



# Between Genitive and Accusative Uses. On the Impact of Negation on Nominal Phrases Introduced by *jako* in Contemporary Polish

Małgorzata Gębka-Wolak

Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika w Toruniu  
Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń  
ORCID: 0000-0003-4587-496X

---

**ABSTRACT:** The paper discusses research results based on data excerpted from the National Corpus of Polish. The analysis concerns the impact of negation on the grammar case used in nominal phrases introduced by *jako*. The purpose of our study was to establish the proportion of genitive and accusative uses in these contexts. We have also analysed the possible impact of the grammatical status of *jako* on the grammar case.

We established that, in contemporary Polish, most nominal phrases introduced by *jako* contain genitive

forms. Accusative forms, although rarer, may not be considered marginal, as they tend to appear in up to 34% of the contexts. We have also shown that there is a correlation between the grammatical status of *jako* and the way negation impacts these phrases. In structures where *jako* is considered part of the verb (e.g. *Sportowiec nie traktuje trzeciego miejsca jako porażkę*), accusative structures tend to appear more often than in those containing *jako* interpreted as independent lexical units (e.g. *Nie znaliśmy tej dziewczyny jako studentki*).

**KEYWORDS:** contemporary Polish, syntax, negation, nominal phrase introduced by *jako*, genitive of negation, *jako*, the grammatical status of *jako*.

---

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT:** The author declares that there were no conflicts of interest in this study.

**AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION:** The author assumes sole responsibility for: preparing the research concept of the article, the way it is presented, developing the method, collecting and analyzing data, formulating conclusions, and editing the final version of the manuscript.

---



## 1. Introduction

The subject of the article is the syntax of contemporary Polish language. The observation covers independent sentences or components falling into the subset of verbal constructions of negation, in which the expression *nie* (*not*) directly precede the verb-centre, e.g. *nie analizuję* (*I do not analyse*), *nie oceniamy* (*we do not evaluate*), *nie znacie* (*you do not know*).<sup>1</sup> Two general formal conditions are imposed on the analysed constructions:

- a) the verb falls into the class of units that require a nominal accusative phrase, in other words, those that open up a syntactic position for a nominal accusative phrase (NP<sub>acc</sub>); this position, under the impact of negation, is realised (updated) by a nominal complement phrase in the sentences under study (NP<sub>gen</sub>);
- b) furthermore, the nominal phrase introduced by *jako* (*as*) into the sentence structure is a component of the negated verbal construction.<sup>2</sup>

Examples of constructions of interest are included in sentences [1–6]:

- [1] Nigdzie na świecie nie postrzegają mnie jako aktora komicznego.  
Nowhere in the world do they perceive me as a comic actor. [NKJP]<sup>3</sup>
- [2] Nigdy jednak lustracji nie postrzegął jako cel sam w sobie.  
However, he never saw lustration as an end in itself. [NKJP]
- [3] Z badań Fundacji Batorego wynika, że co trzeci urzędnik nie traktuje zatrudniania znajomych jako czegoś nagannego.  
Research by the Batory Foundation shows that one in three officials does not regard hiring friends as something reprehensible. [NKJP]

---

1 We refer to the treatment of negation as a purely syntactic grammatical category, dividing the set of verbal constructions into two subsets: a) negated constructions in which the expression *nie* precede the verb-centre (directly negated phrases, e.g. *nie lubię jabłek*—*I don't like apples*) or the superior of the verb-centre (indirectly negated phrases, e.g. *nie mogę lubić jabłek* (*I can't like apples*), and b) non-denial constructions in which the verb or its superior is not preceded by the expression *nie* (*not*), e.g. *lubię jabłka* (*I like apples*), *mogę lubić jabłka* (*I can like apples*) [see: Saloni, Świdziński 1997: 156–158].

2 Magdalena Danielewiczowa applies the label *jako*-phrase to such expressions [Danielewiczowa 2020].

3 Examples marked with the abbreviation NKJP are taken from the Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego (National Corpus of Polish Language), see: <http://nkjp.pl/>.

- [4] Zwycięstwa nad Norwegią nie traktuję więc tylko jako święto polskich mężczyzn.  
I therefore do not regard the victory over Norway only as a celebration of Polish men. [NKJP]
- [5] W Konstantynopolu w IV–V w. nie znano agap jako uczt dla ubogich.  
Agapas as feasts for the poor were not known in Constantinople in the 4th to 5th centuries. [NKJP]
- [6] Sądzę, że na pl.sci historia, nikt Pana nie zna jako Poetę.  
I think that on pl.sci historia, no one knows you as a Poet. [NKJP]

This paper aims to observe the impact of negation on the case category value of nominal phrases introduced into sentence structures by the expression *jako*. In particular, we are interested in answering the question whether there is a connection between the operation of the negation mechanism and the grammatical status of the expression *jako*. The theoretical background of the considerations carried out in this paper is thus provided by two blocks of issues. The first is the grammatical consequence of using the negation marker in the form of realising the accusative participial position by a nominal genitive of negation, known in the literature as the genitive of negation. The second is the grammatical status of the phrase *jako*.

The research activities aim to refine the description of selected linguistic facts of contemporary Polish rather than evaluate it. In other words, they are descriptive, not prescriptive. Furthermore, we believe that research should aim for a highly disciplined description, conducted within the framework of the indicated reference model. Its choice is based on the researcher's preference and the object and purpose of the research. The description presented here is rooted in structural methodology<sup>4</sup> and directly references Andrzej Bogusławski's concept of the language unit and operational grammar [Bogusławski 1988]. Furthermore, a recent analysis of the grammatical status of *jako* has been conducted within this model [see Danielewiczowa 2020, 2021: 58–135<sup>5</sup>]. We will refer to some of its findings in this paper. The key element of the terminological grid adopted is the lexical unit, a sign taken bilaterally, constituting "the proper association of *signifiant* and *signifié*" [Danielewiczowa 2012: 26]. A lexical unit should be

4 A presentation of the assumptions of Polish structural syntax in its classical and contemporary versions is provided by a review text by Maciej Grochowski [2012].

5 Furthermore, Danielewiczowa's study includes a discussion on the research status in this area [Danielewiczowa 2021].

seen as a ready-to-use entity not only by virtue of its bilaterality. A lexical unit is a set of grammatical, semantic and pragmatic information that is assigned to a specific shape—a segment or a sequence of segments, e.g. [ktoś] *lubi* [coś] ([somebody] *likes* [something]), [ktoś] *patrzy na* [kogoś // coś] ([somebody] *is looking at* [somebody // something]), [ktoś] *traktuje* [coś] *jako* [coś] ([somebody] *treats* [something] *as* [something]).

However, when describing the syntactic phenomenon of the genitive of negation, we refer to the approach and conceptual framework presented in Polish formal syntax, primarily in its distributional model.<sup>6</sup> The study's material was sourced from the National Corpus of Polish Language. To excerpt it we used the Poliquarp search engine.<sup>7</sup>

## 2. The genitive of negation versus the nominal phrase introduced by *jako*

When we speak of the genitive of negation, we mean the syntactic mechanism that regulates the genitive case category value of the nominal phrase that is a constituent of verbal negation constructions, as well as the nominal phrase with this value.<sup>8</sup> There is a number of descriptions of this mechanism available, which differ in theoretical approach, purpose, scope and detail of analysis [see e.g. Buttler 1976: 111, 1986: 305–309; Harrer-Pisarkowa 1959; Przepiórkowski et al. 2002: 143–152; Rybicka-Nowacka 1990; Saloni, Świdziński 1997: 156–158; Świdziński 1998]. At this point, we will limit ourselves to briefly recalling only those findings to date that are directly related to the subject of the analysis and that will make it possible to clarify the aim of the research generally formulated in section 1.

The first issue is the scope of the negation's functioning. In normative studies, this syntactic mechanism is correlated with the function performed by the phrase affected by the expression *nie*. Indeed, attention is drawn to the fact

6 The foundations of the model were presented by Zygmunt Saloni and Marek Świdziński in *Składnia współczesnego języka polskiego* [Saloni, Świdziński 1997], and were later creatively developed by, among others, Maria Szupryczyńska [1996], Marek Wiśniewski [2005], Andrzej Moroz [2002], Małgorzata Gębka-Wolak [2011].

7 A description of the NKJP and the tool used can be found in: Przepiórkowski et al., ed. 2012.

8 In the literature, the genitive of negation is mainly referred to as a) the very value of the case category required by the presence of the negated verb of the past tense within a construction of a given syntactic level (Genitive of Negation) or in a construction of a higher level (Long Distance Genitive of Negation), as well as b) a nominal genitive phrase of such provenience [cf. e.g. Przepiórkowski, Świdziński 1997; Świdziński 1998; Przepiórkowski 2000; Przepiórkowski et al. 2002: 149–150; Pirnat 2015]. In contrast, the term Genitive of Negation is referred to a syntactic mechanism—as in this paper—in the article by Marcin Woliński et al. [2023: 2]. It discusses the constructions “subject or not subject to the genitive of negation”.

that the substitution of the accusative for the genitive applies to direct object which is directly or indirectly dependent on the negated verb [see e.g.: Buttler 1986: 307; Jadacka 2005: 153; Markowski 2007: 153]. In contrast, the genitive of negation in relation to the accusative indirect object, including the predicative one, and the accusative with an adverbial function is described as a secondary extension of the proper scope of the mechanism, resulting in fluctuations in the realised value of the case category [Buttler 1986: 308]. Among the examples of constructions with the accusative alternating with the accusative in the literature, the nominal phrases introduced by *jako* into the sentence structure with verbs like *traktować, oceniać* (*treat, judge*), cf. *Nie traktować tego jako obelgę* and *Nie traktować tego jako obelgi* [Buttler 1986: 308], are mentioned as being of interest in this study. Expressions with *jako* are classified as the predicative objects in sentences of this kind [Klemensiewicz 1953: 32; Buttler 1976: 112; Lesz-Duk 1987: 31–32].<sup>9</sup> In the opinion of Danuta Buttler, the indirect object in contemporary Polish, i.e. in the second half of the 20th century, was more common than direct object. For this reason, Buttler considered it “an acceptable adjunct of the accusative, a model form, but one that occurs less frequently” [Buttler 1986: 308].<sup>10</sup> Interestingly, the result of a survey conducted by Halina Rybicka-Nowacka [1990] among students and young people in the last grades of secondary school (227 people) does not seem to confirm the observations made by Buttler. The construction with the accusative—*Jan nie traktował tego jako obelgę*—was chosen by 123 people, i.e. 54% of the respondents, and with the genitive—*Jan nie traktował tego jako obelgi*—by 104 people, i.e. 41% of the respondents. However, with regard to the sentence with the verb *potraktować* (*treat*), i.e. *Faktu tego sąd nie potraktował jako okoliczności łagodzącej // okoliczność łagodzącą*, more respondents chose the genitive—142 responses, or 63% of respondents—than the accusative—85 responses, or 37% of respondents. Due to the size and composition of the research group, the responses obtained do not necessarily reflect the preferences of a large group of language users. The choices of the young learners may have been influenced by the provisions of the accusative norm (implicitly—taught), which indicated the accusative as the model. Rybicka-Nowacka’s survey undoubtedly confirmed the hesitations

9 Let us add that the construction with *jako* is a 20th-century syntactic innovation. Indeed, the analytic construction with a preposition displaced the synthetic object with an instrumental case [Buttler 1976: 183; Lesz-Duk 1987: 31–32].

10 The problem of the variational nature of the accusative and the genitive with the verb *traktować* appeared much earlier, as evidenced by normative guidelines formulated in “Poradnik Językowy” as early as in the 1930s [Doroszewski, Rzewnicki 1933: 159–160; Doroszewski 1938/1939: 18].

of Polish users as to the values of case in constructions with *jako* in sentences with negated verbs *traktować*, *potraktować* (*treat*).

What we do not know is the answer to the question what today, more than 40 years after the observations made by Buttler and Rybicka-Nowacka, the proportions are in sentences with negated verbs such as *traktować*, *potraktować* between the use in the context of *jako* accusative and genitive phrases. Alina Wróblewska and Aleksandra Wieczorek write that “there is usually an agreement of forms and a convergence of cases of the argument of the verb identified by the subordinator *jako* and this subordinator”, and the difference of cases is an exceptional phenomenon [Wróblewska, Wieczorek 2018: 28–29]. However, investigating the phenomenon of negation in sentences with the expression *jako* was not the aim of the research of the mentioned authors, so they did not support the observation with the results of material research. The present study aims to add to the knowledge in this area.

In the light of the information contained in the literature on the value of the case category of the nominal phrase introduced into the structure of verbal constructions negated by the expression *jako*, it is reasonable to pose a hypothesis on the persisting alternation of the accusative and genitive and on the predominating genitive realisations in contemporary Polish. This hypothesis will be verified on the basis of material from the National Corpus of Polish Language. Apart from its descriptive purpose, the article has an explanatory one. This is because we will attempt to answer the question whether the value of the case category of the studied phrases updated in texts is related to factors of grammatical nature such as:

- a) the type of syntactic position realised,
- b) the type of noun realising the nominal phrase introduced by *jako*.

The inclusion of the first factor results from the above-mentioned tradition of limiting the scope of use of the genitive of negation to the direct object. However, we will analyse this issue within a different conceptual grid and taking into account the contemporary state of knowledge on the status of *jako*.

The second factor was pointed out by Witold Doroszewski and Jan Rzewnicki in response to a question sent to the editors of “Poradnik Językowy” [Doroszewski, Rzewnicki 1933: 159–160]. They stated that in constructions with the negated verb *traktować*, feminine nouns more easily succumb to the impact of negation, while at the same time recognising the accusative with masculine nouns, e.g.: *nie traktował tego jako wyrzut* (*He didn't treat it as a reproach*), *nie traktował jako awans* (*he didn't treat it as a promotion*), as “sounding quite good”.

### 3. Excerpting and analysing material from the NKJP

As already mentioned, we excerpt the material contained in the NKJP with the given grammatical parameters using search terms built according to the syntax of the search engine's query language, in our case—the Poliqarp search engine.<sup>11</sup> Thus, we have to start the research by establishing search formulas that will match the subject and purpose of the research. Let us recall that we are interested in a subset of verbal negation constructions in which the expression *nie* immediately precede the verb-centre, which opens the position for the nominal accusative phrase (realised in the context of negation by the nominal genitive phrase), and whose constituent is the nominal phrase introduced by *jako* into the sentence structure. One way of excerpting the material may be to look for constructions with forms of specific verbs. An indicative list of such verbs can be obtained, directly from the NKJP. To achieve this, the following formula is proposed:

[7] [orth=nie] [pos=verb] [pos=subst & case=gen] [orth=jako] [pos=subst & case=gen | case=acc]

Formula [7] enables the search for strings containing forms of verbs preceded by negation, with a right-hand context consisting of a noun in the genitive case, followed by the expression *jako* and a noun in either the genitive or accusative case, e.g. *nigdy nie traktował mitologii jako wiedzy* (*he never treated mythology as knowledge*), *społeczeństwo nie odczuwa państwa jako siły, która chroni naród* (*society does not perceive the state as a force that protects the nation*). A search carried out in the balanced subcorpus of the NKJP returns 231 examples with the desired parameters, some of which have verbs whose non-negated form requires the genitive rather than the accusative, e.g. *chcieć, używać* (*want, use*), the negated form *nie ma* of the verb *być* in the sense of 'to be in a certain place' [WSJP]. These will remain outside the field of analysis, as will examples where the expression *jako* introduces the nominal nominative phrase, marked as the accusative in the NKJP by mistake. We also exclude from the analysis sentences with the expressions *uznawać jako* (*regard*) and *uznać jako* (*regard*) as questioned in normative studies [e.g. Markowski 2007: 162], e.g. *Lange nie uznawał materializmu jako światopoglądu* (*Lange did not regard materialism as a worldview*) [NKJP].

11 For a description of query language, see *Ściągawka do Narodowego Korpusu Języka Polskiego*, by Adam Przepiórkowski, Aleksander Buczyński and Jakub Wilk [2006], attached to the NKJP and available online.

The formula in [7] narrowed down the retrieved material to examples with undeveloped realisations of nominal phrases in a single linear system. Nonetheless, the retrieved material, see table 1, makes it possible to find out in the context of which negated nominal participial phrases and the one introduced by *jako* co-occur, which in turn makes it possible to plan search formulas with specific verbs.

Table 1. Verbs used in constructions with negation and with NP<sub>gen</sub> and *jako* + NP<sub>gen</sub> || NP<sub>acc</sub>

Verb	Number of examples
<i>traktować</i> (treat)	74
<i>postrzegać</i> (perceive)	8
<i>doceniać</i> (appreciate)	5
<i>potraktować</i> (treat)	5
<i>kwalifikować</i> (qualify)	3
<i>odczuwać</i> (feel)	3
<i>przyjmować</i> (accept)	3
<i>wykorzystywać</i> (use)	3
<i>odbierać</i> (take)	2
<i>odebrać</i> (take)	2
<i>dyskwalifikować</i> (disqualify)	2
<i>pojmować</i> (comprehend)	2
<i>przedstawiać</i> (present)	2
<i>przyjąć</i> (accept)	2
<i>rozpatrywać</i> (examine)	2
<i>widzieć</i> (see)	2
<i>wskazać</i> (indicate)	2
<i>wymieniać</i> (list)	2
<i>wymienić</i> (list)	2



<i>zatrudniać</i> (employ)	2
<i>znać</i> (know)	2
<b>Number of examples retrieved</b>	<b>130</b>

Source: own work.

Table 1 contains 21 verbs that were attested in the retrieved material in at least two examples meeting the formal conditions imposed on their construction. The largest number of examples, as many as 74 (32.03% of the total retrieved material), are sentences with the verb *traktować*. It should be emphasised that there are over 9 times more examples with this verb than with the second on the list verb *postrzegać*. It should be added that the number of sentences with *traktować* is also the highest in the set of examples without negation, but their percentage share in the material is lower, as among the 1000 examples there are 189, which amounts to 18.9% of the total retrieved material. In addition, the data obtained provide an explanation as to why it is primarily constructions with the verb *traktować* that are cited in grammatical studies as illustrating the problems related to the use of the expression *jako* and the interpretation of its grammatical status [see e.g.: Buttler 1976, 1986; Doroszewski 1938/1939; Rybicka-Nowacka 1990].

### 3.1. The case of a nominal phrase introduced by *jako*

We have included the verbs listed in table 1 in the following search formulas, see [8–9], used to gather more extensive material aimed at verifying the hypothesis about the persisting alternation of the accusative and the genitive in contemporary Polish and the predominating genitive realisations.

[8] [orth=nie] [base=traktować<sup>12</sup>] [] {0,2} [orth=jako] [pos=subst & case=gen]

[9] [orth=nie] [base=traktować] [] {0,2} [orth=jako] [pos=subst & case=acc]

Apart from the fact that they make it possible to find occurrences of specific verbs in the NKJP, they differ from the formula in [7] in that they allow zero or at most a two-segment space between the verb and the expression *jako*. This increases the scope of the search to include constructions with a two-component nominal phrase and constructions in which the nominal phrase is placed before

12 Here, the infinitives of the subsequent verbs in the list will be inserted in the individual formulas.

the negated verb, immediately followed by the expression *jako* and the second nominal phrase. For each verb included in table 1, we conducted two searches, once asking for the nominal phrase introduced by *jako* in the accusative, and the second time for the nominal phrase of the genitive. The search was carried out in the full NKJP corpus in order to obtain more extensive research material. The results obtained are presented in tables 2–5.

Table 2. provides aggregate data including the total number of examples searched with *jako* (column 2), as well as data on the numerical and percentage share of nominal genitive phrases (columns 3 and 4) and nominal accusative phrases (columns 5 and 6). The verbs (column 1) are arranged in order of their frequency in the first search (see table 1).<sup>13</sup>

We can see that changing the subcorpus in which the search was conducted and modifying the search formula significantly increase the number of results obtained for individual verbs and, naturally, the total (2189 examples). The verb *traktować* still has the highest frequency in the material—constructions with its forms cover 54.73% of all the retrieved examples. Other verbs with relatively high frequency are *odbierać* (6.58%), *postrzegać* (6.44%) and *potraktować* (5.12%). The ranking of the studied verbs by the criterion of frequency is shown in table 3.

In table 4, we provide data on the percentage share of examples with the nominal accusative phrase introduced by *jako* in the retrieved material from the NKJP, arranged from the highest to the lowest values, i.e. from 34.09% in sentences with the verb *przyjąć* to 0% with the verb *zatrudnić*. The average percentage of the accusative phrases in the material studied is 17.11%.

Table 5 presents, in turn, data on the percentage share of examples with nominal genitive phrase introduced by *jako* in the retrieved material from the NKJP, arranged from the highest to the lowest values, i.e. from 100% in sentences with the verb *zatrudnić* to 67.36% with the verb *odbierać*. The average percentage share of the genitive phrases in the material studied is 82.89%.

It should be noted that the data included in the tables on the values of the case of nominal phrases introduced by *jako* refer to the values assigned as a result of the automatic tagging (marking) process of the material in the NKJP and, as their review shows, contain incorrect classifications of some of the syncretic forms. The genitive singular forms of feminine nouns with hard stems, as well as neuter nouns, are relatively often described as accusative plural forms, such as the nouns *zasady* (*principles*) in [10] and *narzędzia* (*tools*) in [11]:

13 It is clear that the retrieved material does not cover all the occurrences of constructions included in the NKJP that meet the conditions imposed on the constructions under study. However, it is a relatively comprehensive representation of them, providing a basis for generalising conclusions.

Table 2. Aggregate result of the study on the share of phrases with *jako* + NP<sub>acc</sub> and *jako* + NP<sub>gen</sub> in the NKJP

Verb	Total number of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>gen</sub> and <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>acc</sub>	Examples with NP <sub>gen</sub>		Examples with NP <sub>acc</sub>	
		number	percentage	number	percentage
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>traktować (treat)</i>	1198	1000	83.47	198	16.53
<i>postrzegać (perceive)</i>	141	111	78.72	30	21.28
<i>doceniać (appreciate)</i>	19	17	89.47	2	10.53
<i>potraktować (treat)</i>	112	96	85.71	16	14.29
<i>kwalifikować (qualify)</i>	32	28	87.50	4	12.50
<i>odczuwać (feel)</i>	33	24	72.73	9	27.27
<i>przyjmować (accept)</i>	37	31	83.78	6	16.22
<i>wykorzystywać (use)</i>	15	12	80.00	3	20.00
<i>odbierać (take)</i>	144	97	67.36	47	32.64
<i>odebrać (take)</i>	88	70	79.55	18	20.45
<i>dyskwalifikować (disqualify)</i>	28	27	96.43	1	3.57
<i>pojmować (comprehend)</i>	17	13	76.47	4	23.53

Table 2. Aggregate result of the study on the share of phrases with *jako* + NP<sub>acc</sub> and *jako* + NP<sub>gen</sub> in the NKJP—continued

Verb	Total number of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>gen</sub> and <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>acc</sub>	Examples with NP <sub>gen</sub>		Examples with NP <sub>acc</sub>	
		number	percentage	number	percentage
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>przedstawiać</i> (present)	52	38	73.08	14	26.92
<i>przyjąć</i> (accept)	44	29	65.91	15	34.09
<i>rozpatrywać</i> (examine)	7	5	71.43	2	28.57
<i>widzieć</i> (see)	63	58	92.06	5	7.94
<i>wskazać</i> (indicate)	14	12	85.71	2	14.29
<i>wymieniać</i> (list)	86	85	98.84	1	1.16
<i>wymienić</i> (list)	19	16	84.21	3	15.79
<i>zatrudniać</i> (employ)	6	6	100	0	0
<i>znać</i> (know)	34	30	88.24	4	11.76
<b>Number of examples retrieved</b>	<b>2189</b>				

Source: own work.

Table 3. Numerical and percentage share of the verbs under the study in the retrieved material

Verb	Total number of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>gen</sub> and with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>acc</sub>	Percentage share of retrieved material
<i>traktować</i> (treat)	1198	54.73
<i>odbierać</i> (take)	144	6.58
<i>postrzegać</i> (perceive)	141	6.44
<i>potraktować</i> (treat)	112	5.12
<i>odebrać</i> (take)	88	4.02
<i>wymieniać</i> (list)	86	3.93
<i>widzieć</i> (see)	63	2.88
<i>przedstawiać</i> (present)	52	2.38
<i>przyjąć</i> (accept)	44	2.01
<i>przyjmować</i> (accept)	37	1.69
<i>znać</i> (know)	34	1.55
<i>odczuwać</i> (feel)	33	1.51
<i>kwalifikować</i> (qualify)	32	1.46
<i>dyskwalifikować</i> (disqualify)	28	1.28
<i>doceniać</i> (appreciate)	19	0.87
<i>wymienić</i> (list)	19	0.87
<i>pojmować</i> (comprehend)	17	0.78
<i>wykorzystywać</i> (use)	15	0.69
<i>wskazać</i> (indicate)	14	0.64
<i>rozpatrywać</i> (examine)	7	0.32
<i>zatrudniać</i> (employ)	6	0.27

Source: own work.

Table 4. Percentage share of examples with *jako* + NP<sub>acc</sub> in the material

<b>Verb</b>	<b>Percentage share of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP<sub>acc</sub> in retrieved material</b>
<i>przyjąć</i> (accept)	34.09
<i>odbierać</i> (take)	32.64
<i>rozpatrywać</i> (examine)	28.57
<i>odczuwać</i> (feel)	27.27
<i>przedstawiać</i> (present)	26.92
<i>pojmować</i> (comprehend)	23.53
<i>postrzegać</i> (perceive)	21.28
<i>odebrać</i> (take)	20.45
<i>wykorzystywać</i> (use)	20.00
<i>traktować</i> (treat)	16.53
<i>przyjmować</i> (accept)	16.22
<i>wymienić</i> (list)	15.79
<i>potraktować</i> (treat)	14.29
<i>kwalifikować</i> (qualify)	12.50
<i>wskazać</i> (indicate)	14.29
<i>znać</i> (know)	11.76
<i>doceniać</i> (appreciate)	10.53
<i>widzieć</i> (see)	7.94
<i>dyskwalifikować</i> (disqualify)	3.57
<i>wymieniać</i> (list)	1.16
<i>zatrudniać</i> (employ)	0

Source: own work.

Table 5. Percentage share of examples with *jako* + NP<sub>gen</sub> in the material

<b>Verb</b>	<b>Percentage share of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP<sub>gen</sub> in the retrieved material</b>
<i>zatrudniać</i> (employ)	100.00
<i>wymieniać</i> (list)	98.84
<i>dyskwalifikować</i> (disqualify)	96.43
<i>widzieć</i> (see)	92.06
<i>doceniać</i> (appreciate)	89.47
<i>znać</i> (know)	88.24
<i>kwaliifikować</i> (qualify)	87.50
<i>potraktować</i> (treat)	85.71
<i>wskazać</i> (indicate)	85.71
<i>wymienić</i> (list)	84.21
<i>przyjmować</i> (accept)	83.78
<i>traktować</i> (treat)	83.47
<i>wykorzystywać</i> (use)	80.00
<i>odebrać</i> (take)	79.55
<i>postrzegać</i> (perceive)	78.72
<i>pojmować</i> (comprehend)	76.47
<i>przedstawiać</i> (present)	73.08
<i>odczuwać</i> (feel)	72.73
<i>rozpatrywać</i> (examine)	71.43
<i>odbierać</i> (take)	67.36
<i>przyjąć</i> (accept)	65.91

Source: own work.

[10] [...] zasady równości w żadnym wypadku nie [nie:qub] pojmuję [pojmo-  
wać:fin:sg:pri:imperf] jako [jako:conj] zasady [zasada:subst:pl:acc:f] gło-  
szącej, że [...]. [NKJP]<sup>14</sup>

[11] Naszej pracy nie [nie:qub] traktujemy [traktować:fin:pl:pri:imperf] jako  
[jako:conj] narzędzia [narzędzie:subst:pl:acc:n] do przepychanek. [NKJP]

Such errors could easily be corrected manually. However, it is difficult to decide unequivocally what case value neuter nouns such as *wotum* (*vote*) have. In the NKJP they are described as accusatives, yet they could just as well be regarded as genitives, see [12], as a segment of the unit *wotum nieufności* (*vote of no confidence*).

[12] Prośby Adama absolutnie nie [nie:qub] traktuję [traktować:fin:sg:pri:imperf]  
jako [jako:conj] wotum [wotum:subst:sg:acc:n] nieufności wobec mojej  
osoby. [NKJP]

As for nouns having syncretic accusatives and genitives in the singular, of genders *m1* and *m2*, a review of the material shows that with the exception of a few lexemes, e.g. *partner* (*partner*) and *ktoś* (*someone*), they have been marked as singular genitives, see [13] and [14]:

[13] [...] ale na pewno nie [nie:qub] potraktował [potraktować:praet:sg:m1:perf]  
by [by:qub] m [być:aglt:sg:pri:imperf:nwok] jako [jako:conj] szczura  
[szczur:subst:sg:gen:m2] czcigodnego kolegi. [NKJP]

[14] Sąd nie [nie:qub] traktuje [traktować:fin:sg:ter:imperf] ojca [ojciec:subst:sg:  
gen:m1] jako [jako:conj] partnera [partner:subst:sg:acc:m1]. [NKJP]

This is a consequence of including the expression *jako* in the contexts studied in the grammatical class of coordinate conjunctions, i.e. such expressions that do not have their own case requirement. Here we touch upon the problem of the algorithm that is used by morphological analysers at the stage of automatic analysis of the material, and the lemmatisation rules adopted by the researchers. From the article by Wróblewska and Wieczorek we learn that in the manually annotated NKJP subcorpus the expression *jako* is regarded primarily as

14 Solutions to the morphosyntactic marker abbreviations used in the NKJP are contained in: Przepiórkowski, Buczyński, Wilk 2006.



a coordinate conjunction, essentially regardless of the case of the nominal phrase introduced by *jako* [Wróblewska, Wieczorek 2018: 17].<sup>15</sup> The automatic annotation used in the full NKJP is—as we see in our material—similar.

Despite the doubts raised by the automatic qualification of the case values of nominal phrases introduced by *jako*, we can conclude that the corpus study confirmed that an alternative realisation of the nominal phrase introduced by *jako* into the sentence persists in contemporary Polish. The data obtained show that genitive realisations predominate. However, in the light of the obtained data, it cannot be claimed that the accusative realisations are exceptional, as Wróblewska and Wieczorek state [Wróblewska, Wieczorek 2018: 28]. This, in turn, suggests a need for some caution in rejecting the prepositional and conjunctive qualification proposed by these authors and ascribing to *jako* a uniform grammatical qualification to the pseudo-predicative, i.e. an unalterable predicative and linking lexeme, not used independently, and having no rection [Wróblewska, Wieczorek 2018: 23]. Indeed, the accusative realisations of the nominal phrase in the context of the negated verb cannot be considered marginal, at least in sentences with certain verbs. The difference in the cases of nominal phrases of the participial and the one introduced by *jako* brings this expression closer to prepositions, which in negated verbal constructions block the impact of negation on the value of the case category, cf. [15]:

[15] Nie uważam tego za czas stracony.

I don't regard it as wasted time. [NKJP]

We now proceed to the verification of the second research hypothesis, namely whether the value of the case category of a nominal phrase incorporated into a sentence by *jako* and updated in texts is related to the type of realised syntactic position.

### 3.2. Case value versus type of syntactic item being implemented

In this part of the study, we will refer to the proposal of Magdalena Danielewiczowa, presented within the framework of the language unit theory (cf. p. 1) [Danielewiczowa 2020, 2021: 58–135]. Let us emphasise that the analysis of the grammatical status of *jako* from the perspective of its falling into the grammatical class of prepositions, conjunctions [USJP, ISJP] or pseudo-predicatives

<sup>15</sup> In some lexicographical studies, *jako* co-occurring with the nominative is described as a preposition, and with other cases as a conjunction [see: USJP; ISJP; Wróblewska, Wieczorek 2018: 17].

[Wróblewska, Wieczorek 2018: 2–23] shifts the question about the location of the expression *jako* + nominal phrase in the sentence structure, i.e. the syntactic position occupied, to the background. Instead, this grammatical parameter seems to be related to the variant realisation of the case of the nominal phrase co-occurring with *jako* in negated verbal constructions.

The research by Danielewiczowa shows that *jako* of interest in this study should be attributed to at least two interpretations [Danielewiczowa 2020, 2021: 58–135].<sup>16</sup> Firstly, it is a segment included in specific lexical units, e.g. [ktoś<sub>i</sub>] *odebrał* [coś<sub>j</sub>] *jako* [coś<sub>k</sub>] ([someone<sub>i</sub>] *took* [something<sub>j</sub>] *as* [something<sub>k</sub>]), [ktoś<sub>i</sub>] *postrzega* [coś<sub>j</sub>] *jako* [coś<sub>k</sub>] ([someone<sub>i</sub>] *perceives* [something<sub>j</sub>] *as* [something<sub>k</sub>]), which imply<sup>17</sup> three syntactic positions for nominal phrases with specific values of the case category (denoted in the subscript by the symbols *k, i, j*), including one position for a phrase directly introduced by the segment *jako* into the structure, in these contexts semantically non-independent. Secondly, *jako* is an independent lexical unit which, together with its co-occurring nominal phrase, is not subject to verb valency. Danielewiczowa states that syntactically, the *jako*-phrase “can refer to the subject, indirect and direct objects and the adverbials, in particular adverbials of place and time” [Danielewiczowa 2021: 134].

From the point of view of the phenomenon investigated in this study, it is important that the nominal phrase co-occurring with *jako* either a) is grammatically influenced by the semantics and syntax of the verb of which *jako* is a segment, since it is an element of the predicate-argument structure, cf. [16], or b) is not grammatically influenced by the semantics and syntax of the verb, as it is a co-component of the independent lexeme *jako*, together with which, in the semantic plane, it directly refers to the subject, object or circumstance expressed in the sentence, see [17].

16 Due to the limited volume of the article, we do not recount the argumentation presented by Danielewiczowa. In our opinion, it is fully convincing. Danielewiczowa presented one more hypothesis concerning the status of *jako*. According to the researcher, *jako* can be interpreted not only as a verb segment and an independent lexeme. It can also be “a mark of an operation performed in Polish on a certain class, or perhaps on certain classes of verbs” [Danielewiczowa 2021: 76]. This operation would be semantic in nature. *Jako* would cause “a shift from purely perceptual meanings to perceptual and epistemic meanings, for example: [ktoś] *widzi* [kogoś<sub>i</sub> / coś]–[ktoś] *widzi* [kogoś<sub>i</sub> / coś] *jako* [kogoś<sub>i</sub> / coś // jakiegoś / jakiegoś] [...]” [Danielewiczowa 2021: 76].

17 These are obligatory positions due to the semantic properties of the verb, in other words, its actants. At the same time, they are necessary positions in the surface-syntax structure, i.e. subject to valency—in the terminology of distributive syntax—connoted.

- [16] Proszę tytułiku nie postrzegać jako groźbę [...].  
Please do not see the title as a threat [...]. [NKJP]
- [17] Czy dokonania Zyzaka nie dyskwalifikują go jako pracownika w publicznej instytucji?  
Don't Zyzak's achievements disqualify him as an employee in a public institution? [NKJP]

The question arises as to whether the indicated functional difference is related to the value of the case category that the studied nominal phrases take on in the negated verbal constructions. To answer this question, we divided the material obtained from the NKJP into two subgroups. The first included examples with verbs in which *jako* is a segment, see table 6, while the second included examples with verbs that do not contain a segment *jako*, see table 7. In determining the status of *jako*, we used the list of lexical units provided in Danielewiczowa's study [Danielewiczowa 2021: 65–66] and the reduction test of the expression *jako*. The data in the tables are arranged according to the percentage share of accusative phrases in the material (column 5).

Of the 21 verbs studied, we recognised 11 as units containing the segment *jako*. There were 1868 examples of using the forms of these verbs in the NKJP material. Percentage share of examples with *jako* + NP<sub>acc</sub> is the highest for examples with the verb *przyjąć* and accounts for 34.09%, and the lowest in this group is 12.5% for examples with the verb *kwalifikować*. The average percentage share of accusative phrases is 23.46%.

Of the 21 verbs studied, we recognised 10 as units not containing the segment *jako*. There were far fewer examples of using the forms of these verbs in the material from the NKJP, namely 321. The percentage share of examples with *jako* + NP<sub>acc</sub> is the highest for examples with the verb *wykorzystywać* and accounts for 20%, and the lowest in this group is 0% for examples with the verb *zatrudniać*. The average percentage share of accusative phrases is 10.13%.

We see that, regardless of its status, the expression *jako* “lets the genitive case in”, i.e. it does not block the operation of the mechanism of the genitive of negation. However, in structures where it is a segment of a verb and the nominal phrase occupies the required syntactic position, the presence of *jako* seems to sustain to some extent the possibility of using the accusative. Such structures are thus reminiscent of constructions with a preposition, which as a rule blocks the operation of the genitive of negation. The independent unit *jako* definitely loses this property of the preposition more clearly.

Table 6. Nominal phrase co-occurring with *jako* grammatically influenced by the semantics and syntax of the verb

Verb	Number of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>gen</sub>	Percentage share of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>gen</sub>	Number of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>acc</sub>	Percentage share of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>acc</sub>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>przyjąć</i> (accept)	29	65.91	15	34.09
<i>odbierać</i> (receive)	97	67.36	47	32.64
<i>rozpatrywać</i> (examine)	5	71.43	2	28.57
<i>odczuwać</i> (feel)	24	72.73	9	27.27
<i>przedstawiać</i> (present)	38	73.08	14	26.92
<i>pojmować</i> (comprehend)	13	76.47	4	23.53
<i>postrzegać</i> (perceive)	111	78.72	30	21.28
<i>odebrać</i> (take)	70	79.55	18	20.45
<i>traktować</i> (treat)	1000	83.47	198	16.53
<i>potraktować</i> (treat)	96	85.71	16	14.29
<i>kwifikować</i> (qualify)	28	87.5	4	12.5

Source: own work.

Table 7. Nominal phrase co-occurring with *jako* not grammatically influenced by the semantics and syntax of the verb

Verb	Number of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>gen</sub>	Percentage share of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>gen</sub>	Number of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>acc</sub>	Percentage share of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>acc</sub>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>wykorzystywać (use)</i>	12	80.00	3	20.00
<i>przyjmować (receive)</i>	31	83.78	6	16.22
<i>wymienić (list)</i>	16	84.21	3	15.79
<i>wskazać (indicate)</i>	12	85.71	2	14.29
<i>znać (know)</i>	30	88.24	4	11.76
<i>doceniać (appreciate)</i>	17	89.47	2	10.53
<i>widzieć (see)</i>	58	92.06	5	7.94
<i>dyskwalifikować (disqualify)</i>	27	96.43	1	3.57
<i>wymieniać (list)</i>	85	98.84	1	1.16
<i>zatrudniać (employ)</i>	6	100.00	0	0

Source: own work.

### 3.3. Case value versus gender category value

We now proceed to responding to the observation by Doroszewski and Rzewnicki that in constructions with a negated verb *traktować* feminine nouns are more easily influenced by negation [Doroszewski, Rzewnicki 1933: 159–160]. To this end, we conducted a material search in the NKJP using formulas that take into account the gender parameter. We used four formulas:

[18] [orth=nie] [base=traktować] [] {0,2} [orth=jako] [pos=subst & case=acc & gender=f & number=sg]

[19] [orth=nie] [base=traktować] [] {0,2} [orth=jako] [pos=subst & case=gen & gender=f & number=sg]

[20] [orth=nie] [base=traktować] [] {0,2} [orth=jako] [pos=subst & case=acc & gender=m3 & number=sg]

[21] [orth=nie] [base=traktować] [] {0,2} [orth=jako] [pos=subst & case=gen & gender=m3 & number=sg]

Given the syncretic nature of noun forms, we narrowed the search to nouns in the singular. As a control group for the feminine gender, we considered nouns of gender *m3*. The results obtained for the verb forms *traktować*, *odbierać*, *postrzegać*, *potraktować*, i.e. the verbs with the highest frequency in our study, are presented in table 8.

Table 8. Case values of the nominal phrase introduced by *jako* by gender form

<i>traktować</i> ( <i>treat</i> )	Examples with a noun of gender <i>f</i>	Examples with a noun of gender <i>m3</i>
Number of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>gen</sub>	438	349
Percentage share of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>gen</sub>	81.72	<b>88.58</b>
Number of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>acc</sub>	98	45
Percentage share of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>acc</sub>	<b>18.28</b>	11.42

<i>odbierać (receive)</i>	Examples with a noun of gender <i>f</i>	Examples with a noun of gender <i>m3</i>
Number of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>gen</sub>	35	33
Percentage share of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>gen</sub>	62.50	<b>78.57</b>
Number of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>acc</sub>	21	9
Percentage share of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>acc</sub>	<b>37.50</b>	21.43
<i>postrzegać (perceive)</i>	Examples with a noun of gender <i>f</i>	Examples with a noun of gender <i>m3</i>
Number of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>gen</sub>	31	16
Percentage share of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>gen</sub>	<b>93.94</b>	64
Number of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>acc</sub>	2	9
Percentage share of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>acc</sub>	6.06	<b>36</b>
<i>potraktować (treat)</i>	Examples with a noun of gender <i>f</i>	Examples with a noun of gender <i>m3</i>
Number of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>gen</sub>	37	29
Percentage share of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>gen</sub>	82.22	<b>90.63</b>
Number of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>acc</sub>	8	3
Percentage share of examples with <i>jako</i> + NP <sub>acc</sub>	<b>17.78</b>	9.37

The material from NKJP did not confirm that “feminine nouns yield more easily to” the mechanism of the genitive of negation. This is true neither for the verb *traktować*, mentioned by Doroszewski and Rzewnicki, nor for two (*potraktować*, *odbierać*) of the three other units under observation. It can be assumed that the proportions between the case values of the gender forms will be different for various verbs. However, it is worth noting that also this corpus

study shows that among the alternating nominal phrase realisations introduced by *jako* into a sentence in contemporary Polish, the genitive forms have a higher frequency, but the accusative forms are not considered marginal yet.

#### 4. Conclusions

Data concerning the frequency of NP<sub>gen</sub> and NP<sub>acc</sub> introduced to verbal negation constructions by the expression *jako* is still quite approximative, as it was obtained using an automatically tagged corpus. Thus, as we pointed out, it may contain erroneous qualifications of certain syncretic forms. Verifying the collected data by hand would certainly allow for obtaining more precise information on the actual frequency of those nominal phrases. However, the data we obtained is sufficient for several conclusions to be formulated, adding to the existing knowledge on how the genitive of negation operates within nominal phrases introduced by *jako* into the structure of verbal negation constructions in contemporary Polish.

As for the scope of the occurrence of the genitive of negation in contemporary Polish, it includes nominal phrases co-occurring both with the expression *jako* constituting a segment of verb lexemes, e.g. [ktoś] *traktuje* [coś] *jako* [coś] ([someone] *treats* [something] *as* [something]), [ktoś] *postrzega* [coś] *jako* [coś] ([someone] *perceives* [something] *as* [something]), [ktoś] *odbiera* [coś] *jako* [coś] ([someone] *takes* [something] *as* [something]), as well as being an independent lexeme, e.g. in sentences with verbs: [ktoś] *wykorzystuje* [coś] ([someone] *uses* [something]), [ktoś] *przyjmuje* [coś] ([someone] *accepts* [something]), [ktoś] *wymienia* [coś] ([someone] *lists* [something]). The genitive is the dominant case category value of nominal phrases co-occurring with *jako*. The accusative realisation is rarer, although it cannot be considered exceptional or marginal, particularly in the context of *jako* forming part of lexical units.

Among the more important conclusions of the study is the demonstration of a link between the operation of the negation mechanism and the grammatical status of the expression *jako*. Although it does not block the genitive of negation, in structures in which it is a verb segment and the nominal phrase occupies the required participial syntactic position, the presence of *jako* seems to sustain to some extent the possibility of using the accusative. A nominal phrase introduced by *jako* into a construction as an independent lexical unit is far less likely to have the accusative value. The genitive realisations predominate, thus replicating the case of the nominal phrase to which *jako* + NP refers in the semantic plan, see: *Nie znamy już tańca* (gen) *jako czynu* (gen) *magicznego*—*We no longer know dance* (gen) *as a magic act* (gen).



In contrast, there is no clear relationship between the value of the case category of a nominal phrase and the gender of noun realising that phrase.

Determining the case category values for some noun forms is challenging due to the syncretic nature of the accusative and genitive. The annotation rules adopted in the NKJP, in particular the inclusion of *jako* in most contexts in the class of coordinate conjunctions, have the effect of assigning the genitive value to syncretic forms. Moreover, it is not excluded that the accusative and genitive syncretism is a factor supporting the expansion of the genitive of negation in the nominal phrases studied. Bearing in mind the data obtained by Rybicka-Nowacka [1990], it can be said that the process of accusative displacement is progressing. As it seems, this is fostered by the co-referentiality of the two nominal phrases: the one included in the construction by the expression *jako* and the other (participial) nominal phrase co-occurring with it in the given structure. The reference to the same subject or object seems to be a factor supporting the alignment of the case category value in the surface-syntax plan.<sup>18</sup>

Nevertheless, in the light of the data obtained, it is difficult to classify the independent unit *jako* unambiguously to one of the two grammatical classes to which the unit has been assigned in the literature, namely prepositions or coordinate conjunctions. Prepositions block the operation of the negation mechanism by retaining their own case requirements. Coordinate conjunctions, on the other hand, do not constitute an obstacle for the operation of negation.<sup>19</sup> Taking into account the importance of the independent unit *jako* described by Danielewiczowa [2021: 125–135] and its function as a thematic marker and relativiser<sup>20</sup>, *jako* could be considered a unit belonging to a separate grammatical class of functional expressions. In fact, this is not a new proposal. Let us recall that Zenon Klemensiewicz, listing the formal realisations of predicative objects, separates expressions with *jako* into a distinct type, distinguishing it from the prepositional type [Klemensiewicz 1953: 32]. On the other hand, Wróblewska and Wiczorek, referring to Saloni's grammatical classification [Saloni 1974], propose to divide the subclass of predicative and linking lexemes that are unchangeable, not used

18 Note that the co-referential nominal components in appositional constructions have the same case values.

19 In addition, it would be an interesting research task to systematically examine the impact of negation on expressions falling into particular classes of functional expressions, and then to prepare a grammatical classification taking into account the criterion of negation.

20 Danielewiczowa refers to *jako* as the relativiser in constructions such as ***a jako r jest p // a jest p jako r (a as r is p // a is p as r)***, in which the symbol *a* denotes “a subject characterised by means of a *jako*-phrase or an object subject to this characterisation” [Danielewiczowa 2021: 133–134].

independently, and having no rection into two classes: non-predicative expressions, i.e. conjunctions, and predicative expressions, in which they include the pseudo-predicative *jako* [Wróblewska, Wieczorek 2018: 23]. The inclusion of *jako* in the subclass of expressions that do not have rection is not a convincing solution if we take into account the state of affairs emerging from our research that *jako* introduces not only nominal phrases that duplicate the case value of another nominal phrase. Including *jako* in the subclass of expressions with rection appears to be a slightly better solution, which could be divided into two classes: expressions requiring case and not subject to negation (prepositions) and expressions requiring case and subject to negation (the expression *jako*).

*Translated by Ewa Kisiel*

## References

### *Sources (including the abbreviations used)*

NKJP—Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego, <https://nkjp.pl> [accessed: 24 May 2024].

### *Dictionaries (including the abbreviations used)*

ISJP—Bańko Mirosław, ed. (2000), *Inny słownik języka polskiego*, vol. 1–2, Warszawa.

USJP—Dubisz Stanisław, ed. (2003), *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego*, vol. 1–4, Warszawa.

WSJP PAN—Żmigrodzki Piotr, ed., *Wielki słownik języka polskiego PAN*, Kraków, <http://www.wsjp.pl> [accessed: 24 May 2024].

### *Literature*

Bogusławski Andrzej (1988), *Preliminaria gramatyki operacyjnej*, “Polonica”, vol. 13, p. 163–223.

Buttler Danuta (1976), *Innowacje składniowe współczesnej polszczyzny*, Warszawa.

Buttler Danuta (1986), *Składnia*, in: Danuta Buttler, Halina Kurkowska, Halina Satkiewicz (1986), *Kultura języka polskiego. Zagadnienia poprawności gramatycznej*, Warszawa, p. 301–448.

Danielewiczowa Magdalena (2012), *W głąb specjalizacji znaczeń. Przysłówkowe metaoperatory atestacyjne*, Warszawa.

Danielewiczowa Magdalena (2020), *Jako-fraza w strukturze walencyjnej czasownika i poza tą strukturą*, „Prace Filologiczne”, vol. 75, part 1, p. 95–108. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32798/pf.649>.

- Danielewiczowa Magdalena (2021), *Aspekt tematyczny w informacyjnej strukturze wypowiedzi*, Warszawa. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31338/uw.9788323550198>.
- Doroszewski Witold (1938/1939), *Objaśnienia wyrazów i zwrotów*, „Poradnik Językowy”, no. 1–2, p. 18.
- Doroszewski Witold, Rzewnicki Jan (1933), *Zapytania i odpowiedzi*, „Poradnik Językowy”, no. 9–10, p. 159–160.
- Dunaj Bogusław (1994), *Konstrukcje z czasownikami konotującymi orzecznik w polszczyźnie*, „Rocznik Naukowo-Dydaktyczny WSP w Krakowie. Prace Językoznawcze”, no. 168, p. 35–42.
- Gębka-Wolak Małgorzata (2011), *Pozycje składniowe frazy bezokolicznikowej we współczesnym zdaniu polskim*, Toruń.
- Grochowski Maciej (2012), *Główne kierunki badań syntaktycznych w Polsce w drugiej połowie XX wieku i na początku XXI wieku*, in: *Językoznawstwo w Polsce. Kierunki badań i perspektywy rozwoju*, ed. idem, Warszawa, p. 139–155.
- Harrer-Pisarkowa Krystyna (1959), *Przypadek dopełnienia w polskim zdaniu zaprzeczonym*, „Język Polski”, no. 1, p. 9–32.
- Jadacka Hanna (2005), *Kultura języka polskiego. Fleksja, słowotwórstwo, składnia*, Warszawa.
- Klemensiewicz Zenon (1953), *Zarys składni polskiej*, Warszawa.
- Lesz-Duk Maria (1987), *Zmiany w zakresie rekcji narzędnikowej czasowników w historii języka polskiego*, „Acta Universitatis Lodzianensis. Folia Linguistica”, no. 15, p. 21–36.
- Markowski Andrzej (2007), *Język polski. Poradnik prof. Markowskiego*, Warszawa.
- Moroz Andrzej (2002), *Strukturalna charakterystyka konstrukcji składniowych zawierających składnik zerowy*, Toruń.
- Pirnat Žiga (2015), *Genesis of the Genitive of Negation in Balto-Slavic and Its Evidence in Contemporary Slovenian*, „Slovenski Jezik – Slovene Linguistic Studies”, no. 10, p. 3–52. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17161/SLS.1808.18309>.
- Przepiórkowski Adam (2000), *Long Distance Genitive of Negation in Polish*, „Journal of Slavic Linguistics”, no. 8, p. 151–189.
- Przepiórkowski Adam, Świdziński Marek (1997), *Polish Verbal Negation Revisited. A Metamorphosis vs. HPSG Account*, <https://tinyurl.com/y52x6d2h> [accessed: 24 May 2024].
- Przepiórkowski Adam et al. (2002), *Formalny opis języka polskiego. Teoria i implementacja*, Warszawa.
- Przepiórkowski Adam et al., ed. (2012), *Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego*, Warszawa.
- Przepiórkowski Adam, Buczyński Aleksander, Wilk Jakub (2006), *Ściągawka do Narodowego Korpusu Języka Polskiego*, <http://nkjp.pl/poliqarp/help/pl.html> [accessed: 20 October 2023].

- Rybicka-Nowacka Halina (1990), *Przypadek dopełnienia w konstrukcjach zaprzeczonych we współczesnym języku polskim (norma a praktyka językowa)*, "Poradnik Językowy", no. 8, p. 572–577.
- Saloni Zygmunt (1974), *Klasyfikacja gramatyczna leksemów polskich*, "Język Polski", no. 1, p. 3–13, no 2, p. 93–101.
- Saloni Zygmunt, Świdziński Marek (1997), *Składnia współczesnego języka polskiego*, Warszawa.
- Szupryczyńska Maria (1996), *Pozycja składniowa frazy celownikowej w zdaniu polskim*, Toruń.
- Świdziński Marek (1998), *Negacja w polszczyźnie. Uwikłania składniowe imiesłowów, gerundiów i quasi-gerundiów*, „Prace Filologiczne”, vol. 43, p. 463–472.
- Wiśniewski Marek (2005), *Dystrybucyjne właściwości odprzymiotnikowych nazw cech we współczesnej polszczyźnie*, Toruń.
- Woliński Marcin et al. (2023), *O konstrukcji \_\_\_\_, ale nie \_\_\_\_ i podobnych w języku polskim*, "Język Polski", no. 4., p. 5–21. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31286/JP.00223>.
- Wróblewska Alina, Wieczorek Aleksandra (2018), *Status morfoskładniowy wyrazu jako we współczesnej polszczyźnie*, "Język Polski", no. 3, p. 16–30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31286/JP.98.3.2>.

**Małgorzata Gębka-Wolak, Ph.D., Professor at UMK**—Department of Polish Language, Faculty of Humanities, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń; research interests: grammar of contemporary Polish, legal and juridical language, forensic linguistics, Polish language teaching methodology.