

# On the Principles and Postulates of Cultural Linguistics (as Exemplified by a Definition of WORK)

**Jerzy Bartmiński**

Professor Emeritus of the Maria Skłodowska-Curie University and the Polish Academy of Sciences

[jerzy.bartminski@poczta.umcs.lublin.pl](mailto:jerzy.bartminski@poczta.umcs.lublin.pl)

## Abstract

*The study consists of four parts. The first part is devoted to the beginnings of cultural linguistics in Poland, connected with the Wrocław-based programme for research on Polish national culture, the emergence of the “Language and Culture” research network (and a publication series with the same title), and the launch of the Lublin-based journal Etnolingwistyka in 1988. The second part contains examples of linguistic facts being viewed in cultural perspective, with a special role of the lexicon as the “mirror of culture”. Part three presents a repertoire of seven conceptual constructs proposed in Lublin cognitive ethnolinguistics (linguistic worldview, stereotypes as cultural concepts, cognitive definition, viewpoint and interpretive perspective, profiling of base images, values, and the experiencing, conceptualizing, and speaking subject). Finally, the fourth part illustrates the application of this theoretical framework in an analysis of the Polish cultural concept of PRACA ‘work’.*

*Keywords: cultural linguistics, Język a Kultura (‘Language and Culture’) series, Etnolingwistyka yearly journal, Lublin cognitive ethnolinguistics, linguistic worldview, cultural concept, PRACA/work*

## Streszczenie

O założeniach i postulatach lingwistyki kulturowej (na przykładzie definicji PRACY)

*Artykuł składa się z czterech części. W pierwszej autor przypomina początki formowania się lingwistyki kulturowej w Polsce, związane z wrocławskim programem badań nad polską kulturą narodową, utworzeniem konwersatorium „Język a Kultura” (też serii wydawniczej pod takim tytułem) i lubelskiego rocznika Etnolingwistyka w roku 1988. W drugiej podaje przykłady traktowania faktów językowych w perspektywie kulturowej, eksponując rolę słownictwa jako zwierciadła kultury. W trzeciej przedstawia 7-punktowe instrumentarium pojęciowe wypracowane w ramach lubelskiej etnolingwistyki kognitywnej (językowy obraz świata, stereotypy traktowane jako koncepty kulturowe, definicja kognitywna, punkt widzenia i perspektywa interpretacyjna; profilowanie bazowych wyobrażeń; wartości; podmiot*

doświadczający, konceptualizujący i werbalizujący). Na koniec na przykładzie jednego konceptu PRACA pokazane zostają efekty analizy z zastosowaniem przedstawionego tego instrumentarium pojęciowego.

Słowa kluczowe: *lingwistyka kulturowa, seria Język a Kultura, rocznik Etnolingwistyka, lubelska etnolingwistyka kognitywna, językowy obraz świata, koncept kulturowy, PRACA*

## PART I

1. **1. The beginnings of cultural linguistics have recently been described by Waldemar Czachur** in his *Lingwistyka kulturowa i międzykulturowa* ('Cultural and Intercultural Linguistics') (2017). Outlining the context for the appearance of cultural linguistics in the Polish and German areas, the Warsaw Germanist wrote that:

In Poland, the development of the thought on relations between language and culture, adopting also an institutional dimension, can be dated back to the second half of the 1980s. In 1988 the journal "Etnolingwistyka" was founded, with Professor Jerzy Bartmiński as its editor-in-chief. The same year witnessed the establishment, in Wrocław, of the academic publication series *Język a Kultura* constituting an output of a nationwide discussion seminar under the same title.

(Czachur 2017: 12)

I am inclined to concur with this opinion. And since I was personally involved in both of these already forgotten undertakings, at the beginning of this presentation I would like to elaborate on the origins of cultural linguistics in Poland and provide a more detailed perspective on the subject.<sup>1</sup>

2. **The beginnings of cultural linguistics are connected with Wrocław.** As a matter of fact, although the yearly *Etnolingwistyka*, which enjoys such an outstanding position, is published in Lublin, its roots were in the Wrocław of the 1970s<sup>2</sup>. This was so because the fundamental idea of combining language and culture in academic research, which constitutes the core of ethnolinguistics, was born in the community of Polish studies specialists at the University of Wrocław when its Polish Philology Institute was headed by the unforgettable Professor Czesław Hernas.

<sup>1</sup> The article originally appeared in Polish in the issue 3.1 of *Tertium Linguistic Journal* (2018: 26-55),

<sup>2</sup> I wrote about it in the paper: Bartmiński (2008).

In the 1990s the central authorities in Warsaw entrusted the University of Wrocław with a task of organizing work on a so-called “key issue” defined as “Poland's national culture; its development tendencies and perception”. Managing research related to that project, Professor Czesław Hernas conducted an open seminar attended by philologists (specialists in literature and linguistics), folklorists, cultural studies specialists, ethnologists, including the three outstanding Jerzys: Jerzy Cieślikowski, Jerzy Woronczak and Jerzy Jastrzębski, also Jan Miodek and Janusz Anusiewicz, as well as Piotr Kowalski and Jolanta Ługowska, who were at the beginning of their academic careers, as well as researchers from other academic centres: Roch Sulima from Warsaw and Włodzimierz Pawluczuk from Białystok (subsequently from Cracow). In their discussions, participants focused on anthropological and cultural issues. Professor Hernas invited me to take part in the seminar as the author of *O języku folkloru* (1973), a book written under the inspiration of Maria Renata Mayenowa (and factually – Roman Jakobson, an advocate of a differential description oriented towards folklore's specific features in relation to a colloquial dialect), and suggested that I initiate work on a dictionary of the language of folklore. I accepted the invitation gladly, especially in view of the fact that it was immediately accompanied by financial support, which allowed me to offer full-time employment in Lublin to two persons responsible for the preparation of such a dictionary.

In 1980 a trial sheet of the dictionary was published in Wrocław under the title *Słownik ludowych stereotypów językowych*, and with a foreword prepared by Professor Hernas and me. In retrospective it can be referred to as some kind of an “ethnolinguistic manifesto” because instead of a typical linguistic dictionary, the result of the project was a linguistic-cultural dictionary. The reviewer of the **trial sheet** was Andrzej Maria Lewicki, who, in *Poradnik Językowy*, wrote that “it is an attempt at compiling a dictionary of a new type”, “an extremely bold lexicographic experiment, even too bold for the current level of semantic studies” (Lewicki 1984: 587–592).

3. Aware of challenges facing the project, we started to organize conferences and publish collective volumes dedicated to important theoretical issues. The subsequent volumes started to appear in 1981. They were usually published under the so-called ‘red Lublin series’ (Pol. ‘czerwona seria lubelska’)

- Bartmiński, Jerzy (ed.) (1981) *Pojęcie derywacji w lingwistyce*,
- Lewicki, Andrzej, Maria (eds.) (1982) *Stalość i zmienność związków frazeologicznych*,
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (ed.) (1988) *Konotacja*,

- Abramowicz, Maciej, Jerzy Bartmiński (eds.) (1989) *Tekst ustny – texte oral: struktura i pragmatyka, problemy systematyki, ustność w literaturze*.
- Bartmiński Jerzy (ed.) (1990) *Językowy obraz świata*,
- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Małgorzata Mazurkiewicz-Brzozowska (eds.) (1993) *Nazwy wartości*,
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (ed.) (1993a) *Pojęcie ojczyzny we współczesnych językach europejskich*.

And others.

The most important theoretical texts from that period of exploration were particularly the following two papers: “**Definicja leksykograficzna a opis języka**” (Bartmiński 1984), which comprised a recommendation for releasing semantic descriptions from narrow structural frameworks and including in them features referred to as connotative, cultural, contextual or “paralinguistic”<sup>3</sup>, as well as “**Definicja kognitywna jako narzędzie opisu konotacji**” (Bartmiński 1988), which included a draft of a new type of definition that in time acquired wider application and considerable popularity (cf. Bartmiński 2018, in press).

4. In **1985** the management of the Wrocław office (which, after Professor Czesław Hernas’s arrest in 1982 was managed by the rector of the University of Wrocław Professor Mieczysław Klimowicz) entrusted me with the function of the second degree coordinator and responsibility for the division “**Language and Culture**”.

The division had already been working on the following issues:

- communication grammar (Bogusław Dunaj),
- the language of television (Zofia Kurzowa),
- the cultural function of language (Janusz Anusiewicz),
- a dictionary of the language of folklore (Jerzy Bartmiński).

When in 1985 (responding to my request) the special office that financed culture at Wrocław University (*Biuro Problemu Węzłowego*) agreed to establish (and finance) the “**Language and Culture**” **Discussion Seminar**, I managed to attract the interest of new researchers specializing in the disciplines of language and culture:

---

<sup>3</sup> From the perspective of 25 years, Piotr Żmigrodzki concluded that “[this] text initiated a certain trend in the Polish metalexigraphic discussion” and that “only the year 2000 witnessed the publication of *Inny słownik języka polskiego*, which presented definitions following, generally speaking, [...] the recommendations formulated by Bartmiński, but, in any way, definitely doing away with scientism, previously ubiquitous in Polish lexicography” (Żmigrodzki 2010: 33–34).

- a dictionary of the language of Norwid (Jadwiga Puzynina),
- the functions of language (Renata Grzegorzyczkowa),
- the intervarietal vocabulary (Andrzej Markowski),
- a linguistic label (Małgorzata Marcjanik),
- internationalisms (Jolanta Maćkiewicz),
- lexical semantics (Ryszard Tokarski and Iwona Nowakowska-Kempna), and others.

At the peak period of its activity the Wrocław office financed 17 research teams.

5. The year 1988 should be remembered for two reasons. Firstly, the first volume of the yearly journal *Etnolingwistyka* was published in Lublin and the first volume of the series *Język a Kultura* was published in Wrocław. Since that year it has been possible to talk about an “institutional dimension” (as Czachur described it) of reflection on the relation between language and culture.

The “Foreword” to the first volume of *Etnolingwistyka* includes a policy statement of ethnolinguistics reading as follows:

Ethnolinguistics is a direction in modern linguistics that chooses language in its complex relation with culture as a subject matter of research, thus a whole language system as an institutionalized social construct with the whole richness of its types, styles and variants, as well as the whole diversity of its uses, in relation to a system of culture as a characteristic order of human activities together with formulas and values inscribed in them, as well as to culture as a product of such activities.

(Bartmiński 1988c: 5)

The editor of the journal identified “the notion of a linguistic worldview understood as a ‘naïve’ image underlying a language, fixed in the structure of grammar and the meanings of words, as well as in the structure and meanings of texts” as “the main subject matter” of ethnolinguistics.

(Bartmiński 1988c: 5)

Meanwhile, published in 1988 and edited by Anusiewicz and Bartmiński, the first volume of the series *Język a Kultura* included declarations about a curriculum of the discussion seminar, a network of entries for the planned linguistic volume of *Encyklopedia kultury polskiej* (Bartmiński 1988), as well as a research manifesto by Janusz Anusiewicz on a cultural theory of language. Anusiewicz wrote:

Our research goal is to deal with the issues of a cultural theory of language understood, as generally as possible, as a theory dealing with the multiaspectual, multidimensional, and multifunctional character of language in relation to culture, as well as penetrating possibly the most completely perceived relations between language and culture, based on the assumption that the content, form and modes of existence of culture are identifiable on the basis of linguistic facts, and not the other way round.

(Anusiewicz 1988: 23)

6. Was the idea to combine language and culture a novelty? No, it was not. In fact, establishing relations between language and culture has had a long historical tradition and corresponds to the spirit of European, particularly German, anthropology from the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, the times of Herder and Humboldt. However, in the contemporary science of language, after the period dominated by the structuralist paradigm autonomizing language and research on language, the idea to treat language in the context of culture is being revived and is becoming more and more popular.

The need to combine linguistic research with a worldview, values, culture, and cognition is continually emphasized by specialists in glottodidactics dealing with the processes of teaching foreign languages (Zgółka 2006; Peeters 2015) and a native language as a foreign one (in Poland: Zarzycka 2004; Miodunka et al. 2004; Ligara 2008; Gębal 2010; Dąbrowska 2017); they are accompanied in their actions by translatology specialists (cf. Tabakowska 2004; Underhill 2012; Głaz 2015; Gicala 2017).

Both Wrocław and Lublin centres were inspired by the achievements of American ethnolinguists, especially Sapir and Whorf. Nevertheless, the authors from Wrocław (particularly Anusiewicz) used extensively works by German researchers (Herder, Humboldt, Trier, Weisgerber), while those from Lublin (Bartmiński, Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska) frequently referred to works by Russian ones (Apresjan, Toporov, Ivanov, Nikita Tolstoy and Svetlana Tolstoy) and, of course, also German ones (Herder and Humboldt).

However, research projects initiated in Lublin were rooted more in local dialectology and folklore studies, used the methodologies developed by Bronisław Malinowski and especially Anna Wierzbicka, which bore fruit in their relative originality (which drew the attention of Marzena Guz, a German language scholar from Poznań (2012), Elżbieta Tabakowska, an English language scholar from Cracow (2013), Adam Głaz, an English language scholar from Lublin (2015), and others).

On the grounds of Slavonic linguistics, the demand for an integral approach to language and culture was put forward the strongest in the 1960s by the father of Slavonic ethnolinguistics Professor Nikita Tolstoy, who, as the initiator and manager of the “Polesye expedition (n.b. referring to the pre-war research on Polesye conducted by Kazimierz Moszyński) reached the conclusion that “it is not possible to conduct ‘purely linguistic’ research on the lexis concerning spiritual culture without taking into consideration the beliefs, rituals, rules of everyday life, or mythological images of the speakers of a given language”(Tolstoy 1992)<sup>4</sup>. The consequence was that descriptions were prepared by means of a set of common terminological instruments based on such notions as *system*, *opposition* and *contrast*, *paradigmatics* and *syntagmatics*, *text*, *model* and *variant*, *pattern* and its realization, etc.

Writing the “Foreword” to volume 1 in 1988, the editor of *Etnolingwistyka* shared these convictions:

Language and culture are *par excellence* human phenomena. They are universal, semiotic, systemic. They have their lexicons, their grammars. They serve interpersonal communication. Simultaneously, they do not exhaust their essence in a simple symbolization of the external world; they also model, co-create, and design this world to human measure. They transform objects belonging to the material world into cultural objects belonging to the human worlds, into mental objects with rich connotations

(*Etnolingwistyka* 1, 1988c: 6)

As emphasis in research conducted by the Lublin groups was put on the cognitive aspect of language, with time ethnolinguistics practised in Lublin started to be referred to as “cognitive” (after: Zinken 2004, 2009; cf. Nepop-Ajdaczyć 2007) in order to distinguish it from the “etymological ethnolinguistics” of Vladimir Toporov and the “dialectological ethnolinguistics” of Nikita Tolstoy<sup>5</sup>.

7. The output of the first stage of the work performed within the framework of the “Language and Culture” discussion seminar was a volume of *Współczesny język polski* published under the editorship of J. Bartmiński in Wrocław in 1993 as volume II of *Encyklopedia kultury polskiej* and reissued in an extended edition in Lublin in 2001. The book had five editions in Lublin.

---

<sup>4</sup> Many years later this programme was systematically expounded by Svetlana Tolstaja in the paper entitled “Постулаты московской этнолингвистики” (Tolstaja 2006).

<sup>5</sup> I use the formulations used by the Russian authors – Anatoly Zhuravlov and Elena Berezovich.

The other publication of a considerable theoretical importance resulting from the activities of the discussion seminar was *Lingwistyka kulturowa* by Janusz Anusiewicz published in Wrocław in 1994 (additional printing in 1995). It preceded by a year the publication of *Toward a Theory of Cultural Linguistics* by Gary Palmer in 1996, which is regarded as the beginning of cultural linguistics in the West.

For some time the name of the newly developing subdiscipline of linguistics was a contentious issue: *ethnolinguistics* or *cultural linguistics*. J. Anusiewicz in *Lingwistyka kulturowa* erroneously put them in opposition to one another, claiming (contrary to facts) that ethnolinguistics limited the field of its interest to the folk language. In fact, from the beginning (the first volume of the journal) ethnolinguistics was focused on both the folk language and the national language. After years Anusiewicz's error was corrected by Anna Dąbrowska (2004). She concluded that both terms could be used interchangeably.

8. The Wrocław programme of the “key issue” on culture was suspended in the political turmoil of 1989, following the introduction of a new grant-based system.<sup>6</sup> The “Language and Culture” discussion seminar lost its patron (death of Professor Anusiewicz), but what remained was a social agreement among the participating universities. Seminar meetings continued to be held, but their rules were changed. Altogether over the period of thirty odd years from 1985 to 2017 the discussion seminar comprised 44 conferences<sup>7</sup> whose result was numerous articles published systematically in the “white” series (Pol. ‘biała seria’), the “red” series and *Etnolingwistyka*. By 2017, 28 volumes had been published in Wrocław in the irregular *Język a Kultura* “white” series; in Lublin, the (also irregular) “red” series had comprised 35 volumes<sup>8</sup> published under various titles, while the regularly published journal *Etnolingwistyka* celebrated the publication of its 30th volume in 2018 (beginning from volume 28, *Etnolingwistyka* is also published in the English language version). Thus, the total research output was 93 volumes, excluding separately published monographs.

---

<sup>6</sup> An interesting side note. The first two volumes in the *Język a Kultura* series were published by the University of Wrocław – attention: outside the range of the still functioning censorship system – in an internal limited edition of the series marked with a red and white strip, but two years later they were “legally” reprinted with a new graphic design in the so-called “white series”. This detail is remarkable, inasmuch as projects of research on the linguistic worldview and the already planned dictionary of values alarmed the then communist authorities, which resulted in the tapping of the phones of my colleagues in Wrocław in the 1980s! I learned about it years later while studying relevant documentation in the Institute of National Remembrance.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Burzyńska-Kamieniecka (2016). The volume contains proceedings from the 43rd discussion seminar held in Karpacz from 30 May to 1 June 2014. A recapitulation of the 37 meetings (held before 2003) was presented by Bartmiński and Dąbrowska (2004).

<sup>8</sup> The content of the 25 volumes of the “red” series is outlined in a publication by Agnieszka Boguta (2010).

## PART II

9. Both cultural linguistics and lexiculture are based on the thesis clearly formulated by Roman Jakobson under the influence of anthropologists according to which “language should be treated as an integral part of social life”, “language is, in fact, a foundation of culture”, and “language and culture imply each other” (Jakobson 1989: 472-473). Within the framework of lexiculture, it is assumed that language and culture are combined by “a paradox of mutual dependence” (Bartmiński 1993b; Łozowski 2014).

According to the ideational concept of culture as an axionormative system, culture comprises “everything that has to be known or that has to be believed in in order to behave in a manner acceptable to members of a given community” (Ward Goodenough, after: Burszta 1986) – and simultaneously – as Tomasz Krzeszowski acknowledges after Lakoff – what underlies a natural language is values, and it is values that shape its structure and functioning (Krzeszowski 1994: 29)<sup>9</sup>.

10. **The participation of “culture in language”** – at various levels of its organization – constitutes an axiom of cultural linguistics. At this point I want to limit myself to a short enumeration of the major aspects of the problem (cf. Bartmiński 2018b).

(a) All linguistic behaviours are culturally determined; this is the subject matter of the last 26th volume of the “white” Wrocław series published in 2016.

(b) The differentiation of language styles (colloquial, artistic, academic, official) has a cultural foundation (cf. e.g. Bartmiński 1993a: 19–21).

(c) The functioning of speech genres such as a fairy tale, proverb, riddle, folk ditty, order, etc. is based on patterns having a socio-cultural status (Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2007: 153–284).

(d) Forms of address and courteous formulas are realized in the linguistic material of socio-cultural conventions (Marcjanik 1993: 271–281 et al.).

(e) The coherence patterns of a text refer to the general principles regulating thought processes and cultural conventions (Bartmiński, Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2009).

---

<sup>9</sup> In particular, it consists in that language is a tool used to formulate value judgements; it is an object undergoing value judgements, and first of all it is a transmitter of values and a source of information about values (Bartmiński 2003). Jadwiga Puzynina expresses these complex relations by means of a synthetic formulation of “język wartości” (1992).

(f) Syntax remains in a direct relation with the intellectual operations of conducting reasoning processes, which has a linguistic expression, for example, in an extended system of conjunctions.

(g) Phraseology reflects old and contemporary cultural images, cf. *Sisyphean labour*; *to look as if deposited from a cross*; *to throw down the gauntlet to somebody*; *not to fall asleep, thus causing pears drying in hot ash to burn*, etc.

(h) Word formation techniques are connected with the changes of socio-cultural models of living and the ways of conceptualizing reality. A case in point is the expansion of feminine forms in the Polish languages, e.g. *politolożka* ('political scientist', fem.), *ekspertka* ('expert', fem.), *ministra*. ('minister', fem.), which is connected with efforts to increase the linguistic visibility of women in social life.

(i) Etymology which asks about the onomasiological foundations of names, describes the "internal form" of words; in the Polish and Russian *dom* ('home') we can find a cultural idea of building a house and establishing a community.

(j) Inflectional norms also have a clear cultural foundation; a textbook example is the use of the *-owie* ending in the plural nominative to refer to male persons enjoying considerable prestige: *panowie* ('gentlemen'), *profesorowie* ('professors'), *senatorowie* ('senators').

(k) Phenomena from the level of phonetics and prosody are also culturally motivated, e.g. when we talk of styles of speech, recitation, declamation, rapping, etc.

(l) The most important area of language where connections between language and culture adopt the most distinctive form is lexis. It is "a very sensitive indicator of culture" – as Anna Wierzbicka repeats after Edward Sapir (2007: 71). In order to emphasize a very close connection between lexis and culture, specialists in glottodidactics use the notion of *lexiculture* (cf. Bronisława Ligara 2008 after Robert Glisson). Within the scope of lexiculture, it is assumed that (cognitive) definitions are texts of culture, cultural definitions.

### **PART III**

With the above statement, I move on to the third part of my paper, in which I will present lexiculture instruments used to define axiological concepts as texts of culture.

11. Lexiculture uses a set of seven key notions constituting tools applied in analytical work:

- (1) linguistic worldview,
- (2) stereotype,

- (3) cognitive definition,
- (4) point of view and interpretative perspective,
- (5) profiling and profile,
- (6) values,
- (7) subject.

In the past each of these notions was the focus of a separate conference, cf. the publications:

(Re 1) Bartmiński, Jerzy (ed.) (1990) *Językowy obraz świata*<sup>10</sup>.

(Re 2) Anusiewicz, Janusz, Jerzy, Bartmiński (eds.) (1998) *Stereotyp jako przedmiot lingwistyki*<sup>11</sup>.

(Re 3) Bartmiński, Jerzy (ed.) (1988) *Konotacja*; Bartmiński, Jerzy, Ryszard, Tokarski (eds.) (1993) *O definicjach i definiowaniu*<sup>12</sup>.

(4) Bartmiński Jerzy, Stanisława, Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Ryszard, Nycz (eds.) (2004) *Punkt widzenia w języku i w kulturze*; Bartmiński, Jerzy, Stanisława, Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Ryszard, Nycz (eds.) (2004) *Punkt widzenia w tekście i w dyskursie*.

(Re 5) Bartmiński, Jerzy, Ryszard, Tokarski (eds.) (1993) *Profilowanie w języku i w tekście*<sup>13</sup>.

(Re 6) Bartmiński, Jerzy, Małgorzata, Mazurkiewicz-Brzozowska (eds.) (1993) *Nazwy wartości*; Bartmiński, Jerzy (2004) *Język w kręgu wartości*<sup>14</sup>.

(Re 7) Bartmiński, Jerzy Anna, Pajdzińska (eds.) *Podmiot w języku i kulturze* (2008).

Other cultural linguistics issues were discussed in the subsequent volumes of both the “red” series published in Lublin<sup>15</sup> and the “white” series published in Wrocław, whose first two

<sup>10</sup> Cf. also, e.g.: Anusiewicz, Dąbrowska (eds.) 2000; Marczevska 2002: 18-30; Bartmiński 2006: 11-21; Guz 2012; Głaz, Danaher, Łozowski (eds.) 2013; Gicala 2018.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. also, e.g.: Bartmiński J., Panasiuk J., 1993; SSiSL 1996-2017; Bartmiński 2007; Bielińska-Gardziel 2009.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. also, e.g.: SLSJ 1980; SSiSL 1996-2017; Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2007: 23-31, 2017; Brzozowska 2009; Żmigrodzki 2010; Bartmiński 2013, 2018c; LASiS 2015-2017.

<sup>13</sup> See also, among others: Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2015; Grzeszczak 2015; Bartmiński 2018a.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. also Niebrzegowska 1996. Values were also the subject matter of four volumes in the “red” series (thus creating a sub-series) entitled *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów* (WJOSS) 1-4. Besides this series, the UMCS Press published the following volumes: *JWP* 2006; *LASiS* 1, 3 and 5. The Institute of Central and Eastern Europe published also the volume entitled *Pojęcie ojczyzny we współczesnych językach europejskich*, ed. Bartmiński (1993), *Nazwy wartości w językach europejskich. Raport z badań empirycznych*, eds. Bielińska-Gardziel, Brzozowska, Żywicka (2017).

<sup>15</sup> For example, Lewicki, Tokarski (eds., 1995); Grzegorzczkova, Pajdzińska (eds., 1996); Bartmiński, Boniecka (eds., 1998); Bartmiński, Boniecka (eds., 1998); Pajdzińska, Krzyżanowski (eds., 1999); Pajdzińska, Tokarski (eds., 2001); Krzyżanowski, Nowak (eds., 2004), Adamowski (ed., 2005, vol. 1 &2); Bartmiński, Majer-Baranowska (eds., 2005); Nowak, Tokarski (eds., 2007); Pajdzińska, Tokarski (eds., 2010); Czerwiński, Nowak, Przybylska (eds., 2010); Filar, Piekarczyk (eds., 2013); Filar, Piekarczyk (eds., 2014); Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Szadura, Szumiło with participation of Kłapcio (eds., 2014); Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Nowosad-Bakalarczyk, Piekot (eds., 2015).



The semasiological (from a name to a meaning) and onomasiological (from the world to a name) approaches are complementary, non-contradictory. We may as well ask about the meaning (“connotation” in a broad Milleean sense of the word) of the words *sun*, *moon*, *stars* like about the ways of referring to ‘the largest daytime light in the sky’, ‘the largest night time light in the sky’, ‘small lights in the sky visible at night’, etc. A good presentation of the issue of linguistic worldview in German, American, and Polish linguistic is included in a book by Marzena Guz (2012).

**12.2.** A linguistic worldview consists of *stereotypes*, that is *cultural concepts*<sup>17</sup>. Recently we have been prone to use the term *concept* rather than *stereotype* because of the widespread (impossible to overcome) use of *stereotype* in the sense of prejudices, and hence with a negative connotation. The term *concept* – with the addition: *cultural* does not cause such problems. In short, it is defined as ‘a notion marked axiologically and equipped with specific connotations’ (Gryshkova 2014).<sup>18</sup> Thus *concept* comprises a wider set of features than *notion*. *Notion* includes cognitive features only: *mother* is ‘a woman who has borne a child’, *mother-in-law* is ‘a husband's mother’; while *stereotype/ concept* includes emotive and pragmatic content, i.e. a rich linguistic and cultural connotation: *mother* – ‘loving’, ‘protective’, ‘caring’ etc., *mother-in-law* – ‘unfriendly’, ‘catty’.

**12.3. Cognitive definition** is a tool used to describe concepts. Its major aim is to report on “the way of perceiving an object by the speakers of a given language, i.e. on the socially consolidated knowledge of the world cognizable through a language and its usage, the categorization of its phenomena, their descriptions and value judgements” (Bartmiński 1988: 69–170). A cognitive definition is a text of culture within the meaning of the Tartu school and at the same time a narrative text, a specific narration about an object (Bartmiński 2013, 2014b, 2018c). What is disputable is the “open” character of a cognitive definition (Bartmiński, Tokarski 1993), because openness, which is a feature of a meaning rather than a definition “which always reduces an open set of features to a record that is more or less limited” (Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2017: 566), features for which “linguistic evidence” can be indicated” (Wierzbicka 1993; Bartmiński 2015).

---

<sup>17</sup> More in: Bartmiński 2007, 2016.

<sup>18</sup> In the circle of Lublin ethnolinguistics, its equivalent is stereotype understood after Hilary Putnam (1975) as a social image of an object. Such an understanding of stereotype underlies *Słownik stereotypów i symboli ludowych* (SSiSL 1996–2017).

**12.4. Point of view is**

a subjectively cultural factor determining the way of talking about an object, including about the categorization of an object, the selection of an onomasiological basis while creating its name, about the selection of features that are pronounced about an object in concrete utterances and consolidated in its meaning.

(Bartmiński 1990/2006: 105)

**12.5. Profiling** is a subjective (having its own subject) linguistic-notional operation consisting in a specific shaping of an image of an object by perceiving it in specified aspects, subcategories, facets such as origin, features, appearance, functions, events, experiences, etc. within the framework of a certain type of knowledge and in accordance with the requirements of a particular point of view (Bartmiński, Niebrzegowska 1998; Bartmiński 2018a, 2018b).

**12.6. Values** – as it has already been mentioned above – constitute the core of every culture and at the same time are inseparable from language. They are a factor that controls the creation of base images and their profiling in discourse (Cf. the volumes: JKW 2004, JWP 2006, WJOSS 1–4.).

**12.7. Subject** – is an entity that governs discourse, verbalization and conceptualization; it underlies an image / vision of the world. A subject experiences and conceptualizes reality. A linguistic image always bears the mark and “traces” of its creator, reflects their mentality (cf. Bartmiński, Pajdzińska 2008; Bartmiński 2008a).

**13. The operationalization of lexiculture instruments.** A set of these analytical tools of lexiculture proposed preliminarily in 1980 in the trial sheet of the dictionary of linguistic stereotypes (SLSJ) and systematically expanded in the subsequent years was the most consistently and on a large scale used in *Słownik stereotypów i symboli ludowych* (SSiSL), whose volume II, part 1 (*Zboża*) was published in 2017 – and in *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, whose first three volumes: *DOM*, *PRACA* and *HONOR* were published in the years 2015-2017 (LASiS 1, 3 and 5).

Some theoretical aspects of the lexiculture methodology were addressed in books by Jerzy Bartmiński (2006, 2007, 2014) and Stanisława Niebrzegowska(-Bartmińska) (1995, 2007) and doctoral dissertations by Marzena Marczevska (2002), Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel (2009), Grzegorz Żuk (2010), Monika Grzeszczak (2015), as well as, to some extent, Małgorzata Brzozowska (2009) and Marta Nowosad-Bakalarczyk (2009) published in a book form. What

should also be mentioned is habilitation dissertations by Jan Adamowski (1999), Jadwiga Kozłowska-Doda (2015) and Joanna Szadura (2017). They used the lexiculture methodologies and, to some extent, enriched them. The most complete information on the achievements of lexiculture before 2009 is included in the bibliography of Beata Maksymiuk-Pacek and Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (2009) as well as articles by Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (2004b, 2009, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2017).

The most important long term project carried out by the lexiculture team is *Słownik stereotypów i symboli ludowych* (SSiSL 1996-). Its methodology was adopted with some modifications by the international team that, since 2012, has been working on the semantics of the names of values within the framework of the EUROJOS discussion seminar and publishing *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów* (cf. LASiS 1, 3 and 5). For detailed analytical research within the EUROJOS discussion seminar, the following 5 entries were selected:

- HOME and EUROPE because we refer to Europe as “our common home”;
- WORK because it determines young people's successes and failures;
- FREEDOM because it is the flagship value in our part of the world;
- DIGNITY and HONOUR because they reach the sources of European culture and are written down in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* adopted by the UNO in 1948.

14. The manner of explicating concepts – corresponding to the principles of cognitive ethnolinguistics – can be found in the aforementioned volumes of the LASiS (1, 3 and 5), synthetically, also, among others, in the study of “the European home” (Bartmiński 2018b).

At this point I would like to present this problem **as exemplified by WORK**.

I draw on volume 3 of the LASiS 3 published in 2016 under the editorship of J. Bartmiński, M. Brzozowska and S. Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska. It contains cognitive (cultural) definitions of the concept of WORK in 14 Slavonic (Polish, Czech, Slovak, Russian, Byelorussian, and Ukrainian, as well as Bulgarian, Serbian, and Croatian) and non-Slavonic languages – including those spoken by Slavs’ close (Lithuanian), more distant (Greek, German, Italian and Spanish.)

The articles are organized according to a similar pattern; a general introduction, a short review of the current status of research on work, and an identification of a material basis are followed by the core part: a discussion of work in light of systemic data (dictionary definitions of the lexical exponents of the concept of work; etymology of the names of work; superior categories (hypernyms), co-hyponyms of WORK and antonyms; synonyms, derivatives and

phraseologisms), as well as survey- and text-based data (proverbs; literary texts; press and journalistic texts; corpus data) – this part reflects the “separative” approach, as it is referred to by S. Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (2015).

I will provide a brief outline of some research results in the order adopted in the papers included in the volume WORK, focusing on what connects particular languages.

Names of work and their etymology. In European languages, the concept of work has different lexical exponents whose etymology says a lot about the conceptualization of work as a certain type of actions.

The etymology of the Polish word *praca* is uncertain, while that of *robota* and *trud* is relatively clear. *Robota* has the same root as *parobek* (‘servant, domestic’), Old Polish *roba* ‘female slave’ and Russian *rab* ‘male slave’; the Czech *robota* means ‘serfdom’. In Old Church Slavonic, *robota/rabota* meant ‘enslavement, slavery’. The Latin equivalent *labor* meant not only ‘work’ but also ‘suffering, painful effort’. Coincident results are provided by an etymological analysis of the word *trud*, which in the Polish language means ‘hard work, effort’, and in Russian is the basic lexical exponent of the concept of WORK; *trud* in Church Slavonic was used in the meaning of ‘physical effort, suffering and obstacles’, ‘fear and sadness’. *Trud* remains etymologically related to the Lithuanian *triūsas* ‘work, excess of tasks’ and the Latin *trūdō* ‘I hit, push, rush violently’; and all these forms are reducible to the Proto-Indo-European root *\*ter-* in the meaning ‘to rub, to chafe’ (Boryś 2005: 644). The connection between work and suffering is confirmed by the etymology of the French *travail* and the Spanish *trabajo*. In both words, the meaning of work is combined with ‘burden’; both words remain in an etymological connection with the Latin *trabalium* ‘burden’. Thus, the etymology of the names of work indicates that the primary sense of the concept of work includes the ideas of coercion, suffering, subordination to somebody, slavery. Svetlana Tolstaja observed that the lexeme of the Russian *trud* ‘work’ enters into semantic relations with lexemes naming not only pain and suffering but also childbirth and afterlife; thus, its semantics comprises a whole human life – “from birth in painful labour through the continuous hardship of everyday life to the last agonies of death” (Tolstaja 2008: 120).

Zuzanna Topolińska, who conducted a systematic analysis of the continuants of the five proto-Slavonic roots *\*děti*, *\*orb-*, *\*port’-*, *\*prav-*, *\*trud-* referring to work (these roots are present in the Polish lexemes *działać*, *robić*, *pracować*, *sprawiać*, *trudzić się*), reached the conclusion that, in historical development, the most important thing was the difference between

simple physical work associated primarily with effort, enslavement, hardship, suffering and creative, socially organized work:

From work in the meaning of becoming familiar with the real world of nature, the work of a farmer, animal breeder, etc., we move on successively to work in an organized community, work “for somebody”, institutionalized work, work to make a living, and from the very beginning there appears a motif of creation, handicraft, technical and technological invention. In other words: the semantic field expands, associations connected with a diversified pragmatic context of using the notion of work cross each other, and the frequency of usage in new, “refined” contexts increases.

(Topolińska 2018: 349)

In the particular languages’ dictionary definitions of the names of work, the number of distinguished meanings varies. In *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego* under the editorship of Stanisław Dubisz (2003), the word *work* has been assigned 7 meanings:

- 1) ‘man's deliberate activity aimed at creating particular material or cultural goods, constituting a basis for society's existence and development, action, doing something, labour; a job’;
- 2) ‘a product of man's deliberate activity, particularly in the areas of science or culture’;
- 3) ‘a job, employment as a source of earning; a position, earning a living’;
- 4) ‘the functioning, activity of the organism, organs of a man or animal’;
- 5) ‘the functioning, being in motion of a machine or device’;
- 6) colloquially ‘an institution where people earn a living; a workplace, a firm’;
- 7) physics ‘one of the fundamental physical categories determining the value of energy necessary to move a material body in space [...]’.

The other languages’ dictionaries distinguish from three meanings (e.g. in Lithuanian and German) to eight meanings in Italian. The differences consist in different principles of defining and start at the time of establishing the superior category (hypernym).

The hypernym of the names of WORK is *działanie / działalność*, moulded from the verb *działać*, which appears in all Slavonic languages. The meaning of *zajęcie / zajmowanie się czymś* is a little narrower than that of *działanie*, but both of them are definable by means of an even more general category of *robienie czegoś, czynność, aktywność*. Thus, what we deal with is a structuring consisting of a few levels:

level I: *czynność, aktywność* – the common denominator: ‘doing something’;

level II: *działanie, zajęcie* – the common denominator: ‘doing something + deliberate’;

level III: *praca, robota* – common denominator: ‘doing something + deliberate + with effort + focus on result’).

The word formation base for *działanie* was *dzianie się*, which has a general meaning of ‘happening, taking place’. The derivatives include: *dzieło* ‘a made object’, *dzielny* originally ‘active, energetic’ (a significant difference: in Polish, *dzielny* means only ‘brave’, in Czech, *delný* means ‘industrious’), *dzieje* ‘history’, etc.

Cohyponyms – that is names of other actions, occupations or forms of activities besides work – include: *gry i zabawy, odpoczynek, sport, spacer, wycieczki* (‘games and plays’, ‘rest’, ‘sport’, ‘walks’, ‘excursions’), (and more broadly: *turystyka* [‘tourism’]); *nauka, czytanie, zajęcia dydaktyczne, modlitwa* (‘learning’, ‘reading’, ‘didactic classes’, ‘prayer’). The identification of cohyponyms is equivalent to the establishment of a difference or contrast and directly leads to an opposition.

Undoubtedly, *praca* (‘work’) and *bezrobocie* (‘unemployment’), *praca* (‘work’) and *odpoczynek* (‘rest’), *praca* (‘work’) and *próżnowanie / lenistwo* (‘loafing’/ ‘idleness’), *praca* (‘work’) and *święto, rozrywka, luz* (‘holiday’, pastime, ‘free time’) function in antonymic arrangements. In proverbs, *mówienie* (‘talking’) can also be a contextual antonym for work, like in the Byelorussian *Bolsz rabi, a mieńsz hawary* (‘Do more, speak less’); the Serbian *Lasno je govoriti, al' je teško tvoriti* (‘Easy to say, difficult to do’).

The synonymy of work in *Dystynktywny słownik synonimów* by Alicja Nagórko, Marek Łaziński and Hanna Burkhardt (2004) comprises a short series: *praca, zajęcie, zatrudnienie, robota*, the expressive words *fucha* (colloquially, disrespectfully ‘illegal work performed during normal working hours’) and *chałtura* (colloquially, disrespectfully ‘an artist's unambitious work to earn a living’). In fact, the synonymy of work is very rich; it can be divided into six distinctive meanings of the lexeme naming work (it was done exemplarily in the PSWP under the editorship of Halina Zgólkowa, 2001):

for the meaning (1) ‘actions requiring effort, performed for some purpose’: *aktywność, działanie, harówka, katorga, kierat, krwawica, męczarnia, mordęga, mozól, obowiązki, orka, pańszczyzna, pot, robota, siódme poty, służba, trud, wysiłek, zachrzan, zapieprz, zajęcie, zatrudnienie, zasuw, znój*;

for the meaning (2) ‘the result of actions’: *dorobek, dysertacja, dzieło*, (disrespectfully) *elaborat, elukubracja, esej, monografia, omówienie, opracowanie, produkcja, publikacja, rezultat, rozprawa, studium, szkic, tekst, twór, twórczość, utwór, wynik pracy*, (colloquially, disrespectfully) *wypociny, wytwór*;

for the meaning (3) ‘a job, a source of income’: *ciepła posadka, angaż, engagement, etat, fotel, fucha, funkcja, godność, miejsce, posada, pozycja, robota, stanowisko*, (colloquially, contemptuously) *stołek, synekura, zajęcie, zatrudnienie*; in the recent years the negatively marked synonyms of work in this meaning were joined by *śmieciówka, umowa śmieciowa*; they are used colloquially to refer to employment contracts for a definite period of time that do not require health insurance (*Jak pracodawcy przestanie się opłacać zatrudniać ludzi na śmieciówkach, to jest większa szansa, że da pracownikowi etat*);

for the meaning (4) ‘all activities performed together’: *aktywność, czynności, działalność, działania, postępowanie, robota*;

for the meaning (5) ‘the functioning of an organism’: *aktywność, czynność, działanie, funkcjonowanie, trud, wysiłek*;

for the meaning (6) ‘a place, institution where work is performed’: *fabryka, firma, instytucja, miejsce pracy, przedsiębiorstwo, zakład*.

What draws attention is the wealth of pejorative synonyms of work in its fundamental meaning (1) ‘actions requiring effort, performed for some purpose’: colloquially *odwalić* and *chalturzyć/odstawić chalturę*; *harować, zasuwać* ‘to perform hard work under compulsion’, vulgarly *zapieprzać* and *zapierdalać*.

In the Polish language, the most synonyms refer to hard work.

The derivatives and phraseologisms consolidate the category of the performer of work: Polish *robotnik* and *pracownik*; in Lithuanian, Russian, Ukrainian, Czech and Bulgarian, special names are given to those who “like/love” work or are “inclined” to work: Ukrainian *pracelub, pracelubnyj*; Czech *pracemilovný*; Bulgarian *rabotosposoben*. Borrowing from the English *workaholic* are used to indicate distance to people who work excessively, do not know when to stop working: Polish *pracoholik/pracoholiczka*; Bulgarian *rabotoholik*, Croatian *radoholičar*.

Diligent people who like working are associated with a bee (if work results in obvious benefits), with an ant (if work is performed with great care and diligence), while those working hard are compared to a horse, an ox or a mule (in Spanish *trabajar como una mula*), sporadically to a dog (Italian *lavorare come un cane*). In general, difficult and hard work is compared to the work of animals (Italian *lavorare come una bestia* ‘to slog away like a beast’).

A collective performer of work is reflected by the lexis where the prefix *współ-* (‘co-’) is combined with the verb *pracować* (Polish *współpracować, współpracownik, współpracownica*); such words, however, refer to mental, rather than physical, work.

The distinctions between an employer and an employee, physical work and mental work (the latter regarded as more valuable) are linguistically consolidated.

The terminology concerning working time units, e.g. Polish *roboczegodzina*, *dniówka*; work organization set forth in labour codes, regulated by labour law, employment contracts, job offers, the job market, medicine of labour, etc. has an international dimension and is copied from one language to another.

Work tools are linguistically consolidated, with distinction given to the elementary tool, that is the human hand: Russian *ручной труд*; Polish *prace ręczne*; Spanish *trabajo manual*. The memory of the hand as the fundamental work tool is also confirmed by such phraseologisms as the Polish *być czyjąś prawą ręką* (lit. 'to be somebody's right hand' 'to be somebody's main assistant'), *mieć ręce pełne roboty* (lit. 'to have one's hands full of work' - 'to have a lot of work'), *złota rączka*, *mieć złote ręce* (lit. 'a golden hand, dim.' , 'to have golden hands' 'a handyman' 'to have the skills to do everything very well'), *roboty pali się komuś w rękach* (lit. 'work is burning in somebody's hands' 'somebody works quickly and effectively'); handmade things (*ręczna robota* [lit. 'manual work']) are in demand. It is also possible *zakasać rękawy* (lit. 'to roll up one's sleeves' 'to start work with enthusiasm') and *urobić sobie ręce po łokcie* (lit. 'to work one's hands up to the elbows' 'to ruin one's health by working hard'), but also *mieć dwie lewe ręce* (lit. 'to have two left hands', 'be clumsy').

The experimental research consisted in conducting an open survey in which respondents were asked to answer the following question: *What, in your opinion, constitutes the essence of real work?* The use of the modifier "real" was meant to draw attention to the imaginary, rather than objective, side of work; to how work was perceived, and not to what typical work was like in reality. Answers were each time provided by a numerically similar group of students (according to the guidelines, it was to be at least 100 persons) selected based on the gender balance principle (half women, half men) and the diversity of major subjects (sciences and humanities). We managed to conduct the survey for nine languages (cf. NWwJE 2017).

Among Polish students, the survey was conducted on three occasions in Lublin in the years 1990, 2000 and 2010. This allowed us to show not only the perception of work by the young generation of Poles but also certain changes occurring over the period of 20 years: a decrease in the importance of the social aspect (the creation of a community) and the ethical aspect of work; the quality of work also turned out to have lost its significance. What gained in importance was earnings. The respondents also drew attention to the psychological side of work, particularly the possibility of drawing satisfaction and pleasure from work. An employee's commitment to (passion for) work as well as individual effort devoted to work were regarded as important factors.

Textual data such as proverbs, press articles, and electronic linguistic corpuses were used selectively.

The final stage following the partial, “separative” analyses is a holistic presentation, a synthetic cognitive definition and a reconstruction of the profiles of the base image of work functioning in social communication, in the contemporary national discourses. A cognitive definition of work in the Polish language may assume the following shape<sup>19</sup>:

#### WORK

1. is (always) action *działanie / zajęcie* [different from activities such as learning, playing, practising sports, praying *nauka, zabawa, sport, modlitwa...*].
2. (always) a life necessity [cf. e.g. the proverbs *Bez pracy żyją ptacy*].
3. (always) work is performed by man [cf. the lexemes *pracownik, robotnik; pracodawca, pracobiorca*; man can be replaced by *robot*, but referring to *praca maszyn* consists in the metaphorical widening of the word *praca*].
4. (always) has a particular aim [cf. *zpracował na coś; wypracował/ opracował coś*; the proverb *Praca ludzi wzbogaca*, etc.].
5. (always) requires effort *wysiłek* [this feature of work is consolidated the strongest in etymology and synonyms: *trud, harówka, męczarnia* etc.; in derivatives: *napracować się/ narobić się, spracować się*; in phrases: *praca uciążliwa, wyczerpująca; pracować jak wół / koń; zapracować się na śmierć*, etc.]
6. (always) the effect<sub>1</sub> of work is some object or value [cf. the derivatives: *wyrób, praca* ‘a work’, *robotka; opracowanie, wypracowanie; dorobek...*].
7. (usually) the effect<sub>2</sub> of work is earnings [cf. *zarobek, zapłata* (for *praca najemna*; the phrases: *robić / zrobić kasę / pieniądze*; but: *praca społeczna* ‘without pay’; the proverb: *Jaka praca taka płaca...*].
8. (it is believed that) it is man's moral obligation [cf. the proverbs *Bez pracy nie ma kolaczy; Kto nie pracuje ten nie je...*].
9. can be physical and/or mental *fizyczna* and/or *umysłowa*, cf. *robot; praca magisterska, doktorska*, etc.].
10. can be tiring/pleasant, light/hard / ... [cf. *praca męcząca, przyjemna; praca lekka, ciężka...*].

<sup>19</sup> Presenting briefly the concept of WORK in the Polish language, I use the paper by Bartmiński and Bielińska-Gardziel (2015).

11. can have a team / individual character [cf. the phrases *prace zbiorowe; polowe...*].
12. can be commissioned / voluntary [cf. *prace zlecone...*].
13. can be performed freely or under compulsion [cf. the phrases *umowa pracy, praca niewolnicza, nakaz pracy...*].
14. can give satisfaction, pleasure/displeasure.
15. (usually) is performed by means of tools [cf. *rękodzieło; praca maszynowa...*]
16. (usually) is performed in a particular place [cf. *pracownia*, the phrases: *miejsce pracy; praca biurowa, praca domowa* (running a household as work), *praca chałupnicza, roboty polowe; dom pracy twórczej, obóz pracy...*].
17. (usually) is performed in a particular point in time [cf. the phrases *czas pracy, godziny pracy, dni robocze, sobota pracująca; praca po godzinach, praca na czarno*; disputes about *ośmiogodzinny dzień pracy, skrócenie tygodnia pracy...*].
18. (usually) is performed in accordance with particular principles [cf. the phrases *bezpieczeństwo i higiena pracy – bhp; warunki pracy, inspekcja pracy, kodeks pracy, urząd pracy, sąd pracy...*].

The ontological status of the definitional features of work is diversified. Some features are assigned to work permanently, while others optionally. For this reason, the definition proposed above includes such “modifiers” as “always”, “usually”, “may be”. Such a “holistic” cognitive definition of the Polish WORK is limited to components with “certification”, i.e. those for which it is possible to provide “linguistic evidence”, to indicate basic parameters (facets, dimensions) including: [performer], [action], [aim of activity], [effort], [effect / product], [earnings / salary]. A model record of the base image of WORK can assume the shape of the following sentence: **SOMEBODY – ACTS – DELIBERATELY – OVERCOMING DIFFICULTIES – ACHIEVES EFFECTS – RECEIVES EARNINGS**. The facets such as [tool], [quality / features of action], [ethos – duty], [time], [place], [conditions] have a weaker position (less often included in definitions and textual applications). Arranged non-accidentally, all facets make up a “cognitive structure” of the notion of WORK.

In social communication, **the base concept** of WORK functions in contextual variants, it is differently **profiled**. In the Polish social space, it is possible to distinguish 5 profiles of the notion of WORK.

**The traditional (folk) profile**, in which the prototype of work is the cultivation of land, and the effect of this work is bread and abundance (sometimes wealth). Work had a sacral dimension; hard work was (and is) its inherent attribute; the tool of work was a plough (previously an already mythical wooden plough), a sickle and a scythe; earnings; monetary

rewards were of lesser importance. Man was subordinated to work. Mental work was not (and is not) held in high regard.

**The religious profile**, in which work is a moral obligation and necessity as a continuation of God's creation; the aim of work is man's self-fulfilment and the creation of a human community. The physical and mental aspect are treated integrally; work has its foundation in the dignity of the human person, its effect is not only a product but also intellectual and spiritual values serving man.

**The pragmatic profile of the entrepreneur (employer)**, in which work is a process undergoing rationalization in the categories of the economic results of goods and prices, buying and selling. Work is a commodity. What counts is the effect of work in the form of a product and its price. The key role is played by the costs of work (capital expenditures, salaries), the efficiency of work, and the conditions of work organization (time and place, labour code, labour law, ergonomics).

**The pragmatic profile of the worker (employee)**, in which what counts is earnings, opportunities for individual development and continuous learning, and the subjective aspect of work. It is expected that work will be attractive and not very hard; work atmosphere should be friendly. Emphasis is placed on the continuous threat of work exploitation; therefore, trade unions are necessary to defend workers' rights.

**The profile of the unemployed.** Work is valuable; it is a commodity that is demanded and difficult to achieve, but negotiable: not every job, not every salary, and not all work conditions are acceptable.

## Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Dr. Władysław Chłopicki for his invitation to give this presentation at the Tertium conference entitled "The Language of the Third Millennium X" Openness in linguistic, cultural and translation studies. Openness in research and teaching", Kraków 21–23 March 2018.

## References

Abramowicz, Maciej, Jerzy Bartmiński, (eds.) (1989) *Tekst ustny – texte oral: struktura i pragmatyka, problemy systematyki, ustność w literaturze*. Wrocław: Wiedza o kulturze.

- Abramowicz, Maciej, Jerzy Bartmiński, Wojciech Chlebda (2009) „Językowo-kulturowy obraz świata Słowian na tle porównawczym. Założenia programu „A””. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka*, vol. 21. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 341–342.
- Adamowski, Jan Antoni (1999) *Kategoria przestrzeni w folklorze. Studium etnolingwistyczne*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Adamowski, Jan Antoni (ed.) (2005) *Przestrzeń w języku i w kulturze* (1–2). Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Anusiewicz, Janusz (1988/1991) „Kulturowa teoria języka. Zarys problematyki”. [In:] Janusz Anusiewicz, Jerzy Bartmiński (eds.) *Język a Kultura*, vol. 1. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego; 21–46. [reprint in: Janusz Anusiewicz, Jerzy Bartmiński (eds.) (1991) *Język a Kultura*, vol. 1. *Podstawowe pojęcia i problemy*. Wrocław: Wiedza o kulturze; 17–30].
- Anusiewicz, Janusz (1994) *Lingwistyka kulturowa. Zarys problematyki*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Anusiewicz, Janusz, Anna, Dąbrowska (eds.) (2000) *Język a Kultura*, vol. 13, *Językowy obraz świata i kultura*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Anusiewicz, Janusz, Anna, Dąbrowska, Michael, Fleischer (2000) *Językowy obraz świata i kultura. Projekt koncepcji badawczej*. [In:] Janusz Anusiewicz, Anna Dąbrowska (eds.) *Język a Kultura*, vol. 13, *Językowy obraz świata i kultura*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego; 11–44.
- Apresjan, Jurij (1994) „Naiwny obraz świata a leksykografia”. [“Native image of the world and lexicography”] (trans.) Joanna Berej, Anna Pajdzińska [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka*, vol. 6. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 5–12.
- Арутюнова, Нина [Arutjunova, Nina] (ed.) (1991) *Логический анализ языка. Культурные концепты*. Москва: Наука.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (1973) *O języku folkloru*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (ed.) (1980) *Słownik ludowych stereotypów językowych. Zeszyt próbny*. Wrocław.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (ed.) (1981) *Pojęcie derywacji w lingwistyce*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (1984) „Definicja leksykograficzna a opis języka”. [In:] Kazimierz Polański (ed.) *Słownictwo w opisie języka*. Katowice: UŚ; 9–21.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (1988a) „Definicja kognitywna jako narzędzie opisu konotacji”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Konotacja*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 169–183.

- Bartmiński, Jerzy (1988b) „Konwersatorium „Język a Kultura”. Projekt programu”. [In:] Janusz Anusiewicz, Jerzy Bartmiński (eds.) *Język a Kultura*, vol. I. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego; 7–19. [reprint in: Anusiewicz, Janusz, Jerzy Bartmiński (eds.) (1991) *Język a Kultura*, vol. 1. *Podstawowe pojęcia i problemy*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego; 9–16].
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (1988c) „Słowo wstępne”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka*, nr 1. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 5–7.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (1990) „Punkt widzenia, perspektywa, językowy obraz świata”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Językowy obraz świata*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 109–127. [reprint in Bartmiński Jerzy (2006) *Językowe podstawy obrazu świata*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS 2006; 76-88].
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (ed.) (1993a) *Pojęcie ojczyzny we współczesnych językach europejskich*. Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (1993b) „Wprowadzenie”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Encyklopedia kultury polskiej XX wieku. Współczesny język polski*. Wrocław: Wiedza o kulturze; 13–23.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (ed.) (2001) „Język w kontekście kultury”. [In:] *Współczesny język polski*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 13–22.
- Bartmiński Jerzy (ed.) (2001) *Współczesny język polski*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS (edition V in 2014).
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (2003) „Miejsce wartości w językowym obrazie świata”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Język w kręgu wartości*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 59–86.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (2005) „Koncepcja językowego obrazu świata w programie sławistycznych badań porównawczych”. [In:] Kwiryna Handke (ed.) *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej*, vol. 40. Warszawa: PAN; 259–280.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (2006) *Językowe podstawy obrazu świata*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS. (edition V in 2012).
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (2007) *Stereotypy mieszkają w języku. Studia etnolingwistyczne*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS. (edition II in 2009).
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (2008a) „Polifoniczność tekstu czy podmiotu? Podmiot w dialogu z samym sobą”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński, Anna Pajdzińska (eds.) *Podmiot w języku i kulturze*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 161–183.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (2008b) „Etnolingwistyka, lingwistyka kulturowa, lingwistyka antropologiczna?”. [In:] Anna Dąbrowska (ed.) *Język a Kultura*, vol. 20. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego; 15–33.

- Bartmiński, Jerzy (2009) Jörg Zinken (ed.) *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*. Sheffield i Oakville: CT Equinox.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (2013) "The Cognitive definition as a Text of Culture". [In:] Adam Glaz, David Danaher, Przemysław Lozowski (eds.) *The Linguistic Worldview: Ethnolinguistics, Cognition, and Culture*. London: Versita; 161–180.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (2014a) *Polskie wartości w europejskiej aksjoserze*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (2014b) „Narracyjny aspekt definicji kognitywnej”. [In:] Dorota Filar, Dorota Piekarczyk (eds.) *Narracyjność języka i kultury*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 99–115.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (2015) „Perspektywa semazjologiczna i onomazjologiczna w badaniach językowego obrazu świata”. [In:] *Poradnik Językowy*, nr 1. Warszawa; 14–29.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (2016) „Słowa kluczowe, kulturemy, koncepty kulturowe”. [In:] *Przegląd Humanistyczny*, nr 3. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego; 21–29.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (2018a) *O profilowaniu pojęć z punktu widzenia etnolingwistyki kognitywnej*. [In:] Agnieszka Libura, Daria Bębeniec, Hubert Kowalewski (eds.) *Dociekania kognitywne*, Kraków: Universitas; 13–48.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (2018b) *Język w kontekście kultury, czyli co dziś znaczy metafora „europejski dom”?* Katowice: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Śląsk.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (2018c) *In the circle of inspiration of Anna Wierzbicka: The cognitive definition – 30 years later* (Moskwa, in press).
- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel (2015) „Polski językowo-kulturowy obraz DOMU i jego profile”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka (eds.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 1, *DOM*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 89–121.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel (2016) „15 lat Konwersatorium EUROJOS”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka*, vol. 28. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 317–326.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Barbara Boniecka (eds.) (1998a) *Tekst. Analizy i interpretacje*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Barbara Boniecka (eds.) (1998b) *Tekst. Problemy teoretyczne*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Bartmiński Jerzy, Anna Dąbrowska (2004) „O konwersatorium ‘Język a Kultura’ – z okazji jubileuszu”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Ryszard

- Nycz (eds.) *Punkt widzenia w języku i w kulturze*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 359–377.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Monika, Grzeszczak (2014) „Jak rekonstruować kanon wartości narodowych i europejskich?”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka*, vol. 26. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 21–44.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Urszula Majer-Baranowska (eds.) (2005) *Bariery i pomosty w komunikacji językowej Polaków*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Małgorzata, Mazurkiewicz-Brzozowska (eds.) (1993) *Nazwy wartości: studia leksykalno-semantyczne*, vol. 1. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Stanisława, Niebrzegowska (1998) „Profile a podmiotowa interpretacja świata”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński, Ryszard Tokarski (eds.) *Profilowanie w języku i w tekście*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 211–223.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Stanisława, Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (2009) *Tekstologia*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Stanisława, Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Ryszard, Nycz (eds.) (2004) *Punkt widzenia w tekście i w dyskursie*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Bartmiński Jerzy, Anna, Pajdzińska (eds.) (2008) *Podmiot w języku i kulturze*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Jolanta, Panasiuk (1993) *Stereotypy językowe*. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Encyklopedia kultury polskiej XX wieku. Współczesny język polski*. Wrocław: Wiedza o kulturze; 363–387.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Ryszard, Tokarski (1993) „Definicja semantyczna: czego i dla kogo?”. [In:] Jerzy, Bartmiński, Ryszard, Tokarski (eds.) *O definicjach i definiowaniu*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 47–61.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy, Ryszard, Tokarski (eds.) (1993) *O definicjach i definiowaniu*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Bielińska-Gardziel, Iwona (2009) *Stereotyp rodziny we współczesnej polszczyźnie*. Warszawa: SOW.
- Boguta, Agnieszka (2010) *Bibliografia analityczna „czerwonej serii”, 1981-2008. Tomy 1–25*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Boryś, Wiesław (2005) *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Brzozowska, Małgorzata (2009) *Etymologia a konotacja słowa*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

- Burszta, Wojciech (1986) *Język a kultura w myśli etnologicznej*. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze.
- Burzyńska-Kamieniecka, Anna (ed.) (2016) *Język a Kultura*, vol. 26, *Kulturowe uwarunkowania zachowań językowych. Tradycja i zmiana*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Chlebda, Wojciech (2010) *Etnolingwistyka a leksykografia*. Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Czachur, Waldemar (ed.) (2017) *Lingwistyka kulturowa i międzykulturowa. Antologia*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Czerwiński, Maciej, Paweł, Nowak, Renata Przybylska (2010) *Język IV Rzeczypospolitej*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Dąbrowska, Anna (2017) „*Język i kultura a glottodydaktyka*”. [In:] Dorota Filar, Piotr Krzyżanowski (eds.) *Barwy słów. Studia lingwistyczno-kulturowe*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 125-142.
- Dubisz, Stanisław (ed.) (2003) *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Szkolne PWN.
- Etnolingwistyka* (1988-2018) (ed.) Jerzy Bartmiński, vols?. 1–30. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Gębał, Przemysław (2010) *Dydaktyka kultury polskiej w kształceniu językowym cudzoziemców. Podejście porównawcze*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Gicala, Agnieszka (2018) *Przekładanie obrazu świata. Językowy obraz świata w teorii i praktyce przekładu artystycznego*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Głaz, Adam, David, Danaher, Przemysław, Łozowski (eds.) (2013) *The Linguistic Worldview: Ethnolinguistics, Cognition, and Culture*. London: Versita.
- Głaz, Adam (2015) „*Etnolingwistyka daleka i bliska*”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka*, vol. 27. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 7–20.
- Gryshkova, Nina (2014) „*Leksem, pojęcie, stereotyp, koncept, znaczenie, idea – propozycja regulacji terminologicznych*”. [In:] Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Joanna Szadura (eds.) *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów. 3. Problemy eksplikowania i profilowania pojęć*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 21–50.
- Grzegorzczkowska, Renata (1991) „*Rola języka w tworzeniu kultury umysłowej*”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Język a Kultura*, vol. 1. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 61–71.

- Filar, Dorota, Dorota, Piekarczyk (eds.) (/2013/ 2014) *Narracyjność języka i kultury. Literatura i media*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.nie przekład tylko reprint?
- Grzegorzyczkowa, Renata (2011) „Jeszcze o rozumieniu JOS-u w perspektywie badań porównawczych: problem inwariantu pojęciowego”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka*, vol. 23. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 217–225.
- Grzegorzyczkowa, Renata, Anna, Pajdzińska (1996) *Językowa kategoryzacja świata*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Grzeszczak, Monika (2015) *Pojęcie demokracji i jego profilowanie w polskim i niemieckim dyskursie publicznym (1989–2009)*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego Jana Pawła II.
- Guz, Marzena (2012) *Językowy obraz świata u wybranych przedstawicieli lingwistyki niemieckiej, amerykańskiej i polskiej*. Poznań: Rys.
- Jakobson, Roman (1989) „Wspólny język lingwistów i antropologów”. [In:] Roman Jakobson, *W poszukiwaniu istoty języka. Wybór pism*, vol. 1. (ed.) Maria Renata Mayenowa. Warszawa: PIW; 471–489.
- Język a Kultura* [seria wydawnicza], vol. 1-26, (1988-2016). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, obejmuje m.in.:
- Vol. 1. (1991) Janusz Anusiewicz, Jerzy Bartmiński (eds.) *Podstawowe pojęcia i problemy*.
- T. 2. (1991) Jadwiga Puzynina, Jerzy Bartmiński (eds.) *Zagadnienia leksykalne i aksjologiczne*;
- Vol. 3. (1991) Jadwiga Puzynina, Janusz Anusiewicz (eds.) *Wartości w języku i tekście*;
- Vol. 4. (1991) Renata Grzegorzyczkowa, Jerzy Bartmiński (eds.) *Funkcje języka i wypowiedzi*;
- Vol. 5. (1992) Janusz Anusiewicz, Franciszek Nieckula (eds.) *Potoczność w języku i w kulturze*;
- Vol. 6. (1992) Janusz Anusiewicz i Małgorzata Marcjanik (eds.) *Polska etykieta językowa*;
- Vol. 7. (1992) Jolanta Maćkiewicz, Janusz Siatkowski (eds.) *Kontakty języka polskiego z innymi językami na tle kontaktów kulturowych*;
- Vol. 8. (1992) Iwona Nowakowska-Kempna (ed.) *Podstawy metodologiczne semantyki współczesnej*;
- Vol. 9. (1994) Janusz Anusiewicz, Kwiryna Handke (eds.) *Płeć w języku i kulturze*;
- Vol. 10. (1992) Janusz Anusiewicz, Bogdan Siciński (eds.) *Języki subkultur*;
- Vol. 11. (1994) Janusz Anusiewicz, Bogdan Siciński (eds.) *Język polityki a współczesna kultura polityczna*;

- Vol. 12. (1998) Janusz Anusiewicz, Jerzy Bartmiński (eds.) *Stereotyp jako przedmiot lingwistyki. Teoria, metodologia, analizy empiryczne*;
- Vol. 13. (2000) Anna Dąbrowska, Janusz Anusiewicz (eds.) *Językowy obraz świat i kultura*. Itd.
- JKW (2003) – Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Język w kręgu wartości*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- JWP (2006) – Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Język, wartości, polityka. Zmiany rozumienia nazw wartości w okresie transformacji ustrojowej w Polsce. Raport z badań empirycznych*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Казлоўская-Дода, Ядвіга [Kazlouskaya-Doda, Yadviha] (2015) *Паняцце „дом” у сучаснай беларускай мове*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Krzyszowski, Tomasz (1994) „Parametr aksjologiczny w przedpojęciowych schematach wyobrażeniowych”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka*, vol. 6. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 29–51.
- Krzyżanowski, Piotr, Paweł Nowak (eds.) (2004) *Manipulacja w języku*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- LASiS 1 (2015) – Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka (eds.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 1, *DOM*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- LASiS 3 (2016) – Jerzy Bartmiński, Małgorzata Brzozowska, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (eds.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 3. *PRACA*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- LASiS 5 (2017) – Sotirov, Petar, Dejan Ajdačić (eds.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 5, *HONOR*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Lewicki, AndrzejMaria (1984) [Rec.] *Słownik ludowych stereotypów językowych. Zeszyt próbny*. Wrocław 1980. [In:] Mieczysław Szymczak (ed.) *Poradnik Językowy*, nr 9–10. Warszawa – Łódź: PWN; 587–592.
- Lewicki, Andrzej, Maria (eds.) (1982) *Stalość i zmienność związków frazeologicznych*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Lewicki, AndrzejMaria, Ryszard Tokarski (eds.) (1995) *Kreowanie świata w tekstach*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Левицкий, Андрей, Сергей, Потапенко, Ольга, Воробьева [Levickij, Andrej, Sergej Potapenko, OlgaVorob'eva] (eds.) (2013) *Лингвоконцептология: перспективные направления. Монография*. Луганск: Изд-во ГУ „ЛНУ имени Тараса Шевченко”.
- Ligara, Bronisława (2008) „Leksykultura w ujęciu Roberta Glissona a nauczanie kompetencji kulturowej”. [In:] Władysław Miodunka, Anna Seretny (eds.) *W poszukiwaniu nowych*

- rozwiązań. *Dydaktyka języka polskiego jako obcego u progu XXI wieku*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego; 51–60.
- Łozowski, Przemysław (2014) „Język a kultura w programie etnolingwistyki kognitywnej Jerzego Bartmińskiego. Między Sapirem a Malinowskim”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka*, vol. 26. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 155–176.
- Maksymiuk-Pacek, Beata, Stanisława, Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (eds.) (2009) *Bibliografia adnotowana lubelskiego zespołu etnolingwistycznego (until 2009)*. Lublin: Polihymnia.
- Marcjanik, Małgorzata (1993) „Etykieta językowa”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Encyklopedia kultury polskiej XX wieku. Współczesny język polski*. Wrocław: Wiedza o kulturze; 270–281.
- Marczewska, Marzena (2002) *Drzewa w języku i w kulturze*. Kielce: Wydawnictwo Akademii Świętokrzyskiej.
- Miodunka, Władysław (ed.) (2004) *Kultura w nauczaniu języka polskiego jako obcego*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Nagórko, Alicja, Marek, Łaziński, Hanna, Burkhardt (2004) *Dystynktywny słownik synonimów*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Nepop-Ajdaczyć Lidia (2007) *Polska etnolingwistyka kognitywna*. Kijów: CWP Uniwersytet Kijowski.
- Nowak, Paweł, Ryszard, Tokarski (2007) *Kreowanie światów w języku mediów*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Nowosad-Bakalarczyk, Marta (2009) *Płeć a rodzaj gramatyczny we współczesnej polszczyźnie*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Mussolf, Andreas (2017) „Analiza scenariuszy metaforycznych w ramach lingwistyki kulturowej”. [In:] Waldemar Czachur (ed.) *Lingwistyka kulturowa i międzykulturowa*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego; 69–99.
- Niebrzegowska, Stanisława (1995) *Polski sennik ludowy*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Niebrzegowska, Stanisława (1996) „Świat wartości sennika ludowego”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka*, vol. 8. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 99–112.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława (2004a) „Pojęcie wzorca tekstu a modelująca funkcja motywu”. [In:] Maria Wojtak, Małgorzata Rzeszutko (eds.) *W kręgu wiernej mowy*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 283–299.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława (2004b) „Badania etnolingwistyczne w Lublinie”. [In:] Zofia Krążyńska, Zdzisław Zagórski (eds.) *Poznańskie Spotkania Językoznawcze*, vol. 13. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk; 7989.

- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława (2007) *Wzorce tekstów ustnych w perspektywie etnolingwistycznej*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława (2009) „Lubelski zespół etnolingwistyczny – jego historia i program badawczy”. [In:] Beata Maksymiuk-Pacek, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (eds.) *Bibliografia adnotowana lubelskiego zespołu etnolingwistycznego (until 2009)*. Lublin: Polihymnia; 7–19.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława (2013) „Projekt badawczy (ETNO)EUROJOS a program etnolingwistyki kognitywnej”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka, vol. 25*; Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 267–281.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława (2014) „Od separacyjnego do holistycznego opisu językowego obrazu świata. Na marginesie dyskusji nad kształtem artykułów w „Leksykonie aksjologicznym Słowian i ich sąsiadów””. [In:] Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Joanna Szadura (eds.) *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 3. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 71–102.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława (2015) „O profilowaniu językowego obrazu świata”. [In:] *Poradnik Językowy* nr 1. Warszawa; 30–44.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława (2017) „Czy definicja kognitywna jest definicją otwartą?”. [In:] Dorota Filar, Piotr Krzyżanowski (eds.) *Barwy słów. Studia lingwistyczno-kulturowe*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 549–571.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława, Marta, Nowosad-Bakalarczyk, Tomasz, Piekot (eds.) (2015) *Działania na tekście: przekład – redagowanie - ilustrowanie*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława, Marta, Nowosad-Bakalarczyk, Tomasz, Piekot (eds.) (2015) *Działania na tekście w edukacji szkolnej i uniwersyteckiej*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława, Joanna, Szadura, Mirosław, Szumiło przy udziale Janusza Kłąpca (2014) *Historia mówiona w świetle nauk humanistycznych i społecznych*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- NWwJE (2017) – Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Małgorzata Brzozowska, Beata Żywicka (eds.) *Nazwy wartości w językach europejskich. Raport z badań empirycznych*. Przemysł: Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Wschodnioeuropejska.
- Pajdzińska, Anna, Piotr, Krzyżanowski (eds.) (1999) *Przeszłość w językowym obrazie świata*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

- Pajdzińska, Anna, Ryszard, Tokarski (eds.) (2010) *Relatywizm w języku i kulturze*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Pajdzińska, Anna, Ryszard, Tokarski (eds.) (2001) *Semantyka tekstu artystycznego*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Palmer, Gary (1996) *Toward a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*. Austin: University Texas Press.
- Peeters, Bert (2015) *Language, culture and values: towards an ethno-linguistics based on abduction and salience*. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka*, vol. 27. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 47–62.
- PSWP (2001) Zgólkowa Halina (ed.) *Praktyczny słownik współczesnej polszczyzny*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Kurpisz.
- Putnam, Hilary (ed.) (1975) *Mind, Language and Reality. Philosophical papers*, vol.2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Puzynina, Jadwiga (1992) *Język wartości*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- PWJK (2004) – Jerzy Bartmiński, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Ryszard Nycz (eds.) *Punkt widzenia w języku i w kulturze*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Руденко, Елена [Rudenko, Elena] (2014) *Этнолингвистика без границ. Введение в лингвистическую антропологию*. Минск: БГУ.
- Толстой, Никита [Tolstoj, Nikita] (ed.) (1995–2012) *Славянские древности: Этнолингвистический словарь*. Москва: Международные отношения.
- SSiSL (2017) Jerzy Bartmiński, Stanisława Niebrzegowska (eds.) *Słownik stereotypów i symboli ludowych*, vol. 1, *Kosmos*, cz. 1-4. Lublin 1996–2012, vol. 2, *Rośliny*, cz. 1, *Zboża*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Степанов, Юрий [Stepanov, Jurij] (1997) *Константы. Словарь русской культуры. Опыт исследования*. Москва: Школа „Языки русской культуры”.
- Szadura, Joanna (2017) *Czas jako kategoria językowo-kulturowa w polszczyźnie*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Tabakowska, Elżbieta (2004) *Językoznawstwo kognitywne a poetyka przekładu*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Tokarski, Ryszard (1993) „Słownictwo jako interpretacja świata”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Encyklopedia kultury polskiej XX wieku. Współczesny język polski*. Wrocław: Wiedza o kulturze; 335–362.
- Tolstaja, Svetlana (2006) „Постулаты московской этнолингвистики”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka*, vol. 18. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 7-27.

- Толстая, Светлана [Tolstaja, Svetlana] (2008) „Труд и мука” [In:] *Пространство слова. Лексическая семантика в общеславянской перспективе*. Москва: Индрик; 114–120.
- Толстая, Светлана [Tolstaja, Svetlana] (2013a) „Никита Ильич Толстой и его путь к этнолингвистике”. [In:] Светлана Толстая, Татьяна Агапкина (eds.) *Ethnolinguistica Slavica. К 90-летию академика Никиты Ильича Толстого*. Москва: Индрик; 10–25.
- Толстая, Светлана [Tolstaja, Svetlana] (2013b) „Коды культуры и культурные концепты” [In:] Толстая, Светлана *Толстой, Никита. Славянская этнолингвистика: вопросы теории*. Москва: Институт славяноведения РАН; 109–113.
- Tolstoj, Nikita (1992) „Język a kultura: niektóre zagadnienia słowiańskiej etnolingwistyki”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka*, vol. 5. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 15–25.
- Topolińska, Zuzanna (2018) „Praca w języku polskim i macedońskim”. [In:] Arkadiusz Bağlajewski, Jerzy Bartmiński, Monika Łaszkiwicz, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (eds.) *Praca ludzka w perspektywie interdyscyplinarnej*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 325–350.
- Underhill, James (2012) *Ethnolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Underhill, James (2014) „Tłumacząc home i homeland. Od poetyki do polityki”. [“Translating home and homeland. From poetics to politics”] (trans.) Adam Głaz [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka*, vol. 26. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 87-105.
- Воробьев, Владимир [Vorob'ev, Vasilij] (2008) *Лингвокультурология*. Москва: РУДН.
- Wierzbicka, Anna (1993) „Nazwy zwierząt”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński, Ryszard Tokarski (eds.) *O definicjach i definiowaniu*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 251–267.
- Wierzbicka, Anna ([1997] 2007) *Słowa klucze. Różne języki – różne kultury*. [Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words. English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese. Oxford: Oxford University Press] (trans.) Izabela Duraj-Nowosielska. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- WJOSS 1 (2013) Maciej Abramowicz, Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel (eds.) *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów: 1. Analizy semantyczne domu, pracy, ojczyzny, wolności i in.* Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- WJOSS 2 (2014) Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (eds.) *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów: 2. Wokół europejskiej aksjosphery*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

- WJOSS 3 (2014) Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Joanna Szadura (eds.) *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów: 3. Problemy eksplikowania i profilowania pojęć*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- WJOSS 4 (2018) Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Joanna Szadura, Beata Żywicka (eds.) *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów: 4. Słownik językowy – leksykon – encyklopedia w programie badań porównawczych, vol. 4*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- WJP (1993) Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Encyklopedia kultury polskiej XX wieku. Współczesny język polski*. Wrocław: Wiedza o kulturze.
- Зализняк, Анна, Ирина, Левонтина, Алексей, Шмелев [Zaliznjak, Anna, Irina, Levontina, Aleksej, Šmelev] (2005) *Ключевые идеи русской картины мира*. Москва: Языки славянской культуры.
- Zarzycka, Grażyna (2004) „Mały leksykon kultury polskiej dla cudzoziemców”. [In:] Władysław Miodunka (ed.) *Kultura w nauczaniu języka polskiego jako obcego*. Kraków: Universitas; 151–160.
- Zgółka, Tadeusz (2006) „Etnolingwistyka praktyczna”. [In:] Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka*, vol. 18. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS; 129–134.
- Zinken, Jörg (2004) „Metaphors, stereotypes, and the linguistic picture of the world: Impulses from the Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin”. [In:] *Metaphorik.De*, nr 7; 115–136.
- Zinken, Jörg (2009) „The Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin and Anglo-American Cognitive Linguistics”. [In:] Bartmiński Jerzy, *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*. London & Oakville: Equinox Publishing; 1–5.
- Żmigrodzki, Piotr (2010) „Definicja leksykograficzna a opis języka – ćwierć wieku później. Jeszcze o roli naiwnego obrazu świata w definiowaniu”. [In:] Wojciech Chlebda (ed.) *Etnolingwistyka a leksykografia*. Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego; 33–40.
- Żuk, Grzegorz (2010) *Twierdza czy wspólnota? Europa w polskim dyskursie publicznym*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Żywicka, Beata (2007) *Miejsca i wartości. Zmiany w językowym obrazie przestrzeni we współczesnej polszczyźnie*. Lublin: Polihymnia