

Dorota Chłopek

University of Bielsko-Biala
dchlopek@ubb.edu.pl
ORCID: 0000-0003-3636-8969

Intertextual ‘construal’ relationships in the dynamics of discourse – ‘Aspectuality’ in English Clauses vs. ‘Aspect’ in their Polish Counterparts

Linguistic meaning is largely a matter of *construal*, and imensions of construal reasonably described as matters of *prominence* are critical to both semantics and grammar¹.

Introduction

The objective of this article is to demonstrate the relationship between ‘aspectuality’², i.e. ‘situation types’³, or ‘Aktionsart’⁴, in English predicates, and the constructions used in their counterpart Polish translations, concentrating on their grammatical aspect. While the term ‘aspect’,

¹ Ronald W. Langacker, “Discourse in Cognitive Grammar,” *Cognitive Linguistics* 12, no. 2 (2001): 158.

² For the notion verbal ‘aspectuality’ see, e.g.: Zeno Vendler, “Verbs and Times,” *The Philosophical Review* 66, no. 2 (1957): 143–160.

³ Carlota S. Smith, *The parameter of aspect* (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1991, reprinted by Springer in 1997).

⁴ For the term *Aktionsart* see e.g. Manfred Krifka, “Thematic relations as links between nominal reference and temporal constitution,” in *Lexical matters*, eds. Ivan A. Sag and Anna Szabolcsi (Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information, 1992), 29–53.

together with ‘tense’ and ‘mood’, occurs in TAM⁵ (tense-aspect-mood), or TA⁶ (tense-aspect) constructions, which morphologically consist of main verbs and auxiliary verbs in English, aspectuality relates to the semantics of verbs and their complements, i.e. predicates, and even to whole clauses. Croft states that aspect is a dimension of “verbal semantics relevant to grammatical structure.”⁷ Furthermore, in Smith’s words, “the term «situation type» refers to classes of events and states.”⁸ Additionally, “the situation type of a sentence indirectly classifies the event or state talked about according to its temporal properties.”⁹ Fauconnier, however, argues that “sentences are not carriers of propositions.”¹⁰ In his view, “grammar provides fine-grained tense and aspect combinations that reflect motion through the space configuration during discourse,”¹¹ simultaneously manifesting the dynamics of discourse. The English examples cited in this article occur in the present tense and ‘imperfective aspects’¹², ‘unmarked/simple’, e.g. *sees*, and ‘progressive’, e.g. *is seeing*¹³. Moreover, the simple aspect and present tense refer to stative situation types and to those that are ‘derived habitual-stative’¹⁴, which describe events that are “unalterably fixed in advance”¹⁵, although the signaled events may happen in the future. But the progressive “is often described as taking an «internal perspective» on the event, as if one is watching it unfold rather than viewing it holistically as a unitary entity.”¹⁶ The examples are cited from *The Hobbit or There and Back Again*

⁵ ‘TAM’ (tense-aspect-mood), by Talmy Givón, *Syntax: An Introduction. Volume I* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2001).

⁶ ‘TA’ (tense-aspect), by William Croft, *Verbs: Aspect and Causal Structure (Oxford Linguistics)* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2012).

⁷ William Croft, *Verbs: Aspect and Causal Structure (Oxford Linguistics)* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2012), xii.

⁸ Smith, *The parameter*, xiv.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 3.

¹⁰ Gilles Fauconnier, *Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), xxiv.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, xli.

¹² Cf. T. Givón, *Syntax: An Introduction. Volume I*, p. 288.

¹³ Cf. Douglas Biber, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan, *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 1999), 452.

¹⁴ Smith, *The parameter*, 185.

¹⁵ Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (London; New York: Longman, 1985), 182.

¹⁶ Ronald W. Langacker, *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Volume II: Descriptive Application* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), 208, referred to as ‘FCG2’.

by Tolkien¹⁷ (version a) and they are compared to three renditions into Polish, by Skibniewska¹⁸ (version b), Braiter¹⁹ (version c), and Polkowski²⁰ (version d). The term *intertextual relationship* applies to the 'equivalence' in the 'construal'²¹ evoked by the English version and its Polish renditions; despite the lack of the distinction between the simple and the progressive English aspects in Polish, there is the 'general imperfective'²² aspect in Polish that enters into the equation with both. The question considers whether the Polish versions maintain the general imperfective, or use predicates with the perfective aspect or other lexical means besides the 'aspectual', which evoke other 'construals' of the situations depicted. The 'construal' in Langacker's Cognitive Grammar²³ corresponds to a situation type in Smith's²⁴ study, set in the paradigm of functional linguistics. While Comrie offers a functional definition of aspect, based on Holt²⁵, as "different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation,"²⁶ Langacker argues that "[g]rammatical structure is based on conventional imagery, which reflects our ability to construe a conceived situation in alternate ways."²⁷

The article consists of four main parts preceded by a reference to earlier studies on related issues and to the methodology that has been adopted. The first section focuses on the two notions of 'construction' and 'construal' from *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Volume I: Theoretical Prerequisites* (FCG1) by Langacker, whose theoretical framework²⁸, called Cognitive

¹⁷ J. R. R. Tolkien, *The Hobbit or There and Back Again* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1937/1978).

¹⁸ J. R. R. Tolkien, *Hobbit czyli tam i z powrotem*, trans. Maria Skibniewska (Warszawa: Iskry, 1997).

¹⁹ J. R. R. Tolkien, *Hobbit*, trans. Paulina Braiter (Warszawa: Amber, 2012).

²⁰ J. R. R. Tolkien, *Hobbit albo tam i z powrotem z objaśnieniami*, trans. Andrzej Polkowski (Warszawa: Bukowy Las, 2012).

²¹ Ronald W. Langacker, *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Volume I: Theoretical Prerequisites* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987), referred to as 'FCG1'.

²² Smith, *The parameter*, 130.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Ead.*

²⁵ Comrie relies on the approach to aspect adopted by Jeans Holt in "Études d'aspect," *Acta Jutlandica* 15, no. 2 (1943).

²⁶ Bernard Comrie, *Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976/1991), 3.

²⁷ Langacker, FCG1, 138.

²⁸ Langacker, FCG1 and FCG2; Ronald W. Langacker, *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); Ronald W. Langacker, *Investigations in Cognitive Grammar* (Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009) etc.

Grammar, relates grammatical structures to embodied cognition. The second section focuses on the aspectuality of English clauses. The third part contains examples in English and their Polish counterparts. The fourth part is a consolidation of the analysis conducted with attempts to present the intertextual relationships and contrasts, summarized in a conclusion. The article has a descriptive character and signals an area of further research.

Previous research on aspect and aspectuality in English and other languages

Situation types across languages were analyzed by Smith²⁹ who expanded the classic study of lexical aspects in English clauses by Vendler³⁰, adding semelfactive³¹ situations to the original classification, i.e. punctual but iterative, such as those expressed by *knock*, *tap*, *sneeze*, *cough* or *blink*, etc., which are also called ‘momentaneous’³² and ‘cyclic achievements’³³. Smith addressed the lexical aspect in a number of languages, including Polish. The emergence of tense and aspect in the Polish spoken by children had been approached by Weist et al.³⁴ earlier, in 1984. Moreover, Broman Olsen concentrated on semantics and the pragmatics of the features of the

²⁹ Smith, *The parameter*, 33. The temporal properties of the five situation types distinguished by Smith – states, activities, accomplishments, semelfactives, and achievements – and examples of linguistic expressions coding each type respectively are compiled in Table 1, later in this article, in the section titled “Situation types coded by English predicates in subject literature.”

³⁰ Vendler, *Verbs and Times*.

³¹ C. Smith, *The parameter*, p. 29, adapted the Latin term *semel* (once) for atelic and instantaneous events and named them ‘semelfactive’ situation types, which are quick, instantaneous, and occur in repeated instances, i.e. they are ‘iterative’. Smith, *The parameter*, p. 19, subsumed the terms *atelic* and *telic* under the temporal property of ‘telicity’, a special feature of ‘contouring’ the given situation. While telic events, such as the ‘achievement’ depicted by *reach the top*, have a natural end, *atelic* situations, such as the ‘activity’ described by *sleep*, are processes which do not involve a natural end.

³² Lauri Carlson, “Aspect and Quantification,” in *Tense and aspect (Syntax and Semantics)*. Volume 14, eds. Philip Tedeschi and Annie Zaenen, (New York; London: Academic Press, 1981), 31–64, 39. Reference in Croft, *Verbs*, 40.

³³ William Croft, “The structure of events and the structure of language,” in *The new psychology of language: cognitive and functional approaches to language structure*, ed. Michael Tomasello (Mahwah, New Jersey; London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, 1998), 67–92, 74. Reference in Croft, *Verbs*, 40. Smith, *The parameter*, 20, demonstrated in (2) that ‘achievements’, such as that expressed by “Suddenly Bill knew the truth”, c.f. *ibid*, (1b), 18, are telic situations, which do not last in time, hence they are not ‘durative’. A ‘cyclic achievement’ is another term relating to semelfactive situations, which last in time by being repeated; in other words, they are ‘iterative’.

³⁴ Richard M. Weist, Hanna Wysocka, Katarzyna Witkowska-Stadnik, Ewa Buczowska, and Emilia Konieczna, “The defective tense hypothesis: On the emergence of tense and aspect in child Polish,” *Journal of Child Language* 11, no. 2 (1984): 347–374.

lexical aspect, which entails clausal aspectuality, and she contrasted it with grammatical aspect from that perspective, not only in English, but also in languages such as “French, Koine Greek, Latin, Mandarin Chinese, Navajo, Polish, Russian, and Spanish.”³⁵ Cienki and Irishkanova edited a volume on *Aspectuality across Languages* in which the “Main lines of research” on “Aspect across traditions”³⁶ are presented. Additionally, the volume edited by Guentchéva entitled *Aspectuality and Temporality. Descriptive and Theoretical Issues* offers insight into aspectuality and “aspect and tense as manifested in many diverse and complex ways, in several Indo-European languages (such as Albanian, Bulgarian, Armenian, English, Norwegian, Hindi,) Hamito-Semitic languages (Berber, Zenaga Berber, Arabic varieties, Neo-Aramaic) as well as in languages more or less well studied.”³⁷ A collection of articles on aspect and tense in different languages, mainly inspired by the functional perspective of language, constitutes a compilation of views in relation to these two grammatical categories, for example, in the volume edited by Bache, Basbøll, and Lindberg³⁸ entitled *Tense, Aspect and Action: Empirical and Theoretical Contributions to Language Typology*, which was published in 1994. A related book, *The Study of Aspect, Tense and Action*, by Bache³⁹ draws on “generative linguistics, structuralist phonology, glossematics, functional grammar, cognitive semantics and prototype theory.”⁴⁰ Aspect and tense were also analyzed from the perspective of cognitive linguistics in three Indo-European languages, French, German, and Russian, in the volume edited by Cienki and Irishkanova⁴¹ entitled *Aspectuality across Languages*, whose first chapter relates to *Aspect through*

³⁵ Mari Broman Olsen, *A Semantic and Pragmatic Model of Lexical and Grammatical Aspect* (New York: Routledge, 1997), xiii.

³⁶ Olga K. Irishkanova, Aliyah Morgenstern, Cornelia Müller, and Nicole Richter, “Aspect across traditions: Main lines of research,” in *Aspectuality across Languages*, eds. Alan Cienki and Olga K. Irishkanova (Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2018), 27–49.

³⁷ Zlatka Guentchéva, ed., *Aspectuality and Temporality Descriptive and theoretical issues* (Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2016), 1.

³⁸ Carl Bache, Hans Basbøll, and Carl-Erik Lindberg, *Tense, aspect and action: empirical and theoretical contributions to language typology* (Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994).

³⁹ Carl Bache, *The Study of Aspect, Tense, and Action: Towards a Theory of the Semantics of Grammatical Categories* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997).

⁴⁰ C.f. Peter Lang on the book *The Study of Aspect* by Carl Bache, 348, accessed March 17, 2023, https://books.google.pl/books/about/The_Study_of_Aspect_Tense_and_Action.html?id=kEpiAAAAAAJ&redir_esc=y.

⁴¹ Alan Cienki and Olga K. Irishkanova, eds., *Aspectuality across Languages* (Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2018).

the lens of event construal with a sub-section by Cienki⁴² on construal in cognitive linguistics and cognitive grammar. Numerous works on related issues to those undertaken in the present article have already been published. Nonetheless, none of them, to our knowledge, discusses intertextual relationships and contrasts between aspectuality coded by predicates in English clauses and this aspect or its absence in Polish renditions, which trigger parallel construals to those evoked by the English original. Hence, this study aims to sensitize Polish students of English, who have only three tenses in Polish verbs (present, future, and past tense forms) to translate into, to the numerous ‘tenses’ in English educational grammar books as ‘TA constructions’. They entail lexical aspect, i.e. aspectuality, which subsumes either static or vivid construals of the situations depicted by whole clauses.

Methodology

The present article combines certain achievements of cognitive linguistics and the functional perspective on language, including educational books on the English grammar. As far as cognitive science is concerned, this article makes use of ‘symbolic assembly’ and ‘construal’ from FCG1. The former constitutes a ‘construction’ having unit status achieved through usage leading to ‘form-meaning pairings’⁴³ of increased degrees of complexity⁴⁴. The latter – ‘construal’ in FCG1 – is the ‘cognitive ability’ to visualize a particular situation triggered by a linguistic expression, such as *the glass with water in it*, with ‘content’ leading to *the glass is half-full* and, simultaneously, to *the glass is half-empty*. Hence, Langacker argues that these are “different construals on the same content and you can see these correspond to different linguistic expressions.”⁴⁵ Moreover, since “we have content and construals,”⁴⁶ Langacker claims that “meaning is a function of both the content and the construal.”⁴⁷ Consequently, the original version and the renditions provide ‘content’ which may trigger similar or

⁴² Alan Cienki, “Recent cognitive linguistics approaches,” in *Aspectuality across Languages*, eds. Alan Cienki and Olga K. Irishkanova (Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2018), 21–26.

⁴³ Joan L. Bybee and Clay Beckner, “Usage-Based Theory,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*, eds. Bernd Heine and Heiko Narrog (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 827–855.

⁴⁴ R. Langacker, FCG1, p. 82; Adele E. Goldberg, *A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

⁴⁵ Ronald W. Langacker, *Ten Lectures on the Basics of Cognitive Grammar* (Leiden: BRILL, 2017), 9.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ *Id.*, 6.

different construals of the same situation depicted in both versions. As far as functional linguistics is concerned, while the distinction of progressive vs. simple aspects within English imperfective aspects, among others, draws on Givón's⁴⁸ study, the situation types of English clauses relate to Smith's⁴⁹ and Croft's⁵⁰ classification, who respectively developed Vendler's⁵¹ original categories. Hence, selected achievements of cognitive linguistics and functional linguistics, including the findings obtained from educational grammar⁵², interpenetrate in this article.

Construal as a basic notion in the description of a grammatical construction

The notions of 'grammatical construction', i.e. a 'symbolic assembly', and 'construal' were both developed by Langacker in his FCG1. He introduced the notion of the 'symbolic unit' "for the representation of both lexical and grammatical structure,"⁵³ with no separate syntax and morphology⁵⁴ in grammar. He argued that a morpheme is the simplest type of symbolic unit, "in which a semantic and a phonological structure participate as unanalyzable wholes in a symbolic relationship."⁵⁵ Moreover, "Grammar involves the syntagmatic combination of morphemes and larger expressions to form progressively more elaborate symbolic structures. These structures are called **grammatical constructions**,"⁵⁶ which make language non-compositional.

Langacker regarded 'construal' as a basic notion in semantic structure to the description of linguistic constructions. He claimed that "[i]n cognitive semantics, meaning is identified with conceptualization"⁵⁷ and that "our ability to **construe** the same situation in alternate ways"⁵⁸ is

⁴⁸ Givón, *Syntax*.

⁴⁹ Smith, *The parameter*.

⁵⁰ Croft, *Verbs*.

⁵¹ Vendler, *Verbs and Times*.

⁵² Biber et al., *Longman Grammar*; R. Quirk et al., *A Comprehensive Grammar*.

⁵³ Langacker, FCG1, 58.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 82.

⁵⁵ *Id.*, 58.

⁵⁶ *Id.*, 82.

⁵⁷ Ronald W. Langacker, *Investigations in Cognitive Grammar* (Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009), 6.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

crucial to ‘linguistic semantics’⁵⁹. He distinguished three basic ‘dimensions’ pertaining to construal, namely: “the level of specificity at which a situation is characterized, the perspective adopted for «viewing» it, and the degree of prominence conferred on the elements within it.”⁶⁰ ‘Specificity’ has the converse notion of ‘schematicity’⁶¹. According to Langacker, specificity reflects “the level of precision and detail at which a situation is characterized.”⁶² Specificity seems to be fundamental to the differences in construals evoked by the progressive vs. simple distinction in English aspect, sometimes entailing specific aspectuality.

The notion of ‘construal’ has also been used in other studies within the framework of cognitive linguistics. Talmy⁶³ wrote about ‘grammatical construal’ in his landmark article⁶⁴ first published in 1988. Taylor and MacLaury⁶⁵ also focused on ‘construal’ by discussing the ‘cognitive construal of the world’ in language. Moreover, Pütz and Dirven⁶⁶ devoted a volume to ‘the cognitive construal of space’, in line with what Pütz⁶⁷ stated addressing selected elements of different natural languages. Finally, the

⁵⁹ C.f. Ronald W. Langacker, “Universals of construal,” *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*19 (1993):447–463.

⁶⁰ Langacker, *Investigations in Cognitive Grammar*, 6.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² *Id.*

⁶³ See: Leonard Talmy, *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Volume I: Concept Structuring Systems* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2000a); Leonard Talmy, *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Volume II: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2000b). *Volume I* and *Volume II* include ‘most’ of Talmy’s ‘material’ published before the year 2000 (c.f. Talmy, 2000a,b, p. 1). Talmy developed an approach to grammar called the ‘conceptual structuring system of language’ (c.f. *Idem*, p. 7), whose outline is presented in *Volume I*, wherein Talmy distinguished and examined in detail three ‘such schematic systems’: of ‘configurational structure’, of the ‘distribution of attention’, and of ‘force and causation’ (c.f. *Idem*).

⁶⁴ See: Leonard Talmy, “Grammatical construal. The relation of grammar to cognition,” in *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*, eds. Dirk Geeraerts, René Dirven, and John R. Taylor (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006), 69–108. Talmy applies the term ‘grammatical construal’ to the schematic or structural categories of syntax and morphology within the system of conceptual structures, together with the system of conceptual content, constituting Talmy’s semantic approach to grammar. See the original publication: Leonard Talmy, “The relation of grammar to cognition,” in *Topics in Cognitive Linguistics*, ed. Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1988), 165–205, reprinted in 2006.

⁶⁵ John R. Taylor and Robert E. MacLaury, *Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World* (Berlin, New York: Mouton De Gruyter, 1995).

⁶⁶ Martin Pütz and René Dirven, eds., *The Construal of Space in Language and Thought* (Berlin, New York: Mouton De Gruyter, Mouton De Gruyter, 1996).

⁶⁷ Martin Pütz, “Introduction: Language and the cognitive construal of space,” in *The Construal of Space in Language and Thought*, eds. Martin Pütz and René Dirven (Berlin, New York: Mouton De Gruyter, Mouton De Gruyter, 1996), XI–2.

doctoral dissertation by Möttönen provides the reader with an in-depth insight into 'construal in expression', arguing that "the notion of construal is [...] inherently intersubjective and context-sensitive."⁶⁸

The 'aspectuality' of English TA constructions is not only manifested at the level of the clause but also in sentences at the level of the context of usage-based discourse.

Situation types encoded by English predicates in subject literature

In a landmark study on the aspectual meaning of the sentence, Smith referred to the research on natural categories in the prototype theory by Rosch⁶⁹, arguing that "[t]he aspectual situation types are categories which lend themselves to the prototype approach. The temporal schema of a situation type gives the cluster of properties that are central to the category. Category members have some or all of these properties."⁷⁰ Croft demonstrated an extended classification of situation types in *Verbs: Aspect and Causal Structure*⁷¹, with different sub-types of situations, compilations of 'aspectual types/construals', and a revision of the 'Aristotle/Vendler classification', likewise discussed in Smith's study on aspectual meanings. She distinguished five situation types based on their "temporal properties of dynamism, durativity, and telicity,"⁷² comprising 'telic' vs. 'atelic' situations. "Telic events have natural final endpoints, whereas atelic events do not."⁷³ Table 1⁷⁴ presents a compilation of situation types, their temporal features, and basic example predicates.

⁶⁸ Tapani Möttönen, "Construal in expression: An intersubjective approach to cognitive grammar" (PhD diss., University of Helsinki, 2016), 4.

⁶⁹ Eleanor Rosch, "Natural Categories," *Cognitive Psychology* 4, no. 3 (1973): 328–350; Eleanor Rosch, Carolyn B. Mervis, Wayne D. Carey, David M. Johnson, and Penny Boyes-Braem, "Objects in Natural Categories," *Cognitive Psychology* 8, no. 3 (1976): 382–439; Eleanor Rosch, "Principles of Categorization," in *Categorization and Cognition*, eds. Eleanor Rosch and Barbara B. Lloyd (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1978), 28–49. Selected in-text citations in C. Smith, *The parameter*.

⁷⁰ Smith, *The parameter*, 12

⁷¹ Croft, *Verbs*, 44.

⁷² Smith, *The parameter*, 3.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ *Ead.*, 'Situation types' in (2). Table 1 includes transposed examples.

A situation type/construal	Temporal properties	Selected examples
<i>States</i>	static, durative	know the truth, love Anna, 'think that' ⁷⁵
<i>Activity</i>	dynamic, durative, atelic	sleep, run on the beach, 'think about' ⁷⁶
<i>Accomplishment</i>	dynamic, durative, telic, consisting of process and outcome	write an essay, walk to the beach, learn Italian
<i>Semelfactives</i>	dynamic, atelic, instantaneous	knock, tap, sneeze, cough, blink
<i>Achievement</i>	dynamic, telic, instantaneous	pass an exam, find an excuse, lose a car key

Table 1. Situation types distinguished by Smith (1997)

States, being stative rather than vivid, do not exhibit a change in their 'durative' process. Consequently, they are not 'generally' expressed by predicates in the progressive aspect⁷⁷ or 'viewpoint'⁷⁸, which is "also sometimes called the DURATIVE or CONTINUOUS aspect,"⁷⁹ as encoded by *was working* in the main clause of *John was working (when I entered)*⁸⁰. Being only telic, not durative⁸¹, *achievements* do not exhibit the progressive aspect. Thus, aspectuality influences the aspect of English predicates.

The next section concentrates on English imperfective predicates, coding stative and different dynamic situation types, and the aspect of their counterparts in Polish translation.

Aspectuality in English imperfective predicates vs. aspect in Polish renditions

While 'aspectuality' pertains to different situation types encoded within whole clauses or sentences, 'aspect' is associated with verbs. Comrie argued that "language-particular categories often combine aspect with

⁷⁵ Smith, *The parameter*, 33.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Cf. Langacker, *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*, 150 (19a-b).

⁷⁸ Cf. Ibid., 174.

⁷⁹ Quirk et.al., *A Comprehensive Grammar*, 197.

⁸⁰ Comrie, *Aspect*, 25, 32–40.

⁸¹ Smith, *The parameter*, 20.

some other category, most usually tense.”⁸² Givón⁸³, however, discussed ‘inherent aspect’, corresponding to ‘situation types’ in Smith’s⁸⁴ study, versus ‘grammatical aspect’, and claimed that the latter “is the adding of communicative perspective to states or events above and beyond their inherent aspectuality.”⁸⁵ Givón⁸⁶ presented ‘three aspectual contrasts’⁸⁷, but our interest here extends only as far as the ‘imperfective’ category within ‘perfectivity’ involving “perfective vs. imperfective”⁸⁸ aspects. According to Givón, “[t]he imperfective category is often sub-divided into two main divisions:

- *progressive-durative-continuous*: ongoing process;
- *habitual-repetitive*: repeated events.”⁸⁹

Consequently, focusing on ‘inherent aspectuality’, in Section I, five English stative predicates are presented, followed by three Polish renditions. Then, in Section II, different dynamic situation types are depicted by five English predicates in the progressive aspect. Subsequently, their three Polish translations are discussed in Section III. Finally, in Section IV, there are the same five English verbs which occur in Section II, but they are used in ‘habitual-repetitive’ predicates, which are accompanied by three Polish versions.

I. English Stative predicates and their Polish counterparts:

1a. “«I’m sure he [**knows**]⁹⁰ we came from Lake-town [...]»”. p. 195

2a. “«Drat the bird!» [...] «I [**believe**] he is listening [...]»”. p. 194

3a. “«[...] Burglar [**wants**] a good job [...] that’s how it is usually read. [...]»”. p. 25

⁸² Comrie, *Aspect*, 9.

⁸³ C. f. Givón, *Syntax: An Introduction. Volume I*, 288.

⁸⁴ Smith, *The parameter*.

⁸⁵ Givón, *Syntax: An Introduction. Volume I*, 288.

⁸⁶ Idem, 287.

⁸⁷ Id. The contrasts occur in the following categories: ‘perfectivity’, ‘sequentiality or relevance’, and ‘immediacy’.

⁸⁸ Id.

⁸⁹ Id., 289.

⁹⁰ The expressions highlighted in **bold** print occur in square brackets to indicate changes to the original version.

4a. “«[...] Beorn may be your friend, but he [**loves**] his animals as his children. [...]»”. p. 119

5a. “«Hmmm! It [**smells**] like elves!» thought Bilbo [...]”. p. 48

The situations designated by the predicates *knows* in 1a, *believe* in 2a, *wants* in 3a, *loves* in 4a, and *smells (like elves)* in 5a, are static, durative,⁹¹ and *unbounded*,⁹² they “do not change over time.”⁹³

The three Polish versions of 1a through 5a describe the situations depicted in the original version in the following way.

1b. “– Na pewno już [**wie**], że przybyliśmy tu z Miasta na Jeziorze [...]”. p. 237

1c. “– Jestem pewien, że [**wie**], iż przybyliśmy z Miasta na Jeziorze [...]”. p. 264

1d. “– Na pewno [**wie**], że przybyliśmy z Miasta na Jeziorze [...]”. p. 325

The renditions from 1b to 1d include *wie*, ‘knows’, a general imperfective predicate, which is an equivalent translation of *knows* in 1a.

2b. “– Do licha z tym ptakiem! [...]. – [**Zdaje się**], że on nas podsłuchuje [...]”. p. 236

2c. “– Niech лихо porwie to ptaszysko! [...]. – [**Mam wrażenie**], że nas podsłuchuje [...]”. p. 263

2d. “– Niech лихо porwie tego ptaka! [...]. – [**Założę się**] że podsłuchuje”. p. 324

I believe in 2a, lit. in Polish ‘wierzę’, ‘sądzę’, ‘uważam’⁹⁴, is rendered by general imperfective predicates in two Polish versions, in 2b by *Zdaje się*, ‘It seems’, and in 2c by *Mam wrażenie*, ‘I have a feeling’, but 2d includes a non-equivalent perfective predicate, *Założę się*, ‘I bet’.

⁹¹ See: Table 1.

⁹² Croft, *Verbs*, 35.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 34.

⁹⁴ *Wielki multimedialny słownik angielsko-polski polsko-angielski PWN-Oxford*, ISBN: 978-83-60147-95-5, further referred to as: *PWN-Oxford dictionary*.

3b. "[...] włamywacz [**szuka**] odpowiedniego zajęcia [...]. Tak się ten znak odczytuje. [...]". p. 24

3c. "[...] «Złodziej [**szuka**] dobrego zajęcia [...]. [...]". p. 31

3d. "[...] «Włamywacz [**poszukuje**] zajęcia [...]. [...]". p. 67, p. 69

3b through 3d contain general imperfective predicates, which evoke similar construals to that triggered by *wants* in 3a: *szuka*, 'looks for' or 'is looking for', in 3b and 3c, and *poszukuje*, 'seeks' or 'is seeking', in 3d.

4b. "[...] Beorn jest wam życzliwy, ale swoje zwierzęta [**kocha**] jak rodzone dzieci. [...]". p. 143

4c. "[...] Beorn zaprzyjaźnił się z wami, ale swoje zwierzęta [**kocha**] jak własne dzieci. [...]". p. 163

4d. "[...] Beorn może być waszym przyjacielem, a swoje zwierzęta tak [**kocha**], jakby były jego dziećmi. [...]". p. 218

The predicate *loves* in 4a is rendered by *kocha*, 'loves', a general imperfective predicate occurring in 4b through 4d.

5b. «Hm! [**Pachnie**] mi tu elfami» – pomyślał Bilbo [...]". p. 54

5c. "Hm! [**Pachnie**] mi tu elfami, pomyślał Bilbo [...]". p. 64

5d. «Mmmm! [**Pachnie**] mi tu elfami», pomyślał Bilbo [...]". p. 113

Similarly, *it smells*, in 5a, is expressed in 5b through 5d by the general imperfective predicate *pachnie*, 'it smells'.

Therefore, it can be noticed that, apart from 2d, which conveys *I believe* in 2a by means of a perfective predicate, the other stative verbs in the English versions above are translated into Polish through general imperfective predicates, which constitute the intertextual relationships between the English original and the three Polish renditions.

While Section I contains five English predicates designating only stative situation types, the five predicates in the progressive aspect in Section II evoke the following dynamic 'construals': of an 'activity' in 6a, of a 'transitory state' in 7a, of a 'non-incremental accomplishment' in 8a

and in 9a respectively, and an ‘indirectly presented activity’ in 10a. Section II includes a discussion of these situations encoded by particular predicates.

II. Events described by English predicates in the progressive aspect

The predicates in 6a through 10a contain the following verbs in the progressive aspect: *happen*, *sit* and *think*, *come*, *die*, and *begin*, in different situation types. They depict events unfolding in the time of speaking. According to Smith, “the progressive requires event verb constellations.”⁹⁵

6a. “«Look!» said one. «The lights again! [...] Something [**is happening**] up there»”. p. 209

The predicate *is happening*, in 6a, depicts an activity, with no beginning and no end.

7a. “«You said sitting on the doorstep and thinking would be my job [...] so I [**am sitting and thinking**]»”. p. 179

The coordinated predicate *am sitting* and *thinking* (in the meaning ‘about something’), in 7a, encodes the aspectual construal of two ‘transitory states’, as Croft classifies “inactive actions in the Progressive,”⁹⁶ and, after Dahl⁹⁷, prescribes them to the ‘more imperfective’⁹⁸ category. Smith associates *is sitting* with “a static, resultative interpretation.”⁹⁹ Hence, the posture verb *sit* undergoes flexible categorization. What is more, the private predicate, which Smith relates to ‘think about’, “is dynamic, an Activity.”¹⁰⁰

8a. “«The Eagles! The Eagles!» he shouted. «The Eagles [**are coming**]!»” p. 241

The verb *come* is classified by Croft¹⁰¹ as an achievement. In 8a, however, it occurs as *are coming* in the progressive aspect, expressing a ‘runup

⁹⁵ Smith, *The parameter*, 11.

⁹⁶ Croft, *Verbs*, 154.

⁹⁷ Östen Dahl, *Tense and Aspect Systems* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1985).

⁹⁸ Croft, *Verbs*, 144.

⁹⁹ Smith, *The parameter*, 33.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. The terms which begin with uppercase fonts in the original text are maintained capitalized in the verses quoted in this article.

¹⁰¹ Croft, *Verbs*, 144, Table 4.3.

process', in the situation type of a 'non-incremental accomplishment'¹⁰², also observed in 9a, which is a verse from a song.

9a. "The daylight [**is dying**]!" p. 49

Croft calls the construal type evoked by *is dying* in "*Help! She's dying!*"¹⁰³ a 'non-incremental accomplishment.' He claims that "the Imperfective profiles the undirected activity phase of a non accomplishment: «the imperfective, in itself not indicating any real performance, can express the tendency towards, and gradual approach to, the critical point at which the action takes place»."¹⁰⁴ Croft argues that "nonincremental accomplishments are bounded [...], since their profiled inception and completion transitions include the rest state and result state."¹⁰⁵ Non-incremental accomplishment is a 'runup process' which can be described by "sentences with achievement predicates."¹⁰⁶

10a. "«[...] What is our burglar doing for us? [...] I [**am beginning**] to think he might go through the Front Gate and spy things out a bit!»". p. 179

The predicate *begin* in 10a, belongs to 'inceptive verbs' and 'inceptive sentences', according to Smith, which "may in effect present an Activity indirectly."¹⁰⁷ Moreover, Langacker argues that "[a]spectual predicates like *begin*, *keep*, and *finish* focus strongly on occurrences, being solely concerned with their manifestation through time."¹⁰⁸

Discourse dynamics and 'specific uses' of English predicates may allow for flexible categorization. For example, *I am thinking* in 7a, contains the main verb *think* in the meaning 'think about', and describes an activity, while 'think that' is a stative situation¹⁰⁹. Moreover, *The daylight is dying*, in 9a, encodes a 'non-incremental accomplishment' through *is dying*, like *are*

¹⁰² Ibid., 67.

¹⁰³ Id., 153.

¹⁰⁴ Croft, *Verbs*, 118. Croft related to James Forsyth, *A grammar of aspect: usage and meaning in the Russian verb* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 49.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 68.

¹⁰⁶ Id., 67.

¹⁰⁷ Smith, *The parameter*, 25.

¹⁰⁸ Langacker, *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*, 441.

¹⁰⁹ Smith, *The parameter*, 33.

coming, in 8a, since both evoke a ‘runup process’. Smith admits that “[t]he lack of correspondence between structure and situation type is also due to the pervasive possibility of situation type shifts.”¹¹⁰

III. The three Polish versions of the English predicates in 6a through 10a:

6a’. “[...] Something [**is happening**] up there»”. p. 209

6b. “[...] Coś tam [**się dzieje**]”. p. 255

6d. “[...] Coś tam [**się dzieje**]”. p. 344

While 6c omits the clause in 6a’, 6b and 6d contain the general imperfective reflexive verb *się dzieje*, ‘is happening’ or ‘happens’.

7a’. “«[...] so I [**am sitting and thinking**]»”. p. 179

7b. “[...] no, więc [**siedzę i myślę**]”. p. 215

7c. “Toteż [**siedzę i myślę**]”. p. 241

7d. “Więc [**siedzę i myślę**]”. p. 301

The coordinated predicate *am sitting and thinking* in 7a’ is rendered in 7b through 7d by *siedzę i myślę*, ‘[I] am sitting and thinking’, a general imperfective coordinated predicate.

8a’. “«The Eagles [**are coming**]!»” p. 241

8b. “– Orły [**lecą**]!” p. 295

8c. “– Orły [**nadlatują**]!” p. 327

8d. “– Orły [**lecą**]!” p. 389

8b through 8d include a general imperfective predicate, where 8b and 8d contain *lecą*, ‘[they] are flying’¹¹¹, but 8c uses *nadlatują*, ‘[they] are coming flying’¹¹².

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 54.

¹¹¹ The entry LECIEĆ, FLY, definition (def.) 1 in PWN-Oxford dictionary.

¹¹² The entry NAD|LECIEĆ *pf*–NAD|LATYWAĆ *impf*, def. 1, *ibid.*

9a'. "The daylight [**is dying**]!" p. 49

9b. "Już światło dnia [**gaśnie**]" p. 55

9c. "[...] i słońce już [**gaśnie**]" p. 65

9d. "Dzień już przed zmrokiem [**ucieka**]" p. 114

The three Polish renditions make use of general imperfective verbs: *gaśnie*, 'is dying', in 9b and 9c, and *ucieka*, 'is escaping', in 9d, in the poetic language of the song.

10a'. "«[...] I [**am beginning**] to think he might go through the Front Gate [...]»!" p. 179

10b. "[...] mógłby chyba pójść przez Główną Bramę [...]" p. 216

10c. "[...] [**uwązam**], że mógłby wejść przez Frontową Bramę [...]" p. 242

10d. "[...] to może by tak wśliznął się do środka przez Bramę Główną [...]?" p. 301

While 10b and 10d omit the rendition of *I am beginning to think* in 10a', 10c includes the general imperfective verb *uwązam*, '[I] think', so it also omits *I am beginning*.

Apart from the general imperfective verbs that dominate the Polish renditions of the examples in 6a through 9a, omission occurs in 6c and in 10b through 10d, with 9d containing a semantically different predicate.

IV. Finite base and -s forms of verbs in English predicates and their Polish counterparts

The progressive of different situation types in 6a through 10a is substituted in 11a through 15a, by predicates in the simple aspect¹¹³, likewise in the present tense.

Smith argues that "Present sentences are of three types: Statives, which denote States that obtain at the Present time; progressives, which denote ongoing events; perfective non-statives, which denote derived habitual

¹¹³ Talmy Givón, *English Grammar: A Function-Based Introduction. Volume II* (Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 1993), 73.

statives.”¹¹⁴ Sentences such as “Mary plays tennis”¹¹⁵ and “Sam feeds the cat”¹¹⁶ “have event verb constellations and habitual interpretations.”¹¹⁷

11a. “«He may have a good head for business – especially his own business,» some murmured, «but he is no good [**when anything serious happens**]!»” p. 213

The predicate *is no good* relates its adverbial *when anything serious happens* to a situation which is “unalterably fixed in advance,”¹¹⁸ so it may be of the ‘derived habitual stative’ type.

11b. “– On może ma dobrą głowę do interesów, szczególnie do własnych – szemrali – ale jest do niczego [**w chwilach niebezpieczeństwa**]”. p. 260

11c. “– Może i ma dobrą głowę do interesów, zwłaszcza swoich własnych – szemrali – na nic się jednak nie przydaje, [**gdy dzieje się coś poważnego**]”. p. 288

11d. “– Może i ma głowę do interesów, zwłaszcza własnych, ale nic po nim [**w chwilach prawdziwego zagrożenia**]!” p. 352

The general imperfective verb *dzieje się*, ‘is happening’, ‘happens’, is used in 11c. In 11b and 11d the prepositional phrase relates to the idea of circumlocution, meaning lit. ‘in moments of danger/threat’.

12a. “«[...] he is quite ready to sit on a heap of gold and starve, [**as long as you sit here**]».” p. 229

In 12a the posture verb *sit* occurs in a dependent clause with the conjunction phrase *as long as*, which focuses on future time. Being “fixed in advance”¹¹⁹, *sit here* maybe a ‘derived habitual stative’ situation type.

12b. “[...] gotów jest siedzieć na swojej górze złota, [**póki wy tu pozostaniecie**]”. p. 280

¹¹⁴ Smith, *The parameter*, 185.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, (40b).

¹¹⁶ *Ead.*, (40b’).

¹¹⁷ *Ead.*

¹¹⁸ Quirk et al., *A Comprehensive Grammar* 182.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*

12c. “[...] gotów jest tkwić na kupie złota, póki nie zemrze z głodu, [**a nie wpuści was do środka**]”. p. 310

12d. “[...] gotów jest siedzieć na kupie złota i umrzeć na niej z głodu, [**dopóki będziecie go oblegać**]”. p. 374

The Polish versions of 12a contain ‘circumlocution’ with different verbs in the future tense. While 12d includes the imperfective verb *oblegać*, ‘to besiege’, in *dopóki będziecie go oblegać*, ‘until you besiege him’, 12b and 12c contain perfective verbs. In 12b, *póki wy tu pozostaniecie*, ‘while you stay here’, makes use of the verb *pozostać*, ‘stay’ or ‘remain’. 12c contains the verb *wpuścić*, ‘let in/into’, in *a nie wpuści was do środka*, ‘and [he] won’t let you in’.

13a. “«And winter [**comes**] after autumn,» said Bifur”. p. 179

In 13a, the ‘time-position adverbial’¹²⁰ *after autumn*, following *come*, triggers a construal of a situation that is “unalterably fixed in advance, and is as certain as it would be,”¹²¹ which may be associated with a ‘derived habitual stative’ situation type.

13b. “– A po jesieni [**nadejdzie**] zima – powiedział Bifur”. p. 215

13c. “– Po niej [**nadejdzie**] zima – dodał Bofur”. p. 242

13d. “– A po jesieni [**nadejdzie**] zima – mruknął Bifur”. (p. 301)

13b through 13d include *nadejdzie*, lit. ‘will come’, a perfective prefixed verb inflected in the future tense.

14a. “[...] they make very well, or get other people to make to their design, prisoners and slaves that have to work [**till they die**] [...]”. p. 60

The semi-auxiliary verb ‘HAVE to’ prior to the adverbial *till they die* in 14a, signals that the event expressed by the predicate *die* is “unalterably fixed in time.”¹²² Thus, although *till* indicates a future situation with its

¹²⁰ Id.

¹²¹ Id.

¹²² Id.

meaning ‘before fulfillment of condition’¹²³, *die* may evoke a ‘derived habitual stative’ construal.

14b. “[...] póki nieszczęśnicy nie [wymrą] [...]”. p. 68

14c. “[...] aż [umrą] [...]”. p. 80

14d. “[...] dopóki nie [umrą] [...]”. p. 132

The three Polish versions of 14 contain perfective verbs inflected in the future tense, *wymrą*, lit. ‘[they] will die out’, in 14b, and *umrą*, lit. ‘[they] will die’, in 14c and 14d.

15a. “«Tomorrow [begins] the last week of autumn,» said Thorin one day”. p. 179

The predicate *begins*, in 15a, describes a future time event, introduced by *tomorrow*, but “unalterably fixed in time,”¹²⁴ on the basis of the calendar. Hence, it may also be labeled a ‘derived habitual situation’.

15b. “– Jutro [zaczyna się] ostatni tydzień jesieni [...]”. p. 215

15c. “– Jutro [zaczyna się] ostatni tydzień jesieni [...]”. p. 242

15d. “– Jutro [zaczyna się] ostatni tydzień jesieni [...]”. p. 301

The three Polish renditions in 15 use the same imperfective reflexive verb in the present tense *zaczyna się*, lit. ‘[it] starts’ or ‘[it] begins’.

The English predicates in 11a through 15a, including non-stative verbs in the simple aspect, contain time position adverbials locating the situations in future time, but they are “unalterably fixed in time.”¹²⁵ Therefore, 11a through 15a can be labeled ‘derived habitual situations’. The Polish equivalents contain different lexical constructions, juxtaposed in the next part in Table 4 and in the Conclusion.

¹²³ PWN-Oxford dictionary.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

Intertextual relationships and contrasts between the construal types of the English originals and the aspects in their Polish renditions

Smith related to the study on Dutch and English by Verkuyl¹²⁶, who “argued that the situation type of a sentence is determined not by the verb alone but by the verb constellation (and associated adverbials [...]).”¹²⁷ These influence the construal type of the English predicates. The question is how the Polish renditions comply with the original construal. Tables 2 through 4 contain a juxtaposition of the situation types encoded by the English predicates occurring in sections I, II, and IV above and the results obtained in the Polish renditions presented in sections I, III, and IV. The English predicates from 1a to 15a are given the forms in which they are used in the examples cited in the sections above, I, II, and IV. The specific forms of the given predicates are maintained in the three tables below in order to highlight their correspondence to the context of occurrence in discourse compared to the three Polish equivalents. While it is assumed here that the Polish general imperfective poses a feasible intertextual relationship to the English simple and progressive aspects, the perfective aspect and circumlocution used in Polish, or even omission, constitute contrasts between the Polish and English versions which are in the two imperfective aspects.

English stative predicates in I	Aspects in the Polish versions
1a. <i>knows</i>	general imperfective (3) ¹²⁸
2a. <i>believe</i>	general imperfective (2); perfective (1)
3a. <i>wants</i>	general imperfective (3)
4a. <i>loves</i>	general imperfective (3)
5a. <i>smells (like)</i>	general imperfective (3)

Table 2. The relationship between English stative predicates and their Polish counterparts

¹²⁶ Henk J. Verkuyl, *On the Compositional Nature of the Aspects* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Co., 1972).

¹²⁷ Smith, *The parameter*, 4.

¹²⁸ The number in brackets corresponds to how many Polish equivalent versions contain the particular aspect or other non-equivalent means of translation.

The progressive in English activity (A) and 'non-incremental accomplishment' (NC) predicates in III	Aspects in the Polish renditions
6a. <i>is happening</i> (A)	general imperfective (2); omission (1)
7a. <i>am sitting and thinking</i> (A)	general imperfective (3)
8a. <i>are coming</i> (NC)	general imperfective (3)
9a. <i>is dying</i> (NC)	general imperfective (3)
10a. <i>am beginning</i> (A)	general imperfective (1); omission (2)

Table 3. The relationship between English predicates in the progressive aspect encoding different construal types and their Polish counterparts

English 'habitual-stative' predicates in IV	Aspects in the Polish versions
11a. <i>happens</i>	general imperfective (1); circumlocution (2)
12a. <i>sit</i>	circumlocution (3)
13a. <i>comes</i>	perfective (3)
14a. <i>die</i>	perfective (3)
15a. <i>begins</i>	general imperfective (3)

Table 4. The relationship between English derived habitual-stative predicates and the Polish version

Although Tables 2 through 4 present only fifteen examples, they signal specific intertextual relationships and contrasts that are of interest here. The English stative predicates in Table 2, and the predicates in the progressive aspect describing dynamic situations in Table 3, have, in most cases, intertextually related predicates to their Polish counterpart, i.e. in the general imperfective aspect. Nonetheless, the English predicates encoding 'derived habitual-stative' situations, compiled in Table 4, are expressed by contrastive lexical means in Polish. Moreover, the 'derived habitual-stative' situations described by the English predicates in 12a through 15a relate to future time events, with only the predicate *happens* used in 11a depicting a present time situation. Consequently, two Polish equivalents of 11a and the three of 12a contain circumlocution, the three renditions of 15a use the same imperfective predicate, and the Polish translations of 13a and 14a make use of predicates relating to future time.

Conclusion

Polish grammar does not exhibit the distinction between events in the progressive aspect and static situations, i.e. generic stative¹²⁹ vs. habitual or derived habitual-stative events. It seems that the former take the general imperfective aspect in the Polish rendition. The simple aspect that relates derived habitual-stative situations to future time appears to take other lexical means in Polish, classified as circumlocution, or predicates positioning the situations depicted in future time. Smith argues that “[t]he habitual interpretation depends both on information in the sentence, and on world knowledge.”¹³⁰ Hence, the examples cited in 11 through 15 need to be analyzed with a view to the whole situational context, as well as for those in 1 through 10. Table 4 shows the problems posed for translators with the English habitual-stative predicates, from 11 to 15, that have event constellations and which are expressed in Polish by means of predicates encoding both the perfective aspect and circumlocution, apart from in the case of the general imperfective aspect. Basic knowledge on the situation types of English predicates, especially in the simple grammatical aspect, could be useful to Polish learners of English who delve into the system of the English ‘tenses’, whose construal is ‘context-sensitive’¹³¹ since they constitute TA constructions encoding lexical aspect. It appears that translation from English into Polish, which relies on intertextual relationships, also contains contrasts.

Despite the contrasts which occur in the renditions, there is always equivalence based on intertextual relationships, since, in our view, it is not only what you say, but how you say it.

¹²⁹ Smith, *The parameter*, 18.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 35.

¹³¹ Möttönen, “Construal in expression,” 4.

Dorota Chłopek

Abstract

The following is a brief comparative / contrasting discourse of “situation types” in English clauses and their Polish renditions in “The Hobbit or There and Back Again” by J. R. R. Tolkien. The article highlights certain types of situations in English predicates which are intertextually related to their Polish counterparts expressed through contrastive lexical means. The description seeks to sensitize Polish users of English to the impact of the aspectuality of English clauses on the construal of the situations presented in the dynamics of discourse, which is ‘limited’ to the grammatical means available within the Polish language.

Keywords: ‘aspectuality’, intertextual relations, contrasts, situation types, construal, construction

Słowa kluczowe: ‘aspektualność’, relacje intertekstualne, kontrasty, typy sytuacji, konstruowanie, konstrukcja