I. Articles

Renata G r z e g o r c z y k o w a
ORCID: 0000-0003-0430-6683
(University of Warsaw, Poland)

Remarks on the contribution of grammar to linguistic worldview*

Abstract. The article looks at grammar in the construction of linguistic worldview (LWV): the problem is important inasmuch as most researchers tend to focus on lexical issues. By adopting a broad understanding of grammar as a body of mechanisms that make language possible, the author claims that the Polish linguistic worldview draws from the word-formation system (it allows for the emergence of new words and organises the lexicon by arranging it into conceptual categories with formal linguistic exponents). The inflectional and syntactic systems, in turn, contribute to the LWV much less: the only grammatical categories with a semantic function relevant in this respect are number, tense, modality, and conjunctions, which code relationships between entities and phenomena.

KEY WORDS: linguistic worldview; grammatical categories with a semantic function; word-formation system, inflectional system

The lexicon as the main foundation of linguistic worldview

Linguistic worldview is a concept well-established in today's cognitive-ethnolinguistic research, mainly owing to the studies conducted by the Lublin

---

School of Ethnolinguistics, headed by Jerzy Bartmiński (on the concept itself and research methods, see Bartmiński 2006). These studies cover a huge research area, spanning, as part of the so-called EUROJOS project, many Slavic languages and the languages of neighbouring nations (see LASiS 1–3). For more information on the project itself and the research problems it addresses, see Abramowicz, Bartmiński and Chlebda (2009).

The concept of linguistic worldview refers, generally speaking, to the established ways in which the world is captured or interpreted in language, understood as a system (the language code); the ways of viewing the world are different in different languages, which means that people who speak these languages perceive the world in slightly different ways. These differences manifest themselves primarily in the lexical sphere, which has been the focus of LWV research so far. The lexicons of different languages bring to light differences in the categorisation of world phenomena and the ways they are structured conceptually. Different conceptual structures evoke characteristic images and connotations that often become apparent only in individual language uses. As an illustration, suffice it to recall here examples form the EUROJOS project, such as the differences in the conceptualisation of HOME (cf. LASiS, vol. 1) or WORK (Mazurkiewicz-Brzozowska 1993, LASiS, vol. 3), or the distinct ways of categorizing and conceptualizing emotions such as joy (Mikołajczuk 2009) or wistfulness, which in Polish has only one exponent (*tęsknota*) but several different names in Russian: *toska, skuka, unyniye* (Grzegorczykowa 2012).

Another example, which has been highlighted and described recently, is the concept of TENDERNESS. Pope Francis has characterised it as referring to a particularly desirable attitude towards other humans, a variety of love that highlights certain aspects of that emotion. Tenderness obligatorily involves direct contact with the object of the emotion and is a kind of feeling that must be shown. Different languages conceptualise tenderness differently. Romance names (Fr. *tendresse,* It. *tenerezza*), as well as the Russian *nezhnost'*, highlight the gentleness with which the object (recipient) of the feeling is treated, through the association with the adjectives *tendre*, *tenero*, *nezhniy*, which mean 'weak, frail, delicate'. The Polish name *czułość*, on the other hand, thanks to its associations with *czuć* 'feel, sense' evokes sensitivity to others and being perceptive to their feelings and needs (for a broader treatment of this concept, cf. Grzegorczykowa 2017).

All in all, the specific character of a linguistic worldview is revealed most clearly in the lexicon of a given language, which reflects the cognitive outlook on the world of the users of that language, at the same time determining their way of perceiving the world. The lexicon covers the entire cognitively

accessible reality: the material, natural, and human-made worlds, cultural and social phenomena, the mental sphere and the products of human thought, the different ways in which people capture the world cognitively: counting, measuring, evaluating, creating very complicated conceptual constructs, such as NEOLIBERALISM or PERMISSIVISM, etc. Everything that the human beings can think of and perceive is moulded linguistically. The limits of thought and cognition are at the same time the limits of language – a truth that has long been recognized by certain philosophers.

In this context, it is legitimate to ask what other elements of language structure, besides the lexicon, contribute to the cognitive interpretation of the world and thus influence the formation of the LWV. What is the role of grammar, which, together with the lexicon, is the defining component of language, allowing its users to create an infinite set of utterances?

Understanding of the term *grammar*

First of all, the term *grammar* is ambiguous. In traditional textbook descriptions of inflected languages (such as Polish), grammar encompasses two separate domains: (1) morphology, which includes inflection (grammar *sensu stricto*) and word-formation, and (2) syntax, i.e. syntactic rules which provide the basis for assembling lexical items into texts. Inflection is primarily subservient to syntax: it takes part in creating utterances, marks syntactic relationships, and communicates certain obligatory meanings in the process of building utterances. The primary role of word-formation, on the other hand, is to multiply lexical items. The boundary between these domains is demarcated by regularity (or lack thereof) in building linguistic constructions, as was long ago observed by Adam Heinz (1961). The products of inflection, because they are assembled according to rules, can be produced "online" in texts (in the system, they exist only in the form of general rules). By contrast, the products of word-formation (derivation), due to the irregularity of the processes involved, are added to the lexicon. Of course, there are borderline phenomena, such as the formation of the names of activities (gerund-like forms), such as *singing, walking,* or comparative and superlative forms, e.g. *weak*, *weaker*, *the weakest.* The dominant function of inflectional structures is syntactic, i.e. they mark the syntactic role of words (although, for example, number in nouns has actual reference in the world), while the main function of derivation is semantic (although, for example, gerunds serve the syntactic function of building utterances, e.g. *He was writing for an hour > The writing took one hour*: the syntax is changed but the meaning remains the same).

Newer theories of language, e.g. Cognitive Grammar (cf. Langacker 1987, Taylor 2002) treat grammar more holistically as a description of a body of mechanisms that make language possible, without drawing sharp distinctions between its individual components. The traditional approach also finds it necessary to see fuzziness between the particular components of language, not only between inflection and word-formation (as observed by Heinz), but also between the lexicon and grammar. This fuzziness is apparent, among others, in the repetitiveness of many syntactic constructions (phrasemes), which are re-created (like lexemes) rather than created. Also, it transpires through the fact that many general conceptual categories are expressed by means of lexical exponents, e.g. location of events in time, in addition to being signalled by inflectionally expressed tenses, can be described by means of a system of lexical exponents that denote anteriority, contemporaneity, and posteriority of events in relation to the time of the speech act or another temporal location. Similarly, both lexical and syntactic means are used to characterize spatial relationships: *in front of the house*, *behind the house*, *next to the house*, *to fall from above*, *something protrudes from the water* (a static relation viewed as a dynamic one). As is well-known, spatial language is particularly subjective and anthropocentric and thus constitutes an important component of LWV (see, for example, Przybylska 2002 on Polish prepositions). Finally, the fuzziness between syntax and the lexicon is evident in the syntactic requirements of words, especially verbs.

The distinctions mentioned above, concerning grammar in the strict sense (i.e. inflection and syntax), show that grammatical facts which serve syntax alone (i.e. mark intratextual relations), such as grammatical case, which has no reference in the world, do not participate directly in creating a linguistic worldview. But what role is played by semantic categories, such as number in nouns, which says whether the object being described is a single item or a collection of things. The very fact that contemporary Polish makes its users code the singularity or a multiplicity of objects, and the fact that the singular form is unmarked and can be used generically and abstractly (e.g. *Człowiek jest istotą rozumną* 'Man is a rational being', *Pies jest ssakiem* 'The dog is a mammal') imply that contemporary Polish encodes a certain worldview. It stands in contrast, to give one example, to the worldview entrenched in Old Polish with its dual number, such as *dwie świecy wielicy* 'two great lights'. On the other hand, the fact that some lexemes fall outside the category of number (e.g. *pluralia tantum*, such as *drzwi* 'doors', *sanie* 'sledge, sleigh') may affect the perception of the objects denoted by them, suggesting some duality in their structure. But this is a lexical matter.

Things are slightly different when it comes to the category of gender, which in contemporary Polish is essentially a marker of syntactic relations between a modifier and a head noun: *Widzę dużego psa/dużą krowę* 'I can see a large dog-MASC.ACC/a large cow-FEM.ACC'. As such, gender does not contribute directly to the LWV (with the exception of the category of masculine personal gender, as discussed below). By contrast, in languages in which generic features (and more broadly – various types of properties of objects) affect the categorization of objects (as in an Aboriginal Australian language where femininity is associated with the concept of fire, cf. Lakoff 1987), the category of gender can be said to play a role in creating the linguistic worldview. This is because in such cases, the world is perceived in specific terms imposed by the language. In Polish, the category of gender, which essentially has an intratextual function, may be brought back into notice in mythical and poetic thinking (for more on this topic, see Pajdzińska, in this volume).

The role of the word-formation system

In the light of what has been said above, it seems that the word-formation system, i.e. the system of word-formation categories that have their morphological exponents, does participate in the creation of a specific LWV. This is because the word-formation system has two separate functions: a **dynamic** one, whose function is to create new words, and a **static** one, whereby it organizes lexical items into more general conceptual classes with their own formal exponents. It is a telling fact that Polish has classes of names referring to agents (doers of actions), such as *odbiorca* 'recipient', *nadawca* 'sender', *nauczyciel* 'teacher', or demonyms (names of residents), such as *gdańszczanin* 'an inhabitant of the city of Gdańsk', *paryżanin* 'a Parisian', or names of small objects, such as *obrazek* 'a little picture', *domek* 'a little house', *stolik* 'a small table', or, finally, expressive names, such as *psina* 'doggie, poor little dog', *psisko* 'pooch, a good old dog, a huge dog', or *psiątko* 'cute little dog'. The role of word-formation in creating the LWV is therefore twofold: (i) it forms and motivates specific object names, such as the names of the porcini mushroom (*Boletus*): *borowik* and *prawdziwek* (each of which gives a different picture of the referent and thereby participates in its conceptualisation);[1] and (i) arranges lexical items into more general conceptual classes. The existence and quality of these conceptual classes characterize

---

[1] *Borowik* is the one that grows in *bór* 'woods', whereas *prawdziwek* is the "true" (*prawdziwy*) mushroom. [editor's note]

the way the world is interpreted by a given language. In particular, the existence of certain categories specific to a given language, which do not exist or are rarely found in other languages, can be considered a hallmark of this language: for example collective nouns such as *ptactwo* 'fowl', *robactwo* 'vermin', *nauczycielstwo* 'the body of teachers', *duchowieństwo* 'clergy', which constitute only a small class in Polish, are very characteristic of Serbian and Croatian (cf. Francić 1961).

Finally, let us mention a certain word-formational/inflectional phenomenon typical of contemporary Polish feminist discourse, namely a recent tendency to contest the linguistically privileged position of men, believed to underlie the structure of Polish. This privilege is supposed to consist in the fact that personal masculine nouns (e.g. *naukowiec* 'scientist', *architekt* 'architect', *sędzia* 'judge', etc.), especially in the plural, refer to both women and men: *Polscy naukowcy/architekci/sędziowie zajęli w tej sprawie stanowisko* 'Polish scientists/architects/judges have taken a stand in this matter'; *Ona jest naukowcem/architektem/sędzią* 'She's a scientist/an architect/a judge'. This linguistically privileged position of men is also manifested in the existence of masculine personal gender, originating in the 17th century, which requires that plural names of men take separate forms of modifying adjectives and past tense verbs: *Chłopcy przyszli* 'The boys have come MASC-PL'; *mądrzy chłopcy* 'wise-MASC-PL boys'; but: *Kobiety/psy przyszły* 'The women/the dogs have come-NON-MASC-PL'; *mądre kobiety/psy* 'wise-NON-MASC-PL women/dogs'. As a side note, let us mention that the use of men's names with verbs in non-masculine personal form is indicative of depreciation, as in *Chłopy/chłopaki przyszły* 'The guys have come-NON-MASC-PL', rather than *przyszli* 'have come-MASC-PL'. Perhaps, the inflectional category of depreciation could also be considered a grammatical phenomenon involved in contributing to the Polish linguistic worldview.

Contemporary feminist discourse attempts to undermine this linguistically privileged position of men. Of course, grammar cannot be changed, but it is possible to create separate names for women and accordingly change the required inflectional forms in text, e.g. *Obywatele i obywatelki odpowiedzieli/odpowiedziały na wezwanie* 'Male citizens and female citizens responded-MASC-PL/responded-NON-MASC-PL to the call'; *Politycy i polityczki poświęcili/poświęciły tej kwestii wiele uwagi* 'Men-politicians and women-politicians devoted-MASC-PL/devoted-NON-MASC-PL a lot of attention to this issue'; *Goście i gościnie* (sic!) *naszego programu zgodzili się/zgodziły się z naszymi propozycjami* 'The male guests and the female guests of our program agreed-MASC-PL/agreed-NON-MASC-PL with our proposals'.

As one can see, these attempts are not always successful, and in any case they complicate the syntax of the utterances. What they strive to do, however, is to encode the information about the equality of sexes in the Polish linguistic worldview.

To sum up, the role of word-formation categories in the LWV is different than their role in forming the names of specific objects. The word-formation structure of the names of specific objects contributes to the conceptualisation and perception of these objects. Word-formational categories, on the other hand, impose on the linguistically interpreted world a network of more general conceptual categories that arrange it into specific classes. The role of word-formation categories is therefore similar to that of grammatical categories with a semantic function, such as number or gender in some languages.

Let us now take a closer look at strictly grammatical (inflectional) categories and syntactic rules.

The role of strictly grammatical (inflectional and syntactic) categories

Grammatical categories and their formal exponents are used primarily to build utterances, i.e. they constitute a mechanism that people employ to talk about the world. In creating messages, language users must interpret in some way the world they are describing by obligatorily informing their audience about their attitude toward the events being described, their role in them, the time of the events, etc.

Grammatical categories which serve communication do not answer the question of what the world described by the language is like (as in the case of lexically-encoded LWV) but they perpetuate in language the codified ways of speaking. These ways are different in different languages. There are different ways of presenting the communicated content, different ways of depicting the events that are being talked about. The individual languages have their own characteristic syntactic properties. Therefore, one can speak of what Anna Wierzbicka calls ethnosyntax (cf. Wierzbicka 1979), i.e. the different ways of forming syntactic constructions characteristic of different languages. Typological research provides many examples in this area. E.g. in so-called ergative languages, which include Caucasian languages, syntactic constructions describing agent–object situations (i.e. actions directed toward the patient) are always viewed from the perspective of the object (patient), which is placed in sentence-initial position, similarly to the passive voice in

languages like Polish. Many syntactic constructions use the category of person, concealing the agent in impersonal constructions. If these constructions refer to the speaker, they often carry a "self-effacing" meaning, e.g. *Bywało się w świecie, zwiedzało się to i owo*, lit. 'It/Self has been around the world, it/self has seen this and that'.

In the case of ethno-syntactic differences, however, one does not speak of differences in the linguistic worldview so much as of differences in the linguistic ways of depicting the world in utterances, of different ways of speaking about the world. And these are two different types of phenomena corresponding to two different language functions: the nominative function and the communicative function.

Verbal categories in Polish shape the events being described in relation to the speaking situation, and so they require that the speaker express his/her attitude to the message being communicated (whether they see the events as being real, possible, desirable, or conditional). They also require that relations be specified between the participants of the dialogue and the actants of the situation being described and that the time of the event be defined in relation to the act of speech.

Among the grammatical categories mentioned above, which are used to build utterances and, at the same time, shape their content, tense is perhaps one that most obviously bears testimony to the way the world's phenomena are captured in language. The events described in an utterance may be characterized in various ways with regard to time: there is general time, relative times that locate the time of the event in relation to other events, and habitual time. At this point, tenses combine with modality: a language that allows its speakers to depict an action as possible or necessary, shows the specific attitude of the speakers towards reality. This is particularly evident in the situation when these meanings are expressed with separate grammatical forms, as in the Latin participles of the type: *venturus, moriturus*, or *emendandus*, in which the meaning of futurity is associated with the notions of duty and necessity.

As mentioned above, the temporal characteristics of events can be signalled lexically. Languages have whole systems of adverbs and adverbial expressions that denote anteriority, posteriority, and simultaneity in relation to a reference point in time or a speech act (in English: *then, that day, next, the next day, previously, the previous day, now, today, tomorrow, yesterday*). The existence and content of such a system testify to the way in which a given language construes time.

A similar view could be taken on so-called distancing modality, whose function is to signal the fact that the sender is distancing him-/herself from

the message he/she is communicating. In Bulgarian, for example, distancing modality is grammaticalised as the so-called imperceptive mood, and in Polish, it is expressed lexically with the particles *podobno* 'reportedly' and *rzekomo* 'allegedly' (which suggest that the information is false), or using verbal constructions, such as: *Miał powiedzieć*, lit. 'He was to say', *Musiał już przyjechać, skoro są jego rzeczy* 'He must have already come, since his things are here' – in this latter case the information is inferred from what one can see.

The way the speakers of a given language view the world is also apparent in the existence of certain conjunctions which make it possible to interpret the events in terms of cause-effect relationships and mutual conditioning: something will happen on the condition that something else occurs. This relation is expressed by the category of mood, as well as the lexical exponents *jeśli* 'if' and *chyba że* 'unless'. Very complex relationships, assuming the existence of real or imagined situations, are also expressed by concessive constructions: *Chociaż był chory, poszedł do pracy* 'Even though he was ill, he went to work', in which the imagined situation of not going to work is evoked as the most probable consequence of being ill.

All the syntactic mechanisms described above are used to construct messages, and at the same time to portray, in a specific way, the reality communicated in the utterances. It can therefore be said that they participate in the creation of a two-fold linguistic worldview: a conceptual-nominative view codified in the lexicon and a communicative view expressed via utterance-building mechanisms.

Conclusions

(1) The most important foundation of LWV, the thing that allows us to see language as a conceptual structure imposed on the surrounding reality, is the lexicon of a given language, which compartmentalises reality into separate phenomena and shapes the conceptual and ideational images of these phenomena. An important role in shaping the image of an object is played by the origin of its name (etymology) as well as productive word-formational motivations, as in the names of natural objects, such as *borowik* 'boletus' (lit. 'the one from the woods') or *cytrynek* 'brimstone (lit. lemon-coloured) butterfly', or in the Polish word *czułość* 'tenderness'.

(2) The word-formation system, which is an organized set of word-formation categories and types, arranges lexical items conceptually into classes. It does not single out specific objects (unlike lexical items) but

organizes the world in terms of more general classes, as if on a higher level. Thus, it contributes directly to the LWV, though in a different way than the lexicon does.

(3) Some grammatical categories with a semantic function, such as nominal number and gender, which do not serve an utterance-building function, capture reality in certain conceptual categories. Their function is similar to that of word-formation categories. Perhaps, this group could be extended to include the category of aspect in the Polish verb, which describes activities as completed with a result, or provides no information as to the completion of an activity.

(4) Finally, the grammatical categories that are used to produce messages determine the way the reality described in the utterance is perceived, shaping it primarily in relation to the dialogic situation. The system of conjunctions makes it possible to perceive multiple relationships among phenomena.

(5) All these ways of perceiving the world, codified in language, can be brought to light in creative texts, especially in poetry.

Translated by Klaudia Wengorek-Dolecka

References

Abramowicz, Maciej, Jerzy Bartmiński, and Wojciech Chlebda. 2009. Językowo-kulturowy obraz świata Słowian na tle porównawczym. Założenia programu „A". *Etnolingwistyka* 21: 341–342.

Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2009. *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*. Sheffield and Oakville, CT: Equinox.

Francić, Vilim. 1961. *Budowa słowotwórcza serbsko-chorwackich kolektywów*. Kraków: Nakładem Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Grzegorczykowa, Renata. 2012. Nazwy tęsknoty w różnych językach. In Renata Grzegorczykowa (ed.) *Świat widziany poprzez słowa. Szkice z semantyki leksykalnej*. 143-149. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Grzegorczykowa, Renata. 2017. Pojęcie czułości w rozumieniu papieża Franciszka na tle danych językowych. *Annales Universitatis Paedagogicae Cracoviensis. Studia Linguistica* 12: 112–119.

Heinz, Adam. 1961. Fleksja a derywacja. *Język Polski* XLI: 343–354.

Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. 1. Theoretical Prerequisites. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

LASiS – *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów* (*The Axiological Lexicon of Slavs and their Neighbours*). Vol. 1. *DOM (HOME)*, ed. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, and Beata Żywicka, 2015; Vol. 3. *PRACA* (*WORK*), ed.

Jerzy Bartmiński, Małgorzata Brzozowska, and Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartminska, 2016; Vol. 5. *HONOR* (*HONOUR*), ed. Petar Sotirov and Dejan Ajdačić, 2017. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Mazurkiewicz-Brzozowska, Małgorzata. 1993. Praca. Wybrane warianty znaczenia słowa we współczesnej polszczyźnie i ich struktura kognitywna. In Jerzy Bartmiński and Małgorzata Mazurkiewicz-Brzozowska (eds.) *Nazwy wartości.* 133–145. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Mikołajczuk, Agnieszka. 2009. *Obraz radości we współczesnej polszczyźnie.* Warszawa: Semper.

Pajdzińska, Anna. this volume. Linguistic worldview and grammatical categories.

Przybylska, Renata. 2002. *Polisemia przyimków polskich w świetle semantyki kognitywnej.* Kraków: Universitas.

Taylor, John R. 2002. *Cognitive Grammar.* Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1979. Ethno-syntax and the philosophy of grammar. *Studies in Language* 33: 313–383.