno* in Polish) seem to show what Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007) term the "erosion of the meaning of epistemic certainty". *No doubt, doubtless* and the Polish adverbs *zapewne, pewnie,* and *pewno* express a smaller degree of certainty than their literal meanings suggest. They are used to express expectations, and to make assumptions about the state of affairs and about the addressee. *Certainly, for sure, for certain* and their Polish equivalents *na pewno* and *z pewnością* are typically used as focalizers and agreement markers, while *surely* is confrontational and challenging. Other epistemic adverbs, particularly the inferential and argumentative ones, are also used to add emphasis to claims, but it is not their primary function.

f. Low confidence adverbs

Low confidence adverbs indicate the speaker's openness to alternative voices. Some of them indicate that one dialogic position is as equally probable as alternative views (Eng. *perhaps, maybe, possibly,* and *conceivably*; Pol. *może, być może, bodaj,* and *bodajże*); others signal that one dialogic position is the most likely one, but they do not close the space for alternative positions (Eng. *probably, likely,* and *presumably*; Pol. *prawdopodobnie, przypuszczalnie, chyba,* and *raczej*).

Perhaps, maybe and *possibly* show a high degree of intersubjectivity; they are frequent in dialogic contexts, and function as markers of politeness. In Polish there is only one adverb, *może*, which shows a comparable degree of intersubjectivity, and is used as a marker of politeness. *Być może, bodaj* and *bodajże* are more formal and typically occur in monologic gen-

res. The adverbs which signal the most likely alternative are less often used as markers of politeness. *Probably, likely,* are *presumably* also have dialogic uses, e.g. they express assumptions concerning the addressee's knowledge (*probably*), and are used to ask for confirmation (*presumably*). Their Polish equivalents *prawdopodobnie* and *przypuszczalnie* do not have such dialogic uses. *Chyba* is frequent in dialogic contexts, where it is confrontational and challenging like *surely*.

g. Adverbs of necessity

The items subsumed under the heading of adverbs of necessity constitute the least uniform set, particularly when viewed from a cross-linguistic perspective. Three English adverbs, *necessarily, inevitably* and *unavoidably,* can be used to express the deontic notion of necessity resulting from circumstances. In Polish, two adverbs express deontic necessity: *koniecznie* and *nieuchronnie. Koniecznie,* however, does not express circumstantial necessity, but obligation. It can also express dynamic modality (volition). *Nieuchronnie* is occasionally used to express circumstantial necessity, but in most of its uses, it functions as an adverb of manner. The Polish adverb *niechybnie* expresses epistemic necessity; it signals what is logically necessary in specific situations.

Additionally, *not necessarily* and its Polish equivalent *niekoniecznie* express epistemic meanings; they signal that a claim is not always true, which makes them useful as hedges when the speaker wishes to express an opinion in a mitigated way. In some contexts, *inevitably* expresses the epistemic sense of conformity with expectations. The small size of the group and the fact that most of the adverbs which express necessity also express other meanings suggests that the deontic sense of necessity is primarily expressed by non-adverbial markers in the two languages.

11.3. Functions of modal adverbs: a summary

11.3.1. Ideational functions

Halliday (2004: 29) uses the term "ideational" to refer to the function of language which is connected with naming things "thus construing them into categories". Most modal adverbs in English and Polish express epistemic meanings, i.e. they signal degrees of certainty and doubt. This

seems to be their major ideational function. Some of them have additional meanings, e.g. they signal reported information (e.g. Eng. *reportedly*, Pol. *podobno*), inference (e.g. Eng. *clearly*, Pol. *najwyraźniej*), and expectations (e.g. Eng. *of course*, Pol. *oczywiście*). A small group of adverbs express deontic meanings: circumstantial necessity (*necessarily, inevitably,* Pol. *nieuchronnie*), obligation (Pol. *koniecznie*), and logical necessity (Pol. *niechybnie*).

11.3.2. Interpersonal functions

The interpersonal function involves taking positions towards claims expressed by the interlocutors, and, in monologic contexts, towards different voices signalled in the text (cf. White 2003; Halliday 2004; Martin and White 2005). Modal adverbs are used to acknowledge alternative voices; they express agreement or disagreement with them. Some modal adverbs are dialogically expansive, i.e. they encourage alternative views, while others are dialogically contractive, i.e. they discourage alternative voices (cf. White 2003; Martin and White 2005). Generally speaking, low confidence adverbs are more likely to be dialogically expansive because they explicitly signal that the speaker is not certain; high confidence adverbs are more likely to be dialogically contractive, as they indicate that the speaker favours one specific alternative. The discourse functions of modal adverbs are, however, often different from what is suggested by their literal meanings (cf. Biber and Finegan 1988).

The low confidence adverbs which signal the speaker's openness to alternative views function as important elements of linguistic manifestations of politeness. In dialogic contexts, *perhaps, maybe* and their Polish equivalent *może* are used to offer the addressee some alternative for consideration. This property makes them useful in requests, invitations, offers and suggestions. *Possibly* mainly occurs in polite requests. In Polish, requests and other speech-acts which are potentially threatening to the addressee's face tend to be expressed in a more straightforward way, or they contain markers of politeness which do not occur in English, such as diminutive forms of nouns, adjectives and adverbs. The low confidence adverbs which show a smaller degree of readiness to accept alternative views, such as *probably*, are used to express opinions in a non-imposing way. The ones which express a higher degree of certainty are used to

emphasize agreement and disagreement with the interlocutor (e.g. Eng. *certainly, of course, indeed*, Pol. *oczywiście, pewnie, pewno, zapewne*). By emphasizing agreement and signalling that some things are to be taken for granted (e.g. the use of *of course* to respond to 'thank you'), they help the speaker to build solidarity with the addressee. They may also be used to challenge the addressee, e.g. *surely*, and Pol. *chyba*. The Polish adverb *koniecznie* is also used to add emphasis to requests and suggestions, to make them more insistent.

In monologic genres, modal adverbs are used to interact with different opinions signalled in the text. Confirmatory adverbs such as *indeed* (and Pol. *rzeczywiście, faktycznie, istotnie*) are used to confirm, and thus agree with, other claims. Argumentative adverbs, epistemic emphasizers and low confidence adverbs are frequently used in concessive contexts. They signal agreement with one claim, and enable the speaker to move to a counter-claim. In this way, they are used to balance claims and construct persuasive arguments. The function of balancing claims is particularly characteristic of *admittedly* and *undeniably* (see Chapter 7). Emphasizing and downtoning adverbs also express intersubjective meanings. They are used to express emphatic agreement and disagreement with positions expressed by other speakers. Reportive adverbs such as *supposedly, allegedly*, and *avowedly* (Pol. *rzekomo, jakoby*) function as downtoners; when used in front of qualities which are reported or declared to be true, e.g. *supposedly liberal, allegedly animal-friendly, avowedly apolitical*, they undermine their validity.

11.3.3. Textual functions

Textual functions involve indicating connections between parts of discourse, and "creating cohesion and continuity" (Halliday 2004: 30). Modal adverbs combine their interpersonal functions with textual ones, and perform numerous connective functions which Quirk *et al.* (1985) identify for non-modal conjuncts and subjuncts. Their textual character is confirmed by the use of non-epistemic expressions as their translation equivalents in the parallel corpus. In this study, the greatest range of connective uses has been identified for *indeed*. Its textual functions overlap with those performed by equative, reformulatory, reinforcing and antithetic conjuncts (see Chapter 6). Its Polish translation equivalents in such

cases include: *a także* 'as well as', *a nawet* 'and even', and *ależ* emphatic confrontational 'but'. Reinforcing uses are also possible for *probably* and *likely* (e.g. "hundreds or *probably* thousands"). *Certainly, for sure,* and *for certain* have focusing (particularizing) functions, i.e. they signal that certainty applies particularly to a specific part of the proposition. *Admittedly* has concessive functions; it is typically used to connect two claims, and to signal agreement with one of them. The functional equivalent of *admittedly* in the parallel corpus is the conjunction *wprawdzie* 'while', which, as suggested by its literal meaning 'in truth' also has epistemic roots. *Perhaps* can be used as an appositional conjunct meaning 'for example'.

The Polish adverb *chyba* frequently co-occurs with the subordinator *że*; *chyba że* is used as a conjunction meaning 'unless'. *Jakoby* is used as a subordinator ('that'). It is a reportive adverb and when used as a subordinator, it introduces a reported claim which is marked as untrue (e.g. *nieprawdą jest, jakoby …* 'it is not true that …'). *Bodaj* functions as an appositional conjunct ('for example'); it also has focusing functions ('at least'). *Faktycznie* is functionally similar to *indeed*. Both adverbs can be used to mean 'in fact', which enables them to function as connective markers. Like *indeed, faktycznie* is used to reinforce a prior statement, and to expand a claim by introducing an analogous one.

11.4. Intersubjectification and grammaticalization

As demonstrated by Traugott and Dasher (2002), Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007), and Traugott (e.g. 2014) modal adverbs have developed their modal meanings as a result of grammaticalization, or, more specifically, as a result of (inter)subjectification. Breban (2006), Visconti (2013) and Narrog (2014) have also argued for the need to give more recognition to textual developments of modal markers, which tend to follow their intersubjective developments. The current meanings expressed by modal adverbs can be arranged on a cline from non/less subjective to more subjective, intersubjective and, finally, textual (cf. Traugott 2014; Narrog 2014). The non-subjective meanings of modal adverbs are connected with their uses as adverbs of manner (e.g. *to speak clearly*, Pol. *mówić wyraźnie*). Their subjective meanings are connected with the expression of the speaker's epistemic stance, i.e. the speaker's judgement

concerning the probability of a claim, while their intersubjective meanings are associated with indicating attention to the addressee's stance (asking for confirmation, making assumptions about the addressee, signalling agreement and common ground, countering). Many of the most frequent adverbs combine their (inter)subjective functions with textual ones, and serve connective functions, while at the same time expressing the speaker's stance towards the arguments they connect.

Generally speaking, Polish modal adverbs seem to show a greater resistance to intersubjectification than their English counterparts. This tendency can be illustrated with reference to inferential adverbs. Most inferential adverbs in English have developed the sense of expectations, and function as concurrence markers, indicating the common ground between the speaker and the addressee. *Obviously* has also developed textual functions, and is used to signal the priority of some arguments over others. In Polish, inferential adverbs do not have such intersubjective or textual uses. The same is true about low confidence adverbs. *Perhaps, probably,* and *presumably* are used both in monologic and dialogic genres. They are used to express the speaker's stance, and to signal attention to the stances of the addressee (questions, assumptions). The Polish adverbs *być może, prawdopodobnie,* and *przypuszczalnie* rarely occur in dialogic contexts; they are typically used in monologic genres to express the speaker's stance. In Polish, the subjective and intersubjective meanings tend to be performed by different groups of adverbs. While *być może, prawdopodobnie* and *przypuszczalnie* typically occur in monologic genres, adverbs such as *chyba*, *zapewne, pewnie,* and *pewno* are more likely to express intersubjective meanings, and occur in dialogic contexts. English adverbs are more likely to combine the different functions.

11.5. Subjuncts and disjuncts redefined

Modal adverbs typically function as disjuncts and subjuncts, to use Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) terms. In their textual uses, they also function as conjuncts. However, as observed by Hasselgård (2010: 23), the category of subjuncts is rarely distinguished in English grammar. Of the major reference grammars, only Quirk *et al.* (1985) make the distinction between disjuncts and subjuncts, but the authors themselves admit that in the case of some items,

the two uses may be difficult to separate. Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) distinction between subjuncts and disjuncts seems to be unpopular for two reasons: (1) their definitions are not entirely clear; (2) the same items can function as subjuncts and disjuncts in different contexts, which, when combined with the former argument, makes the two types difficult to distinguish. Disjuncts are said to have a superior role to the rest of the sentence; they function as sentence adverbials. Subjuncts are said to have "a subordinate role … in comparison with other clause elements" (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 566), and typically "relate specifically to an individual element or even to a constituent of an element" rather than the entire clause (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 568). However, the authors also distinguish wide orientation and narrow orientation subjuncts, and note that wide orientation subjuncts can have the entire clause in their scope. This is the most problematic element of the distinction. Wide orientation subjuncts are difficult to distinguish from disjuncts. Quirk *et al.* (1985) write that "it is doubtless easier to appreciate the subordinateness of the role in relation to the subjuncts of narrow orientation". I would like to argue that if the two categories were redefined, they would be more useful in the study of adverbial functions. The distinction is particularly helpful in the analysis of inferential adverbs because the two functions correspond to two different types of inference they express. As noted in Chapters 2 and 5, a similar distinction is made in Polish linguistics (particles vs. metapredicative operators), which makes Quirk *et al.*'s (1985) typology useful from a cross-linguistic perspective.

Synchronous inference is usually expressed by adverbs modifying sentence elements, while retrospective inference is expressed by sentence adverbs. The two types of inference are illustrated in examples (4) and (5), on the basis of the uses of *clearly* (see also Chapter 5).

(4) The boy was going to the boxroom and was ***clearly*** excited at possessing a room of his own for the first time. (BNC, A6N 1294)

(5) You might anticipate that dust from space accounts for the mare infills, but this is not the case. By the time the mare impacts occurred there would probably have been too little dust available to fill the maria. Moreover, infall alone would not level the mare floors. It is therefore proposed that the mare infills are the result of dust migrating into the mare basins from elsewhere on the Moon.

Such migration need not disturb the uniformity of the dust type across the lunar surface. **Clearly**, the dust must have been far less mobile on the lunar farside. (BNC, GW6 991-996)

In (4) *clearly* expresses synchronous inference, as the speaker is making a conclusion based on "the signs" that he can see in front of him. In this sentence *clearly* is an emphasizer; it functions in an area which is intermediate between speaker- and content-related meanings. It is also a subjunct, as it modifies a sentence element, i.e. the subject complement *excited*. It emphasizes the clarity of the evidence, and communicates how the speaker interprets it. In (5) *clearly* expresses retrospective inference, i.e. the speaker's assessment of the situation based on available evidence and deduction. It is more subjective in the sense that it more clearly expresses the speaker's judgement. It is also a disjunct, as it has the entire sentence in its scope.

The distinction between subjuncts and disjuncts would be clearer if subjuncts were classified as items which only modify sentence elements and their constituents, the ability to modify clauses being the function of disjuncts. With reference to modal adverbs, the two categories could be redefined in the following way:

a. Subjuncts relate to individual sentence elements (and their constituents); they are more integrated with the clause than disjuncts. Modal subjuncts are less subjective than modal disjuncts; they function in an area which is intermediate between speaker- and content-related meanings. A characteristic position for subjuncts is before the sentence element they relate to, e.g. before a subject complement, as in (4).

b. Disjuncts have the entire proposition in their scope. Modal disjuncts express the speaker's stance towards the proposition, and may also have intersubjective functions. They show a smaller degree of integration with the clause than subjuncts, and are typically (though not exclusively) used sentence initially and before the finite verb.

If defined in this way, the categories of subjuncts and disjuncts can be more fruitfully employed in the analysis of different meanings expressed by English modal adverbs, their functions, as well as their degrees of (inter)subjectivity. The sentence-initial position "is a preferred locus for processes of grammaticalization" (Auer 1996: 297); it is also a position occu-

pied by discourse markers (Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007: 87). As noted by Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer (2007: 86), the position before the finite verb allows the adverb "to emphasize the truth of the proposition as a whole in focusing on its turning point, the finite". The two positions are the ones where adverbs are most likely to express subjective meanings. The position after the finite verb is more likely to activate the content-related meanings of modal adverbs. Some modal adverbs are almost exclusively used as subjuncts, e.g. the inferential adverbs *manifestly* and *patently*, the emphasizers *definitely* and *decidedly*, and the reportive adverb *avowedly*, while others are frequently used in both functions, e.g. *clearly, obviously,* and *apparently*. In the case of adverbs which are used both as subjuncts and disjuncts, the change of function often results in the change of meaning, e.g. *apparently* and *seemingly* are downtoners when used as subjuncts, i.e. they signal that the qualities they refer to are deceptive. When used as disjuncts, they functions as markers of retrospective inference. The distinction is thus helpful in the identification of their meanings.

11.6. Cross-cultural insights from the cross-linguistic comparison

11.6.1. Modal adverbs and politeness

The analysis of modal adverbs conducted in this work offers some insights into cross-cultural differences between English and Polish politeness strategies. As noted by Ogiermann (2009: 38), it is possible to classify cultures into those which put more emphasis on positive politeness and those in which negative politeness is more important. English is associated with negative politeness, while Polish is a positive politeness language. This cross-linguistic and cross-cultural difference is noticeable in the use of low confidence adverbs in polite requests, offers, suggestions, invitations, etc. in the two languages. In English three adverbs are used to lessen the potential threat to the addressee's face: *maybe, perhaps* and *possibly*, while in Polish only one adverb has this function: *może*. In polite requests the modal adverbs usually co-occur with the modal auxiliaries to make the speech-act less direct. In Polish, indirectness is perceived as less

important in polite speech (Lubecka 2000; Marcjanik 2008; Ogiermann 2009); more emphasis is given to indicating a low degree of social distance between interlocutors. The distance is reduced by the use of diminutive forms of nouns, adjectives and adverbs, which are very frequent in Polish, particularly in colloquial speech. The role of modal adverbs is thus less significant in Polish politeness strategies than it is in English.

Another cross-cultural difference concerns the use of the adverb *koniecznie* 'necessarily' in requests, suggestions and recommendations. The addition of *koniecznie* makes those speech-acts more direct and more insistent. However, it also signals a low degree of social distance between discourse participants, which may be perceived as something positive in Polish culture. As noted by Wierzbicka (2003: 52), the Polish cultural tradition often involves doing what the speaker thinks is good for the addressee. Recommendations and advice emphasized with *koniecznie* seem to reflect this cultural trait. For instance, by adding *koniecznie* to a book recommendation, as in *Koniecznie musisz przeczytać tę książkę* lit. 'you must necessarily read this book', the speaker signals that s/he wants the addressee to enjoy the book as much as s/he enjoyed it.

11.6.2. Modal adverbs and the cultural heritage of English and Polish

In Chapter 1, I noted a difference of opinion between Nuyts (2001a) and Wierzbicka (2006) concerning cross-linguistic parallels in the uses of modal adverbs. In Nuyts's (2001a: 56) view, the class of epistemic adverbs is "remarkably comparable" across languages (Nuyts examined English, Dutch and German adverbs), while in Wierzbicka's (2006: 247) view, English "has a much larger repertoire of epistemic (sentential) adverbs than other European languages". Wierzbicka (2006) separates epistemic adverbs, such as *probably, clearly,* and *undoubtedly* from modal particles, such as *perhaps, maybe,* and *surely.* The former are more monologic and speaker-oriented, while the latter are more dialogic and addressee-oriented. Nuyts (2001a) puts them in one category. Wierzbicka argues that the repertoire of epistemic adverbs (when separated from particles) is larger in English than in other languages, because the philosophy of the Enlightenment with its emphasis on the limitations of human knowledge has had a greater impact on English culture and the English language than on other languages.

The contrastive analysis conducted in this work confirms some of the points made by Wierzbicka, but not all of them. The inventories of English and Polish epistemic adverbs, as presented in Table 24 (including both epistemic adverbs and interactive particles), seem to be of a similar size, though not all the categories are equally numerous in the two languages. However, as illustrated in Table 25, English has more adverbs which are etymologically related to illocutionary verbs and mental state verbs, and such adverbs rarely develop the functions of interactive particles or markers of politeness.

Table 25. English and Polish adverbs related to illocutionary verbs and mental state verbs

Verb types	English adverbs	Polish adverbs
illocutionary verbs	*reportedly* *allegedly* *avowedly* *arguably* *admittedly* *assuredly* *unquestionably* *undeniably* *indisputably* *unarguably* *incontrovertibly* *incontestably*	*bezsprzecznie* *bezapelacyjnie* *bezspornie* *bezdyskusyjnie* *niezaprzeczalnie* *niepodważalnie* *niezaprzeczenie* *niekwestionowanie* *rzekomo*
mental state verbs	*supposedly* *reputedly* *conceivably* *presumably* *undoubtedly* *indubitably*	*przypuszczalnie* *niewątpliwie* *bez wątpienia*

In Polish, adverbs related to illocutionary and mental state verbs are almost exclusively argumentative (speech-act adverbs and *niewątpliwie* 'undoubtedly'). One of them, *przypuszczalnie*, is a low confidence adverb, and one (*rzekomo*) is a reportive adverb. In English, such items are more frequent among reportive and low confidence adverbs. The development of

a rich set of adverbs related to illocutionary and mental state verbs may, indeed, have been influenced by the cultural heritage of the English language.

However, many English adverbs, including those formed from past participles of mental state verbs, such as *presumably*, show a tendency to develop intersubjective meanings and dialogic uses. More often than their Polish equivalents, they develop the sense of expectations and are used to ask for confirmation, as illustrated in examples (6) and (7), already quoted in Chapters 3 and 9.

(6) ***Presumably*** Meryl invited him … ? (BNC, C8D 2953)

(7) But … but you don't agree with them, ***obviously***? (BNC, HHA 2243).

They also function as emphasizers in interrogative sentences, as in (8), also quoted in Chapter 10.

(8) How can the Secretary of State ***conceivably*** claim that Her Majesty's inspectorate is to be strengthened when its numbers are to be cut by two thirds and it is to be subject to clear and specific direction from the Secretary of State? (BNC, HHV 1343)

Even if epistemic adverbs do not occur in questions, they are not only used to express the speaker's stance, but they also appear in direct references to the addressee, as evidenced by their use with the second person pronoun, illustrated in (9) and (10).

(9) You ***clearly*** see the importance of this point. It does you credit. (BNC, AN8 2199-2200)

(10) You ***probably*** can't wait any longer. It's a good enough excuse that you need to check for gaffs, but the real reason for dry-assembly is to see what this hitherto fictitious table looks like. (BNC, A0X 1368-1369)

English modal adverbs often function as discourse markers (cf. Aijmer 2009), and a strict separation of epistemic adverbs from modal particles does not seem to be possible. It is perhaps possible in the case of negative argumentative adverbs, such as *indisputably* and *undeniably*, but such adverbs are monologic in Polish as well.

Another characteristic of "Anglo" culture noted by Wierzbicka (2006, 2010) is the emphasis it places upon the notion of evidence, which she considers to be one of the key cultural concepts in English. If this claim is true, its importance is likely to be noticeable in the use of evidential adverbs. English has a rich repertoire of evidential (reportive and inferential) adverbs. English reportive adverbs, particularly *reportedly*, but also *allegedly*, can be said to indicate the importance of empirically verifiable evidence. *Reportedly* can be used to signal the source of scientific data and findings; *allegedly* is used to communicate that the speaker disclaims responsibility for a claim which s/he has not verified. Their use can be interpreted as indicating the importance of evidence and precision of speech. Polish reportive adverbs are mainly used to qualify hearsay information and signal that its truth value is questionable. They are all rather colloquial (see Chapter 4).

Inferential adverbs are more numerous in English. In English, eight adverbs can be used to express inference; in Polish there are seven of them, but two originated as the superlative forms of other inferential adverbs: *najwyraźniej<wyraźnie*; *najwidoczniej<widocznie*. While *najwyraźniej* and *wyraźnie* tend to express different types of inference (*najwyraźniej* expresses retrospective inference; *wyraźnie* usually expresses synchronous inference), *najwidoczniej* and *widocznie* do not. They are treated as distinct markers even though they seem to only differ in the degrees of confidence they express. In a less synchronically oriented description than the one found in current Polish linguistics, they could be considered as different uses of the same adverb, like *clearly* and *most clearly*. The frequencies of English inferential adverbs are higher than those of their Polish equivalents, though in large corpora, such as the BNC and the NKJP, their manner meanings cannot be easily separated from their evidential uses, and the exact number of occurrences of their modal meanings is difficult to establish in both languages. The high frequency of *obviously* also results from the fact that it has developed the sense of expectations, and acquired new functions (concurrence marker). The large inventory of evidential adverbs may perhaps be interpreted as an indication of the importance which evidence plays in "Anglo" discourse.

11.7. Suggestions for further research

A cross-linguistic analysis of the entire category of modal adverbs offers a necessarily brief treatment of the properties and functions of individual items in the group. Some of the adverbs, particularly the less frequent ones whose uses are poorly evidenced in the analyzed corpora, can be more fruitfully examined on the basis of other sources. This study has primarily focused on the English adverbs and their translation equivalents in Polish; a focus on the Polish adverbs and their translation equivalents in English is likely to bring complementary results, particularly those concerning cross-categorial correspondences. This study has demonstrated that the meanings expressed by some English adverbs are expressed by verbs in Polish, e.g. reportive adverbs often correspond to the reportive verb *mieć* in Polish translations, while the adverbs *seemingly* and *apparently* correspond to the verbal phrases *wydaje się* and *zdaje się* 'it seems, it appears'. On the other hand, the Polish adverbs *może* and *chyba* appear in contexts where English uses verbs and verbal phrases; *może* corresponds to the auxiliary *may*; *chyba* corresponds to *I think*. Translations show that categorial differences also concern cross-linguistic parallels between adverbs and adjectives. The sense of obviousness expressed by English inferential adverbs, such as *obviously* and *manifestly*, is expressed by phrases containing the adjective *oczywisty* 'obvious' in Polish, e.g. *w sposób oczywisty* 'in an obvious way'. Such differences are likely to be more numerous, and could be revealed by more extensive studies concerning specific categories of modal adverbs as well as individual items. Contrastive studies involving more languages could be conducted to identify the types of modal meanings associated with specific categories of modal markers in different languages.

Another interesting area for future cross-linguistic research is the use of modal and non-modal adverbs as markers of politeness. This study reveals that some interpersonal functions which are characteristic of modal adverbs in English are performed by non-modal adverbs and other non-modal items in Polish. The identification of the pragmatic functions performed by such modal and non-modal equivalents is likely to enable identification of the properties which allow lexical items to develop meanings associated with politeness.

References

Adamska, Irmina. 2004. "*Oczywiście* 'of course' and *rzeczywiście* 'indeed' – two different types of evidential markers in Polish: a relevance-theoretical account". In: Henryk Kardela, William J. Sullivan and Adam Głaz (eds.). *Perspectives on Language.* Lublin: Wydawnictwo M. Curie-Skłodowskiej, 9–21.

Ädel, Annelie. 2010. Just to give you kind of a map of where we are going: A taxonomy of meta discourse in spoken and written academic English. *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 9(2): 69–97.

Ädel, Annelie. 2014. "What I want you to remember is..." Audience orientation in monologic academic discourse. In: Lieselotte Brems, Lobke Ghesquière and Freek Van de Velde (eds.). *Intersubjectivity and Intersubjectification in Grammar and Discourse. Theoretical and Descriptive Advances.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 101–127.

Aijmer, Karin. 1997. "*I think* – an English modal particle". In: Toril Swan and Olaf Jansen Westvik (eds.). *Modality in Germanic Languages.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1–47.

Aijmer, Karin. 2002. *English Discourse Particles. Evidence from a Corpus.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Aijmer, Karin. 2007a. "The interface between discourse and grammar: *The fact is that*". In: Agnès Celle and Ruth Huart (eds.). *Connectives as Discourse Landmarks.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 31–46.

Aijmer, Karin. 2007b. "Modal adverbs as discourse markers. A bilingual approach to the study of *indeed.*" In: Jochen Rehbein, Christiane Hohenstein and Lukas Pietsch (eds.). *Connectivity in Grammar and Discourse.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Aijmer, Karin. 2009. "Does English have modal particles?" In: Andrew Kehoe and Antoinette Renouf (eds.). *Corpus Linguistics: Refinements and Reassessments.* New York/Amsterdam: Rodopi, 111–130.

Aijmer, Karin. 2013. "Analyzing modal adverbs as modal particles and discourse markers". In: Liesbeth Degand, Bert Cornillie and Paola Pietrandrea (eds.). *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. Categorization and Description.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 89–106.

Aijmer, Karin. 2016. "Modality and mood in functional linguistic approaches". In: Jan Nuyts and Johan van der Auwera (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Modality and Mood.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 495–513.

Aijmer, Karin, Bengt Altenberg and Mats Johansson. 1996. "Text-based contrastive studies in English. Presentation of a Project". In: Karin Aijmer, Benght Altenberg and Mats Johansson (eds.). *Languages in Contrast. Papers from a Symposium on Text-*

based Cross-linguistic Studies in Lund, 4-5 March 1994. Lund: Lund University Press, 73–85.

Aijmer, Karin and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen. 2004. A model and a methodology for the study of pragmatic markers: the semantic field of expectation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36 (10): 1781–1805.

Aijmer, Karin and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen (eds). 2006. *Pragmatic Markers in Contrast.* Oxford: Elsevier.

Aijmer, Karin and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen. 2009. "Discourse markers". In: *Handbook of Pragmatics* online. John Benjamins.

Aikhenvald, AlexandraY. 2003. "Evidentiality in typological perspective". In: Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R.M.W. Dixon (eds.). *Studies in Evidentiality.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1–31.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. "Evidentiality in grammar". In: Keith Brown (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics.* Oxford: Elsevier, 320–325.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2007. Information source and evidentiality: what can we conclude? *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 19: 209–227.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2018. "Evidentiality. The framework". In: Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–36.

Alonso-Almeida, Francisco. 2015. On the mitigating function of modality and evidentiality. Evidence from English and Spanish medical research papers. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 12 (1): 33–57.

AnderBois, Scott. 2014. On the exceptional status of reportative evidentials. *Proceedings of SALT 24*: 234–254.

Andersen, Gisle. 2000. *Pragmatic Markers and Sociolinguistic Variation.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Anderson, Lloyd B. 1986. "Evidentials, paths of change, and mental maps: Typologically regular asymmetries". In: Wallace Chafe and Johanna Nichols (eds.). *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology.* Norwook, NJ: Ablex, 273-312.

Angermüller, Johannes. 2013. "Discourse analysis in Europe". In: Bonnafous Simone and Malika Temmar (eds.). *Discourse Analysis and Human and Social Sciences.* Bern: Peter Lang, 9–24.

Antaki, Charles and Margaret Wetherell. 1999. Show concessions. *Discourse Studies* 1(1): 7–27.

Auer, Peter. 1996. The pre-front field in spoken German and its relevance as a grammaticalization position. *Pragmatics* 6 (3): 295–322.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. (1981 [1935]). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays.* Edited by M. Holquist, translated by C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bally, Charles. (1965 [1932]). *Linguistique générale et linguistique française* (4th edn). Berne: Francke.

Bańko, Mirosław. 2012. *Wykłady z polskiej fleksji.* Warszawa: PWN.

Barron, Anne and Klaus P. Schneider. 2014. "Discourse pragmatics: signposting a vast field". In: Anne Barron and Klaus P. Schneider (eds.). *Pragmatics of Discourse.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 1–33.

Bartmiński, Jerzy and Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska. 2012. *Tekstologia.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Beeching, Kate. 2002. *Gender, Politeness and Pragmatic Particles in French.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Beeching, Kate. 2012. "Semantic change. Evidence from false friends". In: Peters Lauwers, Gudrun Vanderbauwhede and Stijn Verleyen (eds.). *Pragmatic Markers and Pragmaticalization. Lessons from False Friends.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 11–36.

Bellert, Irena. 1971. Niektóre postawy modalne w interpretacji semantycznej wypowiedzeń. *Sesja Naukowa Międzynarodowej Komisji Budowy Gramatycznej Języków Słowiańskich w Krakowie w dniach 3-5 grudnia 1969 roku, Prace Komisji Słowianoznawstwa* 23: 155–169.

Bellert, Irena. 1977. On semantic and distributional properties of sentential adverbs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 337–351.

Benveniste, Émile. 1966. *Problèmes de Linguistique Générale.* Paris: Gallimard.

Biber, Douglas and Edward Finegan. 1988. Adverbial stance types in English. *Discourse Processes* 11(1): 1–34.

Biber, Douglas and Edward Finegan. 1989. Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text* 9 (1): 93–124.

Biber, Douglass, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English.* Harlow: Longman.

Birecka, Karolina. 2005. "Analiza wybranych czasowników nakazu". http://www.sknj.ifp. uni.wroc.pl/publikacje/b01.pdf.

Bogusławski, Andrzej. 1971. O tzw. modalności zdaniowej. *Sesja Naukowa Międzynarodowej Komisji Budowy Gramatycznej Języków Słowiańskich w Krakowie w dniach 3-5 grudnia 1969 roku, Prace Komisji Słowianoznawstwa* 23: 123–128.

Bogusławski, Andrzej. 1977. Z problematyki wyrażeń epistemicznych. *Sprawozdania Towarzystwa Naukowego w Toruniu* 29: 63–65.

Bogusławski, Andrzej. 2003. "*Może* i *być może*". In: Jadwiga Linde-Usiekniewicz and Romuald Huszcza (eds.). *Prace językoznawcze dedykowane Profesor Jadwidze Sambor.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Wydziału Polonistyki UW, 11–43.

Bogusławski, Andrzej and Jan Wawrzyńczyk. 1993. *Polszczyzna jaką znamy (Nowa sonda słownikowa).* Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Bonami, Olivier and Danièle Godard. 2008. "Lexical semantics and pragmatics of evaluative adverbs". In: Louise Mc Nally and Christopher Kennedy (eds.). *Adjectives and Adverbs: Syntax, Semantics, and Discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 274–304.

Boniecka, Barbara. 1976. O pojęciu modalności (przegląd problemów badawczych). *Język Polski* 56 (2): 99–110.

Boniecka, Barbara. 1998. "Tekst potoczny a dyskurs". In: Jerzy Bartmiński and Barbara Boniecka (eds.). *Tekst. Problemy teoretyczne*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Skłodowskiej-Curie, 45–62.

Boniecka, Barbara. 1999. Wykład o modalności. *Annales UMCS* Sectio FF Vol. XVII: 7–29.

Boryś, Wiesław. 2006. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Boye, Kasper. 2012. *Epistemic Meaning. A Crosslinguistic and Functional-Cognitive Study*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Boye, Kasper. 2018. "Evidentiality: The notion and the term". In: Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 261–272.

Boye, Kasper and Peter Harder. 2013. "Grammaticalization and pragmatics". In: *Handbook of Pragmatics* online. John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075./hop.17.gra1.

Bralczyk, Jerzy. 1978. *O leksykalnych wyznacznikach prawdziwościowej oceny sądów*. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.

Bréal, Michel. 1897. *Essai de sémantique*. Paris: Hachette (Eng. trans. *Semantics: Studies in the Science of Meaning*. New York: Dover. 1965)

Breban, Tine. 2006. "Grammaticalization and subjectification of the English adjectives of general comparison". In: Angelika Athanasiadou, Costas Canakis and Bert Cornillie (eds.). *Subjectification: Various Paths to Subjectivity*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 241–278.

Brinton, Laurel J. 1996. *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brinton, Laurel J. 2008. *The Comment Clause in English: Syntactic Origins and Pragmatic Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bromhead, Helen. 2009. *The Reign of Truth and Faith. Epistemic Expressions in 16th and 17th Century English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bulygina T. V. and A. D. Šmelev. 1993. "Kommunikativnaja modal'nosť: konstatacija vozmožnosti, gipotezy i kvazi-soobščenija". In: Giusti F. Fici and S. Signorini (eds.). *Kategorija skazuemogo v slavjanskich jazykach: modal'mosť' i aktualizacija*. Akty meždunarodnoj konferencii Certosa di Pontignano 26-29.03.1992. München.

Bulygina T. V. and A. D. Šmelev. 1997. *Jazykovaja konceptualizacija mira (na materiale russkoj grammatiki)*. Moscow.

Buttler, Danuta. 1978. *Rozwój semantyczny wyrazów polskich*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Bybee, Joan L. and William Pagliuca. 1985. "Cross-linguistic comparison and the development of grammatical meaning". In: Jacek Fisiak (ed.). *Historical Semantics and Historical Word-formation*. Berlin: Mouton, 59–84.

Bybee, Joan L., Revere Perkins and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bybee, Joan and Suzanne Fleischman. 1995. "Modality in grammar and discourse. An introductory essay". In: Joan Bybee and Suzanne Fleischman (eds.). *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1–14.

Byloo, Pieter, Richard Kastein and Jan Nuyts. 2007. "On *certainly* and *zeker*". In: Mike Hannay and Gerard J. Steen (eds.). *Structural-functional Studies in English Grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 35–57.

Celle, Agnès. 2009. "Hearsay adverbs and modality". In: Raphael Salkie, Pierre Busuttil and Johan der Auwera (eds.). *Modality in English: Theory and Description*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 269–293.

Celle, Agnès. 2011. "The intersubjective function of modal adverbs. A contrastive English-French study of adverbs in journalistic discourse". In: Karin Aijmer (ed.). *Contrastive Pragmatics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 23–36.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1986. "Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing". In: Wallace L. Chafe and Johanna Nichols (eds.). *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwook, NJ: Ablex, 261–272.

Coates, Jennifer. 1983. *The Semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries*. London/Canberra: Croom Helm.

Coates, Jennifer. 1990. Modal meaning: The semantics-pragmatics interface. *Journal of Semantics* 7: 53–63.

Coates, Jennifer. 1995. "The expression of root and epistemic possibility in English": In: Joan Bybee and Suzanne Fleischman (eds.). *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 56–66.

Cornillie, Bert. 2007. On the continuum between lexical and grammatical evidentiality. Evidence from Spanish. *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 19 (1): 108–129.

Cornillie, Bert. 2009. Evidentiality and epistemic modality: on the close relationship of two different categories. *Functions of Language* 16 (1): 44–32.

Cornillie, Bert. 2010. "An interactional approach to epistemic and evidential adverbs in Spanish conversation". In: Gabriele Diewald and Elena Smirnova (eds.). *Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European Languages*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 309–330.

Cornillie, Bert. 2018. On speaker commitment and speaker involvement. Evidence from evidentials in Spanish talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 128: 161–170.

Cornillie, Bert and Paola Pietrandrea. 2012. Modality at work. Cognitive, interactional and textual functions of modal markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44 (15): 2109–2115.

Cornillie, Bert and Pedro Gras. 2015. On the interactional dimension of evidentials: The case of the Spanish evidential discourse markers. *Discourse Studies* 17(2): 141–161.

Cribb, Michael. 2012. Semantic and pragmatic miscues in non-native spoken extended discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 71–82.

Culioli, Antoine. 1995. *Cognition and Representation in Linguistic Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cyran, Władysław. 1967. *Przysłówki polskie. Budowa słowotwórcza*. Łódź: Łódzkie Towarzystwo Naukowe.

Danielewiczowa, Magdalena. 2002. *Wiedza i niewiedza. Studium polskich czasowników epistemicznych*. Warszawa: Katedra Lingwistyki Formalnej Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Danielewiczowa, Magdalena. 2008a. Opis przysłówków epistemicznych jako wyzwanie teoretyczne. *Prace Filologiczne* vol. LIV. *Seria Językoznawcza*: 47–62.

Danielewiczowa, Magdalena. 2008b. Jak nie należy opisywać przysłówków epistemicznych? *Wiener Slawitischer Almanach* 72. *Lexikalishe Evidenzialitäts-Marker in slavischen Sprachen:* 109–128.

Danielewiczowa, Magdalena. 2009. *Ewentualnie* jako semantyczny równoważnik pewnego warunku, ewentualnie pewnej alternatywy. *Linguistica Copernicana* 1(1): 77–92.

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

Davies, Norman. 2005. *God's Playground. A History of Poland. Vol. II. 1795 to the Present*. Revised edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie, Clare Cook, Jeffrey Muehlbauer and Ryan Waldie. 2017. (De-) constructing evidentiality. *Lingua* 186-187: 21–54.

Degand, Liesbeth, Bert Cornillie and Paola Pietrandrea (eds.). 2013a. *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. Categorization and Description*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Degand, Liesbeth, Bert Cornillie and Paola Pietrandrea. 2013b. "Modal particles and discourse markers: Two sides of the same coin?" In: Liesbeth Degand, Bert Cornillie and Paola Pietrandrea (eds.). *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. Categorization and Description*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1–18.

De Haan, Ferdinand. 1998. *The Category of Evidentiality*. Unpublished ms., University of New Mexico.

De Haan, Ferdinand. 1999. Evidentiality and epistemic modality: Setting boundaries. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 18: 83–101.

Delancey, Scott. 2001. "The mirative and evidentiality". In: Patrick Dendale and Liliane Tasmowski (eds.). *Evidentiality. Special Issue of Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 369–382.

De Smet, Hendrik and Jean-Christophe Verstraete. 2006. Coming to terms with subjectivity. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17: 365–392.

Diewald, Gabriele. 2006. "Discourse particles and modal particles as grammatical elements." In: Kerstin Fischer (ed.). *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 403–425.

Diewald, Gabriele. 2011. Pragmaticalization (defined) as grammaticalization of discourse functions. *Linguistics* 49(2): 365–390.

Diewald, Gabriele. 2013. "'Same same but different' – Modal particles, discourse markers and the art (and purpose) of categorization". In: Liesbeth Degand, Bert Cornillie and Paola Pietrandrea (eds.). *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. Categorization and Description*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 19–45.

Diewald, Gabriele and Elena Smirnova. 2010a. "Introduction. Evidentiality in European languages: the lexicogrammatical distinction". In: Gabriele Diewald and Elena Smirnova (eds.). *Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European Languages*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1–14.

Diewald, Gabriele and Elena Smirnova. 2010b (eds.). *Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European Languages*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dostie, Gaétane. 2004. *Pragmaticalisation et marqueurs discursifs. Analyse sémantique et traitement lexicographique*. Bruxelles: De Boeck and Larcier, Editions Ducoulot.

Downing, Angela. 2001. Surely you knew! *Surely* as a marker of evidentiality and stance. *Functions of Language* 8: 251–282.

Downing, Angela. 2006. "The English pragmatic marker *surely* and its functional counterparts in Spanish". In: Karin Aijmer and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen (eds.). *Pragmatic Markers in Contrast*. Oxford: Elsevier, 39–58.

Downing, Angela. 2009a. "From manner adverb to stance marker. *Surely,* (inter)subjectivity and English cultural norms". In: Rhonwen Bowen, Mats Mobärg and Söve Ohlander (eds.). *Corpora and Discourse – and Stuff: Papers in Honour of Karin Aijmer*. Göteborg: University of Göteborg, 13–22.

Downing, Angela. 2009b. *Surely* as a marker of dominance and entitlement in the crime fiction of P.D. James. *Brno Studies in English* 35: 79–92.

Downing, Angela and Philip Locke. 2006. *English Grammar. A University Course* (2nd edn) [first published 1992]. London/New York: Routledge.

Duszak, Anna. 1997. "Cross-cultural academic communication: a discourse-community view". In: Anna Duszak (ed.). *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 11–39.

Duszak, Anna. 1998. *Tekst, dyskurs, komunikacja językowa*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Duszak, Anna and Grzegorz Kowalski. 2013. *Systemowo-funkcjonalna analiza dyskursu*. Kraków: Universitas.

Dyvik, Helge. 1998. "A translational basis for semantics." In: Stig Johansson and Signe Oksefjell (eds.). *Corpora and Cross-linguistic Research: Theory, Method and Case Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 51–86.

Dyvik, Helge. 2004. "Translations as semantic mirrors: from parallel corpus to wordnet". In: Karin Aijmer and Bengt Altenberg (eds.). *Advances in Corpus Linguistics. Papers from the 23rd International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 311–326.

Erman, Britt and Ulla-Britt Kotsinas. 1993. Pragmaticalization: The case of *ba'* and *you know*. *Studier i modern språkvetenskap* 10: 76–93.

Ernst, Thomas. 2009. Speaker-oriented adverbs. *Natural and Linguistic Theory* 27 (3): 497–544.

Facchinetti, Roberta. 2009. "Subjectivity, (non-)subjectivity and intersubjectivity". In: Anastasios Tsangalidis and Roberta Facchinetti (eds.). *Studies on English Modality in Honour of Frank Palmer*. Bern: Peter Lang, 53–68.

Faller, Martina. 2002. *Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Cuzco Quechua. PhD dissertation*. Department of Linguistics. Stanford University, at: http://personal-pages.manchester.ac.uk/staff/martina.t.faller/documents/thesis-a4.pdf.

Faller, Martina. 2017. Reportative evidentials and modal subordination. *Lingua* 186-187: 55–67.

Finegan, Edward. 1995. "Subjectivity and subjectivisation: An introduction". In: Dieter Stein and Susan Wright (eds.). *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation in Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–15.

Fischer, Kerstin. 2000. *From Cognitive Semantics to Lexical Pragmatics. The Functional Polysemy of Discourse Particles*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fischer, Kerstin (ed.). 2006a. *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Fischer, Kerstin. 2006b. "Towards an understanding of the spectrum of approaches to discourse particles: introduction to the volume". In: Kerstin Fischer (ed.). *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1–20.

Fischer, Kerstin. 2014. "Discourse markers". In: Klaus P. Schneider and Anne Barron (eds.). *Pragmatics of Discourse*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 271–294.

Fisiak, Jacek, Maria Lipińska-Grzegorek and Tadeusz Zabrocki. 1978. *An Introductory English-Polish Contrastive Grammar*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Foolen, Ad. 1996. "Pragmatic particles". In: *Handbook of Pragmatics* online. John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/hop2.pra3.

Fox, Barbara A. 2001. Evidentiality: Authority, responsibility, and entitlement in English conversation. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11(2): 167–192.

Fraser, Bruce. 1990. An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 383–95.

Fraser, Bruce. 1996. Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics* 6 (2):167–190.

Fraser, Bruce. 1999. What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics* 31: 931–952.

Fryer, Daniel Lees. 2013. "Exploring the dialogism of academic discourse: Heteroglossic engagement in medical research articles". In: Gisle Andersen and Kristin Bech (eds.). *English Corpus Linguistics: Variation in Time, Space and Genre*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi, 183–207.

Gerhardt, Julie. 1985. On the use of *will* and *gonna*. Toward a description of activity types for child language. *Discourse Processes* 8: 143–75.

Gerhardt, Julie. 1990. The relation of language to content in children's speech. The role of *hafta* statements in structuring 3-year-olds' discourse. *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics* 4 (1/2): 1–57.

Gil-Salom, Luz and Carmen Soler-Monreal. 2009. Interacting with the reader: Politeness strategies in engineering research article discussions. *International Journal of English Studies. Special Issue*: 175–189.

Głowiński, Michał. 1988. "Dyskurs". In: Janusz Sławiński (ed.). *Słownik terminów literackich*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Goffman, Erving. 1972 [1955]. "On face-work: an analysis of ritual elements in social interaction". In: John Laver and Sandy Hutcheson (eds.). *Communication in Face to Face Interaction: Selected Rreadings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 319–346.

Grabias, Stanisław. 1994. *Język w zachowaniach społecznych*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Greenbaum, Sidney. 1969. *Studies in English Adverbial Usage*. London: Longman.

Grochowski, Maciej. 1984. Program metodologiczny opisu partykuł. *Sborník Prací Filosofické Fakulty Brněnské University A* 32: 77–88.

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

Grochowski, Maciej. 1986b. On the syntactic properties of particles (with special reference to Polish). *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 33: 7–16.

Grochowski, Maciej. 1989. "Preliminaries for semantic description of Polish particles". In: Harald Weydt (ed.). *Sprechen mit Partikeln*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 77–84.

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

Grochowski, Maciej. 2002. "Właściwości linearne partykuł modalnych a struktura tematyczno-rematyczna wypowiedzenia". In: Janusz Siatkowski (ed.). *Z polskich studiów slawistycznych seria 10, Językoznawstwo*. Warszawa: Komitet Słowianoznawstwa PAN, 89–98.

Grochowski, Maciej. 2008. "O cechach syntaktycznych i semantycznych wyrażeń *widać, widocznie, najwidoczniej* (na tle kategorii ewidencjonalności)". In: Björn Wiemer and Vladimir A. Plungian (eds.). *Lexicalische Evidenzialitäts-Marker in slavischen Sprachen (Wiener Slawistischer Almanach* 72). München-Wien: Verlag Otto Sagner, 129–148.

Grochowski, Maciej. 2009. Miejsce partykuł w systemie części mowy. Historia i współczesność (na przykładzie języka polskiego). *Sprawozdania z czynności i posiedzeń Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności* LXXI (2007): 20–37.

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

Grzegorczykowa, Renata. 1975. *Funkcje semantyczne i składniowe polskich przysłówków*. Wrocław/Warszawa/Kraków/Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich Wydawnictwo PAN.

Grzegorczykowa, Renata. 1998. "Przysłówek". In: Renata Grzegorczykowa, Roman Laskowski and Henryk Wróbel (eds.). *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia*. Warszawa: PWN, 524-535.

Grzegorczykowa, Renata. 2007. *Wstęp do językoznawstwa*. Warszawa: PWN.

Grzegorczykowa, Renata. 2010. *Wprowadzenie do semantyki językoznawczej* (4th edn). Warszawa: PWN.

Grzegorczykowa, Renata, Roman Laskowski and Henryk Wróbel (eds.). 1998. *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia* (2nd edn). Warszawa: PWN.

Halliday, Michael A.K. 1970. Functional diversity in language as seen from a consideration of modality and mood in English. *Foundations of Language* 6: 322–361.

Halliday, Michael A. K. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd edn revised by Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen). London: Hodder Arnold.

Hanks, William F. 2012. Evidentiality in social interaction. *Pragmatics and Society* 3:2. (*Special Issue on Evidentiality in Interaction*): 169–180.

Hansen, Björn. 1998. Powstanie i rozwój słów modalnych w języku polskim. *Poradnik Językowy* 1-2: 25–43.

Hansen, Björn. 2009. "Modals and the boundaries of grammaticalization: The case of Russian, Polish and Serbian-Croatian". In: Walter Bisang, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann and Bjön Wiemer (eds.). *What Makes Grammaticalization?: A Look from its Fringes and its Components*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 245–270.

Hansen, Björn and Petr Karlik (eds.). 2005. *Modality in Slavonic Languages*: *New Perspectives*. München: Sagner.

Hansen, Björn and Ana Drobnjaković. 2010. Polish in the light of grammaticalization theory. *Cognitive Studies/Études Cognitives* 10: 35–51.

Harris, Zelig S. 1952. Discourse analysis. *Language* 28 (1):1–30.

Hasselgård, Hilde. 2006. "'Not now'– On non-correspondence between the cognate adverbs *now* and *nå*". In: Karin Aijmer and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen (eds.). *Pragmatic Markers in Contrast*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 93–113.

Hasselgård, Hilde. 2010. *Adjunct Adverbials in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haumann, Dagmar. 2007. *Adverb Licensing and Clause Structure in English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Heliasz, Celina. 2012. *Przysłówkowe wykładniki ograniczania dostępu do wiedzy o działaniach*. Warszawa: Wydział Polonistyki Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Hengeveld, Kees. 1988. Illocution, mood and modality in a functional grammar of Spanish. *Journal of Semantics* 6: 227–269.

Hennemann, Anja. 2013. *A Context-Sensitive and Functional Approach to Evidentiality in Spanish or Why Evidentiality Needs a Superordinate Category*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Holmes, Janet. 1982. Expressing doubt and certainty in English. *RELC Journal* 13 (2): 9–28.

Holmes, Janet. 1983. "Speaking English with the appropriate degree of conviction". In: Christopher Brumfit (ed.). *Learning and Teaching Languages for Communication: Applied Linguistics Perspectives*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research, 100–113.

Holmes, Janet. 1988. *Of course*: a pragmatic particle in New Zealand's women's and men's speech. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 2: 49–74.

Honowska, Maria. 1984. *Prawdopodobnie* (Przyczynek do teorii aktu mowy). *Polonica* 10: 121–131.

Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horn, Larry. 1972. *On the Semantic Properties of Logical Operators in English*. Bloomington: Mimeo Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Hoye, Leo Francis. 1997. *Adverbs and Modality in English*. London/New York: Longman.

Hoye, Leo Francis. 2009. "Modality in discourse: The pragmatics of epistemic modality". In: Anastasios Tsangalidis and Roberta Facchinetti (eds.). *Studies on English Modality in Honour of Frank Palmer*. Bern: Peter Lang, 99–131.

Hryniewicz, Janusz. T. 2004. *Polityczny i kulturowy kontekst rozwoju gospodarczego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, Ken and John Milton. 1997. Qualification and certainty in L1 and L2 students' writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 6 (2): 183–205.

Jakubowska, Ewa. 1999. *Cross-cultural Dimensions of Politeness in the Case of Polish and English*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Jaszczolt, Katarzyna M. 2009. *Representing Time. An Essay on Temporality as Modality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jaszczolt, Katarzyna M. 2011. "Contrastive analysis". In: Jan-Ola Östman and Jef Verschueren (eds.). *Pragmatics in Practice*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 111–117.

Jędrzejko, Ewa. 1987. *Semantyka i składnia polskich czasowników deontycznych*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Jodłowski, Stanisław. 1971. *Studia nad częściami mowy*. Warszawa: PWN.

Jodłowski, Stanisław. 1976. *Podstawy polskiej składni*. Warszawa: PWN.

Jucker, Andreas H. and Yael Ziv. 1998. "Discourse markers: Introduction". In: Andreas H. Jucker and Yael Ziv (eds.). *Discourse Markers. Description and Theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kakietek, Piotr. 1980. *English Modal Auxiliaries and their Equivalent Constructions in Polish*. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.

Kärkkäinen, Elise. 2003. *Epistemic Stance in English Conversation. A Description of its Interactional Functions, with a Focus on I think*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kiseleva, K. L. and Deni Pajar. 1998. *Diskursivnye slova: opyt kontekstno-semantičeskogo analiza*. Moskva.

Kiss, É. Katalin. 2009. "Introduction". In: Katalin É. Kiss (ed.). *Adverbs and Adverbial Adjuncts at the Interfaces*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1–18.

Klemensiewicz, Zenon. 1963. *Zarys składni polskiej*. Warszawa: PWN.

Klinge, Alex. 1995. On the linguistic interpretation of contractual modalities. *Journal of Pragmatics* 6: 649–675.

Kokorniak, Iwona and Małgorzata Fabiszak. 2014. "Grammaticalization of Polish mental predicate prefixes". In: Sylvie Hancil and Ekkehard König (eds.). *Grammaticalization – Theory and Data*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 109–128.

Korytkowska, Małgorzata and Roman Roszko. 1997. *Modalność imperceptywna. Gramatyka konfrontatywna bułgarsko-polska* vol. 6, part 1, Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy.

Koseska-Toszewa, Violetta. 1978. Relacje modus-tempus w języku bułgarskim na tle języka polskiego. *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej* XVII: 289–298.

Koseska-Toszewa, Violetta, Viara Maldžieva and Jordan Pencev. 1996. *Modalność. Problemy teoretyczne. Gramatyka konfrontatywna bułgarsko-polska* vol. 6, part 1, Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy, Instytut Slawistyki Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1977. "What 'must' and 'can' must and can mean". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1(1): 337–355.

Kronning, Hans. 2003. "Modalité et énidentialité." In: Merete Birkelund, Gerhard Boysen and Poul Søren Kjaersgaard (eds.). *Aspects de la modalité*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 131–151.

Krzeszowski, Tomasz. 1984. "Tertium comparationis". In: Jacek Fisiak (ed.). *Contrastive Linguistics. Prospects and Problems*. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers.

Krzeszowski, Tomasz P. 1990a. *Contrasting Languages: The Scope of Contrastive Linguistics*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Krzeszowski, Tomasz. P. 1990b. "Prototypes and equivalence". In: Jacek Fisiak (ed.). *Further Insights into Contrasive Analysis*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 29–46.

Krzyżyk, Danuta. 2008. *Synonimia pojęć prawdziwościowych – teoria i nauczanie*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Labocha, Janina. 1996. "Tekst, wypowiedź, dyskurs". In: Stanisław Gajda and Mieczysław Balowski (eds.). *Styl a tekst*. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski, 49–53.

Lakoff, George. 1973. Hedges: A study in meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 2: 458–508.

Langacker, Ronald. W. 1985. "Observations and speculations on subjectivity". In: John Haiman (ed.). *Iconicity in Syntax. Proceedings of a Symposium on Iconicity in Syntax, Stanford, June 24-26, 1983*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 49–90.

Langacker, Ronald. W. 1990. Subjectification. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1.1: 5–38.

Langacker, Ronald. 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. II. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, Ronald. W. 2002. "Deixis and subjectivity". In: Frank Brisard (ed.). *Grounding: The Epistemic Footing of Deixis and Reference*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1–28.

Laskowski, Roman. 1998. "Zagadnienia ogólne morfologii". In: Renata Grzegorczykowa, Roman Laskowski and Henryk Wróbel (eds.). *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia*. Warszawa: PWN, 27–86.

Lazard, Gilbert. 2001. On the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 359–367.

Lee-Wong, Song Mei. 1999. *Politeness and Face in Chinese Culture*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Lehmann, Christian. 1995 [1982]. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization. A Programmatic Sketch*. (Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien-Projekts 48). Munich: Lincom Europa.

Lehmann, Christian. 2008. "Information structure and grammaticalization". In: Elena Seoane and Maria José López Couso (eds.). *Theoretical and Empirical Issues in Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 207–229.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Barbara. 2007. "Polysemy, prototypes, and radial categories". In: Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuykens (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 139–169.

Lewis, Diana M. 2003. Rhetorical motivations for the emergence of discourse particles, with special reference to English *of course*. In: Ton van der Wouden, Ad Foolen, and Piet Van de Craen (eds.). *Particles. Special Issue of Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 16: 79–91.

Lewis, Diana M. 2006. "Discourse markers in English: A discourse-pragmatic view". In: Kerstin Fischer (ed.). *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 43–59.

Lewis, Diana M. 2011. A discourse-constructional approach to the emergence of discourse markers in English. *Linguistics* 49 (2): 415–443.

Lewis, Diana M. 2014. Discourse patterns in the development of discourse markers in English. *Functions of Language* 21 (1): 95–118.

Liao, Silvie. 2009. Variation in the use of discourse markers by Chinese teaching assistants in the US. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41 (7): 1313–1328.

Ligara, Bronisława. 1997. *Polskie czasowniki modalne i ich francuskie ekwiwalenty tłumaczeniowe*. Kraków: Universitas.

Lubecka, Anna. 2000. *Requests, Invitations, Apologies and Compliments in American English and Polish. A Cross-cultural Communication Perspective*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.

Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Łapa, Romana. 2003. *Predykatywne wyrażenia modalne z bezokolicznikiem we współczesnej polskiej prasie*. Poznań: Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne.

Macaulay, Ronald K. S. 1995. The adverbs of authority. *English World-Wide* 16: 37–60.

Majsak, T. A. and S. G. Tatevosov. 2000. Prostranstvo govorjaščego v kategorijach grammatiki, ili Cego nel/zja skazat' o sebe samom. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 5: 68–80.

Marcjanik, Małgorzata. 1997. *Polska grzeczność językowa*. Kielce: WSP.

Marcjanik, Małgorzata. 2008. *Grzeczność w komunikacji językowej*. Warszawa: PWN.

Marcjanik, Małgorzata. 2009. *Mówimy uprzejmie. Poradnik językowego savoir-vivre'u*. Warszawa: PWN.

Marín-Arrese, Juana I. 2009. "Commitment and subjectivity in the discourse of a judicial inquiry". In: Raphael Salkie, Pierre Busuttil and Johan der Auwera (eds.). *Modality in English: Theory and Description*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 237–268.

Marín-Arrese, Juana I., Gerda Haßler and Marta Carretero (eds.). 2017. *Evidentiality Revisited*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamims.

Martin, James Robert and David Rose. 2003. *Working with Discourse: Meaning beyond the Clause*. New York/London: Continuum.

Martin, James Robert and Peter R. R. White. 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. London/New York: Palgrave.

Matthewson, Lisa. 2011. "On apparently non-modal evidentials". In: Olivier Bonami and Patricia Cabredo Hofherr (eds.). *Emprical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics* 8. http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss8/index_en.html, 333–357.

McCready, Eric and Norry Ogata. 2007. Evidentiality, modality and probability. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 30(2): 147–206.

Milewski, Tadeusz. 1969. *Językoznawstwo*. Warszawa: PWN.

Misz, Henryk. 1968. Dodatkowe wyznaczniki intelektualne ze stanowiska formalnosyntaktycznego. *Slavia Occidentalis* 27: 147–151.

Mitchell, Mark L., Janina M. Jolley and Robert R. O'Shea. 2003. *Writing for Psychology*. Wadsworth: Cengage Learling.

Mortelmans, Tanja. 2007. "Modality in Cognitive Linguistics". In: Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuykens (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 869–889.

Mortensen, Janus. 2012. "Subjectivity and intersubjectivity as aspects of epistemic stance marking". In: Nicole Baumgarten, Inke Du Bois and Juliane House (eds.). *Subjectivity in Language and in Discourse*. Bingley: Emerald, 229–246.

Mosegaard Hansen, Maj-Britt. 1998. *The Function of Discourse Particles: A Study with Special Reference to Spoken Standard French*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mushin, Ilana. 2012. "Watching for witness": Evidential strategies and epistemic authority in Garrwa conversation. *Pragmatics and Society* 3:2. (*Special Issue on Evidentiality in Interaction*): 270–293.

Mushin, Ilana. 2013. Making knowledge visible in discourse: Implications for the study of linguistic evidentiality. *Discourse Studies* 15 (5): 627–645.

Müller, Simone. 2005. *Discourse Markers in Native and Non-native English Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Myhill, John. 1995. Change and continuity in the functions of the American English modals. *Linguistics* 33: 157–211.

Myhill, John. 1997. *Should* and *ought*: The rise of individually oriented modality in American English. *Journal of English Linguistics* 1: 3–23.

Nagórko, Alicja. 2007. *Zarys gramatyki polskiej*. Warszawa: PWN.

Nagórko, Alicja. 2012. *Podręczna gramatyka języka polskiego*. Warszawa: PWN.

Narrog, Heiko. 2005. On defining modality again. *Language Sciences* 27.2: 165–192.

Narrog, Heiko. 2012. *Modality, Subjectivity, and Semantic Change. A Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Narrog, Heiko. 2014. "Beyond intersubjectification. Textual uses of modality and mood in subordinate clauses as part of speech-act orientation". In: Lieselotte Brems, Lobke Ghesquière and Freek Van de Velde (eds.). *Intersubjectivity and Intersubjectification in Grammar and Discourse. Theoretical and Descriptive Advances*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 29–51.

Narrog, Heiko. 2015. (Inter)subjectification and its limits in secondary grammaticalization. *Language Sciences* 47: 148–160.

Nida, Eugene A. 2001. *Language and Culture: Contexts in Translating*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nuckolls, Janis. B. 2018. "The interactional and cultural pragmatics of evidentiality in Pastaza Quichua". In: Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 202–221.

Nuckolls, Janis and Lev Michael. 2014. "Introduction. Evidentials and evidential strategies in interactional and socio-cultural contexts". In: Janis Nuckolls and Lev Michael (eds.). *Evidentiality in Interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 13–20.

Nuyts, Jan. 2001a. *Epistemic Modality, Language, and Conceptualization: A Cognitive-Pragmatic Perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nuyts, Jan. 2001b. Subjectivity as an evidential dimension in epistemic modal expressions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 383–400.

Nuyts, Jan. 2006. "Modality: Overview and linguistic issues". In: William Frawley (ed.). *The Expression of Modality*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1–26.

Nuyts, Jan. 2007. "Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics". In: Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuykens (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 543–565.

Nuyts, Jan. 2014. "Notions of (inter)subjectivity". In: Lieselotte Brems, Lobke Ghesquière and Freek Van de Velde (eds.). *Intersubjectivity and Intersubjectification in Grammar and Discourse. Theoretical and Descriptive Advances*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 53–76.

Nuyts, Jan. 2015. Subjectivity: Between discourse and conceptualization. *Journal of Pragmatics* 86: 106–110.

Nuyts, Jan and Johan van der Auwera (eds.). 2016. *The Oxford Handbook of Modality and Mood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ochs, Elinor. 1996. "Linguistic resources for socializing humanity". In: John J. Gumperz and Stephen C. Levinson (eds.). *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 407–437.

Ogiermann, Eva. 2009. *On Apologizing in Negative and Positive Politeness Cultures*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Palmer, Frank. R. 1990 [1979]. *Modality and the English Modals* (2ⁿᵈ edn). London: Longman.

Palmer, Frank R. 2001 [1986]. *Mood and Modality* (2ⁿᵈ edn). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Panfilov, V V. 1977. Kategorija modaľnosti i ee roľ v konstituirovanii struktury predloženija i suždenija. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 4: 37–48.

Papafragou, Anna. 2000. *Modality: Issues in the Semantics-Pragmatics Interface*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Perkins, Michael R. 1983. *Modal Expressions in English*. London: Pinter.

Pęzik, Piotr. 2016. "Exploring phraseological equivalence with Paralela". In: Ewa Gruszczyńska and Agnieszka Leńko-Szymańska (eds.). *Polish Language Parallel Corpora*. Warszawa: Instytut Lingwistyki Stosowanej UW, 67–81.

Piekarczyk, Dorota. 2015. "O potrzebie rozróżniania metatekstu i metajęzyka". In: Tomasz Korpysz and Anna Kozłowska (eds.). *Język pisarzy: problemy metajęzyka i metatekstu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego, 11–27.

Plungian, Vladimir. 2001. The place of evidentiality within the universal grammatical space. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 349–357.

Portner, Paul. 2009. *Modality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Prévost, Sophie. 2011. *A propos* from verbal complement to discourse marker: A case of grammaticalization? *Linguistics* 49(2): 391–413.

Quirk, Randolph, Jan Svartvik, Geoffrey Leech and Sidney Greenbaum. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London/New York: Longman.

Rachwałowa, Maria. 1983. Przysłówki metatekstowe i modalne w próbie języka naukowej humanistyki. *Rocznik Naukowo-Dydaktyczny WSP w Krakowie 80, Prace Językoznawcze* IV: 133–142.

Radden, Günter and René Dirven. 2007. *Cognitive English Grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ramat, Paolo. 1996. "Allegedly, John is ill again": stratégies pour le médiatif. In: Zlatka Guentchéva (ed.). *L'énonciation médiatisée*. Louvain/Paris: Peeters, 287–298.

Ramat, Paolo and Davide Ricca. 1998. "Sentence adverbs in the languages of Europe". In: Van der Auwera Johan and Dónall Ó. Baoill (eds.). *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 187–275.

Rospond, Stanisław. 2009. *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego z ćwiczeniami* (4ᵗʰ edn). Warszawa: PWN.

Roszko, Roman. 1993. *Wykładniki modalności imperceptywnej w języku polskim i litewskim*. Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy.

Rozumko, Agata. 2008. "An interdisciplinary approach to teaching grammar to prospective teachers of English". In: Krzysztof Bogacki, Barbara Głowacka and Dorota Potocka (eds.). *Interdisciplinary Perspectives in Foreign Language Teacher Education*. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 309–318.

Rozumko, Agata. 2012a. "Evidential adverbs expressing certainty in English and Polish". In: Krzysztof Bogacki, Joanna Cholewa and Agata Rozumko (eds.). *Formal and Semantic Aspects of Linguistic Research*. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 249–260.

Rozumko, Agata. 2012b. Speech-act adverbs in English and Polish: a cross-linguistic and cross-cultural comparison. *Białostockie Archiwum Językowe* 12: 183–196.

Rozumko, Agata. 2012c. "Cross-cultural aspects of contrastive studies: the discourse of fact and truth in English and Polish. A corpus-based study". In: Agata Rozumko and Dorota Szymaniuk (eds.). *Directions in English-Polish Contrastive Research*. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 89–118.

Rozumko, Agata. 2015. Native and non-native uses of English modal particles. The case of *surely* and *for sure*. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 51 (4): 551–573.

Rozumko, Agata. 2016a. "Epistemic adverbs in English and Polish academic discourse". In: Joanna Leśniewska and Mateusz Urban (eds.). *Beyond Words. Crossing Borders in English Studies*. Vol. II. Kraków: Tertium, 57–72.

Rozumko, Agata. 2016b. Linguistic concepts across languages: The category of epistemic adverbs in English and Polish. *Yearbook of the Poznań Linguistic Meeting* 2 (1): 195–214.

Rozumko, Agata. 2016c. Adverbs of certainty in a cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspective. English-Polish. *Languages in Contrast: International Journal for Contrastive Linguistics* 16 (2): 239–263.

Rozumko, Agata. 2017. Adverbial markers of epistemic modality across disciplinary discourses: A contrastive study of research articles in six academic disciplines. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 52 (1): 73–101.

Rozumko, Agata. 2018. The functions of *clearly* in academic discourse: From an adverb of manner to a discourse marker. *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis* 135: 47–57.

Rozumko, Agata. 2019. Between acknowledgement and countering: Interpersonal functions of English reportative adverbs. *Journal of Pragmatics* 140: 1–11.

Rozumko, Agata, forthcoming. Evidential strategies in receiver-directed talk: The case of English inferential adverbs, *Lingua*, http://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2018.12.003

Rytel, Danuta. 1982. *Leksykalne środki wyrażania modalności w języku czeskim i polskim*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schoonjans, Steven. 2013. "Modal particles: Problems in defining a category". In: Paola Pietrandrea, Bert Cornillie and Liesbeth Degand (eds.). *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles: Categorization and Description*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Schwenter, Scott A. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2000. Invoking scalarity: The development of *in fact*. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 1–1: 7–25.

Shapiro, Barbara J. 2000. *A Culture of Fact: England, 1550-1720*. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press.

Sidnell, Jack. 2012. Who knows best?: Evidentiality and epistemic asymmetry in conversation. *Pragmatics and Society* 3:2 (*Special Issue on Evidentiality in Social Interaction*): 294–320.

Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie. 1992. The interactional utility of *of course* in spoken discourse. *Occasional Papers in Systemic Linguistics* 6: 213–226.

Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie and Karin Aijmer. 2003. The expectation marker *of course. Languages in Contrast* 4 (1): 13–43.

Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie and Karin Aijmer. 2007. *The Semantic Field of Modal Certainty: A Corpus-based Study of English Adverbs.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie, Peter White and Karin Aijmer. 2007. "Presupposition and 'taking for granted' in mass communicated political argument. An illustration from British, Flemish and Swedish political colloquy". In: Anita Fetzer and Gerda Eva Lauerbach (eds.). *Political Discourse in the Media.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 31–74.

Skowronek, Katarzyna. 1993. *Reklama. Studium pragmalingwistyczne.* Kraków: PAN.

Socka, Anna. 2015. Polish particles of hearsay: syntactic and textual distribution. In: Björn Wiemer (ed.). *Studies on Evidentiality Marking in West and South Slavic.* München/Berlin/Leipzig/Washington: Verlag Otto Sagner, 111–137.

Squartini, Mario. 2012. Evidentiality in interaction: The concessive use of the Italian Future between grammar and discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 2116–2128.

Stępień, Marzena. 2010. *Mówienie i prawda. O czasownikowych wykładnikach wiedzy niezweryfikowanej przez mówiącego.* Warszawa: Wydział Polonistyki UW/BEL Studio.

Swan, Toril. 1988. *Sentence Adverbials in English: A Synchronic and Diachronic Investigation.* Oslo: Novis.

Szczyrbak, Magdalena. 2014. *The Realisation of Concession in the Discourse of Judges. A Genre Perspective.* Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press.

Tabor, Whitney and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1998. "Structural scope expansion and grammaticalization". In: Anna Giacalone Ramat and Paul J. Hopper (eds.). *The Limits of Grammaticalization.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 229–272.

Tarano, Gina. 2008. "Discourse adjectives". In: Louise Mc Nally and Christopher Kennedy (eds.). *Adjectives and Adverbs: Syntax, Semantics and Discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 305–327.

Thornes, Tim. 2018. Evidentiality in the Uto-Aztecan languages. In: Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 409–430.

Tokarski, Jan. 1949. O kategorii przysłówka. *Poradnik Językowy* 29/2: 14–20.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65: 31–55.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1995a. "Subjectification in grammaticalisation". In: Susan Wright and Dieter Stein (eds.). *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 31–54.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1995b. The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. Paper presented at ICHL 12 Manchester, UK, August. Version of 11/97. At: http://www/~traugott/papers/discourse.pdf.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2003. "From subjectification to intersubjectification". In: Raymond Hickey (ed.). *Motives for Language Change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 124–139.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2006. "Historical aspects of modality". In: William Frawley (ed.). *The Expression of Modality.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 107–139.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2007. Discussion article: Discourse markers, modal particles, and contrastive analysis, synchronic and diachronic. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 6: 139–157.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2010. "(Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: A reassessment". In: Kristin Davidse, Lieven Vandelanotte and Hubert Cuyckens (eds.). *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 29–71.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2014. "Intersubjectification and clause periphery". In: Lieselotte Brems, Lobke Ghesquière and Freek Van de Velde (eds.). *Intersubjectivity and Intersubjectification in Grammar and Discourse. Theoretical and Descriptive Advances.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 7–27.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Richard B. Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Travis, Catherine E. 2006. "The Natural Semantic Metalanguage approach to discourse markers". In: Kerstin Fischer (ed.). *Approaches to Discourse Particles.* Amsterdam: Elsevier, 219–241.

Trillo, Jesus R. 2002. The pragmatic fossilization of discourse markers in non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34 (6): 769–784.

Tutak, Kinga. 2003. *Leksykalne nieczasownikowe wykładniki modalności epistemicznej w autobiografiach.* Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.

Usoniene, Aurelia and Audrone Šoliene. 2012. "Choice of strategies in realizations of epistemic possibility in English and Lithuanian: A corpus-based study". In: Gert De Sutter, Kris Heylen and Stefania Marzo (eds.). *Corpus Studies in Contrastive Linguistics.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 141–166.

van der Auwera, Johan and Vladimir A. Plungian. 1998. Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2 (1): 79–124.

van der Auwera, Johan, Ewa Schalley and John Nuyts. 2005. "Epistemic possibility in a Slavonic parallel corpus – a pilot study". In: Björn Hansen and Petr Karlik (eds.). *Modality in Slavonic Languages: New Perspectives.* München: Sagner, 201–217.

Van linden, An. 2012. *Modal Adjectives: English Deontic and Evaluative Constructions in Synchrony and Diachrony.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Verschueren, Jef. 1999. *Understanding Pragmatics.* London: Arnold.

Verstraete, Jean-Christophe. 2001. Subjective and objective modality: Interpersonal and ideational functions in the English modal auxiliary system. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(10): 1505–1528.

Vidrine, D. V. 2016. A blurb of: Stanley H. Block, Carolyn Bryant Block and Guy do Plessis. *Mind-Body Workbook for addiction: Effective Tools for Substance-Abuse Recovery and Relapse Prevention*. New Harbinger Publications.

Vinogradov, Viktor Vladimirovitch. 1975 [1950]. "On kategorii modal'nosti in modal'nych slovach v russkom jazyke [On the category of modality and modal markers in Russian]". In: V. V. Vinogradov: *Izbrannye trudy. Issledovanija po russkskoj grammatike*. Moscow, 53–87.

Visconti, Jacqueline. 2013. Facets of subjectification. *Language Sciences* 36: 7–17.

Vold, Eva Thue. 2006. "The choice and use of epistemic modality markers in linguistics and medical research articles". In: Marina Bondi and Ken Hyland (eds.). *Academic Discourse across Disciplines*. New York: Peter Lang, 225–249.

Vološinov, V. N. 1929 [1995]. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Translated by L. Matjka and I. R. Titunik. London: Routledge.

Wajszczuk, Jadwiga. 1997. *System znaczeń w obszarze spójników polskich. Wprowadzenie do opisu*. Warszawa: Katedra Lingwistyki Formalnej UW.

Wajszczuk, Jadwiga. 2000. Can a division of lexemes according to syntactic criteria be consistent? *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* 55: 20–38.

Wajszczuk, Jadwiga. 2005. *O metatekście*. Warszawa: Katedra Lingwistyki Formalnej UW.

Wajszczuk, Jadwiga. 2010. Functional class (so called "part of speech") assignment as a kind of meaning-bound word syntactic formation. *Cognitive Studies/Études Cognitives* 10: 15–33.

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 [last accessed 4 June 2015].

Warchał, Krystyna. 2015. *Certainty and Doubt in Academic Discourse: Epistemic Modality Markers in English and Polish Linguistics Articles*. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.

Watts, Richard. 1984. An analysis of epistemic possibility and probability. *English Studies* 65: 129–140.

Weydt, Harald. 2006. What are particles good for?" In: Kerstin Fischer (ed.). *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 205–217.

White, Peter R. R. 2000. "Dialogue and inter-subjectivity: reinterpreting the semantics of modality and hedging". In: Malcolm Coulthard, Janet Cotterill and Frances Rock (eds.). *Dialogue Analysis VII: Working with Dialogue: Selected Papers from the 7th IADA Conference Birmingham 1999*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 67–80.

White, Peter R. R. 2003. Beyond modality and hedging: a dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Text* 23 (2): 259–284.

Wiemer, Björn. 2006. Particles, parentheticals, conjunctions and prepositions as evidentiality markers in contemporary Polish (a first exploratory study). *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 3: 5–67.

Wiemer, Björn. 2010. "Hearsay in European languages: toward an integrative account of grammatical and lexical marking". In: Gabriele Diewald and Elena Smirnova (eds.). *Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European Languages*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 59–129.

Wiemer, Björn. 2018. "Evidentials and epistemic modality". In: Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 85–108.

Wiemer, Björn and Anna Socka. 2017a. How much does pragmatics help to contrast the meaning of hearsay adverbs? Part 1. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 12-1, 21–56.

Wiemer, Björn and Anna Socka. 2017b. How much does pragmatics help to contrast the meaning of hearsay adverbs? Part 2. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 12-2, 75–95.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1969. *Dociekania semantyczne*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1971. "Metatekst w tekście". In: Maria Renata Mayenowa (ed.). *O spójności tekstu*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 105–121.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 2003. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics. The Semantics of Human Interaction* (2nd edn). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 2006. *English: Meaning and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 2010. *Experience, Evidence and Sense. The Hidden Cultural Legacy of English*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Willett, Thomas. 1988. A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12 (1): 51–97.

Williams, Jessica. 1992. Planning, discourse marking, and the comprehensibility of international teaching assistants. *TESOL Quarterly* 26 (4): 693–711.

Willim, Ewa. 2010. O sporach wokół formy i funkcji we współczesnym językoznawstwie. Formalizm kontra funkcjonalizm? *Studia Copernicana* 1 (3): 81–127.

Willim, Ewa and Elżbieta Mańczak-Wohlfeld. 1997. *A Contrastive Approach to Problems with English*. Warszawa/Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Witosz, Bożena. 2012. Badania nad dyskursem we współczesnym językonawstwie polonistycznym. *Oblicza komunikacji* 5: 61–76.

Wróbel, Henryk. 2001. *Gramatyka języka polskiego*. Kraków: Spółka Wydawnicza "Od nowa".

Żabowska, Magdalena. 2006. Zróżnicowanie semantyczne partykuł epistemicznych. *LingVaria* 1: 203–213.

Żabowska, Magdalena. 2013. *Faktycznie* i *rzeczywiście* – operacje na wiedzy i ich leksykalizacja. *Linguistica Copernicana* 1 (9): 131–141.

Żabowska, Magdalena. 2014. "Partykułologia i partykułografia. Stan obecny i perspektywy". In: Andrzej Moroz, Piotr Sobotka and Magdalena Żabowska (eds.). *Maiuscula linguistica. Studia in honorem Professori Matthiae Grochowski sextuagesimo quinto dedicata*. Warszawa: BEL Studio, 103–119.

Dictionaries

CALD: *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary and Thesaurus.* Cambridge University Press. at: https://dictionary.cambridge.org.

CED: *Collins English Dictionary* (Complete and Unabridged 10th Edition). HarperCollins Publishers. at: http://www.dictionary.com.

COBUILD: *COBUILD Advanced English Dictionary* at: https://dictionary.cambridge.org.

Col: *Collins English-Polish/Polish-English Dictionary.* 1996. ed. by Jacek Fisiak *et al.* Warszawa: Polska Oficyna Wydawnicza.

DC: http://www.dictionary.com (based on the *Random House Dictionary* 2018).

ISJP: *Inny Słownik Języka Polskiego* vols 1-2. 2000. ed. by Mirosław Bańko. Warszawa: PWN.

LDOCE: *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (2nd edition) 1990. Longman: Harlow/Warszawa: PWN.

LDOCE online: *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* at: https://www.ldoceonline.com.

Merriam-Webster: https://www.merriam-webster.com.

OD: *English Oxford Living Dictionaries* at: https://en.oxforddictionaries.com.

PWN: *Great English-Polish/Polish-English Dictionary.* 2006. Warszawa: PWN and Oxford University Press (online edition).

SJP Dor.: *Słownik Języka Polskiego* vols 1-11. 1958-1969. ed. by Witold Doroszewski. Warszawa: Polska Akademia Nauk (online: http://sjp.pwn.pl/doroszewski).

SJP Szym.: *Słownik Języka Polskiego* vols. 1-3. 1978-1981. ed. by Mieczysław Szymczak. Warszawa: PWN.

St: Stanisławski, Jan. 1999 [1955-1964]. *The Great English-Polish/Polish-English Dictionary.* Warszawa: Philip Wilson.

USJP: *Uniwersalny Słownik Języka Polskiego*. 2003. ed. by Stanisław Dubisz. Warszawa: PWN.

WSJP: *Wielki Słownik Języka Polskiego* online ed. by Piotr Żmigrodzki *et al.* at: http://wsjp.pl.

Language corpora

The British National Corpus (BNC): http://bncweb.lancs.ac.uk/

Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego (NKJP): http://www.nkjp.uni.lodz.pl/index_adv.jsp

Paralela (a parallel English-Polish/Polish-English corpus): http://paralela.clarin-pl.eu/

Appendix
Frequencies of modal adverbs in the corpora

Table 26. Frequencies of English modal adverbs in the British National Corpus (BNC)

Modal adverbs	Frequency per 1 million words (BNC)		Frequency per 100 million words
	written language	spoken language	
REPORTIVE ADVERBS			
reportedly	16.5	0.19	1,452
allegedly	11.54	2.4	1,039
supposedly	9.74	6.53	924
reputedly	2.04	0.1	180
avowedly	0.42	0	37
apparently	77.64	72.05	7,575
INFERENTIAL ADVERBS			
clearly	158.07	105.38	14,992
obviously	86.37	293.86	10,651
evidently	15.9	2.5	1,424
seemingly	13.28	2.02	1,188
plainly	7.8	2.21	709
manifestly	2.23	0.92	199
patently	2.33	0.67	212
CONFIRMATORY ADVERBS			
of course	273,04	541,79	29,641
indeed	189.94	162.83	18,391
naturally	44.91	16.91	4,124
ARGUMENTATIVE ADVERBS			
admittedly	7.45	5.09	708
arguably	6.95	1.54	627
assuredly	0,65	0	57
undoubtedly	25.73	7.49	2,340
unquestionably	2.47	0.19	219
undeniably	1.76	0.19	157
indisputably	0.53	0	47
indubitably	0.38	0	33
unarguably	0.16	0	14
incontrovertibly	0.16	0	14
incontestably	0.05	0	4

Modal adverbs	Frequency per 1 million words (BNC)		Frequency per 100 million words
	written language	spoken language	
EPISTEMIC EMPHASIZERS			
certainly	170.62	297.03	18,090
surely	61.21	61.58	6,022
no doubt	63.19	36.79	5,938
definitely	23.96	91.16	3,055
doubtless	9.45	1.15	843
for certain	7.69	5.28	731
for sure	4.55	4.03	442
decidedly	4.78	0.1	441
LOW CONFIDENCE ADVERBS			
perhaps	329.05	440.54	33,510
probably	232.40	580.03	26,467
maybe	78.54	298.56	10,012
possibly	69.75	86.84	7,035
presumably	30.66	48.22	3,197
likely	5.92	1.83	539
conceivably	2.87	1.25	265
ADVERBS OF NECESSITY			
necessarily	56.58	60.14	5,600
inevitably	33.82	7.3	3,049
inescapably	0.76	0.1	68
unavoidably	0.65	0.1	58
ineluctably	0.16	0	14

Table 27. Frequencies of Polish modal adverbs in the National Corpus of Polish (NKJP)

Polish adverbs[1]	Frequency per 100 million words (NKJP)	Frequencies of modal adverbs in selected registers (per 1 million words)			
		spoken Polish	prose	daily press	monthly maga-zines
REPORTIVE ADVERBS					
podobno	6,460	228.84	87.08	59.70	55.73
ponoć	2,376	31.56	20.60	29.42	35.42
jakoby	1,673	0.56	21.16	14.34	14.35
rzekomo	1,450	3.38	14.86	13.02	12.21
podobnież	49	14.09	0.74	0.08	1.37
niby	6,849	237.86	146.70	25.85	59.7
INFERENTIAL ADVERBS					
wyraźnie	11,003	16.34	150.57	69.48	123.82
widocznie	2,525	35.51	56.45	9.29	15.72
najwyraźniej	2,347	7.89	41.79	15.97	21.52
jawnie	570	2.25	9.38	3.33	5.19
najwidoczniej	510	0.56	12.12	2.08	1.98
ewidentnie	429	6.76	2.81	2.84	7.63
najoczywiściej	14	0	0.37	0.05	0.45
CONFIRMATORY ADVERBS					
oczywiście	35,176	358.48	355.33	242.707	417.89
rzeczywiście	14,979	245.189	144.42	111.03	116.34
faktycznie	4,605	143.16	35.83	35.34	33.43
istotnie	2,915	0	47.87	9.67	16.03
naturalnie	1,854	25.80	35.64	12.36	25.80
ARGUMENTATIVE ADVERBS					
niewątpliwie	4,538	2.81	50.81	26.40	53.43
bez wątpienia	1,611	0	17.29	13.30	22.75
bezsprzecznie	203	0.56	2.37	1.52	5.49
bezapelacyjnie	137	2.25	1.18	1.80	1.22
bezspornie	77	0	0.82	0.48	1.37

---

[1]   English equivalents of the Polish adverbs listed in Table 27 can be found in the relevant sections of Chapters 4-10.

Polish adverbs	Frequency per 100 million words (NKJP)	Frequencies of modal adverbs in selected registers (per 1 million words)			
		spoken Polish	prose	daily press	monthly maga-zines
ARGUMENTATIVE ADVERBS					
bezdyskusyjnie	68	0	0.41	0.66	0.61
niezaprzeczalnie	43	0	0.59	0.17	1.68
niepodważalnie	14	0	0.14	0.02	0
niezaprzeczenie	5	0	0.16	0	0
niekwestiono-wanie	5	0	0.08	0.01	0
EPISTEMIC EMPHASIZERS					
na pewno	21,548	592.39	199.37	235.07	204.44
pewnie	14,420	601,11	222.80	112.27	107.94
zapewne	10,397	3.38	138.14	74.66	113.75
z pewnością	7,440	1.12	74.23	76.23	105.81
zdecydowanie	7,344	104.58	49.79	81.82	104.58
pewno	968	90.19	23.33	2.48	1.68
LOW CONFIDENCE ADVERBS					
może	49,345	1,120.08	602.70	491.40	549.52
chyba	37,970	2,584.90	491.77	226.29	312.23
raczej	20,468	233.91	259.41	209.41	249.63
być może	14,686	41.147	122.20	144.16	125.50
prawdopodobnie	13,394	55.23	90.89	195.96	97.56
bodaj	1,525	0.56	27.41	11.10	16.03
bodajże	667	14.65	4.2	1.90	2.13
przypuszczalnie	370	0	5.23	2.55	2.90
ADVERBS OF NECESSITY					
koniecznie	2,529	43.96	36.75	21.18	38.62
niekoniecznie	2,390	30.43	20.96	17.69	41.68
nieuchronnie	550	0	8.86	3.84	6.10
niechybnie	274	0	5.23	2.55	2.90
niezawodnie	171	0	4.36	0.54	1.37

Table 28. Frequencies of English modal adverbs in the parallel corpus *Paralela*

Modal adverbs	Number of occurrences in *Paralela*
REPORTIVE ADVERBS	
reportedly	160
allegedly	881
supposedly	705
reputedly	10
avowedly	4
apparently	5,382
INFERENTIAL ADVERBS	
clearly	15,754
obviously	7,252
evidently	1,043
seemingly	439
plainly	29
manifestly	266
patently	34
CONFIRMATORY ADVERBS	
of course	44,141
indeed	13,921
naturally	3,442
ARGUMENTATIVE ADVERBS	
admittedly	230
arguably	98
assuredly	18
undoubtedly	1,633
unquestionably	174
undeniably	174
indisputably	28
indubitably	16
unarguably	5
incontrovertibly	5
incontestably	4

EPISTEMIC EMPHASIZERS	
certainly	11,248
surely	4,199
no doubt	1,821
definitely	8,113
doubtless	246
for certain	4,759
for sure	2,975
decidedly	226
LOW CONFIDENCE ADVERBS	
perhaps	18,502
probably	27,537
maybe	73,730
possibly	6,625
presumably	424
likely	12,806
conceivably	65
ADVERBS OF NECESSITY	
(not)necessarily	2,549
inevitably	748
unavoidably	33
inescapably	4
ineluctably	0