

Teaching and learning contrastive grammar in Foreign Language Departments: the example of French and Polish demonstratives¹/*Para um ensino/aprendizagem de gramática contrastiva em departamentos de língua estrangeira: o exemplo do demonstrativo em francês e em polonês*

Joanna Górnkiewicz *

Universidade Jagellonne de Cracovie, Polônia.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9375-4896>

Received: february 20th, 2020. **Approved:** march 10th, 2020.

How to cite this article:

GÓRNIKIEWICZ, Joanna. Teaching and learning contrastive grammar in Foreign Language Departments: the example of French and Polish demonstratives. **Revista Letras Raras**, [S.l.], v. 9, n. 1, 2020. p. Port. 168-183 / Eng. 165-181. ISSN 2317-2347, UFCG: Campina Grande, 2020.

ABSTRACT

In this article, the author, a lecturer and researcher in the Department of Foreign Languages at one Polish university, shares her teaching experience in contrastive French-Polish grammar. Having taken the utility of the subject for granted, she wonders about the appropriate program and bibliographic references. Using the example of one word class, the author shows that even where two languages have the same categories, there can be variation in terms of how they are used by speakers. This question is not emphasized enough in the available contrastive grammars.

KEYWORDS: contrastive grammar, university course, student, teacher, demonstratives

RESUMO

Neste artigo, com base numa classe de palavras escolhida, a autora compartilha sua experiência como professora-pesquisadora encarregada das aulas de gramática contrastiva franco-polonesa, em um departamento de língua estrangeira de uma universidade polonesa. Tendo em conta a utilidade do assunto para a matéria, ela questiona o conteúdo e as referências bibliográficas a serem propostas. A autora mostra que, embora as duas línguas tenham formas comparáveis, a utilização que é feita delas não é necessariamente idêntica, assunto que as obras comparativas disponíveis não apresentam.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: gramática contrastiva, cursos universitários, aprendiz, professor, classe dos demonstrativos

RESUMÉ

Dans cet article, à partir d'une classe de mots choisie, l'auteur partage son expérience d'enseignant-chercheur chargé de cours de grammaire contrastive polono-française dans un département de langues étrangères d'une université polonaise. Tenant l'utilité de la matière pour acquise, elle s'interroge sur le contenu et les références bibliographiques à proposer. Elle montre que même si les deux langues disposent de formes comparables, l'usage qui en est fait n'est pas forcément identique, ce que les ouvrages comparatifs disponibles ne mettent pas en avant.

MOTS-CLES: grammaire contrastive, cursus universitaire, apprenant, enseignant, classe de démonstratifs

¹ *Pour un enseignement/apprentissage de la grammaire contrastive dans les départements de langues étrangères : l'exemple du démonstratif en français et en polonais.* » Translated from Portuguese by Rafael Sobral and reviewed by Magnólia Cruz. Published for the first time in the Journal *Synergies pays riverains de la Baltique* n° 12 - 2018 p. 11-24. In : <https://gerflint.fr/Base/Baltique12/gornikiewicz.pdf>

 joanna.gornikiewicz@uj.edu.pl

 <http://dx.doi.org/10.35572/rlr.v1i9.1739>

1. Introduction

Generally defined by linguistic researches as the description of differences and similarities, at least, between two languages (KOCZERHAN, 2009), contrastive (applied) grammar is seen both as a chance for students and teachers (NEMSER, 1975), and as an obstacle in a foreign language acquisition and teaching (KRÓL-MARKEFKA, 2008). However, which role must be given in foreign language departments where the teacher is in face of a very specific public? At first, students are simple learners and are graduated to become teachers or specific users of foreign languages, for instance the case of translators and interpreters. For a contrastive grammar to be useful to them, it should elucidate the contrasts in the structural and functional aspects between the two languages, in order to make them able to remove occasional interferences. In contrast, it must be taken into account the pragmatic and linguistic aspects (JAZOWY-JARMUŁ, 2014) next to its textual one, for the final aim of producing utterances not only grammatically correct, but also perceived as natural in a foreign language (WÓJCIK, 1974).

The differences that come up between Polish and French, as much as those ones that show up among corresponding descriptive systems, were the object of some publications until now. However, most of them are papers or scientific books destined to experts and, therefore, not very well known by the general public. These researches deal mainly with some detailed problems, while grammars which present global descriptions for the two languages remain in a relative lower number. In our contribution, based on the example of a chosen word class, we will try to answer the following questions: may these generally used works to be used as didactic books for the teaching and learning of French as a Foreign Language in the university milieu? Must they be used as reference books to the contrastive grammar course? And, in case of a negative answer, how to organize the course (in which content and references to choose) for the students to obtain a greater achievement and do not fall off on new pitfalls?

2. Available works

The first book with a comparative approach emerged in Poland at the end of the 1950s, in the collection of the Scientific Society of Lodz. It is the *Structure of French and Polish Languages*, by Bolesław Kielski, made of two parts (1957, 1960) and finished with the *Dictionary of French and Polish grammatical terminology* (1959). All three volumes were written in Polish.



<http://dx.doi.org/10.35572/rlr.v1i9.1739>

The *Structure* work is not considered a grammar by its author. We found out a report about this in the Preface of the *Dictionary*: “there is no French and Polish contrastive grammar, and it is yet doubtful if the project must emerge (to compare the structure of the languages is a different thing)” (KIELSKI, 1957, p. 7, own translation²). Thus, the credit for being the first author of this kind of publication is from Stanisław Gniadek, one of the draftsmen of the Kielski’s *Dictionary*. His French and Polish contrastive grammar, written in French and edited by the national publisher PWN, would probably be useful to Romanic Philology students in Poland and to the French Slavists (GNIADEK, 1979, p. 7). The most recent research was made by Katarzyna Kwapisz-Osadnik, who published in the year of 2007 a Polish comparative outline entitled *Podstawowe wiadomości z gramatyki polskiej i francuskiej* (French and Polish grammar book). The target audience is broader (KWAPISZ-OSADNIK, 2007, p. 7) and even exceed the Kielski’s *Dictionary*’s (1959, p. 5), which is not intended to Romanic Philologists. On the other hand, the aim is plainer:

The form of the book seems more like a juxtaposition of grammatical notions than a broad comparative study. The point is to indicate similarities and differences in Polish and French terminologies, and not to study deeply or to describe linguistic phenomena. (KWAPISZ-OSADNIK, 2007, p. 8, own translation).

3. An example: the demonstrative

To support our point of view, we chose a word class whose frequency of occurrence and diversity of applications in a literary work has taken us to examine more carefully the existing didactic books, as much as the possible needs and public expectations about the content of available books and suggested teaching. It has to do with the demonstrative word class, and particularly with determiner demonstratives, very much present in the text *Courrier Stud*, by Antoine de Saint-Exupéry.

These demonstratives and comparable forms in Polish are interesting in three aspects, according to our opinion:

- on the system level because of: a) its form, b) its nature and syntactic function [agents that transmit an additional indication (GREVISSE-GOOSSE, 2016) to the French people *versus* elements of characterization to Polish];
- on the pragmatic and textual level because of its occasional correspondence (or not).

² **Translator’s Note:** All translations from Polish into French were made by the author, such as this one.



<http://dx.doi.org/10.35572/rlr.v1i9.1739>

French demonstratives find their place in the word class of determiners (or in determiner or non-qualifier adjectives, according to the terminologies) – to the series of *ce* (*ce livre*) –, or in the pronouns' – to the series of *celui* (*celui que j'ai lu*). For these distinctive forms, Polish opposes a unique series: the demonstratives “which serve both to adjective and pronominal use” (GNIADK, 1979, p. 81). This series is classified in traditional Polish grammars under the label of “adjectival pronoun”, e.g. *zaimek przymiotny*. First and foremost, it has to do with the forms that mark up the differences of distance in space or time *ten* vs *tamten* (close and distant forms according to Kielski (1959, p. 17, 63-64), variable in number and gender (Polish has three genders). These forms are complemented by the literary variable *ów* (anaphoric) and the adjective pronoun *taki*, making up a second subsystem that is used in reference mechanisms of recognition (PAPIERZ, 2003, p. 72) (which will not be analysed here). In contrast, it must be noted that the simple form may denote, both as isolated and as a nominal group part, close and distant objects from the interlocutor, as they are morphological complex forms (*tam* [lâ] + *ten*) that can only refer to distant objects. In relation to French, it has an asymmetrical system in which the simple forms, firstly neutral according to the distinction between closeness and distance, and the compound forms by *ce N-ci/là* are much less frequent, where this distinction is explicitly marked (JONASSON, 2002, p. 111). Nowadays, the forms with the particle *là* are opposed to the simple forms that mark up closeness in practice, while the form with *ci* is used when there is actually a contrast that needs to be marked up (JONASSON, 2002, p. 111).

Thereby, we find out the forms that interest us divided into different word classes, and only Kielski (1959: 114, 117-118) warns the reader against a possible misunderstanding, specifying in the entry of *Pronoun*, in his *Dictionary*, that the French term has a more restricted extension (the pronouns replace a nameⁱⁱ) than there of the *zaimek*. In fact, Polish pronouns are divided into four subclasses, accordingly to the role they perform, either as a name, or an adjective, or a number, or an adverb. However, none of the authors suggest the criteria which are in the roots of terminological differences between French grammar and traditional Polish grammarⁱⁱⁱ. And these differences remain defying readers of French and Polish languages.

4 The uses for demonstratives according to grammars

4.1 *Le tertium comparationis*: the three comparisons



<http://dx.doi.org/10.35572/rlr.v1i9.1739>

We will now turn on to what grammars approach, generally a little or not at all: to the uses of demonstratives in both languages, that is, to their semantic and textual value. On one hand, these are the most interesting aspects (PAPIERZ, 2003, p. 13), and, on the other hand, their consideration will provide a full comparative analysis (KOCZERHAN, 2009, p. 17). For that, at least partly, it is necessary to give up on the temptation of granting a privileged status to one of the languages confronted, and appeal to some notions considered universal, immutable principles that must be in the roots of each contrastive grammar. Thus, the notion of reference (PADUČEVA, 1992, p. 15) will be taken into account, as much as the notion of *deixis* and the definite/indefinite nature of the referent (PAPIERZ, 2003, p. 12, 16). Concerning this last category, though, the indefinite nature of an element must be understood differently in a language deprived of explicit marks from such an opposition (articles or some other morphological marks for such purposes) (PISARKOWA, 1969, p. 47).

4.2. The referential instruction

According to traditional definitions, the demonstrative, as its own name suggests, should “demonstrate an object” (DUBOIS et al., 1999). In Poland, the semantic criteria are still strongly rooted in school grammar (SYNOWIEC, 2001, p. 98), heiress of traditional grammar, and to which the criteria of demonstration is definitive for the whole pronoun class (SZOBER, 1969, p. 18-19; JODŁOWSKI, 1973, p. 53), or enable more specifically to define the demonstrative (JODŁOWSKI, 1973, p. 47). In both languages, we also recognize likewise the opposition of two types of application: deictic and anaphoric, called that *in praesentia*, and whose receiver, according to Bühler’s metaphor, is guided “in the realm of what is present”, in the situation of enunciation or in the textual context.

Nowadays, the lack of definitions and traditional distributions do not need to be demonstrated anymore. According to the French researchers, whose point of view we will use, the privileged role must be given to the context of enunciation, necessary to the identification of the referent from the demonstrative expression (for instance, KLEIBER, 1983, 1990; CORBLIN, 1987; DE MULDER, 1998; GARY-PRIEUR; LEONARD, 1998). The demonstrative is qualified as a direct designator (KLEIBER, 1990), semantically incomplete, invariably bringing some news through contextualization. As such, its nature would be purely deictic (DE MULDER, 1998, p. 21), and the only question that comes up is the one of knowing which kind of *dêixis* it is (KLEIBER,



2003, p. 37). In a comparative perspective, we have to know if the languages analysed use demonstratives in the same way.

4.3. The uses of the Polish (adjective) demonstrative identified in contrastive grammars

In Polish, the name does not need to be preceded by a determiner up-to-date. It is implied, such as by Gniadek (1979, p. 73) points out, that “the article does not exist, and the predestination, when necessary, is achieved by the use of pronominal adjectives”. However, in his *Grammar*, the only observation about the use of demonstratives in Polish is concerned to their occasional use as counterparts to the definite article “which from time to time has the meaning of the demonstrative, e.g. *de la sorte – w ten sposób*” (p. 76). These applications, qualified by Pisarkowa (1969, p. 56) as phraseological, constitute the only context which implies the presence of the Polish demonstrative^{iv}. In turn, Kwapisz-Osadnik (2007, p. 40) states that even if Polish does not have articles, its role is sometimes fulfilled by the demonstrative, for instance *Podaj mi ten nóż – Donne-moi le couteau!* (See also KIELSKI, 1960, p. 52). Concerning Kielski, he was the only one to include and support by concrete examples specific observations over the role performed by the Polish demonstrative:

There, where French generalizes by the use of the indefinite article, Polish allows the use of a(n) (adjective) demonstrative pronoun, although in sporadic manner, e.g.: *'Pracuje jak ten wół, 'Któż to sprawił jak nie ci huligani?'* (KIELSKI, 1960, p. 54).

The pronominal forms *ten, ci*, are here “functionally weak and deprived of accent”, and constitute the counterpart of the definite article. The semantic value is also neutralized in the exclamatory structures of the kind: *'Oj ta zima!', 'Ach ten dziwak!'* (Eh, cet hiver! Ah! cet original!), or where, in French, frequently appears an exclamatory determiner (KIELSKI, 1960, p. 55), though the demonstrative is not removed, for example *Cette folle!* (MARIVAUX) (RIEGEL et al., 2016, p. 691).

5 The referential value of determiner demonstratives

However, what about the applications recognized in both languages? Do they correspond to each other? Contrastive grammars ignore this problem, which enquires their usefulness in the



teaching and learning French as a Foreign Language and restricts them considerably, even in contrastive grammar classes^v. In contrast, some examples are enough to show that speakers from both languages not always explore the forms provided to them in the same way.

In our study, which tries to fulfil partially the existing gaps in the contrastive literature, we will refer to the deixis of Bühler (2009). We will concentrate in the reference established in the axis of Text – Reality, setting aside for the lack of space another component of the applications *in praesentia* (derivative deixis), that is, the reference established in the axis of Text – Text. On the other hand, we will take into account the applications in cases whose pursuit of the referent cannot be made outside of itself, the so-called applications *in absentia*, that is, the ones which correspond to the deixis *am Phantasma* (the second one in derivative suggesting manners). Therefore, our attention will be in the incomplete descriptions correlated or not with a gesture, but invariably followed by its linguistic associate, both in deictic manner pattern and in deictic imaginary reference (TOPOLIŃSKA, 1984, 312).

5.1. Applications *in praesentia* or the deictic manner pattern

a) Applications ostensibly performed

The demonstrative is, or may be, followed by an additional index: “finger stretched, head movement, or some basic glance” (KLEIBER, 1983, p. 104), which refers to assignable objects by ostensible enunciative space. For instance, this conversation between two pilots, in which the more experienced one tells the novice with a map how to overfly Spain in safety:

– Écoute-moi donc : s’il fait beau, tu passes tout droit. Mais s’il fait mauvais, si tu voles bas, tu appuies à gauche, tu t’engages dans cette vallée. (CS, p. 8)³.

– Słuchaj więc : jeśli będzie ładnie lecisz prosto przed siebie. Ale jeśli pogoda się zepsuje, jeśli będziesz leciał nisko, bierzesz kurs na lewo, na tę dolinę. (PP, p. 37)⁴.

According to Topolińska (1984, p. 312), the presence of the linguistic associate of gesture – for the demonstrative *ten* – is mandatory in Polish, on utterances in which the

³ – Listen to me, then: if the weather is good, you go straight. But if it is bad, if you fly low, you press to the left, and enters this valley. (CS, p. 8).

⁴ – Then, listen: if you fly well, go ahead. But if the weather falls down, if you are flying low, follow the course to the left into this valley. (PP, p. 37).



predication occurs upon the identity of the referent, in a way that the opposition is not necessarily explicit. In relation to the gesture itself, it is indispensable in case of some being or various objects which must be identified among a lot others (on a map, there are a lot of valleys that sap the mountainous terrain); for the most, it is optional when the problem of reference recognition does not emerge. Hence:

- Qui a goupillé ce capot?
- Moi. (CS, p. 5)⁵.

As we have finished discussing the preparation for the take-off of a correspondence aprplane, the leader of the runway that “spin around the manoeuvre” do not need to join the gesture to the word in order to make them know which object he aims at. According to Topolińska (1981, p. 42), in Polish, during a situation in which the nominal group refers to an object easily identified by the interlocutor, the use of the demonstrative is justified; meanwhile, it cannot be said that its use is systematic^{vi}. Moreover, the Polish translation of this passage endorses our purpose:

- Kto zamocowywał nakrywa silnika?
- Ja. (PP, p. 32)⁶.

In Polish, a language with “no determiners” (no updaters), the information over the reference is given by the semantic structure of the sentence. Thus, in our example, the translator, in order to facilitate the repository reference to the reader (the manoeuvres would not need this reference), added some precision in the form of name complement: *nakrywa silnika* (hood of the engine).

b) Works performed by no gestures

The demonstrative can also denote non-material referents over which we cannot point out. This is the particular case of temporal expressions. In French, demonstratives are used to record utterances in time, and in relation to the present of the speaker. Similarly, in Polish, *ten* appears frequently in syntactic groups by working as time complements, and “demonstrates/shows the shortest distance” (PISARKOWA, 1969, p. 57). However, speakers from both languages analysed do not explore the systemic possibilities in the same way. If in

⁵ – Who fixed this hood?

– Me. (SC, p. 5).

⁶ – Who built the hood of the engine?

– Me. (PP, p. 32).

 <http://dx.doi.org/10.35572/rlr.v1i9.1739>

French (from the Hexagon), “when it comes to the day we are in, we use *ce matin* and *ce soir*” (GREVISSE-GOOSE, 2016: 1045 c) 1º), in Polish, the deictic adverb “today” (*dziś, dzisiaj*) is the only appropriate one^{vii}, such as in this advice given to Geneviève by his son’s doctor:

Vous vous fatiguez trop. Ce n’est pas sérieux. Je vous donne l’ordre de sortir *ce* après-midi. (CS, p. 27).

Pani jest przemęczona. To nic poważnego. Polecam pani wyjść *dziś* po południu z domu. (PP, p. 32)⁷.

c) Applications directly performed

It is the demonstrative reference (not by gesture) to an object not present which may be identified based on the elements from the enunciation context in relation to the occurrence of demonstrative description (KLEIBER, 1990, p. 160). Thus, in the example below, by no introduction or referent’s effective presence, the runway leader waiting for the daily shipping may very well to say both in French and Polish:

Ce pilote a toujours du retard.

Ten pilot ciągle się spóźnia.⁸

If he can make it, that is because the referent is identifiable, based on the enunciation context – the place where the sentence is pronounced (at the airport) and the enunciation moment, which may: a) coincide with the expected arrival of the airplane (surprise); b) be prior to it (argument in favor of “there is still time”); or c) subsequent (impatience, irritation).

5.2 The applications *in absentia* or the deictic imaginary reference

Based on this conceptualization, it is found different researches in the literature in which the search for the referent cannot be made outside of its own expression. The deictic core responsible for the demonstrative apprehension and indicator of point of view (KLEIBER, 2003, p. 41) is seen as displaced, the speaker cannot assume this role anymore. The *am Phantasma* deixis is “a deixis whose punctuation is made in mental spaces or areas”, and makes the movement in two realms to be possible: the imaginary and memorial realms (BÜHLER, 2009;

⁷ You are too tired. It is not serious. I order you to go out this afternoon. (SC, 27).

You are overloaded. It is nothing serious. I recommend you to go out of this house this afternoon. (PP, p. 32).

⁸ This pilot is always late.

This pilot is still late.

 <http://dx.doi.org/10.35572/rlr.v1i9.1739>

KLEIBER, 2003, p. 39). All examples below are in the memory domain. Although that is still very broad to explore, we privilege the specific reference by requesting the memory of “tu”.

In both languages, the demonstrative appears in contexts whose speaker and receiver share some common knowledge over a situation, or have an experience in common (TOPOLIŃSKA, 1981, p. 45; KLEIBER, 2003, p. 44). Hence:

Ah la Grèce, cette mer, ces îles! (WILMET, 1986, *apud* KLEIBER, 2003, p. 35).

Ależ ten wczorajszy gość był nudny. (TOPOLIŃSKA, 1981, p. 46)⁹.

It refers to a travel which was made alongside or separately, though at the same place, or refers to a night spent alongside or even over which it was informed previously to the interlocutor. It is possible to add to them the messages which belong to the terminology of Topolińska (1981, p. 46) from the series “te souviens-tu?”:

Ah te souviens-tu de ce prof de maths qui mettait des bonnes notes à toutes les copies? (KLEIBER, 2003, p. 44).

Czy pamiętasz tego chłopca w czerwonej czapeczce, który się bawił wczoraj przed domem? (TOPOLIŃSKA, 1981, p. 46)¹⁰.

Moreover, references to some information read or heard in the media, over which is supposed some knowledge by a broad public (TOPOLIŃSKA, 1981, p. 46), or to some situations for rumours that happen in closed environments:

Avez-vous entendu parler de cette île bretonne 100% autosuffisante en énergie? (Facebook page from Mr. Mondialisation, October 9th, 2017).

Słyszaleś o tym nowym podinspektorze ? podobno ma przyjść do nas na szefa wydziału. (ZAJAS, *Z otchłani*, 2015)¹¹.

Such as Kleiber (2003, p. 44) points out, “it is only in the demonstrative case that is possible to have an impression of some view or direct perception, or at least of a direct experience from the entity denoted”. He highlights that “it is the ‘perception’ or speaker’s experience in the past which is found reactivated”. With the definite (or with no determiner in

⁹ Ah, Greece, this sea, these islands! (WILMET, 1986, *apud* KLEIBER, 2003, p. 35).

But the guest of yesterday was annoying. (TOPOLIŃSKA, 1981, p. 46).

¹⁰ Ah, do you remember that mathematics teacher who gave good grades in all copies? (KLEIBER, 2003, p. 44).

Do you remember that boy with red cap who was playing outside home yesterday? (TOPOLIŃSKA, 1981, p. 46).

¹¹ Have you ever heard about this Breton island 100% self-sufficient? (Facebook page from Mr. Mondialisation, October 9th, 2017).

Have you ever heard about this new sub inspector? He must come to us supposedly as the head of the department (ZAJAS, *from the abyss*, 2015).

 <http://dx.doi.org/10.35572/rlr.v1i9.1739>

Polish), there would not have changes in point of view, and the past would be reached from the situation of enunciation. In the *Courrier Sud*, this application is not peripheral:

Te souviens-tu de ce premier départ? Nous l'avons fait ensemble [...] Le moteur faisait ce bruit dense qui existe seul et derrière lequel le paysage passe en silence comme un film. Et ce froid, car nous volions haut: ces villes prises dans la glace. (CS, p. 18).

Czy pamiętasz nasz pierwszy wyjazd? Byliśmy wtedy razem [...] Zdawało się nie istnieć nic poza gęstym szumem silnika, a pod nim krajobraz przesuwiał się bezgłośnie jak film. I ten chłód – bo lecieliśmy wysoko: miasta zakrzepłe w lodzie. (PP, p. 32)¹².

This passage refers explicitly to the common memory of Bernis, the letter's author, and the anonymous pilot-narrator, his dual (ODAERT, 2009), who is the recipient. From the four French demonstratives, the Polish translator kept only one and he was not wrong. It would be stylistically unsustainable to make them all correspondences in Polish (only because of the typological peculiarities of this language^{viii}), and yet the memory reference did not disappear completely. The first demonstrative, the one whose interpretation was facilitated by the subsequent context, was replaced by the inclusive possessive *nasz*, which demonstrates explicitly that the object denoted must be perceived based on a past situation, by constituting the common experience of the interlocutors. In respect to the other suppressed demonstratives, in the original, they are part of the nominal groups supplemented by elements that facilitate the identification of the speech object, which makes superfluous the additional determination. As a result, *gesty zsum silnika* loses this personal touch from the original and becomes generalized, both to all flights alongside and individually. The remembrance is activated by the *ten chłód* syntagma. In the sentence it appears, the remembrance of the logical cause relation contributes to characterize the referent of *ce froid*, in the meaning of mobilizing the general knowledge over the decline in temperature related to the rise in high heights. Once it is implemented to a world that belongs to the past of the encoder, the reader will not have extreme temperatures, considering next *miasta zakrzepłe w lodzie* – these cities taken by ice – as some metaphorical illustration of the physical feeling that was felt and memorized, but not as a real memory.

¹² Do you remember that first departure? We did that together [...] The engine made this thick noise that exists alone, and from behind which the landscape passes silently like a movie. And this cold, for we were flying high: these cities taken by ice. (CS, p. 18).

Do you remember our first travel? We were together, then [...] it seemed there was nothing beyond a thick rattling of the engine, and under it the landscape moved silently like a movie. And this coldness – for we flew high: cities clotted in ice. (PP, p. 32).



The analysis of this example shows that even if certain transfers in the mother tongue are not removed in advance, they must be considered in a broader (textual) perspective. It is also into this aspect that we must touch upon future and professional users of both languages.

Conclusion

The usefulness of comparative grammar teaching in modern languages departments must not be demonstrated. It is confirmed by the mandatory nature of the courses dedicated to this subject. On the other hand, questions related to the content and occasional bibliographic references remain opened.

Firstly, bearing in mind that the students do a parallel course in French descriptive grammar (revisited because of the linguistic progress), the approach provided to them in contrastive grammar must not swerve a lot, neither on a terminological level, nor on the proposed classifications. However, the comparative researches available are not very recent (the last one chronologically published do not search to renew the proposal). This approach must be, at the same time, “juxtaposed” by not much difficulties to the traditional description of Polish, the only one known by Polish bachelors. This is one more reason (besides the undeniable advantages of any personal work) to which, in our teaching practice responsible for this kind of course, we encourage students to develop a comparative work based on Polish and French monolingual grammars. We hope to the future that they can find the answers to possible questions (or at least to some of them, because there are also problems that are only stressed in contrast to another language).

Certainly, a simple comparison of forms and categories cannot be satisfying, even if it is not useful (in fact, the commonest failure in relation to the demonstrative determiner is the creation of a non-existent female plural form, *cettes*, inasmuch as the Polish inflection and/or Polish regularities in French; in the morphosyntax course, the students mistake systematically the determiners with the pronominal correspondents). The second aspect over which we tried to keep student’s attention on is related to the differences and similarities in the applications and available forms in both languages, either in the syntactical construction level^{ix} and in the semantic and pragmatical values’ level. We hope to have demonstrated that even if two languages have comparative forms, the correspondence between them, such as Jonasson (2002, p. 111) skilfully pointed out, is not necessarily perfect, and it would be good for students to have consciousness



over this kind of difficulty. As we saw, this problem is not highlighted in the literature available. While it is expected for some more efficient comparative grammar, or even for a comparative stylistic study which aims at the possible difficulties that may come up during all learning and working stages with a foreign language, it is always possible to appeal to works that are specialized, comparative, or translational (these last ones are experiencing now their full growth and provide interesting observations and explanations). And this is the path we give some privilege to, as we illustrated in the section 3.4.

References

- BÜHLER, K. 1934/2009. *Théorie du langage*. Paris : Agone.
- CORBLIN, F. 1987, *Indéfini, défini et démonstratif*. Genève/Paris : Droz.
- DE MULDER, W. 1998. « Du sens des démonstratifs à la construction d'univers ». *Langue française*, n° 120, p. 21-32.
- DUBOIS, J. et al. 1999. *Dictionnaire de linguistique et des sciences du langage*. Paris : Larousse.
- GARY-PRIEUR, M-N. LEONARD, M. 1998. « Le démonstratif dans les textes et dans la langue ». *Langue française*, n° 120, p. 5-20.
- GNIADK, S. 1979. *Grammaire contrastive franco-polonaise*. Warszawa: PWN.
- GREVISSE, M., GOOSSE, A. 2016. *Le bon usage. Grammaire française*. 16.éd. Bruxelles : De Boeck/Duculot.
- JAZOWY-JARMUL, M. 2014. « Czy gramatyka kontrastywna jest potrzebna tłumaczowi? ». *inTRAlinea. online translation journal*, n° spécial, *Challenges in Translation Pedagogy*.
- JODLOWSKI, S. 1973. *Ogólnojęzykoznawcza charakterystyka zaimka*. Warszawa : PWN.
- JONASSON, K. 2002. Références déictiques dans un texte narratif. Comparaison entre le français et le suédois. In : *Référence discursive dans les langues romanes et slaves*. Lublin : UMCS.
- KIELSKI, B. 1957. *La structure des langues française et polonaise étudiées à la lumière de l'analyse comparative*. Łódź : SSL.
- KIELSKI, B. 1959. *Słownik terminologii gramatycznej francuskiej i polskiej*. Wrocław : Ossolineum.
- Kielski, B. 1960. *Struktura języków francuskiego i polskiego w świetle analizy porównawczej*. Cz. 2, *Z zagadnień nauki o zdaniu*. Wrocław : Ossolineum.
- KLEIBER, G. 1983. « Les démonstratifs (dé)montrent-ils ? Sur le sens référentiel des adjectifs et pronoms démonstratifs ». *Le français moderne*, n° 51(2), p. 99-117.
- KLEIBER, G. 1990. « Sur l'anaphore associative : article défini et adjectif démonstratif ». *Rivista di Linguistica*, n° 2(1), p. 155-175.



- KLEIBER, G. 2003. « Adjectifs démonstratifs et point de vue ». *Cahiers de praxématique*, n° 41, p. 33-54.
- KOCZERHAN, M. 2009. *Podstawy językoznawstwa konfrontatywnego*. Opole : Nowik.
- KRÓL-MARKEFKA, A. 2008. « Some structural considerations on the use of contrastive data in teaching English articles ». *Studia Iagellonicae Cracoviensis*, n° 125, p. 103-112.
- KWAPISZ-OSADNIK, K. 2007. *Podstawowe wiadomości z gramatyki polskiej i francuskiej: szkic porównawczy*. Katowice : Wyd. UŚ.
- LASKOWSKI, R. 1999. Zagadnienia ogólne morfologii. In : *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego*. Warszawa: PWN.
- NEMSER, W. 1975. Problems and prospects in contrastive linguistics. In : *Modern linguistic and language teaching*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- ODAERT, O. 2005. « Saint-Exupéry et son double ». *Image [&] Narrative [e-journal]*, n° X/2 (25).
- PADUCEVA, E. V. 1992. *Wypowiedź i jej odniesienie do rzeczywistości*. Warszawa : PWN.
- PAPIERZ, M. 2003. *Zaimki w języku i tekście. Studium słowacko-polskie*. Kraków : Universitas.
- PISARKOWA, K. 1969. *Funkcje składniowe polskich zaimków odmiennych*. Wrocław : Ossolineum.
- RIEGEL, M., PELLAT, J.-C., RIOUL, R. 2016. *Grammaire méthodique du français*. 6.éd. Paris : PUF.
- SYNOWIEC, H. 2001. Fleksja i nauka o częściach mowy. In : *Nauka o języku polskim w zreformowanej szkole*. Warszawa : Nowa Era.
- SZOBER, S. 1969. *Gramatyka języka polskiego*. 11.éd. Warszawa : PWN.
- TOPOLIŃSKA, Z. 1981. *Remarks on the Slavic Noun Phrase*. Wrocław : Ossolineum.
- TOPOLIŃSKA, Z. 1984. Składnia grupy imiennej. In : *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego*. Warszawa : PWN.
- WÓJCIK, T. 1974. « Miejsce gramatyki kontrastywnej w procesie nauczania języka obcego ». *Studia Rossica Posnaniensia*, n° 6, p. 159-169.

Literary Texts

Saint-Exupéry, A. 1953, *Courrier Sud*. In : OEuvres. Gallimard. [CS]

Saint-Exupéry, A. 1968, *Poczta na Południe*. Trad. A. Olędzka-Frybesowa. Warszawa : PWN.
[PP]



<http://dx.doi.org/10.35572/rlr.v1i9.1739>

Notes

ⁱ Gniadek (1979, p. 7) appreciates the work of Kielski, but highlights the need to “accommodate this confrontation”, aged at that time by some decades, “to the progresses of linguistics (...) both in relation to the methods and to the concrete acquisitions in French and Polish linguistics”.

ⁱⁱ To look here, actually, for the traditional definition of pronoun. For criticism over it, look for Riegel *et al.* (2016, p. 358), for instance.

ⁱⁱⁱ The retained criteria by traditional grammar, in their definition for general word class of pronoun, are mostly semantic (the nature of “non mnemonic”) (JODŁOWSKI, 1973) and inflectional (variable nature or not, type of paradigm, and declination), and even the word class a lot heterogeneous, both from the semantic and morphological point of views. Nonetheless, the researches focused on reference values have shown that pronouns form a lexical and semantic class in which the homogeneity is justified by the referencing role of its representatives (PADUČEVA, 1992, p. 17).

^{iv} The names in such expressions (time or manner complements) are not able to function without a demonstrative that “confirms and documents” their defined nature and with which they form fixed groups.

^v For some fairness questioning, we always highlight that monolingual grammar authors are not very much emphatic about this subject.

^{vi} What may be demonstrated by dissecting the examples provided by the author. If the demonstrative denoting only one man in *Ten pan mnie denerwuje* (Ce monsieur m'énerve) seems natural to us with no obligation, it is on another manner in *Daj mi ten ołówek* (Donne-moi le [ce] crayon), pronounced in the situation where among the interlocutors only one visible object corresponds to the definition of the word “crayon”. In fact, if we prefer *Daj mi ołówek*, this is because it is only possible to illustrate it by “le crayon qui est devant/entre nous” (tautology). However, according to ourselves, the paraphrase that would be more appropriate to *ten pan* has more marks of situational anchoring: “ce monsieur qui a parlé ou agi de cette façon”, and not more generally “ce monsieur qui est ici avec nous, ce monsieur qui participe à l'acte de communication”, such as proposed by Topolińska (1981, p. 43). This kind of observation is done “live” to comment on a copy or a precise behaviour.

^{vii} In Belgium, it is possible to say normally *aujourd'hui matin* ou *aujourd'hui soir*. If the reference exceeds the day which constitutes the present of the speaker, the Polish language appeals to the



demonstrative: *Tej niedzieli bede u was* (Je viendrai vous voir /ce/ dimanche), in which the demonstrative points to the closest distance (PISARKOWA, 1969, p. 57). Nevertheless, a sentence with zero determination is interpreted in the same way: *W niedziele bede u was*.

^{viii} In Polish, a name is not systematically preceded by a predeterminer.

