I. Articles

DOI: 10.17951/et.2018.30.231

Adam Głaz
ORCID: 0000-0002-6143-3542
(UMCS, Lublin, Poland)

Cognitive ethnolinguistics from Lublin and cultural linguistics in the English-speaking context*

Abstract. Basic sources of inspiration in the emergence of Lublin cognitive ethnolinguistics (LCE) include: research on the language of folklore (directly inspired by Maria Renata Mayenowa, and indirectly by Roman Jakobson and Piotr Bogatyryev), Russian ethnolinguistics (Nikita Tolstoy) and semiotics (Vyacheslav Ivanov and Vladimir Toporov), 18th- and 19th-c. German thought (Johann Herder, Wilhelm von Humboldt), the idea of linguistic relativity (Franz Boas, Edward Sapir, Benjamin Whorf), plus a major role that has been played by the work of Bronislaw Malinowski and, especially, Anna Wierzbicka. Inspirations from cognitive linguistics have enriched Lublin ethnolinguistics with the cognitive dimension. After several decades of its existence, LCE functions alongside models of cultural linguistics as it is practised by authors writing in English, especially with an approach known as Cultural Linguistics (capitalised), associated with the names of Farzad Sharifian or Gary Palmer. It is also instructive to consider, in this context, specific issues and challenges that LCE must face, as has been pointed out by Western scholars (not necessarily working under the rubric of Cultural Linguistics). Two such problems are discussed here: the role of translation in the reconstruction of linguistic worldview (raised by James Underhill) and the notion of linguistic worldview as such, as it is understood in LCE and Cultural Linguistics.

Key words: Lublin cognitive ethnolinguistics; cultural linguistics in English; Cultural Linguistics; linguistic worldview; translation and reconstruction of linguistic worldview

* The article appeared in Polish as "Lubelska etnolingwistyka kognitywna a anglojęzyczna lingwistyka kulturowa. Wybrane problemy" in *Etnolingwistyka* 30. 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. Introduction

Thirty volumes of the journal *Etnolingwistyka/Ethnolinguistics*, published over the course of thirty consecutive years, are a good incentive to look back at the history and current status quo of both the journal and the whole discipline. It is also a good occasion to venture an insight into possible developments in the future. Indeed, surveys and syntheses of this kind have already been offered by authors directly or more loosely connected with Lublin ethnolinguistics: cf. Bartmiński (2017) or my own attempts to familiarise the Polish reader with Western ethnolinguistic ideas (Głaz 2015) or the Western reader with the Polish context (Głaz 2017). This has in fact been happening periodically: Bartmiński wrote synthetically on Slavic ethnolinguistics (Bartmiński 2004; 2009b); Plas (2006) compared Slavic ethnolinguistics and American linguistic anthropology; Zinken (2009) juxtaposed the Lublin-based work with American cognitivism, pointing to their distinct origins, differences of approach, but also similarities and points of convergence. Paradoxically, it is the similarities that can block the way to mutual understanding; Zinken concludes his survey with a "final caveat: fruitful exchange between academic traditions is not easy" (2009: 5).

The present study is partly synthetic but is also offers an account of selected specific issues identified as important and ways of dealing with them within the traditions of Lublin cognitive ethnolinguistics and Western cultural linguistics in English.

But before this can be done, a major problem of terminological and theoretical nature needs first to be addressed: what in fact is the Western English-language cultural linguistics or, as formulated in the title, cultural linguistics in the English-speaking context? It is not simply "Western" cultural linguistics because, as reported by our colleagues from Romance philological circles, linguists writing in French are much more inclined to engage in sociologically-oriented discourse analysis. The Rouen-based ethnolinguist, James Underhill, is Scottish and mainly publishes in English (Underhill 2009, 2011, 2012, 2013), like other Anglophone scholars working in France, e.g. Philip Riley from Université de Lorraine in Nancy (cf. Riley 2007). Aline Viviand-Esik, who obtained her doctoral degree from Université Paris IV Sorbonne and the Polish Wrocław University on the basis of a dissertation in French (Viviand-Esik 2014; fragments in English: Viviand-Esik 2017), can be considered an exception, albeit a commendable one.[1] The French

[1] Interestingly, even the work of Pierre Demarolle from the university in Nancy, published in *Etnolingwistyka* (Demarolle 2003), has an unmistakably sociological profile (cf. its title: "Semantics and society. The notions of selection and pre-orientation in the

and English contexts are also home ground for John Leavitt of Université de Montréal. On the other hand, English is the language of publication for Carsten Levisen, who is Danish, Anna Wierbicka (Polish), Bert Peeters (Belgian),[2] or Farzad Sharifian (Iranian): the first of them works in his home country, the others, in Australia. Since cultural linguists can represent many configurations of language, geography and nationality, by cultural linguistics in the English context, I understand a section of cultural linguistics (including ethnolinguistics) that is practised by scholars who publish in English and mainly refer to English sources (but are not necessarily native speakers of the language) and can be affiliated with institutions in many parts of the world.

Another problem is to identify and isolate a portion of cultural linguistic research that could be compared with Lublin cognitive ethnolinguistics (LCE). The 500-page *Routledge Handbook of Language and Culture* (Sharifian 2015b) and the volume *Advances in Cultural Linguistics* (Sharifian 2017a) contain contributions, at various levels of detail, on linguistic relativity, linguaculture, cultural semiotics, cultural scripts, cultural aspects of translation, language and cultural history, intercultural communication, multimodal communication, ethnosyntax, ethnosemantics, motifs in folk songs, the language of religion, myths, emotions, and politics, language and aging, language acquisition and development, language teaching, dialectal diversity, world Englishes, embodiment, prototype effects, colour categorisation, the language of space and time, kinship, conceptualisations of body parts, (im)politeness, humour, forms of address, irony, language and cultural gender, language and identity, language and the personal self, evidentials, or writing systems. Also discussed there is the relationship between cultural linguistics on the one hand and sociolinguistics or linguistic anthropology on the other. As one can see, the range of research areas could hardly be broader. Consequently, any attempt to compare cultural linguistics thus understood with LCE clearly calls for a narrower focus. That is what this study aims to provide.

2. Outline

I therefore claim that the most instructive way of moving forwards would be to selectively focus on some of the issues investigated in LCE and English-language cultural linguistics. I will look at those issues from

French school system in 1956–1968").

[2] Peeters also works in French and Flemish, cf. the Rouen Ethnolinguistics Project (REP) website.

the point of view of a cognitive linguist, a collaborator and translator, but also a critic of both traditions. In what follows, I will schematically draw the necessary historical background and then move on to a discussion of two specific problems. The background involves issues of terminology, the origin and development of Lublin ethnolinguistics and Western linguistic anthropology (or anthropological linguistics), the model of ethnolinguistics as proposed by James Underhill, and the emergence of Cultural Linguistics (sic!), together with its peripheries.

The two specific problems I will deal with are:

1. the role and place of translation in linguistic worldview research;

2. the very idea of linguistic worldview, the methods of its investigation in the Lublin academic environment and the dispersed community of English-language scholars.

At least the latter problem is not new (cf. Głaz, Danaher and Łozowski 2013; Głaz 2017) but the approach and some of the observations proposed here can be.

3. The background

In several publications, Jerzy Bartmiński (the key figure in LCE) discusses his preference for the term *ethnolinguistics* as the name of the discipline over other options (see Bartmiński 2009a: 7–8; 2017: 21–23). He refers to the rather unfortunate proposal made by Janusz Anusiewicz in the latter's fundamental book *Lingwistyka kulturowa* (1994) to link ethnolinguistics only with folk culture, as well as the correction that came from Anna Dąbrowska (2005), who competently argued for the factual identity of cultural linguistics and ethnolinguistics. The term *ethnolinguistics* probably comes from Bronislaw Malinowski,[3] whose goal was to capture the collective worldview of specific communities. If, then, Lublin-based ethnolinguists follow Malinowski in this respect, it is perhaps justifiable to see their endeavours as coming close to anthropology. According to Bartmiński (2009a: 7), ethnolinguistics focuses not so much on the language of a given community as on the community itself (with the worldview if cherishes): this unmistakably lies within the scope of anthropological inquiry. However, access to the collective awareness and worldview of that community is obtained by analysing its language, so that the methodology employed for the purpose comes from linguistics. In the literature on the subject published in English, one talks about *anthropological*

[3] According to Gunter Senft (2013).

linguistics, *cultural linguistics*, or *linguistic anthropology*, the latter term being especially common in the USA.[4]

Lublin ethnolinguistics derives from a few major sources (cf. Bartmiński 2017), the first and most important of which is research on the language of folklore inspired directly by Maria Renata Mayenowa, and indirectly by Roman Jakobson and Pyotr Bogatyryev. The second source comprises etymological and dialectological studies, mainly Russian, on Slavic folk culture (the so-called "Tolstoy ethnolinguistics", cf. Tołstoj 1992). An original proposal of the Lublin team, in a sense parallel to the Moscow pan-Slavic dictionary *Slavyanskiye drevnosti* (1995–2012), is the *Słownik stereotypów i symboli ludowych* (Dictionary of Folk Stereotypes and Symbols) (1996–), which focuses exclusively on Polish data.[5] The third source is the 18th- and 19th-c. thought of the Germans Johann Herder and Wilhelm von Humboldt. The key notion developed by the latter is that of *worldview*.[6] A detailed inquiry into Humboldt's approach to language and worldview has been offered by Jürgen Trabant (2000, 2015) and the aforementioned James Underhill (2009), who point out the difference between Humboltd's *Weltansicht* and *Weltanschauung*, as well as the vast misunderstanding that has resulted from a cavalier reading of his output. Further inspiration came from the work of American "relativists", Franz Boas, Edward Sapir, and Benjamin Lee Whorf, the first two of whom were in fact European Jews.[7] Another key influence on Lublin ethnolinguis-

[4] Some authors (Duranti 2009: 3; Sharifian 2017c) consider *ethnolinguistics* to be the most common term with regard to the research in Europe, which appears to my mind a misjudgement. No statistics are available: nonetheless, a cursory survey of book publications from the last decade suggests otherwise. Also, in his extensive discussion of the tenets and scopes of various approaches to the language-culture nexus, both in the Polish and English-language (mainly American) context, Chruszczewski (2013) mentions the term *etnolingwistyka* (*ethnolinguistics*) only once, following Anusiewicz (1994). Surprisingly, Chruszczewski makes no comment on Anusiewicz's claim that "the disciplines [cultural linguistics, anthropological linguistics/ethnolinguistics, linguistic anthropology] are not particularly broadly pursued in Poland" (Anusiewicz 1994: 11; cited in: Chruszczewski 2013: 63). Even if it were true in 1994, twenty years later it is certainly no longer the case (at least with regard to Lublin's ethnolinguistics).

[5] Although much of its theoretical basis relies on the Tartu-Moscow semiotics (whose principles were applied to linguistic analysis by Ivanov and Toporov 1965), few scholars today would question that the Lublin dictionary is a founding work of great originality. Svetlana Tolstaya describes the relationship between the two dictionaries as follows: "The Lublin dictionary sets an unattainable example of perfection and attention to detail in dealing with linguistic and cultural data. The broader, pan-Slavic perspective, in turn, creates more opportunities for interpretation by going beyond a specific national tradition" (Tołstojowa 2010: 269).

[6] Although its origin is sought in earlier thinking, e.g. in the work of Martin Luther (Wikipedia).

[7] Especially striking here is the influence of Romantic and post-Romantic German

tics, apart from that of Bronislaw Malinowski (see above), has also been exerted by the work of Anna Wierzbicka, especially her ground-breaking monograph *Lexicography and Conceptual Analysis* (Wierzbicka 1985).

Since the 1970s, Lublin ethnolinguistics has seen a significant extension of its scope in two major directions. First, the methodology that has been developed for research into folk language, and culture began to be used in analyses of standard, general, and colloquial Polish, with its many variants and sociolects. Fragments of the linguistic worldview of the speaker of Polish began to be reconstructed piecemeal, with a recent further extension onto other languages (cf. the EUROJOS project below). Second, more systematic use began to be made of the findings of cognitive linguistics.[8] Furthermore, Lublin ethnolinguistics has received the label *cognitive* – this has been initiated by Jörg Zinken, the editor of Jerzy Bartmiński's *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics* (2009a).[9]

In Western scholarship, a progressively more systematic inquiry into the language-culture nexus began to be pursued at the turn of the 20$^{\text{th}}$ c., in ways that the then intellectual elites must have found iconoclastic, namely through fieldwork. Thanks to the work of Alfred Kroeber, Franz Boas, and then e.g. Margaret Mead, they changed American anthropology and linguistics; the principle of linguistic relativity was openly formulated by Sapir and Whorf.[10] In Europe, Malinowski went one step further by proposing the method of participant observation. The revolutionary idea in the work of those authors, but present already in Herder, was that the speakers of Trobriand, Nootka, Navaho, Takelma, Hopi, Kwakiutl, or Nahuatl operate within the worldview entrenched in each of those languages. Furthermore, the worldview is not only coherent and intriguing; it may through comparison facilitate access to our own, mainly Anglo-centric, conceptual system, a system that had been viewed as the most legitimate, if not the absolute, frame of reference.

---

tradition that Boas made used extensively. For example, it is amazing how many of the ideas that are now associated with Humboldt, or even Sapir and Whorf, can be found in earlier writings of Johann Herder (cf. an extensive account in Leavitt 2011, chapter 4).

[8] The journal *Etnolingwistyka* published the work of, among others, George Lakoff (2003) and Ronald Langacker (2004) in Polish translation.

[9] A critical reaction to the idea came from Kiklewicz and Wilczewski (2011), which in turn met with a riposte from Głaz (2013). A view different from the former authors is also represented by Tabakowska (2013), who in fact considers Lublin ethnolinguistics the flagship example of original cognitively-oriented research on the Polish language. The relationship between LCE and Anglo-American cognitive linguistics is discussed in Zinken (2009), while a somewhat broader perspective can be found in Bernárdez's (2010) review of Bartmiński's *Aspects*.

[10] The historical background to the principle of linguistic relativity is discussed in Leavitt (2011); cf. a review of his book in Stadnik (2018).

The development of this line of research, however, had a certain side effect: ethnolinguistics (and more broadly: anthropological linguistics) began to be associated mainly with ethnic minorities. In contrast to that, neither LCE, nor, for example, James Underhill limit the scope of their research in this way. On the contrary, according to the Scottish linguist, a viable ethnolinguistic inquiry can only concern the language actually spoken by the researcher well – and naturally, the researcher's mother tongue is the best candidate. Thus, every natural language, regardless of its range, the number of speakers, and its domestic and international status (those parameters are dealt with in *ecolinguistics*) is an *ethnic language* and so can justifiably be subjected to ethnolinguistic analysis.[11]

An additional complication has been introduced by the Australia-based linguist Farzad Sharifian (2011, 2017b,c). The descriptive model he proposes functions under the label of *Cultural Linguistics* (capitalised, henceforth also CL), in contrast to *cultural linguistics* as the name of the discipline. The model's ambition is to propose an integrated description of language in its cultural and cognitive aspects, which is why I think a more appropriate term would be *cognitive-cultural linguistics* (cf. Głaz 2017), without the need to resort to rather dubious and misleading orthographic and typographic solutions.[12]

From its inception, Sharifian's model drew from the Cognitive Grammar, whose *spiritus movens* Ronald Langacker at one point referred to the advent of contemporary cognitive linguistics as a *de facto* return to cultural linguistics (Langacker 1994: 31). However, in his own analyses Langacker makes use of the cultural aspects of language only in a very limited sense: a more systematic attempt in this direction was made by the anthropologist Gary Palmer (1996).[13] Sharifian's framework draws from Palmer's proposal, although the influence of Cognitive Grammar on his model is not so obvious or readily acknowledged as in Palmer's work.

What are the main tenets of Sharifian's CL? A major one rests is the notion of *cultural cognition*, where it is claimed that cognitive processes are not limited to individuals but also function on the intersubjective, communal level. In short: we cognise the world and organise our knowledge of it

[11] Important work on English in as an ethic, culturally and axiologically non-neutral language, came from Anna Wierzbicka (2010, 2013). One can also mention Carsten Levisen's (2012) monograph that, with the help of Wierzbicka's Natural Semantic Metalanguage, describes the key concepts of the Danish language and culture (cf. a review in Głaz 2018).

[12] Critical remarks on the model's name also came from Bert Peeters (2017).

[13] Interestingly, Palmer's book, titled *Toward a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*, was published two years after Janusz Anusiewicz's (1994) seminal monograph under a very similar title, *Lingwistyka kulturowa* [Cultural Linguistics].

as individuals *and* as communities. Cultural cognition is *distributed*: how a community understands the world is not a simple sum of the minds of its members. It is also *emergent* or *enactive* (i.e., it arises from interpersonal interactions) and *dynamic* (being subject to intra-group and inter-group tensions). A fascinating account of distributed cognition is Edwin Hutchins' (1995) analysis of maritime navigation systems: for navigation to be effective, a complex system of device reading, landmark observation, and communication between the navigator, helmsman, and captain must be activated and maintained. In effect, the ship's position is not exactly known to any of those individuals: it is only "known" to the system as a whole, distributed not only over its "human elements" but also the equipment they use. Associations with Clark and Chalmers' (1998) *extended mind* conception are irresistible.

Another major claim made in CL is that we can capture the way we function in culture as language speakers by means of a relatively small set of key descriptive constructs, termed *cultural conceptualisations*. These include: *cultural schemas*, *cultural categories*, and *cultural metaphors/metonymies*. They all function at both the individual and the collective level, and so constitute an inalienable part of cultural cognition. Cultural schemas capture beliefs, norms, patterns of behaviour, expectations, and values associated with various facets of experience. Cultural categories have their lexical exponents, e.g. in the domain of colour, kinship, emotions, foods, events, etc. Cultural metaphors and metonymies, in turn, are rooted in tradition, folk medicine, worldview, and system of beliefs.

Let us consider an example of a cultural schema and its role in the transfer of cultural content from one language to another:

> An Iranian student of Shiraz University receives from her American lecturer the recommendation letter that she had asked him to write for her and them turns to him and says, "I'm ashamed". Bewildered by the student's response, the lecturer asks, "What have you done?!!!" (Sharifian 2011: 101)

The student has apparently transferred the cultural schema of SHARMANDEGI (approx. SHAME) from her native Persian into a conversation with a speaker of American English. SHARMANDEGI is activated in such situations as: (i) offering food, services, or help, (ii) asking for help, (iii) apologising, and (iv) expressing gratitude. The last context approximates the American (European-Anglo-American?) embarassment coupled with gratitude but the approximation is insufficient for the American professor to avoid being perplexed. Although many instructive examples of this kind can be found in Sharifian's publications, they do not unambiguously suggest how cultural schemas differ from cultural categories, why this distinction matters, how the two relate to the notion of a *cultural model* (a key notion

in cognitive anthropology, cf. Quinn 2011), etc. In other words, Sharifian's framework leaves the reader somewhat in the dark as to how the tools it proposes can be successfully operationalised.

Despite these shortcomings, the number of scholars who have found Cultural Linguistics attractive, in one sense or another, is promising. Two big international conferences under the CL auspices have already taken place (Prato 2016 and Landau 2018) and a comprehensive volume devoted to and inspired by CL has been published (Sharifian 2017a), with over thirty chapters. The contributors use a variety of methodologies, from text and discourse analysis, to corpus studies and questionnaires, to ethnographic data analysis. However, this richness of approaches is both the volume's asset and its drawback, as the individual analyses are not fully consistent with one another. On the one hand, this points to the creativity of individual authors; on the other, one can hardly regard CL as a fully-fledged theoretical framework: rather, it is better viewed as a general proposal with details to be elaborated.

Can thus Cultural Linguistics and Lublin ethnolinguistics engage in dialogue? The tenets of CL have been made accessible to the Polish reader through a translation of Sharifian's article, published in *Etnolingwistyka* as Sharifian (2016); a year earlier the journal published a contribution from Gary Palmer (2015), who proposes that linguistic inquiry make a more systematic use of ethnographic (extra-linguistic) data, as the source of grammatically entrenched meanings. This is close to Bartmiński's idea to incorporate the so-called "co-linguistic data" (behaviours, customs, and rituals that accompany language) into reconstuctions of the linguistic worldview: co-linguistic data augment and corroborate claims made on the basis of linguistic analyses.[14] In the same volume of *Etnolingwistyka*, Peeters (2015b) presents his six-pathway model of *applied ethnolinguistics*, based on the work of Anna Wierzbicka: it embraces ethnolexicology, ethnorhetoric, ethnophraseology, ethnosyntax, ethnopragmatics, and ethnoaxiology. It can be applied in the academic context, specifically in teaching a foreign language at an advanced level in a multicultural environment that is often found in Australian universities.

Thus, the ice seems to have been broken. The time has come to engage in an ongoing exchange of ideas between Lublin ethnolinguists and scholars from the USA, Western Europe, and Australia, in the form of a systematic discussion on specific issues. Before I move on to my own divagations on two such issues, I will sketch a possible area of international cooperation so conceived.

[14] Bartmiński draws at this point from the assumptions of Awdiejew and Habrajska's (2004–2006) communicative grammar.

One crucial point concerns the terminological distinction introduced to Lublin ethnolinguistics by Nina Gryshkova (2014), namely that between linguistically-conditioned and axiologically loaded *cultural concepts* (Pol. *koncepty*), related to stereotypes, and supra-linguistic *concepts* (Pol. *pojęcia*). The Polish WOLNOŚĆ, English FREEDOM and LIBERTY, or the French LIBERTÉ are cultural concepts, whereas their common denominator (as well as that which links them to analogical cultural concepts in other languages) is the *concept* (*pojęcie*) of "FREEDOM".[15] Such is the theoretical basis of the project EUROJOS, whose aim is to create parallel descriptions of concepts in European languages, predominantly Slavic but also other European languages and a few from outside Europe (*cf.* LASiS 1 – DOM [HOUSE/HOME], 3 – PRACA [WORK], 5 – HONOR [HONOUR]; volumes on EUROPA [EUROPE] and WOLNOŚĆ [FREEDOM] are in preparation).[16]

Two remarks can be made at this juncture. If, as indicated above, the descriptive-theoretical constructs in CL are not easily operationalised, the analyses proposed in LASiS are designed to achieve maximal methodological and descriptive coherence. They are constructed according to the tenets of the so-called *cognitive definition*, whose aim is "to portray the way in which an entity is viewed by the speakers of a language, to represent socio-culturally established and linguistically entrenched knowledge, its categorisation and valuation" (Bartmiński 2009a: 67). The coherence is achieved not only thanks to the shape of the definition itself, but above all due to the use of key conceptual tools, such as the notion of profiling (cf. Bartmiński 2009a, ch. 8; Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2013: 199) or consistently applied methodology and the System-Questionnaire-Text method of data elicitation. Against this background, Sharifian's types of cultrual categorisation are less convincing

[15] I include it here in quotation marks because each general concept may only be expressed in a specific language (or languages), so that FREEDOM can in fact denote the English (in the sense of English-language) cultural concept, not a general supra-linguistic concept (the same applies to the Polish WOLNOŚĆ, the French LIBERTÉ, etc.). Following the same kind of reasoning, Underhill (e.g. 2012) concludes after Humboldt that general concepts do not exist. For this reason he uses the term *cultural concepts* in the title of this book.

[16] The metaphor of "Europe as home" in several European languages against the backdrop of ethnolinguistics research is discussed in Bartmiński (2018).

Let us note, however, that in some approaches, the distinction between what is referred to in LCE as *pojęcie* (*concept*) and *koncept* (*cultural concept*) is drawn along very different lines, sometimes to the opposite effect. For example, according to Lukszyn and Zmarzer (2006: 103), a *koncept* arises as a unit of thought, a combination of invariant properties of an entity. *Koncept* is always "abstract, independent of language" (JS STP 2005: 52), whereas *pojęcie* is a "verbalised concept… strictly linked to a specific natural language" (p. 82).

and require greater precision. Secondly, the scholars associated with CL have not, to date, engaged in joint analytical endeavors comparable to the EUROJOS or LASiS projects (cf. the remarks above on the edited volume *Advances in Cultural Linguistics*, Sharifian 2017a).[17] It is not my intention, however, to take issue with CL but to perhaps provide an incentive to engage in collaboration of this kind. Particularly valuable, of course, would be a comparison of descriptions of the same concepts or cultural concepts proposed within the framework of LCE and CL. As a next step, this might lead to collaboration on joint projects.

These general reflections take us now to two specific issues important in LCE and English-language cultural linguistics (although not necessarily CL): the role of translation in the reconstruction of linguistic worldview and the very idea of linguistic worldview, as conceived of in the two scholarly traditions.

4. Two selected issues

4.1. The role and place of translation in the reconstruction of linguistic worldview

To a large extent, Lublin ethnolinguists owe an interest in translation in the linguistic worldview context to James Underhill (2013), who lists seven assets of the Lublin team and seven challenges it must face. The strong points are:

1. a serious treatment of Humboldt's legacy;
2. focus on people – language speakers;
3. field research in areas other than major cities;
4. international contacts, also at the level of MA and doctoral students;
5. a historical dimension to the research, despite the synchronic focus;
6. an important role assigned to literature;
7. the profiling conception, especially valuable in analysing various types of discourse.

The seven challenges include:

1. with respect to profiling, the need to be "on guard" not to artificially separate different meanings, which can better be viewed holistically;

[17] In contrast, a methodologically coherent collaboration among scholars associated with Anna Wierzbicka's framework of NSM has produced valuable results (cf. e.g. Goddard 2008, Goddard and Wierzbicka 2002a). This work is being continued in equally consistent manner by relatively recent newcomers to the field (e.g. Levisen and Waters 2017).

2. the need to move, in comparative analyses, beyond binary oppositions, which "tend to condition meanings" (Underhill 2013: 343): a comparison of the Polish WOLNOŚĆ with the English FREEDOM will yield different results than its comparison with the French LIBERTÉ;
3. the need to consider whether stereotypes (one of the key notions in LCE) are prototype (radial) categories or rather are organised by family resemblance;
4. the need to more convincingly justify the existence (and importance) of general, extra-linguistic and extra-cultural concepts (see above), which belong to philosophy more than to linguistics;
5. to need to use corpora more systematically;
6. the need to take into account translated texts in the shaping and reconstruction of linguistic worldview;
7. the need to perhaps limit one's scope of research in order to avoid the danger of "clos[ing] off discussion to speculation" (Underhill 2013: 344).

Some of these challenges[18] have already been addressed, For example, as discussed above, the distinction between (general) concepts and (language-specific) cultural concepts is a fundamental one for LCE.[19] We will consider below the problem of translated texts and their role in the reconstruction of the worldview entrenched in the target language. Especially relevant ones seem to be those that have obtained a stable place in the language's cultural canon. Says Underhill:

> The place of translation within this approach needs to be established, consolidated, and defended. What are the essential foreign texts that have helped cultivate Polish literature? The Bible? Shakespeare? What others? How did the daily translation of Russian into Polish affect the Polish worldview? And how is that worldview holding up to the daily influence of English journalism and its translation into Polish? (Underhill 2013: 344)

How can a list of such texts be compiled? One can survey readers, as the Polish daily *Rzeczpospolita* did at the end of the 20th c.;[20] one can try to establish which expressions have become conventionalised in the target language thanks to translations (not only of books but also films and video games); one can and should seek opinions of authority figures in the fields of literature and translation, etc. Controversies would certainly abound

[18] Which were in fact first formulated at the conference *Linguistic Worldview or Linguistic Views of Worlds?*, Lublin 2011.

[19] Underhill's challenges were formulated in 2011 and appeared in print in 2013, i.e. at a time when Gryshkova's ideas were being forged and so before the publication of her seminal paper (Gryshkova 2014).

[20] See *Kanon na koniec wieku*, https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kanon_na_koniec_wieku (access Sept 15, 2018).

but there would nevertheless be a chance to seriously address the problem pointed out by Underhill.

As an illustration of the problem, consider the Polish *Być albo nie być* as a rendering of Shakespeare's *To be, or not to be*: can we treat it as a part of the Polish linguistic worldview, especially as the more faithful option *Być, czy też nie być*, used by a few translators of *Hamlet*, has not gained the same level of entrenchment?[21] Does the Polish worldview include *Kubuś Puchatek* (*Winnie-the-Pooh*) in the shape it was actually created by Irena Tuwim, the Polish translator of Milne's book (Milne 1938a,b), the shape that significantly differs from its English prototype?[22] Do we include in the Polish worldview Hemingway's *komu bije dzwon* (from *For Whom the Bell Tolls*) or Conrad's *smuga cienia* (from *Shadow Line*) and *jądro ciemności* (from *Heart of Darkness*)? Or is it really Conrad that we owe them to? After all, the latest Polish rendering of the latter book by Jacek Dukaj (Conrad 2017) is titled *Serce ciemności*, where *serce* means 'heart', whereas *jądro*, used by the other translators, means 'core'. The "responsibility" for *jądro ciemności* should be thus attributed not to Conrad but to the six translators who had rendered his novella into Polish before Dukaj.[23]

The reaction of Lublin ethnolinguists to Underhill's friendly critique was a humble one: it was agreed that the Scottish author indeed identified a gap in the methodology of linguistic worldview reconstruction. These problems, however, are hardly novel to Polish researchers: a conference on language contact (Polish vs. other languages) was held in 1990 and the proceedings were published as vol. 7 of the series *Język a Kultura* (Maćkiewicz and Siatkowski 1992). In his contribution to the conference and the volume, Bartmiński explores six degrees of assimilation of language units: from utter "alienness" (as in the case of quotations) to full accommodation. Another author dealing with these problems is Eliza Pieciul-Karmińska (2007), who focuses on translating German theological thought into Polish. In November 2017, a conference was organised in Lublin devoted to these issues, although

[21] *Być albo nie być* has been used, among others, by Cyprian Kamil Norwid, Józef Paszkowski, Stanisław Wyspiański, Jan Kasprowicz, Stanisław Koźmian, Roman Brandstaetter, Jerzy Sito, Maciej Słomczyński, and Stanisław Barańczak. *Być czy też nie być* can be found in translations by Stanisław Tarnawski and Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz. Other options include *Być, czy nie być* (Franciszek Morawski) or *Czy być, czy nie być* (Andrzej Tretiak).

[22] As shown by Monika Adamczyk-Garbowska in her translation, titled *Fredzia Phi-Phi* (Milne 1986a,b).

[23] Aniela Zagórska, Barbara Koc, Jędrzej Polak, Patrycja Jabłońska, Ireneusz Socha, Magda Heydel.

not exclusively from the LCE perspective.[24] A fuller and more synthetic treatment of the ideas discussed at the conference is yet to come; for now a few general comments can be offered:

(i) First, the very question of the role of translations in the shaping of the target-language worldview was hailed as relevant.

(ii) Second, the influence of translation on the target language must be considered, apart from the obvious semantic plane, also at the level of form, sound, prosody, rhythm, and rhyme. The claim was made by Marko Pajević (Tartu) with examples from German and French translations of the Bible (Pajević 2017). Analogous problems in relation to poetry are discussed in depth in Underhill (2016).

(iii) Third, as argued by Roslyn Frank (2017) from the University of Iowa, the problem of translation can also be considered in the large-scale historical perspetive. For example, contact between peoples, nations, and communities, mutual linguistic and cultural borrowing, and the practice of translation (oral translation for millenia, written translation relatively recently) have shaped and disseminated many beliefs, customs, and rituals.[25]

These and many other questions are bound to occupy (ethno)linguists and translators, certainly contributing to our understanding of translation in the context of linguistic worldview.[26]

4.2. The (*linguistic*) *worldview* conception

The other issue I would like to address concerns the very idea of linguistic worldview (LWV). According to Bartmiński, linguistic worldview (or rather, linguacultural worldview, LCWV) is

> a verbalised interpretation of reality that can be captured in judgements of the world. These judgements can be entrenched in the grammar or lexis of a given language, but also presupposed or implied by linguistic forms at the level social knowledge, beliefs, myths, and rituals. (Bartmiński 2006: 12; trans. A.G.)

Let us see to what extent this conception resonates with English-language cultural linguistics, beginning with Franz Boas. In both approaches, Boas's legacy is taken as the starting point: "in each language only a part of the

[24] Videos from the conference are available at: http://www.facebook.com/pg/DepartmentofEnglishStudiesUMCS/videos/ and http://www.youtube.com/channel/UCQWI_TCtugQvIq42fBj1iqA/videos?shelf_id=0&view=0&sort=dd.

[25] One of those is the bear cult, discussed by Frank (see also Frank 2018), common both in and outside Europe, along with the belief of humans deriving from this animal (as found among the Basque people).

[26] A new monograph-length publication in Polish is the very recent Gicala (2018), devoted the theory and practice of translating literary texts.

complete concept that we have in mind is expressed, and [...] each language has a peculiar tendency to select this or that aspect of the mental image which is conveyed by the expression of the thought" (Boas 1966 [1911]: 39). However, Western cultural linguistics and LCE make different use of this idea. If the former follows Boas nearly to the letter (in the sense that language selects some portions from the rich content of concept X and leaves out others),[27] LCE views it somewhat differently: we do not deal with general concepts that make up our knowledge of the world (although the existence of general concepts is not rejected, see above) and *also* expressed in language, but specifically with *language-entrenched* concepts. The general concepts can thus be seen here as generalisations or abstractions of language-specific concepts. A similar approach is represented by Underhill, who postulates that concepts be approached from the perspective of language (and, see above, in fact rejects the existence of supra-linguistic concepts): "there is no outside to language" (Underhill 2009: 99). This idea comes directly from Humboldt, who claimed that "[b]y the same act than [man] spins language out of himself, he spins himself into it, and every language draws about the people that possesses it a circle whence it is possible to exit only be stepping over at once into the circle of another one" (Humboldt 1999 [1836]: 60). If, then, to be human means to speak (a) language, then a worldview cannot arise outside langauge(s): "So liegt in jeder Sprache eine eigentümliche Weltansicht" (Humboldt 1907 [1836]: 60). It may safely be assumed that the Lublin ethnolinguists would agree with this, adding to the level of cultural concepts that of supra-linguistic concepts, as well as that of co-linguistic behaviour.

It appears, then, that although both Western cultural linguistics and Lublin ethnolinguistics are concerned with the problem of *worldview*, the *linguistic worldview* conception has been developed more systematically in Slavic scholarship, e.g. in Russia (*yazykovaya kartina mira*, cf. Apresyan 2006), even if among its predecessors one finds representatives of the West: Herder, Humboldt, Boas, Sapir, and Whorf. Certainly, the notion is not alien to Western scholarship – one needs only mention Underhill's (2009, 2012) five-dimensional linguistic worldview model or David Danaher's (2015) reconstruction of the conceptual world of Václav Havel. In some contrast to this, however, Gary Palmer proposes that linguistic meaning is located within the realm of worldview (Palmer 1996: 291). In this approach, the key and superordinate notion is culture (after all, Palmer is an anthropologist),

[27] One can certainly link this with a major tenet of Langacker's (1987, 2008) Cognitive Grammar, where semantic space is viewed as qualitatively identical with conceptual space but selected from the latter for the purpose of linguistic expression.

as "each culture on board its own ship may build a world and language of its own" (p. 293). Because language serves to express, communicate, and share experiences, worldview is an important factor in shaping the grammatical system of each language: "the study of grammar can be regarded as the study of world view constrained to linguistic symbols" (Palmer 1996: 114). Apart from language, an important role is played here by other symbolic (but non-linguistic) domains of cultural activity, such as sculpture, architecture, cuisine, dance, music, sport, ritual, industrial production, etc. In this approach, linguistic inquiry is enriched by incorporating ethnographic data (cf. Palmer 2015) or the data that Bartmiński calls "co-linguistic". One could only perhaps try to be more precise in formulating that claim, as many activities mentioned by Palmer actually involve the use of language anyway. Also, broadly understood, ritualistic behaviour can be found in sport, cooking, industrial production and the other domains mentioned by the American anthropologist – in fact, it is omnipresent.[28]

We thus have a situation in which ethnolinguistics investigates grammar and discourses/texts as the key to the reconstruction of the linguacultural worldview. To an extent, this is also true of English-language cultural linguistics, although Palmer proposes to make use of ethnographic data to *understand*, rather than *reconstruct*, the worldview characteristic of a given community. Sharifian (2017b) goes in the same direction and uses linguistic data for a description of the "Australian Aboriginal worldview", the "Sufi worldview", etc.

It is worth reminding ourselves at this point that the relational view of the language-culture nexus (i.e., language *and* culture, culture *in the context of* language, etc.) erroneously assumes the possibility, or even necessity, of isolating language and culture as the starting point. In contrast, the holistic approach is grounded in the notion of *linguaculture* (Friedrich 1989) or *languaculture* (Agar 1994). Polish authors, too, use analogous terms, *lingwokultura* or *językowo-kulturowy obraz świata* 'linguacultural worldview'; for example in volume 29 of *Etnolingwistyka* they appear in the titles of four articles by scholars from both within and outside the Lublin team.[29] Let me also mention the monograph by Beata Ziajka (2014) on the linguacultural worldview of country dwellers. This, in effect, is one step further than was

[28] Let us invoke the work of Janusz Anusiewicz, for whom language enjoys a privileged status as something that ultimate defines humans and culture in its totality (1994: 14). A similar idea was expressed by Alfred Kroeber, who considered language to be an indispensable component for the existence of culture (cf. Hymes 1961).

[29] Bartmiński and Bielak (2017), Bartmiński and Kaczan (2017), Piekarczyk (2017), Rak (2017).

once taken by Jerzy Bartmiński, who once brilliantly referred to a "reciprocal dependence" of language and culture (2001: 17). In the holistic view, if language is a cultural phenomenon by definition, it becomes more difficult to justify a search for culture *in* language (as postulated in Anusiewicz (1994: 3) or Bartmiński (2009a: 10)). On the other hand, a methodical search of this kind is of course sensible because to make the holistic assumption is one thing but to show it is another.[30]

5. From comparison to dialogue and cooperation

When comparing Lublin cognitive ethnolinguistics with English-language cultural linguistics, one must follow a credible analogy – but capturing the appropriate level at which it can be drawn is problematic. On the one hand, one cannot compare LCE with a hundred years of very diverse research on dozens of languages and cultures, as has been done in American linguistic anthropology and ethnosemantics. On the other hand, one can perhaps narrow down the purview to a specific descriptive-theoretical model, such as Sharifian's Cultural Linguistics, which I have tried to do above. This, however, is not fully justifiable, either, given that LCE is a coherent conception, elaborated over many years of joint effort from a closely collaborating team of scholars, affiliated with one institution (plus, of course, their collaborators in other parts of the country and abroad). CL, in contrast, is an emerging framework that tries to build its descriptive apparatus and pursued by many scholars worldwide, not always ready to sacrifice their personal ambitions or original ideas for the sake of a common approach. In this context, a certain degree of inconsistency and incoherence is only natural: I will point out one such case.

Lublin ethnolinguistics emphasises the cummulative function of *language* as a reservoir of collective memory and interpretations of the world. In Cultural Linguistics, this function is attributed either to *language* (cf. wa Thiong'o (1986) *collective memory bank*, quoted by Sharifian) or to *culture* (which

[30] Perhaps the problem partly stems from the problematic nature of the notion of culture. Attempts are being made to redefine it in a way that would show its diversity and communicative dynamics (Scollon et al. 2012). In the context of globalisation, culture is being described as a hybrid form of multiculturalism, an emanation of individual values and behaviour (Atkinson 2015). It is considered a mistake to extract and isolate language and culture from their natural environment, i.e. from language use, so as not to (erroneously) suggest their separateness and abstract nature (Eglin 2015). The complexity of the problem transpires through Sharifian's work on world Englishes, which both link and divide the communities that use them (e.g. Sharifian 2015a), as well as on English as a world language (Sharifian 2009).

point, in turn, is made by Palmer, for whom culture is "the accumulated knowledge of a community or society, including its stock of cognitive models, schemas, scenarios, and other forms of conventional imagery" (1996: 290)). Palmer's stance is in fact rather ambivalent and oscillates *between* language and culture, which in fact may point to the artificiality of separating the two:

> We need some independent understanding of [...] cultures in order to grasp the imagery and philosophies conveyed in [its] texts [...], but knowledge of world views is also necessary for the more fine-grained activities of grammatical analysis and precise translation. World views provide the most entrenched and enduring semantic imagery that underlies both grammatical constructions and figurative expressions. (Palmer 1996: 116)

Let us give an example. Palmer makes use of ethnographic descriptions in order to establish the links between cultural models and nominal categories in languages that have the so-called nominal classifiers.[31] He analyses ChiShona (or Shona), a Bantu language spoken in Zimbabwe, where there are eleven "cultural scenarios" responsible for assigning nouns into specific categories. A scenario of this kind, relating to typical, culturally shaped human behaviour in relations to nature and artefacts, as well as the beliefs concerning natural and supernatural phenomena, embraces the following elements or sub-scenarios:

- The spirits of ancestral chiefs bring rain, thunder, and lightning.
- People pray to the ancestors.
- Grain is pounded daily with a mortar and pestle.
- Doctors cure with herbal medicines that are ground in a mortar and pestle.
- Trees, shrubs, and herbs are associated with coolness, moisture, and medicine.

Thanks to a combination of these sub-scenarios, the same nominal class includes nouns that mean 'abundance of grain', 'rain', 'tree', 'a tall, straight object', 'medicine', 'pestle', and 'meal from green mealies' (Palmer 2015). This is thus a top-down approach, in which the starting point is the worldview, whose relationship to grammatical categories and schemata is described so as to arrive at a better understanding of linguistic usage. The LCE approach, in contrast, can be described as bottom-up: the linguacultural worldview is meticulously *reconstructed* on the basis of the grammar, lexis, and texts in a given language, as well as questionnaires and co-linguistic data.[32]

Is it then possible to draw a systematic and synthetic comparison between Lublin ethnolinguistics and English-language cultural linguistics? The reader

[31] In an extended sense, one of such languages is Polish, with its rather complex category of grammatical gender.

[32] Also, what seems to be missing from Palmer's approach are first-hand account from native speakers, a major focus on LCE.

expecting such a synthesis from this study may feel disappointed: instead of a solid synthesis I can only offer a handful of observations for consideration plus a few conclusions below.

First, the need for a dialogue between those two approached to language and culture (languaculture) is beyond doubt: it can benefit both sides. For example, if Sharifian's Cultural Linguistics can propose a coherent repertoire of descriptive constructs, it can help Lublin ethnolinguistics make a step forward in the domain that was criticised by Kiklewicz and Wilczewski (2011), namely the cognitive aspect of the enterprise. However, in order to do that, CL itself must be more disciplined in this respect.

Second, Polish scholars also have something to offer their Western colleagues, mainly in the realm of conceptual, theoretical, and methodological coherence in approaching languaculture. A certain degree of interest in the works of Polish ethnolinguists can already be observed in the English-language scholarly circles (although not necessarily in English-spekaing countries). Let us mention about a dozen names, some of which have appeared above: Jörg Zinken in Germany (Mannheim, for a period of time in Portsmouth, UK); James Underhill and Mariarosaria Gianninotto in France (Rouen and Grenoble, respectively); Jo B. Harper in the UK (London); Carsten Levisen in Denmark (Roskilde); Enrique Bernárdez in Spain (Madrid); Gary Palmer (Las Vegas, Nevada), Roslyn Frank (Iowa City, Iowa), and David Danaher (Madison, Wisconsin) in the USA; John Leavitt in Canada (Montreal); and Bert Peeters (Brisbane) and of course Anna Wierzbicka (Canberra) in Australia. This is not the full list: it only includes those scholars who have personally and directly collaborated with Lublin etholinguists.[33]

Finally, let us mention the role of values and axiological considerations, key issues on Lublin ethnolinguistics.[34] In Western (English-language) cultural linguistics axiology does play a role but does not seem to enjoy the central position. An exception, apart from the work of Anna Wierzbicka, is Bert Peeters, who directly refers to the notion of *ethnoaxiology* and cultural (see e.g. the special issue of *International Journal of Language and Culture* that he guest-edited, Peeters 2015a). But Peeters, an independently-minded scholar, does not fully identify himself with the CL programme (rather, he openly acknowledges inspiration from Wierzbicka's NSM).[35]

[33] Pieter Plas, whom I mentioned above (at a time affiliated with Ghent University, Belgium), has not been active in the academia for a few years now.

[34] This is a major focus in the work of Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (por. Niebrzegowska 1996, Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2012).

[35] This is obviously not to claim that Peeters is the *only* author focusing on axiological

It is precisely by referring to values that I would like to close the present study, perhaps in a somewhat exalted style. I will give voice here to three actors in the languacultural theatre, exceptionally unanimous on this point: Jerzy Bartmiński, Gary Palmer, and Farzad Sharifian. They all independently stand for what I would call an "engaged linguistics" and so work towards a common cause. At the end of his 2009 monograph, Bartmiński expresses his hope that ethnolinguistic reasearch "can contribute to a better coexistence of nations" (Bartmiński 2009a: 221). Gary Palmer writes in a similar spirit: "our everyday world [. . .] is a world desperately in need of mending and healing by greater cross-cultural understanding and tolerance. Perhaps cultural linguistics can contribute to that process" (1996: 296). What Palmer formulates as a tentative wish, Sharifian verbalises with a decidedly greater élan: "Clearly, the studies included in this volume [Sharifian 2017a] give testimony to the great potential that Cultural Linguistics has to contribute to a better understanding of humanity" (Sharifian 2017c: 27). A laudable endeavour, worthy of every effort.

References

Agar, Michael. 1994. *Language Shock: Understanding the Culture of Conversation,* New York: William Morrow.

Anusiewicz, Janusz. 1994. *Lingwistyka kulturowa. Zarys problematyki.* Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Apresyan, Yuriy (ed.). 2006. *Yazykovaya kartina mira i sistemnaya leksikografiya.* Moskva: RAN.

Atkinson, Dwight. 2015. Writing across cultures: 'culture' in second language writing studies. In: Farzad Sharifian (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Culture.* 417–430. London and New York: Routledge.

Awdiejew, Aleksy and Grażyna Habrajska. 2004–2006. *Wprowadzenie do* gramatyki komunikacyjnej, vols. 1-2. Łask: Oficyna Wydawnicza LEKSEM.

Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2001. Język w kontekście kultury. In: Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Współczesny język polski.* 13–22. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2004. Etnolingwistyka słowiańska – próba bilansu. *Etnolingwistyka* 16: 9–27.

Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2006. *Językowe podstawy obrazu świata.* Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2009a. *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics.* London and Oakville, CT: Equinox.

Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2009b. Basic assumptions of Slavic ethnolinguistics. In: Karl Gutschmidt, Sebastian Kempgen, Tilman Berger and Peter Kosta (eds.) *Die slavischen Sprachen. Ein internationales Handbuch zu ihrer Struktur,*

semantics but he is one of those directly relating to the ethnolinguistic tradition. An example of work on cultural values coming from a different circle of researchers is Blumczynski and Gillespie (2016), a volume on devoted cultural values in translation.

ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung. / The Slavic Languages. An International Handbook of their Structure, their History and their Investigation. Vol. 2. 1165–1175. Berlin: De Gryuter.

Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2017. Ethnolinguistics in the Year 2016. *Etnolingusitics* 28: 9–31. https://journals.umcs.pl/et/article/view/2614/pdf_1; doi: 10.17951/et.2016.28.7

Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2018. *Language in the Context of Culture. The Metaphor of "Europe as Home" in This Day and Age.* Trans. Adam Głaz. [Biblioteka Przeglądu Rusycystycznego 27.] Katowice: Śląsk and Stowarzyszenie Inicjatyw Wydawniczych.

Bartmiński, Jerzy and Agata Bielak. 2017. Językowo-kulturowy obraz słomy w polskiej lingwokulturze. Szkic etnolingwistyczny. *Etnolingwistyka* 29: 111–133. doi: 10.17951/et.2017.29.111

Bartmiński, Jerzy and Anna Kaczan. 2017. Językowo-kulturowy obraz pszenicy (*Triticum*) w języku polskim. *Etnolingwistyka* 29: 85–110. doi: 10.17951/et.2017.29.85

Bernárdez, Enrique. 2010. Language and culture. A review of *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*. Bartmiński, Jerzy. (2009). Edited by Jörg Zinken. London & Oakville, CT: Equinox. 250 pp. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 8(2): 376–385.

Blumczynski, Piotr and John Gillespie (eds.). 2016. *Translating Values. Evaluative Concepts in Translation.* London: Plangrave Macmillan.

Boas. Franz. 1966 [1911]. *Introduction to Handbook of American Indian Languages.* Ed. Preston Holder. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press.

Chruszczewski, Piotr. 2013. Wybrane propozycje metodologiczne językoznawstwa antropologicznego. In: Piotr Stalmaszczyk (ed.) *Metodologie językoznawstwa. Ewolucja języka. Ewolucja teorii językoznawczych.* 53–70. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Clark, Andy and David J. Chalmers. 1998. The extended mind. *Analysis* 58(1): 7–19. doi: 10.1093/analys/58.1.7

Conrad, Joseph. 2017. *Serce ciemności.* Polinisation by Jacek Dukaj. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Danaher, David S. 2015. *Reading Václav Havel.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Dąbrowska, Anna. 2004/2005. Współczesne problemy lingwistyki kulturowej. *Postscriptum* 2–1(48–49): 140–155.

Demarolle, Pierre. 2003. Semantyka a społeczeństwo. Pojęcie selekcji i preorientacji w szkolnictwie francuskim w latach 1956–1968. Transl. Maciej Abramowicz. *Etnolingwistyka* 15: 48–61.

Duranti, Alessandro (ed.). 2009. *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader.* 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Eglin, Peter. 2015. Language, culture, and interaction. In: Farzad Sharifian (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Culture.* 141–153. London and New York: Routledge.

Frank, Roslyn. 2017. Introducing diachronic cultural linguistics: Translating the "Bear's Son Tale" in the longue durée. Paper delivered at *Languages – Cultures – Worldviews 2017*, Lublin, 16–18 November, 2017.

Frank, Roslyn. 2018. Looking at Europe through a Basque lens: Ethnolinguistic considerations of two worldviews. *Etnolingwistyka* 30: 189–213. doi: 10.17951/et.2018.30.189

Friedrich, Paul. 1989. Language, ideology and political economy. *American Anthropologist* 91: 295–312.

Gicala, Agnieszka. 2018. *Przekładanie obrazu świata. Językowy obraz świata w teorii i praktyce przekładu artystycznego*. Kraków: Universitas.

Głaz, Adam. 2013. Prostowanie zwierciadła. Przyczynek do (jeszcze?) niezaistniałej dyskusji nt. kondycji lubelskiej etnolingwistyki. *Biuletyn PTJ* LXIX: 139–151.

Głaz, Adam. 2015. Etnolingwistyka daleka i bliska. *Etnolingwistyka* 27: 7–20. doi: 10.17951/et.2015.27.7

Głaz, Adam. 2017. Promoting dialogue: Two traditions in language and culture research. In: Joanna Ziobro-Strzępek and Władysław Chłopicki (eds.) *Across Borders: The West Looks East*. 41–58. Krosno: Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Zawodowa im. Stanisława Pigonia.

Głaz, Adam. 2018. The Danish universe of meaning. Carsten Levisen, *Cultural Semantics and Social Cognition: A case study on the Danish universe of meaning* [Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 257], Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2012, pp. xx, 333. *Ethnolinguistics* 29: 303–306. doi: 10.17951/et.2017.29.284

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

Godddard, Cliff (ed.). 2008. *Cross-linguistic Semantics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Goddard, Cliff and Anna Wierzbicka (eds.). 2002. *Meaning and Universal Grammar: Theory and Empircal Findings*. Vols. 1 and 2. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Gryshkova, Nina. 2014. *Leksem*, *pojęcie*, *stereotyp*, *koncept*, *znaczenie*, *idea* – propozycja regulacji terminologicznych. In: Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, and Joanna Szadura (eds.) *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów* 3. 21–50. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von. 1907 [1836]. Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluβ auf die geistige Entwickelung des Menshengeschlecht. In: Albert Leitzmann (ed.) *Wilhelm von Humboldts Gesammelte Schriften. Hrsg. Von der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Band VII. Erste Abteilung. Werke VII. Erte Hälfte: Einleitung zum Kawiwerk.* 1–344. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von. 1999 [1836]. *On language: On the Diversity of Human Language Construction and its Influence on the Mental Development of the Human Species*. Trans. Peter Heath; ed. Michael Losonsky. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hutchins, Edwin. 1995. *Cognition in the Wild*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Hymes, Dell. 1961. Alfred Louis Kroeber. *Language* 31(1): 1–28.

Ivanov Vyacheslav V. and Vladimir N. Toporov.1965. *Slavyanskye yazykovye modeliruyushchye semyoticheskye sistemy*. Moskva: Izd. Nauka.

Maćkiewicz, Jolanta and Janusz Siatkowski (eds.) 1992. *Kontakty języka polskiego z innymi językami na tle kontaktów kulturowych*. [*Język a Kultura* 7] Wrocław: Wiedza o Kulturze.

JS STP. 2005. *Języki specjalistyczne. Słownik terminologii przedmiotowej*. Ed. Jerzy Lukszyn. Warszawa: Katedra Języków Specjalistycznych Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Kiklewicz, Aleksander and Michał Wilczewski. 2011. Współczesna lingwistyka kulturowa: zagadnienia dyskusyjne (na marginesie monografii Jerzego Bartmińskiego *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*). *Biuletyn PTJ* LXVII: 165–178.

Lakoff, George. 2003. Metafory i wojna: system metafor użyty, by usprawiedliwić wojnę w Zatoce Perskiej. Trans. Aneta Wysocka. *Etnolingwistyka* 15: 29–48.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. 1. *Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1994. Culture, cognition, and grammar. In: Martin Pütz (ed.) *Language Contact and Language Conflict*. 25–53. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2004. Semantyka językoznawcza. Trans. Adam Głaz. *Etnolingwistyka* 16: 29–73.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LASiS. *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*. Ed.-in-Chief: Jerzy Bartmiński. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS:
vol. 1: DOM. Ed. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, and Beata Żywicka. 2015. [abridged English version: *The Axiological Lexicon of Slavs and their Neighbours*. Vol.1. *The Concept of* HOME. 2018].
vol. 2: EUROPA. Ed. Wojciech Chlebda. 2018.
vol. 3: PRACA. Ed. Jerzy Bartmiński, Małgorzata Brzozowska, and Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska. 2016.
vol. 4. WOLNOŚĆ. Ed. Maciej Abramowicz and Jerzy Bartmiński (in print).
vol. 5. HONOR. ed. Petar Sotirov and Dejan Ajdaczić. 2017.

Leavitt, John. 2011. *Linguistic Relativities: Language Diversity and Modern Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levisen, Carsten. 2012. *Cultural Semantics and Social Cognition: A Case Study on the Danish Universe of Meaning*. Berlin/Boston: De Gryuter.

Levisen, Carsten and Sophia Waters (eds.) 2017. *Cultural Keywords in Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadephia: John Benjamins.

Lukszyn, Jerzy and Wanda Zmarzer. 2006. *Teoretyczne podstawy terminologii*. Warszawa: Katedra Języków Specjalistycznych Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Milne, A. A. 1938a. *Chatka Puchatka*. Trans. Irena Tuwim. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo J. Przeworskiego.

Milne, A. A. 1938b. *Kubuś Puchatek*. Trans. Irena Tuwim. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo J. Przeworskiego.

Milne, A. A. 1986a. *Fredzia Phi-Phi*. Trans. Monika Adamczyk-Garbowska. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Milne, A. A. 1986b. *Zakątek Fredzi Phi-Phi*. Trans. Monika Adamczyk-Garbowska. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Niebrzegowska, Stanisława. 1996. Świat wartości sennika ludowego. *Etnolingwistyka* 8: 99–112.

Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława. 2012. Miejsce wartości w opisie gatunków mowy. *Język a Kultura* 23: 33–41.

Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława. 2013. Stereotypes and values in the linguistic worldview. In Adam Głaz, David S. Danaher, and Przemysław Łozowski (eds.) *The Linguistic Worldview: Ethnolinguistics, Cognition, and Culture*. 199–214. London: Versita.

Pajević, Marko. 2017. Buber/Rosenzweig's and Meschonnic's Bible translations – Biblical Hebrew as transformer of language theory and society. Paper delivered at *Languages – Cultures – Worldviews 2017*, Lublin, 16–18 Nov, 2017.

Palmer, Gary. 1996. *Toward a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Palmer, Gary. 2015. Ethnography: A neglected method of inductive linguistics. *Etnolingwistyka* 27: 21–45.

Peeters, Bert (ed.) 2015a. *Language and Cultural Values: Adventures in Applied Ethnolinguistics*. Special issue of *International Journal of Language and Culture* 2(2).

Peeters, Bert. 2015b. Language, culture and values: towards an ethnolinguistics based on abduction and salience. *Etnolingwistyka* 27: 47–62.

Peeters, Bert. 2017. Applied ethnolinguistics *is cultural linguistics but is it* cultural linguistics*?* In: Farzad Sharifian (ed.) *Advances in Cultural Linguistics*. 507–527. Singapore: Springer.

Pieciul-Karmińska, Eliza. 2007. *Językowy obraz Boga i świata. O przekładzie teologii niemieckiej na język polski*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.

Piekarczyk, Dorota. 2017. Dlaczego kwiaty są dobre i niewinne? O językowo-kulturowym obrazie kwiatu słów kilka. *Etnolingwistyka* 29: 47–60. doi: 10.17951/et.2017.29.47

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.

Quinn, Naomi. 2011. The history of the cultural models school reconsidered: A paradigm shift in cognitive anthropology. In: David B. Kronenfeld, Giovanni Bennardo, Victor C. de Munck, and Michael D. Fischer (eds.) *A Companion to Cognitive Anthropology*. 31–46. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Rak, Maciej. 2017. *Na bezrybiu i rak ryba*. Językowo-kulturowy obraz raka w polszczyźnie. *Etnolingwistyka* 29: 149–169. doi: 10.17951/et.2017.29.149

REP. Rouen Ethnolinguistics Project. Université de Normandie, Rouen, France. https://webtv.univ-rouen.fr

Riley, Philip. 2007. *Language, Culture and Identity: An Ethnolinguistic Perspective*. London: Bloomsbury.

Scollon, Ron, Suzanne Wong Scollon, and Rodney H. Jones. 2012. *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach*. 3rd ed. Malden, MA: Wiley–Blackwell.

Senft, Gunter. 2013. *Ethnolinguistik*. In Bettina Beer and Hans Fischer (eds.) *Ethnologie: Einführung und Überblick*. 8th ed. 271–286. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

Sharifian, Farzad (ed.) 2009. *English as an International Language. Perspectives and Pedagogical Issues*. Bristol–Buffalo–Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Sharifian, Farzad. 2011. Cultural *Conceptualisations and Language: Theoretical Framework and Applications*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Sharifian, Farzad. 2015a. Cultural Linguistics and world Englishes. *World Englishes* 34(4): 515–532. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12156

Sharifian, Farzad (ed.). 2015b. *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.

Sharifian, Farzad. 2016. Lingwistyka kulturowa. *Etnolingwistyka* 28: 31–57. doi: 10.17951/et.2016.28.31

Sharifian, Farzad (ed.). 2017a. *Advances in Cultural Linguistics*. Singapore: Springer.

Sharifian, Farzad. 2017b. *Cultural Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Sharifian, Farzad. 2017c. Cultural Linguistics: The state of the art. In: Farzad Sharifian (ed.) *Advances in Cultural Linguistics*. 1–28. Singapore: Springer.

Slavyanskiye drevnosti. Etnolingvisticheskiy slovar′ *v 5 tomakh.* Vol. 1-5. Ed. Nikita Tolstoy. Moskva: Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya.

Słownik stereotypów i symboli ludowych. 1996–. Vol. 1, parts 1-4. Ed. Jerzy Bartmiński and Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Stadnik, Katarzyna. 2018. The principle of linguistic relativity: The history of the idea, the evolution of scientific thinking, contemporary challenges. John Leavitt, *Linguistic Relativities: Language Diversity and Modern Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. *Ethnolinguistics* 29: 298–302. doi: 10.17951/et.2017.29.280

Tabakowska, Elżbieta. 2013. A linguistic picture, image, or view of 'Polish Cognitive Studies'. In: Adam Głaz, David S. Danaher, and Przemysław Łozowski (eds.) *The Linguistic Worldview. Ethnolinguistics, Cognition, and Culture*. 321–338. London: Versita.

Tołstoj, Nikita Iljicz. 1992. Język a kultura. (Niektóre zadania słowiańskiej etnolingwistyki). *Etnolingwistyka* 5 15–25.

Tołstojowa, Swietłana. 2010. Lubelsko-moskiewskie kontakty naukowe z perspektywy moskiewskiej. *Etnolingwistyka* 22: 268–269.

Trabant, Jürgen. 2000. *Traditions de Humboldt*. Paris: Éditions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme.

Trabant, Jürgen. 2015. *Wilhelm von Humboldt Lectures*. REP, Université de Normandie, Rouen. https://webtv.univ-rouen.fr/permalink/v1253a1ea9272ns1g6a7/

Underhill, James W. 2009. *Humboldt, Worldview and Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Underhill, James W. 2011. *Creating Worldviews: Metaphor, Ideology, and Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Underhill, James W. 2012. *Ethnolinguistics and Cultural Concepts.* TRUTH, LOVE, HATE *and* WAR. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Underhill, James W. 2013. Reflections upon Bartmiński's ethnolinguistic approach to language and culture. In: Adam Głaz, David S. Danaher, and Przemysław Łozowski (eds.) *The Linguistic Worldview. Ethnolinguistics, Cognition, and Culture*. 339–349. London: Versita.

Underhill, James W. 2016. *Voice and Versification in Translating Poems*. Ottawa: Ottawa University Press.

Viviand-Esik, Aline. 2014. La compréhension des gentilés *Polacy*, *Niemcy*, *Francuzi* et *Europejczycy* par la jeunesse polonaise contemporaine. Une étude ethnolinguistique. Doctoral dissertation. Worcław University, Poland, and Université Paris IV Sorbonne, France.

Viviand-Esik, Aline. 2017. Europeans, Poles, Germans, French. Conceptualisation and evaluation of images. *Ethnolinguistics* 28: 169–186. https://journals.umcs.pl/et/article/view/2302/pdf_1; doi: 10.17951/et.2016.28.169

wa Thiong'o, Ngũgĩ. 1986. *Decolonising the Mind*: *The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Heinemann Educational.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1985. *Lexicography and Conceptual Analysis*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 2010. *Experience, Evidence, and Sense: The Hidden Cultural Legacy of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 2013. *Imprisoned in English. The Hazards of English as a Default Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ziajka, Beata. 2014. *Językowo-kulturowy obraz świata społeczności wiejskiej utrwalony w przezwiskach i przydomkach: na przykładzie nieoficjalnych antroponimów mieszkańców Zagórza i wsi okolicznych w powiecie chrzanowskim.* Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński.

Zinken, Jörg. 2009. The Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin and Anglo-American cognitive linguistics. In: Jerzy Bartmiński. *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics.* Ed. Jörg Zinken. 1–5. London and Oakville, CT: Equinox.