ACTA UNIVERSITATIS LODZIENSIS
Folia Litteraria Polonica 3(58) 2020
http://dx.doi.org/10.18778/1505-9057.58.10

Anita Filipczak-Białkowska*
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9447-1628

Does standard interpretation exist? Empirical verification of selected assumptions of communicational grammar

Introduction

Researchers have developed many theories, mainly based on psychology and linguistics, the aim of which is to grasp and explain the mechanism that mediates in reaching agreement between two people, on the basis of the communications they send. One such theory is called communicational grammar.[1] Its assumption

* Ph.D., University of Lodz, Faculty of Philology, Chair of Journalism and Social Communication; e-mail: anita.filipczak@uni.lodz.pl

1 Communicational grammar is an extensive methodology, under constant development, of the study of communicational phenomena. Its assumptions were presented in the books by its originators: Grażyna Habrajska and Aleksy Awdiejew, as well as in numerous articles. Those interested in expanding their knowledge about it can easily find source texts (*Wprowadzenie do gramatyki komunikacyjnej*, Vol. 1, Oficyna Wydawnicza Leksem, Łask 2004, Vol. 2, Oficyna Wydawnicza Leksem, Łask 2006; *Komponowanie sensu w procesie odbioru komunikatów*, Primum Verbum, Łódź 2010, also A. Awdiejew, *Gramatyka interakcji werbalnej*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Krakow 2007). In this study, I shall reference only those assumptions of communicational grammar which have a direct impact on the study of the issue. The manner of understanding the process of verbal interaction is essential for the problem discussed in this article, as it covers the sphere of the sender and the sphere of the recipient. The former constitutes in this case the primary area of interest, yet for clarity's sake other elements need also be briefly discussed. Awdiejew and Habrajska described

is that "communication is a partly realised interpersonal contact, the aim of which is […] to coordinate the joint activity of a community ensuring the community's most comfortable conditions of survival."[2] Linguistic communication and the resulting agreement, i.e. understanding and acceptance, often following earlier negotiations, of the content communicated in a message, is the method which leads to developing the principles of social cooperation (in a peaceful manner). However, how is it possible that agreement is achieved?

Communicational grammar, to the assumptions of which I shall refer, assumes that through human cognitive processes there emerge visions about the state of things which become preserved in people's memory. They become generalised and as a result standard knowledge develops, which is common for all the users of a language. In their minds, that standard knowledge operates as ideational (representational) images, which are automatically elicited from memory if needed. For that purpose people use lexemes, which form a text. Individual elements of a text in the form of linguistic units do not possess autonomous meaning, i.e. they do not denote themselves – they rather direct recipients' attention towards certain typical situations or states of things, which function in the minds of the persona communicating through ideational images. For example, in order to understand the word LEKARZ [a doctor], one needs to know the meanings of the words "ill", "a patient" and "to treat". It entails the vision of the typical (i.e. standard) appearance of a doctor, the equipment of a doctor's exam room, as well as the examination itself, or writing out a prescription. Therefore, the linguistic unit is a trigger automatically eliciting from one's memory a specific complex and non-divisible set of elements of a communicational situation, and of the procedures occurring in it. Therefore, the configuration of meaning conveyed in

verbal interaction as follows: "The starting point is the communicational intention of a sender expressed in the form of a cognitive representation […], which can be divided into two parts: the ideational image […] and the pragmatic intention […]. Having realised the content of their own communicational intention, the sender proceeds to verbalising it, i.e. selecting the structural means of a language to produce a sequence of forms which a recipient can interpret as a communication produced specifically for them with a specific pragmatic intention. Within the process of verbalisation, the sender conveys a piece of information available within a system […]; the piece of information is the result of the creative composition of the units of linguistic array available to the sender and the recipient, and it assumes that the sender uses a relevant non-systemic piece of information […], which together with a piece of information available systemically enables the proper interpretation of the communication. A piece of information available systemically enables a standard interpretation of a communication in those cases when a recipient does not possess any other relevant pieces of information […]" [*Wprowadzenie*…, Vol. 1, p. 30].

2 A. Awdiejew, G. Habrajska, *Komponowanie*…, p. 7 [unless indicated otherwise, all quotations in English were translated from Polish].

a communication occupies a much bigger area of reference than one might expect based on the formal organisation of the text.[3]

In the process of communication, ideational images function as semantic standards, i.e. inter-subjective generalised representations with a predicative-argumentative organisation.[4] When constructing a text, the sender has to approximate their subjective vision to the set of those interpersonal semantic standards if the sender wants to be understood. Next, the assumption is that if a recipient wants to understand the meaning which the sender strives to convey, the recipient has to first view the text through the prism of semantic standards (conduct a standard interpretation), and in the next stage utilise the available non-standard knowledge, which can transform the original or standard meaning.[5] That shorthand specification of the process of linguistic communication enables one to notice that the concept of communicational grammar is based, in this respect, on a certain set of assumptions. Verification of those assumptions on the basis of an analysis of material or social studies would strengthen the academic foundations of the methodology. In this article, I shall present the results of a study which aimed to verify one of the major assumptions of communicational grammar: the existence of the phenomenon of a standard interpretation.

Standard interpretation. Terminology

Standard interpretation "presents a generalised model of analysis of a communication by a virtual recipient, which consists of constructing […] basic components of meaning which work together."[6] In other words, the assumption is that despite the reception of a communication being a subjective process, its course is to some extent pre-determined, since "a recipient, at certain stages of interpretation, progresses through specific standard references, common for most speakers of a language, while the later subjective extension of the interpretation will not contradict those standards."[7] The aim of the study, the results of which I discuss in this article, was to verify the veracity of the assumption. In other words, the aim was to find an answer to the question whether it is true that in the

3 Cf. A. Awdiejew, G. Habrajska, *Komponowanie*..., p. 188.

4 A. Awdiejew, G. Habrajska, *Wprowadzenie*..., Vol. 1, p. 43.

5 Such elements of knowledge which modify standard meaning include, e.g. one's familiarity with the political views of the sender, and knowledge based on the current conditions of the communicational situation in which interaction occurs. That enables one to notice, e.g. the use of irony in an interlocutor's statement, which requires one to apply the special procedure of the interpretation of meaning.

6 A. Awdiejew, G. Habrajska, *Komponowanie*..., p. 9.

7 Ibidem, pp. 9–10.

process of interpreting a communication, individual real recipients reproduce the same mental path that a standard interpretation assumes.

In communicational grammar, it is important to notice the difference between the formal structure of text units (lexemes) and the plan of the content, which is conveyed through them: "at the level of content, a text does not possess a linear structure as its formal structure might suggest, while the relations between units are defined based on their inter-relations of meaning."[8] The linguistic form applied in a text may refer to ideational images of varying degrees of complexity – it may indicate parts of semantic standards, whole standards, their sets, or their sequences, i.e. scenarios.[9] In communicational grammar it is eventually assumed that "[…] a text does not 'convey' meaning of a communication but rather only indicates the possible directions of its interpretation."[10] Interpretation, then, mainly consists of reproducing the systemic pieces of information included in a text, both those conveyed explicitly and those assumed. A recipient includes in that process also the set of non-systemic pieces of information which they possess since the process of interpretation is subjective in nature – each interpreter has a different stock of pieces of information relevant for the interpretation and strives to achieve their communicational goals.[11] Because of these various conditions in which text interpretation occurs, the cognitive representation (expressed in an ideational image and pragmatic intention) reproduced by an individual recipient is usually not equivalent to the sender's cognitive representation, being only its approximation.

Time-space scenario in communicational grammar

The images of the world retained in memory can take one of two forms: fixed images, i.e. such which do not change in time or space (static images of states), and moving (dynamic) images of events, which exist as changing configurations altering over time and space. Awdiejew and Habrajska defined scenarios as follows:

> In the case of events, various types of images combine in human minds in logically structured wholes, often referred to as scenarios. Scenarios form at the syntagmatic level of structuring where individual cognitive images are bound in sequences or which exist simultaneously. Scenarios can be represented as extensive semantic patterns, which include sequences of individual predicate-argument systems, both in

8 A. Awdiejew, G. Habrajska, *Wprowadzenie*..., Vol. 1, p. 22.

9 Ibidem, pp. 22–23.

10 A. Awdiejew, G. Habrajska, *Komponowanie*..., p. 9.

11 Ibidem, p. 9.

the form of events and states. Their co-existence is a result of the requirements of the coherence of meaning within the courses of typical generalised situations.[12]

Between the individual elements which exist in a scenario, there often exist cause-and-effect relations. In line with the assumption of there being a standard interpretation, predicates which introduce event scenarios[13] determine the course of the process of interpretation requiring a recipient to reproduce the standard interpretative path. In other words, in order to understand the meaning of a statement which includes a predicate which introduces an event scenario, a recipient reproduces a systemically defined sequence of semantic standards which, even though not expressed at the text level, are essential to complete the meaning of a communication. Therefore, in order to understand the meaning of such predicates as *przepraszać* [to apologise], *chronić* [to protect], or *wybaczać* [to forgive], it is necessary to realise some previous states and events which caused the predicates, i.e. develop appropriate scenarios.

Below, by indicating a few strategic steps, I shall present a detailed discussion of the interpretative processes which according to the methodology of communicational grammar occur when interpreting four statements of my choosing, which will constitute the basis for verifying the hypothesis tested in this study.[14] Those statements are: "Prawnik powinien przeprosić" [The lawyer should apologise], "Wyznanie znanego aktora: jestem gotowy wybaczyć" [Confession by well-known actor: I'm ready to forgive], "Chrońmy gatunek culex pipiens" [Let us protect the species Culex pipiens], "Matka przedszkolaka z przedszkola nr 12 w Łęczycy: jestem zbulwersowana" [Mother of a kindergarten pupil from kindergarten no. 12 in Łęczyca: I am appalled].

One can assume that the predicate *przepraszać* within the standard interpretation could open the following scenario:

UCZYNIĆ [to do] (SOMEONE1, SOMETHING) & SKRZYWDZIĆ [to hurt] (SOMEONE1, SOMEONE2) → PRZEPRASZAĆ [to apologise to] (SOMEONE1, SOMEONE2, (FOR) UCZYNIĆ [to do] (SOMEONE1, SOMETHING))

The lexeme "przepraszać" used in the text evokes a sequence of events when an earlier actant had led to a situation which was unfavourable for someone. Only

12 A. Awdiejew, G. Habrajska, *Komponowanie*..., pp. 104–105.

13 In communicational grammar, those units are called hyperterms, cf. A. Awdiejew, G. Habrajska, *Wprowadzenie*..., Vol. 1, p. 72–73.

14 The survey which I used for the study covered more examples of statements, yet the permitted length of the article prevented me from presenting all the results. I shall discuss all the results of the survey in my forthcoming book.

once that stage has been considered in the process of interpretation can one fully understand the content which underlies the word. Having reproduced the scenario, a recipient acquires a complement of the meaning included in the text even though at the level of its formal structure there exists only the lexeme "przeprosić".

Next, one can assume that for the predicate *wybaczać* the time-space scenario could take the following form:

> UCZYNIĆ [to do] (SOMEONE1, SOMETHING) & SKRZYWDZIĆ [to apologise] (SOMEONE2, SOMEONE1) → PRZEPROSIĆ [to apologise to] (SOMEONE2, SOMEONE1) (optionally as this stage can be omitted, it is not required in the scenario) → WYBACZYĆ [to forgive] (SOMEONE2, SOMEONE1)

As in the previous example, the introduction in the text of the lexeme "wybaczyć" unavoidably triggers a sequence in which first there must have occur an action which led to a sense of harm in the person now ready to perform the act of forgiving.

Similar to the previous examples, the predicate *chronić* acquires meaning only when the process of interpretation includes the element of a threat. The situation of a threat is not expressed at the text level, yet to fulfil the meaning, the threat must be realised. Therefore, one can assume that the standard interpretation of the predicate *chronić* requires one to recreate the following sequence:

> ISTNIEĆ [to exist] (SOMEONE1/SOMETHING1) & POTRZEBNYM/WARTOŚCIOWYM BYĆ [to be necessary/valuable] (SOMEONE2, SOMETHING2) → CZYNIĆ [to do] (SOMEONE2, SOMETHING2) & NIEBEZPIECZNYM [dangerous] > BYĆ [to be] (SOMETHING2, (FOR) SOMEONE1/SOMETHING1) = ZAGRAŻAĆ [to threaten] (SOMEONE2/SOMETHING2, SOMEONE1/SOMETHING1) → POWSTRZYMAĆ [to prevent] {SOMEONE3, SOMEONE2 (FROM) CZYNIĆ [form doing (SOMEONE2, SOMETHING2) & NIEBEZPIECZNYM [dangerous] > BYĆ [to be] (SOMETHING2, (FOR) SOMEONE1/SOMETHING1}

The scenario introduced by the predicate *zbulwersować się* could take the following form:

> ZROBIĆ [to do] (SOMEONE1, SOMETHING) & NIEWŁAŚCIWYM [inappropriate] > BYĆ [to be] (SOMETHING) →
> ZBULWERSOWAĆ SIĘ [to become appalled] (SOMEONE2, (WITH) SOMEONE1, (ABOUT) ZROBIĆ [doing] (SOMEONE1, SOMETHING))

The scenarios proposed above are examples of standard interpretations evoked by the selected lexemes. According to the assumptions of communicational grammar, one should assume that every recipient when interpreting a text which includes those words is going to realise that exact sequence of events, i.e. they are going to perform a mental process consisting of recreating the missing elements of the scenario in order to make the meaning complete.

The subcategorisation of arguments in semantic standards

The phenomenon of the subcategorisation of arguments in semantic standards is of major importance for the study procedure applied in the discussed study, as the "presence of a specific verb which fulfils the function of a predicate in a text does not determine the type of the predicate-argument system in a finite manner."[15] The same verbs may open at the text level various types of predicate-argument systems depending on the nouns included in the text in specific argument positions. The difference is clearly visible when considering the following texts: "Matka karmi dziecko" [Mother is feeding the child], and "Ojciec karmi dziecko" [Father is feeding the child]. Both texts refer to the same general pattern:

KARMIĆ [to feed] (SOMEONE, SOMEONE ELSE),

yet the meaning of the predicate-argument system of KARMIĆ [to feed] (MOTHER, CHILD) is broader in terms of reference, i.e. it allows more variants than the predicate-argument system of KARMIĆ [to feed] (FATHER, CHILD)[16].

Please consider that the introduction of a certain noun instead of the argument impacts the process of completing the meaning of the statement in such a way that it directs and limits the extent of standard interpretations. For example, the role an actant plays defines the array of its actions and the area of activity, and specifies the remaining actors who exist with the actant within the space in a standard version. One should discuss how those processes progress in the analysed examples.

1. The subcategorisation of arguments in the predicate-argument system for the statement "Prawnik powinien przeprosić."

The fact of introducing in the predicate-argument system opened by the predicate "przepraszać" the first argument, i.e. the actant, in the form of the noun "prawnik" determines specific actors in the standard interpretation, who can appear in the position of the second argument, i.e. in the position of the person who deserves an apology. In my mind, that might be the lawyer's client or another party in a court case (the judge, the accuser, the jurors, the audience). Depending

15 A. Awdiejew, G. Habrajska, *Komponowanie*..., p. 136.

16 Cf., ibidem, pp. 136–140.

on which noun appears in the position of the second argument of the predicate-argument system, the action for which the lawyer should apologise is replaced with another action of the lawyer. However, that action always takes a negative value (E-)[17] since it is understood as an action which hurts someone, and in normative terms it assumes a negative value. One can assume that in a standard situation the lawyer can offend someone during a court hearing or cause a situation which may be somehow unfavourable for their client.

2. The subcategorisation of arguments in a predicate-argument system for the statement "Wyznanie znanego aktora: jestem gotowy wybaczyć."

The noun "aktor" which appears in the place of the first argument in the predicate-argument system opened by the predicate "wybaczyć" somewhat limits the scope of ideational images which may appear in the standard interpretation, yet it still allows diverse interpretative paths, as for that professional group it is typical to have considerable transparency in terms of private affairs and openness to displaying unusual signs of emotional fragility. Therefore, in a standard situation an actor may direct an act of forgiveness towards people who accompany them in their professional life (other actors or directors), but they can also state their willingness to forgive their wives or girlfriends for some actions. Please note that the predicate "wybaczać" framed in the standard manner determines the scope of earlier actions – those actions undertaken in relation to the person who performs the act of forgiving must possess negative evaluation (E-).

3. The subcategorisation of arguments in the standard interpretation of the statement "Chrońmy gatunek culex pipiens."

The predicate-argument system in the analysed example opens with the predicate "chronić" [protect] introduces in the position of the first argument the noun "ludzie" [people], and in the position of the second argument – a species of an animal (as per the method of recording applied in the selected methodology: ZWIERZĘCIA [of animal] >GATUNEK [species]). Thus, the eventual structure is as follows:

CHRONIĆ [to protect] (PEOPLE, OF ANIMAL>SPECIES); CULEX PIPIENS (SPECIES)[18].

---

17 Awdiejew and Habrajska stated that: "Semantic standards, which constitute part of the semantic system, possess [...] standard values as the images of reality presented by them connect to their normative evaluations. Those evaluations may possess very distinct and intense character, e.g. (E-) ZACHOROWAĆ [to become ill] (SOMEONE) [...]" [in:] A. Awdiejew, G. Habrajska, *Wprowadzenie...*, Vol. 1, p. 297.

18 That is the so-called secondary predicate. Awdiejew and Habrajska defined it as follows: "When a sender's ideational image is more complex than the semantic standard, i.e. the semantic standard cannot contain all the elements of the ideational image, the sender

What is important is that specific animals can be considered, not all the animals there are – in a standard situation those are not bacteria (as those we rather kill than protect) or animals which are considered parasites or pests. The standard interpretation also requires the species to be endangered to become extinct. Therefore, the time-space scenario opened by the predicate "chronić" with the complement of the object of the actions, i.e. the species of the animal, will have the following standard interpretation:

> ISTNIEĆ [to exist] (SOMEONE1/SOMETHING1) & POTRZEBNYM/WARTOŚCIOWYM BYĆ [to be necessary/valuable] (SOMEONE2, SOMETHING2) → CZYNIĆ [to do] (SOMEONE2, SOMETHING2) & NIEBEZPIECZNYM [dangerous] > BYĆ [to be] (SOMETHING2, (FOR) SOMEONE1/SOMETHING1) = ZAGRAŻAĆ [to threaten] (SOMEONE2/SOMETHING2, SOMEONE1/SOMETHING1) → POWSTRZYMAĆ [to prevent] (SOMEONE3, SOMEONE2 (FROM) CZYNIĆ [to do] (SOMEONE2, SOMETHING2))

What is worth noticing is the complex evaluation of the elements of the ideational image triggered by the predicate "chronić". The person who protects received a positive evaluation (E+); the object subject to protection, in a standard situation, also receives a positive value (E+) as it connects with the normative evaluation resulting from the relationship that normally we protect only those objects which we consider as beneficial. Then the antagonist, who introduces an action dangerous for the protected object, inherits the normative negative evaluation (E-).

What is noteworthy is that during a non-standardised survey among the study subjects conducted after the study I found that most of them did not recognise the Latin name of the animal: Culex pipens is the common house mosquito. Therefore, a standard interpretation could not have been initialised.[19] This fact has an interesting reflection in the results (vide below).

4. The subcategorisation of arguments in the predicate-argument system for the statement "Matka przedszkolaka z Przedszkola nr 12 w Łęczycy: jestem zbulwersowana."

---

introduces in their statement such specifications of the primary predicate, in the form of, e.g. secondary predicates, which can facilitate the recipient's recreation of the approximate ideational image. Such specifications, being separate semantic standards, are perceived as projections of additional ideational images, coherent in compositional terms with the primary predicate. [...] The aim of the thus developed meaning is to approximate the content of the statement being interpreted to the sender's cognitive interpretation," [in:] A. Awdiejew, G. Habrajska, *Wprowadzenie*..., Vol. 1, p. 45.

19 That also enables one to conclude, though with considerable caution, that standard interpretation can be a process which is automatic and thoughtless.

In the analysed statement, the actant in the form of "matka przedszkolaka" determines the remaining actors who might appear in the ideational image, expressed using the predicate-argument system ZBULWERSOWAĆ SIĘ [to become appalled] (PRZEDSZKOLAKA [of kindergarten pupil] > MATKA [mother], TOWARDS SOMEONE, ABOUT SOMETHING). As per the principles of standard interpretation, in the position of the second argument there can appear nouns naming the employees of the kindergarten, the scope of actions performed by them in the position of the third argument, yet there is a major limitation: those actions will normally assume negative evaluations and one might expect that they will express various kinds of omissions by the employees which lead to dangerous situations, or which feature a potential to cause such situations.

It is extremely difficult (and risky if one intends to retain academic reliability) to predict all the possible subcategorisations of arguments in the standard interpretation for individual examples, as in order to refer to them a scientist would have to only capitalise on their competences, which for obvious reasons are imperfect (mainly because it is marked by individual experiences). Therefore, I shall introduce an auxiliary rule of interpreting survey results, namely that if an ideational image is referenced several times and by various respondents, it is considered as standard. It is difficult to specify how many such references there should be in relation to the study sample, which is why it is necessary to make an arbitrary decision. I shall assume that the same answer provided by 8 people proves there exists a semantic standard and that enables one to consider such an interpretation as a sign of standard interpretation.

Study method

In order to verify the hypothesis of the existence of a standard interpretation, it was necessary to establish the appropriate procedure and develop a special tool. I conducted the study using an anonymous survey (a paper-and-pencil version). The study subjects were given short texts (which imitated announcements on news websites) and asked to indicate the reasons which caused the texts to be created. As I have already mentioned, those statements were:

Prawnik powinien przeprosić [The lawyer should apologise],
Wyznanie znanego aktora: jestem gotowy wybaczyć [Confession by a well-known actor: I'm ready to forgive],
Chrońmy gatunek culex pipiens [Let us protect the species culex pipiens],
Matka przedszkola z Przedszkola nr 12 w Łęczycy: jestem zbulwersowana [Mother of a kindergarten pupil from Kindergarten No. 12 in Łęczyca: I am appalled].

I intentionally selected sufficiently general examples to make sure that interpretations aimed at finding the causes could develop in any direction and cover various situations, in line with the individual experiences of the study subjects.[20] A large diversity among the answers provided by the respondents would indicate that the assumption about a standard interpretation was false. I treated agreement in terms of the indicated causes as an argument in favour of the dominance of the model of a standard interpretation. In other words, I assumed that the hypothesis of the existence of a standard interpretation would be proven if the study subjects in their interpretations referred to the same semantic standards which exist in the standard form of the time-space scenario triggered by a predicate.

Study group

The study was conducted on a sample which consisted of students of journalism and social communication. They were students of first-year bachelor's studies and first-year master's studies. The group totalled 79 subjects. It also included people from Ukraine. I assumed that the variety of the study population positively influenced the value of the results. It proved that the assumption of communicational grammar being tested was not limited to conditions specific for Poles, which in turn offers basis for assuming its universality.

I considered the group adequate for studying the phenomenon since the persons included in it came from geographically diverse regions and diverse social groups, which means there existed potential for individual interpretations to be revealed in the answers they provided.

Standardisation of survey results

The causes indicated by the study subjects took the form of short descriptions. It was necessary to reduce them to a standard form and compare with the above-discussed standard time-space scenarios appropriate for each of the examples being tested. As a result, I developed several categories for every example. I created them by selecting common ideational images to which the study subjects referred, even though they used different lexemes in their statements. I presented the results of the categorisation in tables, defining every ideational image using a semantic

20 One should consider as a sign of a non-standard interpretation the fact that, e.g. the actor forgave the fact it was necessary to wait long for a taxi or that the actor's friend playing with him forgot his role and caused a theatre play to flop, while the mother could be appalled by the fact that kindergarten classes started at 8 a.m. or that the school year in Poland starts, as per the law, on 1 September, which might interfere with her vacation plans.

standard, indicating the number of respondent references to a standard, and quoting example statements which I assigned to a category.

A sheet prepared by one study subject could include more than one cause which the person deemed to be the cause of the statement tested in the survey, or a respondent might not have indicated such a cause at all, which is why the number of answers acquired in the survey differs from the number of persons who participated in the study. In every case, I analysed all the interpretations provided by the respondents. Answers which did not fit the defined categories were also of major importance – I treated them as a sign of a non-standard interpretation.

Below I present the results of the survey for individual examples.

Prawnik powinien przeprosić

As I have already mentioned, the standard scenario for the predicate "przepraszać" has the form:

> UCZYNIĆ [to do] (SOMEONE1, SOMETHING) & SKRZYWDZIĆ [to hurt] (SOMEONE1, SOMEONE2) → PRZEPRASZAĆ [to apologise to] (SOMEONE1, SOMEONE2, (FOR) UCZYNIĆ [for doing] (SOMEONE1, SOMETHING))

I have already indicated that the noun "prawnik" appears in the position of the first argument (SOMEONE1). In their answers, respondents mentioned in the position of the second argument (SOMEONE2) such persons as: sędzia [a judge], klient [a client], oskarżony [a defendant].

Next, it was necessary to define which actions of the lawyer the respondents deemed to be the basis for the later apology and whether the actions fulfilled the pattern assumed for standard interpretation: UCZYNIĆ [to do] (PRAWNIK [lawyer], SOMETHING) & SKRZYWDZIĆ [to harm] (PRAWNIK [lawyer], SOMEONE2).

In Table 1, I present the categories of answers which respondents provided in the survey.

Table 1. Standard interpretations for the statement "Prawnik powinien przeprosić"

Semantic standard	Number of references	Example answers provided in the survey
ZROBIĆ [to do] (PRAWNIK [a lawyer], SOMETHING) & POPEŁNIĆ [to commit] (PRAWNIK [a lawyer], MISTAKE), ZAWODOWY [professional] (BŁĄD [a mistake])	59	"popełnił błąd" [made a mistake], "Prawnik podjął błędną linię obrony" [the lawyer engaged in an incorrect line of defence], "Pomyłkowo powiedział błędny przepis" [he quoted the wrong provision by mistake], "udzielił błędnej porady" [he offered incorrect advice], "popełnił błąd podczas rozprawy" [he made a mistake during a case hearing]

ZROBIĆ [to do] (PRAWNIK [a lawyer], SOMETHING) & OBRAZIĆ [to offend] (PRAWNIK [a lawyer], SOMEONE)	31	"powiedział coś niestosownego" [he said something inappropriate], "Obraził kogoś" [He offended someone], "Prawnik obraził drugą stronę postępowania" [The lawyer offended the other party in the case], "Bo kogoś obraził, swojego klienta" [Because he offended someone, his client], "Podczas rozprawy sądowej prawnik mógł użyć niewłaściwego słownictwa, nadużyć swoich praw i kompetencji, a to z kolei mogło prowadzić do obrazy uczestników rozprawy" [During the court hearing, the lawyer might have used incorrect vocabulary, abuse his rights and competences, which in turn might have led to offending the parties in the case]
UCZYNIĆ [to do] (PRAWNIK [lawyer], SOMETHING) & SKRZYWDZIĆ [to harm] (PRAWNIK [lawyer], SOMEONE)	11	"Prawnik wygłosił o kimś krzywdzącą opinię" [The lawyer uttered an unjust opinion about someone], "Prawnik zrobił komuś coś złego" [The lawyer did something wrong to someone], "... ludzi, którym zrobił jakąś krzywdę" [... people to whom he did harm], "komuś zaszkodził" [he harmed someone]
UCZYNIĆ [to do] (PRAWNIK [lawyer], SOMETHING) & NIESKUTECZNIE [unsuccessfully] > DZIAŁAĆ [to act] (PRAWNIK [lawyer]).	5	"nie zdołał obronić swojego klienta na rozprawie" [he did not manage to defend his client in the hearing], "rozczarował swojego klienta, któremu obiecywał coś lepszego niż się stało" [he disappointed his client, whom he had promised something better than that which happened], "osobę, którą reprezentował, jeśli przegrał sprawę" [the person whom he represented lost the case]

Source: own study.

Five times the fact that the lawyer's actions were unsuccessful was indicated as the reason why he should apologise: UCZYNIĆ [to do] (PRAWNIK [lawyer], SOMETHING) & NIESKUTECZNIE [unsuccessfully] > DZIAŁAĆ [to act] (PRAWNIK [lawyer]). Based on my own competence, I would not indicate such an interpretation as a standard one, yet the fact that similar observations were made by several people indicates a certain trend in thinking and enables a conclusion that a similar interpretation is becoming generalised.[21]

I recorded four manifestations of non-standard interpretations for the example. Two study subjects referred contemplatively to the attitude evaluating the sender

21 That, in turn, leads to a statement (which, however, requires further extensive study) that semantic standards undergo modifications. They are the outcomes of generalisations yet they are not universal in nature. That observation opens an interesting study area for applying the methodology of communicational grammar.

of the statement "Prawnik powinien przeprosić". The subjects described it in the following manner: "Prawnik postąpił w sposób nieaprobowany przez kogoś i ta osoba uważa słusznie lub nie, że prawnik powinien przeprosić" [The lawyer acted in a way that was not approved by someone and that person thinks rightly or not that the lawyer should apologise], and "Prawnik wcześniej dopuścił się karygodnego czynu zdaniem osoby, która mówi/zapisuje powyższe zdanie" [The lawyer had committed a reprehensible act according to the person who said/recorded the statement". One person assumed a justifying attitude and wrote: "Ale też prawnik jest zwykłym człowiekiem i może przeprosić w sytuacjach, gdy np. wylał na kogoś kawę" [Oh, but a lawyer is human, too, and he can apologise in a situation when, e.g. he spills coffee over someone], indicating as the reason for the apology a situation other than a typical court situation. One person indicated, among many other standard interpretations, also one in which "może powinien przeprosić swoją żonę za coś" [maybe he should apologise to his wife for something], introducing in the position of the second argument in the standard a person from outside the typical scope for a lawyer.

An overview of the answers provided by the study subjects in reference to the studied example enables the following statement. Based on the analysis of the processes of the subcategorisation of the arguments in the referenced semantic standard, one might conclude that the lawyer was viewed only through the prism of his professional function, in a stereotypical communication situation occurring in a court room and in his work with a client, i.e. in an environment of people fulfilling specific functions typical for that communication situation (defendant, judge, etc.) and engaging in actions solely from a scope of those typical for the profession. The key point is that in a standard situation the predicate "przepraszać" requires the earlier actions of an actant to assume a negative evaluation (E-). The answers provided by the study subjects fulfilled that requirement in every case (the semantic standard "obrazić kogoś" [offend someone], "popełnić błąd" [make a mistake], and "skrzywdzić" [harm] traditionally are assigned a negative value).

Wyznanie znanego aktora: jestem gotowy wybaczyć

The standard scenario opened by the predicate "wybaczyć" [to forgive] is the following for the studied example:

> UCZYNIĆ [to do] (SOMEONE, SOMETHING) & SKRZYWDZIĆ [to harm] (SOMEONE, AKTOR [an actor]) → PRZEPROSIĆ [to apologise to] (SOMEONE, AKTORA [an actor]) (optionally as this stage can be omitted, it is not required in the scenario) → WYBACZYĆ [to forgive] (AKTOR [an actor], SOMEONE)

In their answers, study subjects listed in the position of the missing argument (SOMEONE) such persons as: a partner, director, the media/journalists. References to the actor's parents appeared twice. Often the originator of the harmful behaviour was not defined.

The study subjects indicated several actions which required forgiveness of the actor's part, which I classified under several categories. I present this in Table 2.

Table 2. Standard interpretations for the statement "Wyznanie znanego aktora: jestem gotowy wybaczyć"

Semantic standard	Number of references	Example answers provided in the survey
UCZYNIĆ [to do] (SOMEONE, SOMETHING) & SKRZYWDZIĆ [to harm] (SOMEONE, AKTORA [the actor])	20	"Ktoś wyrządził mu krzywdę" [Someone did harm to him], "Tego aktora spotkała krzywda z czyjejś strony" [This actor was harmed by someone], "Ktoś sprawił przykrość aktorowi" [Someone caused the actor distress], "Warunek: ktoś musiał zachować się w nieodpowiedni sposób w stosunku do aktora" [Condition: someone must have behaved improperly towards the actor], "Ktoś zrobił aktorowi coś jednoznacznie złego" [Someone did something clearly bad to the actor]
POMÓWIĆ [to impute] (SOMEONE, AKTORA [the actor])	16	"Aktor został zniesławiony" [The actor was libelled], "jego dobre imię mogło być zagrożone, a autorytet podważony" [his good name might have been threatened and his respect challenged], "rozsiewanie niedorzecznych plotek" [spreading wild rumours], "Kłamstwa o sobie ze strony dziennikarza/ publikacji w magazynie" [Lies about him from a journalist/ publication in a magazine], "niesłusznie oskarżyli go o coś, co zaszkodziło jego karierze (np. o molestowanie nieletniej)" [he was wrongly accused of something which harmed his careers (e.g. about molesting a minor)], "Znany aktor został skrzywdzony/ oczerniony" [A well-known actor was harmed/defamed]
ZDRADZIĆ [to betray] (PARTNER, AKTORA [the actor])	14	"Aktor został zdradzony" [The actor was cheated on], "... swojej żonie wszystkie jej zdrady z innymi aktorami i w ogóle z kim popadnie" [... all his wife's infidelities with other actors and with anyone else around], "Aktor został zdradzony przez partnera życiowego lub zawodowego" [The actor was betrayed by his life or professional partner], "Zdradziła go żona!" [His wife was unfaithful to him!], "Aktor został zdradzony przez swoją dziewczynę" [The actor's girlfriend cheated on him]

OBRAZIĆ [to offend] (SOMEONE, AKTORA [the actor])	13	"Ktoś obraził aktora" [Someone offended the actor], "Aktor został przeze kogoś obrażony" [The actor was offended by someone], "Został kiedyś obrażony" [He was offended at some point]
OSZUKAĆ [to swindle] (REŻYSER [a director], AKTORA [the actor])	8	"Kłótnia z reżyserem" [A falling out with a director], "Nie zatrudnienie go przez reżysera do filmu mimo wcześniejszych ustaleń" [Not being employed by a director for a film despite earlier arrangements], "Aktor nie otrzymał roli u swojego przyjaciela-reżysera" [The actor did not get a role from his friend the director], "Reżyser nie wziął do filmu tego aktora, choć mu to obiecał" [Director did not give the actor a role although he promised him that]
PRZEPROSIĆ [to apologise to] (SOMEONE, AKTORA [the actor], (FOR) SKRZYWDZIĆ [to harm] (SOMEONE, AKTORA [the actor])	5	"Aktor został przez kogoś obrażony, ta osoba aktora przeprosiła" [The actor was offended by someone, the person apologised to the actor], "Znany aktor został przeproszony przez kogoś" [Someone apologised to a famous actor], "kiedy dziennikarz przeprosił" [when a journalist apologised]

Source: own study.

Five people indicated that the possible reason which might have induced the actor to forgive was that the person who had caused him harm apologised to him. Even though the number of those answers was small, I did not consider the case as an example of a non-systemic interpretation, as the interpretation provided by the study subjects fits the standard interpretation opened by the predicate "wybaczać", though it is an optional element. What is required is a previous experience of negligence.

Among all the answers provided by the study subjects, I found two which I considered to be manifestations of non-standard interpretations. One person indicated that the reason which led to the actor uttering the statement included in the survey was the fact that during an interview someone might have asked about the actor's childhood and as a result the actor admitted that he was ready to forgive past actions of one of his parents: "Pytanie w wywiadzie dot. trudnego dzieciństwa i zaniedbania przez jedno z rodziców" [Question in an interview regarding a difficult childhood and neglect by one of his parents]. Another person also referred to the actor's difficult situation from his childhood and wrote: "ojciec go bił, zniweczył jego dzieciństwo" [his father beat him, wrecked his childhood]. I considered those statements, though forming a coherent category, as non-standard, since they did not fulfil the requirement regarding the minimum number of indications among

all survey results. In other words, two instances of an interpretation among all the answers of the 79 study subjects do not form a basis for considering such an interpretation as standard.

When considering the answers of the study subjects regarding the discussed example, one can identify the typical interpretative paths the subjects took. When analysing the processes of the subcategorisation of the arguments in the quoted standards one might notice that the actor was perceived not only in reference to professional activities (director), but also, or even predominantly, through the prism of events which occurred in the actor's private life (wife, girlfriend, partner, parents) or those emerging in relation to his activities as a public figure (the media, journalists). Please note that the predicate "wybaczać" framed in the standard manner determines the scope of earlier actions undertaken in relation to the person who performs the act of forgiving. Those actions have to feature negative evaluation (E-). The interpretations indicated by the study subjects[22] always referred to the standards with a traditionally assigned negative value: "skrzywdzić" [to harm], "pomówić" [to libel], "zdradzić" [to betray/cheat on], "obrazić" [to offend], "oszukać" [to swindle].

Chrońmy gatunek culex pipiens

The standard scenario for the analysed example could be transcribed as follows:

> ISTNIEĆ [to exist] (CULEX PIPIENS) & POTRZEBNYM/WARTOŚCIOWYM [necessary/valuable] > BYĆ [to be] (CULEX PIPIENS) → CZYNIĆ [to do] (SOMEONE1, SOMETHING1) & NIEBEZPIECZNYM [dangerous] > BYĆ [to be] (SOMETHING1, (FOR) CULEX PIPIENS) = ZAGRAŻAĆ [to threaten] (WYGINIĘCIE [extinction][23], CULEX PIPIENS) → CHRONIĆ [to protect] {(SOMEONE2, CULEX PIPIENS, (AGAINST) WYGINĄĆ [to become extinct] (CULEX PIPIENS)}

In order to assume that in reference to this example study subjects applied a standard interpretation, their answers would have to include lexemes which invoke ideational images which in the above scenario are expressed in the form of individual semantic standards. In Table 3, I presented the survey results.

---

22 Some doubts can arise from the category PRZEPROSIĆ [to apologise to] (SOMEONE, AKTORA [the actor], (FOR) SKRZYWDZIĆ [for harming] (SOMEONE, AKTORA (the actor)), yet a more in-depth analysis of the structure of the semantic standard indicates that it also contains a reference to the ideational image which traditionally features a negative evaluation. Compare with the PRAWNIK example.

23 WYGINĄĆ [to become extinct] (CULEX PIPIENS)

Table 3. Interpretative standards for the statement "Chrońmy gatunek culex pipiens"

Semantic standard	Number of references	Example answers provided in the survey
ZAGRAŻAĆ [to threaten] (WYGINIĘCIE [extinction], CULEX PIPIENS)	54	"Gatunek culex pipiens jest zagrożony" [The species Culex pipiens is endangered], "Gatunek culex pipiens jest zagrożony wyginięciem" [The species Culex pipiens is threatened with extinction], "…gdyż grozi mu wyginięcie" [… as it is threatened with extenction], "Gatunek culex pipiens jest zagrożony wymarciem" [The species Culex pipiens is threatened with extinction], "Populacja gatunku culex pipiens zmniejszyła się w ciągu ostatniego roku o połowę" [To the population of the species Culex pipiens decreased by half in the last year]
WYGINĄĆ [to become extinct] (CULEX PIPIENS)	22	"Istnieje ryzyko, że gatunek culex pipiens wyginie" [There is a risk that the species Culex pipiens might become extinct], "wymiera" [is dying out], "Gatunek culex pipiens jest na wymarciu" [The species Culex pipiens is becoming extinct], "ponieważ jest rzadkim gatunkiem" [because it is a rare species], "Gatunek culex pipiens prawdopodobnie jest na wymarciu lub bliski osiągnięcia tego stanu" [The species Culex pipiens is probably becoming extinct or close to it]
POTRZEBNYM/ WARTOŚCIOWYM [necessary/valuable] > BYĆ [to be] (CULEX PIPIENS)	10	"bo jest ważny dla ludzkości" [because it is important for humanity], "bo jest ważny i indywidualny" [because it is important and unique], "Gatunek culex pipiens jest ważny dla człowieczeństwa" [The species Culex pipiens is important for humanity]

Source: own study.

Among the non-standard interpretations, of which I recorded 4, a certain tendency emerged: the study subjects indicated the harmful activities of human beings, which according to them have led the species to the brink of extinction. The following statements appeared: "ludzie polują na zwierzę lub niszczą środowisko – zabierają mu miejsce do życia lub pożywienie" [people hunt animals or destroy the environment – they take away their place for living or eating", "Kłusownicy coraz częściej polują, dla ich rogów i kłów" [Poachers hunt them, more and more, for their antlers and fangs], "Gatunek na wymarciu dodatkowo borykający się z niebezpieczeństwem tworzonym przez np. człowieka" [A species which is becoming extinct additionally struggles with the dangers created by, e.g. humans], "… ponieważ coraz więcej gatunków zwierząt wymiera przez działania człowieka" [… because more and more animal species are becoming extinct as a result of human activity].

Based on the analysis of the processes involved in the subcategorisation of the arguments in semantic standards which indicate the categories of the answers, one can note considerable compliance in terms of the selection of interpretation paths. This is also visible at the level of the survey answers. Among the lexemes used by the study subjects a clear pattern emerged (the expression "zagrożony wyginięciem" [threatened with extinction] appeared 22 times in that exact form). Another feature of the gathered material was that the study subjects often provided only one possible reason as the cause of the statement "Chrońmy gatunek culex pipiens".[24] I considered this to be an argument supporting the hypothesis of the existence of a standard interpretation.

At this point, reference should be made to evaluation in the standard interpretation of the studied example. As one might notice, that which is threatened with extinction (the common house mosquito in this case) automatically receives a positive value (E+), while the essence or the factor which causes the situation of endangerment receives a negative value (E-). As a result, the people appearing in non-standard interpretations as the originators of the situation of the threat inherit the negative value (E-). The interpretation patterns which deceived the study subjects led to a situation in which people were assigned a negative value (E-) while the common house mosquito received a positive value (E+).[25] The fact of considering that something requires protection results in the automatic assignment of a positive value.

Matka przedszkola z Przedszkola nr 12 w Łęczycy: jestem zbulwersowana

The scenario introduced by the predicate *zbulwersować się* in a standard interpretation (while retaining the same principles as in the above-discussed examples) could assume one of two forms. One of these is associated with the actions undertaken by the employees of the kindergarten which appalled the mother of one of the children. That scenario could be transcribed as follows:

---

24 The results produced by the example illustrate the typical trait of ideological thinking, which features fairly uniform exclusively correct pattern of thinking, i.e. the only correct (considered as just) interpretation path. The interpretations provided for this example correspond to the assumptions of the ideology of ecologism (cf. A. Heywood, *Ideologie polityczne. Wprowadzenie*, trans. M. Habura, N. Orłowska, D. Stasiak, (ed. scientific) T. Żyro, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 2008, pp. 273–297). That is yet another argument in favour of the claim that a standard interpretation is subject to transformations, i.e. it is possible to manage the changes within its scope. The study of the mechanisms which enable the changes is an area which demands study.

25 Vide the notes on the awareness of the reference of the term "Culex pipiens" in the section "The subcategorisation of arguments in semantic standards, subsection c) The subcategorisation of arguments in the standard interpretation of the statement "Chrońmy gatunek culex pipiens".

ZROBIĆ [to do] (PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [kindergartener>employee], SOMETHING) & SKRZYWDZIĆ [to harm] (PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [a kindergarten pupil>employee], DZIECKO [a child]) → ZBULWERSOWAĆ SIĘ [become appalled] {DZIECKA>MATKA [child>mother], (AGAINST) PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [kindergarten>employee], (ABOUT) ZROBIĆ [to do] (PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [kindergarten>employee], SOMETHING) & SKRZYWDZIĆ [to harm] (PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [kindergarten>employee], DZIECKO [child])}

The other scenario expressing the standard interpretation considers the situation in which the employees of the kindergarten neglect their responsibilities and it can be transcribed in the following manner:

ZOBOWIĄZANYM > BYĆ [obliged > to be] (PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [kindergarten>employee], ZROBIĆ [to do] (PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [kindergarten>employee], COŚ [something])) → NIE ZROBIĆ [not to do] (PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [kindergarten>employee], SOMETHING) & MÓC[26] > UCIERPIEĆ [to happen to>be harmed] (DZIECKO [child]) → ZBULWERSOWAĆ SIĘ [become appalled] {DZIECKA>MATKA [child's>mother], (AGAINST) PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [kindergarten>employee], (ABOUT) NIE ZROBIĆ [not to do] (PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [kindergarten>employee], SOMETHING) & MÓC > UCIERPIEĆ [to happen to>become harmed] (DZIECKO [child])}

In both cases, the predicate "zbulwersować" existing at the text level necessarily evokes, as one of the earlier elements of the scenario in a standard interpretation, a semantic standard which is traditionally assigned a negative value. Those elements are: SKRZYWDZIĆ [to harm] (PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [kindergarten>employee], DZIECKO [child]) for the first scenario, and MÓC > UCIERPIEĆ [be able to > become harmed] (DZIECKO [child]) for the other.

At this point it is necessary to consider the survey results. I list the identified categories[27] and the examples of the study subjects' answers in Table 4.

---

26 It introduces the potential possibility of the emergence of a situation. It is an optional fragment. The semantic standard may also take the form: UCIERPIEĆ [become harmed] (DZIECKO [child]). It is worth noting that even the potential possibility of the emergence of the situation in which a child may experience harm is normatively associated with a negative value.

27 In the analysis of this example, I decided to break down the categories further. The first one (NIE DOPILNOWAĆ [to fail to care for] (PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [kindergarten>employee], DZIECI [children]) & MÓC > UCIERPIEĆ [to be able to > become harmed] (DZIECI [children])) is strongly bound with the other one (NIE DOPILNOWAĆ [to fail to care for] (PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [kindergarten>employee], DZIECI [children]) > ULEC [to become subject to] (DZIECKO [child], WYPADKOWI [an accident]) and, basically, could exist

Table 4. Standard interpretations for the statement "Matka przedszkola z Przedszkola nr 12 w Łęczycy: jestem zbulwersowana"

Semantic standard	Number of references	Example answers provided in the survey
NIE DOPILNOWAĆ [to fail to care for] (PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [kindergarten>employee], DZIECI [children]) & MÓC> UCIERPIEĆ [be able to> become harmed] (DZIECI [children])	20	"Panie prowadzące zajęcia przez większość czasu nie pilnują dzieci" [The teachers conducting the classes do not watch the children for the majority of the time], "Przedszkolanki z Przedszkola nr 12 w Łęczycy nie dopilnowały dzieci" [Kindergarten teachers from Kindergarten No. 12 in Łęczyca failed to care for the children], "Niedopilnowanie dzieci przez przedszkolankę" [Failure to care for children by a kindergarten teacher], "W przedszkolu nr 12 w Łęczycy doszło do zaniedbania przez wychowawców" [At kindergarten No. 12 in Łęczyca the carers were negligent], "W przedszkolu doszło do jakiegoś niedopatrzenia względem dziecka" [At a kindergarten there was some sort of negligence regarding a child]
NIE DOPILNOWAĆ [to fail to care for] (PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [kindergarten>employee], DZIECI [children]) & ULEC [to become subject to] (DZIECKO [a child], WYPADKOWI [an accident])	17	"zdarzył się wypadek, ucierpiało jej dziecko" [an accident occurred, her child got harmed], "W przedszkolu miało miejsce niebezpieczne zdarzenie" [A dangerous event occurred at the kindergarten], "Dziecko spadło ze schodów" [A child fell down the stairs], "że moje dziecko złamało sobie nogę" [that my child broke a leg], "Dziecko w przedszkolu zostało ugryzione przez kolegę" [A child in a kindergarten got bitten by another child]

as a single category. However, in many of the answers of the study subjects assigned to the first category there appeared only that potential of harm occurring, which is not present in the other one, which was why I separated those categories. Similarly, the third category (NIEODPOWIEDNIO > ZACHOWAĆ SIĘ [improperly > to behave] (NAUCZYCIELKA [a teacher]) & SKRZYWDZIĆ [to harm] (NAUCZYCIELKA [a teacher], DZIECKO [a child]) is so extensive that it fits the fourth category (KONTROWERSYJNIE >ZACHOWAĆ SIĘ [controversially >to behave] (PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [kindergarten>employee]) and the fifth (UDERZYĆ [to strike] (NAUCZYCIELKA [a teacher], DZIECKO [a child]). However, it would be difficult to decide whether the cognitive representation which a study subject tried to convey by writing: "nieodpowiednie zachowanie nauczycielki względem podopiecznych" [improper behaviour of a teacher towards a person under her care] included a situation of using physical force by a teacher, which was clearly indicated by other study subjects. Therefore, I presented the individual categories in this example in such a way to, first of all, not abuse the rights of the researcher, and, secondly, not to lose certain subtleties in the meaning which were featured in the survey answers.

Table 4. (continued)

Semantic standard	Number of references	Example answers provided in the survey
NIEODPOWIEDNIO > ZACHOWAĆ SIĘ [improperly > to behave] (NAUCZYCIELKA (a teacher]) & SKRZYWDZIĆ [to harm] (NAUCZYCIELKA [a teacher], DZIECKO [a child])	14	"nieodpowiednie zachowanie nauczycielki względem podopiecznych" [improper behaviour of a teacher towards those under her care], "Złe traktowanie dzieci przez osoby pracujące w przedszkolu" [Mistreatment of children by persons working at the kindergarten], "Zbulwersowana zachowaniem przedszkolanki, która źle potraktowała jej dziecko" [Appalled by the behaviour of a kindergarten teacher who mistreated a child], "matkę zbulwersowało zachowanie nauczycielki w stosunku do jej dziecka" [the mother was appalled by the behaviour of a kindergarten teacher towards her child], "Matce nie podoba się postępowanie przedszkola wobec jej dziecka" [the mother did not appreciate how a kindergarten handled her child]
KONTROWERSYJNIE >ZACHOWAĆ SIĘ [controversially >to behave] (PRZEDSZKOLA>PRACOWNIK [kindergarten>employee])	13	"Prawdopodobnie w przedszkolu doszło do jakiejś sytuacji kontrowersyjnej" [Presumably there was a controversial situation at the kindergarten], "Pani w przedszkolu poruszała kontrowersyjne tematy" [A kindergarten teacher discussed controversial topics], "Nauczycielka używa wulgaryzmów na zajęciach" [A kindergarten teacher used swear words in class], "Jeden z wychowawców/opiekunów grupy przedszkolnej spożywał w pracy alkohol. Sprawa wyszła na jaw" [One of the carers of a kindergarten group drank alcohol. This became public knowledge], "Wydarzyło się coś, co godzi w postawy, poglądy i/lub oczekiwania matki przedszkolaka" [Something happened that went against the attitudes, views and/or expectations of a mother of a kindergarten pupil]

Semantic standard	Number of references	Example answers provided in the survey
UDERZYĆ [to strike] (NAUCZYCIELKA [a kindergarten teacher], DZIECKO [a child])	11	"Przedszkolak został uderzony przez przedszkolankę" [A kindergarten pupil was struck by a teacher], "Przedszkolanki biły dzieci w przedszkolu w Łęczycy" [Kindergarten teacher hit children at a kindergarten in Łęczyca], "Matka jest zbulwersowana, bo zobaczyła siniaki na ciele swojego syna" [Mother was appalled as she saw the bruises on her son's body], "Przedszkolak z Łęczycy pobity przeze swoją przedszkolankę" [A kindergarten pupil from Łęczyca beaten by his teacher], "..., bo nauczycielka bije uczniów za złe zachowanie" [... because the kindergarten teacher hits children if they misbehave], "Dziecko tej matki ma siniaki na ręce w wyniku szarpania go przez przedszkolankę" [The mother's child has bruises on his arm as a result of being pulled by a kindergarten teacher]

Source: own study.

The answers provided by the study subjects included several non-standard interpretations. Among such I include the following: "Matka dowiedziała się, że w grupie jej dziecka w przedszkolu są niezaszczepione dzieci" [The mother learnt that in her child's group at the kindergarten there are children who have not been vaccinated]. Another example of that type of an interpretation: "…brakiem 1000+ na dziecko" [… that she did not receive 1000+ ? for the child]. Two people interpreted the statement contemplatively indicating that the words "jestem zbulwersowana" [I am appalled] were an expression of the subjective opinion of the sender: "Matka się zbulwersowała, bo jej dziecko zostało **(w jej opinii)** niedopilnowane" [The mother became appalled because her child was not cared for enough (in her opinion)], "W przedszkolu nr 12 w Łęczycy lub z jego winy zadziało się coś, co zbulwersowało matkę dziecka z tego przedszkola. **Albo po prostu jest zbulwersowana, matki tak mają**" [At kindergarten No. 12 in Łęczyca something happened, or because of something the kindergarten did, which appalled the mother of a child attending it. Or she's just appalled, mothers are sometimes like that]. In two other answers, and only two, the study subjects stressed that the situation which triggered the mother's critical remarks might not have been caused by the kindergarten: "W przedszkolu miało miejsce niebezpieczne zdarzenie. Chociaż «Matka» może być tylko opisem postaci, a **wydarzenie nie musi mieć związku z przedszkolem**" [At the kindergarten, a dangerous event occurred. Though the "Mother" might only

be a description of a character and the event did not necessarily have to do anything with the kindergarten], "bulwersująca sprawa między przedszkolem a jej dzieckiem, coś się stało/ **może być zbulwersowana sprawą niezwiązaną z jej dzieckiem**, po prostu została nazwana matką" [an appalling matter between a kindergarten and her child, something happened/ she may be appalled at an issue not related to her child, she was simple referred to as a mother]. The first thoughts of the study subjects progressed along the lines of a standard interpretation: the mother's attitude was caused by the irregularities in the operations of the kindergarten. Adopting a contemplative attitude enabled some to notice other interpretations. The final two examples, existing as exceptions to the rule, constituted particularly clear proof for the existence of a standard interpretation.

The analysis of the processes of the subcategorisation of arguments clearly indicates that, according to the study subjects, the originator of the situation which caused the mother to become appalled was a kindergarten teacher, the kindergarten's headmaster or another employee of the kindergarten (even though none of the persons appeared at the text level). What was symptomatic was that there was a very high agreement between the answers provided by the study subjects. In the standard interpretation, the mother's state of mind was caused by a situation which in standard conditions assumes a negative value. In their answers, the study subjects indicated that the reason for the condition were the instances of neglect of children by the kindergarten employees, their improper behaviour towards those under their care, controversial activities against the will of parents, as well as the fact of experiencing physical harm by children, as a result of an accident or intentional acts of aggression by kindergarten teachers. All those situations feature negative evaluations in standard conditions. An overview of the answers provided by the study subjects for this example illustrated the typical interpretative paths applied by the study subjects, and supports the hypothesis of the existence of a standard interpretation.

Summary and conclusions

In the article, I presented the results of a study intended to verify the assumption of communicational grammar concerning the existence of the phenomenon of a standard interpretation in the process of receiving communications. According to this assumption, despite the fact the reception of a communication is a subjective process, its course is to some extent pre-determined since, as Adwiejew and Habrajska assert, "a recipient, at certain stages of interpretation, progresses through specific standard references, common for most speakers of a language, while the later subjective extension of the interpretation will not contradict those standards."[28]

28 A. Awdiejew, G. Habrajska, *Komponowanie*..., pp. 9–10.

I designed a special tool to verify the hypothesis of the existence of a standard interpretation. 79 study subjects were provided with a list of communications and asked to indicate the causes which led to the emergence of those. The communications were highly general, which was intended to ensure freedom of interpretation. I standardised the answers I received as per the principles assumed in the methodology of communicational grammar. I assumed that a large diversity among the answers provided by the respondents would indicate that the assumption concerning standard interpretation was false. I treated agreement in terms of the indicated causes as supporting the prevailing model of a standard interpretation.

The results enabled me to formulate the following conclusions:

1. despite the ensured freedom in terms of the direction of interpretation, individual real recipients recreated the mental pathways presumed in standard interpretations (while retaining the principle of the subcategorisation of arguments as binding);
2. the principle of subcategorisation applied in communicational grammar applies not only to individual arguments in a semantic standard, but also to individual semantic standards in a time-space scenario;
3. in the process of interpretation, real recipients maintained the standard evaluations in the quoted predicate-argument systems.

Basically, one must accept that communicational grammar's assumption concerning of the existence of a standard interpretation was proven by the empirical data acquired in the study.

Bibliography

Awdiejew Aleksy, *Gramatyka interakcji werbalnej*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Krakow 2007.

Awdiejew Aleksy, Habrajska Grażyna, *Komponowanie sensu w procesie odbioru komunikatów*, Primum Verbum, Łódź 2010.

Awdiejew Aleksy, Habrajska Grażyna, *Wprowadzenie do gramatyki komunikacyjnej*, Vol. 1, Oficyna Wydawnicza Leksem, Łask 2004.

Awdiejew Aleksy, Habrajska Grażyna, *Wprowadzenie do gramatyki komunikacyjnej*, Vol. 2, Oficyna Wydawnicza Leksem, Łask 2006.

Heywood Andrew, *Ideologie polityczne. Wprowadzenie*, trans. M. Habura, N. Orłowska, D. Stasiak, (ed. scientific) T. Żyro, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 2008.

Anita Filipczak-Białkowska

Czy istnieje interpretacja standardowa? Empiryczna weryfikacja wybranych założeń gramatyki komunikacyjnej

Streszczenie

W artykule postawione zostało główne pytanie badawcze: „czy istnieje interpretacja standardowa?", która w metodologii gramatyki komunikacyjnej, do jakiej odwołuje się autorka, definiowana jest jako uogólniony schemat analizy komunikatu przez wirtualnego odbiorcę, polegającej na konstruowaniu podstawowych, współpracujących ze sobą, komponentów sensu. Empirycznej weryfikacji poddano założenie, że choć odbiór komunikatu jest procesem subiektywnym, to jego przebieg jest do pewnego stopnia zdeterminowany, gdyż odbiorca, na pewnych etapach interpretacji, przejdzie przez określone, standardowe odniesienia, wspólne dla większości mówiących w danych języku, a jego dalsze subiektywne rozwinięcie interpretacji nie będzie przeczyło tym standardom. Artykuł prezentuje wyniki cele, metody i wyniki badania ankietowego przeprowadzonego na okoliczność weryfikacji założenia o istnieniu interpretacji standardowej, jednego z głównych założeń gramatyki komunikacyjnej w opracowaniu A. Awdiejewa i G. Habrajskiej.

Słowa kluczowe: interpretacja standardowa, schemat poznawczy, gramatyka komunikacyjna, wartościowanie.

Does standard interpretation exist? Empirical verification of selected assumptions of communicational grammar

Summary

The article poses a major study question: "Does standard interpretation exist?" In the methodology of communicational grammar, to which the author refers, standard interpretation is defined as a generalised pattern of the analysis of a communication by a virtual recipient, which consists of constructing basic,

mutually cooperating elements of meaning. An empirical test was applied to the assumption that, despite the fact that the reception of a communication is a subjective process, its course is to some extent pre-determined, since a recipient, at certain stages of interpretation, progresses through specific standard references, common for most speakers of a language, while the later subjective extension of the interpretation will not contradict those standards. The article presents the results, the aims, methods, and the results of a survey study conducted to verify the assumption about the existence of a standard interpretation, one of the major assumptions of communicational grammar being developed by A. Awdiejew and G. Habrajska.

Keywords: standard interpretation, cognitive pattern, communicational grammar, valuation

Anita Filipczak-Białkowska – holds a Ph.D. in linguistics. She works at the Department of Communication Practices, Chair of Journalism and Social Communication, University of Lodz. Her doctoral dissertation was entitled *Manifestowanie orientacji ideologicznej w dyskursie politycznym*. Her academic focus is communication science, with particular consideration of linguistic and psychological perspectives. She specialises in the problems of exerting influence on people in various types of discourses.