

I. RESEARCH ARTICLES

DOI: 10.17951/et.2016.28.7

Jerzy Bartmiński
(UMCS, Lublin, Poland)

ETHNOLINGUISTICS IN THE YEAR 2016*

This article is the voice of *Etnolingwistyka*'s Editor-in-Chief on the current tasks of ethnolinguistics as a scholarly subdiscipline, as well as those of the journal. According to the author, of the two foundations of Slavic ethnolinguistics mentioned by Nikita Tolstoy (i.e., its pan-Slavic character and the unity of language and culture) it is mainly the latter that has preserved its topicality: language is the source of knowledge about people and human communities, as well as the basis for building one's identity (individual, national, regional, professional). The agenda of cultural linguistics has been followed by the contributors to the present journal and its editorial team with a focus on various genres of folklore, the problems of the linguistic worldview, and in recent issues with studies on the semantics of selected cultural concepts (FAMILY, DEMOCRACY, EQUALITY, OTVETSTVENNOST', etc.). An ethnolinguistics that thus seeks "culture in language" (i.e. in the semantic layer of linguistic forms) is close – especially in its cognitivist variant – to Western cultural or anthropological linguistics. When Slavic ethnolinguistics focuses on the semantics of value terms, it stands a good chance of engaging in a dialogue with Western anthropological linguistics and contribute original insights to the common body of research on values. A specific proposal in this direction is the international project EUROJOS.

KEY WORDS: cultural linguistics, culture in language, *Etnolingwistyka*, EUROJOS, *Axiological Lexicon of Slavs and their Neighbours*, cultural concepts

* This is a revised and extended version of the paper presented at the conference *Slawische Ethnolinguistik: Methoden, Ergebnisse, Perspektive* (17–19 December, 2015), organized by the Department of Slavonic Studies at the University of Vienna. The article appeared in Polish as "O aktualnych zadaniach etnolingwistyki" in *Etnolingwistyka* 28, pp. 7–29. The present English translation has been financed by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, project titled "English edition of the journal *Etnolingwistyka. Problemy języka i kultury* in electronic form" (no. 3bH 15 0204 83).

1. New challenges for the discipline and the journal

More than a decade ago, when I surveyed the then state of the art in Slavic ethnolinguistics (Bartmiński 2004),¹ I endeavoured to sum up its achievements and review its general problems, relating to the discipline's subject matter and methodology. After a brief synthesis of research on the language of folklore, the problems of ethnopoetics and ethnosemantics, I went on to underscore the importance of intercultural comparative analyses, mainly those that focus on values. Since then, many new studies of a wide array of data have been published (too many to list, in fact), novel theoretical and methodological approaches have been proposed. The social space of our research has broadened, new vistas for intercultural inquiries have opened, including cooperation between Central/Eastern and Western Europe.

Today, one should again reflect on the appropriate focus of ethnolinguistic research (folk, national, trans-national culture?), on its new methodologies (how does one define values?), on the sources and types of data (questionnaires, corpora, associative tests?). One can wonder what are the most urgent issues, as well as perspectives for the development of the discipline. What chances are there for ethnolinguistics to find its position in the vast research area of contemporary linguistics and the new European communicative space? In what directions can and should this journal develop, now that it has been on the market for a quarter of a century and has recently acquired a more international flavour? As its founder and current Editor-in-Chief I also wonder what questions it should address and what methodologies should be favoured. In this article I will try to inquire into the future of the discipline, as well as into that of the journal, designed from its inception to document and facilitate progress of the ethnolinguistic endeavour.

2. From a dialectological to a cognitive ethnolinguistics

Slavic ethnolinguistics has emerged from etymological and dialectological research. The goals and theoretical foundations of the discipline were first formulated in a straightforward manner by Nikita Tolstoy; they were accepted and followed for many years in Russia, Belarus, Ukraine, Serbia, and partly in Poland. Tolstoy proposed that ethnolinguistics can be understood narrowly (as a branch of linguistics) or broadly (as a branch of cultural studies) – but in fact he favoured the latter by viewing ethnolinguistics as an all-embracing endeavour that investigates cultural content transmitted through a variety

¹ The study was published in English ten years later, as in 2014 (cf. Bartmiński 2004 in the References).

of formal means (language, artefacts, customs, images, etc.), the key notion integrating the totality of linguistic and cultural data being the *cultural code*. Tolstoy's ethnolinguistics was designed to study the traces of the past in the folk cultures of all Slavic nations (the so called *zhivaya starina*), to reconstruct the spiritual proto-homeland of the Slavs, all with the aid of comparative and cartographic methods. The crowning achievement of Russian ethnolinguistics – meticulously documented by Agapkina (2013) – is the monumental dictionary *Slavyanskiye drevnosti: Etnolingvisticheskiy slovar' v 5 tomakh* [Slavic Antiquities: An Ethnolinguistic Dictionary in 5 volumes] (*SD* 1995–2012), edited by Nikita Tolstoy himself. In a recently published article, Svetlana Tolstaya, the undisputed leader of Moscow ethnolinguistics after the her husband's death, notes that during the so-called Polesia expedition, initiated in the 1960s, Tolstoy concluded:

[A] “purely linguistic” approach to investigating the lexis of spiritual culture, without reference to beliefs, customs, rules of everyday life, mythological imagery of language speakers, is not possible. [...] Thus a new trend in the humanities was born: Slavic ethnolinguistics, which set out to investigate language and culture in the organic relationship between them, and to do so on the basis of all kinds of data available: language, customs, beliefs, folklore, all in relation to archaic views of the world and of humans – in short, to the worldview of Slavs. (Tolstaya 2013: 17)

Many years later, the programme was systematically laid out in Tolstaya (2006).

A similar approach was adopted by the team of Lublin-based dialectologists and folklorists who in 1976 commenced work on a new dictionary of the language of Polish folklore. A preliminary installment was published in 1980 (*SLSJ* 1980) – so as to aid the preparation of the dictionary the journal *Etnolingwistyka* was launched in 1988 and the actual dictionary began to appear (in installments) in 1996 under a somewhat modified title Dictionary of Folk Stereotypes and Symbols (*Słownik stereotypów i symboli ludowych*, *SSiSL* 1999–).

Work on the Russian and Polish ethnolinguistic dictionaries bore fruit in the form of a substantial number of studies devoted to specific problems of both analytical and theoretical orientation (cf. the relevant bibliographies: Agapkina 2013; Maksymiuk-Pacek and Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2009; Tomczak 2010; Boguta 2010).

3. A pan-Slavic community: fact or fiction?

For Nikita Tolstoy, the two fundamental principles of Slavic ethnolinguistics were its pan-Slavic character (*obshch斯拉vianskoe izmerenye*) and the unity of language and culture (*edinstvo yazyka i kul'tury*).

The first of these principles found its way to great pan-Slavic projects, developed since 1960s, namely the *Obshcheslavjanskij lingvističeskij atlas* (Slavonic Linguistic Atlas, *OLA* 1988–)² and Proto-Slavic dictionaries compiled in Moscow (Trubachev 1974–), Kraków (Sławski 1974–2001, actually published in Wrocław) and a little later in Prague (Havlová 1989–). Both the Moscow and the Kraków projects were to document the cultural and linguistic unity of the Slavic world and both were abandoned half-way, not only for political but also for cultural reasons. A pan-Slavic community proved to be an unrealistic and unattainable ideal, or – to be more precise – a relative category, limited to a certain historical, linguistic, and cultural context. This was largely dependent on the older Indo-European context (cf. the solid accounts in Benveniste 1969 or Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1984), as well as on diverse later cultural contexts: antique (Greek and Roman), Judeo-Christian, Byzantine, and Western European (cf. Bartmiński 2015). The most dramatic influence on inter-Slavic relations was exerted by national ideologies, which lead to unsurmountable conflicts, additionally fed by the Western-vs.-Eastern Christianity divide. The division into *Slavia Latina* and *Slavia Orthodoxa* can also be felt in folklore and ethnolinguistic studies, even if both disciplines can legitimately question that division, fostering the common Indo-European and Christian roots of Slavic cultures.

The second of Tolstoy's principles, however, that of the unity of language and culture, has remained fully valid. The scholar formulated the most radical theory of "culture-language isomorphism" in language-and-culture research, a theory based on the ideas of the Moscow-Tartu semiotic school (cf. especially Tolstoy 1990, also Tolstoy 1995).

It is against this backdrop that the profile of the present journal should be appreciated. In the Foreword to its first issue (Bartmiński 1988), the Editor-in-Chief declares to pursue ethnolinguistic research along the lines laid out by the German Wilhelm von Humboldt, the Americans Franz Boas, Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf, the Russians Vyacheslav Ivanov and Vladimir Toporov, or Nikita and Svetlana Tolstoy, the Poles Jan Karłowicz, Kazimierz Moszyński, Bernard Sychta, Wanda Budziszewska, Hanna Taborska, as well as two authors mainly writing in English: Bronisław Malinowski and Anna Wierzbicka. Consider the following excerpt from this programmatic declaration:

Ethnolinguistics is an enterprise within contemporary linguistics concerned with language in its complex and multifarious relations to culture. Its focus is thus on the

² Work on *OLA* began in the wake of the 4th International Congress of Slavists (Moscow, September 1958), when a special international committee was set up for the purpose.

language system as an institutionalised social product in the whole richness of its many varieties, variants, and styles, in the diversity of its use, in relation to the system of culture as human activity, together with the patterns and values that reside therein, as well as to culture as a product of that activity.

Language and culture are linked through a similarity so profound that they can be studied with analogous methods and described in compatible terms. The relevant categories include: system, contrast and opposition, paradigm and syntagma, text, model, variant, communicative patterns, etc.

Language and culture are *par excellence* human phenomena – universal, semiotic, and systemic. They have their respective lexicons and grammars, and both serve for the purposes of communication. At the same time, they do not only symbolise the outside world but model, design, and co-create that world in order to meet the needs of their users. Language and culture transform objects of “objective reality” into objects of culture that belong to the world of humans, i.e., into connotation-rich mental objects.

The mutual relations between language and culture are very difficult to investigate systematically – ethnolinguistics aims to analyse them on the basis of linguistic data. The most fertile notion it operates with is the linguistic worldview: a worldview that is “naïve”, encoded in the very fabric of a language’s grammatical structure and lexicon, as well as in the structure and meaning of texts. (Bartmiński 1988: 5)

Some twenty years later, Wojciech Chlebda (2010) wrote:

The birth of Polish ethnolinguistics coincided with changes in the paradigms in linguistics in general, and indeed, in the humanities. The good old structuralism was in the best of shapes, when the “human factor” began to claim increasingly more attention for itself: the notions of idiolect, linguistic profiles of the speaker and hearer, communicative intentions and consequences of speech events, creation and reception of texts, their influence on individuals and communities, the functioning of humans in the space of discourse, history, and culture. Not so much a retreat as a shift away from taxonomic linguistics to anthropological-cultural linguistics, to the communicative perspective, linguistic pragmatics, discourse theory, narratology, cognitivism, took place exactly at the time when Polish humanities saw the birth of what was later termed the “Lublin school of ethnolinguistics”. [...] Ethnolinguistics became a crucible for testing factors and elements new to the Polish context. (Chlebda 2010: 8-9)³

At present, a few schools are usually mentioned as important places on the Slavic ethnolinguistic map: Vladimir Toporov’s etymological school, Nikita Tolstoy’s dialectological school, Yuriy Apresyan’s semantic school, or the recently recognised Aleksandra Matveeva and Yelena Berezovich’s onomastic school in the Urals. The Lublin-based ethnolinguistic research is referred to as cognitive ethnolinguistics.

³ For a discussion of the problem in English see Chlebda (2013).

4. Common theoretical assumptions of Slavic ethnolinguistics

Slavic ethnolinguistics maintains its coherence through following the following general assumptions:

1) language and culture are one: the bond is so profound that they can only be studied jointly;

2) the cognitive function of language is as important as its communicative function; language contains codified interpretations of reality and classifications of experiences; onus should be put on the semantic dimension of the lexicon;

3) language is a peculiar repository of cultural content, something that preserves a memory of the past (in Russian: *zhivaya starina*); symbolic meanings and the mythological layer of culture should be foregrounded;

4) the linguistic-cultural worldview, including the view of humans, should be reconstructed on the basis of a broad array of language data (the language system, lexis, texts, usage), as well as beliefs and behaviours (the “co-linguistic” data) of a given community; ethnolinguistics thus synthesises data from the domains of dialectology, folklore studies, and ethnography;

5) analysis of archived data should be combined with intense fieldwork, involving interviews with speakers of a given language, variety, or dialect; it is important to engage students in the fieldwork;

6) data elicitation during fieldwork, analyses and interpretations of the data should be combined with the processes of editing the texts and source materials thus obtained;

7) the ultimate goal of ethnolinguistic research is to account for the conceptualisations of the world constructed by the language speakers, i.e. for the speakers’ mentality.⁴

5. *Etnolingwistyka*: a local and an international journal

It is this kind of agenda that was welcomed and actually followed by the authors publishing their work in the journal *Etnolingwistyka* in the years

⁴ Commenting on the last point, Adam Głaz (private correspondence) opined that this kind of ethnolinguistics actually becomes a subdiscipline of anthropology: “We move, as it were, in two directions: on the one hand we accentuate language and culture in language (which is the domain of linguistics), on the other hand, we are concerned with the speakers of that language (which is the domain of anthropology). A similar dilemma has been present in Western scholarship for decades: the term *linguistic anthropology* seems to prevail over *anthropological linguistics*”. In the East, ethnolinguistics is often referred to as *linguo-culturology* (Pol. *lingwokulturologia*).

1988–2015 (cf. Tomczak 2010). The range of issues discussed on its pages did undergo modifications over the course of twenty-seven years, but as declared by the Editor-in-Chief in vol. 1 (Bartmiński 1988), the focus of interest was unwaveringly the linguistic or the linguistic-cultural worldview (the authors frequently referred to the beliefs and ritual behaviours of the people(s) they were describing).

With regard to thematic preferences, at least three stages in the journal's history can be distinguished. The first seven volumes were to aid the preparation of the newly launched Dictionary of Folk Stereotypes and Symbols (*SSiSL*). The dictionary's database was supplemented in this way with texts of various genres of folklore, such as tales, magic spells, the dream book, wedding songs, spring carols, songs for St. John's Eve (June 23), folk accounts of the universe, as well as accounts of magic behaviours, funeral rituals, wedding-ceremony personas and artefacts. Preliminary versions of the following dictionary entries were also published: ZMORA 'bogy, spectre', STRZYGON' 'vampire-like demon', MARMUR 'marble', KOROWAJ 'korovai; traditional wedding bread', DROGA 'road', MIEDZA 'balk, field boundary', MORZE 'sea', POPIÓŁ 'ash', DUNAJ 'river', SŁOŃCE 'sun', NÓW 'new moon'.

The second stage began in 1995 with vol. 8. The journal obtained a new graphic layout but more importantly, an international Advisory Board was established to accommodate the extended scope of interest in the general variety of Polish and cross-linguistic comparative studies. Papers were being published on the theoretical and methodological aspects of the linguistic worldview conception, along with more analyses of specific segments of the worldview: LUD 'people', GNIEW 'anger', OŁÓW 'lead', TĘCZA 'rainbow', DĄB 'oak', OSIKA 'aspen', KOT 'cat', BOCIAN 'stork', DUSZA 'soul', REGION 'region', WOJNA 'war', PŁACZ 'crying', KOBIEȚA 'woman'.

The third stage began with volume 16 (2004), when the journal became the organ of two ethnolinguistic commissions: international (affiliated with the International Committee of Slavists) and domestic (affiliated with the Committee of Linguistics, Polish Academy of Sciences). By the same token, it undertook the initiatives on the agendas of the two bodies.⁵

⁵ The tasks placed before the Ethnolinguistic Committee, which was set up in Ljubljana, Slovenia, on August 16, 2003, include an inquiry into "the fundamental problems of contemporary and historical Slavic ethnolinguistics, including the work on ethnolinguistic dictionaries, both pan-Slavic [...] and national", as well as "comparative research on the linguistic worldview of Slavs and their neighbours, with an axiological component (the semantics of value terms, axiological lexis in lexicography), linguistic stereotypes (especially national, self- and hetero-stereotypes, conceptualisations of time and space in language systems and usage" (Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2003: 280–281).

The next volume, no. 17, contains analyses of the Russian, Byelorussian, Lithuanian, German, French and American stereotypes of the Pole. The subsequent volumes were dominated by axiological studies, a result of the momentum gained by the EUROJOS project at the time. In vol. 21 the following axiological concepts are discussed: RÓWNOŚĆ 'equality', DEMOKRACJA 'democracy', NARÓD 'nation', PATRIOTYZM 'patriotism', NACJONALIZM 'nationalism', RODZINA 'family', KARIERA 'career', or the Russian OTVETSTVENNOST' 'responsibility'; in vols. 22-27, we have DOM 'house/home', PRACA 'work', WOLNOŚĆ 'freedom, liberty', UCZUCIA 'feelings, emotions', RADOŚĆ 'joy', PAMIĘĆ 'memory', BIEDA 'poverty'; the Russian SVOBODA 'freedom', CHESTNOST' 'honesty', SAMOLUBYE 'pride', and ZHIZN KAK TSENOST' 'life as a value'; the Polish, Ukrainian, and Russian perspectives on Europe; the Polish HONOR and the Russian CHEST', the Czech VÁNOCE 'Christmas', the Croatian HIŽA 'house/home', and the English HOME and HOMELAND.

Two special theme issues have appeared: on death and dying (vol. 9/10) and on the US/THEM opposition (vols. 19-20). We have also engaged in discussions on the European axiological canon (vol. 23) or the role of etymological investigations in the linguistic worldview research (vol. 24). A whole series of articles was devoted to stereotypes of nationalities (Poles, Russians, Jews) and the semantics of colour. Self-reflecting divagations on ethnolinguistics' goals and possible applications appeared in vol. 18 (2006).⁶

Some volumes have been dedicated to distinguished ethnolinguists: Anna Wierzbicka, Nikita Tolstoy, Vladimir Toporov, Jadwiga Puzynina, Svetlana Tolstaya, Renata Grzegorzczkova, Hanna Popowska-Taborska.⁷

In our research on the linguistic worldview we have moved between folk dialects (continuously the main focus of Lublin-based ethnolinguistics) and the standard, national variety of Polish – but we have also looked at the languages of small, regional, and socially-defined communities. To a progressively larger extent we have now been moving into the realm of comparative, cross-linguistic analyses, which has drawn more authors from outside Poland (some contributing more than once), nearly half of the total

⁶ Cf. Tolstaya (2006) on Moscow ethnolinguistics, Feoktistova (2006) on ethnolinguistics at the Ural State University, Antropov and Volodina (2006) or Ajdaczić (2006) on ethnolinguistics in Belarus and Serbia, Bartmiński (2006) on Lublin ethnolinguistics. A series of papers dealt with ethnolinguistics' relations to other disciplines, such as dialectology (Pelcowa 2006), folklore studies (Wrocławski 2006), ethnography (Tyrpa 2006), anthropology of culture (Sulima 2006), or pedagogy (Zgółka 2006). An especially valuable contribution is that by Pieter Plas (2006), who juxtaposes Slavic ethnolinguistics with Anglo-American anthropological linguistics.

⁷ Vol. 27 is dedicated to the present author on the occasion of his 75th birthday.

number in the last ten volumes of the journal.⁸ The most numerous group have been Russian authors: Albert Bayburin, Olga Byelova, Lena Berezovich, Aleksandr Khrolenko, Varvara Dobrovolskaya, Marina Eremina, Lyubov Feoktistova, Olga Frolova, Natalya Komleva, Yuriy Kostylev, Andrey Moroz, Irina Syedakova, Yevgeniy Stefanskiy, Svetlana Tolstaya, Vladyslava Zhdanova.

The Byelorussian authors publishing in the journal in the years 2006–2015 are: Nikolay Andropov, Mariya Konyushkevich, Alla Kozhynova, Alena Rudenka, Nina Myechkovskaya, Vyacheslav Shcherbin, Tatyana Volodina. The Ukrainian authors are: Natalya Khobzey, Galina Yavorska, Aleksy Yudin, Svitalna Martinek, Lidya Nepop-Ajdačić, Margaryta Zhuykova. Other foreign contributors come from the Czech Republic (Irena Vaňková), Bulgaria (Katya Mikhaylova, Petar Sotirov), Serbia (Dejan Ajdačić, Lubinko Redenković, Mariya Vuchković), Croatia (Amir Kapetanović), Slovenia (Mariya Stanonik), Lithuania (Aloyzas Gudavičius), Latvia (Elena Koroleva), France (Galina Kabakova and James Underhill), Germany (Jörg Oberthür, Magdalena Telus, Jörg Zinken), Belgium (Pieter Plas), Japan (Koji Morita), and Australia (Anna Wierzbicka).

In the last decade the journal has also published Polish translations from Russian (Yuriy Apresyan, Aleksandr Góra, Vladimir Toporov) and English (Teun van Dijk, George Lakoff, Ronald Langacker, Eleonor Rosch). Prior to that, translations of the work by, among others, Nikita Tolstoy, Michael Fleischer, or Anna Wierzbicka had also appeared.

As can be seen, the languages of publication in *Etnolingwistyka* are Polish and Russian, and recently also English. Volumes 28–30 of the journal will appear in two versions: Polish and English. However, Russian will continue to enjoy the status of the privileged foreign language, for two reasons. First, it is through that language that we can make the journal accessible to most of its overseas readers, not only from Russia, Ukraine, or Belarus but also from the Czech Republic, Bulgaria, and Serbia. Second, the journal *Etnolingwistyka* and ethnolinguistics as a discipline have been functioning and will hopefully continue to function as a platform for intensive cooperation between Polish and Russian scholars, regardless of the unstable political climate between the two countries.⁹

⁸ More precisely, 167 articles have been written by 78 authors from abroad (45 in Russian, 8 in English, the others in Polish). Of the Polish authors, 34 have come from the Lublin circles and 55 from other institutions.

⁹ The issue was mentioned by several delegates to the 2009 conference in Lublin: Jerzy Bartmiński, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, and Feliks Czyżewski on the Polish side, and Svetlana Tolstaya and Yelena Berezovich on the Russian side (cf. the reports by several participants in the event in *Etnolingwistyka* 22, 2010: 256–270). Cf. also Tolstaya (1993) and Bartmiński (2011).

6. Two ethnolinguistic dictionaries: from Moscow and Lublin

The ethnolinguistic dictionaries compiled by the Moscow-based and Lublin-based teams are each an original contribution to the field: the five-volume *Slavyanskiye drevnosti* (*SD*, initiated by Nikita Tolstoy and finished in 2012 by Svetlana Tolstaya) and the Dictionary of Folk Stereotypes and Symbols (*SSiSL*, ed. Jerzy Bartmiński and Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska). According to Svetlana Tolstaya:

... with the publication of the first volume of the Lublin-compiled Dictionary of Folk Stereotypes and Symbol (1996) and the Moscow-compiled *Slavyanskiye drevnosti* (1995), ethnolinguistic lexicography has become an independent discipline within Slavic studies, representing an integral approach to language and culture. (Tolstaya 1997: 53)

Both publications share the basic assumptions of ethnolinguistic research (an integral approach to folk culture, a quest for symbolic meanings in culture), as well as a coherent treatment of linguistic data (lexis of folk dialects), folklore data (folk oral texts), and ethnographic records of beliefs and practices. They are both “designed as attempts to synthesise folk knowledge” (Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2010: 21). But they also exhibit certain non-trivial differences. The Moscow *SD* embraces folk traditions of all Slavs, which allows for a high level of interpretive credibility. On the other hand, the format of the Lublin dictionary, based on Polish data alone, allows its authors to include richer documentation, embrace a variety of folk genres, and propose more detailed semantic analyses in the format of the so called cognitive definition.

7. Slavic ethnolinguistics vs. Western (English-language) ethnolinguistics

In the first decade of the 21st c., Slavic ethnolinguistics (especially in Poland, after the country’s accession to the EU in 2004) found itself in a new communicative context, in direct contact with Western ethnolinguistics, mainly as it is practiced in English-speaking circles. A closer cooperation thus became possible. The first signal of interest on the part of Western scholars in Slavic research came from the young German scholar (then a doctoral student) Jörg Zinken, who after a research stay in Lublin published an article on the “Lublin school” (Zinken 2004). Soon afterwards, the Belgian Slavist Pieter Plas (2006) compared Slavic (more precisely: Moscow and Lublin) ethnolinguistics with its Anglo-American counterpart and with linguistic anthropology. The author points to a parallelism between the two with

regard to the anthropological aspect of the research: both find it necessary to underscore the inalienable link between language, culture, and cultural identity, as well as the importance of folk ethnographic accounts. On the other hand, what gives Slavic ethnolinguistics its unique flavor, claims Plas, is the privileged status it assigns to lexical semantics, especially the cultural, ideological, and axiological aspects of word meanings, rather than to the dynamic pragmatic and functional context, the latter being the case in the Anglo-American publications.

The next move was to publish, again at the initiative of Jörg Zinken, a selection of articles of the present author (in book form and in English). The volume came out in Equinox Publishing (Bartmiński 2009), with the editor's introductory chapter (Zinken 2009). It has enjoyed considerable interest¹⁰ and positive reviews.¹¹

In 2011, the Department of English Studies at UMCS, Lublin, Poland, organised a conference titled *The Linguistic Worldview or Linguistic Views of Worlds?*. The proceedings, plus a few other contributions dealing with Lublin ethnolinguistics¹² and commenting on them,¹³ were then published as Głaz, Danaher, and Łozowski (2013). The volume, as a whole, juxtaposes and compares the work of Lublin-based ethnolinguists with ethnolinguistic and cognitive linguistic research as it transpires through English-language publications (especially by such authors as Anna Wierzbicka and Ronald Langacker).

In the concluding section to her chapter, Elżbieta Tabakowska writes:

What it does, it does extremely well. It has many merits. First, it builds welcome bridges between the "West" and the "East" – not only in the literal, geographical sense by developing networks embracing scholars working in Poland's eastern neighboring countries, but also by striving for closer integration of PCS [Polish Cognitive Studies] with "mainstream" brands of linguistic cognitivism. On the other hand, it promotes Slavic languages in non-Slavic academic circles, where the knowledge of and about them is still rather scarce.

Second, the postulate of bringing linguistic and literary studies closer together and bridging the gap dug by advocates of strict demarcation lines between disciplines that

¹⁰ Cf. Nowosad-Bakalarczyk (2010); Kiklewicz and Wilczewski (2011); Głaz (2013).

¹¹ Cf., among others, Bernárdez (2010); Šarić (2012); Degani (2012); Kulpina and Tatarinov (2012).

¹² Chapters by Jerzy Bartmiński, Agata Bielak, Małgorzata Brzozowska, Dorota Filar, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Marta Nowosad-Bakalarczyk, Anna Pajdzińska, Dorota Piekarczyk, Katarzyna Prorok and Adam Głaz, and Aneta Wysocka.

¹³ Contributions from scholars from outside Poland: David Danaher (USA), Enrique Bernárdez (Spain), James Underhill (France), Irena Vaňková (Czech Republic), Anna Wierzbicka (Australia); and from Poland: Wojciech Chlebda, Agnieszka Gicala, Adam Głaz, Przemysław Łozowski, Agnieszka Mierzwińska-Hajnos, Elżbieta Tabakowska.

build up the field of humanistic studies is invaluable. Practical results of that work are easily seen, if only by reading papers published in the “red series”, are written both by linguists and by literary scholars.

Last but not least, by their focus on colloquial language and folklore, PCS draws linguists’ attention to phenomena that tend to be ignored by other schools of contemporary linguistics, e.g. the investigation of “pragmatic residua” or folk etymologies. (Tabakowska 2013: 334–335)

Slavic ethnolinguistics met with serious interest, followed by actual cooperation, from the Scottish linguist and translator, the France-based specialist in Czech James Underhill (see Underhill 2009, 2011, 2012 on the linguistic worldview), who in 2015 initiated the Rouen Ethnolinguistics Project (REP)¹⁴ and began to organise international ethnolinguistic seminars.¹⁵

In Underhill (2013), the author points out seven characteristic “dimensions” of Lublin ethnolinguistics: attention to the influence of ideology on language, along with the practice of “appropriation” of culturally salient words (such as *the people*) by politicians; the use of interviews and questionnaires as a data elicitation procedure; interest in local rural traditions, in the peripheries distant from metropolitan centres; openness to students and young scholars, both from Poland and overseas; a coherent and joint approach to synchrony and diachrony; sensitivity to belles-lettres; the conception of profiling of base concepts in diverse political and social contexts, which allows for a new perspective on word meaning (Underhill 2013: 340–342). The author also lists, in a symmetrical fashion, seven challenges to Lublin ethnolinguistics: the need for a greater recognition of religious (especially biblical) texts in documenting and reconstructing the linguistic worldview; the need for greater attention to internal semantic diversification (of the *freedom-vs.-liberty* type); more precision in discussing the relationship between prototypes and stereotypes; the validity of prioritizing connotation with respect to denotation (*kochać* ‘love’ and *uwielbiać* ‘love, adore, worship’ denote similar emotions but differ semantically); the need for a recognition of corpora; the need for a more systematic treatment of translated works in the process of linguistic worldview reconstruction.

The “new opening” on the part of Slavic ethnolinguistics onto the proverbial West was marked by the publication, in volume 27 (2015) of this journal, of articles in English authored by Gary B. Palmer (2015), Bert Peeters (2015), Irena Vaňková (2015) (with references to Lublin-produced work), as well as by Polish authors (but also in English), Przemysław Łozowski

¹⁴ <https://rep.univ-rouen.fr>

¹⁵ The latest of those took place in Prague in June 2016. Titled *Kulturní lingvistika pro dnešní Evropu/Cultural Linguistics for Today’s Europe*, it was co-organised by Charles University and Université de Rouen.

and Anna Włodarczyk-Stachurska (2015). The section is preceded, for the benefit of the Polish reader, by an introductory contribution from Adam Głaz (2015).

The latter author says this about a prospective encounter of diverse ethnolinguistic traditions:

It would be instructive to think which of the methodological procedures [of Lublin ethnolinguistics] can be attractive to linguists in the West. In my opinion, good candidates are: the tripartite, balanced SQT (System-Questionnaire-Text) procedure, enriched with corpus analysis; the inclusion of co-linguistic data in linguistic description [...]; the conception of profiling; the fundamental role of cultural values in reconstructing worldviews; the notion of the stereotype, especially in relation to prototype theory... (Głaz 2015: 17)

At the same time, however, the author adds:

One must also reverse the question and ask in what way Lublin ethnolinguistics can progress through contact with other approaches. Two areas come to mind in this respect: first, an incorporation of corpus analysis into the SQT model (as postulated by Underhill 2013: 344); second, the need for a more systematic treatment of translated works in the process of linguistic worldview reconstruction (in the target language and culture) (cf. also Underhill 2013: 344). (Głaz 2015: 17).

In fact, both proposals have partially been met. Corpora *are* taken into account in Lublin ethnolinguistics but they are treated as collections of texts (which means that the problem is actually a broader one and concerns the use of texts; cf. Bartmiński 2014: 284). The proposal to consider the influence of translations on the linguistic worldview in the target culture is legitimate but, again, it comes within a broader issue, namely the selection of the sources for the reconstruction process and the heterogeneity of those sources (also, cf. Popowska-Taborska (2010) on the loan translations, into Polish, of the terms for HONOUR and WORK).

Vistas for fruitful collaboration open with and within the EUROJOS project, where the respective experiences of Slavic and Western ethnolinguists can enrich the repertoire of the questions being posed and supply analytical tools novel to the other side. The project also has a chance to become a platform for matter-of-fact debate and possibly common initiatives (cf. below).

8. The name of the discipline: a few problems

Comparing Slavic ethnolinguistics with its Western counterpart is no easy task inasmuch as the latter enterprise goes by an assortment of names. Similar or plainly the same issues are discussed within disciplines identified through different labels.

The term *ethnolinguistics* was introduced by Bronislaw Malinowski.¹⁶ It then made its way to German (*Ethnolinguistik*), French (*ethnolinguistique*), Russian (*ètnolingvistika*), as well as Czech, Slovak, Serbian, Lithuanian, Polish, and other languages. Malinowski's focus was to capture the worldview of native speakers of a language through observing (actually in the form of participant observation) of their lifestyle, studying their beliefs, and analysing their linguistic behaviour.

In the United States, language in its relations to beliefs and cultural patterns is studied within anthropological linguistics and linguistic anthropology, whereas ethnolinguistics focuses on the languages of ethnic minorities and the socio-pragmatic aspects of language use (Crystal 1987: 412). The relationships between language, culture, and society are also investigated under the rubrics of metalinguistics, macro-linguistics, general semantics, and cognitive anthropology.

In Europe, ethnolinguistic research is mainly concerned with lexical semantics; for example, according to Greimas and Courtés (1979: 134–135), in France it functions as *etnosémiotique*, with *ethnolinguistique* as its component.

In Germany, research on the linguistic worldview has a long and notable tradition,¹⁷ pursued within the framework of the so-called “content-related grammar” (*die inhaltbezogene Grammatik*; cf. Helbig 1970), but the term *Ethnolinguistik* is not enjoying favourable reception to the extent that for Gunter Senft (1998)¹⁸ the focus of ethnolinguistics is the same as that of anthropological linguistics and linguistic anthropology.¹⁹

On Slavic territory, ethnolinguistics – albeit originating with the German linguistic anthropology of Johannes Herder (1744–1803) and Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835) – has moved far beyond these original inspirations and, in the context of linguistic relativity, overtly evokes the work of the Americans Franz Boas, Edward Sapir, and Benjamin Lee Whorf. Over the last two decades of the 20th c., Slavic ethnolinguistics enjoyed its “second birth”

¹⁶ Such is the claim made by Senft (1998) and Gład (2015: 8); cf. also Kijewska-Trembecka (1984).

¹⁷ Cf. surveys in Mańczyk (1982) and Anusiewicz (1990).

¹⁸ Gunter Senft, professor of linguistics at the University of Cologne, is a specialist in several languages, notably in Kilivila, spoken on one of the Trobriand islands. Senft continues Malinowski's work by employing the famous anthropologist's participant observation method: together with his wife, he spent 25 months on the island, studying its language.

¹⁹ Senft compares William Foley's *Anthropological Linguistics* (1997) with Alessandro Duranti's *Linguistic Anthropology* (1997) and concludes that in fact these are synonymous names of the same discipline, dealing with language as a cultural resource and with speaking as cultural practice.

(in the parlance of Nikita Tolstoy): it engaged into new kinds of relationship with sociolinguistics, ecolinguistics,²⁰ and especially with cognitive linguistics, yet remaining distinct from each.

9. Two perspectives on the language-culture relationship

Mutual compatibility of various models of ethnolinguistic research rests in, as has already been said, their coherent focus on the language-culture relationship. This “reciprocal dependence” kind of relationship can be viewed from two perspectives: one can investigate the role of language in culture or that of culture in language.²¹ If we take the “language-in-culture” approach, we inquire about the role of language in social life, about its status, prestige, contact with other languages, multilingualism – in other words, we treat language as a part of culture, where the preferred focus are small social and cultural groups, such as ethnic minorities (cf. Crystal 2000; Ziółkowski 1987; Zieniukowa 1998). This, in effect, is the focus, not of ethnolinguistics but sociolinguistics (Helbig 1986: 239) or of the new discipline of ecolinguistics, initiated by Einar Haugen (cf. Wysoczański 2000).

If, however, we inquire into the place of culture in language, which is what ethnolinguistics pledges to do, we strive to reconstruct the subjective (i.e., subject-driven) worldview entrenched in language, in its grammatical forms, in the structure of lexical fields, or in word meanings. Does this kind of reconstruction amount to severing language and the mental sphere that accompanies it from reality, as is suggested by some scholars (cf. Łozowski 2014)? Does conceptualisation pull the linguistic worldview away from the actual object, the real-life referent? We do not go that far. The concept of HOME as ‘dwelling, living’ does not nullify the image of the physical ‘place for living’. By introducing the notion of the conceptualising and speaking subject (*homo cogitans*, *homo loquens*), we want to relate to psychological, social, and axiological experience, but also to the most basic somatic, sensuous experience, the denotation of the lexemes *homes* and (especially) *house* that links their semantics with the physical, material object. Language functions in specific situational frames, in connection with the behavioural sphere – it is verified by practice. The “final” or “ultimate interpretant” of meaning (in the sense of Charles S. Peirce) is one’s attitude to a given utterance, action

²⁰ Głaz (2015: 8) notes a close affinity between ethnolinguistics and ecolinguistics but regards them as distinct disciplines.

²¹ Łozowski (2014) also draws attention to the symmetrical or asymmetrical nature of the relationship.

taken with respect to what the utterance links with. And it links with the image of a real-life object (i.e., the meaning, concept, idea), as well as with the object itself.

10. Ethnolinguistics, i.e. cultural linguistics

In his *magnum opus*, Janusz Anusiewicz (1995) rightly distinguishes cultural linguistics (with its focus on language) from linguistic anthropology (with its focus on culture). He also, this time without an equally good justification, treats it as distinct from ethnolinguistics (anthropological linguistics) – indeed, he contrasts the two.²² Anusiewicz's error was corrected several years later by Anna Dąbrowska:

My impression is that the subject matter of [ethnolinguistics] aligns rather closely with that of [cultural linguistics]. The impression is nearly palpable when one considers the content of at least some of the volumes of the journals *Etnolingwistyka* and *Język a Kultura*.²³ (Dąbrowska 2005: 100)

Therefore, according to the author,

the two labels [*ethnolinguistics* and *cultural linguistics*, JB] can be used interchangeably, either being the potentially preferred term. (Dąbrowska 2005: 100)

Myself, I offered a few comments on the issue in Bartmiński (2008). In the Lublin circles the term *etnolingwistyka*/*ethnolinguistics* has been favoured from the beginning, not least because it allows, in Polish, for handy derivations of an adjective (*etnolingwistyczny* 'ethnolinguistic') or of an agentive noun (*etnolingwista* 'ethnolinguist').²⁴ However, the priority of the language-culture relationship for the scholars associated with the Lublin circles can be seen in the subtitle to an edited volume dedicated to myself on the occasion of forty years of my academic career: "In the mirror of language and culture" (Adamowski and Niebrzegowska 1999).

In the course of work on the Dictionary of Folk Stereotypes and Symbols, the Lublin ethnolinguistic team have worked out a cognitive ethnolinguistic

²² Anusiewicz's argument that ethnolinguistics "is currently concerned with the relationship between folk dialects and folklore, rather than between the standard variety and general culture" (1995: 11) was misinformed from the very beginning and uncorroborated even by the content of the first volumes of *Etnolingwistyka*, to which the author actually refers. An equally erroneous claim was that the notions of stereotype and cognitive definition can only be applied to the "peculiar kind of culture that folk culture is" (Anusiewicz 1995: 105).

²³ Eng. "Language and Culture", a journal published by Wrocław University Press, available at <http://jk.sjol.eu>.

²⁴ No such preference seems to arise in the case of the English term. [translator's note]

approach with a whole terminological-descriptive toolbox that contains the following notions: linguistic worldview, stereotypes (colloquial mental images of people, objects and phenomena held by a given community), cognitive definition (to account for the language-entrenched interpretation of the world maintained by the language speakers), point of view and perspective for viewing reality, profiling of base images, and finally the importance of the experiencing, conceptualising, and speaking subject, operating with his/her experiential database and following specific intentions in cultural communication, relative to such and such values.²⁵

11. Values as a privileged theme in ethnolinguistic research

Values enjoy a privileged status in this array. Their role in culture cannot be overestimated, they constitute an inalienable aspect of language, its obligatory parameter.²⁶ Interest in values in language (or, in the words of Jadwiga Puzynina, “the language of values”) increased in Poland and Russia when analyses of the communist newspeak revealed the influence of language on people’s perception of reality and on their behaviour, as well as the existence of “symbolic power” (in the sense of Pierre Bourdieu). Indeed, for some time we have been witnessing what can be called an “axiological turn” in linguistics.²⁷

In 1985, a Polish axiological dictionary was conceived, soon to be extended onto a project for a Slavic axiological dictionary (Yudin 2003), and then followed by broader cross-cultural research. In the early 2000s these ideas took specific shape in the form of the EUROJOS project,²⁸ with the goal to compile and describe an axiological lexicon of Slavs and their neighbours.

²⁵ Each of these notions was at a certain point the theme of a separate conference, whose proceedings were published in the so-called “red series” of the Department of Polish Philology, UMCS, Lublin.

²⁶ Cf. Krzeszowski (1994) for an especially convincing argumentation.

²⁷ In Russia, there is work of Nina Arutyunova, Anna Zaliznyak, Irina Levontina and Aleksey Shmelev, Irina Sedakova, Lena Berezovich, Svetlana Tolstaya; in Poland, the authors active in this field are Zofia Zaron, Jadwiga Puzynina, Elżbieta Laskowska, Renata Grzegorzczkova, Tomasz P. Krzeszowski, Jerzy Bartmiński. The trend also includes the work of Anna Wierzbicka on cultural key words, first in Polish, then in English (1997, 2010) and Russian.

²⁸ Cf. Bartmiński and Bielińska-Gardziel in this volume.

12. The EUROJOS project and the future of cultural linguistics

The international EUROJOS project is currently the most important avenue of research within ethnolinguistics *qua* cultural linguistics.

The axiological lexicon is an attempt to produce parallel descriptions of values in Slavic languages, but also against the backdrop of values as encoded in other languages. Values constitute the very core of any culture: to define one's identity, both at the individual and the communal level, it is necessary to identify the values people cherish and specify one's relationship to them. Specific analyses were launched with an inquiry into five concepts: HOUSE/HOME, EUROPE (for Europe is the home we live in, it is the place where we want to feel "at home"), WORK (an object of special interest in today's uncertain employment situation), FREEDOM (for it is a flagship value in our part of the world), and HONOUR (for it reaches back to the very origin of European culture, to ancient Greece, while the related notion of dignity is mentioned in the United Nations' 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*). The lexicon will aim to identify the similarities and the cultural specificities in those concepts. Its guiding idea is a quest for "unity in diversity".

The lexicon is being compiled with the aid of a conceptual and terminological toolbox agreed on through a series of meetings and seminars. The actual descriptions and definitions are constructed in parallel fashion and are based on a comparable set of sources. Values are treated as "cultural concepts", ones that are axiologically laden, endowed with culture-specific connotations. So far (June 2017) volumes on HOUSE/HOME (Bartmiński, Bielińska-Gardziel and Żywicka 2015), WORK (Bartmiński, Brzozowska and Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2016), and HONOUR (Ajdaczić and Sotirov 2017) have been published, the subsequent volumes (on EUROPE and FREEDOM) are in preparation.²⁹ Both the EUROJOS project and the axiological lexicon will be further pursued under the patronage of the Ethnolinguistic Commission affiliated with the International Slavic Committee, the Institute of Slavic Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences, and the Department of Polish Philology of UMCS in Lublin.

translated by Adam Głaz

²⁹ Cf. a report in Bartmiński, Bielińska-Gardziel, and Chlebda 2016.

References

- Adamowski, Jan and Stanisława Niebrzegowska (eds.). 1999. *W zwierciadle języka i kultury*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Agapkina, Tatyana (ed.). 2013. *Slavyanskaya etnolingvistika. Bibliografiya*. 4th ed. Moskva.
- Ajdaczić, Dejan. 2006. Etnolingwistyka w Serbii. *Etnolingwistyka* 18: 67–75.
- Ajdaczić, Dejan and Petar Sotirov (eds.). 2017. *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. 5: HONOR. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Antropov, Nikolay and Tatyana Volodina. 2006. Belorusskaya etnolingwistyka segodnya: realizatsiya idey. *Etnolingwistyka* 18: 47–65.
- Anusiewicz, Janusz. 1990. Problematyka językowego obrazu świata w poglądach niektórych językoznawców i filozofów niemieckich XX wieku. In: Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Językowy obraz świata*. 277–307. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Anusiewicz, Janusz. 1995. *Lingwistyka kulturowa. Zarys problematyki*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy. 1988. Słowo wstępne. *Etnolingwistyka* 1: 5–7.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2004. Etnolingwistyka słowiańska – próba bilansu. *Etnolingwistyka* 16: 9–27. [English translation: Basic assumptions of Slavic ethnolinguistics. In: *Die slavischen Sprachen. The Slavic Languages. Ein internationales Handbuch zu ihrer Struktur, ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung. An International Handbook of their Structure, their History and their Investigation*. Herausgegeben von/edited by Karl Gutschmidt, Sebastian Kempgen, Tilman Berger, Peter Kosta, Band 2/Volume 2, 2014, 1165–1175. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.]
- Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2006. Niektóre problemy i pojęcia etnolingwistyki lubelskiej. *Etnolingwistyka* 18: 77–90.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2008. Etnolingwistyka, lingwistyka kulturowa, lingwistyka antropologiczna? *Język a Kultura* 20: 15–33.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2009. *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*. London and Oakville, CT: Equinox. [paperback 2012, Sheffield and Oakville, CT: Equinox]
- Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2011. Pol'sko-rossiyskiye vstrechi na pole etnolingvistiki. *Novaya Pol'sha* 7–8 (132): 51–55.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2014. Ankieta jako pomocnicze narzędzie rekonstrukcji językowego obrazu świata. In: Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, and Joanna Szadura (eds.) *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów 3. Problemy eksplikowania i profilowania pojęć*. 279–308. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2015. Tradycja uśpiona w języku. Pytania o źródła polskiej tożsamości kulturowej. In: Jan Adamowski and Marta Wójcicka (eds.) *Wartości w języku i kulturze*, vol. 8. 11–33. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy and Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel. Fifteen years of the EUROJOS project. This volume.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel and Wojciech Chlebda. 2016. Raport z realizacji grantu „Metody analizy językowego obrazu świata w kontekście badań porównawczych”. *Etnolingwistyka* 28: 325–328.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel and Beata Żywicka (eds.). 2015. *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów, t. 1: DOM*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Małgorzata Brzozowska and Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (eds.). 2016. *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów, t. 3: PRACA*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1969. *Le vocabulaire des institutions indoeuropéennes*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minui.
- Bernárdez, Enrique. 2010. Language and culture. A review of Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 8 (2): 376–385.
- Boguta, Agnieszka (ed.) 2010. *Bibliografia analityczna „czerwonej serii” 1981–2008*, vols. 1–25. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Chlebda Wojciech. 2013. Can Polish ethnolinguistics become a philological keystone of the humanities? In: Adam Głaz, David S. Danaher, and Przemysław Łozowski (eds.) *The Linguistic Worldview. Ethnolinguistics, Cognition and Culture*. 25–37. London: Versita. DOI: 10.2478/9788376560748.c1
- Chlebda, Wojciech. 2010. W poszukiwaniu językowo-kulturowego obrazu świata Słowian. In: Wojciech Chlebda (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka a leksykografia. Tom poświęcony Profesorowi Jerzemu Bartmińskiemu*. 7–20. Opole: Wydawnictwo UO.
- Crystal, David. 1987. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, David. 2000. *Language Death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dąbrowska, Anna. 2005. Współczesne problemy lingwistyki kulturowej. In: Małgorzata Czerwińska et al. (eds.) *Polonistyka w przebudowie*, vols. 1 and 2. 99–110. Kraków: Universitas.
- Duranti, Alessandro. 1997. *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Feoktistova, Lyubov'. 2006. Etnolingwisticheskiye issledovaniya v ural'skom universitete. *Etnolingwistyka* 18: 29–46.
- Foley, William. 1997. *Anthropological Linguistics*. Malden, Mass. and Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Degani, Marta. 2012. Review: Semantics; Cognitive Science: Bartmiński (2012). *LINGUIST List* 23.3940, Sep 24, 2012. <http://linguistlist.org/issues/23/23-3940.html>, accessed 22 Nov, 2016.
- Gamkrelidze, Tamaz and Vyacheslav Ivanov. 1984. *Indoyevropeiskiy yazyk i indoyevropeitsy. Rekonstruktsiya i istoriko-tipologicheskij analiz prayazyka i protokul'tury*. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press and Georgian Academy of Sciences.
- Głaz, Adam. 2013. Prostowanie zwierciadła. Przyczynek do (jeszcze?) niezaiśnialej dyskusji nt. kondycji lubelskiej etnolingwistyki. *Biuletyn PTJ* XLIX: 139–151.
- Głaz, Adam. 2015. Etnolingwistyka daleka i bliska. *Etnolingwistyka* 27: 7–20. DOI: 10.17951/et.2015.27.7
- Głaz, Adam, David S. Danaher, and Przemysław Łozowski (eds.) 2013. *The Linguistic Worldview. Ethnolinguistics, Cognition, and Culture*. London: Versita. <https://www.degruyter.com/view/product/246955>
- Greimas, Algirdas and Joseph Courtés. 1979. *Sémiotique. Dictionnaire raisonné de la théorie du langage*. Paris: Hachette.
- Havlová, Eva (ed.). 1989–. *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského*. (Seš. 1–6 ed. E. Havlová, 7–12 ed. A. Erhart, 13–16 ed. Ilona Janyšková). Brno: Tribun EU.
- Helbig, Gerhard. 1970. *Die Geschichte der neueren Sprachwissenschaft*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Helbig, Gerhard. 1986. *Entwicklung der Sprachwissenschaft seit 1970*. Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut.

- Kiklewicz, Aleksander and Michał Wilczewski. 2011. Współczesna lingwistyka kulturowa: zagadnienia dyskusyjne (na marginesie monografii Jerzego Bartmińskiego *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*. *Biuletyn PTJ* XLV II: 165–178.
- Kijewska-Trembecka, Marta. 1984. Etnolingwistyczna koncepcja języka Bronisława Malinowskiego. *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 11/12 (230/231): 71–80.
- Krzyszowski, Tomasz P. 1994. Parametr aksjologiczny w przedpojęciowych schematach wyobrażeniowych. *Etnolingwistyka*: 29–51.
- Kulpina, Valentina and Viktor Tatarinov. 2012. O сопоставительных аспектах польской когнитивной этнолингвистики. *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta* 1: 82–88.
- Łozowski, Przemysław. 2014. W poszukiwaniu ontologicznego statusu JOS: językowy obraz świata czy językowy obraz kultury i doświadczenia? In: Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, and Joanna Szadura (eds.) *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów 3. Problemy eksplikowania i profilowania pojęć*. 9–19. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Łozowski, Przemysław and Anna Włodarczyk-Stachurska. 2015. The need for textual evidence in reconstructing linguistic pictures of conceptual categories. *Etnolingwistyka* 27: 87–102. DOI: 10.17951/et.2015.27.87
- Maksymiuk-Pacek, Beata and Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (eds.). 2009. *Bibliografia adnotowana lubelskiego zespołu etnolingwistycznego (do roku 2009)*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Mańczyk, Augustyn. 1982. *Wspólnota językowa i jej obraz świata. Krytyczne uwagi do teorii językowej Leo Weisgerbera*. Zielona Góra: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława. 2003. Komisja Etnolingwistyczna przy Międzynarodowym Komitecie Slawistów. *Etnolingwistyka* 15: 280–281.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława. 2010. Dwa słowniki etnolingwistyczne – moskiewski i lubelski. In: Wojciech Chlebda (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka a leksykografia. Tom poświęcony Profesorowi Jerzemu Bartmińskiemu*. 21–32. Opole: Wydawnictwo UO.
- Nowosad-Bakalarczyk, Marta. 2010. [Review of] Jerzy Bartmiński, *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*. Red. Jörg Zinken, Londyn: Equinox, 2009, 256 s. *Biuletyn PTJ* XLVI: 253–261.
- OLA. 1988–. *Obshchесlavянский лингвистический атлас*. [Slavonic Linguistic Atlas] Moskva: Nauka.
- Palmer, Gary B. 2015. Ethnography: A neglected method of inductive linguistics. *Etnolingwistyka* 27: 21–45. DOI: 10.17951/et.2015.27.21
- Peeters, Bert. 2015. Language, culture and values: Towards an ethnolinguistics based on abduction and salience. *Etnolingwistyka* 27: 47–62. DOI: 10.17951/et.2015.27.47
- Pelcowa, Halina. 2006. Dialektologia a etnolingwistyka. *Etnolingwistyka* 18: 91–103.
- Plas, Pieter. 2006. Slavic ethnolinguistics and Anglo-American linguistic anthropology: Convergences and divergences in the study of the language-culture nexus. *Etnolingwistyka* 18: 135–143.
- Popowska-Taborska, Hanna. 2010. W poszukiwaniu językowego obrazu świata. ‘Dom’, ‘praca’, ‘wolność’ a także ‘honor’ i ‘Europa’ w kaszubskich dialektach i w powstającym kaszubskim języku literackim. *Etnolingwistyka* 22: 53–71.
- Šarić, Liljana. 2012. Bartmiński, Jerzy, 2009. *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*. *Studies in Language* 36 (4): 956–965.
- SD. 1995–2012. *Slavjanskiye drevnosti*. Etnolingvističeskij slovar' v 5 tomakh. [Slavic Antiquities: An Ethnolinguistic Dictionary in 5 volumes] Vol. 1-5. Ed. Nikita Tolstoy. Moskva: Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya.

- Senft, Gunter. 1998. Ethnolinguistik. In: Bettina Beer and Hans Fischer (eds.) *Ethnologie. Einführung und Überblick*. 4th ed. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- SLSJ. 1980. *Słownik ludowych stereotypów językowych. Zeszyt próbny*. [Dictionary of folk linguistic stereotypes. Preliminary installment] Wrocław: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Sławski, Franciszek (ed.). 1974–2001. *Słownik prastłowiański*. Vols. 1–8 (A–F). Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- SSiSL. 1999–. Słownik stereotypów i symboli ludowych. [Dictionary of Folk Stereotypes and Symbols] Vol. 1, parts 1–4. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Sulima, Roch. 2006. Folklorystyka i etnolingwistyka a horyzont poznawczy antropologii kultury. *Etnolingwistyka* 18: 121–128.
- Tabakowska, Elżbieta. 2013. A linguistic picture, image, or view of “Polish Cognitive Studies”. In: Adam Głaz, David S. Danaheer and Przemysław Łozowski (eds.) *The Linguistic Worldview. Ethnolinguistics, Cognition and Culture*. 321–338. London: Versita.
- Tolstaya, Svetlana M. 1993. Etnolingvistika v Lyubline. *Slavyanovedeniye* 3: 47–59.
- Tolstaya, Svetlana M. 1997. Slovar’ narodnykh stereotipov i simvolov. T. I. Kosmos. *Zhivaya starina* 4: 52–53.
- Tolstaya, Svetlana M. 2006. Postulaty moskovskoy etnolingvistiki. *Etnolingwistyka* 18: 7–27.
- Tolstaya Svetlana M. 2013. Nikita Ilyich Tolstoy i jego put’ k etnolingvistike. *Ethnolinguistica Slavica. K 90-letiyu akademika Nikity Ilyicha Tolstogo*. 10–25. Moskva: Indrik.
- Tolstoy, Nikita I. 1990. Yazyk i kul’tura. (Nekotoryye problemy slavyanskoy etnolingvistiki). *Zeitschrift für Slawische Philologie*, Bd L, Heft 2: 238–253. [Polish translation in *Etnolingwistyka* 5: 15–25, 1992]
- Tolstoy, Nikita I. 1995. *Yazyk i narodnaya kul’tura. Ocherki po slavyanskoy mifologii i etnolingvistike*. Moskva: Indrik.
- Tomczak, Łukasz. 2010. *Etnolingwistyka. Bibliografia adnotowana 1988–2008*. Ed. Jerzy Bartmiński and Sebastian Wasiuta. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Trubachev, Oleg N. (ed.). 1974–. *Etimologicheskii slovar’ slavyanskikh yazykov: praslavyanskiy leksicheskiy fond*. Vols. 1–28, 1974–2002; vols. 29–39, 2002–2014, ed. Anatoliy Zhuravlev. Moskva: Nauka.
- Tyrpa, Anna. 2006. Etnolingwistyka ludowa, narodowa, porównawcza – koncepcje neofilologów i polonistów. *Etnolingwistyka* 18: 105–116.
- Underhill, James. 2009. *Humboldt, Worldview and Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Underhill, James. 2011. *Creating Worldviews. Metaphor, Ideology and Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Underhill, James. 2012. *Ethnolinguistics and Cultural Concepts. Truth, Love, Hate and War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Underhill, James. 2013. Reflections upon Bartmiński’s ethnolinguistic approach to language and culture. In: Adam Głaz, David S. Danaheer and Przemysław Łozowski (eds.) *The Linguistic Worldview. Ethnolinguistics, Cognition and Culture*. 339–349. London: Versita.
- Vaňková, Irena. 2015. *Vánoce* ‘Christmas’ in the ethnolinguistic perspective. Czech key words and values. *Etnolingwistyka* 27: 63–86. DOI: 10.17951/et.2015.27.63
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1997. *Understanding Cultures through their Key Words*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Wierzbicka, Anna. 2010. Cross-cultural communication and miscommunication: The role of cultural keywords. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 7 (1): 1–23.
- Wrocławski, Krzysztof. 2006. Folklorystyka, etnolingwistyka, etnofilologia? *Etnolingwistyka* 18: 117–120.
- Wysoczański, Włodzimierz. 2000. Ekologia języka jako dyscyplina heterogenicznego opisu języka. *Biuletyn PTJ* LV: 63–76.
- Yudin, Aleksey. 2003. Projekt “Slavyanskogo aksiologicheskogo slovaryā”. O sozdanii issledovatel’skoy gruppy po razrabotke aksiologicheskogo slovaryā. In Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Język w kręgu wartości*. 456–458. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Zgółka, Tadeusz. 2006. Etnolingwistyka praktyczna. *Etnolingwistyka* 18: 129–134.
- Zieniukowa, Jadwiga. 1998. Z problemów etnolingwistyki. In: Ewa Jędrzejko (ed.) *Nowe czasy, nowe języki, nowe (i stare) problemy*. 233–241. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Zinken, Jörg. 2004. Metaphors, stereotypes, and the linguistic picture of the world: Impulses from the Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin. *Metaphorik.de* 7: 115–137.
- Zinken, Jörg. 2009. The Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin and Anglo-American cognitive linguistics. In: Jerzy Bartmiński. *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*. 1–5. London and Oakville, CT: Equinox.
- Ziółkowski, Marek. 1987. Etnolingwistyka. In: Zofia Staszczak (ed.) *Słownik etnologiczny. Terminy ogólne*. 94–97. Warszawa–Poznań: PWN.