

Table 1. Differences between the concepts of BOUNDARY and WHOLENESS

BOUNDARY	WHOLENESS
end (beginning)	whole
the 'finiteness' ('completeness') of the object is not important	'complete' object, i.e. considered as a whole (all parts)
belongs to the object, is its part – we talk about gradable features	division of the object into parts is limited; we do not talk here about gradable features
it communicates about the object / action that those properties of both that are discussed cannot be more intensive / greater etc.	no information about the intensity of the property or about the (non)possibility of increasing it
allows talking about the object and isolating it at all	if we talk about it, it is in a sense redundant, since we assume that all objects are 'whole,' 'complete'

What is the difference between BOUNDEDNESS and WHOLENESS? The case of the unit *do cna* ‘entirely’

This presentation recounts some of the results of my research on the syntax and semantics of adverbs denoting boundary. My attempt is to answer the question about the difference between BOUNDARY and WHOLENESS and to show on the example of the unit *do cna* ‘entirely’ the possibility of co-occurrence of the meanings of *boundedness* and *wholeness*.

Contrary to a common assumption in linguistics, I propose the thesis that BOUNDEDNESS is not a subtype of WHOLENESS (Kleszczowa 2005). I would like to briefly present the results of my research concerning the concept of BOUNDARY, discuss the concept of the WHOLENESS in ontology, the PART – WHOLE relation as well as the correlation between BOUNDARY and WHOLENESS; I suggest that the discrepancies in interpretation of the last two concepts arise from the lack of differentiation between two levels of language use - the general and the metalinguistic one. It is only in the metalanguage that WHOLENESS is ascribed boundaries. Since neither linguistics nor philosophy give answer to the question about the difference between BOUNDEDNESS and WHOLENESS, I propose my own, arbitrary, solution which enables to distinguish the units denoting boundary from the adverb group.

I propose a thesis that there are adverbs denoting both WHOLENESS and BOUNDARY, which I exemplify with *do cna* ‘entirely’. The unit *do cna* ‘entirely’ belongs to the group of so-called gradation expressions, designed to provide information about emotions (persuasive function) and about transgressing some norm common to communication participants. The examined sequence is first described within the context of other gradation expressions denoting boundary. As a next step, I prove, in accordance with the principles of the structuralist school, that it is a unit of language and an adverb, and engage in polemics with the definition of adverb proposed by Wajszczuk (2005). In order to extract the components of meaning of this unit, I place it in opposition to other units (*do szczeru, ze szczerem* ‘entirely’), comparing the example material found in the PWN Corpus of Polish and in general dictionaries. I briefly comment on various dictionary definitions.

The aim of semantic analysis is to establish the meaning components of the unit, and to provide an explication of the unit that should, according to the assumptions of the structuralist school, contain – if possible – the simplest possible units, i.e. so-called indefinibilia (Wierzbicka 1980). I acknowledge that the adverb *do cna* ‘entirely’ communicates about the sender’s evaluation concerning the attributes of the object acquired as a result of the action expressed by the means of a perfective verb. I claim that these properties, originally expressed by means of passive participles, can at present be expressed also by means of non-deverbal adjectives. These attributes relate to the meaning of both the WHOLENESS and the BOUNDARY. If we can ascribe a given characteristic to the whole object, then we talk about WHOLENESS. We may talk about BOUNDEDNESS in the same case only if we are able to state that the intensity of this particular feature cannot be greater (the condition of encompassing the whole object is anyway not relevant for boundary). The suggested explication takes into consideration three syntactic schemata in which this unit occurs.