

ANDRZEJ BOGUSŁAWSKI

University of Warsaw
Department of Formal Linguistics

On Case, Gender and Related Phenomena in Polish (for the umpteenth time)

Key words: unit of language, operation, suboperation, accommodation, case, number, gender.

Introduction

No end seems to be in sight to the controversy over “grammatical genders” in Polish. Ever new lists of “gender” or “genderlike” *labels* with the concomitant classes of words (usually: nouns) or their forms as well as examples thereof are produced, and ever new objections to what other authors propose are raised.

In the essay below, I can rightly be judged to just follow suit. Yes, I will. *In my own way.*

I shall not present an overview of the relevant literature. Rather, I will try to make a number of *positive* statements pertaining to those aspects of *units* of Polish (more exactly, contemporary standard Polish) that are somehow related to what one encounters in the linguistic literature on “gender” in Polish, more specially, on the *interface* between case, number and gender.

To explain: when I am talking about “units of language”, I understand them in accordance with my (1978) (and some of my other publications); the obvious main source of the concept is de Saussure’s idea of “*entités concrètes (d’une langue)*”.

1. Units of language; operations and suboperations

To briefly recall my basic statements concerning units of language: these are members of *bilateral non-enumerative proportions* of expressions which are indivisible into further such members. Among such units of language, in its primary, i.e. sound, medium, there are, necessarily and in the first place, (specific) *Contrastive Syllabic Segments*, CSS, for short, or alternatives of such segments. There are also second-rank units which have the nature of operations modifying those segments (and, ultimately, always yielding CSS, again). The basic category of CSS can be represented in terms of an ordered set $\langle \sigma, (SOp) \rangle$ where the first element, σ , stands for a contrastive syllabic segment or an alternative of such segments, and the second element, *SOp*, may be empty (as marked by means of parentheses) and, in case it is not empty, it stands for one or more than one operation affecting *other* expressions. Those operations are changes that are effectuated when σ (i.e. σ as the main component of a given unit of language with its higher-ranking syntactic properties, to be described separately, *apart* from the very operations we are talking about, which also belong to the unit's syntactic properties in their broad sense) enters syntagmatic interrelations with those other expressions. Such operations may be called *suboperations* (hence, the symbol adopted is *SOp*), to distinguish them from operations that make up full-fledged units of language in their own right. Both operations and suboperations may involve some segmental items, e.g., suffixes (cf., e.g., -š as the marker applied to the basic 3rd person singular non-past forms (CSS) in the *operation* yielding the 2nd person singular non-past in Polish, with the all-important concept 'you'), and even syllabic segments; but not *contrastive* (bilaterally-proportionally separable) syllabic segments as I understand them.

To illustrate the notions I have introduced (or rather recalled), I shall offer several examples. The word *alas* is an English CSS which has some definite properties of its juxtaposition with other expressions (I shall not go into the respective details), but it lacks *SOp*. On the other hand, the alternative *love / loves* represents a CSS which is coupled with a positive *SOp* providing for a number of "moves"; one of the latter consists in the choice of the form *him*, out of the alternative *he / him*, in the right-hand valency place of *love / loves* (such suboperations have to be listed somewhere and labeled in some way, e.g., as "accusative": the respective items recur in other units as well, e.g., *like / likes* has a similar operational requirement). Finally, the modification of the CSS *table*

yielding the CSS *tables* is one of the “pluralising” *operations* on English nouns (the operations representing true self-contained *units* of language).

I am convinced that there is, in a (basic, i.e. syntactic) description of a language, no getting round the very general and simple concepts as sketched above, all of them turning on the central concept of proportion. Consequently, there is no getting round the refusal to deal separately, e.g., with *kick*, *the* or *bucket* in the English *kick the bucket* (apart, that is, from the special concerns of etymological research). What I have said about the chosen (in a way, famous, but also trivial) example of a set phrase applies, on equal terms, to all other expressions of a similar nature plenty of which are merely superficially less clearly indivisible than that phraseologism. A curious phenomenon we observe in linguistics and in approaches to language in general is that, while most researchers, albeit by far not all, approach strings like *kick the bucket* as “self-evidently” semantically indivisible (although no “self-evidence” should be treated as self-evident!), they often neglect to extend what underlies (in reality, even if it is not verbalized by them) their attitude towards *kick the bucket* etc. to other, less obvious cases. There are myriads of such indivisible, though apparently (but in fact only spuriously) divisible, expressions, many of them having a considerable external size and / or a complicated internal structure which cannot be reduced to phonological / graphematic items and their concatenations governed by independent regularities of the so-called “second level of articulation” (in the sense of Martinet), but is observable on parts that are similarly not *meaningful* in the strict sense of the word.

On the other hand, whatever is properly and non-enumeratively separable has to be accounted for in as generalized a form as possible. A serious linguistic description must measure up to this methodological requirement, given that a language is an *instrumentarium* for multiple and *open-ended* use. This is because the corollary of the latter characteristic is the fact that no list of specific cases of use of particular expressions or of groups of such cases can adequately render the substance of language if the groups that seem to a linguist to be worth singling out are, in point of fact, ultimately reducible to symmetrical embodiments of more general features as these are functioning in varying, but quite definite, contextual or pragmatic circumstances.

2. Rise of gender conceptions

Before I proceed to lay down my observations and proposals concerning what has been indicated in the title, i.e. case, number and gender in Polish, while embedding my reflections in the framework outlined above, let me make a brief reminder on how various existing “gender images” of Polish have happened to arise.

Nouns have been observed in texts. One of the first observations *everybody* is apt to make reads: when one takes nouns as the starting point, one notices that, in similar circumstances, *different multiple* concomitant attributes of *other* words, words accompanying the nouns and obviously non-coincidentally connected with the nouns (as used in real texts), make their appearance in the respective concatenations according as one passes on from *certain* chosen nouns to some *different* ones. Here is an illustration: *syn* ‘son’ – *duży* ‘big’, *córka* ‘daughter’ – *duża*; *stół* ‘table’ – *duży*, *szafa* ‘cupboard’ – *duża*. In a certain selection of such parallelisms, one notices a most conspicuous intersection between the distinctions proper to the expressions, on the one hand, and the difference of the respective designata in terms of the concepts ‘male’ vs. ‘female’, on the other (cf. the examples *syn*, *córka*). At the same time, there are plenty of surprises: not only has a cupboard nothing in common with ‘being female’, despite the form *duża szafa*, like *duża córka*, but also, for example, *podlotek* ‘teenager girl’ is similar to *syn* ‘son’ in this word’s behaviour (*duży podlotek*), rather than to *córka* ‘daughter’. Thus, in addition to “natural gender”, there is, in our nouns, something vaguely reminiscent of it, but somehow independent and purely linguistic. We may name it “grammatical gender”. The sexes are two in number (disregarding hermaphrodites); “words’ sexes”, if one is allowed to use this metaphor, obviously appear to be more numerous, cf., for one thing, *pole* – *duże* ‘big field’.

The question poses itself: How many attributes of different words in the whole of the lexicon that are *similar* to what has just been described are there? In using the word “attributes”, I refer to either attributes of single text words or of groups of them each of whose members occurs in some specialized positions in texts; i.e. I may also refer to *groups* forming so called “lexemes” – with one recurrent meaning for each member of such a group.

It must be noted, at this point, that “similarity” I have thus invoked is a notoriously weak relation. When one pursues the task (inherent in the question

just posed) of ascribing each noun (as a “lexeme”) *some such similarity–difference* label (merely as an example of which, say, the label “masculine” [contrasted with the label “feminine”] can be mentioned) and when one does so on the basis of *global* impressions the nouns give one, one inevitably ends up facing a rather wide variety of *possible* labelings. This is true even though one starts from what is anchored in the absolutely *definite* and objective phenomenon of “sex – adjectival desinences interface” (instead of adjectival desinences you of course may take features of articles, verbs, etc.). But if one thinks, simultaneously, that there must be something *unique* that one’s loose term “gender” (masculine, feminine, neuter, for instance) is hinting at, one concludes that it is ultimately necessary to weigh out *different* possible globalized preferences and to take a *decision* to proclaim just *one* of them as mirroring, so to speak, the “*true*” spirit of the *ghost* behind the initial *purely* morphological, i.e. *word, reality*. In our exemplary case, the “ghost” is encapsulated in the phrase “grammatical gender”.

For instance, the difference between an animal and a thing is no doubt somehow akin to the difference I have just mentioned between males, females and asexual objects. Now, one actually happens to see, at the same time, that the relevant distinction *is present* in Polish: it may be illustrated with the difference between (*widzę tego psa* [from *pies*, nom.] ‘(I see) this dog; acc.’ and *ten dom* [from *dom*, nom.] ‘this house; acc.’, a difference which is so similar to the difference between *ten pies* ‘this dog; nom.’ and *ta krowa* ‘this cow; nom.’. Well, why not grasp all this jointly by saying: *pies* is not just masculine like *chłopiec* ‘boy’ or *dom* ‘house’, but also “masculine-animate”, as opposed to *dom* which becomes, correspondingly, in our eyes, “masculine-inanimate”? Furthermore, in the same way that the word *szafa* is similar to the patently feminine *córka*, the word *dolar* with its accusative (*tego dolara*) is similar to the pair *pies – psa*; so there appears to be, or it seems so, a new special, undeniably *grammatical*, “gender”, viz. the masculine-animate gender, which is proper to the lexeme *dolar* as a whole no less than to the lexeme *pies* (again, taken as a whole, with all its “case-number” items – *psa, psu, psy* etc. – which are felt to make up a unity; cf. the *instrumental*, not accusative, in the following phrases: *psem, którego poglaskalem* ‘... whom I have stroked’, *dolarem, którego wydałem* ‘... which I have spent’).

But how about the noun *grzyb*? Both *znalazłem piękny grzyb* and *znalazłem pięknego grzyba* ‘I have found a beautiful mushroom’ are admissible utterances. Therefore, it may seem reasonable to set up a new category (there are many

examples of this kind): perhaps there is in Polish yet another gender, viz. “masculine-half-animate”. And if we, furthermore, agree that there is a gradation of relative frequency and a scale of stylistic shading in the use of forms like *grzyb* and forms like *grzyba*, according as we closely watch individual nouns one by one, cf. *kup jej kwiatek* ‘buy her a flower; diminutive’ vs. the “secondary” *kup jej kwiatka* (although virtually everybody only says *kup jej kwiat* [non-diminutive]), we may be tempted to postulate an even broader variety of “genders”. There is (let us continue), in present-day Polish, the following distinction: *proszek* ‘powder’ (a mass term), gen. sing. *proszku*, vs. *proszek* ‘tablet’ (a “countable” noun), gen. sing. *proszka*; the distinction is accompanied by the acc. sing. *proszek* in the former case and the same acc. sing. (*ten*) *proszek*, however, with the secondary (for the time being) form (*tego*) *proszka*, in the latter case. Is this a situation of yet another gender distinction? Well, what can safely be said is that, in any case, my observations concerning the word *proszek* are of a very similar kind as those made by scholars in the cases touched upon before.

Zaron (2004) showed that certain salient, stable and implemented in massive series sets of purely external characteristics of Polish noun forms as used in definite equally salient syntactic positions, when the sets are taken “in themselves”, irrespective of what adjectival or verbal forms accompany them, make up a definite mosaic of autonomous morphological patterns (declension patterns) that may impose itself on speakers’ linguistic awareness while at the same time remaining in *some* correlation with the classical adjectival-nominative-singular *syntactic* trichotomy of “masculine-feminine-neuter”.

With some more fine-grained distinctions (cf., e.g., the nominative plural, with its distinction *-owie* vs. *-i* [the former ending being used with absolute regularity, in particular, in official plurals of last names ending in a consonant or in *-a*, *-o*, with reference to males or married couples, cf. *Glempowie*, *Biskupowie* vs. *biskupi* ‘bishops’]) or, contrariwise, with more attention paid to strict parallelisms and complementarity of different sound patterns (cf., e.g., nom. *-a* vs. acc. *-ę*, e.g., *rozrabiaka* – *rozrabiakę* ‘brawler’, *banita* – *banitę* ‘exile’ [nom. plur. *banici*], nom. *-Ø* vs. acc. *-a*, e.g., *wichrzyciel* – *wichrzyciela* ‘trouble-maker’, *wygnaniec* – *wygnańca* ‘exile’ [nom. plur. *wygnańcy*, where *-y* is a combinatorial variant of *-i* in *banici*]), one can propose other, respectively, more or less ramified, pictures related to the same empirical material.

3. Questions to be asked

My point of view which I shall try to apply to the relevant Polish material is different. And the questions I ask are, accordingly, different.

I am concerned with quite *detailed* features of the *objective functioning* of *specific* expressions (in the sense of individual shapes with their *complete* outfit) as cognitive and communicative tools of real *speech*, rather than as objects of some abstract contemplation known from the entire tradition (where expressions are more or less arbitrarily detached from their proper environment and pinned up in a kind of museum, like butterflies displayed in an exhibition).

According to the outline of my “framework” presented *supra*, the principal and main distinction to be made in the description is that between, on the one hand, genuine units of language, both in the category of CSS and in the category of operations, and on the other, elements that are subservient to units of language, either as materialising their contrastive syllabic segments proper or as markers of concomitant syntagmatic suboperations. Other obligatory questions to be answered deal with the specific allocations of particular elements with respect to different relationships within the functioning expressions and their wider concatenations. Finally, there are questions about detailed dependencies between, on the one hand, elements of units, e.g., alternating segments (cf. the aforementioned alternates *he, him*), and on the other, classes or features of exterior expressions (which are in some way relevant to the former elements).

4. The idea of the “masculine-animate” gender; its critique

I shall first address the area of phenomena touched upon above, viz. that of adjectival modifications in concatenations of the respective (adjectival) expressions with nouns in a non-initial (non-nominative) position, cf., e.g., *widzę tego psa* ‘I see this dog’, where the nouns belong to a class with the following characteristics: first, the core of the class are designations of animate or personal entities, second, the designations are, at the same time, such that the counterparts of the *adjectival* expressions joining them (secondarily also designations of objects other than animate or personal ones) in the *initial* or basic position, viz. the nominative position, have shapes whose properties are associated with the label “masculine”, cf. *duży, ten*. The question to be answered, in my framework, is about *which* specific operations or suboperations in the indicated syntactic

environment are executed by means of *which* elements in *which* kinds of context. In other kinds of conceptual framework or terminology than mine, at bottom, the *same* issues of course have been dealt with many times; it so happened that the solutions that have been advanced were far from being unanimous: they differed widely.

As is clear from the above example (*widzę tego psa*), what I have in mind are modifications of adjectival expressions that combine with nouns in the direct object, or accusative, position. Whereas in most cases adjectival expressions in that position either do not change compared to the initial or basic position just mentioned (the nominative position, cf. *ten dom jest piękny* ‘this house is beautiful’: *widzę ten dom*) or change there in a special, “feminine”, way (cf. *widzę tę dziewczynę* ‘I see this girl’, cf. the nominative *ta dziewczyna*), some of them may be said to be modified by acquiring features proper to those counterparts of the nominative that occur in the *genitive* position, as is the case of our current example *widzę tego psa*, cf. *łapa tego psa* ‘the paw of this dog’, or of the following example: *widzę tych studentów* ‘I see these students’, cf. *zeszyty tych studentów* ‘these students’ copybooks’.

As the most widespread account, going back, above all, to Mańczak (1956), has it, the true noun designations of animate *resp.* personal masculine entities, furthermore, some other noun designations that are *assimilated* to those ones, adjust the concomitant adjectival expressions by inducing them to assume forms ending in *-ego* (in the singular, cf. *tego psa*) or in *-ych/-ich* (in the plural, cf. *tych studentów*), forms which are *otherwise* identical with those in the *genitive* (singular *resp.* plural). These special adjectival forms in the accusative position are triggered by *nouns* belonging to a separate subclass, it is said. Therefore, on the pattern of nouns which induce non-omnipresent shapes of the adjectival expressions in the nominative and which are, owing to this fact, distinguished as bearers of a definite “grammatical gender”, say, feminine, the nouns now under consideration ought to be distinguished in a similar way as bearers of another “grammatical gender”. The names that rather naturally suggest themselves here are *masculine-animate* (*męskożywotne*), for the phenomena of the singular, and *masculine-personal* (*męskoosobowe*), for the phenomena of the plural; of course, none of the names is to be understood “at its face value” (i.e. *dolar*, e.g., is “masculine-animate” no less than *pies*).

Underlying this *picture* of (unquestionable) “raw” or “brute” facts are three assumptions. First, that adjectival forms materialize *exclusively* “agreement”

with *nouns* they join (not any other word partners). Second, that in each case position the relevant forms, whether substantival or adjectival, are furnished *separately*, one by one, by some “generator” which is “programmed” in advance according to what the conventional schemata of declension with their fixed case “boxes” multiplied by “number columns” suggest. Third, that each such “row” of “boxes” exhausts in what it applies to the stock of *all* nouns and can be adequately described by enumeration of all the respective representatives of the noun lexemes that happen to be present in the lexicon (this is supplemented by the stipulation according to which all further, e.g., future, lexemes can be accommodated in the picture just outlined to the extent that the present criteria prove to be valid for them).

Obviously, what we are dealing with in that way are expressions which are, so to speak, extracted or severed from *quite specific* texts (where they really function as they do) and which thus *now* begin to hover in the thin air of their imaginable detached series that can be set up when the isolated expressions are confronted with the impenetrable cloud of mixed associations released by the fixed set of abstract questions *kto? co? / who? what?, kogo? czego? / of whom? of what?, komu? czemu? / to whom? to what?* etc.

Unfortunately, none of the assumptions listed above are warranted.

First, it is no more than a prejudice to confine case accommodation to *nouns* (as having, in a way, a “monopoly” for reflecting those verb-bound cases in their shapes). For example, verbs governing special forms of nouns, i.e., in my terms, verbs whose $\langle \sigma, (SOp) \rangle$ includes certain suboperations on the argument noun expressions, are by no means barred from imposing similar constraints on *non-noun* expressions which syntagmatically co-operate with them or even replace nouns in such co-operation. This shows particularly clearly when nouns do not crop up in a text at all while, say, adjectives or pronouns fill the respective valency places alone (*Daj to temu!* ‘give it to this (one)’). The unquestionable fact that where there is an *additional* “gender” distinction in a case position, an adjectival expression is *also* “governed” by a *noun* (i.e. materializes a suboperation inscribed in the *noun*), is in no way incompatible with the same expression being governed (even primarily!) by the verb. In many instances (notably, in the plural), *only* verbal government can be observed on adjectival expressions; the reason is simply that where no *internal distinctions* within definite case forms are present no dependence on nouns (in my terms: no suboperation, here, “gender” suboperation, inscribed in noun CSS’s) can be stated either.

Second, expressions freely function in quite specific embeddings, with much idiosyncratic variation, and they need not reckon with any abstract constraints conceived of in advance. Recall, as a case in point, that Zaliznjak (1967) even talked about *ždatel'nyj padež* 'waiting case' in Russian because of certain peculiarities of the government of the isolated or nearly isolated verb *ždat'* – partly on the pattern of the genitive and partly on the pattern of the accusative. At the same time, there is no necessity of having some Chinese walls between case series: it is imaginable that what appears in one syntactic position *independently* is transferred *as such* to another syntactic position (this is a phenomenon similar to that of people rarely coining expressions out of letters or phonemes [recall the case of *gas*] and nearly always resorting, very often in an absolutely arbitrary, haphazard way [recall, e.g., E. *strong butter* – P. *zjełczale masło*, P. *dyskretny urok* – E. *soft grace*] to existing words and morphemes).

Third, an obligatory even distribution of all existing nouns in all syntactic positions is a myth. Some nouns may be fitting for only some embeddings. And not only for semantic reasons. Certain nouns or other words may be eliminated from a series because the respective semantic compound structures are expressed in a special way which blocks a meaningful appearance of the expected items in the series. As an example, one can point to the lack of the 'possessive' genitive for such words as *ja* 'I', *ty* 'you': there are separate adjectival units of language which replace the expected genitives, viz. *mój* 'my', *twój* 'your', and so on. There may be more circumstances that stand in the way of an absolute regularity of series of forms. For instance, the Polish personal proper names in *-ty*, such as *Wincenty*, do not have the plural form for their corresponding resultants of the (markerless) operation which yields the sense 'entity called by the name _' (as in *wszyscy Janowie z tej szkoły* 'all J.s from this school'): the forms **Wincenci*, **Wincentowie* are unacceptable; one can only solve the problem of expressing the relevant content by resorting to some more or less complicated periphrase.

5. Introductory positive observations on the Polish genitive and accusative

Following the above reservations concerning the widely adopted mode of thinking about inflection and following the corresponding general remarks that have voiced my own attitude, I shall now sketch out my positive account of what is going on in the *genitive* and in the *accusative* inflectional series of (standard) Polish.

To begin with, let me revert to my reminder of the “possessive genitive” (see above). In my view, this is a clear cut instance of a series of operations on two or more NP’s where one or more of them play the part of the designation of ‘possessor(s)’ and one or more of them play the part of ‘possessum (-a)’; the relation referred to by means of the respective morphological changes on the NP’s designating ‘possessor(s)’ is that of the latter being ‘in possession’ of the respective objects. I shall not go into the question of how ‘possession’ is to be exactly understood here; clearly, it cannot be anything in the way of a juridical ownership relationship: *ławeczka Piotra* ‘P.’s bench’ can be no more than a bench where he once was sitting with Kate (A. Kiklevič once presented a convincing relevant generalization for Polish; a similar generalizing tendency in the analysis of English and Russian is known from B. Partee’s works). Even with this kind of extremely wide coverage, there is little doubt that the morphological change in question is a true self-contained exponent of some definite piece of (purported) knowledge.

There are valid arguments for keeping *Genetivus subiecti* or *Genetivus obiecti* apart from the “possessive genitive”. An overall generalization covering *all* these occurrences would be a clear case of *overgeneralization*, i.e. of an erroneous generalization: *odpoczynek Piotra* ‘P.’s relax’ cannot normally refer, e.g., to ‘someone else’s relax such that P. often thinks of it’. Syntactic facts such as the possibility of two genitives joining one NP while referring to two actants in one action or state, as in *Fregego krytyka Anzelma* ‘Frege’s critique of Anselm’ (with the appropriate regimentation of word-order) also speak to the correctness of my claim (this remark applies to the internal distinction *Genetivus subiecti* vs. *Genetivus obiecti* as well).

Apart from that, the latter kinds of occurrence of the genitive must, for a large subclass of constructions, be regarded as materializing a *suboperation* that belongs, not to particular “lexemes” in the category of *nomina actionis* or in some other category of a similar kind, but to *formatives*, and thus units of language, regularly producing particular *nomina actionis*, e.g., the formative embodied in *-ń-* with the *concomitant* replacement of the accusative by the genitive, a formative that is indispensable in words such as *czytanie* ‘reading’.

However, the most important fact about *Genetivus subiecti* or *Genetivus obiecti* is that they have to be classed, quite generally, regardless of their relationship to formatives or whole lexical elements, precisely among *suboperations*. This places

them on one side of the great divide pointed out at the outset, while the possessive genitive is on the other side of it. It is true that in most specific instances the material aspect of both the operations such as those in the “possessive genitive” and the indicated suboperations is the same, thus giving rise to the situation of homonymy whose easy acceptance is, generally speaking, not welcome. Note, however, that there are also cases where the “determining” member of the constructions in question is *not* identical: thus, we may contrast *moje przystąpienie do organizacji* ‘my joining the organization’ with *wykluczenie m n i e przez nich z organizacji* ‘their having excluded me from the organization’; moreover, the “possessive genitive” has only its *adjectival counterpart* here, viz. *mój*, cf. *moja organizacja*.

One more suboperation which also uses the devices of the possessive genitive, but which similarly expands to pronouns such as *ja*, *ty* – in their forms *mnie*, *ciebie* (cf. the cases of *Genetivus obiecti* above), is a specialty of Polish: what I have in mind is the suboperation attached to the negative particle *nie* ‘not’. This suboperation is indeed very special, compared for example to the facts of Russian where the use of the accusative and the marked genitive with negation is highly complicated (for details, see my (1998)). It is so special in that the Polish item almost automatically replaces *Accusativus obiecti* even if negation applies to some remote expression governing further expressions (not all of them!; however, I am not going into the details of the relevant constraints) the last of which normally governs the accusative, cf. *On nie chciał zacząć pisać artykułu*. ‘he did not want to begin to write the article’ vs. *pisać artykuł*.¹

6. Interpretation of the accusative singular

I shall now turn to the *accusative singular* where, according to customary accounts, certain expressions assume shapes that are, as it were, *contingently* identical with the shapes they assume in the genitive singular. In the case of adjectival forms, which are different in concatenations with *those* expressions, on the one hand, cf. *tego psa*, and in concatenations with other expressions, on the other hand, cf. *ten dom*, *tę dziewczynę*, the former category is taken to carry

¹ By the way, there is an interesting, although marginal, case where the replacement is semantically blocked, viz. the expression *nie wystarczy VNP_{acc}*, by, cf. *Nie wystarczy otrzymać paszport [acc.] / *paszportu [gen.], by wyjechać za granicę*. ‘it is not enough to get the passport to go abroad’.

a special functional load of the “masculine-animate gender” which is claimed, in addition, to permeate all the forms of the respective lexemes.² The parity of reasoning leads the researchers, in turn, to ascribe yet another gender, viz. “masculine-inanimate”, to nouns marked for the zero desinence both in the nominative and in the accusative, the gender being claimed to be proper, again, to all the forms of a given lexeme, e.g., *dom*.

In my view, this kind of account is inadequate: it neglects the fact that the part of expressions that are called “masculine-animate” in the accusative are **not independent** of what is to be found in the genitive, whereas what happens in the genitive **is independent** of what happens in the accusative, cf. *część mercedesa* ‘a part of a M. car; gen.’ (acc. = gen.: *mercedesa*), *część kamienia* ‘a part of a stone; gen.’ (acc. = nom.: *kamień*). Just the opposite is the case: *all* expressions that are called “masculine-animate” in the accusative are *exact* copies of the forms of the genitive; and *all* the new so-called “masculine-animate” accusatives, whose number has been steadily increasing over the centuries following the beginning of the rise of what is called “accusative = genitive”, result from a simple procedure of replacing the forms to be described as “accusative = nominative” by the corresponding forms of the genitive. Moreover, the *adjectival* forms of the genitive *automatically* accompany the substantival forms of the genitive as soon as the latter invade the area of the accusative; and they also function in this way independently, without the noun partners, if only their reference is identical with the reference of those (possibly present, but also possibly absent) partners.

All these facts taken together lead us to recognize that the real operation taking place in the accusative singular (when the necessary generalization is respected), apart from the instances where the basic nominative form is simply left intact, in which case there is *no* special operation at all (but merely insertion of the basic forms in a new syntactic position), and apart from the “feminine” accusative modifications, cf. *dziewczynę*, does not consist in any *separate, additional* modification of either the basic or some non-basic forms. The operation consists in the straightforward expansion of *ready-made* forms coined in other, viz. “genitive” positions. These forms just cover new syntactic areas, on a par with the preservation, in the same areas, of the basic endingless nominative forms.

² Grounds for the latter claim used to be indicated, after Zaliznjak (1964), mainly by pointing to constructions with a “distant gender influence” such as *Opowiedział o psach, z których jednego zabili*. ‘he told a story of some dogs one of which was killed’.

However, the natural null-option is precisely the *preservation* of the *basic* forms which I have just mentioned. The genitive forms used as accusatives, which are *not* basic, contrast with that null-option as a marked, i.e. positively characterized, kind of expression.

Therefore, it is reasonable to acknowledge the existence of one simple *positive* operation or suboperation that governs the facts we are discussing. Its formula reads:

[“masc.-anim.” acc. sing.]

Replace the basic (nominative) form with the form of the genitive singular.

Thus, there is no need to talk about any “influence” of “masculine-animate” or, much less, of “masculine-inanimate”, *substantival* forms *over the adjectival forms* which would, as it were, mirror the “masculine-animate” or the “masculine-inanimate” nature of the nouns in the different adjectival shapes. Everything boils down to possible *overall case* markings: either there is no such (positive) marking (the situation of the majority of expressions, including the animate neutra such as *dziecko* ‘child’, *zwierzę* ‘animal’, *popychle* ‘drudge’), or there is the special “feminine” marking (mainly, *-ę*, *-a*), or else, finally, there is the marking executed by *simply taking over* the non-basic genitive shapes as they stand, without any special, purely “accusative” addition.

Of course, the distribution of the three possibilities is *motivated* in a definite way (either by certain general semantic or morphonological features or by purely individual assignments, with many parallel solutions, cf. *zjadł ogórek / ogórka* ‘ate a cucumber’). *Pars magna* of the motivation consists in the obvious tendency to distinguish the shapes of designations of *animate* entities, on the one hand, as used when the entities are approached in the capacity of agents / epistemic subjects, and on the other, as used when the same entities play the part of patients / epistemic objects. This is neatly ensured where we start from, say, *artysta* and end up with *artystę*. But we fail to attain such a salient solution when we start from the adjectival *ten* (*artysta*): we cannot correctly substitute the form *tę* (or *ta*) because this form corresponds to the nominative *ta*, not *ten*. The efficient solution in such circumstances is offered by the following unrivalled and obvious move: as *pies* is replaced by its genitive counterpart *psa*, so is *ten* replaced by *its* genitive counterpart *tego*. Still, these are (all of them) no more and no less

than instances of, first, a bare *motivation* of a certain inflectional choice, and second, a *motivation* of the choice of **case markings alone**.

The situation of masculine animate nouns ending in *-a*, cf. *artysta*, acc. *artystę*, cannot alter my present *negative* appraisal of the idea of a separate *gender* marking triggered by such nouns in the concomitant adjectival forms such as *ten*. The point is that the *reference* of these *adjectival* forms in the nominative is the same as the reference of the *nouns* in the nominative (*ten artysta*); at the same time these forms have their counterparts in the genitive, e.g., *tego*, which cannot be modified in the way the feminine forms get modified, cf. *ta*, gen. *tej*, acc. *tę / tą*. Therefore, they preserve their *genitive* shape *on a par* with masculine animate nouns, according to **one** and the same simple rule for **case marking** (a rule that I have spelled out above).

The only truly independent *gender* markings, or, in other words, suboperations complementing segments of *nouns*, that can be mentioned here are the suboperations *within the genitive* which introduce the *binary* distinction “masculine-neuter” vs. “feminine”, cf. *tego* vs. *tej* (unlike the trichotomy “masculine [*ten* etc.] vs. feminine [*ta* etc.] vs. neuter [*to* etc.]” in the nominative).

In this way, my reasoning substantiates (in the mode adopted here) the old and, to my mind, sound doctrine of the three well known genders in Polish for singular (and only derivatively, for plural, as in cases such as *opsach, z których jednego zabili*), with the addition of the “cumulative” masculine-neuter gender in certain non-basic cases, e.g., in the genitive singular. This doctrine was cultivated, *inter alios*, by Doroszewski. My reasoning also vindicates the correctness of Łuczyński’s (2004) (who opposed Głowacki (2003)) and Bobrowski’s (2005; 2006; 2006a) theoretical positions in defence of the traditional trichotomy and against the innovations advanced by Mańczak and many other linguists.

The details of how the transfer of the forms from the genitive to the accusative position (as a real *case* operation or suboperation) is *motivated* are, as is well known, extremely complicated. I shall not discuss them here; let me just mention that a rather comprehensive overview of the relevant material has been given in my (1986) and in Łaziński (2006).

7. A supplementary comment on the masculine and feminine singular inflection, with special reference to the accusative

There are a small number of words that might seem to be in a way troublesome from the point of view that has been expounded above (an important article on some of them is Saloni (2007)). These are nouns whose forms are unitary in all cases of singular without there being a similarly unitary choice of adjectival modifiers or forms of verbs. As an example, take the noun *magnificencja* and the corresponding concatenations such as: *pelen laskawości* ('gracious'), *nasz magnificencja zezwolił* ('allowed'), acc. *pełnego laskawości, naszego magnificencję* vs. *pełna laskawości, nasza magnificencja zezwoliła*, acc. *pełną laskawości, naszą magnificencję* or [...], *Jego magnificencja* vs. [...], *Jej magnificencja* (with analogous parallel modifiers, verb forms, and accusatives; the additions *Jego, Jej*, as well as [the uniform] *Wasza*, cf. *Wasza Eminencja*, in the addressative pronominal use, are markers of a special "poetic" operation on a definite class of operands, and not phraseologisms *sensu stricto*, *pace* Saloni (2007: 214); the additions just mentioned change nothing in our picture of the inflectional facts).

I think the correct solution would consist in positing *two* parallel CSS-units for each such lexical phenomenon. Just to take our exemplary noun *magnificencja*, we would have <magnificencja, SOP'> and <magnificencja, SOP''>, where *SOP'* would stand for all the masculine choices (including *Jego*) and *SOP''* would stand for all the feminine choices (including *Jej*), each set of choices being unequivocally associated with the concepts 'male', 'female', respectively. This would oppose nouns such as *magnificencja* to nouns such as *sierota* which are basically feminine (in reference to both males and females).

Clearly, the number of nouns illustrated here is very small: these are, among others, *ekscelencja, eminenca, Jego wysokość, Jego dostojność, Jego Świątobliwość* (where *Jego* are *not* markers of an operation, unlike in the previous case, but parts of the respective CSS's proper).

Some nouns belong to the same class, with the only difference that they have partly overt distinct case forms; a notable example (if not a *unicum*) is represented by the nouns (*ten*) *sędzia, sędziego, ..., sędzią, sędzim, sędziowie, sędziów, ...* vs. (*ta*) *sędzia, sędzi, ..., sędzią, sędzi, sędzie, sędzi ...*³

³ Maybe the word *starosta*, at least in some cognitive uses (e.g., in reference to a "chief" in a group) and in some kinds of sociological usage, is similar to *sędzia*, although it of course does not have distinct masculine and feminine case forms and it does not extend the paralle-

I can only think of utterances where feminine forms, with such words, are used in reference to men, as word games, as jokes. Therefore, I cannot accept Saloni's (2007: 214) admission of his beautiful example (of a real text) *krakowska Magnificencja Mieczysław Wejman* as a good possibility (the text is either jocular or an effect of negligence, of off-handedness). The same is valid for Saloni's (2007: 215) claim that both *Witamy Cię, nasz drogi magnificencjo!* and *Witamy Cię, nasza droga magnificencjo!* in reference to a man are "kpiarskie, ale poprawne": the first utterance is not a bit a piece of mockery, the second is only correct in its being purposefully and efficiently (no doubt about that!) *grammatically incorrect* (in reference to a man not woman).

8. The accusative as a series of operations

As for the choice between the qualification of the procedure tackled above in terms of either an "operation" or a "suboperation", the following must be said. Operations, as distinct from suboperations, normally carry a definite independent semantic or pragmatic load. But in my framework, the superordinate criterion of recognizing the existence of an operation is that of non-enumerative separability in a proportional pattern within *the overall realm of bilateral expression items*. From this point of view, whatever yields the accusative forms in a regular way *is an operation* rather than a suboperation. The reason is that it does meet the requirement of non-enumerativeness. It meets that requirement in the following way: the accusative is a *by default* (majority) option among all case assignments pertaining to the non-first arguments of verbs and verbal expressions. This characteristic is reasonably construed as a non-enumerative feature.

In this way, the accusative *operations* can be considered to have been validly established. But they no doubt appear to be rather peculiar: they are wholly redundant in their relation to the majority of verbs that display more than one valency place. One may picture an accusative operation as a kind of "bridge" between a given verbal concept and its argument which embodies, more often than not, a patient (e.g. *powiadam kogoś* 'inform someone') or an epistemic object (e.g. *omówić coś* 'discuss something'); this is a "bridge" which is perhaps similar to that represented by the Spanish accusative *a*. (For a more detailed discussion, see my (1986).)

lism to the plural; but the word *wojewoda* can hardly follow suit in any kind of usage: *nasza wojewoda* is almost as jocular in reference to a woman as it is in reference to a man.

9. Gender-related operations in the singular

To close my discussion of case and gender phenomena in Polish nominal phrases in *singular*, from the vantage point of “operations and suboperations”, I shall make a statement on certain additional operations that can be registered in this domain.

These affect so called “two-gender” nouns ending in *-a*: first, neutral words whose canonical representative is the word *sierota* ‘orphan’, second, “pejorative” designations of people with certain behavioral characteristics, cf. *pijanica* ‘drunkard’, or with certain professional membership, cf. *pisarzyna* ‘poor writer’. All of them are often qualified by grammarians in a very simple way: as ones that can take modifiers in either masculine or feminine forms, cf. *ten sierota* or *ta sierota*. However, this statement is not satisfactory: the gender of the modifiers is by no means arbitrary. Either certain cognitive or certain pragmatic values are attached to the genders in these cases; moreover, there is nearly always a hierarchy of genders such that one of them is basic and, as a result, deprived of a *positive* cognitive or pragmatic load.

Here is my draft description of the relevant facts.

Neutral nouns, such as *sierota*, *niemowa* are basically feminine: both female and male orphans used to be named *ta* (etc.) *sierota*; nor is there any possible differentiation in the plural that would allow one to refer to *male* orphans *only* as distinct from female orphans *only* (the exclusive way to make the distinction is by using a periphrase, e.g., *sieroty płci męskiej* ‘male orphans’). However, in singular (and only in singular), one can use masculine modifiers (*ten* [etc.] *sierota*) to introduce an additional presupposition saying that the referent is male. Obviously, we deal here with a separate operation which has a cognitive value. Thus, the marking in question can in no way be considered a pure accommodation feature (or, in my terms, an effect of a suboperation).

The same thing – a change of the gender of adjectival forms going beyond *pure accommodation feature* – is valid for the reverse change: from masculine to feminine adjectival forms. The change in question applies to one subclass of pejorative words that refer to males only: the subclass includes nouns representing a definite *action* characteristic such as *pisarzyna* ‘writer’, *pijanica*, *moczymorda* ‘drunkard’. The self-contained operation of the replacement of the (both expected and real) adjectival masculine modifiers by their feminine counterparts, cf. *ta*

malarzyna ‘this painter’ instead of *ten malarzyna*, cannot alter the sex reference. What remains as a possible effect of the *operation* is a kind of (redundant) *reinforcement* of the negative evaluative component of a given word; this effect, unlike the semantic impact of constructions such as *ten sierota*, must be classed as *pragmatic*.

Special attention, however, should be drawn to another subclass of pejorative words that refer to males only: the subclass including nouns that do *not* represent a definite *action* characteristic which can be eliminated in a person’s subsequent life experience, but rather refer to some immutable “general” kind of ‘someone’, to his durable predispositions. In such cases, the only admissible adjectival accompaniment has the feminine shape, cf. *ta morda* / **ten morda* lit. ‘this mug’ (recall Borowski’s addressing Kwaśniewski: *Olek, mordo ty nasza* lit. ‘O., our mug, you’). In a way, this pattern materializes the shape proper to the short series of general and neutral exclusively feminine names of entities in the denotation of *someone* / *ktoś*, viz. *osoba* ‘person’, *istota* ‘(human) being; individual’.

For obvious reasons, the same unique pattern is valid for pejorative names of a general character where a presupposition is present which provides for females only as referents, cf. words such as (*ta*) *zolza*, (*ta*) *jędza* ‘shrew’, (*ta*) *zaraza* lit. ‘pest’ (this is exactly similar to hypocoristic nouns applying to females, cf. *nasza mordka*, *mordeczka* lit. ‘our mug’ etc.).

Finally, there are pejorative nouns ending in *-a* that can refer *either* to males *or* to females, on equal grounds. Here, one finds the same divide as outlined above.

If a given noun transmits an “immutable” characteristic as described above and illustrated with the name *morda*, which applies to males only, it is invariably feminine. Thus, one says *Jaka z niego (niej) jest okropna pokraka!* ‘what a terrible freak he / she is’, *ta skleroza* lit. ‘sclerosis’, *ta cholera* ‘that fellow, curse him / her’, *ta kurwa* lit. ‘whore’, *ta miernota* ‘mediocrity’, *ta paskuda* ‘scoundrel’ (all the examples are applicable to both males and females).

Again, the matter is different where a definite action characteristic comes to the fore. Here, the choice of masculine or feminine adjectival forms is regulated in the following way. If it is clear to the hearer that the referent is male, either masculine adjectival forms are used, cf. *ten niezdara* ‘this muff’, *ten skarżypyta* ‘this telltale’, while materializing the full-fledged cognitive operation that identifies the referent as a male (cf. the similar case of *ten sierota* above), or feminine adjectival forms are used which *pragmatically*, on the strength of

certain cultural conventions, merely reinforce the negative evaluative component of the content of the word (as referring to a male; this case is similar to examples such as *ta pijaczyna* above). However, from a purely semantic point of view, the pejorative nouns in question which can refer to either males or females have a thoroughly general character and have just *one basic* gender exponent: the relevant forms are feminine (cf. the plural forms such as *te niezdary, każda* [fem.] *z których ...* ‘these muffs each of whom ...’).

Yet another full-fledged cognitive operation consists in adding a feminine adjectival form (where no mockery is plausible) to identify the referent in singular as a female (*ta* [etc.] *niezdara*).

To close these comments on gender operations in singular, we may add that there is also a possibility of using masculine accommodation where a female is referred to by means of an exclusively male characteristic. However, these are merely cases where one has to do with a metonymical procedure indicating similarity to certain kinds of male, cf. *Z niej jest straszny zawadiaka*. ‘she is a terrible blusterer’.

10. Gender-related operations of declinability removal

The last mentioned operations remind us of one very special phenomenon of Polish professional and honorific personal nomenclature with morphological word shapes unequivocally associated with masculine patterns. These nouns sometimes happen to be accompanied by feminine adjectival or verbal forms which indicate that the person in question is female, cf. *nasza doktor wyszła* ‘our doctor has left; fem.’. The parity of reasoning obviously compels me to accept also the existence of a new operation of a similar marking of sex as in the abovementioned case illustrated with the example *ta niezdara*. The operation is all the more distinct as there is no ambiguity here between using the feminine form to attain a purely cognitive aim of informing the hearer of the sex of a given person and using it to pragmatically reinforce the pejorative effect of an expression such as *niezdara* when applied to a male; moreover, the nouns in question lose inflection in the oblique cases and the lack of the endings is a perfect “female” marker which can only go with feminine modifiers, but is independent of the presence of modifiers (again, unlike in the cases like *niezdara* where noun forms are always inflected).

Otherwise, there are different restrictions of both morphological and pragmatic nature limiting the field of application of the procedure now under

consideration (such restrictions are absent from the series exemplified with the word *niezdara*). Thus, words in *-or* (*doktor*), *-er* (*minister*), with a distinct flavour of foreign origin, are easy operands in our procedure, albeit not in a distinctly formal area of speech; but words with obvious native Polish morphemic patterns such as, e.g., *rzecznik prasowy* ‘spokesman’ or *plutonowy* ‘one of the ranks of non-commissioned officers’ do not normally accept feminine modifiers (**ta rzecznik prasowy* [but also **ta rzeczniczka prasowa*], **ta plutonowy* [but also **ta plutonowa*]) and are heavily restricted in their ability to lose endings (expressions such as *do kierownik*, *do naczelnik* ‘to boss, to chief’ are extremely awkward, although phrases like *do pani kierownik* or even *do pani podsekretarz stanu* are acceptable in informal speech). Nouns with an adjectival shape either have their normal feminative, cf. *przewodnicząca* ‘chairperson’, or must both be inflected and preserve their masculine form (also in modifiers) in reference to women, cf. *do (tego / *tej) plutonowego*. It goes beyond the scope of my present aims to offer a detailed account of Polish usage in the relevant domain.

From my vantage point, it is more important to take a stand on the issue of the *nature* of the differentiation in question. Views have been voiced (e.g., by Saloni, cf., among his latest publications, his (2007: 212)), according to which Polish offers the speaker, in the case of an entry such as *doktor*, two nouns with the homophonous nominative singular: one inflected and masculine, the other uninflected and feminine, the “paradigm with bare zero-endings” playing the part of a “word formation” device, parallel to suffixes such as *-k-* in, e.g., *nauczyciel-k-a* ‘teacher; fem.’. This kind of view is in line with the standard overall scheme of imposing uniform morphological patterns on everything or almost everything, where the choice of the patterns is suggested by the dominating (putatively) uncontroversial and customary arrangements of forms. In our case, the relevant theoretical pattern to be complied with is that of parallel forms in *all* “case rows”, wherever *some* difference in the whole “lexeme” can be discovered.

This, however, leads to an inadequacy. The point is that there is no objective necessity of looking upon the nominative singular of the noun *itself* as compelling one to make a choice between two possibilities *that are not susceptible to being correctly generalized*: a form such as *doktor* without accompanying modifiers simply involves no other distinction than on the level of “professional appurtenance” or of “honorific titles”. The mere possibility of *associating* this unique form with either forms that indicate females in *other syntactic positions* or forms failing to do so in those positions cannot allow us *objectively* to split the

meaning of the unique form in a *given* position (which is the proper target in my framework of a “*working grammar*”). What is more, “masculine” forms in those other positions preserve the “natural gender neutrality” as well: they can refer to both males and females (recall that W. Doroszewski strongly favoured addressing women or speaking about them in masculine forms such as *pani doktora, profesora Kurkowską*). As a result, nouns such as *doktor* are, basically, normal masculine names of persons with no *semantic* sex indications, on a par with such masculine words as *szpieg* ‘spy’ (failing to have any endingless oblique case forms) or such feminine words as *osoba* ‘person’. It is only pragmatically, on the basis of the contrast between their forms and the *possible* endingless markedly feminine shapes in oblique cases, that the *implicature* saying that the person referred to is a male can arise (but modifier or verbal indications of femininity are by no means obligatory: phrases such as *minister wyszedł, mój kierownik* etc. in reference to women are absolutely acceptable, especially in formal speech).

On the other hand, the brute fact of usage that consists in dropping the endings in oblique cases to indicate the female nature of the referent remains (together with the fact of such endingless forms governing the feminine forms of adjectival modifiers). This procedure, with its obvious semantic load, must count as a full-fledged, albeit additional, *operation* in the realm of inflection. There is no need to introduce separate “lexemes” denoting female persons. The operation is limited to oblique cases, practically speaking, of singular; in the plural, the endingless forms are absolutely marginal and in any case almost always have to be supported by some adjectival non-masculine-personal forms marking plurality (some bare *profesor wyszły* ‘professors [fem.] have left’ is nearly shocking).

11. The genitive and the accusative plural

The above more or less exhaustive discussion of the theoretical aspects of both case-and-gender accommodation and exploitation of gender (*scil.* of gender forms of modifiers) in self-contained, meaningful operations as observed on the Polish *genitive and accusative singular* has paved the way to a viable account of the Polish cases and genders in the plural. In particular, a number of solutions presented in the foregoing part of the article carry over, *mutatis mutandis*, to the *genitive and accusative plural*.

Above all, in parallel with the accusative singular operation that copies the genitive form yielding a *by default* “bridge” linking the majority of verbs to their

non-first arguments, I shall recognize an analogous operation of marking the accusative plural which can be formulated in the following way:

[“masc.-pers.” acc. plur.]

Replace the form of the nominative plural with the form of the genitive plural.

This operation applies, however, to other operands than in the singular. It applies, first of all, to the special groups of nouns (as well as to their adjectival modifiers or pronominal replacements) as listed below, with the important limitation that no numeral participates in a given phrase; in addition, however, it also applies, after all, to *some selected* nouns when a numeral participates in a given phrase.

The numeral-bound constraint just mentioned will be commented upon first. It is as follows. A vast majority of phrases in the nominative position where a constitutive element is a **numeral** (other than *jeden*; the phrase “other than *jeden*” is understood here in its strict sense: compound numerals such as *dwadzieścia jeden*, *dwudziestu jeden* behave like all other numerals) are preserved *intact* in the accusative position. The only regular departure from what this formula provides for (a departure which I have just alluded to as the numeral-bound constraint) is as follows: if there are accusative phrases *without* a numeral where a noun form ending in *-ów* or in such an ending *-i/-y* that does not replace *-a*, *-o* or *-e* in the nominative singular is present (i.e. a form transferred from the genitive), the corresponding accusative phrase *with* a “non-collective” numeral requires that *both* the noun *and* the numeral assume their genitive forms. Cf., e.g., *te dwa chamy*, gen.-acc. *tych chamów*, gen.-acc. *tych dwóch chamów* / acc. **te dwa chamy*; *ci dwaj prezesi*, gen.-acc. *tych prezesów*, gen.-acc. *tych dwóch prezesów*; *ci dwaj lekarze*, gen.-acc. *tych lekarzy*, gen.-acc. *tych dwóch lekarzy*; but: *te dwie eminencje*, gen. *tych eminencji* (nom. sing. *eminencja*), acc. *te eminencje*, *te dwie eminencje*; *te dwa popychła* (‘drudge’), gen. *tych popychli* (nom. sing. *popychle*), acc. *te popychła*, *te dwa popychła*;⁴

⁴ The following thought experiment suggests that the role of the ending *-ów* as inducing the gen. = acc. plur. (otherwise, merely with respect to personal names) is overwhelming: according to my intuition, as soon as we accept the form *popychlów*, the accusative *tych popychlów* in reference to male persons alone becomes rather natural. On the other hand, the synonymous word *popychadło* (also registered by Doroszewski), with its gen. plur. *popy-*

(*tych*) *dwoje studentów* (with the “collective” form of the numeral), gen.-acc. *tych studentów*, gen.-acc. (*tych*) *dwoje studentów* / *(*tych*) *dwojga studentów*.

Here now is the announced list of groups of nouns replacing the basic, nominative, forms of plural in the accusative positions with the respective genitive forms, as used *beyond* phrases with numerals:

- first, nouns which have the so called masculine-personal shape of the nominative plural (in *-i*, *-cy*, *-dzy*, *-rzy* or *-owie*), regardless of whether they denote males, females or other objects, cf. *satelita – satelici – satelitów*;⁵
- second, those nouns denoting persons where the genitive plural of the nouns has the ending *-ów* or such an ending *-y/-i* which does not replace the ending *-a* of the nominative singular, with the following further proviso: the respective referents are *not exclusively* female.

Thus, we get: ((*ci*) *studenci*) – (*tych*) *studentów* ‘(these) students; gen.-acc.’; ((*ci*) *śludzy*) – (*tych*) *ślug* ‘(these) servants; gen.-acc.; nom. sing. *śługa*’; ((*ci*) *lekarze*) – (*tych*) *lekarzy* ‘(these) physicians; gen.-acc.; nom. sing. *lekarz*’; ((*te*) *chamy*) – (*tych*) *chamów* ‘(these) cads’; gen.-acc.’; ((*te*) *niedorajdy*) – (*tych*) *niedorajdów* ‘(these) muffs; gen.-acc.’; *Basetla – Basetlowie – Basetłów* (gen.-acc.).

All the other nouns (as well as their modifiers or pronominal replacements) leave the nominative plural in the accusative position without any change. Thus, we have in the accusative position the nominative plural shapes: *te domy*, *te kobiety* ‘these women’, *te pola*, but also: *te podlotki* ‘these teenagers [exclusively girls]’, *te babsztyl* ‘these hags’, *te niedorajdy* – as the counterpart of the genitive *niedorajd* (neutral with respect to sex), *te eksceleńce* ‘these excellencies’ (even where the persons referred to are male only or where adjectival forms are masculine plural [*ci eksceleńce* etc.]; cf. the genitive plural *eksceleńcy* with the ending *-i* replacing the ending *-a* of the nominative singular *eksceleńca*), *te kanalie* (feminine only) ‘these blackguards’, and so on.

chadel / **popychadłów*, is in no way eligible for that kind of accusative (the only admissible form remains: *te popychadła*).

⁵ These forms apply to males or females who are dependent on someone in a special way (which we need not describe here; to illustrate the latter instance, that of females, take, e.g., lesbians, cf. *Widziałem tych jej satelitów*. ‘I have seen those satellites [all of them females] of hers’; of course, one can resort to the appropriate word formation operation and coin the derivate *satelitka*, but this is not absolutely necessary) or to nations dependent on some other nation. The name *satelita* for celestial bodies or certain parts of engines has the nominative plural *satelity*, with adjectival forms in *-e*, which is preserved, on general grounds, in the accusative position, in spite of the ending *-ów* in the genitive plural.

A very interesting word is the noun *zuch* ‘wolf (in scouting)’ with its genitive plural *zuchów*; this genitive form may refer either to boys only or to children among whom are boys, but also at least one girl; however, in strict fulfillment of the rule formulated above, the accusative position only accepts (*te*) *zuchy* as a designation of a group consisting exclusively of girls.

A note is in order here on account of Saloni’s (2007: 216–217) description of nouns such as *ekscelecja*, *magnificencja* whose accusative plural was mentioned above (among other forms). The author rightly says that “Linguistic reality is more complicated than all schemata”. In this context, he voices his puzzlement caused by the trouble of how to class the words just mentioned in his list of “gender” categories. Ultimately, he foresees the solution (for a “Grammatical dictionary”) saying that these *lexemes as wholes* are masculine-personal, but have accusatives plural that are, from his point of view, *irregular* in that the accusatives are equal to the respective nominatives plural. However, my way of describing the facts allows me to say that there are *almost no* irregularities in all the forms of our words. In particular, there is a clear rule in favour of keeping their nominative plural forms in the accusative plural (the rule has been stated above).

In terms of Saloni’s own criteria, there is one irregularity which he, surprisingly, does not mention as such. It consists in the presence of the form of the accusative singular such as *te magnificencję* (in reference to a woman): this form is *not* masculine-personal (or masculine-animate). But, as I have shown, the two lexemes (reasonably accepted), the masculine one and the feminine one, can be taken to be, both of them, absolutely regular.

What is important about personal nouns, as far as the grammatical category of “masculine-personal” is concerned, is, contrary to what Saloni claims, not the shape of the accusative plural, but that of the nominative plural.⁶ Forms such as *tych chamów* do not by themselves make the lexeme *cham* masculine-personal,

⁶ This claim might be questioned on the grounds that phrases such as *te chamy*, with a clearly “non-masculine-personal” shape, are pronominally substituted by the 3rd person “masculine-personal” plural form *oni* rather than its “non-masculine-personal” plural form *one*. This would be wrong, however. The distinction *oni* : *one* is independent and self-contained: it is a distinction between ‘you know whom or what I am talking about [reference to what has just been denoted by a masculine-personal nominative plural, say, *satelici* ‘nations’, or to whichever persons among whom at least one male person is present]’ and ‘you know whom or what I am talking about [reference to anyone or anything else than stated in the preceding gloss]’.

cf. the lexeme *niedorajda*, with its possible accusative plural *niedorajdów* (alongside the form *niedorajdy*), which (lexeme) is nevertheless not conveniently called “masculine-personal”. The insertion of the genitive *tych chamów* in the accusative position is just motivated, as it happens, in the case of this word, by the masculine-personal denotation of *cham* (coupled with its nominative form in a consonant which allows for its having the ending *-ów* itself). Now, with words such as *magnificencja*, the nominative plural cannot have, for morphonological reasons, the substantival masculine-personal shape in the first place. Still, it has, as expected, a possible *adjectival* and *verbal* masculine-personal *nominative* accompaniment. This allows us, after all, to see the words in question as really “masculine-personal”.

The only irregularity about them lies in the fact that there is an alternative possibility of using the *non*-masculine-personal accompaniment; of using it *not only* when exclusively females are referred to (this is normal), but *also when exclusively males* are referred to. (More will be said about the nominative plural in the sections that follow.)

12. Near-absence of regular gender-related operations in the genitive and the accusative plural

It might seem that there is, in the position of the genitive plural, an analogon of the operation in the singular that adds the presupposition ‘male’ to words such as *sierota* (see above).

In fact, however, the only gender-related inflectional marker within plural is the ending *-ów* of the genitive plural of “pejorative” nouns in *-a* which confines the referents to males; the zero ending is neutral with respect to sex (it may only generate a “Gricean” implicature that the referents are partly or exclusively female). As for which nouns are able to express this distinction, I can only think of the nouns ending in *-da*; the example adduced above might illustrate it: *niedorajdów* vs. *niedorajd*; similarly: *maruda* ‘dawdler’ – *marudów* vs. *marud*. It is doubtful if any relevant exceptionless rule can be formulated (apart from the very implication: the ending *-ów* [in the category of nouns in question] → ‘male’); a complete scanning over the lexical material and of various speakers’ options would be necessary to clarify the issue, something I could not perform heretofore. A number of statements would most certainly be reduced to lists of individual lexical cases where the idiosyncratic and, perhaps, with certain items, alternative, solutions would have to be inscribed in the respective segmental units.

As for the claim itself positing the described implication, it can be justified by pointing to the obvious deviance of the following strings: *Stefana, Ferdynanda, Karolinę, Zosię, Martę, *wszystkich tych niedorajdów / + wszystkie te niedorajdy, Zosię, Martę, Agnieszkę, *wszystkich tych niedorajdów / + wszystkie te niedorajdy*, paralleled by the licit *Stefana, Karola, Zygmunta, wszystkich tych niedorajdów / wszystkie te niedorajdy*.

In most cases of plural, no parallelism to such a “masculinizing” operation as that in *ten sierota* etc. can be stated. Nouns that only denote males have mostly the ending *-ów*, cf. *lebiegów*; sometimes they have parallel forms, cf. *pijanic / pijaniców*; “pejorative” nouns in *-ina, -yna* whose denotation excludes females have nevertheless almost exclusively the zero ending, cf. *pisarzyn, pijaczyn*. But nowhere is there any independent *inflectional* marker at work that would be like that inherent in *ten* as added to *sierota* by indicating that the denotation embraces exclusively males. Most other nouns in *-a* (those different from neutral ones like *sierota*) similarly lack any means of marking the sex of the referents in the plural (thus, the nouns do not differ from words of the type *sierota*). Their exclusive zero ending in the genitive plural confines them to designating (in all occurrences of plural forms) either males only or females only or else any groups including “mixed” referents among whom there is at least one male or at least one female, without any true inflectional-linguistic distinction, cf. the genitives plural of words in *-a*: *oferm* ‘milksop’, *niezdar* ‘muff’, *plaks* ‘sniveller’, *choler* ‘son of a bitch’, *męczydusz* ‘bore’, *zapchajdziur* ‘factotum’, *skner* ‘miser’, *kutw* ‘hunks’ etc. (the only possibility of indicating the sex is periphrastic, cf. *te wszystkie ofermę płci męskiej* ‘all those muffs who are male’; *te wszystkie ofermę, mam na myśli samych mężczyzn; wszystkie osoby płci męskiej będące ofermami* etc.).

In this context, I must remark that Saloni’s (2007: 212) proposal to accept forms such as *kaleków, slugów* (in the capacity of “masculine-personal” forms) is either his quite idiosyncratic (and, may I say, doctrinaire) idea or a report on some dialect of Polish for which no textual evidence has been submitted, either by the author himself or (as far as I know) by any other investigator.

To close this section, let me add that the words in the group spoken about above of course do not govern adjectival masculine-personal forms (*ci* etc.); they also copy their nominative plural forms in accusative positions.

13. The Polish nominative plural: preliminaries

I shall now turn to a fragment of Polish (relevant to the topic indicated in the title) which, in all its details, is (in an interesting, not trivial, way) incomparable to anything among phenomena of grammatical structure that one can find in the entire Slavonic world and thus, most certainly, also in the totality of languages. The fragment in question can be referred to by means of the cover term “the nominative plural”. Perhaps some common features of expressions in this category (among those features that are not naturally more widespread) can be traced in Polish and Slovak; still, even Slovak is far from being a copy or near-copy of Polish.

There are two most striking traits of the Polish nominative plural.

The first of them is the presence of a special series of morphological forms, called “masculine-personal”. These are either special adjectival (pronominal) masculine-personal forms *optionally* accompanying special masculine-personal forms of nouns themselves or else *merely* adjectival (pronominal) masculine-personal forms *accompanying* those noun forms that have a general, non-special character. The special features of all these forms mark classes or groups of referents as members of the following alternative:

(i) those *only* including (human, more broadly: speaking) *males*, cf. *mężczyzna* – (*ci*) *mężczyźni* ‘(these) men’, *eminencja* – (*ci*) *eminencje* ‘(these) cardinals’ (the latter example illustrates honorific titles ending in *-cja* which may be accompanied alternatively, but not preferably, by non-masculine-personal adjectival forms [e.g., *te eminencje*] even if the referents are exclusively male; but note that similar nouns in *-ość*, if at all imaginable in plural, can only be accompanied by non-masculine-personal adjectival forms, e.g., *Ich pełne łaskowości dostojności*),

(ii) those including (human, more broadly: speaking) *males* and, possibly, *females* in a category *allowing* for the supplementary presence of females, cf. *aktor* – (*ci*) *aktorzy*, *Kowalski*, *Kowalska* – (*wszyscy*) *Kowalscy* (about disconnected persons having the respective mutually related names), *magnificencja* – (*ci*) *magnificencje*, *ekscelencja* – (*ci*) *ekscelencje* (the parenthetical remark in p. (i) is valid here, too, with the difference that the preferential form in our present case is non-masculine-personal),

(iii) those including *necessarily both* *males* and *females*: these are names used to refer to married couples such as *Bartoszewscy*, *Stefanowie*, *dziadkowie*

‘grandfather and his wife’ (I shall talk about these forms below) or such as (obsolete) words in *-ostwo*, e.g., *generalostwo* (with the external inflectional pattern of singular; hence, they used to be called *singularia tantum*; otherwise, the word formation suffix entails the presence of adjectival and pronominal masculine-personal forms as well as verbal past tense forms in *-li*, if any such words *are* present as related predicates or modifiers),

(iv) in some isolated cases, those including persons who are either male or female or at least one member of whom is either a male or a female; such is the case of *impresario – ci impresaria / (ci) impresariowie*,

(v) those including *other* referents than human males or females, but only as covered by the same term that is originally used to refer to males (or predominantly males), cf. *przedstawiciel* ‘representative’ – *(ci) przedstawiciele* (e.g., about specimina of plants, words etc.), or, in very special cases, by a term that may be common to persons and other referents: a notable item in this category is the noun *satelita* (about persons and about celestial bodies).

However, what makes the Polish nominative plural (in all likelihood) completely unrivalled among the world case-number-gender systems is the second trait associated with the first, viz. the additional possibility of the same nominative “masculine-personal” forms being replaced, in certain circumstances, by forms modified in some such way that the issuing shapes are close to the shapes of morphologically comparable words in *the opposing category*, i.e. *the category which excludes masculine-personal forms*.

As an illustration, take the shape of the following word: *kompany* ‘comrades, pals’, which replaces the masculine-personal form *kompani* while being reminiscent, at the same time, of, say, *pawiany* ‘baboons’ (the only form denoting the animal species in question). This kind of form, or replacement, has been named by some scholars *pejorative* (Obrębska-Jabłońska (1925/1946), Laskowski (1998), Bobrowski (2006a)) or, by some others, *depreciative* (Bień, Saloni (1982); Saloni (1988; 1992) and their followers). In my (1995: 40–41), I have proposed to distinguish (for purposes of bilingual lexicography) the following categories: *m os-zyw* (*walet* ‘jack’, *głupek* ‘blockhead’), named “masculine personal-animate” in English (it is characterized by the lack of the masculine-personal nominative), *m żyw-os* (*lizus* ‘toady’), named “masculine animate-personal” in English (with a secondary masculine-personal nominative), *m os* (*krezus* ‘Croesus’), named “masculine personal” in English (with a secondary non-masculine-personal nominative); as for the very forms now under consideration,

they were labeled *r. nie-m.-os.*, e.g., *lizusy*, *krezusy*, as distinct from such masculine-personal forms labeled *r. m.-os.* as *lizusi*, *krezusi*, *przychodzili*.

Regrettably, what we observe in the literature is an almost universal neglect of making the distinction between the true functional “deneutralizing” *modification* of a basically neutral form (as in my example *kompany* vs. the basic *kompani*), on the one hand, and externally similar *unique* forms, or freely alternating couples of forms, of certain inherently “pejorative” words such as *cham*, with its only form of nom. pl. *chamy*, or such as *lizus* ‘toady’, with the alternating forms *lizusi* (governing the masc.-pers. adjectival forms, cf. *ci lizusi*) / *lizusy* (governing the non-masc.-pers. adjectival forms, cf. *te lizusy*). Thus, just to take one example, Bobrowski (2006a: 92) assigns to words such as *chamy* (p. 92) “obligatory pejoratization”; in this way, he assigns the same function to the ending *-y* in *chamy* and in *kompany*, with the only difference that the function is introduced by the lexeme *cham(-)*, in his words, *obligatorily*. This is a misleading formulation: it is precisely *non-obligatoriness* of forms such as *kompany* that is what the entire puzzling phenomenon is all about. Obligatoriness vs. non-obligatoriness of an ending, in this case, of the ending *-y*, makes all the difference. Thus, my vision is radically different from the one presented by Bobrowski (it is different precisely in *this* respect), and earlier, by Laskowski (Grzegorzczkova, Laskowski, Wróbel 1998), with his “pejorative masculine-personal” gender (*rodzaj pejoratywny męskoosobowy*) which embraces both *kompany* and *chamy*. I am not going to analyze the authors’ reasonings in detail. I shall only say that Bobrowski’s (2006a: 92) formula providing for a replacement of a masculine-personal form by a form *of whatever gender* as what “pejoratization” consists in is not adequate. For a positive solution, see below. Let me add that my own proposal in my (1995) is wanting from the present point of view (even if it might provide for correct and more exact indications of facts of Polish for non-Polish users of bilingual lexicography with Polish as the target language).

My main aim in the subsequent observations will be to characterize the Polish forms such as those illustrated with the word *kompany*. These observations must, however, be made against the background of knowledge of all the other categories of forms that will be envisioned in a description that purports to offer an approximation of a full account of the “Polish nominative plural”. This description cannot disregard certain features pertaining to other plural forms as well.

14. Operations on proper names in the realm of plural

To begin with, it is necessary to acknowledge the existence of several functional kinds of the nominative plural and other plural case forms that must neither be lumped together nor assimilated to the phenomenon whose representative will be the form *kompany* cited above.

First, there is the possible *nominative* plural resulting from the operation on those personal proper names that are called “last names” and end in a (conventionally) “soft” consonant, i.e. a consonant which is either simply soft (palatalized) or is a continuant of a soft consonant (with analogous morphonological properties) such as *ć* or *l*. The operation in question yields expressions with the meaning:

‘bearers [male or female] of a “last” name having the shape of either the inflected word _ or the uninflected word _ [the latter is used in reference to females] who are descendants of a male ancestor of a kin’,

e.g. *Miś – Misie, Mickiewicz – Mickiewicze*, as against the ordinary plural *Misio-wie, Mickiewiczowie* which will be commented upon below. Forms like *Mickiewicze* are clearly opposed to the *kompany*-category by their governing adjectival masculine-personal forms, cf. *ci Mickiewicze* (as against *te kompany*).

As is clear from what has been stated, the described operation is limited in an extremely capricious way: there is no *corresponding separate* counterpart of it in the case of last names with *mophonological* characteristics different from those stated above.

Apart from this idiosyncratic category, the situation of possible pluralization of *all* last names, including the forms of the nominative of the nouns in the group that I have just singled out, but also other names, notably “first” names, is as stated below.

On the one hand, there is the simple pluralization of *products* of the most general operation yielding expressions with the meaning:

‘object whose proper name is _’;

here is an example of such an expression: (*pewien*) *Jan* (as derived from the class of genuine, one-referent proper names having the shape *Jan*; note that this ex-

pression is different from a genuine proper name which is present in the phrase *niejaki Jan* ‘a certain J.’).

How are the *plurals* shaped? Normal male last names ending in a consonant, *-a*, *-o* or *-e*, cf. *Herman*, *Mickiewicz*, *Rokita*, *Kościuszko*, *Heine* have their nominative plural in *-owie*, the genitive plural in *-ów* and all the other plural forms complying with the general rules; those having adjectival shapes, such as *Potocki*, *Grobelny*, assume normal plural adjectival forms (in some cases, their nominative singular is preserved, pluralization being marked only on modifiers or verbs: in such a way confusion with common names is avoided, cf. *Wesoły* – *panowie Wesoły* rather than **Weseli*). Female last names ending in (non-adjectival) *-a* or having typical adjectival shapes assume normal plural substantival or adjectival forms, cf. *Puzyniny*, *Malanowskie*, *Bałutowe*; those with non-typical adjectival forms or ending in a consonant or *-o*, *-e* preserve the nominative singular in all case positions while their plurality is only marked on modifiers or verbs, cf. *Wolny*, *Herman*, *Kościuszko*. Finally, *indeclinabilia*, both for males and for females, follow the pattern of the feminine names just mentioned, cf. *Pompidou*.

The important characteristic of these plural forms is that bearers of the relevant proper names are approached in the same way as each such bearer is in his or her capacity of an *isolated* individual. The following test can make it clear. Imagine you face an unknown individual about whom you obtain exclusively the information that his or her name is so and so; you may then say: *Oto przede mną jest (jakiś / jakaś) Wołek // Pompidou // Malanowski / Malanowska* etc. ‘here is [so and so] before me’; suppose now you are confronted *in a similar way* with several or many persons; if there are two “unrelated” men with the name *Malanowski* and two “unrelated” women with the name *Malanowska* or two such men with the name *Herman* (inflected) and two such women with the name *Herman* (uninflected), you can only say truthfully: *Oto przede mną są Malanowscy i Malanowskie* resp. *Hermanowie i Herman*; you cannot truthfully say: *Oto przede mną są Malanowscy* resp. *Hermanowie* (let alone: *Malanowskie* resp. *Herman*). I have deliberately omitted possible additions of such specifiers as *jacyś / jakieś* ‘some’ because each of them excludes from the very beginning, due to its masculine-personal or its non-masculine-personal shape, reference to some of the persons confronted. In particular, the difference between inflected and uninflected names ending in a consonant, *-a* or *-o*, *-e* must be respected. The only exception allowing the speaker to confine herself to one name for all the

persons involved is that of total *indeclinabilia* (including such names as *Wesoły* for both males and females, cf. *supra*; thus, it is imaginable to have an utterance like *Oto przede mną są Wesoły / Pompidou*. where both males and females are referred to).

On the other hand, there is an operation that creates *immediately*, from arbitrary proper names or even mere shapes reminiscent of proper names (all of which naturally have a form of singular) *plural* expressions conveying the concept:

‘persons constituting an arbitrary collective body whose unity is based on some factors the single indispensable element of which is their being directly or indirectly related to someone bearing a particular proper name *pn* [just taken into consideration], while *if* the unity is based on the *names* of each of the persons, then either it is fully exact [i.e. each of them has an absolutely identical name] or, in case there are differences, it conforms to the regularities governing the differentiating relationship between the respective names of males and the respective names of females’.

The shapes resulting from this operation are identical with the plural forms described before (as results of pluralization of individual application of the concept ‘object whose proper name is *_*’). We thus obtain, in the end, forms such as *Stieberowie, Malanowskich, Mickiewiczom, Bohdanowie, Tomaszowie, Tomaszach* etc.

Owing to the great generality of the content as it has been formulated above, these forms *may* refer to any plurality of persons, either consisting only of males or consisting of both males and females, whose *sole* common feature is either the strict identity of their proper name or the fact that their names are related to a proper name in some regular way, as when the name of some of the persons in the plurality is, e.g., *Nowak*, and the name of some other persons is *Nowakowa*. Yet it is much more widespread to use the forms in question when *other* circumstances, apart from the linguistic feature just indicated, are present as well, e.g., when the persons in question are a married couple related to the name of the husband (the wife may have an altogether different name) or are siblings related to a name which is common to them.

One can even say that the use of our plurals to refer to coincidental groups of persons united exclusively by their proper names when the speaker has just casually selected them as her object of interest is of a rather “academic” nature

and is attested in almost negligible numbers of real occurrences. This might give rise to a conjecture going in the direction of distinguishing a number of separate substantively weightier items in language, such as “names of married couples” (accompanied by special forms of numerals, cf. *oboje Nowakowie* ‘both N.’), “names of kins”, “names of siblings”, “names of all members of the family “headed” by father NN”, etc. But this would contravene the principle of separation of kinds of *use* to which semantic instruments are put from the instruments themselves, i.e., briefly, the principle of respecting the great divide between pragmatics and semantics. It is true that as soon as you refer to an individual you are acquainted with as *Kaczyński* and as soon as you are known to your audience to do so, your use of the plural form *Kaczyńscy* or *bracia Kaczyńscy* in a way invokes the genuine proper name *Kaczyński* of, say, *Jarosław Kaczyński*, whereas your use of the phrase *Kaczyńscy* in the sentence *Zostali mi przedstawieni jacyś bracia Kaczyńscy, których widziałem po raz pierwszy w życiu*. ‘some brothers K. were introduced to me whom I saw for the first time in my life’ is no different from that in some utterance *W tym sklepie pracuje dwóch Kaczyńskich*. ‘in this shop, two K. are working’ where you may have no idea of how to appropriately use the shape *Kaczyński* as a genuine proper name while dealing with one of the employees in that shop. Still, all those differences can only be known to the observers on non-linguistic grounds (or owing to the context); the *forms* themselves are unitary. Therefore, I must insist on the generalization that I have made.

Even so, the claim of the relationship of homonymy between, on the one hand, products of the operation just described and, on the other hand, the plural forms of expressions with the meaning ‘object whose proper name is __’, in the singular, is unavoidable. The reason is that the latter forms cover only persons whose *exact* names are *either inflected male or uninflected female names, but not both*, whereas the former products may cover *both* males and females. This is notably the case in all kinds of generalization, cf. *wszyscy Nowakowie, ci Nowakowie*. All the described circumstances preclude any merger of the two categories of expressions we have touched upon in some overall category (the relevant operation products can in no way be accommodated in one monosemous series).⁷

⁷ Let me add that the phrase *wszyscy Marie* ‘all M.s’, strictly speaking, denotes both females whose first name is *Maria* and males whose first name is *Maria*: the phrase *wszystkie Marie* can only refer to females. But given that most persons called *Maria* are female and that the phrase *wszyscy Marie* (in its contrast to *wszystkie Marie*) is easily interpreted as referring to males only, it would be preferable, in saying that something is true of *all* bearers of

In this context, it will be important to notice the morphological difference concerning pluralization of first names: whereas names of married couples after the first name of the husband in the nominative plural always follow the general pattern described above, cf. *Janowie*, *Tomaszowie* etc. like *Mickiewiczowie*, *Fredrowie* etc., the plural of the first names denoting just more than one person according to the procedure described earlier on has the shape ending in *-e* (not in *-owie*) if the names end in a soft or “functionally soft” consonant, cf. *Tomasze*, e.g., *w tej szkole są dwaj Tomasz* ‘in this school, there are 2 T.’s’ (vs., e.g., *Janowie*, which is overtly identical with designations of married couples, of groups of friends, etc.). This circumstance speaks forcefully to the validity of the homonymous split I have advocated.

15. “Qualitatively characterizing” operations on proper names

At this point, I am coming to one more special type of use of proper names, a type of use, practically speaking, confined to personal proper names and transforming them, again, into plural forms according to the “academic” pattern of surface shapes mentioned above, with such a functional load, however, that they cannot be accommodated in any rubric spoken about previously. I have in mind plurals that can be defined as carrying the sense of

‘objects having commonly known features characteristic of _’

where the blank is to be filled with a genuine proper name (having a real reference) or with a specific “literary” (quasi-)proper name. Normally, one deals with names of persons (e.g., *Wojtyła*).

The addressed aspects of similarity are not made precise in the relevant utterances, but are more or less transparent when the name inserted in the blank () is actually firmly associated with some salient properties of its definite bearer and when the hearer can infer the speaker’s intention from the circumstances of the utterance. Since an *arbitrary* proper name as such cannot suggest any relevant personal pattern, to use just a name chosen at random would make little sense. A typical context for using our present operation can be exemplified by the following sentence: *Kościół potrzebuje nowych Wojtyłów*. ‘the Church needs new

that name, to use a more complicated phrase, viz. *wszystkie Marie i w ogóle wszyscy Marie* ‘all Marias [female] and, in general, all Marias’.

Wojtylas'. In the nominative, apart from official plurals such as *Quislingowie*, *kompany*-nominatives can also be used, cf. *Quislingi*.

In the case of “positive examples” and “edifying” utterances, the only plural shapes to be used as resultants of our present operation are the “official” forms of plural conventionally attached to “last” proper names (but pseudos, nicknames or first names in a similar capacity can do, too; practically speaking, merely *these* categories are involved in the operation we are dealing with, although, theoretically speaking, geographic names etc. can undergo our *semantic* operation as well, only with *no special forms* of plural as illustrated by the word *Quislingi*).

If, in rarer cases, the speaker *disapproves* of certain features of a chosen person whom s/he designates in a syntactic position of the nominative, s/he can use either the same form of the nominative plural or another, non-masculine-personal form of it which morphologically corresponds to that person's name, as exemplified with the name of the Norwegian. I shall take up this topic in a later section.

16. The non-masculine-personal replacement of masculine-personal forms in the nominative plural

I shall now proceed to submit the announced interpretation of the most peculiar Polish phenomenon in the field we have addressed: that of the speakers' performing an occasional shift – from the established norm of referring to, mainly, human males, by using a special masculine-personal form of the nominative plural – to a modified form where the modification consists in bringing the resulting form closer to the related shapes of non-masculine-personal nouns, viz. nouns denoting animals, plants, infants, women or inanimate objects, cf. my introductory example of a possible replacement of the form *kompani* with the form *kompany*. This kind of possible modification is something every native speaker of (standard) Polish has a perfect command of, even if she makes, generally speaking, a rather infrequent use of the procedure.

According to the widely circulated treatment proposed in the latest decades of Polish linguistics by Bień, Saloni (1982), Saloni (1988; 1992) (and supported by a number of scholars of a similar theoretical persuasion), the nominative plural of masculine nouns denoting persons is a value of the case (and number) parameter which, in Polish, intersects with another, separate and newly postulated, inflectional parameter; its adopted name and interpretation introduces, namely, the

distinction ‘depreciative’ vs. ‘non-depreciative’. Correspondingly, the parameter takes the indicated two values while overtly marking them in a suitable way: the non-depreciative member receives the ending *-owie* or the ending *-i/-y* with an alternation in the preceding consonant (an alternation that softens it or replaces *k, g, r* with *c, dz, rz*, respectively, cf. *aktor – aktorzy*); the other, depreciative, member has normally a shape copying the relevant features of the forms of the majority of masculine or feminine nouns where the endings *-y/-i* (*i* after *k, g*) and *-e* (but not *-owie*) are functioning. In a way, Saloni’s schema echoes Obrębska-Jabłońska’s (1925/1946) picture of the phenomenon where she opposed “positive-masculine-personal” forms (formy “dodatnio-męsko-osobowe”) of the nominative plural to the respective “pejorative” forms (thus, she may be interpreted as suggesting that the forms in *-i/-y* are “marked” no less than the other ones, although she nowhere addressed the categories of markedness / unmarkedness explicitly).

A striking fact about Saloni’s schema is that it provides for a vast regularity which is not confirmed by empirical material. If we disregard the numerous forms such as *chamy* where the alleged “depreciative” member is the only form of a given noun and thus can in no way implement an inflectional *distinction* within a given lexeme and if we concentrate, in accord with the basic idea in question, on the real possibilities of the said *distinction*, we see that the possibilities are severely limited because of various kinds of morphological blocking which affects large series of nouns, and that where there is no such blocking, speakers anyway use the depreciative form quite infrequently. Its use is triggered by rather subtle circumstances. Most importantly, it is *not* released by the fact that a speaker simply deems the referents, either as a *class* denoted by a given noun or as those *specific* males who are addressed in a given situation, deserving a kind of critical or even derogatory attitude. Note, by the way, that the question of *what* particular aspects of the respective persons are to be weighed out and overtly objected to by the speakers when they use a “depreciative” form has not been clarified at all within the conception we are discussing.

As an example, take the relatively new noun *deweloper*: it is by far not enough that someone wants to qualify the activities of developers in general or of some individual developers as somehow marred in regard of their value for her to use the form *deweloperzy* instead of the form *deweloper*; more than that, in an overwhelming majority of situations, it will not even occur to a speaker that she faces that special choice: whether to use the latter or the former shape of this word or of any other similar word. Thus, the suggestions inherent in Saloni’s (or,

for that matter, also Obrębska-Jabłońska's, Laskowski's or Bobrowski's) labels are certainly insufficient to correctly circumscribe the relevant domain of use and may even be seriously misleading.

Saloni's vision has also been objected to, in several brief and cursory statements, by Łaziński (2006: 176–7). The author writes: “[...] it is more convenient [...] to regard the phenomenon as a case of stylistic variability of forms which clearly leaves out a part of masculine-personal nouns and, for the part of nouns actually affected by it, is a substandard form”.⁸

Below, I shall take up, in turn, the formal and the functional constraints imposed on the *kompany*-nominative, as I shall call it preliminarily.

17. Formal constraints on the replacement

Here are the most important formal constraints. If the expected non-masculine-personal ending appropriate to a given noun is, for morphological reasons, *-e*, cf., e.g., *króle* ‘kings’ (cf. the ordinary *króle* ‘rabbits’), *wygnańce* ‘exiles’, the respective form is, one must admit, not altogether excluded from use, but its nature is, more often than not, that of a (more or less conventional) archaism. If anything, the quasi-archaic forms in question may count as elevated; in no way can they function as adding some axiological minus to the operands thus modified; some similar cases are also attested for nouns with a “hard” consonant at the end of the word-formation basis and with the corresponding ending *-y*, cf. *dziady* (alongside the ordinary *dziadowie*), *praszczury* in the sense of ‘ancestors’.⁹ However, following a conversation with Professor Saloni (for which I am indebted to him), I must admit that the “pejorative / depreciative” forms in *-y/-i* indeed *can*, secondarily, be paralleled by the *-e*-forms meant to play exactly the same role. I can point to such relatively realistic possibilities of use as that of *wuje / stryje* (‘uncles’) *poszli sobie popić* alongside my example adduced in the next section: *dziadki poszli sobie popić*; interestingly enough, the

⁸ The latter statement is inadequate, unless any kind of pragmatic markedness is to be claimed to belong to “substandard” phenomena; this, however, would amount to a drastic and strange terminological regulation. Apart from his mention of possible archaisms among the forms in question, Łaziński has not clarified his “stylistic variability” in any way.

⁹ An important qualification, however, must be added to this statement: proper names which morphologically can only accommodate the ending *-e* can be used in a different way, at bottom, in line with the *kompany*-nominative; for the relevant interpretation, see a section below.

same move is impossible with respect to the plural form *ojce* from *ojciec* ‘father’: this form is exclusively archaic and elevated.

The reason why the morphologically governed ending *-e* in nouns is, at the very best, secondarily available for a similar use as that applying to forms such as *kompany* is not only the circumstance that plenty of the nominative plural forms in *-e* where the ending *-e* replaces the endings *-owie* or *-y* have archaic flavour about them, but, above all, the fact that *-e* is the *exclusive* ending in perhaps a vast majority of the members of the relevant morphological class and the *by default* reaction to combinations of the *-e*-forms with adjectival non-masculine-personal forms (*te nauczyciele* ‘these teachers’, *te żołnierze* ‘these soldiers’, etc.) is that of appraising them as cases of *elementary ungrammaticality* (so strong is the feeling of the fundamental difference between the *basis* of language [with its *ci nauczyciele* etc. in this particular case] and all kinds of secondary actions that may happen to be applied to linguistic forms).

As for adjectival non-masculine-personal forms themselves, cf. *te, wszystkie*, they of course are required by the non-neutral noun forms spoken about above, but they do not carry any negative axiological load in these cases either. The most such adjectival forms can achieve in the way of “depreciation” (apart from their participating in *kompany*-nominatives) is redundantly compounding the lexical “pejorativeness” of nouns such as *chamy* (with their *obligatorily* taking non-masculine-personal modifiers), in particular, in cases where pejorative nouns have parallel forms or parallel possibilities of “gender government”, cf. *ci lizusi / te lizusy; ci oberwańcy / te oberwańce* ‘these ragamuffins’, *wszyscy / wszystkie nicponie* ‘all good-for-nothings’, *ci / te walkonie* ‘these do-nothings’, *nasi / nasze lenie* ‘our sluggards’, *ci / te brzydale* ‘these frights’, marginally: *te ciecie* ‘these houselords; flippant’ instead of the basic *ci ciecie*.

I am passing on to another morphological category where modifications similar to that in *kompany* are not implemented. Practically speaking, nouns whose nominative singular ends in *-a* (most of them are borrowings in *-ta*, cf. *astronauta, -sta*, cf. *artysta, -ita*, cf. *kosmopolita*) are inept at forming their non-masculine-personal counterparts. Perhaps only words of native origin such as *wojewoda – wojewodowie* can be, rather theoretically, thought of as admitting their counterparts in *-y* (*wojewody*). Numerous words in *-a* discussed earlier on in this article have the exclusive ending *-y* (*sieroty, ofermi, zapchajdziury* etc.) and are automatically beyond the area of our present concern.

Finally, nouns that have an adjectival type of declension are excluded from that area as well. The reason is that the respective adjectival forms in *-e* serve as standard, or basic, forms of designations of females, cf. *dyżurny – dyżurne*. This kind of morphological-semantic blocking is highly significant: it forcefully shows that the postulated inflectional parameter of “depreciativeness” cannot stand any comparison with the real core of case, number and gender distinctions (in the case of “gender”, I have in mind the traditional basic distinctions); in other words, it shows the additional and extraneous, I would say: parasitic, character of the phenomena of the *kompany*-nominative.

Following these reservations concerning the formal “outs” among the nouns that can, from the semantic point of view, be affected by the *kompany*-nominative transformation, but fail to undergo it, it will be appropriate to formulate a positive condition on that nominative.

It reads:

[LUD: form]

Replace the ending -om or -ach in the plural forms (of the dative or locative, respectively) which succeeds either a hard consonant (other than a “functionally soft” one in the sense of Doroszewski, e.g., l, ż) or, secondarily, a soft or a “functionally soft” consonant – with -y/-i (-i following k, g) instead of the endings -i/-y (with the necessary concomitant alternations), -owie, -e, or else with -e instead of the endings -owie, -y, respectively, provided the replacing endings do not substitute the ending -a of the nominative singular or plural or -o of the nominative singular.

Apart from obvious correct resultants of this instruction such as *kompan – kompanom – kompany, warszawiak – warszawiakom – warszawiaki*, we obtain such acceptable forms of the same character as *luteranin – luteranom – luterany, przyjaciel ‘friend’ – przyjaciółom – przyjacioły, wuj ‘uncle’ – wujom – wuje*. Note that the imaginable transformation of the *nominative* singular or plural of such words would be very complicated and idiosyncratic should it lead to forms that are actually in use (therefore, Bobrowski’s (2006a: 92) suggestion that what takes place here is a change on the nominative plural is not adequate). Our proposed rule also correctly reflects such “outs” as *ksiądz ‘priest’ – księżom – *księży* (because of the “wrong” consonant before the ending and because of the ending *-a* in the regular or official nominative plural; one can only use

a kind of suppletivism: *klechy* instead of the non-existent **księży*; the form *księdze* suggested by Saloni [p.c.] seems to be purely theoretical), *książe* ‘prince’ – *książętom* – **książęty* (because of the ending *-a* in the nom. plur. *książęta*), *sędzia* ‘judge’ – *sędziom* – **sędzie*, *złotko* ‘champion (winner of a golden prize; cf. *złoto* ‘gold’)’ – *złotka* (nom. plur.) – *złotkom* – **zlotki* (should men be called *zlotko*, plur. *zlotka*; so far, only a Polish female volley-ball team has been called that way, but, surely, nothing prevents one from calling men *zlotka* as well), *macho* – *machom* – **machy*, *mafioso* – *mafiosom* – **mafiosy* (cf. the nom. plur. *mafiosi*).¹⁰

To make the survey of the formal constraints on the *kompany*-type replacement complete, it will be appropriate additionally to clarify the behaviour of all kinds of possible modifiers of nouns that are susceptible to undergoing the operation we are discussing. The relevant statement is quite simple: the modifiers can neither assume their masculine-personal forms in syntagms with nouns undergoing the replacement nor accompany, in non-masculine-personal forms, masculine-personal forms of nouns; thus, e.g., both such syntagms as **ci kompany* and as **te kompani* are illicit; they can only occur as slips of the tongue. This applies, in particular, to what can be expected as the most plausible relevant concatenations with personal names, given that the operation in question affects *plural* forms and yields, again, *plural* forms, viz. to concatenations with numerals. Only non-masculine-personal numeral forms that are adjusted to non-masculine-personal *nominative* forms of nouns can occur in the appropriate syntagms; other non-masculine-personal numeral forms, forms which require an accommodation of nouns and deprive them of their nominative shapes, in particular, which require that the nouns assume the genitive form, are not eligible in our operation. Therefore, we can have syntagms such as *dwa kompany*, *oba kompany*, *trzy kompany* and *cztery kompany*, but not **pięć kompanów* etc.

18. The functional role of the replacement

The most important aspect of the *kompany*-nominatives is its functional role. If we closely follow up the real circumstances of the rather infrequent use of these forms, we must give up the idea that they serve the purpose of “stigmatizing”

¹⁰ The slang word *wykidajło* has both the form *wykidajła* and the form *wykidajły*, cf. Doroszewski’s dictionary, but these have just parallel endings which do not function in a contrastive way; the lexeme *as such* is “pejorative”. Cf. also the archaic *rębajło* – *rębajły*, with no contrast.

either classes of persons (this is in fact excluded) or some specific groups of persons. Even if our forms crop up in negative statements about such groups, the critique need not be and normally is not directed against the fact that the persons in question satisfy the features expressed by the respective nouns; rather, the critique is concerned with certain concrete situations in which the persons are involved, surely, in *some* connection with the relevant sets of features.

But what is most striking about the real usage is the fact that, contrary to the opinions prevailingly voiced in linguistic literature, the largely dominant way of how *kompany*-nominatives are exploited is in situations where speakers are *amused* by some events and are talking about them in a good-natured tone of voice, in a jocular, playful, sometimes ironic mood, perhaps with some flippancy which only *can oscillate* on the border-line between non-seriousness and malice (I have elaborated on these features of Polish usage in my (2007a)).

Here is a sample of genuine or easily imaginable utterances where our nominatives are used. A mother praises her sons upon their coming home with their school certificates: *Ach, wy moje kochane prymusy*. ‘ah, you my dear tops’; in another situation, she accompanies her feeding them with the comment: *Nasze wojaki muszą się pożywić*. ‘our soldiers must refresh themselves’. Someone complains about his arrogant neighbours: *Te beznadziejne sąsiady znowu grają na cały regulator*. ‘those damned neighbours are again playing music fortissimo’. A group of Polish TV-journalists used to be called *pampersi*; but it was quite current to change it into *pampersy*, no matter whether they were criticized as “right-wing extremists” or whether they were spoken about by their friends. I once encountered an ideal specimen of absolutely idiomatic Polish usage: in the nineties, Professor Janus made a remark on some unwise moves on the part of certain politicians of the Christian-National Party spontaneously modifying their label *chrześcijanie* (in its metonymic application) into *chrześcijany*; there was in her utterance no general condemnation of the persons in question, let alone any derogatory attitude towards someone’s Christian faith. In a similar way, one can plausibly utter something like *Tu się cały czas panoszą te cholerne weterany*. ‘those bloody veterans are lording it all the time here’. It is fairly common to jestingly or jovially apply the same kind of modification to the last name common to members of a family with whom one is on friendly terms, e.g., *Łapiedon – Łapiedony* (officially, of course, *Łapiedonowie*); this can even be extended to names whose morphonological nature is the same as that of words requiring the ending *-e* and, practically speaking, failing to be eligible for our

kompany-nominative of common nouns (see *supra*); for an additional comment on proper names and their relationship to *kompany*-nominatives, see a separate section below. Recall also lines of poetry such as *tańcowaty dwa Michały*, where one is playing on (proper) *first* names.

It is true that, contextually and epiphenomenally, the basic “jocular flippancy” of our nominative may often be accompanied with a critical attitude of the speaker towards the persons spoken about. Thus, obviously pejorative lexemes such as *bumelant* or *malwersant* would readily be used in their *kompany*-nominatives *bumelanty* lub *malwersanty*; but this cannot happen solely because the user has just recalled that the respective kinds of behaviour are appraised as bad by some people or even are sincerely so appraised by him/herself. It is extremely significant that the word *wróg* ‘enemy’ which is often used to blame someone, but which is at the same time very “serious”, is almost immune to being changed into the form *wrogi*; this transformation is either a conventional (elevated) archaism or requires that some highly sophisticated conditions be met for it to be used.

Another circumstance worth paying attention to is the fact that speakers resort to *kompany*-nominatives almost exclusively to refer to a wholly specific situation involving a concrete group of people. This is in full harmony with the ludic nature of the operation. Where entire abstract classes of persons and, correspondingly, what is common to *all* the respective members are addressed, the use of forms such as *strażaki* ‘firemen’ or *dziadki* ‘grandfathers’ is absolutely improbable; and the reason is that the idea of making fun of the *concept* ‘fireman’ or ‘grandfather’ can hardly occur to anyone. On the other hand, well known persons whom one approaches in a jovial way can easily and naturally be described in utterances such as *Strażaki szykują piękną imprezę*. ‘the firemen are preparing an interesting event’ or *Dziadki* [instead of *dziadkowie*; what I have in mind is not the word *dziadkowie* as a designation of a married couple] *poszli sobie popić*. ‘the grandpas have gone for a drinking session’.

19. Ludicrativus

At this point it is necessary to propose, at last, a definite characterization of our object.

While invoking my conceptual categories recalled before, I shall say the following. The modification of the subgroup of nominatives plural whose boundaries have been explained above, a modification functionally opposing

the resultants to the basic masculine-personal forms of the nominative plural is an *added* operation which cannot be treated as implementing a special inflectional parameter. The operation has a pragmatic character; more specifically, it should be related to the so-called poetic function and, within its realm, it must be characterized as materializing what I would call “ludic instrumentalization” of expressions; other features that may accompany that kind of use are basically epiphenomenal (contextually determined). As a name of the operation, I would propose “ludicrative”, or *ludicrativus*, from Lat. *ludicer* / *ludicrus* ‘playful; ridiculous; amusing’; a resultant of the operation may be called, in accordance with the procedures known from grammatical tradition, *ludicrativum* (as related to such and such a word, cf. *deminutivum* in its relation to a basic word).

In a way, I was prone already long ago to approach *kompany*-nominatives as a kind of extraneous *addition* to inflection; I even thought of characterizing their essence as a kind of deliberate playing with linguistic deviance. But I owe to Bobrowski (2006a) an important stimulus for a more regimented account of the nominatives in terms of an “operation” (“operation” in the sense introduced in my (1978)). He submitted this solution as a reasonable answer to the puzzle while pointing to my (1999) where I discussed the possibility of interpreting a series of Polish (substandard) expressions illustrated with *premie-sremie* as resultants of a suitably formulated operation.¹¹

Similarly as the vocative is no real element of inflection in its well-grounded understanding, so is the use of *kompany*-nominatives something where means supplied by phenomena of inflection are perhaps utilized, but which belongs to an altogether different plane of language.

On the other hand, the account in terms of a definite operation respects the undeniable fact that what is visible in our raw phenomena is a *unitary* well circumscribed formal procedure which applies in a uniform way, at least potentially, to members of a very large class of expressions, without any necessity of making additional individual decisions for certain unrepeatable situations. A far-reaching differentiation is no doubt present in our material, but what is at stake is only identification of suitable *motivating circumstances*. To make them quite precise may be difficult, but the identification most certainly involves a well defined set of aspects of speech situations one has to cope with.

¹¹ Whether the specific formula proposed in my article was adequate may be a debatable point, as Bobrowski noted in his article; but this is another matter.

20. Ludicrativus and proper names

I have mentioned earlier on that proper names are relatively frequent objects of the transformation yielding the appropriate *kompany*-nominatives. This is entirely natural given that both proper names as such and the operation in question are concerned with specific groups of people.

What is to be added now is an explanation of the undeniably *contemptuous*, even sarcastic, in no way playful, good-natured, use of “last” proper names as operands in what I have decided to dub *ludicrativus*. As typical examples in current Polish journalism or in related genres of speech, including private conversations, one may point to such targets as *Lepper* or *Michnik* addressed in the ludicrativa *Leppery*, *Michniki*.

The riddle about this series of expressions can be described in the following way. On their formal (external) side, they do not differ from ludicratives commented upon before, both based on common and proper names; but their functional nature is not in line with, to put it in general terms, “flippancy” of those ludicratives. On the contrary, it is the present proper name nominatives that could substantiate most strongly the idea of “pejorativeness” or “depreciativeness” of the morphological phenomenon of *kompany*-nominatives. This may give rise to a guess, by far not preferable, that there are *two* “homonymous” operations creating the strange nominatives by means of the same set of surface transformations: one of the operations would be “merry”, the other, “gloomy”. On the other hand, the two operations would apply to disjoint and thus mutually complementary sets of operands, a circumstance that normally inclines one to think of contextual factors being at work and suitably modifying some *unitary* functional load. The two sets of operands are: first, those proper names that identify, in accordance with their nature, one person only, without any kind of their (non-coincidental) extension to other persons, so that other persons (possibly) denoted by the *plural* nominatives have (non-coincidentally) nothing to do with the name of that person; second, those proper names that identify, again, in accordance with their nature, one person only, however, with a certain kind of their (non-coincidental) extension to other persons, e.g., by way of another person being the former person’s wife who (non-coincidentally) has the last name almost identical with her husband, the difference being merely that the husband’s name is inflected and the wife’s name

uninflected. Clearly, in the first case, the *kompany*-nominative is “gloomy”, in the second case, “merry”.

I shall claim that the indicated “danger of multiplying entities beyond necessity” can nevertheless be avoided. In what way?

To begin with, let us agree that personal proper names (*stricto sensu*, i.e. not as mere shapes, but with their individual reference) are associated with what the respective persons *do* (see my (2007) for an extensive theoretical treatment of proper names) and what they do in such a way that the acts somehow distinguish them on a non-coincidental basis (e.g., the fact that *a* had her breakfast at 7:00 yesterday rather than at 8:00 is *not* apt to be a distinctive *personal* trait) while at the same time their being distinctive is not independent of the persons as *agents* (e.g., a particularly low pitch as an acoustic property of how a person speaks surely makes the person distinct, but not in the plane of her *agentive* properties). Now all such distinctive agentive traits inevitably attract our attention, when they are being considered, from a comparative point of view, as shared or possibly shared by other persons, in such a way that they are appraised as good, commendable, worth approval or admiration etc. or as displaying some opposite *value* qualities, briefly, when they are being considered in an evaluative way.

Suppose now one wants to *enhance* what characterizes a person known under a proper name by entertaining an extension of the approved qualities to other persons; it is clear that a playful form of expression would weaken one’s suggestiveness with regard to his *serious* aim; one may say: such an utterance would be pragmatically strongly incoherent. If, on the other hand, context clearly indicates one’s critical attitude towards what a person embodies and what other persons share or may share, nothing can annul hearers’ awareness of *that* attitude. One then is free to resort to either “official” forms or ludicratives, using the latter as means of *adding* irony to one’s disapproval and thus in a way sharpening one’s contemptuous attitude: there is no reason why one should be afraid of one’s hearers apprehending one’s utterance as a kind of quotation wherein one just recalls *other* people’s possibly censuring the person in question and all other persons who are thought of as similar to her in the relevant respect (otherwise, such a quotative, mocking, use of the forms of proper names now under consideration is possible as well).

As a result, I am broadening the range of use of our ludicratives while preserving their strict unity. Whatever differences we detect in their functioning (and what is problematic are precisely the “derogatory” occurrences of *kompany*-

-nominatives) indeed is a predictable outgrowth of the interaction of the *unitary* nature of the operation I am trying to describe here, on the one hand, and all the features of context (as just sketched out), on the other.

Let me add that the “contemptuous” subclass of usage within the stock of *kompany*-nominatives tends to expand freely even to those subsets of nouns where I said ludicratives are secondary, in particular, to proper names whose expected ending is *-e*, cf. *Hegle, Kupście* (instead of *Heglowie, Kupściowie*); but one must admit that the forms typically serving as names of kins, cf. *Bohdziewiczze*, would normally efficiently resist attempts to coerce them to play the part of “curses” of sorts. Interestingly enough, the expansion of *kompany*-type-nominatives as means of stigmatization to *adjectival* forms is highly improbable: so strong is the interference of the *superordinate cognitive* value of such forms (as pointing to *female* referents), cf. the extremely strange forms (*wszystkie te*) *Chomskie, Grobelne* as supposed to refer to men (whereas the same forms are normal [but official, non-depreciative!] when the referents are women [and their names are, accordingly, *Chomska, Grobelna*]; note that if the exact female names are *Chomsky, Grobelny*, the correct plural forms denoting only women will be: *wszystkie / te* [etc.] *Chomsky, Grobelny*).

21. Remarks on the origin of ludicrativus

Let me now say a couple of words on the origin of our *ludicrativus*.

The main work dedicated to this topic is the highly valuable study by Obrębska-Jabłońska (1925/1946). As mentioned earlier on, she dubbed the contemporary forms of our concern “pejorative”. But she also registered flippant and jocular (*rubaszne, żartobliwe*) uses of *kompany*-nominatives in the 18th–19th centuries. She exemplified them with Mickiewicz’s *Maćki, Mazury* in *Pan Tadeusz*; we may recall another Mickiewicz’s phrase of a similar character, viz. *moje kamraty* ‘my comrades’ in *Powrót taty*.

The author proposed to derive what I call “ludicratives” from archaic and elevated forms used mainly in the 18th and 19th century poetry. This was an epoch that succeeded the time when the old system of declension, closer to Proto-Slavonic, had disintegrated as a result of the invasion of the syncretic accusative equal to the genitive of masculine animate or, in the plural, masculine personal, nouns, as well as the invasion of the former accusative into the position of the nominative plural. The latter forms were apprehended, both in the accusative and, later, in the nominative plural (where, as is well known, they were quite novel),

as marking an old-fashioned style of text composition. This is most certainly the case when we come across Mickiewicz's nominatives *Hofraty*, *Landraty* (*Pan Tadeusz*) quoted by Obrębska-Jabłońska or Norwid's *bitne generały* as well as so many other places in Polish poetry of the time.

The puzzle we are facing consists in the following: there was, on the face of it, a transition from the elevated or genre-conventional nature of the forms in question to something quite different, viz. a fashionable way of text formation bestowing on the texts a kind of "playful irony", such as we all know very well and as I have exemplified above (e.g. with quotations from Mickiewicz). Obrębska-Jabłońska makes the process dependent on the use of those conventional forms in satirical poetry of the 18th century. Her main illustration is Trembecki's poem *Do Jasia o fryzowaniu*. She says: "In *List do Jasia* [Letter to J.], we grasp in *flagranti* the rise of the pejoratives from the roots of archaisms" (p. 220). Unfortunately, this was, on Obrębska-Jabłońska's part, a kind of leap in the reasoning. The satirical nature of the poem in no way entails the poet's derogatory attitude towards *poprzedniki* 'predecessors', *prawniki* 'lawyers', *doktory* 'doctors', *autory* 'authors', *pacyenty* 'patients', *ministry* 'ministers'. All we know points to the plausibility of Trembecki's just having adjusted his text to the widespread literary convention of his epoch. But even if Trembecki or other satirical writers of the epoch, e.g., Krasicki, tried to make a mockery with regard to persons they mentioned, it is hard to see in what way this could be discovered by the recipients of the poetry, thus allowing the entire population of speakers to imitate the writers and ultimately create the new common linguistic habit.

It is much more plausible that the "animallike" treatment of persons referred to as *chamy*, *obiboki*, *lotry*, *lobuzy*, *urwisy* etc. naturally induced speakers who, for example, came across the promiscuity of using both forms of the name of bishops, viz. *biskupi*, *biskupy*, to approach the nominative *biskupy* as not quite serious and perhaps even (often justifiably) critical in relation to certain bishops, quite independently of the fact that the social position itself of bishops was far from being regarded as close to that of rascals.

There was, I think, yet another factor conspiring to bring about the functional change now under consideration. The 19th century after 1831 as well as the beginning of the 20th century was, for the majority of Poles, an era of a massive experience of the Russian attempts to russificate the inhabitants of the former Polish Kingdom and in any case of the omnipresent contact with Russian. Now, Russian, unlike Polish, had long replaced almost all old nominatives plural of

masculine nouns with the forms of the accusative which were identical in their morphological shape with the feminine ones; thus, there was and there is in Russian no inflectional difference between the names of men and the names of animals, things and women in the nominative plural, in spite of the fact that there has never been any feeling of inferiority of the male persons spoken about. This Russian linguistic situation gives practically speaking every Pole an irresistibly comical impression. And one cannot forget the widespread attitude of Poles many of whom, for easily understandable reasons, are either inimical or contemptuous and derisive in their relation to Russians. All this made it, I think, for a Pole extremely easy to switch from, say, the Russian *veterany*, *oficery* etc. to the *mocking* Polish *weterany*, *oficery* etc.¹²

22. Gender and numerals: “collective” forms of numerals

I have insisted on the correctness of the traditional doctrine of three genders as embodied in the well known threefold possibility of adjectival forms in the nominative singular and of the two genders: masculine-personal and non-masculine-personal as embodied in the binary possibility of adjectival forms in the nominative plural; none of these two kinds of differentiation can be reduced to any forms of pure *case* government.

However, this picture must be deemed simplified if it were to exclude all other kinds of *accommodation* of expressions dependent on *nouns*: there is a certain well known additional differentiation of forms concomitant to the choice of nouns, viz. the differentiation of forms of *numerals* in the respective syntagms with nouns.

The most conspicuous dependence of numerals on *some* nouns they join is that of their assuming, in the concatenations with those nouns, the shape of so called “collective numerals” such as *dwoje* (*dwojga* etc.), *pięćdziesięcioro* (*pięćdziesięciorga* etc.), and so on. These forms materialize *pure accommodation* in syntagms with the word *dzieci* ‘children’, cf. *pięcioro dzieci* (plur. of *dziecko*; otherwise, this plural preserves, in the very well known way, the neuter gender of *dziecko*, cf. [*pięcioro*] *dzieci*, *jedno z których...*), *wnuki* ‘grandchildren’, cf.

¹² It would of course be interesting to compare the use of *kompany*-nominatives in the texts written, for example, by Polish writers in the part of Poland occupied by Russia (Prus, Orzeszkowa and others), on the one hand, and by Polish writers, such as Lam, who were active in the parts of Poland occupied by Austria or Prussia. What is to be expected is some kind of asymmetry in this respect, with the larger proportion of ludicatives in the former texts.

pięcioro wnuków (irrespective of sex; unlike *wnucy* ‘male grandchildren’ or *wnuczki* ‘female grandchildren’), the plural tantum *drzwi* ‘drzwi’, *sanie* ‘sleigh’ and a rather small number of other nouns; the names of the young of animals in *-ęta* (for plural) such as *kocięta* ‘kitten’, *kaczęta* ‘ducklings’ are accompanied by (stylistically) optional parallel series of forms of numerals: on the one hand, the basic forms, cf. *pięć kociąt*, on the other, “collective” forms, cf. *pięcioro kacząt*.

I can only support Saloni’s proposal to regard these phenomena as having a true nature of gender inflection no less than the classical three genders in the singular and the two in the plural. The severely restricted range of nouns governing “collective” forms of (most of) basic numerals cannot be a good reason for denying their partnership vis-à-vis all full-fledged genders, unlike in the case of such *quasi*-genders as “masculine-animate” or “masculine-inanimate” (which, otherwise, Saloni, in agreement with most other writers, regards as legitimate genders).

On the other hand, one cannot accept Saloni’s claim of the existence of a separate gender illustrated by phrases such as *dwie pary spodni* ‘two items of trousers’: the word *para* and the word *dwie* are inflected themselves and make up a normal concatenation of units of language (otherwise, *para*, in this use where no sentential stress is possible on the word, thus precluding its status of CSS, is a marker of an operation unit, roughly, of the nature of a “classifier”). In no well-grounded sense is *para* an inflectional marker; what we are dealing with here, similarly as in the case of jocular **dwoje imienin*, **dwie pary imienin*, is one of the well known instances of blocked inflection or inflectional “defectivism” (I have mentioned another case of it in one of the previous sections: the case of the gap in “possessive genitive” affecting words such as *ja*, *ty*).

23. Accommodation in numerals: their far-reaching independence of nouns

Other forms of numerals *in pure accommodation* are, for the most part, *simple* counterparts of nouns and adjectival (or pronominal) forms in their *case* and *number* series as described above. I.e. in one such series there is, in the majority of concatenations, exactly *one* form per numeral in a syntagm with arbitrary nouns, adjectives etc. These forms must simply be listed (some of them, notably, those in *-u*, with suitable generalizations). For example, in the genitive, the *unique* forms of numerals (apart from the “collective” forms mentioned above) are, for most concatenations: *dwóch* (with just a stylistically

constrained [more formal] variant *dwu*), *trzech*, *czterech*, *pięciu* etc.¹³ From my point of view, such unique forms materialize *suboperations* making up parts of *verbs*, *adjectives* etc.; nouns exercise in such cases no influence over numerals.

Rather, it is numerals that often induce suboperations on nouns and other parts of relevant nominal phrases inscribed in their *signifiants*: the most widespread such suboperation is the requirement in the nominative of numerals, from 5 on, imposed on those other parts of the phrases to “import” their forms of the genitive plural, cf., e.g., *Tam było pięć stołów*. ‘there were 5 tables there’; the same thing applies to all “collective” forms of numerals in the nominative (including *dwoje*, *troje*, *czworo*) and in the instrumental (cf. *z dwojgiem dzieci*, as distinct from, say, the dative, cf. *dwojgu dzieciom*).

There is also one series of positions where *no* phrases based on numerals (apart from the words *jeden* [but including compound numerals such as *21*], *dwaj*, *trzej*, *czterej*) have *any special* inflectional markers, not even special *case* markers. These are *accusative positions* which have been described in section 11.

24. Positive cases of accommodation of numerals to nouns; major numeral-related operations

Still, apart from those (marginal) “collective” forms of numerals, *uniquely* attached to certain nouns, forms that I have mentioned above, there are three *major* groups of accommodation-inflectional phenomena specifically associated with numerals that are also *dependent on* definite classes of *nouns*; these classes *intersect* with some gender-accommodation classes of nouns defined on phrases *without* numerals (we have discussed the latter phrases in section 11). Among the three groups, two are quite important, one is much less important. In this section, I shall describe the two important groups.

First, there is the difference between what we may call “*numeral-masculine-personal*” and “*numeral-non-masculine-personal*” shapes of numerals in the nominative position. The difference can be illustrated, for “*numeral-masculine-personal*” forms, with phrases such as *pięciu mężczyzn* ‘five men’ (cf. *ci mężczyźni*), *pięciu satelitów USA* (cf. *ci satelici USA*), *pięciu chamów* (cf. *te*

¹³ I am making abstraction from cases of indeclinability [irregularly] creeping in, in colloquial speech, which affect parts corresponding to higher numbers in more complicated compound numerals, e.g. *z 1253 – z tysiąc dwieście pięćdziesięcioma trzema*, instead of *z tysiącem dwustu pięćdziesięcioma trzema*.

chamy, tych chamów), *pięciu niedorajdów* (cf. *te niedorajdy, tych niedorajdów*) and, for “numeral-non-masculine-personal” forms, with phrases such as *pięć niedorajd* (cf. *te niedorajdy, tych niedorajd*), *pięć oferm* (cf. *te oferm, tych oferm*), *pięć podlotków* (cf. *te podlotki, tych podlotków*), *pięć ekscelencji* (cf. *te ekscelencje, tych ekscelencji*).

As is easily seen, “numeral-masculine-personal” forms apply not only to “masculine-personal” nouns, but also to “non-masculine-personal” nouns as soon as the latter meet the following conditions: they denote males, they have the ending *-ów* in the genitive plural (*chamy, chamów*), they do not denote exclusively females (cf. *pięć podlotków*, a phrase which is appropriately different from the phrase *pięciu chamów*). All the other nouns require the basic forms of the nominative of numerals (such as *pięć*), unless a “collective” form of a numeral is admissible and needed (cf. *pięcioro sierot*; I shall tackle this possibility below, both in this and the next section).

Thus, we have in the most important nominative position not only *dwóch, trzech, czterech, pięciu, ..., mężczyzn* (cf. *ci mężczyźni*), but also: *dwóch, trzech, czterech, pięciu, ..., chamów* (cf. *te chamy*). On the other hand, we have *pięć niedorajd* (cf. gen. plur. *niedorajd*; this is parallel to *pięciu niedorajdów*, cf. gen. plur. *niedorajdów*), *pięć oferm, pięć podlotków* (reference exclusively to girls), *pięć babsztyli, pięć satelitów* (cf. section 11 and my example of a group of 5 female “sattelites” of a lesbian).

Second, there is a large class of nouns which imposes special requirements on phrases with numerals constituted by both the nouns and the numerals. I shall dub the class “male-biased” (the Polish name might be “rzeczowniki M-preferencyjne”, where *M* is taken from the documentation convention of marking “male” with *M*). Their distinctive trait consists in triggering two opposing sets of **operations** (*not*: suboperations) on the phrases with numerals for which personal nouns are constitutive:

- either, first, 1° a transfer of phrases as given in the genitive (not with “collective” forms of numerals) to the nominative position, 2° the shaping of phrases in all the other positions (including the genitive) according to the rules adopted otherwise for all the respective constituent parts (with numerals in their *basic* forms),
- or, second, the use of “collective” forms of numerals together with all the features of nominal phrases required by those forms (e.g., nouns, adjectives etc. assume the shape of the genitive plural in the nominative position, e.g. *pięcio-*

ro lekarzy; I have mentioned such features above). (Clearly, where there is no “collective” form for a given numeral at all, e.g., for *sto* ‘100’, the possibility stated here is inapplicable and the status of, say, the phrase *stu lekarzy* is the same as that of the phrase *pięciu mężczyzn* cited above.)

To illustrate: we have either *pięciu lekarzy zaprotestowało* ‘five physicians protested’ (cf. *lekarze zaprotestowali*; *nie było pięciu lekarzy* [gen.]) or *pięcioro lekarzy zaprotestowało* ‘five physicians, at least one of them a man, at least one of them a woman, protested’.

25. A note on numeral-related operations and suboperations

The two procedures just described that are characteristic for phrases with numerals and appropriate nouns are unquestionable *operations* since they are far from merely materializing pure accommodation: they introduce a definite semantic distinction.

Thus, there is, from my point of view, an important substantial difference between the first distinction pointed out in section 24, on the one hand, and what we were talking about next, on the other. The first distinction exhibits either mere accommodation features, i.e. involves a *suboperation*, viz. the described transfer of the whole nominal phrases from the genitive, or else *no* positive accommodation of the numerals at all (I mean accommodation to nouns); the latter case is present where the *basic* forms of the numerals (forms as given in isolation or in counting) crop up in the nominative.

By contrast, the two mutually opposing procedures display true *operations* with a salient semantic load: either the numerals assume the so-called “collective” shapes which are exponents of the presupposition ‘the respective persons include at least one male and at least one female’, cf. *pięcioro lekarzy* ‘five physicians’, and which are, in consequence, “marked”, or else a transfer of the shapes of whole nominal phrases from the genitive takes place which, in this case, expounds the presupposition ‘the respective persons are *not bound* to include any female person [that is, the respective persons are all, plausibly, male]’, cf. *pięciu lekarzy*. This last mentioned presupposition gives rise to a very definite implicature based on the (Gricean in its ultimate origin) mechanism which I call “tacit denial” (elaborated on, *inter alia*, in my (1997; 1998)): given that the “collective” form, entailing the presence of at least one female, is *not* used, the other form, which is actually used, is understood, *by default*, as designating males only. It will be remembered, however, that there is no straightforward *semantic* exclusion of

females; it would be highly unnatural to use a sentence like *Wyrzucono z pracy czterdzieścioro lekarzy*. ‘40 physicians have been sacked’ instead of *Wyrzucono z pracy czterdziestu lekarzy*. even though someone might take the latter to mean that the sacked physicians were exclusively men; in all likelihood there were some women among them, but the phrase *czterdziestu lekarzy*, accordingly, does not exclude this reality.

26. “Male-biased” class of nouns

What nouns does the class “male-biased” cover?

It covers a part proper of “masculine-personal” nouns, but also a part proper of “non-masculine-personal” nouns as described earlier on (as we remember, the distinction recalled here is only valid in the *nominative position* and applies to phrases without numerals).

Which “masculine-personal” nouns are *excluded* from our new class? These are, first, nouns that *lexically* denote *only males*, second, nouns in their reference to objects or entities other than persons, nouns that can be illustrated with words such as *przedstawiciel* ‘representative’ in its reference, e.g., to plants, or *satelita* in its reference to nations (a nation dependent on some other nation). To exemplify: *pięciu chłopców*, but **pięcioro chłopców* ‘five boys’; *pięciu satelitów USA*, but **pięcioro satelitów USA*; *pięciu pijaniców*, but **pięcioro pijaniców*.

Which “non-masculine-personal” nouns are *included* in our class? These are nouns distinguished by the following properties: 1° personal reference, 2° absence of codified exclusive reference to females, 3° presence of the ending *-ów* in the genitive plural. To exemplify: *pięciu niedorajdów* ‘five muffs; practically speaking, males’ vs. *pięcioro niedorajdów* ‘five muffs, at least one of them male, at least one of them female’. A negative example: *pięć podlotków* ‘five teenager girls’, **pięcioro podlotków*.

To be sure, the prevailing majority of “male-biased” nouns are masculine-personal nouns whose denotation does not exclude females; as an example, take *pięciu studentów* ‘five students’ vs. *pięcioro studentów* ‘five students, at least one of them male, at least one of them female’.

27. A minor numeral-related operation

I am coming down to the third, less important group of phrases with numerals, among the groups mentioned at the beginning of the preceding section.

In addition to the large class of nouns which I have dubbed “male-biased”, there is another fairly large, albeit much smaller, class of nouns which imposes certain parallel, but different, requirements on phrases with numerals constituted by both the nouns and the numerals. These requirements are in a definite sense symmetrical to those described as proper to the previous class of nouns; they are imposed by nouns that, similarly as in the previous class, allow for reference to both males and females, to the extent that the nouns do not exhibit the features defined for the previous class. I shall name the class “non-male-biased” (the corresponding symmetrical Polish name would be “rzeczowniki nie-M-preferencyjne”). The distinctive trait of the exclusively personal nouns making up our class consists, again, in triggering two opposing sets of **operations** (*not*: suboperations) on the phrases with numerals for which the nouns are constitutive:

- either, first, the shaping of phrases in all the case positions according to the rules adopted otherwise for all the respective constituent parts (the numerals being represented by their *basic* forms),
- or, second, the use of the “collective” forms of the numerals together with all the features of nominal phrases required by those forms (e.g., nouns, adjectives etc. assume the shape of the genitive plural in the nominative position, e.g. *pięcioro sierot*; I have mentioned such features above). (Clearly, where there is no “collective” form for a given numeral, e.g., for *sto* ‘100’, the possibility stated here is inapplicable and the status of, say, the phrase *sto sierot* is the same as that of the phrase, e.g., *pięć sierot* which materializes the first possibility.)

In a way similar to that proper to the previous operations, either the numerals assume the so-called “collective” shapes which are exponents of the presupposition ‘the respective persons include at least one male and at least one female’, cf. *pięcioro sierot* ‘five orphans’, and which are, in consequence, “marked”, or else the basic forms of numerals and, correspondingly, whole phrases are used which expound the presupposition ‘the respective persons are *not bound* to include either any male or any female person’, cf. *pięć sierot*. This last mentioned presupposition, unlike the symmetrical presupposition in the previous class, does not give rise to any special implicature of the kind described for that previous class. The phrases without the “collective” forms are fully neutral with regard to possible sex distinctions within the classes or groups addressed.

This difference between the two classes now under consideration is most certainly a consequence of two factors. First, the enormous pressure of the

highly numerous phrases denoting exclusively males which makes phrases such as *pięciu studentów* being understood on the pattern of the most clearly marked phrases of the type *pięciu mężczyzn* to which the former phrases are so strikingly similar. Second, the prevailing presence of males in groups designated by means of words like *sknera* ‘miser’ which make up the majority in the class now being discussed and which so often undergo the (wholly unmarked) “male-sex-indicating” operation of adjoining masculine adjectival forms such as *ten*, an operation we have touched upon in one of the earlier sections (this precludes the imaginable “tacit denial” effect of the lack of “collective” forms limiting the designated persons to *females*, on the pattern of the absolutely unmarked phrases such as *pięciu kobiet, pięciu kobietom* etc.).

The extremely weak semantic difference between the two possibilities provided for by the present class of nouns makes its practical weight extremely insignificant. The class is disproportionately unimportant compared to what is offered by our “male-biased” nouns. In fact, the real use of phrases such as *pięcioro oferm* is close to nil (it is slightly higher with axiologically “neutral” words such as *sierota, magnificencja*). Still, in a *systemic* description of language, a place for our present second-ranking class, however insignificant, is well warranted.

28. Linear antecedents in phrases based on numerals

My presentation of the inflectional facts concerning phrases based on numerals must be supplemented by a statement on the choice of forms of “specifiers” or “quantifiers” normally preceding numerals.

The concatenations that we have been concerned with display a twofold government: on the one hand, there is the dependence of numerals on nouns, as shown in the examples; on the other, nouns are, in certain situations, governed by the numerals in that the nouns assume, in the nominative position, the forms of genitive plural.

Concomitant to this is the automatic accommodation of words *preceding* the numerals: if the latter are “numeral-masculine-personal”, the genitive plural forms *tych, wszystkich* (etc.) precede the numerals, cf. *tych (wszystkich) pięciu chamów (zostało aresztowanych)* ‘these (all the) five cads (have been arrested)’; if the numerals are “numeral-non-masculine-personal”, the nominative plural forms *te, wszystkie* (etc.) precede the numerals, cf. (*widziałem*) *te wszystkie podlotki, te jej pięć satelitów* (recall my example of a lesbian and her female satellites).

29. A numeral operation on collective nouns in the category *singularia tantum*

One more *operation* involving “collective” forms of numerals, with features that make it quite separate, despite its striking similarity to the one yielding the phrases discussed above, must be briefly described. The operation in question does not materialize any kind of pure accommodation; still, it certainly belongs to nominal inflection. On the other hand, the operation has a stylistically restricted domain of use: it belongs to means of elaborate, perhaps slightly archaic, speech.

The operands in the operation are, on the one hand, numerals, on the other, nouns in a subclass of collective nouns, *collectiva* (usually categorized as [a subset of] *singularia tantum*) covering names of groups of persons related to definite other persons *as individuals* (referred to in terms of further nominal phrases in the genitive or in the form of “possessive” adjectival expressions such as *mój*) in such a way that each of the persons participates in a “personal standing close environment” of at least one of the individuals, while each of the latter is appropriately related to at least one of the persons.

The relationship in question mostly but not exclusively consists in the persons belonging to a common kin; the foremost examples of the nouns involved are *potomstwo* ‘descendants’, *rodzeństwo* ‘siblings’.

The meaning of a resultant of our operation can be formulated as follows:

‘*n* persons, at least one of whom is a male, at least one of whom is a female, belonging to the full set of persons related to *a* which meets the conditions *C* of the given relation to *a* such that all of them jointly (including *a*) make up a group of speaking beings characterized by that relation affecting each of them in at least one appropriate pair’,

where *n* stands for the number, *C* refers to the relation expressed by the noun, and “*a*” stands for either one individual or more than one individual in a closed set (i.e. a set which is liable to enumeration); in accordance with the formulation, the cardinality *n* may but need not be a characteristic of a *proper* (sub)set of persons referred to by means of the given noun (it *may* also be equal to the power of the *improper* subset of the set, i.e. to the power of the set itself; thus, the phrase *pięcioro rodzeństwa Stasia* designates either 5 S.’s siblings who are, in their totality, more than 5 in number [probably the more frequent case] or who are exactly

5 in number; sometimes exact semantic and substantive circumstances prevent the set to be its own improper subset, cf. *pięcioro potomstwa potomstwa Juliusza Cezara* or *dwoje rodzeństwa rodzeństwa, jakie stanowią Karol i Zofia* where the cardinality of the siblings referred to is 4 at least).

Two particularities of our operation are worth paying particular attention to.

The first particularity is as follows. *Collectiva* affected by the operation cannot be enumerated even though just a few of them are actually in use: one must concede that such concatenations as *troje jego ochrony* ‘two of his bodyguards’, *czworo jego służby* ‘four of his servants’, *pięcioro jego osobistej obsługi* ‘five members of his personal assistants’, *dziesięcioro jego koleżeństwa* ‘ten of his fellows’ (where the *collectivum koleżeństwo* is at all in use; the word is to a great extent local), *piętnaścioro jego ferajny* ‘fifteen of his bunch’, *sześcioro jego fraucymeru* ‘six of his “Frauenzimmer” [provided one of the persons is a hermaphrodite]’ are imaginable if marginal.

But at the same time there are distinct constraints on the admissible *collectiva*. First, these cannot be pluralisable “compositional” *collectiva* such as *sztab*, *eskadra* or even *stajnia* ‘academic followers and disciples’. Second, a condition of admissibility of phrases now under consideration is that the meaning of a given *collectivum* includes a clear functional relation to persons, other than the possibility of a given group of people to be just in *some way* associated with those persons, e.g., in terms of a general “possessive” relationship, cf. **dziesięcioro wolontariatu Jurka Owsiaka*. Finally, the functional relationship cannot be quite general, cf. **siedmioro jego otoczenia* ‘seven of his surrounding’. Let us add that, clearly, phrases such as **pięcioro tłumu* ‘five persons of the crowd’ are illicit because there is no personal counterpart of the persons referred to by means of the numeral (such as *Jan* in *pięcioro rodzeństwa Jana*).

The second particularity is as follows. It is impossible to extend our present operation to numerals that can refer to groups of persons including both males and females, but do not have a “collective” form, e.g. *sto*, *dwieście* etc., cf. **sto jego służby*.¹⁴

¹⁴ There is a similar operation on high numerals, in particular, *tysiąc* and compound numerals such as *dwa tysiące*, whose another operand is the word *wojsko* ‘troop’, cf. *dziesięć tysięcy wojska* (in a certain style); but it must be kept distinct. Perhaps an analogous operation is applicable to the noun *młodzież* ‘youth’; this noun can also take “collective” numerals, irrespectively of the conditions described above, cf. *dziesięcioro młodzieży* ‘ten of youth, one at least male, one at least female’ or *dziesięcioro młodzieży Baden Powella* (where

30. Operations on “paucal” numerals

In the above sections on phrases with numerals, I was talking about the facts that can be observed on *all* those phrases alike or at least on phrases based on vast classes of numerals.

However, an exhaustive picture of Polish inflection and syntax in the domain of numerals and phrases constituted by them cannot be silent on certain additional particularities that are displayed by a small number of “small numbers”, viz. 2, 3, 4 (it is well known that there is a broad typological category of “paucality”, of “paucal numbers”, which is variously represented in many languages; Polish is one among them).

First, the numerals *dwa* and *oba* have, apart from their “collective” forms (*dwoje, dwojga* etc., *oboje, obojga* etc.) with their general features of functioning described in the foregoing sections, their feminine nominative forms *dwie, obie* which accompany the nominatives plural of all those nouns whose nominative singular governs the feminine form of adjectival expressions, such as *ta*, in the unmarked occurrences, i.e. where the masculine form, such as *ten*, is not marking the referent as male. In this way, we obtain an intersection of the class of non-masculine-personal government of adjectival forms in the plural and the feminine forms *dwie, obie*: the latter do not apply to masculine nouns that govern non-masculine-personal adjectival forms. Thus, we have: *te dwie książki, te dwie dziewczyny, te dwie niezdary* (even though one may use the phrase *ten niezdara* to refer to both males designated in *te dwie niezdary*), but *te dwa chamy* (ludicratives belong here, too, cf. *te dwa Michały*).

Second, the numerals *dwa, oba, trzy, cztery* have their special nominative forms in *-j (dwaj, obaj), -ej (trzej, czterej)* accompanying exclusively nominative plural masculine-personal forms of *strictly personal* nouns and the appropriate adjectival forms, to the exclusion of the forms of nouns inducing non-masculine-personal adjectival forms, among them ludicratives, but also of such masculine-personal nouns as *przedstawiciele* or *satelici* when these are used to refer to non-persons (unless the speaker wishes to “play with words”, e.g., in the process of personification), cf. **dwaj przedstawiciele tej klasy wyrazów, a mianowicie rzeczowniki przedstawiciel, satelita, zasługują na szczególną uwagę* ‘two

there is no question of the relationship as described before holding between the individual youths and BD).

representatives of this class of words, viz. ..., deserve particular attention' (+*dwóch przedstawicieli ... zasługuje ...*), **dwaj satelici USA nie otrzymają żadnej pomocy* 'two satellites of the US will not receive any help' (+*dwóch satelitów USA nie otrzyma ...*).

What are the distinctive features of the *-j*-forms (apart from what has just been stated)? The most clear presupposition they carry is that their referents are exclusively males. But they also express another, much more subtle presupposition. I think the best way one can grasp their semantic substance in regard of this subtle presupposition is by inscribing in them, basically, the cognitive load of the word *pewien* '(a) certain'. It is quite conspicuous that phrases with the *-j*-forms can be substituted by phrases with the word *pewni* while the same phrases are awkward if comprising the pronoun *pewni* next to the *-j*-numeral, cf. *dwaj ministrowie zostali zwolnieni* 'two ministers have been dismissed' (* *dwaj pewni ministrowie zostali zwolnieni*; + *pewni dwaj ministrowie zostali zwolnieni*, where the numeral only makes the cardinality precise: it may repeat the content of the preceding *pewni*, cf., as a parallel case, *bardzo słona, (bo) przesolona zupa* 'very salt, (because) oversalted soup'). A phrase like *dwaj ministrowie zostali zwolnieni* allows one to draw the inference *pewni ministrowie zostali zwolnieni*, as against *dwóch ministrów musi zostać zwolnionych* 'two ministers have to be dismissed' where no such inference is necessary. The cognitive load of *pewien* that I have mentioned amounts, in our case, to the following:

'as the speaker is aware, _ are such that something that is not equal to what is said about _ in the current sentence is or can be known about _ to the speaker',

where the blank is a place-holder for the referents of the noun phrase (more exactly, of the part of the noun phrase other than the numeral) and the purely syntactic expression (*are*) *such that* indicates that the content in '...' is to be understood as a *thematic* dictum (it cannot be rhematized, i.e. cannot be set in any explicit contrast valid for the current utterance).

As a piece of additional justification of my claim, consider the following situation. The doorkeeper in my faculty building says to me: *Wczoraj wieczorem dwóch studentów włamało się do pana gabinetu*. 'last night two students broke in into your office' and it is clear that he does not know anything more about them. I then can say: *Słyszałem, że wczoraj wieczorem dwóch studentów włamało się do mojego gabinetu*. 'I've heard that ...'; it would hardly be appropriate for me to say: *Słyszałem, że wczoraj wieczorem dwaj studenci włamali się do mojego*

gabinetu. If, however, the doorkeeper says: *Wczoraj wieczorem dwaj studenci włamali się do pana gabinetu.*, it is admissible for me to use the second utterance beginning in *Słyszałem ...*, in the mode of an “echo-utterance”, even though the utterance with the phrase *dwóch studentów* is better in this case, too. If, on the other hand, I can say something more about the students, in particular, something based on my *own immediate* (purported) knowledge, the phrase *dwaj studenci* is very well motivated. Still, the doorkeeper’s wording wherein she uses the phrase *dwaj studenci* and the fact that it creates a good motivation for my own use of the same phrase clearly favour a broad interpretation of the impact of the *-j*-forms: a real possibility of the speaker acquiring some additional knowledge about the referents must be reckoned with when one tries to construct an adequate, i.e. sufficiently liberal, representation of what is conveyed by means of the expressions now under discussion.

It must be remembered nevertheless that the option of using the phrase *dwóch studentów* is open to one even in circumstances that clearly allow one to insert a *-j*-numeral: a phrase with the basic form *dwóch* etc. is evidently the unmarked option and is never “ungrammatical”. Its unmarked character, I should add, is not only due to the fact that the basic expression carries no additional semantic components, but also to the fact that the *-j*-forms exhibit a distinct stylistic feature of their appurtenance to the “formal” register of speech.

References

- BIEŃ J., SALONI Z., 1982, Pojęcie wyrazu morfologicznego i jego zastosowanie do opisu fleksji polskiej (wersja wstępna), *Prace Filologiczne XXXI*, s. 31–45.
- BOBROWSKI I., 2005, Rodzaj gramatyczny rzeczownika a jego liczba, *Język Polski LXXXV*, s. 83–89.
- BOBROWSKI I., 2006, Jeszcze o rodzaju gramatycznym rzeczownika, *Polonica XXVI–XXVII*, s. 231–243.
- BOBROWSKI I., 2006a, Pejoratywizacja, in: I. Bobrowski, K. Kowalik (eds.), *Od fonemu do tekstu*, Kraków: Lexis, s. 89–93.
- BOGUSŁAWSKI A., 1978, Towards an operational grammar, *Studia Semiotyczne VIII*, s. 29–90. [Polish transl. by R. Gozdawa-Gołębiowski: Preliminaria gramatyki operacyjnej, *Polonica XIII*, 1989, s. 163–223].
- BOGUSŁAWSKI A., 1986, Accusative singular operations on Polish nouns, in: R. D. Brecht, J. S. Levine (eds.), *Case in Slavic. Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Roman Jakobson*, Columbus: Slavica Publishers, s. 152–169.

- BOGUSŁAWSKI A., 1995, Bilingual general purpose dictionary. A draft instruction with commentaries, in: J. Wawrzyńczyk (ed.), *Bilingual Lexicography in Poland. Theory and Practice*, Warszawa: Katedra Lingwistyki Formalnej UW, s. 15–55.
- BOGUSŁAWSKI A., 1997, On the puzzling ‘puzzled can’ in *wh*-questions, *Journal of Pragmatics* 29, s. 439–455.
- BOGUSŁAWSKI A., 1998, O negacji w konstrukcjach z czasownikiem *chcieć*, in: E. Jędrzejko (ed.), *Nowe czasy, nowe języki, nowe (i stare) problemy*, Katowice: Wyd. Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, s. 105–127.
- BOGUSŁAWSKI A., 1998a, Nochmals zu Genitiv und Akkusativ in russischen verneinten Verbalphrasen, *Die Welt der Slaven* 1, s. 1–32.
- BOGUSŁAWSKI A., 1999, Spostponować prefigując. O polskiej substandardowej operacji „sr-”, in: J. Wawrzyńczyk (ed.), *Semiosis Lexicographica* 1, Warszawa, s. 7–12.
- BOGUSŁAWSKI A., 2007, *A Study in the Linguistics-Philosophy Interface*, Warszawa: BEL Studio.
- BOGUSŁAWSKI A., 2007a, Przyjacioły jak sokoły. Rzecz o tym, jak Polacy bawią się fleksją, in: M. Barański, Z. Trzaskowski (eds.), *Preteksty, teksty, konteksty*, Kielce: Akademia Świętokrzyska.
- GŁOWACKI J., 2003, Szkolne kłopoty z rodzajem gramatycznym rzeczownika, *Język Polski LXXXIII*, s. 312–315.
- GRZEGORCZYKOWA R., LASKOWSKI R., WRÓBEL H., 1998, *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia* [wyd. II], Warszawa: Wyd. Naukowe PWN.
- ŁAZIŃSKI M., 2006, *O panach i paniach. Polskie rzeczowniki tytułowe i ich asymetria rodzajowo- płciowa*, Warszawa: Wyd. Naukowe PWN.
- ŁUCZYŃSKI E., 2004, Czy ustalanie rodzaju gramatycznego rzeczownika należy uzależniać od liczby?, *Język Polski LXXXIV*, s. 315–316.
- MAŃCZAK W., 1956, Ile jest rodzajów w języku polskim?, *Język Polski XXXVI*, s. 116–121.
- OBREŃBSKA A., 1925/1946, Od archaizmu do nowej formy językowej, *Język Polski X*, 6, s. 161–170. [Repr. in: K. Budzyk (ed.), *Stylistyka teoretyczna w Polsce*, Warszawa 1946: Książka, s. 208–220. (The author: A. Obreńska-Jabłońska). Quotations after the 1946 edition.]
- SALONI Z., 1988, O tzw. formach nieosobowych męskoosobowych we współczesnej polszczyźnie, *Biuletyn PTJ XLI*, s. 155–156.
- SALONI Z., 1992, Co istnieje, a co nie istnieje we fleksji polskiej?, *Prace Filologiczne XXXVII*, s. 75–87.
- SALONI Z., 2007, O rodzaju gramatycznym rzeczowników typu *eminencja*, *Przegląd Humanistyczny* LI, s. 211–217.
- ZALIZNIAK A. A., 1964, K voprosu o grammatičeskich kategorijach roda i oduševlennosti v sovremennom russkom jazyke, *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 4, s. 25–40.
- ZALIZNIAK A. A., 1967, *Russkoe imennoe slovoizmenenie*, Moskva: Nauka.

ZARON Z., 2004, *Aspekty funkcjonalne polskiej kategorii rodzaju. Charakterystyka fleksyjna*, Warszawa–Puńsk: Wydawnictwo Auśra.

O przypadku, rodzaju i związanych z nimi zjawiskach w języku polskim (po raz któryś)

(streszczenie)

Autor przedstawia własną wizję zjawisk fleksyjnych lub związanych z fleksją w języku polskim w zakresie kategorii przypadku oraz liczby w ich odniesieniu do rodzaju gramatycznego.

Do głównych tez autora należy zaprezentowana przez niego motywacja klasycznego ujęcia trójrodzajowego rzeczowników w liczbie pojedynczej i znanego ujęcia dwurodzajowego rzeczowników w liczbie mnogiej ([umowny] rodzaj męskoosobowy i [umowny] rodzaj niemęskoosobowy).

Szczególnym przedmiotem zainteresowania autora jest to, co uznaje on za osobną „operację” (w sensie przyjętym w jego pracach) zastępowania, w pewnych okolicznościach pragmatycznych, „męskoosobowego” mianownika liczby mnogiej rzeczowników (wraz z przydawkami) mianownikiem „niemęskoosobowym”, a co jest znane w literaturze pod nazwą „pejoratywności” lub „deprecjatywności”. Autor, w ślad za Bobrowskim, oponuje przeciwko wprowadzaniu odpowiedniego nowego parametru fleksyjnego dla rzeczowników polskich, choćby tylko męskich mających znaczenie osobowe (koncepcja Bienia i Saloniego). Autor precyzuje klasę operandów tej operacji oraz jej status funkcjonalny (jako należący zasadniczo do „funkcji poetyckiej”, a więc pragmatycznej), nazywając całość łacińskim terminem *ludicrativus*.

W artykule opisane zostały różne inne „operacje” i „suboperacje” jakoś związane z rodzajem, a także z pluralizacją, szczególnie w odniesieniu do imion własnych (głównie osobowych), z uwzględnieniem specyfiki *ludicrativu* w zastosowaniu do tej kategorii.

Osobno i dość szczegółowo omówione zostały zjawiska dotyczące grup z liczebnikiem; m.in. podany został wstępny opis grup z liczebnikiem tzw. zbiorowym przy *singulariach tantum*, takich jak *potomstwo*, *rodzeństwo*.