

Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin

On the research of the so-called linguistic image of the world in Poland

Henryk Duda

Introduction

Although achievements of linguistic studies in Poland have not won international recognition so far, there are sources where some information about it can be obtained. A considerable amount of detail may be found in e.g. the twin-volume issue of the periodical "Historiographica Linguistica,"¹ also published later as a separate volume entitled "Towards a History of Linguistics in Poland. From the early beginnings to the end of the 20th century."² Apart from general surveys of selected branches in Polish linguistic studies (lexicology, onomastics, dialectology), the book also contains monographic papers devoted to those outstanding Polish linguists who are internationally renowned (Jan Niecisław Baudouin de Courtenay,³ Mikołaj Kruszewski, Jerzy Kuryłowicz or Ludwik Zabrocki). It may be interesting to note that the first scholar listed above contributed partly to the growth of linguistic studies in Japan, especially at the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.⁴ The main objective of this paper is to present one of the major schools in

¹ Vol. XXV: 1/2, 1998, edited by E. F. Konrad Koerner with the collaboration of Hans-Josef Niederehe and Aleksander Szwedek.

² Edited by E. F. K. Koerner and Aleksander Szwedek. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company 2001. Studies in the History of the Language Sciences 102.

³ In some works, predominantly those in Russian, the name of Baudouin de Courtenay is used with the traditional Russian middle name derived from the name of the father – Alexandrovich, i.e. Alexander's son. For most of his career Baudouin (1845-1929) was affiliated at Russian universities, but his Polish roots are beyond question. See Z. Leszczyński *Deklaracja polskości Baudouina* [Baudouin's declaration of his being Polish], „Prace Filologiczne” 44, 1999, s. 345-347.

⁴ One of the first professors of Russian at the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (TUFS; Tokyo School of Foreign Languages at that time) was Sadatoshi YASUGI, who started his work in 1905. He was a student of de Courtenay in Petersburg, and a colleague of the internationally recognized Russian linguist Lev Vladimirovich Szczerba. His legacy includes, among others, a Russian-Japanese dictionary (last edition in 1965: 岩波ロシヤ語辞典／八杉貞利著, 岩波書店: 東京). A remark to be found among his commentators is: "it is pity that he did not introduce to Japan the phonological theory he studied under his teacher Baudouin de Courtenay" (T. DOI, *The Study of Language in Japan. A Historical Survey*, ed. 2, Tokyo: Shinozaki Shorin 1976, s. 90-91).

linguistics of the Polish language in Poland, referred to in the specialist literature as the *Ethno-linguistic School of Lublin*.⁵

Linguistic studies in Poland may be divided into Polish language linguistics and linguistics of other languages. The first branch focuses on Polish in its present and past. The other research domain is mainly represented by Slavic language studies and English linguistics. In terms of research domain and methodology, the former are closer to the Polish linguistic studies than the latter. However, the theory of language and general linguistics are of interest to all three groups. In the mid-twentieth century the Polish language studies were dominated by the Structuralist paradigm, accompanied by residual approaches dating back to the earlier periods in linguistics (e.g. diachronic studies conducted in that period betray evident neo-grammarians influences). Also noticeable were attempts to accommodate some ideas of international linguistics, e.g. Generative-Transformational grammar,⁶ or more recently. Cognitive linguistics. The language researchers of languages other than Polish were quicker in adopting new trends in linguistics, sometimes attempting to extrapolate the ramifications of the newly developed theories onto Polish data.⁷ Sometimes they also expressed moderate criticism of the researchers of Polish for their falling behind the mainstream of international linguistics.⁸ Many of such novel proposals are treated with hesitation and reserve on behalf of the researchers of Polish. Similarly, such a reserve is noticeable towards linguistic studies of Polish conducted abroad or by researchers who

⁵ See J. Zinken, *Metaphors, stereotypes, and the linguistic picture of the world: Impulses from the Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin*, "Metaphorik" 2004, nr 7 (<http://www.metaphorik.de/07/zinken.htm>).

⁶ One of the best known researchers of the Polish language who adopted generative grammar in his studies is Ireneusz Bobrowski. His works in the subject include: *Gramatyka generatywno-transformacyjna (TG) a uogólniona gramatyka struktur fazowych (GPSG)* [Generative-Transformational Grammar and the Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar] (Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich: Wrocław 1988), *Gramatyka opisowa języka polskiego* [A descriptive grammar of the Polish language] (Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna im. Jana Kochanowskiego: Kielce 1995-98).

⁷ This is attempted e.g. by Elżbieta Tabakowska in her *Gramatyka i obrazowanie. Wprowadzenie do językoznawstwa kognitywnego* [Grammar and representation. An introduction to cognitive linguistics] (Wydaw. Oddziału PAN: Kraków 1995), or the collective volume of which she is editor *Kognitywne podstawy języka i językoznawstwa* [Cognitive foundations of language and linguistics] (Universitas: Kraków 2004). Also see W. Kubiński, R. Kalisz and E. Modrzejewska (eds.) *Językoznawstwo kognitywne. Wybór tekstów*. [Cognitive linguistics. Selected readings] Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego: Gdańsk 1998.

⁸ See e.g. J. Szpyra-Kozłowska, [book review of] L. Dutkiewicz, I. Sawicka. *Fonetyka i fonologia* (w serii 'Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego') [Phonetics and Phonology – within the series: A grammar of modern Polish], Wydawnictwo Instytutu Języka Polskiego: Kraków 1995, p. 90 – "Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego" LII, 1996, pp. 199-200.

are not Poles.

New trends in linguistics do not easily find way to Polish linguistics. Paradoxically, the reason behind this retardation lies in the socio-political and cultural transformation that Poland has witnessed throughout past two decades, including the rise of such new media as the Internet. After years of Communist suppression, Poland opened to the Western world, which simplified access to literature and conferences. Also, it became possible to undertake linguistic studies in the domains which, even though not overtly banned, were not favoured by the regime. This is why the early 1980s were the time of a spectacular outburst of research projects on the language of political propaganda,⁹ religious speech¹⁰ or the Eastern Borderland Polish language variant, i.e. one spoken by the Poles living in the former Polish territories incorporated to the USSR in 1945.¹¹ Let us add that one of the renowned researchers of the Polish spoken in the Borderlands is Koji MORITA.¹² These two research directions are definitely responsible for the limited interest in modern linguistic theories among Polish researchers.

⁹ Research on the language of political propaganda had been conducted before that time, but the problem became of social import in the period of the First Solidarność (1980-81). One of the factors that led to the rise of the interest in the matter was the scientific session organized at the Jagiellonian University on 16-17 January 1981. For political reasons, the materials from the session were not published officially. They were published in the clandestine mode, by the NOVA publisher in 1984, with a re-edition in London (Polonia) entitled *Nowo-mowa. Materiały z sesji naukowej poświęconej problemom współczesnego języka polskiego odbytej na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim w dniach 16 i 17 stycznia 1981* [Newspeak. Materials from the scientific session devoted to problems of the modern Polish language, held on 16-17 January 1981 at the Jagiellonian University of Cracow].

It was also for political reasons why the pioneering book by Jerzy Bralczyk, *O języku polskiej propagandy politycznej lat siedemdziesiątych* [On the language of Polish political propaganda of the 1970s] was published in Uppsala in 1987.

¹⁰ The literature of the subject is rich and varied. One of the pioneering publication is, *O języku religijnym* [On religious speech] (eds M. Karpluk, J. Sambor, Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL: Lublin 1988). I. Bajerowa, J. Puzynina, *Język religijny. II. Aspekt filologiczny* [Religious speech. Philosophical aspect], [in:] *Encyklopedia katolicka*, red. t. 8, Lublin 2000, col. 19-20 is a synthetic note on religious speech and its research.

¹¹ This domain of linguistic studies is discussed in numerous publications. One of the first works was Z. Kurzowa's *Polszczyzna Lwowa i kresów południowo-wschodnich do 1939 roku* [The variety of Polish spoken in Lviv and the South-Eastern Borderlands until 1939], PWN: Warszawa 1985. It is not the only work by Z. Kurzowa devoted to this problem area. One worth special mention is the series "Studia nad polszczyzną kresową" [Studies on the variety of Polish spoken in the Borderlands], which has been published since 1982. 12 volumes have come out so far.

¹² The author of, among others, *Teksty gwary polskiej ze wsi Naliboki na Białorusi z komentarzem językowym* [Scripts of the Polish dialect spoken in the Belarusian village of Naliboki, with linguistic comments], "Studia nad polszczyzną kresową" X, 2001, pp. 247-256; *Sytuacja językowa i pozajęzykowa Polaków w rejonie Trok na Litwie od końca XIX*

It was more or less at that time when the idea of *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* was born. Although the main principles of the school were introduced to linguistic science by other scholars, these were researchers representing Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin thanks to whom these concepts became permanent in the lexicon of linguistics of the Polish language. The impulse that led scholars to undertake the above-mentioned studies was given by the previously mentioned research on the language of political propaganda. “This language,” J. Bartmiński wrote “drew upon the rule of supremacy of the word over the reality. In this way it turned the humanity back to the stage of magical thinking.”¹³ According to Bartmiński, this explains the renewed interest in “the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, proclaiming the domination of language over human thought and action.”¹⁴ After the collapse of Communism, studies on the language of political propaganda gradually gave way to the studies of the language of propaganda as such, of the use of language in advertising, marketing, etc.¹⁵ Research on the relation between language and thought, which remains in certain connection to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis – though not only, and not in the first place – is conducted in Poland mainly by the representatives of the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin*.

To avoid potential misunderstanding, we opt against classifying the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* within the so-called Cognitive linguistics. Polish supporters of the latter theoretical paradigm try to make the distinction clear. One of the representatives of the Cognitive theory explains that the notion of Cognitive linguistics refers to the research undertaken by “Lakoff, Langacker, Johnson, Turner, Fauconnier, Geeraerts, Ruzdzka-Ostyn, and others. Polish representatives of the paradigm include: Tomasz P. Krzeszowski, Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk,

wieku do dziś [The linguistic and extra-linguistic status of the Polish minority in the region of Trok in Lithuania], “Acta Baltico-Slavica” XXVI (2001/2002), pp. 25-45; „Mowa prosta” na Kresach Wschodnich w aspekcie historycznym [“Simple speech” in the Eastern Borderlands in a historical context], [in:] *Kultura i świadomość etniczna Polaków na Wschodzie* [Culture and ethnic identity of Poles in the East], Wrocław 2004, s. 151-159, and of numerous book reviews.

¹³ J. Bartmiński, *Słowo wstępne* [Foreword], [in:] *Językowy obraz świata* [Linguistic image of the world], 2nd ed., Lublin 1999, s. 8.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ It is thought-provoking that J. Bralczyk, author of the famous book, *O języku polskiej propagandy politycznej lat siedemdziesiątych* [On the language of Polish political propaganda of the 1970s] (see footnote 8), also wrote *Język na sprzedaż* [Language for sale], Business Books: Warszawa 1998. The fact that the latter book was needed in the market is borne out by the fact it was reprinted twice (2000, 2004).

Elżbieta Tabakowska, Henryk Kardela, Michał Post, [...] and others.”¹⁶ Taking the above into account, I intend to use the term cognitive in the present paper as referring to ‘human cognition in general’.¹⁷

In the latter part of this presentation: 1) I discuss the main assumptions made by the school, 2) give examples of exemplary works illustrating the main assumptions of the framework, 3) show the links between the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* and some earlier theories, in which the former seek inspiration, 4) and list the basic publications related to the school and the topics it deals with.

2. Basic terms

The main subject matter of the research by *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* is the *linguistic image of the world* (henceforth as LIW). One of the first definitions of the notion was presented in 1986 by Jerzy Bartmiński and Ryszard Tokarski in their paper entitled “Językowy obraz świata a spójność tekstu” [The linguistic image of the world and the text coherence].¹⁸ According to them, the LIW:

“[...] is a set of opinions and beliefs of a more or less stable status in language, included in or implied by the meaning of words, which denotes the attributes and manners of existence of objects in the extra-linguistic reality. In this sense, the LIW constitutes a fixed mental frame (representation) of the relations obtaining in the linguistic shape of the text, which, at the same time, mirror human knowledge about the extra-linguistic reality.”¹⁹

Nevertheless, the institutionalization of the concept of LIW in the vocabulary of linguistic research of Polish came with the 1987 conference, held by Jerzy Bartmiński, devoted to the notion of LIW, and with the post-conference volume, published in 1990, entitled “Językowy obraz świata” [Linguistic image of the world].²⁰ The volume comprises numerous theoretically-

¹⁶ “I delimit cognitive linguistics in a rather unconventional way, as many other linguists, advocating diverse language theories, would like to be recognized as cognitive linguists (e.g. Noam Chomsky).” R. Kalisz, *Językoznawstwo kognitywne a relatywizm* [Cognitive linguistics and relativism], “Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego” LII, 1996, p. 97.

¹⁷ See J. Zinken, *op. cit.*, p. 115 (footnote 1).

¹⁸ [In:] *Teoria tekstu* [A theory of text], Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich: Wrocław 1986, pp. 65-81.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

²⁰ *Językowy obraz świata* [Linguistic image of the world], ed. J. Bartmiński, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej: Lublin 1990. I am using the second edition, Lublin 1999.

oriented papers, as well as analytical works that may be regarded as exemplary in the studies of the linguistic image of the world, in a selection of its aspects. To this group belongs, for example, a paper by Jolanta Maćkiewicz, dealing with the linguistic image of the island.²¹ Another, later definition of the LIW was formulated by R. Grzegorzczkova, who stated that:

“I wish to define the linguistic image of the world as a fossilized (fixed) conceptual structure in the system of a given language, that is in the set of its grammatical and lexical properties (lexical meaning and degree of agglutination), finding its realization in the form of textual utterances, as everything in language.”²²

This fixed or fossilized conceptual structure comprises a variety of elements. I am listing them down below, following R. Grzegorzczkova, and completing the list with a selection of data from Japanese and other languages. Thus, the LIW manifests itself through:

1) Certain grammatical properties of a language (p. 43), which Grzegorzczkova fails to list, though. Instead, she only remarks that they are phenomena well-known to ethno-linguists, and she refers the reader to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis.²³ An example of a grammatical property meant by Grzegorzczkova is the grammatical category of masculine gender in the Polish language,

“the rise of which may well be attributed to the influences of the social system in historical Poland [...]. Grammatical properties that mirror certain vision of the world are definitely historical in nature (they pertain to the diachronic and not the synchronic aspect of grammar).” (ibid.)

The Polish nominal system is sensitive to grammatical gender. Traditional descriptive grammars propose three genders for singular nouns (masculine, feminine and neuter), whereas in the plural, they postulate a two-gender system of masculine and non-masculine forms.²⁴ Hence,

²¹ J. Maćkiewicz, *Wyspa – językowy obraz wycinka rzeczywistości* [Island – a linguistic image of the reality fragment], [in:] *Językowy obraz świata* [Linguistic image of the world], pp. 193-206.

²² R. Grzegorzczkova, *Pojęcie językowego obrazu świata* [The concept of the linguistic image of the world], [in:], *Językowy obraz świata*, p. 41.

²³ E. Sapir, *Language. An Introduction to the Study of Speech*, Harcourt, Brace and Company: New York 1921; B. L. Whorf, *Language, Thought and Reality*, edited and with introd. By John B. Carroll, foreword by Stuart Chase, Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Cambridge 1956.

²⁴ The rules governing the division into grammatical genders in Polish have been subject to debate at least since the time of the publication of W. Mańczak’s *Ile jest rodzajów w polskim?* [How many genders are there in Polish?], “*Język Polski*” XXXVI, 1956, pp. 116–121. One of the latest proposals to complete the present classification is put forward

one can claim that the linguistic world of the speakers of Polish is divided into masculine and non-masculine elements of reality. This division is also common to other languages of the West Slavic group, but is unknown to languages that do not use the category of gender, or its use differs considerably from the one depicted above. Although the present paper is meant more as a descriptive report on the state of research, rather than a voice in a polemic, in some places the author finds it worthwhile to comment briefly on the presented solutions. Masculine gender is a general and regular property of the Polish language. This generality and regularity led the previously-mentioned scholar Baudouin de Courtenay up to the claim of *gender virilization* in Polish, in opposition to its *sexualization* in other tongues. Baudouin de Courtenay was among the first to state that the use of grammar in some languages is *unjust*, since it falls under the religiously rooted idea of inferiority of woman to man.²⁵ This viewpoint is frequently evoked in works others than the ones written within the *Etholinguistic school of Lublin*.²⁶ Nonetheless, it is tempting to ask why the Polish language, or West Slavic languages in general, developed such a divided gender system. If the roots of the system *do* stem from the social position of woman in historical Poland, how was it different from the position of women in other Slavic countries? This question needs a more detailed analysis.

A good way of illustrating the issue (and of discrepancies between the systems of Polish and Japanese) are the Japanese classifiers. It is a well-known fact that Japanese nouns are grouped in a number of categories. Category status imposes the necessity of choosing a right numeral for a

by Prof. Tetsushirō ISHII of TUFS – it is the quasi-masculine gender (T. Ishii, *Rzeczowniki quasi-męskoosobowe w języku polskim* [*Quasi-masculine personal nouns in Polish*], [in:] *Comparative and contrastive studies in Slavic languages and literatures. Japanese contributions to the XIIth International Congress of Slavists, Kraków, Aug. 24 - Sept. 3, 1998*, University of Tokyo, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology: Tokyo 1998, pp. 27-38.

²⁵ More detail on Baudouin de Courtenay's views to be found in my paper entitled: *Jan Niecisław Baudouin de Courtenay – prekursor „lingwistyki feministycznej”* [Jan Niecisław Baudouin de Courtenay – A forerunner of “feminist linguistics”], “Roczniki Humanistyczne TN KUL”, vol. XLVI, fasc. 1 special, pp. 663-673.

²⁶ A. Pajdzińska, *Kobieta przyjacielem człowieka* [Woman is a friend of a human being], [in:] *Studia z historii języka polskiego i stylistyki historycznej ofiarowane Profesor Halinie Wiśniewskiej na 50-lecie Jej pracy naukowo-dydaktycznej*, ed. Cz. Kosyl, Lublin 2001, p. 156. I found a similar idea in the handbook of Polish for students at TUFS, where the complex category of grammatical gender was commented upon in the following way: 果たしてポーランド人男性が複雑怪奇だとも言うのでしょうか？それともこれはポーランド世界における、少なくとも文法の世界における男性優位の証しなのでしょうか？[Are male Poles complex? Or is it a bit of evidence for male domination, at least in the realm of grammar?] (B. Sieradzka-Baziur, T. Ishii, *Z uśmiechem po polsku. Podręcznik języka polskiego dla Japończyków* [Polish with a smile. A handbook of Polish for the Japanese], part 1, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies: Tokyo 2004, p. 41).

given noun. For instance, in the Japanese sentence *Hagaki wo sanmai kudasai* [葉書を三枚ください] ‘Please give me three postcards,’ *san* [三] means ‘three’ and *mai* [枚] functions as a classifier. The classifier *mai* is used with nouns denoting thin and flat objects (like sheets of paper, post signs but also shirts). Therefore, taken literally, the sentence above reads: ‘Please give me three postcard sheets.’ *Mai* is one of the most important classifiers. Another frequently used one is *-hon* (with variants *-bon*, *-pon*) [本]. It relates to nouns denoting long objects, such as pencils, bottles, etc. When we want to ask for three pencils, we say: *Enpitsu wo sanbon kudasai* [鉛筆を三本ください]. With machines and devices the classifier *dai* [台] is applied: (*Terebi wo sandai kaimashita* [テレビを三台買いました] ‘I bought three TV-sets’), while objects in bundles or sets take *satsu* [冊] (*hon wo sansatsu kaimashita* [本を三冊買いました] ‘three books’). A similar phenomenon is noticeable in Polish, but on a very limited scale. We count certain things in *sztuki* ‘units/pieces’, *pary* ‘pairs’, others in *kostki* ‘chunks, lumps, squares or blocks’ and *arkusze* ‘sheets’ (*proszę dwie pary džinsów* ‘two pairs of jeans, please’, *proszę dwa arkusze papieru* ‘two sheets of paper, please’, *proszę pudełko zapalek* ‘a packet of matches, please’). Faced with these data, the Structuralists would confine themselves to the listing of the whole variety of counting methods in all analysed languages. Whereas to the linguists of the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* this observation may only be a departure point towards the main research objective: the reconstruction of the “conceptual structure, fixed (fossilized) in a given language system.” Under this view, the categorization of nouns is not arbitrary, and even if it were so, in the course of language evolution it would undergo “semanticization.” The rules of such categorization have for long been of central interest to cognitively oriented branches of linguistics.²⁷

Another illustrative example is the honourific prefix *o-* [お] in Japanese. It is added to nouns and some adjectives that refer to a person who should be addressed with respect and honour. Hence there is contrast between saying, e.g. *Watashi wa genki desu* [私は元気です] ‘I am well (healthy),’ and *Sensei wa ogenki desu-ka?* [先生はお元気ですか] ‘Are you well, Professor?’ (*genki* v. *ogenki* ‘healthy’). In some words the prefix *o-* occurs in a fixed concatenation, e.g.: *okane* [お金] ‘money’, *onaka* [お腹] ‘stomach’, *ocha* [お茶] ‘tea’, *osake* [お酒] ‘sake’. Structur-

²⁷ See Дж. Лакофф, *Мышление в зеркале классификаторов*, [in:] *Когнитивные аспекты языка, составление, редакция и вступительная статья В. В. Петрова и В. И. Герасимова*, Прогресс: Москва, 1988, pp. 12-51. This is a Russian translation of *Classifiers as a reflection of mind* published in the collective volume *Noun Classes and Categorization* (Ed. by C. Craig, Amsterdam 1986).

alist linguists would be most likely to say that it is merely a matter of some linguistic habit,²⁸ but the advocates of the LIW would rather tend to discern in these language facts a fixed (fossilized) image of the world that mirrors the beliefs of the Japanese about the role played in their lives by e.g. money, parts of the body, tea or sake. The former would argue that the Japanese speakers can say e.g. *mazui ocha* [まずいお茶] ‘lousy tea’, *mazui osake* [まずいお酒] ‘lousy sake’, *kitanai okane* [汚いお金] ‘dirty money’, whereas the latter would observe that it is equally possible to say *mazui cha*, *mazui sake*, *kitanai kane* [まずい茶、まずい酒、汚い金], which implies the prefix *o-* is not fully conventionalized. My insufficient command of the Japanese prevents me from taking a more radical stand on the matter of degree of lexicalization in words such as *ocha*, *osake*, *okane*, *onaka*. At the same time, the Japanese data that I was provided with by Prof. Tokimasa SEKIGUCHI of TUFS allow my conclusion that the opposition neutral – honorific (*cha* v. *ocha*) was substituted with the opposition masculine speech – feminine speech. This opposition and its operational range are also of interest to the researchers of the LIW, as an element of the linguistic image of woman. Besides, lexicalization is almost irrelevant to these scholars, since their approach to the linguistic image the world is panchronic. They view lexicalized formations as the remnants of the past, which may partly influence present language behaviour.

2) Lexis makes another element of the linguistic image of the world. Through the arrays of lexical meanings and their potential agglutination, lexical stock is used as “a sort of classifier (categorizer) of the world” (ibid.). Unfortunately, also in this case Grzegorzczkowska leaves the issue without further discussion, stating that the phenomenon has already been analysed in numerous works in this subject area. To illustrate the phenomenon at hand, one can use the English verb *to wash*, which has two Polish semantic counterparts: *myć* (*myć ręce*, *naczynia* ‘wash hands, wash up (dishes)’), and *prać* ‘wash clothes’. Japanese is closer to Polish in this respect, having the forms *arau* [洗う] ‘wash (body)’ and *sentakusuru* [洗濯する] ‘wash (clothes)’. The Japanese noun *mizu* [水] corresponds to Polish *woda* or English *water* only in certain contexts. In others, the Japanese uses forms like *yu* [湯] ‘hot water’ or *kaisui* [海水] ‘sea water’.²⁹ Numerous examples of similar phenomena have been discussed in the literature for decades, e.g. the problem of colour diversification and perception. Hence, it is impossible to omit here the debates

²⁸ This stand is also taken by Ewa Krassowska-Mackiewicz, author of the handbook *Język japoński dla początkujących* [Japanese for beginners], Wydawnictwo PJWSTK: Warszawa 2004, p. 52. All examples taken from this book.

²⁹ See for example R. A. Miller, *Nihongo. In defence of Japanese*, The Athlone Press: London 1986, pp. 124-128.

held by numerous linguists on the system of colour names in Japanese, with the special emphasis on the adjective *aoi* [青い], corresponding to English *green, blue, pale*.³⁰ In the context of Polish-Japanese comparative analyses it seems imperative to make mention of the view upheld by Zdzisław Kempf, a linguist from outside the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin*, who ventured research of the Japanese colour name system in relation to the works of Waclaw Sieroszewski:

“The Japanese have one, common name for the green and blue colour – *aoi*. Thus, they say: *sora ga aoi* ‘the sky is aoi’, *kusa ga aoi* ‘grass is aoi’. But one cannot be misled into thinking that a Japanese painter will paint the sky green or grass blue [...]. This overlap – green-blue = *aoi* – only takes place in the linguistic aspect of the colour apperception.”³¹

Kempf points out that although Sieroszewski:

“undeniably got acquainted with this colour apperception in Japan, he did not strive to reflect it in his own artistic vocabulary through some intermediate solutions like the adjective *zielono-niebieski* (green-blue). He interpreted the colours of the Japanese scenery in Polish, in a physically precise way, keeping green separate from blue, or violet from purple.”³²

This example is extremely revealing, as it shows how difficult it can be to get rid of one’s ethno- and lingocentrism. Although Kempf declares that the Japanese adjective used for blue and green (*aoi*) constitutes a purely linguistic phenomenon, Sieroszewski distinguished colours in a “physically precise way.”

As a teacher of Polish to the Japanese, I can observe similar phenomena *in statu nascendi*. For example, my students are likely to refer to the light pink as *wisniowy* ‘cherry red’ [桜色], owing to their mental association with the colour of the blossom of the Japanese cherry (sakura [桜]). Whereas for me, *wisniowy* is dark red, since the cherries that I know are dark red.

In the literature of the subject one can find repeated theses about the semantic fields in various languages. For example, in the work quoted above, Grzegorzczkowska discusses the multitude of names used in Eskimo languages to denote snow. Also, the well-known Polish linguist Tadeusz Milewski writes about thousand names for the camel in the Arabic.³³ The Japanese often emphasize the analytic nature of their lexical system, which is to mean that the Japanese language has

³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 118–124.

³¹ Z. Kempf, *Orientalizm Waclawa Sieroszewskiego. Wątki japońskie* [The oriental dimension in the works of Waclaw Sieroszewski. Japanese traits], Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe: Warszawa 1982, p. 50.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 50.

³³ T. Milewski, *Językoznawstwo* [Linguistics], Warszawa 1965, pp. 225–26.

more lexical items than other languages, and which is to mirror the Japanese strictly analytical attitude to reality. The controversial case of the multiple names for various types of snow forces us to treat such approaches to lexis with reserve.³⁴ How to count the number of words used in Slavic languages to express the feeling of longing?

3) Derivational properties of lexemes. They reveal the way in which speakers mentally represent the phenomena they perceive. For example, the Polish noun *mrowiskowiec* ‘large block of flats’ came into being when speakers of Polish associated living in such a huge house with living in an anthill (*mrowisko*). Thus, in derivational analysis, *mrowiskowiec* is a ‘large block of flats that resembles an anthill.’ Phenomena of this sort are more easily seen in a comparative context. In terms of derivational analysis, the English *skyscraper* is tantamount to ‘a building that scrapes the sky,’ which is to highlight the salient feature of the building’s remarkable height. In Polish this type of building is often referred to by means of the calque expression based on the English *skyscraper*: *drapacz chmur* ‘cloudscaper’. It is as well possible to use the noun *wieżowiec*; motivated by the noun *wieża* ‘tower’ (*wieżowiec* is ‘a building that resembles a tower in height’). The Japanese, on the other hand, describe a skyscraper as *kōsōbiru* (高層ビル) ‘tall building’ or *matenrō* (摩天楼) ‘cloudfeeler’. The Japanese noun for mushroom is *kinoko* (茸, きのこ), which may be interpreted as ‘the tree’s (*ki*) offspring (*ko*).’ The Kanji symbol (茸) disguises this iconic image on the orthographic level, but it becomes more evident when contrasted with such words as: *onnanoko* (女の子) ‘girl’, i.e. ‘woman (女) – child (子)’, *otokonoko* (男の子) ‘boy’, i.e. ‘man (男) – child (子)’.³⁵

If the internal structure of a word loses transparency, we enter the field of etymology, in which case the linguistic image of the world mirrors the state of the speakers’ consciousness at the moment the word was coined. As Grzegorzczkova puts it, “Etymological meanings of words may be compared to the previously mentioned grammatical categories, whose roots are to be sought back in the past.” (p. 44).

³⁴ The claim about innumerable words in Eskimo languages is not supported by evidence. See D. Wilton, *Word myths. Debunking Linguistic Urban Legends*, Oxford University Press: Oxford 2004, pp. 50-54. Also there, bibliography. See D. Jo Napoli, *Language Matters. A Guide to Everyday Questions about Language*, Oxford University Press: Oxford 2003, pp. 38-51.

³⁵ Using *A great Japanese-Russian dictionary* (Большой японско-русский словарь, под ред. Н. И. Конрада, т. 1-2, Москва 1970), I would like to add a handful of other examples: *torinoko* (鳥の子) ‘little bird’ i.e. ‘child (子) of a bird (鳥)’, *ushinoko* (牛の子) ‘calf’, i.e. ‘child (子) of a cow (牛)’, *sakananoko* (魚の子) ‘little fish’, i.e. ‘child (子) of a fish (魚)’, but these are potential formations only, not institutionalized or used by the Japanese speakers.

The attitude towards such linguistic phenomena within the research of LIW, as the ones discussed above, marks a sharp distinction between the traditional, structurally oriented researchers and the representatives of *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin*. The Structuralist linguistics, at least in Poland, separates radically the actual from the structural meaning of a word. The structural reading is a useful tool in derivational analysis of the Polish lexical stock. Through the process of lexicalization, the compositionality of the structural reading disappears, and the internal semantic structure becomes invisible to speakers in daily communication. A typical, handbook example of the process is Polish *bielizna*, which in its etymological, structural reading means ‘something white’ (*biel-* from *biały* ‘white’ + suffix *-izna* ‘a thing or things defined by the attribute in the adjectival base’), whereas actually it means ‘underwear’. The structural reading lost its appeal completely, as illustrated by the collocation of *kolorowa bielizna* ‘colour underwear’: the opposition white (*biały, biel-*) v. colour (*kolorowy*) is lost.³⁶ Another example is the Polish noun *schody* ‘stairs’ (etymologically related to the verb *schodzić* ‘descend, come down’), which do not only pertain to coming down, but also upwards. Polish speakers use freely the phrase *wchodzić po schodach* ‘go upstairs’ (although the structural reading would be self-contradictory: ‘descend up the stairs’). Neither is the phrase *schodzić po schodach* ‘go downstairs’ (structurally: ‘go down downstairs’) seen as unnatural (pleonastic). A similar stand is taken by linguists dealing with languages different than Polish. C. F. Hockett demonstrates that the Chinese noun *hwōchē* ‘train’ means almost exactly train, irrespective of the fact that one can discern the two parts in it: *hwō* ‘fire’ and *chē* ‘wagon, wheeled vehicle’. Hockett writes that:

“there is no necessary image of fire-spitting locomotive inside the speaker’s head, when he uses or hears the word.”³⁷

The truth of the above statement is also borne out by the compound *dyànlì-hwōchē* ‘electric train’, where the train is no longer powered by fire, despite the apparent presence of the element *hwō*.

The researchers of the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* devote a lot of attention to the role of the structural reading, since they regard it as a crucial element of the LIW.

4) Semantic connotations. They are “features (evaluations, emotions) which speakers (gener-

³⁶ M. Brodowska, *Zjawisko leksykalizacji na wybranych przykładach z „Pana Tadeusza”* [The phenomenon of lexicalization in selected examples from “Pan Tadeusz”], “Język Polski” XXIX (1949), pp. 70-75.

³⁷ C. F. Hockett, *Chinese versus English: An exploration of the Whorfian Theses*, [in:] *The view from Language. Selected Essays 1948-1974*, Athens: The University of Georgia Press 1977, p. 58.

ally or in particular groups) associate with the designates of the linguistic names, fossilized in certain linguistic facts (metaphors, derivatives or fixed phrases)". Analysing the Polish metaphor about someone healthy and fit – *ma końskie zdrowie* or *zdrowy jak koń* (lit. 'healthy as a horse') – we can conclude that in the LIW of Polish speakers horse is a healthy and fit animal. However, health and fitness is only a single element in the mosaic of the linguistic image of the world. To enumerate all these elements, one would have to take into account all the fixed expressions featuring the word *koń* 'horse'. In their synthetic work written in the spirit of *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin*, A. M. Lewicki and A. Pajdzińska state:

"Through the analysis of phrasal expressions one can disclose numerous aspects of the linguistic image of the world fossilized in language [...]. It becomes more than evident already at first sight that the centre of that world and its organizing agent is man."³⁸

This fact is reflected in the semantic structure of Polish fixed phrases (most of them pertain to people) and their lexical setup (e.g. a lot of lexical items make reference to parts of the body).

Linguists of different methodological approaches, working in Poland and abroad, seem to be particularly attracted to the analysis of proverbs. For example, in his paper devoted to the roots of selected proverbs in the Polish and Korean languages, Tomasz Lisowski seeks "correspondence and contrast in the linguistic portrayal of concepts expressed by means of phraseologisms in the two typologically diverse languages, belonging to cultures shaped in incompatible religious, political and civilizational contexts."³⁹ Also, Carol V. McKinney and Norris P. McKinney analyze the "Worldview reflected in Bajju proverbs."⁴⁰

Notwithstanding all that has been said above, it must be noted that incorporating proverbs within the LIW is faced with certain problems of theoretical nature. Proverbs differ considerably from any other fixed utterances in that they are texts.⁴¹ One can, of course, search for elements of the LIW inside them, but will the result tell us about the linguistic image of the world? I am of

³⁸ A. M. Lewicki, A. Pajdzińska, *Frazeologia* [Phraseology], [in:] *Współczesny język polski* [The modern Polish language], ed. J. Bartmiński, ed. 2, Lublin 2001, p. 329.

³⁹ T. Lisowski, Yeoucheoreom gyohwalhan czyli chytry jak lis. *Kilka uwag o genezie polskich i koreańskich frazeologizmów* [Yeoucheoreom gyohwalhan or as cunning as a fox. Selected remarks on the roots of Polish and Korean phraseologisms], [in:] *Studia nad polszczyzną współczesną i historyczną. Prace dedykowane Profesorowi Stanisławowi Bąbce w 65-lecie urodzin*, ed. J. Liberek, Wydawnictwo Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne: Poznań 2004, s. 189.

⁴⁰ C. V. McKinney, N. P. McKinney, *Worldview reflected in Bajju Proverbs*, [in:] *Language and Life: Essays in Memory of Kenneth L. Pike*.

⁴¹ A. M. Lewicki, A. Pajdzińska, *Frazeologia* [Phraseology], s. 324.

the opinion that the image of the world that emerges from the analysis of proverbs is of the same type as the image of the world presented in works of literature, the difference between the two types of text being only due to the fact that proverbs constitute a remnant of the oral literature, almost extinct in today's culture. On the other hand, the works written within the theoretical and methodological framework of the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* often make use of paremiological data in the reconstruction of the LIW. Sometimes an additional proviso is added, that the image in question is not only linguistic, but a linguo-cultural one.⁴²

3. Roots and relations

In its fundamental framework, *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* concentrates around the issues discussed in the linguistics of the late 18th up to the early 20th century. When reflecting upon the school's theoretical foundations, Jerzy Bartmiński makes reference to such linguists as Sapir and Whorf, von Humboldt, and the German neo-Humboldtians from the school of Leon Weisberger.⁴³ This reference to figures and related theories is not declarative only. In their numerous works, the representatives of the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* make frequent reference and seek relations to the linguists listed above. For example, the research undertaken by the German neo-Humboldtians is discussed in its relation to the LIW by Janusz Anusiewicz.⁴⁴ The environment of the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* also greeted with interest the Polish translation of von Humboldt's *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts*.⁴⁵ One more linguist, whom I personally consider missing on the list above, is Jan Nieciśław Baudouin de Courtenay. Like all other 19th-century linguists, he was well-acquainted with the Humboldtian thought. Some works even

⁴² Zob. np. A. Dąbrowska, Tę żabę trzeba zjeść. *Językowo-kulturowy obraz żaby w polszczyźnie* [We need to swallow the frog. The linguo-cultural image of the frog in Polish], "Język a Kultura" XIII, 2000, pp. 181-203 (<http://www.lingwistyka.uni.wroc.pl/jk/JK-13/JK13-dabrowska.pdf>).

⁴³ J. Bartmiński, *O językowym obrazie świata Polaków końca XX wieku* [The linguistic image of the world of the Poles in the late 20th century], [in:] *Polszczyzna XX wieku. Ewolucja i perspektywy rozwoju* [The Polish language in the 20th century. Evolution and prospects for development], eds S. Dubisz and S. Gajda, Warszawa 2001, pp. 28-29.

⁴⁴ J. Anusiewicz, XXXX. Also see his, *Kulturowa teoria języka. Zarys problematyki* [A cultural theory of language], [in:] *Języka a kultura* [Language and culture], vol. 1, *Podstawowe pojęcia i problemy* [Basic concepts and problems], eds J. Anusiewicz and J. Bartmiński, Wrocław 1991, pp. 17-30. This text is available on the Internet from the following address: <http://www.lingwistyka.uni.wroc.pl/jk/JK-01/JK01-anusiewicz.pdf>.

⁴⁵ W. von Humboldt, *Rozmaitość języków a rozwój umysłowy ludzkości*, translation and foreword Elżbieta M. Kowalska, Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL: Lublin 2001.

suggest de Courtenay's influence on Whorf.⁴⁶ Bartmiński also makes reference to the Moscow school of semiotics and language. Anna Wierzbicka, awarded the title of Doctor Honoris Causa at the Maria Skłodowska-Curie University in 2004, is among these Polish linguists who won international recognition, and whose achievements are frequently quoted by the representatives of the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin*. Her works are often reprinted by the Lublin's annually "Etnolingwistyka" [Ethnolinguistics]. Some years ago, a wide selection of her papers was published in a volume edited by Jerzy Bartmiński.⁴⁷ In the past years, the researchers in the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* have been trying to find grounds for their studies within the framework of Cognitive grammar, as illustrated by Jolanta Maćkiewicz's paper entitled *Co to jest językowy obraz świata* [What does the LIW mean?].⁴⁸

4. Basic literature on the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin*

The most basic source of knowledge on the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* is the book "Językowy obraz świata", quoted repeatedly above. A lot of contributions in the field are published by the Lublin-based annually "Etnolingwistyka", established and directed by Jerzy Bartmiński (16 volumes have been published since 1988). Of special interest is volume IV (1991), devoted to Wierzbicka (contributors include: Andrzej Bogusławski, Bogdan Szymanek, Adam Pasicki, Iwona Nowakowska-Kempna or Małgorzata Brzozowska). A lot of works that directly relate to the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin*, or in some way discuss the problems of the LIW may be found in the Wrocław publication series "Język a kultura" [Language and culture].⁴⁹ 16 volumes have already been published, almost all of which (vols. 1-13) are available at the Internet address: <http://www.lingwistyka.uni.wroc.pl/jk/>. An attempt at a comprehensive description of the Polish language in the spirit of the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* is presented in the collective volume, "Współczesny język polski" [The modern Polish language].⁵⁰ Thus-far development and a kind of programme for future research of the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* is presented

⁴⁶ See for example J. M. Pen, *Linguistic Relativity Versus Innate Ideas. The Origins of the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis in German Thought*, Mouton: The Hague 1972, pp. 32, 54.

⁴⁷ A. Wierzbicka, *Język, umysł, kultura. Wybór prac* [Language, mind, culture. Selected writings], ed. J. Bartmiński, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN: Warszawa 1999.

⁴⁸ "Etnolingwistyka" 11 (1999), pp. 7-24.

⁴⁹ Vol. 1, eds J. Anusiewicz, J. Bartmiński, Wrocław 1991.

⁵⁰ Ed. J. Bartmiński, "Wiedza o kulturze" [Knowledge of culture]: Wrocław 1993, ed. 2, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej: Lublin 2001.

by J. Bartmiński in his paper, "Językowy obraz świata Polaków końca XX wieku" [The linguistic image of the world of the Poles in the late 20th century].⁵¹

The influence that the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* has already had on linguistic studies in Poland is borne out by a considerable number of papers and books devoted to the problem of the LIW published in the recent years. Among the variety of publications there are these which rely on the assumptions of the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* substantially, as well as those which only verbally declare some theoretical link with the school. All these voices in linguistic debate prove beyond doubt that the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* holds an important position in Polish linguistics. The already available publications concern the following linguistic images: of an *angel, God, bread, body, man, man at home, home, head, heretic, Judas, woman, Church [Roman Catholic], male, city, death, death in Slovakia, teacher, heaven/sky, native country, territorial occupation, hell, heart, word in action, Satan, light, realm of ghosts, realm of the Borderland aristocrat, family festivals, war, village in the Beskid region, the afterworld, earth, the region of Pszczyna, and of Zosia* (one of main protagonists in Mickiewicz's "Pan Tadeusz").⁵²

The central area of interest to the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* is the concept of the linguistic image of the world. This linguistic school is an influential trend in modern Polish linguistics. This is partly due to the problem area that the school focuses on, which attracts a lot of public attention, and promises more than structural studies of grammar can give. Thanks to its interest in national stereotypes, the research activity of the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* overlaps with public debate on most topical social issues, such as the status of ethnic minorities, their future and past, etc. By its attempts to reconstruct the linguistic image of woman, the research of the school is also partly convergent with the questions explored by *gender studies*.

Despite its indisputable merits, I find some aspects of the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin's* activity dissatisfying. First of all, the scholars of the school seem to avoid debate on fundamental issues, such as the relation between language, thought and reality. Reference made to numerous forerunners of this branch of linguistic studies (e.g. to Humboldt, Sapir or Worf) is hardly suf-

⁵¹ [In:] *Polszczyzna XX wieku. Ewolucja i perspektywy rozwoju* [The Polish language in the 20th century. Evolution and prospects for development], eds S. Dubisz and S. Gajda, Warszawa 2001, pp. 27-53.

⁵² These are results of my Internet search in the portal of Linguistic Bibliography (*BL Online. The bibliographical database of linguistics* – <http://www.kb.nl/blonline/blonline.html>).

ficient. In the past, the language phenomena analysed by the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* were treated as evidence for linguistic relativism or linguistic determinism. This tendency to avoid general issues in the research activity of the school seems to be a consequence of the framework that the school adopted. It should be recalled that the roots of the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* date back to the Communist time, when scholars decided to meet the political needs in the period of the First Solidarity movement. The issues of language influence on human thought and action (language determinism) had not been questioned in Poland: Communist newspeak and the activity of regime censors provided cornucopia of tangible evidence of the phenomenon. In his comments on “Współczesny język polski” [The modern Polish language], first published in 1992, J. Bartmiński wrote:

“All the authors began with the assumption that language is not only used for communication, but is a tool for the interpretation of reality. In some (non-deterministic) way, language exposes some image of the world, fosters certain social values and encourages forms of interpersonal communication.”⁵³

The same assumption seems operational in a growing collection of works published recently. The main effort of researches concentrates on attempts to reconstruct the linguistic image of the world in aspects that have remained unravelled so far. At the same time, we are made to take the general assumptions behind the adopted model somewhat for granted. When the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* was being born, its topicality and attractiveness were politically conditioned. Today, when some exhaustion of the problem area becomes evident, and when the consequent research projects merely multiply the evidence in favour of language relativism, the researchers of the *Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin* again try to evade fundamental issues relating to the concept of LIW, and redirect their attention towards sociolinguistic problems, such as the role of woman in language, or national stereotypes.

⁵³ J. Bartmiński, *O językowym obrazie świata Polaków końca XX wieku* [The linguistic image of the world of the Poles in the late 20th century], p. 30.

ルブリン民族言語学派 ポーランドにおける「言語的世界像」の研究について

ヘンリク ドゥーダ

本論では、いわゆる言語的世界像の研究の概観とその歴史を紹介する。この研究の中心となっているのは、主にルブリンのマリア・キュリー・スクウォドフスカ大学の研究者たちである。関連分野の文献において、この学派は「ルブリン民族言語学派」(Lublin Ethnolinguistic School)と呼ばれている。

ルブリン民族言語学派は1980年代に形成された。この学派の主な研究対象は、いわゆる「言語的世界像」であるが、その定義は次のようなものである：「[...] 単語の意味に含まれる、もしくはその意味から暗示されるという形で、程度の差はあれ言語に刻み込まれた観念の集合体で、言語外世界の物体の特徴、その在り方についての見解をあらわにするようなもの。この意味において、言語的世界像 ([Językowy obraz świata 略して] JOS) とは、言語外世界に関する知識に由来し、テキストの言語的形成に含まれるような記述の集合体が定着したものだといえる。」(イェジ・バルトミンスキ、リシャルト・トカルスキ Jerzy Bartmiński, Ryszard Tokarski) 言語的世界像を形成するのは次のような要素である：言語の文法的特質 (例えばポーランド語における文法性、日本語における数量詞など)；語彙、とりわけ単語の意味体系とその連結可能性 (例えば英語の to wash に対して、日本語の「洗う」と「洗濯する」)；そして語彙素の語構成的特質と語源 (例えば日本語の「きのこ」は「木」の「子」である)；ある種の言語事実 (比喩、派生語、慣用句) に埋め込まれた意味論的含蓄 (例えばポーランド語の慣用句 zdrowy jak koń [馬のように健康だ] は、馬が健康的な動物であることを暗示している)。

この学派は、その基本的な主張において、18世紀半ばから20世紀半ばに至るまで熱い議論が繰り広げられた問題を取り上げ、とりわけサピア・ウォーフ (Sapir and Whorf)、ヴィルヘルム・フォン・フンボルト (Wilhelm von Humboldt, 1767-1835)、そして、レオ・ヴァイスゲルバー (Leo Weisgerber) 学派に端を発するドイツの新フンボルト主義者などをその議論の起点としている。また、この学派と密接なつながりのある現代の言語学者として、アンナ・ヴィエジュビツカ (Anna Wierzbicka) の名を挙げる必要があるだろう。

日本語訳：鳥居晃子