

# Aspectuality of Language in an Epistemological Perspective

*The focus of this paper concentrates on the aspectual nature of language, taken into account as the subject matter of the principal object of scientific study and as a relational property of the subject matter of adjacent objects examined from either disciplinary or interdisciplinary perspectives. Its objective is to stipulate the interdisciplinary awareness of scientists in the division of their academic labor in accordance with the existence modes of language and the ways how it can be autonomized as a means of individual signification and social communication from its heteronomous dependencies. This stipulation leads to a directive statement that practitioners of linguistic disciplines should be conscious when they observe the extrasystemic properties of languages and when they pay attention solely to systemic-structural properties of a particular language. By the reference to an autonomy–heteronomy opposition, the author of this paper emphasizes that language as a whole occurring both in perceptual and inferential reality is indivisible. However, the same cannot be said about the scope of the disciplines which depend on the choice of investigative viewpoints. Introduced in the title as a name of the investigative perspective, the notion of epistemology, dealing with a theory of knowledge and knowledge acquirement, pertains to two kinds of knowledge about the scientific object, to the knowledge how the things (and states of affair) exist and how they can be approached in scientific studies. The material basis for the article constitutes research achievements summarized in the author’s English monographs *Epistemological Perspectives on Linguistic Semiotics* (Author 2003), *Lectures on the Epistemology of Semiotics* (Author 2014) and *From Grammar to Discourse: Towards a Solipsistic Paradigm of Semiotics* (Author 2016).<sup>1</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup> Since this article popularizes the idea of aspectuality of language, it is obvious that some of its formulations (albeit in revised versions) might have been fragmentarily published in earlier articles, or subsequent book chapters,, pertaining to semiotic aspects of language and the classification of linguistic disciplines according to academic principles, and, especially, “Conceptual levels in the understanding of language”.

1 **Keywords:** Aspect vs. Constituent, Autonomy vs. Heteronomy, Ecology vs. System,  
 2 Isolationism vs. Integrationism, Subject Matter vs. Object

3

4

## 5 **The Notions of Aspects and Constituents as Abstractable Features**

6

7 In order to exhibit the aspectual character of language, it is necessary to  
 8 introduce a demarcation between aspects and constituents of abstractable  
 9 features of perceived reality. A representative usage of the term *abstracting*  
 10 may be found in *The Language and Logic of Philosophy* written by Hubert  
 11 Griggs Alexander, who has quoted (1972 /1967/: 107), *inter alia*, the definition  
 12 of Alfred North Whitehead from the book *Science and the Modern World*:  
 13 “Each mode of abstracting is directing attention to something which is in  
 14 nature; and thereby is isolating it for the purpose of contemplation” (1925:  
 15 173). To be more exact, what Alexander has emphasized is that “abstracting is  
 16 not really removing anything at all”, but rather “focusing” the observers’  
 17 “attention on some part or aspect of what” they “experience while neglecting to  
 18 pay attention to other parts or aspects” (1972: 107). With reference to one of  
 19 the particular meanings of the Latin term *abstrahere* ‘to draw away’,  
 20 abstracting a certain feature, namely a constituent or an aspect of a prominent  
 21 or conspicuous part or characteristic of an object “implies the drawing away to  
 22 a conceptual plane quite remote from the concrete level of experience... It is a  
 23 process of (1) *focusing attention upon some feature within experience*; (2)  
 24 *holding this feature as the object of our immediate thought*, and (3) *possibly*  
 25 *remembering it later*” (Alexander 1972: 108, emphasis is ours: ZW).

1        In dependence whether something can be removed not only mentally but  
2        also physically from the cognized reality, there are two kinds of abstractions  
3        which appear to be useful for methodological purposes, namely constituents  
4        and aspects. Accordingly, constituents are those abstractions of features, which  
5        can also be physically removed as coexistent parts, or as separate elements  
6        totally isolated from the objects as wholes, and aspects are those abstractions of  
7        features which cannot be removed physically from the cognized reality, as far  
8        as they constitute only its inherent or relational properties. In consequence, one  
9        has to distinguish the following varieties of abstract features: firstly,  
10       constituents as abstractions of parts (segments, fragments, elements), and,  
11       secondly, aspects as abstractions of characteristic qualities of observable  
12       objects, which are divided into inherent properties (internal. or intrinsic,  
13       attributes), and relational properties (external, or extrinsic, attributes), such as,  
14       for example quantitative; functional, serviceable, co-relational. comparative,  
15       equality, relativity, similarity, difference, symmetrical; exclusion, inclusion,  
16       intersection, tolerance, co-existence, opposition, alternation, collocation,  
17       spatial, temporal, isotopic, allotopic, systematic, classificatory, typological,  
18       hierarchical, super- vs. sub-ordination, conditional, determinative,  
19       implicational, causative, and the like).

20

21

## 1 Aspects of Language as Oppositions between Its Inherent and Relational 2 Properties

3

4 The discussion about the aspectual nature of language usually starts, as in  
5 the positions of Eric Lenneberg, *Biological Foundations of Language* (1967:  
6 2), and Dwight Bolinger, *Aspects of Language* (1975 /1968/, 1–8 and 14), with  
7 the emphasis on speech as a species-specific property of humans. Although  
8 Lenneberg's and Bolinger's assertions come from incommensurable theories,  
9 some combinations of dichotomous categories are still valid both for linguistics  
10 and its neighboring disciplines, as expounded by the author of this paper, in his  
11 sign- and meaning-related monographs, *Epistemological Perspectives on*  
12 *Linguistic Semiotics* (Author 2003: 62–74), *From Grammar to Discourse:*  
13 *Towards a Solipsistic Paradigm of Semiotics* (Author 2016: 98–124), ordered  
14 under the label of semiotic-linguistic facts among the aspects of speech, they  
15 will be subsequently applied to the evaluation of language and language-like  
16 objects from the viewpoints of: (1) physicality and logicity, (2) autonomy and  
17 heteronomy, (3) process and product, (4) form and substance, (5) expression  
18 and content, (6) collectivity and individuality, (7) competence and  
19 performance,) (8) synchrony and diachrony, (8) syntagmaticity and  
20 paradigmaticity (10) deep structure and surface structure.

21 *On The Separation of the Physical Domain, Relaying on Empirically Tested*  
22 *Experimental Methods, from the Logical Domain, Basing on Rationally*  
23 *Concluded Associations between Two Interrelated Planes*

24

1       To answer the question regarding the accessibility versus non-accessibility  
2 of language to experimental observations, it is necessary to follow the  
3 terminological distinctions between the so-called physical domain of hard-  
4 sciences and logical domain of soft-sciences, i.e., between the domain of really  
5 existing facts and the domain of cognitively experienced facts, as one may  
6 deduce from the work of Victor Huse Yngve *From Grammar to Science. New*  
7 *Foundations for General Linguistics* (1996: 209–210). In applying Yngve's  
8 way of reasoning, one has to emphasize that language, in its totality, does not  
9 belong to the physical domain, as one cannot describe its forms of  
10 manifestation in terms of objects which are sensorially perceivable. There are  
11 also some linguistic facts that can be only assumed on the basis of inferences.  
12 This inferential knowledge constitutes all mental activities which pertain to the  
13 intersubjective understanding of meanings, tasks, intentions or beliefs cannot  
14 be directly observable either by communication participants or researchers.  
15 Having in view the opposition between assumable and observable realities, one  
16 has to highlight that the physical domain comprises objects of observable  
17 reality, independently whether here and now, being remote in time and space,  
18 and the logical domain consists only of such mutually associated objects,  
19 which manifest themselves both in concrete and mental existence modes  
20 (inclusively and/or exclusively). Accordingly, only those linguistic facts, which  
21 are observable in the physical domain, can be investigated in a direct manner.  
22 An indirect way of revealing some aspects of language is probable in the case  
23 of interpersonal communication, when the observation of linguistic facts  
24 depends on the knowledge of external observers who make inferences about

1 intentions, tasks or purposes of individuals taking part in interpersonal  
2 communication.

3

4 *On Heteronomous Nature of the Subject Matter of Linguistics and the Ways of*  
5 *Its Autonomization in Use and Cognition*

6

7 The usage of the terms *autonomy* and *heteronomy* widely exploited in  
8 linguistics, comes from Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) Worth quoting is his  
9 *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, where he says: “All my actions as  
10 only a member of the world of understanding would therefore conform  
11 perfectly with the principle of autonomy of the pure will; as only a part of the  
12 world of sense they would have to be taken to conform wholly to the natural  
13 law of desires and inclinations, hence to the heteronomy of nature.” (Kant 1997  
14 [1785]: (4:53), 58).

15 In a slightly different meaning, the autonomy-heteronomy distinction has  
16 been applied to language as a system of verbal signs or as an investigative  
17 object. Seen in totality, language is said to be heteronomous by nature, but it  
18 can be made autonomous as a tool of communication through the acceptance of  
19 social norms, or as an object of scientific cognition through the choice of  
20 investigative perspectives.

21 When one says that a given language has autonomized itself by  
22 establishing a unified lexical and grammatical system, one should bear in mind  
23 the fact that it is only a relative autonomy. While acquiring the state of  
24 autonomy, a given language, or rather its standard variety, in accordance with

1 the statement of Max Hermann Jelinek (1868–1938), the author of *Geschichte*  
 2 *der neuhochdeutschen Grammatik von den Anfängen bis auf Adelung* (1913:  
 3 260), becomes independent from its individual users, as a shared means of  
 4 communication.

5 The autonomy of standard vs. heteronomy of dialects, has been exposed by  
 6 William Downes, in *Language and Society* claiming that: “Standardization is a  
 7 complex of belief and behavior towards language which evolves historically”,  
 8 where “one linguistic variety, the standard, is raised above or is made  
 9 superordinate to the dialects, which are subordinate to it. By saying that “the  
 10 standard is autonomous”, linguists “are saying that it functions as a unique and  
 11 independent linguistic system”. Moreover, as Downes adds: “a heteronomous  
 12 linguistic system is one that functions in the linguistic community as a  
 13 dependent variety of an autonomous system” (1998 /1984/: 33–35).

14 Recapitulating, one can say that what the speaking communities recognize  
 15 as a normal state in a language is imposed upon its members by virtue of social  
 16 sanctions. It is the pressure of society, expressed through rejection and  
 17 acceptance, punishment and reward, or stigma and charisma, which decides  
 18 that the individual language user adjusts himself to common rules, without  
 19 being authorized to introduce any changes in the collective character of the  
 20 semiotic system formed by respective conventions of linguistic communities.  
 21 The factor of relativity explains the occurrence of multilingualism and the  
 22 differentiation of language users into minorities and majorities, while  
 23 indicating that a particular language is subjected, in its genesis and functioning,  
 24 to customs and conventions.

1

2 *Language as a Spiritual Workforce in the Wording of the World and Its Textual*  
 3 *Realizations in Grammars and Dictionaries*

4

5 An aspectual depiction of the properties of language has been expressed in  
 6 the discussions between representatives, who argue about whether language is  
 7 a process or a product. Well-known, in this respect, is the claim of Wilhelm  
 8 von Humboldt (1767–1835) that language is *energeia* and not *ergon*,  
 9 interpreted further as a generative activity of expression and an affective force,  
 10 which repeats always in the same way and always in a new way. This claim has  
 11 been formulated in the Introduction to his work *Über die Verschiedenheit des*  
 12 *menschlichen Sprachbaus und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des*  
 13 *Menschengeschlechts* of 1836, well-known under the translated title *On*  
 14 *Language. On the Diversity of Human Language Construction and its*  
 15 *Influence on the Mental Development of the Human Species*, in the statement  
 16 that language “in itself is no product (*Ergon*), but an activity (*Energeia*)” [“Die  
 17 Sprache... ist kein Werk (*Ergon*), sondern eine Thätigkeit (*Energeia*)”] (cf.  
 18 Humboldt 1988: 49 [1836: LVII, § 8; cited and quoted Author 2014: 38).

19 A characteristic feature, considered under a dynamic aspect, is the fact that  
 20 the user of a language, by producing verbal signs from a finite number of  
 21 means, has at her/his disposal, performs an infinite number of uses. Hereafter,  
 22 Leo Weisgerber (1899–1985) proposed in *Vom Weltbild der deutschen Sprache*  
 23 (1953) to interpret the statement “language is *energeia*” rather as “language is a



1 spiritual force” (Germ. *die geistige Kraft*) which transforms things and affairs  
 2 in such a way that they become the property of human thought.

3 As *ergon*, following the Humboldtian observation, are to be regarded the  
 4 outputs of language, i.e., what becomes a ready-made product, liberated from  
 5 the process of speaking. Leo Weisgerber, in turn, explained *ergon*, in his article  
 6 (1955): „Das Worten der Welt als sprachliche Aufgabe der Menschheit“ (The  
 7 wording of the world as the task of humanity), as a result of “the ‘wording’ of  
 8 the world which contributes to a crystallization of a world view in the  
 9 consciousness of individuals, communities and nations, and consequently in  
 10 the spoken and written texts of a language (Author 2003: 65–66; 2016: 103–  
 11 104).

12 Among linguistically inclined psychologists, who have applied the factual  
 13 and processual aspects both to the interpretation of language and text, a  
 14 prominent place occupies Karl Ludwig Bühler (1879–1963), the founder of  
 15 Gestalt psychology in Austria. While alluding to Wilhelm von Humboldt’s  
 16 tenet of that language is not a ready-made product but an uninterrupted  
 17 process, Bühler has exposed in his seminal work *Sprachtheorie: Die*  
 18 *Darstellungstheorie der Sprache* (1990 [1934], 48–68]) specification the view  
 19 that language is both a social activity and a social fact. What is more, against  
 20 the usage reducing the linguistic object to the oppositions between system and  
 21 text, the concurrence between dynamic and static aspects of language and its  
 22 realization in texts, Bühler has presented on the basis of the so called four  
 23 phases of speech formulated such as *Sprechhandlung* ‘speaking as an action’  
 24 and *Sprachwerk* ‘language as work’ against the background of *Sprechakt*

1 'speaking as an (accomplished) act' and *Sprachgebilde* 'language as a (created)  
 2 structure'. In this confrontation of "speaking" vs. "language", *Handlung*  
 3 'activity' and *Akt* 'act', as textual aspects of speech, have been opposed to  
 4 *Work* 'work' and *Gebilde* 'structure', constituting *ipso facto* the systemic  
 5 aspects of speech (cf. Author 2003: 70; 2016: 98).

6

7 *Understanding the Notions of Form and Substance in Metaphorical*  
 8 *Interpretations of the Nature of Language*

9

10 When tackling upon systemic and textual aspects, it is unavoidable to  
 11 consider the essence of language from its formal or a substantial point of view.  
 12 In allusion to the lectures *Cours de linguistique générale* edited by the pupils  
 13 of Ferdinand de Saussure (1916), the famous *dictum* that language is a form  
 14 and not a substance should be interpreted that language itself is not a set of  
 15 expressions, which can be physically measured, but rather a set of values of  
 16 elements that mutually imply each other. In view of the fact that the elements  
 17 of language are interchangeable, because they can be expressed in different  
 18 substances, the form of language alone is understood as a system of pure values  
 19 (Saussure 1922 /1916/: 156–157). The form constitutes the system of relations  
 20 between pure values in abstractively conceived reality. One can say, therefore,  
 21 in accordance with Saussurean tradition, that the form, as a systemic network  
 22 of relations, superimposes itself upon the substance, as the textual realization in  
 23 speech or writing. Hence, form in opposition to substance is language-specific,  
 24 and substance is a property characteristic of *parole*. Metaphorically, the

1 relation between form and substance as viewed by Saussure can be illustrated  
 2 by the analogy of the parallel between language and the game of chess In  
 3 chess, for example, the material shape of each piece, what they have been made  
 4 of (of wood or of ivory, etc.), is not relevant in itself when those pieces are  
 5 exchangeable in the case of when they are lost, even by the pieces of chalk or  
 6 stone. However, a mutual relation between them and the role ascribed to each  
 7 of the exchangeable chess pieces exists separately in the moment they are  
 8 placed on a chessboard (cf. Saussure 1959 [1916]: 110, and 111–122, or 1983  
 9 [1972 /1916/]: 108, and 110–120; discussed in details by Author 2003: 70).

10

11 *The Plane of Expression and the Plane of Content in Language and Linguistic*  
 12 *Communication*

13

14 Another somewhat related opposition between form and substance,  
 15 although programmatically alluding to Ferdinand de Saussure, was developed  
 16 by Louis Trolle Hjelmslev (1889–1965) in in relation to the communicational  
 17 realization of language, namely, in the plane of expression and the plane of  
 18 content. What Saussure called *signifié* and *signifiant* (1922: 99), i.e., a  
 19 psychical linkage between two sides of one sign: the mental image of the  
 20 denoted thing and the acoustic image of the denoting name, Hjelmslev treated,  
 21 in his *Prolegomena to the Study of Language* as two separate functives (1953  
 22 [1943]: 13, 52–58), which are united by a sign function, the content form, on  
 23 the one side and, the expression form on the other side. In such an view, the  
 24 sign function is depicted as a two-sided entity of two “functives”, which act, in

1 speech and thought, towards the substance of expression and toward the  
2 substance of content.

3       What constitutes an amorphous continuum in both planes of expression  
4 and content, united by a sign-function, can become shaped by form in each of  
5 the particular languages. In Hjelmslev's reasoning, "matter" can become a  
6 "substance" only then, when it appears in the role of a functive connected by a  
7 sign-function with "form". The substance is, in Hjelmslevian terms, this part of  
8 matter of content, or expression, which becomes a concrete product, organized  
9 by form for communicating purposes. To bring closer, in an illustrative way,  
10 the difference between matter, substance and form in a language, Hjelmslev  
11 used the metaphor of a piece of mud (or sand), a mold form and a mud pie  
12 formed by this mold. By the substance of mud (or sand) he understood mud, or  
13 sand, which is found within the form of mold. In the form he saw a shape given  
14 to that pie by a mold. The initial difference between mud, or sand, as matter,  
15 and mud, or sand, as substance depended mainly upon the act whether a given  
16 set has an ordered character, or whether it was given any kind of form. In  
17 Hjelmslev's explanation, matter in the plane of expression should constitute all  
18 kinds of sounds emitted by people in different languages. The speech sounds,  
19 forming the constituents of the signs of a given language, in which human  
20 communities communicate, are to be determined as a substance of expression  
21 plane. However, phonemes by means of which those signs are distinguished  
22 from other signs in the system of language, should be considered as a shaping  
23 form of expression plane. As regards the plane of content, Hjelmslev exploited  
24 some examples from the segmenting and naming systems which characterize

1 the color spectrum in different languages of the world. Nevertheless, the scope  
 2 of names, forming determined semantic fields, by which particular languages  
 3 of the world differ from one another, should be treated as facts belonging to the  
 4 form of the plane of content. Pursuing Hjelmslev's explanations, one should  
 5 add that languages contrast in the plane of content also with respect to the  
 6 segmentation of matter not only by means of particular signs fulfilling a lexical  
 7 function but also by means of categorial signs fulfilling a grammatical  
 8 function. One can, therefore, agree that the languages of the world differ from  
 9 one another typologically as to their formal aspects, although matter can be  
 10 always the same (Author 2003: 70–71; for more details see Author 2016: 110–  
 11 121).

12

13 *Language as a Collective Property of Society and Individual Property of*  
 14 *Communicating Individuals*

15

16 Linguistic constituents and aspects of speech permeate, as a rule, two  
 17 kinds of conditionings of human communication that govern the individual and  
 18 social existence modes of its participants, manifested namely, in personal-  
 19 subjective and interpersonal-intersubjective exchanges of related messages  
 20 between them. What manifests itself in human acts of speaking and  
 21 understanding constitute the properties of communicating individuals, as social  
 22 facts appear, however, those collectively accepted tools of interindividual  
 23 communication which crystallize themselves in individual acts of speech as a  
 24 set of shared means of verbal signification. Thus, language, in its social

1 existence form, appears to an external observer as an ordered set of textual  
 2 realizations that are acquired and realized for communicative purposes of  
 3 individuals and requirements of speech communities, in accordance with their  
 4 commonly accepted rules of usage and patterns of acceptability. In abstracting  
 5 the properties of language from individual products and acts of speaking, called  
 6 *parole* in Saussurean terms, practitioners of linguistic studies not only detach  
 7 the social facts from the individual ones, but also distinguish the properties of  
 8 linguistics texts as functionally relevant or irrelevant, in other words, the  
 9 properties of the linguistic facts, which are essential, from the properties, which  
 10 are less or more accidental in their substantial realization. One can, therefore,  
 11 say that language is not a function of an individual speaker; but rather a ready-  
 12 made product, which the society has created through, and for the purposes of,  
 13 communication (cf. Author 2003: 67).

14

15 *Competence as Dispositional Property of Speakers/Listeners, and Performance*  
 16 *as a Role-Oriented Realization of Their Communicative Tasks*

17

18 Language as a social property of speech, is relatively independent from the  
 19 will of its individual users. One can thus say that someone possesses a  
 20 language when s/he understands only the texts of language, while conceiving  
 21 them as verbal, spoken or written signs. The social proprietorship of a given  
 22 language is governed by the rules of the individual appropriation of verbal  
 23 means for the purposes of signification and communication, under the  
 24 normative pressures of speaking communities, or influential authorities. As

1 specified by Saussure (1959: 11, or 1983: 11), the so called “linguistic faculty  
2 proper”, refers to two kinds of abilities: to acquire language of a determined  
3 community during the formative years of an individual, or to create one’s own  
4 means of inter-individual communication. This kind of individual or social  
5 proprietorship related to knowledge of a certain language is usually understood  
6 as “linguistic competence” (Author 2003: 79–70).

7       The term *competence* has been introduced to the theory of language-in-use  
8 by Noam Avram Chomsky in his *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (1965: 3–15).  
9 Initially referred to grammatical and later to the semantic capability of  
10 speakers, it has slowly started to connote the totality of linguistic knowledge,  
11 aptitude and habit of an ideal language-user, who functions in a homogeneous  
12 linguistic community not polluted by any external influences. At the same  
13 time, sociologically inclined linguists, as, Muriel Saville-Troike, among the  
14 other scholars, postulated under the label *The Ethnography of Communication*  
15 (1982), to introduce a pragmatic component into a more general notion of  
16 “communicative competence” emphasizing that considerations of language use  
17 are often indispensable for the comprehension of much of linguistic form.  
18 Instead of assessing what can be said in a given language, practitioners of  
19 language sciences had rather to account for “what can be said when, where, by  
20 whom, to whom, in what manner, and under what particular circumstances”  
21 (Saville-Troike 1982: 8). Consequently, such competence comprises not only  
22 knowing the linguistic code, but also dealing with social and cultural  
23 experience, speakers are presumed to have, and enabling them to use and

1 interpret all linguist forms, in various communicative dimensions and social  
2 settings of language use (cf. Saville-Troike 1982: 22–23).

3 When referring the notion of competence to dispositional properties of  
4 communicating individuals, which enables them to effectively interact with  
5 other individuals in performing their role-oriented tasks under the pressure of  
6 collective sanctions, one has to take into account that some issues might be  
7 related to the modeling of personality traits, which foster the development of  
8 interdiscursive competence of communicating selves in cultural and  
9 educational domains of communication, governed by the rules of  
10 generationally transmitted traditions and socially construed norms (cf. Author  
11 2016: 17, and 106–107). Such a normative model of intercultural  
12 communicative competence, in the area of globalization for the tasks of the  
13 world citizenship, has been proposed by Michael Byram (1997: 32–47), the  
14 promoter of a belief that to draw appropriate conclusions from learning alien  
15 cultures, the learners of a foreign language should first realize and understand  
16 their own culture (cf. Author 2016: 106–107). Hence, teachers of foreign  
17 languages, while preparing appropriate didactic materials for transmitting  
18 culture-related knowledge and improving linguistic skills, are expected to  
19 model the intercultural communicative competence of their pupils through  
20 instilling into their minds between five kinds of respective knowledge,  
21 experiential, existential, comprehensive, apprehensive, and operational,  
22 marked, for example, by neutrality, curiosity, openness, interest, willingness,  
23 etc.

24



1 *On The Functional Stability of Language in Synchrony and Its Developmental*  
2 *Variability in Diachrony*

3

4 In addition to an aspectual depiction of language as a form, which is  
5 realized substantially in individual acts and products of communicational  
6 processes, and to its aspectual definition as a system of pure relations, which  
7 are determined by nothing more than their arrangements in textual realizations,  
8 it seems to be worth stating that a given language exists not only at a given  
9 moment of time, but that it might have also taken place in the past, and may  
10 take place in the future as well. This statement means, in turn, that language  
11 should be considered either on “the axis of simultaneity” or on “the axis of  
12 succession” in accordance with proposal of Saussure (1959: 80, or 1983: 80). If  
13 language exists as a functional system with mutually interdependent text  
14 elements, then it may be internalized as an organized system through the  
15 consciousness of its individual users in the consciousness of a given  
16 communicative community. By virtue of this conscious knowledge, language  
17 may be also externalized in the individual acts of speaking and understanding  
18 only in a synchronic existence mode. Its individual user is not interested in the  
19 history of the constituents of her/his utterances, when s/he utilizes them as a  
20 tool for communicating her/his purposes, or intentions, in order to evoke the  
21 behavior and reactions of receivers, or to express her/his feelings and  
22 emotional states. If considered from a diachronic viewpoint, the changeability  
23 of language constituents and/or aspects is traced mostly by historians and to a  
24 lesser degree is known to be made familiar to those who use it for

1 communicating purposes (Saussure 1959: 79–100, or 1983: 79–98), since the  
2 evolution of language as a whole is a gradual process, which is hardly ever  
3 observable by its users. In fact, each of the dimensions of language, each  
4 structure, each of its constitutive elements, or aspects, can have its own  
5 separate history. Inquiries into their nature can, therefore, be never ultimately  
6 completed. If there are such studies, than they are rather partial and not  
7 systemic. when one takes into account the fact that the particular,  
8 simultaneously functioning, elements of the system of a given language, which  
9 exist also in the consciousness of different users, can be situated on different  
10 levels of the development. In explaining the difference between synchronic and  
11 diachronic description of language, Saussure took advantage of the analogy of  
12 the chess game. With reference to this metaphor of chess one can say that the  
13 chess player in a given moment of time, when s/he sees the situation of the  
14 various chess pieces on the chessboard, is not interested in the fact of what was  
15 earlier. Yet, s/he might simultaneously consider functional dependencies  
16 between chessboard elements to preview the consequences of her/his own  
17 move, which causes changes in a given situation. Synchronic linguistics,  
18 formed on Saussure's principles, studies only a static aspect of language, while  
19 describing its relatively stable functioning in a taxonomical way, that means, it  
20 estimates the hitherto existing relations between text elements of the given  
21 language as a system from the viewpoint of functional interrelationships. What  
22 is more, when used in the context of comparative linguistics, synchronous  
23 linguistics may typologically characterize the systems of contrasted languages  
24 according to their structural properties. Diachronic linguistics, in turn, puts

1 emphasis on documenting the succession of historical and evolutionally  
 2 changes occurring within systems of particular languages. It describes these  
 3 changes in explanatory statements basing on philological-comparative  
 4 methods. Having documented some convergent or divergent variations within a  
 5 given system, practitioners of diachronic linguistics usually assess the causes  
 6 and effects of transformations, occurring in the whole systems of languages,  
 7 their subordinated and constitutive levels, into new qualitatively related  
 8 systems, or into new forms of cognate languages, constituting the continuation  
 9 of previous languages and their preceding states (Author 2003: 73–74).

10

11 *Syntagmatic Collocations of Text Elements in Communication and Their*  
 12 *Paradigmatic Substitutability in the System of Language*

13

14       There are two kinds of relationships in text and system of language, which  
 15 are studied by synchronic linguistics, namely, the relations of co-occurrence or  
 16 mutual commutation of text elements within entities, units and constructions of  
 17 higher order, called syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships. They refer, for  
 18 instance, to the function or substitutability of phonemes within morphemes,  
 19 morphemes within stems, stems within words, words within word groups, word  
 20 groups within sentences, sentences within utterances, utterances within  
 21 discourses and discourses within verbal means of human communication.  
 22 Elements belonging to the same textual row based on collocation, mutual  
 23 subordination or conditioning, in functional respect, enter into the syntagmatic  
 24 relationships, because they are mutually collocated as elements of the same

1 syntagm. However, textual elements, which can occur in the same or in a  
2 similar context, i.e., which belong to the class of elements that mutually replace  
3 each other in the same textual environment, enter into the so-called  
4 paradigmatic relationships, as far as they take place within the system of  
5 language between members of a paradigm, among which only one can become  
6 a part of a given sequence of concatenated elements, and not all at the same  
7 time. Labels for these kinds of relations between text elements of language  
8 entered into linguistics thanks to Saussure, who exposed, while determining the  
9 essence of syntagmatic relationships (franc. *rapports syntagmatiques*), the  
10 linear character of linguistic signs succeeding each other in individual acts of  
11 speaking. However, Saussure specified paradigmatic relationships in a  
12 mentalist way, i.e., on the psychological basis, calling them the relations of  
13 association (franc. *rapports associatifs*). By calling these links as associative,  
14 he meant not only the intersubstitutability of signs in the same environment. He  
15 considered rather the fact that elements of a given language-system can be  
16 associated in the consciousness of users on the basis of certain common  
17 features, e.g., also in accordance with the fact that they are similarly  
18 constructed, or that they have a similar meaning (cf. Saussure 1959: 122–27 or  
19 1983: 122–25). Louis Hjelmslev (1963: *passim*) replaced Saussurean term  
20 *associative relationships* with the term *paradigmatic relationships* while  
21 stressing their empiricalness. In other words, Hjelmslev's exposition of  
22 syntagmatic relationships is based on the functional co-existence of text  
23 elements and the paradigmatic relationships on their contextual  
24 intersubstitutability. An important proposal of Hjelmslev for a linguistic theory

1 is the differentiation between the both-and functions (relations) and the either-  
 2 or functions (correlations). What lies behind this terminology is the  
 3 understanding of text as process and language as system. Accordingly, a both-  
 4 and (a coexistence) relationship is present between the functives in the process  
 5 (i.e., in the text), and an either-or (an alternation)—between the functives in the  
 6 system (i.e., in the language). Thus, in Hjelmslev's scheme, the synthesis of a  
 7 linguistic system is to be seen in terms a "correlational either-or hierarchy",  
 8 and in turn, the analysis and synthesis of a text basing on interdependencies,  
 9 codeterminations, constellations, correlations of its elements, and the like should  
 10 be analyzed in terms of "both-and" as well as "either-or" relationships.

11

12 *Deep Structure as a Grammatical and Lexical Scaffold of Language and*  
 13 *Surface Structure as a Collocational Arrangement of Verbal Means for the*  
 14 *Purpose of Communication*

15

16 Along with the separations of the relations *in absentia* from relations *in*  
 17 *praesentia* in the domain of text elements, linguists have also applied the  
 18 notions of deep structure and the surface (the structure of the depth or surface)  
 19 to the analysis of utterances. Following *A Course in Modern Linguistics* by  
 20 Charles Francis Hockett (1958: 246–252), these syntactic terms have been  
 21 referred to "deep grammar and surface grammar" meaning, the values of  
 22 semantic and stylistic bonds, which connect the basic constituents of sentence  
 23 independently of their order. In a similar understanding, the employment of the  
 24 terms *deep vs. surface grammar* connotes structural concatenations between

1 the forms of the elements of utterances following each other in a determined  
2 linear order. A considerably different usage, however, characterizes the terms:  
3 *deep structure* and *surface structure* have been developed in the generative-  
4 transformational grammar by Chomsky (1965: 16–18, and 128–47).  
5 Principally, they have been related to the explanations of constructional  
6 ambiguity (syntactic or semantic homonyms, homophones, and homographs)  
7 appearing on the surface of utterances. In consequence, explorations in the  
8 deep structure of sentences are practically equated with a search for ultimate  
9 constituents as opposed to immediate ones, lexical and syntactic groups and  
10 simple basic sentences as well as for the kinds of transformations to which they  
11 may subjected. For the adherents of this procedure, not necessarily derived  
12 from a psychologist's position, the notion of the surface structure of linguistic  
13 utterances appeared to be useful for phonological interpretations, where syntax  
14 and semantics are relegated to the domain of the deep structure analyses.

15 Summarizing the selected aspects of speech, one has to pay attention to  
16 their essential role in cognitive approaches to the subject matter of linguistics,  
17 independently of the more general and indeed deeper questions, which should  
18 be posed with reference to their place in the system of all epistemological  
19 perspectives.

20

21

22

## 1    **Theoretical-Ontological Vs. Methodological-Gnoseological- Aspects of** 2    **Linguistics**

3

4        In linguistics, similarly as in its neighbouring disciplines as the sciences of  
 5    language in general, one can distinguish, with reference to Rudolf Botha (1971:  
 6    14), its two aspects, namely theoretical-ontological (subject-matter-oriented)  
 7    and methodological-gnoseological (tool- and strategy-oriented). The theoretical  
 8    aspect of linguistics, constituting its subject-matter-oriented domain, makes up  
 9    the set of all actual and potential propositions and concepts situated in the  
 10   knowledge of language established by practitioners of this discipline, whereas  
 11   the methodological aspect of linguistics, i.e., its methodological domain,  
 12   constitute the set of all types of scientific hypotheses, empirical generalizations  
 13   pertaining to linguistic laws, types of theories and models of language, its  
 14   entities, units and constructions, sets of categories, terms and definitions.

15        Moreover, the methodological domain includes also all kinds of utterances  
 16   formulated in a given language and expressed in other semiotic devices, or  
 17   surrogates, as, e.g., diagrams, figures, schemes, charts, maps, graphs, tables,  
 18   and the like, in the frames of which the totality of above mentioned knowledge  
 19   about language as an object of investigation and description is ordered in a  
 20   coherent, exhaustive, simple, consistent and legitimate way, as well as the set  
 21   of all kinds of techniques, forms of reasoning and taxonomic and explanatory  
 22   procedures, and the like, thanks to which this knowledge is established, and in  
 23   the categories of which further research in linguistics is conducted.

24

1 *Defining the Formal Object of Linguistic Studies*

2

3 Linguists may determine their object of cognition by specifying their  
 4 subject matter and its various aspects, by stipulating its domain of occurrence,  
 5 or by enumerating their tasks and methods on the investigative level, etc. In  
 6 order to answer the question of what the formal object of linguistic studies is,  
 7 one has to know the boundaries between systemic facts and non-systemic facts  
 8 of language.

9 There are also other disciplines which are interested in the concrete  
 10 manifestation forms of particular languages in their social environments but  
 11 from non-linguistic viewpoints, as noticed by Franciszek Grucza 1983: 282), in  
 12 *Zagadnienia metalingwistyki. Lingwistyka – jej przedmiot, lingwistyka*  
 13 *stosowana* [Questions of metalinguistics. Linguistics – its subject matter,  
 14 applied linguistics]. Since the separation of facts to be described as linguistic  
 15 objects from the facts that belong to the domain of other sciences depends on  
 16 the criteria employed in the delimitation of “extra”-linguistic facts from  
 17 “intra”-linguistic facts, one has to decide which of the properties of language  
 18 become autonomous as tools of interpersonal communication, and which  
 19 possess a heteronomous character, being dependent on biological and  
 20 psychological conditionings of individual users. That means, one should  
 21 determine the boundaries between the subject matter of the so-called “external”  
 22 linguistics and the subject matter of “internal” linguistics, following Saussure’s  
 23 suggestion (discussed by Author 2003: 36–38).



1 In an attempt to define the subject matter of “internal” linguistics, one has  
2 to detach those properties which form the system of language from the  
3 properties which are to be subsumed under the non-systemic properties of  
4 language. The latter, encompassing the subject matter of the “external”  
5 linguistics, are studied within the domain of the non-linguistic sciences of  
6 language.

7 From the viewpoint of external conditionings, in which the languages of  
8 the world function as separate, major, and small or minor, systems of  
9 signification and communication, the specification of non-systemic properties  
10 of languages seems to be useful for typological purposes. To be mentioned  
11 here are, correspondingly, such variables as, for example, the history of a  
12 language, its users, territory, domains of use, relationships to other languages  
13 in contact situations, legal status and degrees of its standardization or  
14 codification, etc.

15

16

17 **Aspects of Language Studied by Linguistics and the Non-Linguistic**  
18 **Sciences of Language**

19

20 Owing to the multiaspectuality of language, one should delimit those  
21 properties that constitute the subject matter of linguistics from those which  
22 serve as criteria for defining the scope of the subject matter belonging to the  
23 other non-linguistic sciences of language, or to their neighboring disciplines.  
24 To separate the domains of linguistics and the neighboring sciences of

1 language, it is enough to respect the difference between language as “an  
2 object” of study and language as “a relational property” of objects studied by  
3 other disciplines.

4 As far as the object of anthropology is concerned, a scientist may be  
5 curious to know what are the definitional attributes of the category of the  
6 human being. For a psychologist, the performance of language abilities can be  
7 treated as a clue as to how the mind (psyche), being the principal object of  
8 her/his study, operates. Furthermore, in the sociology of language, the social  
9 group (society) is a formal object of study and the language spoken by this  
10 group serves as a criterion determining its scope. Thus, one can say that  
11 language can be studied from the viewpoint of non-linguistic sciences of  
12 language in the ecosystem of man, i.e., in the communicational settings of  
13 individuals and collectivities.

14 Linguistics proper studies language as a principal object, but sometimes in  
15 relation to its environmental settings, and sometimes in abstraction from the  
16 environment in which it functions. In the first case, heteronomies of language –  
17 studied by neighboring disciplines, such as, for instance, anthropology,  
18 psychology, and sociology – are assigned as the properties of the formal object  
19 of linguistic studies belonging to anthropolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and  
20 sociolinguistics. In these hyphenated disciplines, language constitutes the main  
21 object of study, and man, mind, or society are used as criteria embracing the  
22 scope of objects studied in the domains of so-called heteronomous linguistics.  
23 In the second case, the so-called autonomous linguistics claims to study  
24 linguistic facts solely on the intrasystemic ground. Linguists try to make

1 generalizations about the systemic properties of language as a whole, or  
2 describe and compare systems of particular languages of the world, while  
3 abstracting them from their individual speakers, social groups, or ethnic,  
4 national, or international communities.

5       Regarding the subject matter of autonomous linguistics, one has to take  
6 into account that the language as a definitional model is not to be equated with  
7 the properties characterizing all languages of the world, or a selected language  
8 in particular. Correspondingly, systemic properties of languages determined by  
9 their environments are studied in typological linguistics, in a search for  
10 primariness and secundariness, universalness and exclusiveness, isomorphisms  
11 and allomorphisms, and, in historical linguistics – in a search for origin and  
12 evolution, separation and unification, continuity, or disappearance of structures  
13 which realize respective communicative functions.

14       Apart from “pure” studies based on taxonomic or explanatory statements,  
15 which evaluate the state of language as it is, or explain why so and so is as it is,  
16 one conducts in the domain of linguistics also “applied” studies, based on  
17 directive statements, which determine what should be done in order to reach  
18 certain states of language to be avoided or achieved, as for example foreign  
19 language teaching, lexicography, speech aphasia, speech pathology, speech  
20 therapy, rhetoric and language standardization, and the like (cf Grucza 1983:  
21 274–340, and 341–475; see also 390 and 436–438).

22       As a matter of fact, it is not only linguists who are able to autonomize their  
23 object from a purely linguistic viewpoint; psychologists, sociologists,  
24 logicians, or philosophers, for example may construe their own model of

1 language even though they do so from a perspective of its external  
 2 conditionings. Methodologically important for the linguists in question is when  
 3 their model is formulated according to a linguistic theory of a language system  
 4 delimited from its environmental conditionings, and when the gnoseological  
 5 subject matter of particular autonomous linguistics means also a relative  
 6 autonomy of a given natural language from its individual users in an  
 7 ontological sense.

### 9 *Conceptual Levels in the Understanding of Language*

11 For the reason that theories depend on certain authorized viewpoints, one  
 12 has to acknowledge the statement that language assumed as a theoretical  
 13 construct, does not exist really. Nor can it be abstracted from any concrete  
 14 hitherto existing language. Distinguishing an uncountable “language as a  
 15 theoretical construct” from a countable “language as a real object”, scientists  
 16 have to know that “language as a definitional model” is not to be equated with  
 17 the properties common to all languages of the world or with the properties  
 18 characteristic of one language in particular.

19 Therefore, at least three conceptual levels of language have to be  
 20 distinguished, (1) in general and in particular, (2) *ex definitione*, *in abstracto*  
 21 and *in concreto*, and (3) as a theoretical construct, as an inductive  
 22 generalization, as an autonomous sociolect, or as a heteronomous idiolect. As  
 23 one may notice, language in general can be understood either as language *ex*  
 24 *definitione*, i.e., a theoretical construct on a hypothetical-deductive basis, or as

1 language *in abstracto*, i.e., a generalization of inductively observed language  
 2 properties in time and space. Furthermore, language in particular seen as  
 3 synonymous with language *in concreto*, may be specified either as a shared  
 4 means of verbal signification and communication, autonomized collectively by  
 5 virtue of social sanctions, or as a linguistic idiosystem without interindividual  
 6 norm principles (cf. Author 2016: 94–95).

7

8

### 9 **Aspects Language Detached From Set of Investigative Perspectives**

10

11 To begin with, the question how language as an investigative object exist  
 12 and how it can be approached in cognition, can be answered within the  
 13 framework of a metascientific discipline dealing the knowledge and knowing  
 14 acquiring activities, namely epistemology which is divided into ontology and  
 15 gnoseology. As such, epistemology defines knowledge as a set of investigative  
 16 attitudes and/or investigative standpoints pertaining to the ways of how the  
 17 investigated reality exists and what are the possibilities of its cognition (for  
 18 details and relevant references see Author 2016: 56–58).

19 Irrespective of the divisions between autonomous linguistics and  
 20 heteronomous linguistics, one must state that language in its entirety can be  
 21 approached from various perspectives. Remembering the famous tenet «c'est le  
 22 point de vue qui crée l'objet» expressed by Saussure in *Cours de linguistique*  
 23 *générale* (1922: 23), one has to bear in mind that the subject matter of  
 24 linguistics is created by investigative perspectives both of the disciplinary and

1 interdisciplinary provenance. It is worthwhile mentioning also the perspectives  
 2 derived from philosophical positions, and furthermore, doctrines and frames of  
 3 reference that are developed on metascientific premises (cf. Author 2003: 45).

4 It might be, therefore, appropriate to mention that the specification of the  
 5 subject matter construed by scientists for characterizing the nature of their  
 6 domain of study, or deduced from the observable features of their objects of  
 7 study, depends upon the choice of a given investigative perspective, or a set of  
 8 concatenated investigative perspectives.

9 The properties of the objects belonging to the domain of linguistics, which  
 10 are studied from linguistic and non-linguistic viewpoints, may also be revealed  
 11 by different ontological and gnoseological positions that provide a  
 12 metascientific basis for partial methodologies of individual types of sciences.  
 13 Thus, having stated, in this framework, that the epistemology of linguistics is  
 14 shaped by various scientific paradigms, it is assumed that the properties of its  
 15 objects may be studied, *inter alia*, through the set of meta, hypo-, inter-,  
 16 intradisciplinary, and disciplinary perspectives, useful for distinguishing its  
 17 relevant categories and notions.

18 These perspectives are collected and defined in philosophical dictionaries  
 19 or books on the epistemology of sciences under the names referring to their  
 20 notional contents, disciplinary provenance, ways of presentation, authors  
 21 and/or followers, as in particular: absolutism, anthropocentrism,  
 22 associationism, behaviorism, biologism, causalism, cognitivism, collectivism,  
 23 comparativism, constructivism, creativism, descriptivism, determinism,  
 24 diffusionism, dynamism, emergentism, empiricism, essentialism, evolutionism,

1 existentialism, extrospectivism, functionalism, idealism, instrumentalism,  
 2 integrationism, introspectivism, intuitionism, materialism, naturalism,  
 3 nativism, normativism, objectivism, organicism, personalism, phenomenism,  
 4 pluralism, positivism, pragmatism, psychologism, rationalism, realism,  
 5 relativism, sensualism, solipsism, spiritualism, structuralism, subjectivism,  
 6 symbolism, teleologism, utilitarianism, vitalism, and the like.

7       Among the interdisciplinary perspectives borrowed from the neighboring  
 8 disciplines of linguistics, to be mentioned are, among others, those which have  
 9 played an important role in the creation of linguistic models, such as,  
 10 biologism, historicism, psychologism, sociologism, and anthropologism.  
 11 Parallel to them oscillate such peripheral investigative perspective, as, for  
 12 example comparativism, taxonomism, descriptivism, distributionism,  
 13 formalism, functionalism, cognitivism, and others. Furthermore, one should  
 14 also mention idealizationism, abstractionism, binarism, or semiotism, which  
 15 are nonetheless relevant regarding the epistemological position of linguistics.

16       Groups of investigative perspectives may promote the acceptance of  
 17 preferred patterns of “scientificity” characteristic for particular epochs, and  
 18 imitated as the modeling ones. Worth comparing, are, for example, evolutionism  
 19 against the background of history, archeology, botany, zoology, geology;  
 20 structuralism – physics, chemistry, anatomy, logic, statistics, geography;  
 21 functionalism – psychology, biology, anthropology, sociology; generativism –  
 22 algebra, combinatorics, informatics, computer sciences, formal logic, cognitive  
 23 psychology, and the like.

1        Searching for binary oppositions, one should mention that some  
 2        epistemological positions, occupied by linguists or representatives of  
 3        linguistics-related disciplines, have usually oscillated between two poles.  
 4        Hereto belong such perspectives as: rationalism and empiricism, monism and  
 5        dualism, mentalism and mechanism (the view that all biological processes may  
 6        be described in physicochemical terms), finalism and causalism governed the  
 7        views on the nature of the investigated object. Besides, to be mentioned are  
 8        also: realism and idealism, formalism and substantialism, solipsism and  
 9        collectivism related to manifestation forms. Similarly, methodological choices  
 10       have been determined by the oppositions between: inductivism and  
 11       deductivism, synchronism and diachronism, introspectivism and  
 12       extrospectivism, subjectivism and objectivism, absolutism and relativism,  
 13       particularism and holism, isolationism and integrationism, etc.

14       Numerous orientations, predominant in the history of linguistic thought,  
 15       have provided examples of how linguists discover or perceive the importance  
 16       of only one aspect of language. They usually deem this aspect as either  
 17       exclusively scientific or decisive for the whole domain of studies, while  
 18       rejecting the viewpoints of their immediate opponents, and holding defensively  
 19       their positions when new prospective opponents appear on the stage  
 20       proclaiming that their ideas are no longer valid. Hence, crossing the boundaries  
 21       between isolationist and integrationist approaches, it might be important to  
 22       specify which of the manifestation forms and the existence modes of language  
 23       could be autonomized as the subject matter of linguistics, and which of the  
 24       forms of its manifestation should be treated as belonging to heteronomous



1 conditionings of objects studied by its neighboring disciplines (cf. Author  
2 2016: 79).

3       The ontological and gnoseological commitments of theoreticians of  
4 linguistics to the views on the nature of language and its approachability have  
5 alternated between extreme perspectives, based on assumed attitudes or  
6 experiential standpoints, such as, *inter alia*, inductivism or deductivism,  
7 individualism or collectivism, positivism or idealism, monolingualism or  
8 multilingualism, synchronism or diachronism, evolutionism or diffusionism,  
9 factualism or processualism, formalism or substantialism, taxonomism or  
10 explanationism, idiographism or nomologism, normativism or descriptivism,  
11 instrumentalism or generativism, isolationism or integrationism, etc. At times  
12 they had been influenced by the prevailing theories espoused in the philosophy  
13 of language, or being fashionable in the philosophy of science. As a rule, they  
14 had treated language as an autonomous object of study principally in  
15 abstraction from its external conditionings.

16       In approaches of isolationists, natural languages have been reduced to  
17 “stages” and stages are identified with “systems”. Integrationists, in turn, have  
18 exposed investigative problems relatable to actual speakers, as they cooperate  
19 communicatively and interactively within the frame of discourse practices with  
20 other members of social groupings, such as interindividual, public and mass  
21 aggregations of local or global, national or international communities  
22 connected by blood kinship or ethnic descent, common profession or  
23 confession, and shared means of signification or cognition.

1       Against the background of isolationist or integrationist positions in the  
 2       division of disciplinary work, one should speak in favor of an assumption that  
 3       the natural language is heteronomous by nature, but it may be autonomized as a  
 4       separate object of study. As such, any language can be studied by itself, or in  
 5       relation to its functional environments.

6       The question of how to detach the boundaries of linguistic and non-  
 7       linguistic disciplines is connected with the answer of how to analyze the  
 8       correspondence between the commitments of practitioners of science to the  
 9       ontological views on their object of study and its investigative approachability.  
 10      Hence, from a holistic point of view, it will be necessary to depict the  
 11      functional nature of language taking into account all properties of  
 12      communicating individuals with their biological and cultural endowments as  
 13      representatives of living species, with their sensorial and intellectual faculties  
 14      as persons, and with their linguistic and axiological capabilities as members of  
 15      social collectivities.

#### 17      *The Existence Modes of Language Seen From the Aspectual Viewpoint*

19      Aspectuality of language may be rendered, in the description of its  
 20      concrete and mental, static and dynamic, substantial and relational  
 21      manifestations, as species-specific extraorganismic and intraorganismic  
 22      properties of individuals and society, which are generationally transmitted and  
 23      genetically inherited. Thus, the object of linguistic study may be specified in  
 24      terms of at least one of ten separate existence modes (cf. Author 2016: 79–80).

1        Thus, for detaching the domains of disciplinary and interdisciplinary  
2 studies, while dealing with the functions of language as a system in abstraction  
3 from the environment of its speakers, it is essential to enumerate all existence  
4 modes in which language as a set of collectively accepted meaning bearers  
5 realized in observable extraorganismic and inferable intraorganismic properties  
6 of its speakers and learners, manifests itself in: (1) externalized products of  
7 speech as patterns of concrete vocal sound waves, (2) internalized products of  
8 thought as in mental equivalents of vocal sound waves, (3) externalized  
9 processes of articulation and audition as concrete activity patterns of sending  
10 and receiving vocal sound waves, (4) internalized activities of creation and  
11 interpretation as mental faculties of conceptualizing and interpreting vocal  
12 sound waves, (5), relationships between vocal sound waves and their reference  
13 in use as a set their significative and communicational values, (6) mental  
14 associations between vocal sound waves and their reference in use as a set their  
15 memorized significative and communicational values, (7) externalized links  
16 between interpersonal collectivities of communicating individuals as  
17 concretely observable, dynamic interactions between people, (8) internalized  
18 links between intersubjective collectivities of communicating individuals, as  
19 logically assumable, relationships between the minds of individual  
20 communication participants who interpret vocal sound wave in a similar way  
21 while referring them to the commonly known referential reality, (9)  
22 physiological and intellectual endowments of homo animal loquens, as the  
23 inborn faculty localized in genetically specialized neuronal centers of human  
24 brains to communicate by using vocal systems of verbal means with a threefold

1 duality of pattern structure and sequential segmentation (10) generational  
 2 transmission in the evolution of humankind as the genotype-phenotype  
 3 interplay between physical and logical memes of vocal sound waves and their  
 4 reference in the genetic memory of speaking organisms.

5

6

## 7 **Concluding Statements**

8

9 To summarize the whole discussion about the heteronomous existence  
 10 modes of language and its autonomization in use and cognition, one has to  
 11 observe the fact that for crossing the boundaries between isolationist and  
 12 integrationist approaches to the aspectual character of language, it is important  
 13 to specify which of the manifestation of language can be detached as the  
 14 subject matter of linguistic studies against the background of the investigative  
 15 domains of non-linguistic sciences of language among human sciences.  
 16 However, it is seems to be relevant stressing that not only the linguists are able  
 17 to autonomize their object of study. In the investigative practice, any  
 18 heteronomy of language can be made autonomous from the viewpoint of any  
 19 discipline or any interdisciplinary perspective.

20 Since individuals who speak and communicate are a basic heteronomy of  
 21 language, it is thus the linguistic texts which constitute their “dispositional”  
 22 properties, when being referred each time to extratextual reality during the  
 23 process of understanding and interpretation. These properties can be  
 24 inductively abstracted from all individual realizations of texts repeated by

1 communication participants in the same way in all typical communicational  
2 settings.

3 Hence, what the linguists autonomize are only stages in the variations of  
4 languages. At the same time they are able to detect invariance in the textual  
5 structures of a language. Nevertheless, by drawing conclusions from abstract  
6 features of all languages of the world, it is impossible to create a new system of  
7 verbal signs, which could be utilized as an overall means of communication.

8 In the same way, as it is impossible to abstract from all texts of hitherto  
9 existing languages of the world the properties of a general human language that  
10 might stand for current and for future languages as well, one cannot believe in  
11 the creation of a particular language on ethnic or national levels from the  
12 totality of its idiolects. It is particularly unrealizable when the language as a  
13 system of shared means of communication, which provides the rules for  
14 socially accepted norms, does not possess autonomy from its user as a knowing  
15 subject.

16

17

## 18 **References**

19

20 Alexander, H. G. (1972 /1967/) *The Language and Logic of Philosophy*.

21 Enlarged edition. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press /D.

22 Van Nostrand Company/.

23 Bois, J. S. (1966) *The Art of Awareness. A Textbook on General Semantics*.

24 Dubuque, IA: W. C. Brown Company.

- 1 Bolinger, D. (1975 /1968/) *Aspects of Language*. Second edition. New York,
- 2 NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- 3 Botha, R. (1971) *Methodological Aspects of Transformational Generative*
- 4 *Phonology*. The Hague: Mouton.
- 5 Bühler, K. (1990 [1934]) *Theory of Language: The Representational Function*
- 6 *of Language*. Trans. D. F. Goodwin. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, PA: John
- 7 Benjamins [*Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Jena:
- 8 Gustav Fischer Verlag].
- 9 Byram, M. (1997) *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative*
- 10 *Competence*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters,
- 11 Chomsky, N. (1965) *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: The
- 12 Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- 13 Downes, W. (1998 /1984/) *Language and Society*. Second edition. Cambridge,
- 14 New York & Melbourne: Cambridge University Press / London: Fontana
- 15 Paperbacks/.
- 16 Grucza, F. (1983) *Zagadnienia metalingwistyki. Lingwistyka – jej przedmiot,*
- 17 *lingwistyka stosowana* [Questions of metalinguistics. Linguistics– its
- 18 subject matter, applied linguistics]. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo
- 19 Naukowe,
- 20 Haugen, E. (1972) Language ecology. In *The Ecology of Language. Essays by*
- 21 *Einar Haugen*. Ed. A. S. Dil, Stanford, CA: University of Stanford Press,
- 22 324–339,

- 1 Hauser, M. D., N. Chomsky & W. T. Fitch, 2002. The faculty of language:  
2 What is it, who has it, and how did it evolve. *Science* 298(5598): 1569–  
3 1579.
- 4 Hjelmslev, L. (1953 [1943]) *Prolegomena to a Theory of Language*. Trans. F.  
5 J. Whitfield. Baltimore, MD: Waverly Press [*Omkring sprogteoriens*  
6 *grundlæggelse*. København: Bianco Lunos bogtrykkeri].
- 7 Hockett, C. F. (1958) *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.
- 8 Humboldt, W. von. (1988 [1836]) *On Language. On the Diversity of Human*  
9 *Language Construction and its Influence on the Mental Development of*  
10 *the Human Species*. Ed. M. Losonsky. Trans. P. Heath. Cambridge, UK,  
11 New York, NY: Cambridge University Press [*Über die Verschiedenheit*  
12 *des menschlichen Sprachbaus und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige*  
13 *Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts*. Hrsg. A. von. Humboldt. Berlin:  
14 Dümmler].
- 15 Jelinek, M. H. (1913) *Geschichte der neuhochdeutschen Grammatik von den*  
16 *Anfängen bis auf Adelung*. Erster Halbband. Heidelberg: C. Winters.
- 17 Kant, I. (1997 [1785]) *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Trans. M.  
18 Gregor Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [*Grundlegung zur*  
19 *Metaphysik der Sitten*. Riga: J. H. Hartknoch].
- 20 Kull, K. (2000) Copy versus translate, Meme versus sign: Development of  
21 biological textuality. *European Journal for Semiotic Studies* 12(1): 101–  
22 120.

- 1 Lenneberg, E. H. (1967) *Biological Foundations of Language*. With  
2 appendices by N. Chomsky & O. Marx. New York, NY: John Wiley &  
3 Sons.
- 4 Saussure, F. De. (1922 /1916/) *Cours de linguistique générale*. Publié par C.  
5 Bally et A. Sechehaye. Avec la collaboration de A. Riedlinger. Deuxième  
6 édition (Second edition). Paris: Payot/ Lausanne & Paris: Payot/.
- 7 Saussure, F. De. (1959 [1916]) *Course in General Linguistics*. Trans. W.  
8 Baskin, W. New York, NY, Toronto, ON, London, UK: McGraw-Hill  
9 [*Cours de linguistique générale*. Publié par C. Bally et A. Sechehaye. Avec  
10 la collaboration de A. Riedlinger. Lausanne & Paris: Payot.
- 11 Saussure, F. de. (1972 /1916/) *Cours de linguistique générale*. Édition critique  
12 de T. de Mauro. Paris: Grande bibliothèque Payot / Publié par C. Bally et  
13 A. Sechehaye. Avec la collaboration de A. Riedlinger. Lausanne & Paris:  
14 Payot.
- 15 Saussure, F. de. (1983 [1972 /1916/]) *Course in General Linguistics* (From the  
16 critical French edition of T. de Mauro). Trans. R. Harris, R.. London, UK:  
17 Duckworth [*Cours de linguistique générale*. Édition critique de T. de  
18 Mauro. Paris: Grande bibliothèque Payot /Publié par C. Bally et A.  
19 Sechehaye. Avec la collaboration de A. Riedlinger.: Paris: Payot /  
20 Lausanne & Paris: Payot/].
- 21 Saville-Troike, M. (1982) *The Ethnography of Communication*. An  
22 Introduction. Oxford & New York, NY: Basil Blackwell.
- 23 Sebeok, T. A. (1981) *The Play of Musement*. Bloomington, IN Indiana  
24 University Press.



- 1 Stewart, W. A. (1968) A sociolinguistic typology for describing national
- 2 multilingualism. In *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. Ed. J. A.
- 3 Fishman. The Hague & Paris: Mouton, 531–545.
- 4 Author. (2003) *Epistemological Perspectives on Linguistic Semiotics*. Frankfurt
- 5 am Main, (etc.): Peter Lang.
- 6 Author. (2014) *Lectures on the Epistemology of Semiotics*. Wrocław:
- 7 Philological School of Higher Education in Wrocław Publishing.
- 8 Author. (2016) *From Grammar to Discourse: Towards a Solipsistic Paradigm*
- 9 *of Semiotics*. Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University Press.
- 10 Weisgerber, L. (1953) *Vom Weltbild der deutschen Sprache*. 1 Halbband. *Die*
- 11 *Inhaltbezogene Grammatik*. Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann.
- 12 Weisgerber, L. (1955) Das Wort in der Welt als sprachliche Aufgabe der
- 13 Menschheit. *Sprachforum* 1: 10–19.
- 14 Whitehead, A. N. (1925) *Science and the Modern World: Lowell Lectures*.
- 15 New York, NY: Free Press,
- 16 Yngve, V. H. 1996. *From Grammar to Science. New Foundations for General*
- 17 *Linguistics*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 18