Language in the Context of Culture

Jerzy Bartmiński

Language in the Context of Culture
The Metaphor of "Europe as Home"
in this Day and Age

Translated by
Adam Głaz

Katowice 2018

Abstract. This study is based on the assumption that language and culture are most closely connected at axiological level. Attention is paid to value terms regarded as cultural concepts, with their explications in the form of brioad multi-aspectual cognitive definitions, as proposed in cognitive ethnolinguistics. Such extended definitions or "narratives" are "texts of culture" in the sense of the Moscow-Tartu School: they contain records of socially entrenched knowledge and beliefs, as well as references to norms and values professed by the speaking subject. This approach is illustrated with the metaphor of "Europe as home". The analysis of several languages with regard to the pair of cultural concepts it includes leads to the conclusion that the mappings from HOME (source domain) to EUROPE (target domain) are in fact selective and hardly draw on an image of actual or real home: they are typically based on the image of an "ideal" home, with its atmosphere of family life, security, and feeling-at-home.. To a limited extent, the physical aspect is activated in the process of metaphorisation, in connection with "building the European home". However, in contemporary xenophobic discourse, the semantics of HOME triggers off the negative concept of "separation from the outside": *Europahaus*, interpreted as *Festung Europa* 'Fortress Europe' with its implications of gates, walls, ramparts etc., becomes an unbreachable barrier against the "invasion of strangers".

1. The expression used in the title, *language in the context of culture*, is based on the assumption that language and culture are distinct but they should be viewed as interconnected. It is in this spirit that I will first put forward some arguments for the use of the term *cultural linguistics*. Then, I will provide cultural (cognitive) definitions of EU-

ROPE and HOME/HOUSE as the best exemplifications of intercultural research. Against this background, I will discuss the idea of "a common European home" that in xenophobic discourse assumes a distorted shape of a "closed fortress".

2. The enterprise of linking language with culture has a long historical tradition and falls within the realm of traditional philology. In contemporary linguistics, after a period of dominance of the structuralist paradigm that regarded both language and linguistics as autonomous, the idea of analysing language in the context of culture has seen a revival. Since then, it has continued to grow in importance.

The need to link research on language with worldview, values, culture, and cognition is continually being evoked in the context of language teaching (Zgółka 2006; Peeters 2015), including the teaching of one's mother tongue as a foreign language (in the Polish context: Zarzycka 2004; Miodunka 2004; Ligara 2008; Dąbrowska 2017), as well as in the context of translation (Tabakowska 2004; Underhill 2016; Głaz 2015; Gicala 2018).

An integrated approach to research on language and culture was put forward in the 1960s by the founder of Slavic ethnolinguistics, as well as the head and *spiritus movens* of the ground-breaking "Polesie research expedition", Nikita Ilyich Tolstoy (cf. Tolstoy 1990). Sveltana Tolstaya reports on her husband's views thus:

> [I]t is not possible to investigate the lexis of spiritual culture in a "purely linguistic" fashion, without considering the beliefs, customs, principles of everyday life, or mythological imagery of the speakers. [...] In this way a new enterprise in the humanities was born: Slavic ethnolinguistics with its commitment to studying language and culture in their organic bond, which included the use of all possible types of data (such as language, rituals, beliefs, and folklore) to reveal their relation to archaic views on people and the world (or to what is now called the Slavic worldview). (Tolstaya 2013b: 17)[1]

---

[1] For a systematic presentation of this research programme, see Tolstaya 2006.

Tolstoy assumed that language and culture are isomorphic both at the level of rural dialects and folklore, and the level of standard varieties of languages and national cultures (Tolstoy 1992). A consequence of such approach is the principle of using a coherent conceptual-terminological repertoire in various analyses. The monumental ethnolinguistic dictionary *Slavyanskye drenvosti* (SD 1995–2012) was compiled by the Moscow team according to it. The *Dictionary of Folk Stereotypes and Symbols* (SSiSL 1996–2017), compiled simultaneously in Lublin, was based on similar assumptions.

Towards the turn of the 21st century, proposals were made to distinguish a separate subdiscipline for inquiry into the language-culture interface: *cultural linguistics* (Palmer 1996; in Polish: *lingwistyka kulturowa*, Anusiewicz 1994), *Cultural Linguistics* [sic!] (Sharifian 2015), *kulturwissenschaftliche Linguistik* (Kusse 2012), or (in Russian circles) *linguoculturology* (Maslova 2001; Sabitova 2015) and *linguoconceptology* (Levitskiy, Potapenko, and Vorobyeva 2013). It was also proposed that linguistic research in cultural studies be included, cf. e.g. the books *Linguistik als Kulturwissenschaft* (Wengeler 2006) or *El lenguaje como cultura* (Bernárdez 2008).

These new expressions are used with the intention to replace the more traditional term *ethnolinguistics* (preferred in the Moscow and Lublin schools, cf. Tolstoy 1990, 1995; Tolstaya 2010, 2013b; Tolstoy and Tolstaya 2013; Bartmiński 2009, 2014) that was proposed by the founder of the ethnolinguistic approach Bronislaw Malinowski and has recently gained some support in Western linguistics (Underhill 2012; Palmer 2015; Peeters 2015). According to Anna Dąbrowska (2005), the term *etholinguistics* (as it is practised by the authors publishing in the Lublin-based journal *Etnolingwistyka*) is synonymous with the *cultural linguistic* approach proposed by Anusiewicz (1994): "The subject matters of the two disciplines are very close. […] Their names can,

as it seems, be used interchangeably, or either one can be chosen" (Dąbrowska 2005: 100).

Personally, I opt for continuing to use the term *ethnolinguistics* for two reasons. First, it emphasises the fundamental relation of linguistic inquiry to the *ethnos*[2], a human community whose attributes are both language and culture. It is the case, after all, that the language–culture relationship emerges from any of the two components relating to human groups and individuals: the latter are subjects who experience, conceptualise, act, speak, communicate with one another, bring into being, and use language and culture. These two phenomena are not only linked as means of expression and communication but above all as cognitive systems that allow humans to find their bearings in the world around them. The morpheme *ethno-* indicates the experiencing and cognising human subject (this is the cognitive function of language), who through interaction with others constructs a mental worldview. That worldview becomes socially entrenched, integrates the community, and builds its identity (this, in turn, is the integrating function of language). In this respect, the terms that come closest to *ethnolinguistics* are *linguistic anthropology* and *anthropological linguistics*.[3] A focus on human subjects in language-and-culture studies has recently led to the emergence of a new discipline that in Russian linguistics is referred to as *linguistic personology* (*lingvisticheskaya personologya*) (Rezanova 2007: 78).

---

[2] *Ethnos* is defined in terms of a common culture, rather than merely a common origin, cf. the definition in the Polish *Encyklopedia PWN* (2002): "[Gr. *éthnos* 'a people', 'tribe', 'nation'] every ethnic community (regardless of its size, level of internal structuring, or ethnic identity) that is distinguished from other, neighbouring groups through its characteristic culture, emergent through historical development".

[3] Consider the telling title of Elena Rudenka's (2014) book: *Etnolingvistika bez granits: Vvedenye v lingvisticheskoyu antropologiyu* [Ethnolinguistics without Borders: An Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology] (cf. also Duranti 2000). Chruszczewski (2011) discusses the language–culture interface, especially the problems of language contact, in a book titled *Językoznawstwo antropologiczne* (Anthropological Linguistics).

A juxtaposition of all the names of disciplines that deal with language, culture, and human subject(s) shows different configurations of the same elements, depending on which happens to be placed in focus:

ethnolinguistics	language + speech community/the speaking subject
anthropological linguistics	language + the speaking subject/community
linguistic anthropology	the speaking subject/community + language
cultural linguistics	language + culture
kulturanalytische Linguistik	language + culture
kulturwissenschaftliche Linguistik	language + culture
linguoculturology	culture + language
linguoconceptology	cognition + language
linguistic personology (*lingvistich-eskaya personologya*)	the speaking subject/individual speaker + language

All these terms are composed of two elements: whereas the primary one is language, the attributive and specifying one can be culture, cognition, and the speaking subject (an individual in linguistic personology or a community in linguistic anthropology and ethnolinguistics). Among three specifying components mentioned above, the human speaking subject is the most general one. It is, however, the most important because culture and cognition are subordinate to it playing the role of its attributes. They are, in a way, implied: it takes humans to create a culture and to engage in cognitive processes. These are the reasons why, in my opinion, the most appropriate term for the discipline that deals with the language–culture–speaker (speech community) interface is *ethnolinguitics*, understood as an anthropological-cultural linguistics.[4]

---

4 An additional argument for its adoption are the readily formed derivatives, useful in academic discourse, such as the adjective *ethnolinguistic* or the noun *ethnolinguist.* The derivative potential of the other terms is lower.

3. Roman Jakobson viewed the language–culture relationship in a dualistic perspective. On the one hand, he followed anthropologists in assuming that "language and culture imply each other" and that "language must be conceived as an integral part of the life of society" (i.e., as a part of culture); on the other hand, he claimed that language essentially underlies culture and acts within it as its universal vehicle (Jakobson 1971 [1953]: 555–556). This view was shared by Svetlana Tolstaya: "Language is not just one of many cultural codes, but the primary basis of culture" (Tolstaya 2008: 113). For Janusz Anusiewicz, language is not only "a major component of culture", one that "implies culture", but in fact "the condition for culture's very existence" (Anusiewicz 1991: 20). Elesewhere, I have described this kind of relationship as a "paradox of reciprocal interdependence" (Bartmiński 1993; cf. an in-depth discussion in Łozowski 2014).

4. I shall now attempt to define the **basic concepts** for this study: culture and language. Culture, in most general terms, is

> the totality of the spiritual and material products of civilisation; […] everything that connects with humans' intellectual and artistic endeavours, as well as the ideas and artefacts thus produced — tradition, customs, working styles, etc. (Czelakowska 2017: 21)[5]

For the purpose of this study, however, I have chosen a narrow, ideational, axiological understanding of culture as a body of norms and values that mark out the framework for social behaviour. In Ward Goodenough's well-aimed

---

[5] Various definitions of culture are discussed by Kłoskowska (1993). Referring to the work of Yuriy Lotman, Olena Selivanova, defines culture as "a complex life-phenomenon of a certain group, ethnos, or civilisation; the symbolic means of material and spiritual awareness of the world, the models of its knowledge and interpretation, and also the ways of the collective existence of a nation, an ethnic group or a certain subgroup thereof, preserved in the collective memory of its members" (2010: 315).

statement, "a society's culture embraces whatever it is one has to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to its members" (1957: 167). The core of a culture are the values that tell its members how to act, what is good or bad, what is worthy of one's effort and what should be avoided. Valuation is an inalienable aspect of culture, a view that aligns with the cognitivist understanding of language.

Language, being "a system of signs (primarily auditory, secondarily graphic and other) used for communication within a community" (*Encyklopedia języka polskiego* 1999: 153), has two major functions: *cognitive* (Bühler's [1934] *Darstellungsfunktion*) and *communicative* (interpersonal). At the basis of natural language lie values, which shape its structure and functioning (cf. Krzeszowski 1994: 29, with references to Lakoff's Idealised Cognitive Models). For Krzeszowski, "axiological semantics" is responsible for the deepest bond between language and culture.

5. Language is, above all, a tool of valuation and judgement of people, things, and events as good or bad, true or false, beautiful or ugly. It is also an object of valuation in the context of cultural norms, especially important in the academic subject known in Poland as *Kultura języka* 'Language correctness and appropriateness' (lit. 'the culture of language'): language may be considered as *correct*, *beautiful*, *flexible*, or *careless*, *vulgar*, *stilted*, etc.[6] Finally, it is a medium that facilitates understanding of values and passes them on from one generation to the next; it is a memory archive of traditional spiritual and material culture, and it thus carries values and informs about values (Bartmiński 1993).[7]

---

[6] In Polish universities, this subject has a pedagogical-normative character; it has to do with "raising the level of linguistic competence and its expert usage" (*Encyklopedia języka polskiego* 1999: 200).

Jadwiga Puzynina captures these complex relationships synthetically as "the language of values" (the title of her 1992 book, *Język wartości*).

The third, cultural function of language seems to be especially interesting and important. In its cognitive function, language is the basis for the creation of the entire mental (linguacultural) worldview: it contains a unique worldview in its lexis and grammatical patterns (this is Humboldt's *Weltansicht*, Toporov's *model/picture of the world* (*модель/ картина мира*), or Apresyan's *naïve worldview*; cf. Apresyan 2006; Serebrennikov 1988; Bartmiński 1990, 2006; Anusiewicz, Dąbrowska, and Fleischer 2000; Chlebda 2010; Vaňková and Pacovská 2010). The interpretations of phenomena and their valuation suggest that language acts facilitate the creation of variable or possible worldviews — in linguistic interactions, interlocutors create an alternative social and mental reality.

6. The language–culture interface, or, to be precise, the presence of "culture in language", has been researched and identified on various levels of linguistic organization:[8] from phonology, morphology, and syntax to the lexicon, phraseology and collocations, semantics, text organization, and genological distinctions. I will provide a few selected examples here, without referring to the abundance of literature on the subject.

All linguistic behaviour is culturally conditioned.[9]

Stylistic diversification of language styles (colloquial, literary, academic, official) has a cultural basis by being dependent on the cultural criteria of viewpoint, worldview, rationality, value system, communicative intention, or communicative function.

Speech genres, such as tale, proverb, riddle, song, spell-removing verbal ritual etc., are based on patterns that are as much conventional-linguistic as socio-cultural i.e. relating to the intention of the communicative act.

---

[8] That presence is a generally accepted view among cultural linguists nowadays (Czachur 2017: 21).

[9] Cf. vol. 26 of the Wrocław-based series *Język a Kultura* (2017), titled *Kulturowe uwarunkowania zachowań językowych — tradycja i zmiana* [Cultural Basis of Linguistic Behaviour: Tradition and Change].

Forms of address and politeness formulae are linguistic realisations of socio-cultural conventions. For instance, in Polish one can basically choose between rough *ty* 'you' and polite *pan* 'you-sir', but there are some other addressing forms whose overtones are less unambiguous e.g., the cavalier combination of direct form of imperative mood and politeness marker *pan* in *Siadaj pan!* 'you-sir sit down', as well as the "aristocratic" use of the 3rd person when talking to a patient in *Kiedy był ostatni raz u lekarza?* 'When did he last see the doctor?'.

Patterns of textual coherence relate to general principles of thought processes, identity, opposition, implication, cultural convention, comparison, analogy-making, the creation of complexes, collections, graded continua, etc.

Syntax , i.e. the principles of combining words into sentences and of those into larger units, is directly linked to intellectual operations of generalisation, pattern-matching, and complex reasoning — a linguistic manifestation of those is an elaborate system of conjunctions.

Phraseology or collocational patterns preserves former and current cultural imagery, customs, and beliefs; cf. *Sisyphean labour* (former cultural imagery), *cold war* (current cultural imagery), *Boxing Day* (a custom), *to give up the ghost/ join the choir invisible* (belief in afterlife).

Word-formation is sensitive to changes in socio-cultural conceptualisations and lifestyles. As an example, consider the recent expansion, in Polish, of feminine forms of the type *politolożka* 'female political scientist', *znawczyni* 'female expert', *ministra* 'female parliamentary minister' or the common use, by married women, of double- barrelled surnames (*Ostrowska-Nałęcz, Nowosad-Bakalarczyk*), which underscore partner-like marital relationships and enhance the visibility of women in public life.

Etymology is concerned with the onomasiological base and the "internal form" of words. In Polish and Russian, the word *dom* 'house/home' includes the idea of building

the house and building the family;[10] the names for work, *robota, trud*, joy is accompanied with tiredness and suffering; the names for respect, dignity, and honour, *cześć, godność, honor* include connotations of values attributed to persons worthy of respect, as well as to oneself.

A clear cultural and psycho-social basis can also be found in inflectional patterns governing the distribution of endings for masculine nouns in Nominative plural: *-owie* for esteemed persons (*panowie* 'sirs, lords', *profesorowie* 'professors', *senatorowie* 'senators'), *-i* or *-e* in neutral names (*chłopi* 'peasants', *pisarze* 'writers'), and *-y* in disparaging uses (*chłopy* 'old guys', *pany* 'the evil barons' [a group boasting with their position of a mighty ruler in a district, city etc. (including their superiority as social class) and looking down on all people they recognize as inferior; nowadays the term refers primarily to football hooligans successfully fighting for supremacy with their local rivals], *dziady* 'losers, old gits').

Cultural motivation can also be recognised at the level of phonetics and prosody, in speech styles, recitation, declamation, rapping, etc.

However, the domain where language connects most conspicuously with culture is lexis, and it concerns both common and proper names. It is no accident that Sapir's words "[v]ocabulary is a very sensitive index of the culture of a people" (1949 [1933]: 27) are echoed by Anna Wierzbicka in her book on cultural key words (1997: 31).

7. Having compared Slavic ethnolinguistic research, represented by the Moscow and Lublin schools, with American linguistic anthropology, deriving from the work of Sapir and Whorf Belgian Slavist Pieter Plas (2006) listed the following characteristics common to both traditions: inherent and dissociative connection of language and culture, isomorphism of language and other cultural

---

[10] From PrIE **dem-/*dom-* 'build'.

codes, as well as the appreciation of folklore whose geno-logical diversity is regarded an especially fertile ground for inquiry. The most crucial difference, says the author, is that Slavic ethnolinguistics is focused on lexis whereas American linguistic anthropology is pragmatics-oriented. The most promising area of Slavic research, according to Plas, is an inquiry into lexis as an exponent of ideology and value system.[11]

8. **Bearing this idea in mind I shall finally embark on the crucial task for this study, namely that of defining axiological concepts as texts of culture**.

With regard to the salience of the "cultural load" in the whole lexical inventory of a language, two kinds of expressions can be distinguished:

— the lexis with a covert and facultative cultural factor: this is the lexis concerning material world, nature and technology, as well as people and their actions;

— the lexis with an overt, salient, and obligatory cultural factor.

In the names of natural phenomena, both inanimate (sun, water, gold) and animate (trees, flowers, animals), the cultural factor is hidden as connotation,[12] which surfaces only in context; e.g. 'sadness' in relation to birch tree,[13] 'health'

---

[11] A similar view was expressed by Aleksandr Moldovan at the 14th International Slavic Congress in Ohrid, Macedonia, in 2008. He emphasised that Slavic ethnolinguistics, in developing the ideas of Humboldt and Potebnya, have striven not only to reconstruct the semantics of Slavic worldview(s) but also to capture the values inherent in those worldviews. Moldovan (2008: 34) claims that the study of Slavic themes be performed in the socio-cultural context.

[12] Connotation has been discussed extensively; cf. Bartmiński (1988). Usually, "linguistic connotation" and "encyclopedic connotation" are distinguished, but here they are treated jointly as "cultural connotation".

[13] The motif of a sad, sorrowful birch tree is frequent in poetry, e.g. in the poem *Żołnierz polski* [The Polish Soldier] by Władysław Broniewski (1897–1962) or *Zabite drzewo* [The Killed Tree] by Leopold Staff (1878–1957). [trans. note]

in relation to horse or fish,[14] 'backwardness' in relation to the flail or hammer.[15] Such is also the case with people's professions, family roles, sex, or nationality (e.g. the 'obstinacy, stubbornness' of peasants, the 'strictness' of the father, the 'punctuality' of Germans, etc.), as well as with proper names, referring to people (*Kopernik* [Copernicus], *Napoleon*, *Einstein*) or places (*Paryż* [Paris], *Rzym* [Rome], *Wąchock* [a stereotypical symbol of provincial silliness or stupidity[16]]) — although they have unique reference, they can also be used with an additional cultural content : I *w Paryżu nie zrobią z owsa ryżu* 'They won't turn oats into rice even in Paris'; *Nie bądź taki Napoleon* 'Don't be such a Napoleon'; *Zachował się jak sołtys z Wąchocka* 'He behaved like the Wąchock village mayor', etc.

An overt connection with culture, however, is recognisable in the so-called "cultural lexis" which can be divided into two types. The first one pertains to religious imagery (*Bóg* 'God', *diabeł* 'devil', *anioł* 'angel'), mythological figures (*kłobuk* 'household daemon; the soul of a dead foetus', *rusałka* 'water-nymph', *wampir* 'vampire'), customs and rituals (*wesele* 'wedding', *dożynki* 'harvest festival', *imieniny* 'name-day (party)'), names of artistic and intellectual trends (*kubizm* 'cubism', *dekonstrukcjonizm* 'deconstruction'*)*, artistic and literary works (*aria* 'aria', *sonnet* 'sonnet', *limeryk* 'limerick'), etc.[17] Cultural phenomena here are objectified and lose their main cultural exponent, i.e. the evaluative content.

---

[14] Cf. the Polish proverbial expressions *zdrów jak koń/zdrów jak ryba* (lit. 'healthy as a horse/fish') 'as fit as a fiddle'. [trans. note]

[15] Cf. Polish *prosty jak budowa/konstrukcja cepa* 'a simple as the structure of the flail'; the words *cep* 'flail' and *młot* 'hammer' can also mean 'blockhead, moron'. [trans. note]

[16] A sterotypical town of fools whose inhabitants are symbol of provincial silliness and absurd behaviour, very similar in its cultural function to the Spanish town of Lepe or the Jewish town of Chełm. [editor's note]

[17] According to Robert Galisson (cf. Pruvost and Leno 2003; Ligara 2008), these names belong to the so-called *lexiculture*.

The second group of cultural lexis consists of "culturally loaded" value terms. These are the classic axiological triads: the Platonic *good — truth — beauty*; the Judeo-Christian *faith — hope — love*; the French Enlightenment *liberté — égalité — fraternité*; the Polish nobility's *Bóg — honor — ojczyzna* (God — honour — homeland) and others.[18] Valuation is their inherent property; they function in oppositions (*good* vs. *evil*, *love* vs. *hate*, *freedom* vs. *bondage*, etc.) and so imply a choice: acceptance or rejection. They are defined in the framework of axiological semantics.

9. The lexical items that have an especially salient and obligatory "cultural load" are known as *key words* (Wierzbicka 1997), *culturemes* (*Kulturems*) (Oksaar 1988; Nagórko 2004; Rak 2015), *linguaculturemes* (Vorobyev 2008), or *cultural concepts* (Arutyunova 1991; Tolstaja 2013a; Bartmiński 2016). Russian linguists have recently investigated and described them extensively in the folk Slavic context in SD (1995–2012), only focusing on "those that are endowed with cultural meanings" (Tolstaya 2013b: 21) and so qualify as *cultural symbols* (Tolstaya 2015: 59). They have also investigated general lexis and identified what they call *constants* of Russian national culture (Stepanov 1997; Zaliznyak, Levontina, and Shmelev 2012) or its *key ideas* (ключевые идеи, Zaliznyak, Levontina, and Shmelev 2005).[19] In Ukrainian literature, the terms *concept* (Kononenko 2004; Gryshkova 2014; Golubovska in print) or *the sign of ethnoculture* (Zhayvoronok 2006) are used; the former term also appears in one of Byelorussian textbooks (Rudenka 2014). Dejan Ajdačić (2015) uses the general term *values* (Serb. *vrednosti*); Czech authors use the

---

[18] Cf. Ajdaczić (2017) for an interesting account of Slavic examples from this domain.

[19] In their analyses, the researchers go beyond lexical items and encroach onto the more capacious categories of the semantics of sorrow, humour, love, consumerism, etc. They seek features peculiar to the Russian linguistic worldview (картины мира), as well as links between that worldview and the Russian national spirit.

more neutral *schema* or *stereotype* (Czech *pojem*) (Vaňková and Pacovská 2010; Vaňková 2015).

The term *key words*, introduced by Pierre Guiraud in 1954 as *mots clef*, became popular when Anna Wierzbicka published her *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words* (1997). In her opinion, cultural key words are words that are "particularly important and revealing in a given culture" (pp. 15–16). The words like the Russian *душа* 'soul', Polish *wolność* 'freedom', German *Heimat* and *Vaterland* 'homeland' are part and parcel of the respective cultures. Wierzbicka says: "[T]he concept of *freedom* is not independent of particular languages (being different, for example, from the Roman concept of 'libertas' or the Russian concept of 'svoboda'" (Wierzbicka 1997: 7). Cultural key words, therefore, "reflect and pass on not only ways of living characteristic of a given society but also ways of thinking" (p. 5).

However, it is difficult to point out which words are and which are not "particularly important in a given culture" because "there is no 'objective discovery procedure' for identifying them" (Wierzbicka 1997: 16). In order to isolate the set of cultural key words one largely resorts to intuition and the procedure of ranking;[20] the parameter of frequency, although helpful, is definitely insufficient and in some studies is not even taken into account. The bottom line of these divagations, Wierzbicka admits, is that a culture is revealed through the totality of the lexis of its language.

According to Alicja Nagórko (2004), a more suitable term than *key words* is *cultureme* (Pol. *kulturem*) because it contains a clear reference to culture: it is derived from *culture/kultura* by analogy to the generally accepted terms *morpheme*, *lexeme*,

---

[20] Wierzbicka claims that a way of thinking that is characteristic of a given culture may also be revealed through the use of particles, exclamations, fixed expressions, or radical value judgements, such as the Russian *совершенно* 'totally', *страшно* 'terribly', *ужас* 'horror', etc.

or *semantem*.[21] In the Distinctive Dictionary of Synonyms (*Dystynktywny słownik synonimów* 2004), culteremes are defined as "the key words important for self-identity of a community; they characterise the community's attitude to tradition and inherited values, but also the way it handles topical issues" (p. XIX).

According to Nagórko (2004), culteremes include key words (in Wierzbicka's sense), but also cultural scripts, ethnic stereotypes, proper names, national symbols, national topography, and ethnonyms. Polish culteremes can thus be exemplified by *bohaterszczyzna* 'unnecessary and reckless bravery; foolhardiness', *ziemiaństwo* 'landed gentry', *Kresy* '(Eastern) Borderlands', *cwaniak* 'slyboots, fox', *kołtun* 'narrow-minded prig ', *warchoł* 'brawler', *kotlet schabowy* 'pork chop', or *załatwić coś* 'to transact something' (Nagórko 2004: 28–29). In the folk culture of Podhale (the Polish highlands), Maciej Rak (2015) identifies the following culteremes:[22] *gazda* 'landlord in the Polish highlands', *baca* 'head shepherd in the Polish Carpathians; a "Polish Socrates"', *juhas* 'younger assistant to *baca*', *zbójnik* 'member of a mountain gang of robbers', *ceper* 'low-lander', *ciupaga* 'shepherd's axe', *oscypek* 'smoked ewe's milk cheese made in the Tatra Mountains', *gorzáłka* 'spirit, vodka', *Podhále* 'the Polish highlands', *Giewont* (a peak in the Tatra Mountains). Among the positive values, there are: *Pámbócek* 'God', *Pániezus* 'Lord Jesus', *Gaździná Podhála* 'Podhale's Landlady' (the blessed Virgin Mary), *krzýz* 'cross, crucifix',

---

[21] It was first proposed by the Spanish linguist Fernando Poyatos in 1976 and was discussed by Els Oksaar (1988). The term then gained international circulation (cf. Rak 2015: 11–14). According to the online *Dobry słownik*, synonyms to *kulturem* are: *jednostka kulturowa* 'cultural unit', *pojęcie kluczowe* 'key concept', *słowo klucz* 'key word', *słowo sztandarowe* 'flagship word', *symbol kolektywny* 'collective symbol', *symbol narodowy* 'national symbol' (accessed 3 Oct, 2017).

[22] The author defined culteremes as "ethnolinguistic units, key words that on the formal plane are represented by single lexemes and on the content plane have meanings so rich that they embody the specificity of a given national, ethnic, or regional community" (Rak 2015: 13).

śleboda 'freedom', *honor* 'honour'. Similarly, Jolanta Tambor (2008: 198–203) identifies the following Silesian key words: *hanys* 'indigenous inhabitant of the former Prussian part of Upper Silesia', *familok* 'a house for many families, usually coal miners or other heavy-industry workers', *hałda* 'spoil tip', *krupniok* 'black sausage produced from groats and pork meat, pluck, skin, and blood, whose casing is made of animal intestines', *piwo* 'beer', and *wice* 'jokes in Silesian dialect'.

There are doubts, however, what should be included in the category of culturemes: words alone (*bohaterszczyzna*, *Gaździna Podhala*, *hanys*) or also objects and their names (*kotlet schabowy* 'pork chop', *ciupaga* 'shepherd's axe', *krupniok* 'black saussage*)*? These doubts can be dispelled by introducing the terms *linguocultureme* and *cultural concept*, which unambiguously suggest a limitation to linguistic exponents. At the same time, if the term *linguocultureme* is broad and links language to culture in a general fashion, the term *cultural concept* points to the mental aspect of language (*concept*), which is constitutive of culture: it thus suggests somewhat more narrow boundaries (or better: it indicates the core) of the relevant set. Attempts to establish the cannon of Polish values show that it contains a few dozen basic units (cf. e.g. Pisarek 2002, 2016; Fleischer 1996; Bartmiński and Grzeszczak 2014).

The notion of the *cultural concept*, used in Russian publications, is synonymous with that of *stereotype*, the way the latter is understood in the Dictionary of Folk Stereorypes and Symbols (SSiSL) and in the journal *Etnolingwistyka* (vols. 1–30, 1988–2018; cf. Kiklevich and Kamalova 2010: 7). Since the works on the Axiological Lexicon of Slavs and their Neighbours (LASiS) have been commenced and languages other than Polish (both Slavic and non-Slavic) have been subjected to inquiry, the term *koncept* (Polish for *cultural concept*) began to be used along with *stereotype* (the latter meaning 'a collective image of an entity, a concept with its cultural connotations').

The word *koncept/concept* (from the Latin *conceptus*) is pan-European.[23] The notion of *cultural concept*, in short, means 'an axiological concept endowed with culture-specific connotations' (Gryshkova 2014). Concepts (unqualified) are objective, whereas *cultural* concepts are subjective. The *concepts* of EUROPE, ASIA, MOTHER, or MOTHER-IN-LAW can be given parallel encyclopaedic definitions in various languages, but *cultural concepts* of the continents or family members are immersed in the cultures and histories of specific national communities and are therefore different in different languages.

The notion of *cultural concept* has been used extensively, especially by Russian (Russian-speaking),[24] Ukrainian (Kononenko 2004; Zhayvoronok 2006; Golubovska in print), and Byelorussian authors. Despite numerous valuable publications (cf. Levitskiy, Potapenko, and Vorobyeva 2013), the reconstruction methods and the formal notation of conceptual content remain to be agreed on. This will be my focus now. The appeal to linguists from the father of cognitive semantics, Hilary Putnam (1975), to find the proper ways of defining and formulating stereotypical images is especially topical in the context of comparative research, and especially research on values. According to some authors, values cannot be defined precisely. I would like to argue here, however, that Putnam's postulate can be largely met thanks to the so-called cognitive defini-

---

[23] Cf. Italian *concetto* 'concept'; Spanish *concepto* 'idea, thought'; French *concept* 'concept, representation'; English *concept*; German *Konzept* 'idea, thought, outline'; Russian *kontsept*, Serbian and Croatian *koncept*, Czech *koncept* 'conception, project, outline, schema', etc.

[24] The contribution of Russian conceptologists (Askoldov, Likhachov, Karasik, Stepanov, Alefirenko, Vorkachov, Sternin, Cherneyko and others) is synthetically presented by Olena Selivanova in her linguistic encyclopedia under the entry *концепт*; it is developed in the entries *концептуализация* 'conceptualisation', *концептуальна картина світу* 'conceptual worldview', *концептуальна система* 'conceptual system', *концептуальный анализ* 'conceptual analysis', *концептуальный граф* 'conceptual graph' (Selivanova 2010: 292–306).

tion, the focus of which is not the *meaning of words* (in the sense of traditional, objectivist semantics), but rather the subjective *understanding of words* by the speakers, and their knowledge, the categories they construct, and value judgements they make.

10. The challenge proposing linguistically relevant methods of defining cultural concepts has been met with a response from the international team working on the Axiological Lexicon of Slavs and their Neighbours (LASiS). The Lexicon is being compiled as a part of the EUROJOS project,[25] with the aim to describe, in a parallel fashion, the Slavic values against a broader comparative background. By 2017, five concepts had been thus described: HOME/ HOUSE, EUROPE, WORK, FREEDOM, and HONOUR; three volumes of the series have been published (LASiS 1 on HOME/HOUSE, LASiS 3 on WORK, and LASiS 5 on HONOUR; the volumes on EUROPE and FREEDOM are in the final stages of preparation). The Lexicon's major goal is to capture "unity in diversity", but also to pinpoint the relevant differences, the culture-specific contextualisations that these concepts are subject to.

---

[25] The project was launched in 2001 by the University of Warsaw's Centre for Studies on the Classical Tradition. In 2009 it was affiliated with the Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences, and since 2016 it has been pursued under the auspices of the Ethnolinguistic Commission (of the International Committee of Slavists) and of the Department of Polish Philology, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University (UMCS) in Lublin, Poland. Results of the research were first published in the journal *Etnolingwistyka*, then in the Lublin-based "red series" (cf. three volumes: Abramowicz, Bartmiński, and Bielińska-Gardziel 2012; Bartmiński, Bielińska-Gardziel, and Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2014; Bielińska-Gardziel, Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, and Szadura 2014). Three volumes of the Lexicon were published between 2015 and 2017, with two more under preparation (cf. LASiS in the references). A separate publication is a volume devoted to the use of questionnaires (Bielińska-Gardziel, Brzozowska, and Żywicka 2017). Nearly a hundred linguists from sixteen countries are now involved in the project.

The descriptions are based on four major assumptions:

— the analyses must be based on a comparative body of data: systemic (including the use of lexicographic sources), b) elicited through questionnaires, and c) textual (national-language corpora and nationwide press); the database is jointly tagged S-Q-T;

— analyses must employ a consistent conceptual and terminological "toolbox", e.g. values are described as *stereotypes* in the linguistic sense, i.e. as *cultural concepts*;

— consistent defining strategies must be applied; the subject-oriented idea of *cognitive definition* has been adopted, with the aim to account for how speakers understand word meanings, what background knowledge they share, and how they categorise, characterise, and evaluate reality, rather than accounting for word meanings as it is pursued in traditional semantics;

— the evident and indisputable differences in conceptualisations are treated as profiles derived from the base image; the notion of profiling, developed in cognitive linguistics, is used here in a version adapted to the needs of cognitive ethnolinguistics.

These assumptions act as the basis for comparisons (*tertium comparationis*) and as a measure of comparison in parallel descriptions.

11. The method of defining cultural concepts that responds to these requirements will be illustrated here with EUROPE and HOME/HOUSE, linked into a metaphor of the "European home" or of "Europe as home". The choice is far from arbitrary. First of all, these concepts have been rather well researched in thirteen languages for EUROPE[26]

---

[26] The 2nd volume of LASiS (2018, in print) contains descriptions of EUROPE in several Slavic languages, cush as Polish (Bartmiński and Chlebda), Russian (Frolova), Ukrainian (Javorska), Byelorussian (Lappo), Bulgarian (Długosz), Serbian (Bogdanović), and Croatian (Czerwiński), as well as in a few neighbouring languages , such as Greek (Korus), Modern Greek (Genew-Puhalewa and Ioannidou), Lithuanian (Smetona),

and eighteen for HOME/HOUSE.[27] Secondly, they embody
topical social and political problems, pertaining to the
still popular idea of building the "European home". The
metaphor deserves an analysis, particularly because the
very idea is variously understood. When the call to build
a "common European home" was issued thirty years ago
by Mikhail Gorbachev, the then General Secretary of the
Communist Part of the Soviet Union,[28] international security
was at stake. In comparison to that, the Polish theologian
Józef Tischner saw the "European home" in a different light:
"Europe must be the 'common home' of Europeans. This is
a metaphor for freedom. The new European freedom must
be similar to that experienced to the freedom in one's own
home, where one feels 'like one's own self' and 'at home'".
(Tischner 2017 [1998]: 49).

Linguists, on the other hand, have pointed out that the
Russian *dom* and English *house* (certainly not equivalent
but related to *home*) evoke very different associations: the
former links up with the stereotypicalcommunal apart-

German (Zawadzka-Koch), Chinese (Gianninoto), and American English
(Tieszen). As one can see, the notion of a "neighbouring language" is
treated here rather loosely.

[27] In the 1st volume of LASiS (2015), there are descriptions of
HOME/HOUSE in Polish (Bartmiński and Bielińska-Gardziel), Czech
(Vaňková), Russian (Fiodorova and Pazio-Wlazłowska), Byelorussian
(Kozłowska-Doda), Lemko (Misiak), Bulgarian (Kitanova), Serbian
(Ristić and Lazić-Konjik), Croatian (Kapetanović), Lithuanian
(Rutkovska), and Greek (Markou); Western-European languages are
represented by German (Grzeszczak), French (Skibińska and Viviand),
and Portuguese (Bułat Silva); there are also descriptions of the relevant
cultural concept in Japanese (Wyszkowska), as well as in three African
languages: Suahili (Kraska-Szlenk), Tuareg (Jackowska-Uwadizu), and
Hausa (Pawlak).

[28] The call was responded to positively by the German Chancellor
Helmut Kohl, who invoked Charles de Gaulle's idea of *a Europe from the
Atlantic to the Urals.* Political scientists suggest that Gorbachev's intention
was not so much to increase European security, as to reduce American
influence in Europe.

ment block,[29] while behind the latter stands a stereotype of a "free-standing, owner-occupied family home" (Musolff 2016: 49).[30]

An answer to the question of how to understand *the European home* may be sought in dictionaries (with unsatisfactory results) or in a large database of lexicographic sources, questionnaires, texts of many genres, and language corpora (the system–questionnaire–text triad, S–Q–T for short). It is only through extended explications that one can adequately interpret metaphorical uses, for they can include information about socially entrenched general knowledge, as well as references to norms and values professed by the speaking subjects. They are "narratives about a given object" or texts of culture.

In dictionaries Europe is either omitted (having a unique reference as a proper name) or defined in a rather cursory fashion in geographical terms: "a part of the world; together with Asia it forms a landmass called Eurasia" (SJP online). A richer database makes it possible to reconstruct a multi-aspectual, linguacultural view of Europe that exists in real communicative space and propose an extended explication on this basis.

With DOM/HOME/HOUSE the situation is different: lexicographic definitions in various languages tend to be rich and multi-aspectual; when textual data is added (as in the case of the EUROJOS project), we obtain extended cultural definitions with many elements common to different linguacultures. Generally speaking, linguacultural portraits

---

[29] Gorbachev wrote: "We are Europeans. […] [T]he home is common, that is true, but each family has its own apartment, and there are different entrances, too." (Gorbachev 1987: 191, 195)

[30] One of the reasons for the metaphorical mismatch is a confusion that arose as a result of two English translations of Gorbachev's *dom*: *house* (as reported by Musolff 2016, with references to Chilton and Ilyin 1993 or Chilton and Lakoff 1995) or *home* (e.g. Gorbachev 1987; cf. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Common_European_Home for some background; accessed March 1, 2018). [trans. note]

of HOME/HOUSE tend to be less diverse than those of EU-
ROPE, the former concept being more strongly entangled
in psychological and social contexts, with the latter having
stronger political overtones.

**12. We can now proceed to examine how EUROPE can
be defined linguistically and culturally.** Explications based
on a rich body of data (S–Q–T) allow for reconstructions
of linguacultural images (cultural concepts) of EUROPE in
specific national linguacultures. Let us compare some of
them (on the basis of LASiS, vol. 2).

12.1 The Polish cultural concept EUROPA

The Polish EUROPA may be briefly presented as a sequence
of defining sentences, arranged into facets:[31]

General information: Europe for Poles (on the social scale, not
in current political discourse) is a political and institutional ideal
based on human rights, democracy, freedom, and tolerance,
characterised by an attractive level of wealthiness.

Geography: In a narrow sense, Europe is restricted to Western
Europe. In a broader sense, it is divided into Western and East-
ern Europe, as well as Central Europe to which Poland belongs.

Oppositions: European civilisation is distinguished from and
juxtaposed with Asia (including Russia), and sometimes also
with Africa.

Poland's position vis-à-vis Europe: Geographically located in
the middle of the European continent, Poland gravitates to-
wards Western rather than Eastern Europe in the cultural and
economic sense. It is sometimes conceptualised as lying on the
border between the two worlds.

Characteristics: Europe for Poles is a symbol of high culture,
well-being, consumption, and progress; it is admired for the
high level of its art, science, and education; it is conceptualised
as being inhabited by white people, *Europeans*, who are diverse
in terms of nationality.

---

[31] The full explication in Bartmiński and Chlebda 2018 (in print).

European values: Freedom, equality, and democracy; cooperation and unity of different nations, accompanied by the respect for foreign traditions, diversity, religion, and customs; values recognised in commonly held view: high level of technology and standard of living.

Origin: The roots of Europe are Greek and Roman Antiquity, Christianity, and the ideas of Western Enlightenment.

Polish profiles of Europe: The general attitude of Poles to Europe and European Union is definitely positive (declining since 2013 but never below 70%), whereas in public discourse the image and valuation of Europe is unequivocal.

The centrist and democratic-liberal discourse (represented by the weekly *Polityka* or the daily *Gazeta Wyborcza*) is unquestionably pro-European, civic rather than national, relating to the great Judeo-Christian tradition, the humanistic and enlightened heritage, tolerance of otherness, and "unity in diversity". It accepts multiculturalism, defends civic liberties and democracy.

The feminist discourse (the quarterly *Zadra*, the weekly *Wysokie Obcasy*) views Europe and the European Union as an ally in the struggle for women's rights and parities, for the right to abortion, *in vitro* fertilisation, civil unions,[32] and sexual minority rights.

The right-wing national discourse (the weekly *Wprost*, the dailies *Nasz Dziennik* and *Gazeta Polska*, the quarterly *Fronda*) is Eurosceptic. Europe and the European Union are viewed through the prism of national interests deemed superior to the common European interests; the EU is viewed as a threat to political and national identity; EU's shortcomings are emphasised, with its alleged moral relativism, libertine predilection, and attempts to endanger Christian values.

The radical right-wing discourse, connected with racist and neo-fascist skinhead subculture, is located at the peripheries of the rightist discourse.

The leftist discourse (the magazines *Krytyka Polityczna* and *Liberté*[33]) looks at Europe from the institutional perspective: its

---

[32] The term is used here in a broad sense, with no distinction being implied between its legal import and that of *registered partnership*, *civil partnership*, or *domestic partnership*. [trans. note]

[33] The online edition of *Liberté* is a monthly, the print edition is a quarterly. [trans. note]

structure and civic organisation, the economy, and socio-political life. The rules of its functioning are considered more important than values. National interest is linked with the European security and relevant political decisions. Russia belongs to Europe. Europe's Christian heritage is secondary. Important aspects of the leftist profile of Europe is equality before the law, personal freedom and rights of individuals, minority rights, and social and economic security.

The Catholic discourse is divided into the -institutional-Church trend, the liberal-Catholic trend (the weekly *Tygodnik Powszechny*, the monthly *Znak*, the quarterly *Więź*), and the national-Catholic trend (*Nasz Dziennik*, *Gazeta Polska*, *Fronda*). From the perspective of the institutional Catholic Church, drawing heavily on the authority figure of John Paul II, Europe is built on the traditions of Ancient Rome and Jerusalem linking the material and spiritual aspects of human life. Of special importance and worthy of defence are such values as human dignity, sanctity of human life from conception to natural death, central role of marriage-based family, education, freedom of thought and speech, and a vision of social relations based on the ethics of solidarity. Poland's centuries-old place in the European "spiritual community" is emphasised. The liberal-Catholic discourse capitalises on John Paul II's universalist profile of Europe. The idea of a united Europe is viewed as being familiar to Poles for 450 years ("from the Union of Lublin to the European Union"). The cultural aspects are crucial: Europe should be a "spiritual community" faithful to its Judeo-Christian tradition. Lastly, in the national-Catholic discourse, radically Eurosceptic, the EU is treated as a denial of the "true" Europe: the EU and Western Europe are treated as capitalistically possessive, characterised by exploitation of the weak, ethical negligence, and moral relativism. Europe is portrayed as a moral debtor to Poland, which in turn is the "bulwark of Christiandom", the protector against the hostile Asian civilisation epitomised by Russia. In this profile, Europe does not include Russia.

12.2 EUROPE in German linguaculture[34]

General information: The German view of Europe is constructed from the internal vantage point of a country that considers

---

[34] The full version: Zawadzka-Koch 2018 (in print).

itself to be the continent's central part. The colloquial German view of Europe is dominated by institutional features.

Geography: Contrary to the popular political slogan of Europe extending "from the Atlantic Ocean to the Ural Mountains ", in common understanding, there is a clear division into its eastern, western, northern, and southern parts. Politically and culturally, Europe is identified with the West, usually with the European Union. A commonly used notion is that of East-Central Europe (West-Central Europe is a marginal concept), with its countries being classified as belonging to the East.

Oppositions: European culture, in the sense of Western culture, is juxtaposed with eastern Islam. The West is considered secular, but in public discourse, in order to underscore its cultural distinctness from Islam, its Christian character is often evoked (*christliches Abendland*).

The position of Germany vis-à-vis Europe: Germany is a Western country. The West and Germany mean affluence and wealth, a goal desired and strived for by other European countries. It is commonly believed that Germany is being wangled by the rest of Europe, cf. such popular expressions as *Zahlmeister Europas* 'Europe's sponsor' or *Melkkuh Europas* 'Europe's milk cow'.

Characteristics: Europe's linguistic and cultural diversity are underscored as the continent's richness. The ideal model of social relations is pluralism and multi-culturalism (*Mulitkulti*). The *überzeugter Europäer* 'confirmed European' defends European values; however, the expression *europa-müde* 'tired of Europe' signals a growing skepticism that results from the perceived democratic deficit.

European values: Europe (especially the European Union) is associated with certain fundamental values: freedom, democracy, equality (including gender equality and the rights of sexual minorities), pluralism, tolerance of diversity, lack of discrimination, peace, human dignity, and human rights. The *Multikulti* model is evaluated positively (especially in student questionnaires) but has also been disapproved of recently.

Origin (roots): European culture derives from the Greek and Roman antiquity and Judeo-Christianity; it has been shaped by the ideas of humanism and Enlightenment.

German profiles of Europe:[35] In German liberal-democratic discourse (the daily *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, the weekly *Die Zeit*), Europe's basic values are stressed: democracy, freedom, pluralism, security; the leftist discourse (the daily *Tageszeitung*) emphasises the importance of the socially robust law-and-order state; in the Christian discourse (Catholic and Evangelical, cf. the weekly *Tagespost*, the monthly *Chrismon*) it is human dignity, responsibility, and the need to ground democracy in ethical values; in the rightist discourse (the dailies *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* or *Die Welt*) there are references to "patriotic Europeans" (cf. *PEGIDA*: *Patriotische Europäer gegen die Islamisierung des Abendlandes* 'Patriotic Europeans against the Islamisation of the West').

Additional comments: A unification of all European countries — a Europe without borders, based on partnership and a common legal system — is considered possible if candidate states to the EU meet the requirements pertaining to human rights, freedom of speech, and democratic principles.

There is a stable tradition that relates to Kurt Tucholsky's idea of uniting the whole of Europe, formulated in 1932: *Europa ist ein großes Haus* 'Europe is a big house'.[36] In public discourse, since the 1990s, the metaphor of the European house or home is interpreted as *Festung Europa* 'the European fortress', *Wohlstandsfestung* 'the fortress of prosperity', which in contemporary xenophobic discourse is evoked in the context of immigration policy.

12.3 EUROPE in Russian linguaculture[37]

General information: Europe in Russian linguaculture is perceived from the external perspective of a country which does not belong to it. The Russian cultural concept EVROPA has a complex semantic structure, based on the East–West opposition: the West represents culture and civilisation, progress, civic organisation, technological advancement, a high standard of living, and *европейские ценности* 'European values'.

---

[35] Zawadzka-Koch (2018 (in print)) does not mention the multifariousness of the German view of Europe with regard to discourse types; the typology of German public discourses here follows the analysis in Grzeszczak (2015: 221–301).

[36] Cf. Tucholsky (1989: 433).

[37] Full account: Frolova 2018 (in print).

Geography: Europe is defined as a *материк* 'continent; the territory west of the Ural Mountains ', or, in a narrower fashion, as countries west of the borders of the former Soviet Union. In a still narrower sense, Europe is identified with the European West, Western European countries, the European Union.

Oppositions: Europe is juxtaposed with Asia but also with Russia.

Russia's position vis-à-vis Europe: Pushkin's expression *в Европу прорубить окно* 'cut a window to Europe' (from his poem *The Bronze Horseman*) situates Russia outside Europe and evaluates the relationship between them. Since the 19th century, there has been a debate between Westernisers and Slavophiles: the former (e.g. the philosopher Pyotr Chaadayev, 1794–1856) have opted for a Europeanisation of Russia through common religious and cultural values, while Slavophiles have emphasised the Orthodox religion and Russian national tradition representing a critical attitude towards Europe and Western Christianity. Contemporary European–Russian relations are viewed in dual terms: as an opposition (exclusion) in the social sphere, but as a convergence (inclusion) in the cultural sphere.

Characteristics: Europe is viewed as a mosaic of various countries, inhabited by speakers of various languages. It is unified through culture, civilisation, education, technological progress, civic society, and a high standard of living.

European values: culture, technological advancement, and the comfort of everyday living. Contemporary internet discourse indicates that Russians do not accept the European value of tolerance, especially the tolerance of non-standard sexual orientations.[38] Slavophiles negatively evaluate the Western education as devoid of spiritual aspects, and attempts to follow the European model of progress are viewed as unproductive.

The semantics of the words Европа 'Europe' *and its derivatives европейский* 'European' *and европеец* 'a European': the proper name *Evropa* is metaphorically used in the sense 'education, erudition', 'cultural refinement' and points to Europe as a positive model to follow. The expression *европейский уровень* 'European

---

[38] After the Eurovision contest in 2014 was won by the Austrian singer Thomas Neuwirth, who created an image of a bearded woman called Conchita Wurst, Russian internet users coined the jocular but pejorative term *Гейропа* 'Gayrope'.

level' means high quality, advanced technology or comfort of living, higher than Russian. *Русский европеец* 'a Russian European' is a new type of personality whose pro-European orientation is expressed through behaviour and values. The abstract noun *европеизм* 'Europeism' has an ambivalent interpretation: a) the pursuit of European social order, culture, and civilisation; and b) a superficial imitation of a model, without any concern for its deeper levels.

Russian profiles of Europe: The profiling of the Russian cultural concept EVROPA begins with the 19th-c. debate between Westernisers and Slavophiles continued in contemporary liberal and nationalistic discourse.

These two profiles of Europe, different in their judgements, are nevertheless constructed within the bounds of a joint categorial network, with the use of the same metaphors: a model to follow, the younger and older person, a parent and a child; there is also a metaphor of an ageing, ailing, or tired Europe.[39] Important nodes of the network are Western Christianity and Eastern Orthodoxy, evaluated in polar terms.

Additional comments: Different judgements regarding the process of globalisation and the creation of the European Union have led to the emergence of the words *евроскептик* 'Euroskeptic' (someone who thinks of the EU as lacking perspectives) and *еврооптимист* 'Euro-optimist' (someone who believes in the economic and cultural integration of Europe). Other new creations can be found in newspapers, e.g. *общность* 'community' or *толерантность* 'tolerance'.[40]

In questionnaires elicited from Moscow students (2013 and 2014), the dominant perspective on Europe is that of a consumer: Europe is a "service" or a "commodity". When asked about the nature of true Europe, the students were likely to refer to its cultural aspects (historical monuments, music, museums, film, literature), high-profile civilisation (philosophy, scholarship, the academia), and economy (high level of development), but hardly ever pointed to political and civic issues (freedom, democracy, individual human rights, a just political system).

---

[39] Such is the interpretation in the immensely popular Oswald Sprengler's 1918 book *The Decline of the West* (*Der Untergang des Abendlandes*).

[40] From the Russian National Corpus (www.ruscorpora.ru), Dec 2014.

12.4 EUROPE in Ukrainian linguaculture[41]

General information: Europe is above all a socio-political and cultural notion.

Geography: Europe is identified with the West. "True" Europe is Western and not Eastern Europe. The notion of Central Europe is virtually non-existent. Europe and the European Union are treated synonymously.

Oppositions: Europe is juxtaposed and contrasted with Russia and the Soviet past; occasionally with Asia.

Ukraine's position vis-à-vis Europe: Ukraine considers itself to be a part of Eastern Europe. In the Soviet period, the official ideological stance was to identify Europe with the reactionary capitalist West. Nowadays, Ukraine's transitional borderline location between the East and West is emphasised: the country belongs to two worlds, European and Asian. The Ukraine–EU relationship is asymmetrical: it is metaphorically portrayed as a teacher–student or a superior–subordinate relationship. In the context of Europe, Ukrainians experience a certain "cognitive dissonance": they are not an EU member state, but do belong to Europe in the historical-cultural sense by subscribing to its values. The "European choice" of Ukraine since the beginning of the war in the country's eastern territories (2014) has become existential, as it concerns the future of Ukraine as an independent state.

Characteristics: Europe is traditionally associated with high culture. Its social achievements are emphasised (high standard of living, social security, etc.), which, in a peculiar manner, prolongs the life of the Soviet image of "satiated, complacent Europe".

European values: democracy, freedom, law and order, social security. "True" Europe is a place of peace and security where corruption and violence barely exist, and young people can find satisfying work. The ideal being sought by the political elite is to join Europe as the mainstay of wealth and well-being, to "build Europe in Ukraine", and to develop a new pro-European national identity.

(6a) *The semantics of the words* Європа 'Europe' *and its derivatives* європейський 'European' *and* європеєць 'a European': information about Europe in dictionaries is scarce but derivatives

---

[41] Full account: Yavorska 2018 (in print).

are noted frequently, such as *європеець* 'a European' (masc.), *європейка* 'a European' (fem.), not only in the sense 'an inhabitant of Europe' but also 'someone of high culture'; *європеїзація* 'Europeisation', *європеїзувати* 'Europeanise', *європеїзуватися* 'Europeanise oneself', *європейська культура* 'European culture', *європейські ідеї* 'European ideas', *європеоїди* 'those who belong to the Caucasian race'.

Ukrainian profiles of Europe: Ever since the beginning of Ukraine's independence in 1991 and the acceptance of the governmental strategy of integration with EU in 1998, the predominant discourse in the Ukrainian press is pro-European. Euromaidan (2013–2014) and the "Revolution of dignity" have strengthened the trend further.

Additional comment: an opinion survey among students in the cities of Kyiv and Ostroh (2012–2013) show that Europe is understood geographically as a continent that includes Ukraine, and, politically, as the European Union perceived as the "true" Europe. It is a place of peace and security where there is no violence and no work shortage for young people. "True" Europe is a law-and-order society, with high social standards and a minimal level of corruption. Europe is a model to follow.

In a survey conducted in 2014 after the Russian aggression on Ukraine, students' responses contained new elements: disappointment with European politics under the German leadership, and generally with Europe's attitude to Ukraine (although the media slogan "Europe doesn't want us" was not corroborated in the questionnaire responses). However, the respondents unwaveringly expressed their hope for cooperation between their country and Europe, which continues to attract them as "a place without war or Putin".

12.5 EUROPE in Byelorussian linguaculture[42]

General information: the presence of Belarus, or the land inhabited by the Byelorussian people, in Europe has generally been "vague" or "ambivalent": for centuries Belarus did not exist as a separate state, its borders were unstable, and it was

---

[42] Full account: Lappo 2018 (in print).

known under a variety of names, such as the Principality of Polotsk, Kievan Rus', the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Russian Empire, the Second Polish Republic, the Soviet Union, and eventually the Republic of Belarus. Throughout the 20th century Europe was perceived there as hostile, but, above all, as inaccessible being hidden "behind the iron curtain". Byelorussians identify themselves with the Byelorussian state, although their linguacultural identity is Russian.

Geography: Belarus is situated in the centre of Europe and on its outskirts at the same time: it lies on the border between the Western and Eastern worlds, Catholic and Orthodox, the European Union and Russia. In everyday understanding, Europe is identified with the Western European countries, with the West and generally with *замежжа* 'the foreign countries'. In contemporary colloquial Byelorussian language Europe is synonymous with the European Union.

Oppositions: Most frequently, Europe is contrasted with Asia; in journalism, with America, Asia, or Russia.

The position of Belarus vis-à-vis Europe: A common slogan in the media is "Belarus is Europe". However, Byelorussians also emphasise their uniqueness and the differences between themselves and other Europeans, especially in certain cultural aspects (e.g. the cuisine); they often juxtapose Belarus with rich Europe (a conventionalised expression is "not like we do/not like here").

Characteristics: wealth and well-being, high standard of living, comfort, high culture, rich history; Europe is perceived as a destination for emigrants, "the cradle and cemetery of civilisation", "a dead body well-mummified".

European values: high standard of living and precious cultural values: beautiful architecture, freedom of movement; political values to a smaller extent: freedom, tolerance; European tradition and values are more eagerly mentioned by opposition media.

The prefix *еўра* 'Euro-' means 'made of a good-quality material, with the use of modern technology': *еўрарэмонт* 'Euro-renovation, Euro-repair', *еўрастандарт* 'Euro-standard', etc.

Origin: religious discourse (either Catholic or Orthodox) does not play a crucial role in public space; the Christian dimension of Europe, although recognised and respected, is facultative.

Byelorussian profiles of Europe: The official Byelorussian discourse is changeable but, above all, populist, with pro-Russian

or pro-Western overtones and a clear trace of post-Soviet, conservative attitudes. In a 2014 poll, 52% of Byelorussians described themselves as *советские люди* 'Soviet people', for whom Europe is an alien and hostile land. Only 36% of them identified themselves as Europeans.

From the perspective of an average Byelorussian, Europe is viewed as a land of plenty, with high standard of living, developed civilisation, and easy access to material goods (good roads, bicycles, clothes) — in short, with a good life.

The profile of Europe projected from the viewpoint of the conscious Byelorussian intellectual is that of the cradle of civilisation. This pro-European conceptualisation is closely linked with the liberal-democratic discourse. The European-Byelorussian (for whom the paragon is Francysk Skaryna, 1490–1522[43]) views Europeanness as a social, political, and cultural model. The centuries-long presence of Belarus in Europe is unquestioned.

12.6 EUROPE in Bulgarian linguaculture[44]

General information: The attitude of Bulgarians to Europe is complex and unequivocal. Two Bulgarian abstract nouns deserve special attention: *европейскост* 'Europeanness' and *европейщина* 'quasi-Europeanness', of which the former connotes the stable European values of intellectualism or humanitarianism, while the latter is pejorative and semantically actualised in context.

Geography: Europe is identified with the European Union, which consists of Old Europe (EU member states admitted before 1989) and the New Europe (admitted after that date).

Opposition: The role of the Balkans and Eastern Europe as the buffer zone or proving ground is emphasised.

Bulgaria's position vis-à-vis Europe: There is a clear sense of Bulgaria's and, in the wider sense, Balkans's exterritorial position in relation to Europe; a frequent metaphor is that of Bulgaria as "Europe's backyard" (*заден двор на Европа*).

---

[43] A Byelorussian humanist, physician, translator, and printer, credited with laying the groundwork for the development of the Byelorussian language (Wikipedia, 7 March, 2018). [trans. note]

[44] Full version: Długosz 2018 (in print).

Characteristics: high standard of living and wealth hardly attainable in Bulgaria; full civil rights.

European values: peace, freedom, democracy, work. European (consumer) objects are viewed as modern, reliable, of high quality.

The lexeme *Европа* 'Europe' functions as a metaphor of socio-political progress, while *Европеец* 'a European' is 'someone cultured, polite, of agreeable appearance, dressed in fine clothes'. The expression *по европейски* 'the European way' means 'in a civilised manner, in accordance with the law', 'in a cultured and polite manner', 'diplomatically, peacefully', 'reliably, with the maintenance of high standards'.

Origin: Old Europe follows the tradition of European humanism with Christian roots (the New Europe is undergoing a serious crisis of values).

Bulgarian profiles of Europe: in Bulgarian democratic and conservative-liberal political discourse, the view of Europe is positive: Europe means progress and a model to follow. However, in public discourse, a clearly negative profile of Europe as "a cold princess" is also recognisable. The intellectual discourse, in turn, as it functions in the magazine *Култура/Kultura*, projects the profile of Europe in deep value crisis.

12.7 EUROPE in Serbian linguaculture[45]

General information: for Serbs, Europe is still a distant European Union, an attractive space of material affluence.

Geography: Europe is the countries of Western Europe, especially the rich ones. Serbs consider themselves as a part of southern Europe and identify with Europe as such, although they are not an EU member state yet.

Oppositions: the opposition between Europe and the Balkans is foregrounded; the weaker ones are those between Western and Eastern Europe or between Europe and Asia; an opposition between southern and northern Europe has not been identified.

Serbia's position vis-à-vis Europe: Serbs feel isolated from the rest of the continent they belong to in the geographical sense.

---

[45] Full account: Bogdanovic' 2015.

On the one hand, Europe is their home and family; on the other hand, it is an unattainable fortress.

Characteristics: positive: cultured, beautiful, orderly, developed, diligent and therefore affluent, with high level of consumption; negative: closed, insensitive, unfeeling, cold, and reserved.

European values: freedom, democracy, civilisation; European culture, rights, good education, security, advanced technology, high standard of living.

Origin: the roots of Europe are Greek and Roman Antiquity and Christianity.

Serbian profiles of Europe: the attitude of older countryside dwellers to Europe tends to be negative, that of younger city dwellers tends to be positive.

12.8 EUROPE in Croatian linguaculture[46]

General information: the Croatian cultural concept (stereotype) of Europe has been shaped throughout ages by the agency of three major idioms: Mediterranean, Central-European, and Balkan. In the everyday awareness of Croatian speakers, Europe functions in three aspects: geographical (in relation to other continents), socio-cultural, and especially administrative-institutional (the European Union).

Geography: Europe is identified with Western Europe and therefore does not include Orthodox Serbs.

Opposition: Europe is juxtaposed with Serbia, the Balkans, or Balkanites.

Croatia's position vis-à-vis Europe: The emphasis on Croatia's place among the Western European states correlates with the revival of the idea of *Antemurale Christianitatis* (*the Bulwark of Christendom*), a distance towards "Balkanites", the tendency to situate Croatia not in the Balkans, but in South-Eastern Europe.

Characteristics: economic development, progress, helping the poor.

Values: the cultural concept of EUROPA has positive connotations. There is an established practice of manifesting the European sources of Croatian culture in opposition to the spirit

---

[46] Full account: Czerwiński 2018 (in print).

of the Byzantine Empire, the Balkans, or Serbia. Negative values are ascribed to the Balkans.

Origin: Christianity and Enlightenment.

Croatian profiles of Europe: in liberal and leftist discourses, the European Union is conceptualised as a natural continuation of Europe (synonymy projection), whereas in rightist discourse it is viewed as a negation of "true" Europe (antonymy projection). The latter discourse has developed into explicitly expressed anti-Serbian and anti-Yugoslav sentiments.

Rightist discourses conceptualise Europe by referring to Christianity (sometimes directly to Catholicism), while leftist discourses refer to the ideas of the Enlightenment, in which cultural otherness is unimportant or at least less important than individual civic freedom: this is the contrast between "a Europe of homelands" vs. "a Europe of citizens".

In the conservative discourse, Europe's identification with the EU is questioned or the two are in fact contrasted. The EU is portrayed as an undemocratic and bureaucratic institution. Contemporary Europe is corrupt, while Croats are depositaries of "true" Europeanness. In radically leftists discourses, the EU is criticised for supporting capitalism, market-based economy, and corporations. Both discourses, in a peculiar unison, criticise the West for its hypocrisy, colonial past, and imperialism. Because of painful experiences in the past, Europe is also viewed as conniving and treacherous. Western Europe is considered immoral.

12.9 EUROPE in Chinese linguaculture[47]

General information: the Chinese view of Europe changed throughout the 20th century, along with the changing relationships between Europe, America, and China.

Geography: The notions of Europe and the West function interchangeably. A prominent position among European countries is accorded to Great Britain, France, and Germany.

Oppositions: Europe (and the West) stand in opposition to China.

China's position vis-à-vis Europe: there are profound differences in culture and mentality. Western (English and French) influ-

---

[47] Full account: Gianninoto 2018 (in print).

ence is considered simultaneously as a heritage of imperialist supremacy and an accepted model of development. In many areas, Europe continues to be a source of inspiration. The nature of contemporary reciprocal relationships is best captured through the metaphor of a "bridge", which means friendly communication and understanding.

Characteristics: high level of development, intense pro-democratic efforts, industrial revolution, common market, economic stability.

Values: European culture and civilisation, but also (negatively evaluated) dominance of the developed capitalist countries or internal contradictions. The Europeanisation of Chinese youth culture is considered problematic.

Origin: Spiritual European culture is considered to have derived from Ancient Greece.

Chinese profiles of Europe: the expressions and metaphors that refer to Europe point to ambivalent judgements of the continent: a positive image of Europe being, in many aspects, a model of development is accompanied with a negative image deriving from the history of Chinese-European relations.

12.10 Europe from the American perspective[48]

General information: An analysis of the COCA corpus for the years 2015–2017 and a 2017 questionnaire conducted among the students of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, yields an external, outside image of Europe as a land that is distant but that has strong ties with America. The political aspects is significant (European security is guaranteed by the US), as well as the historical aspect (European roots of American culture are remembered). Europe is also a tourist destination for Americans.

Geography: The boundary between Europe and Asia is the River Don. Europe consists of Northern Europe (Scandinavia, Denmark), Western Europe, Central Europe, and Eastern Europe. In the eyes of the students, Europe's boundaries are fuzzy but its centre is well-delimited: it includes France, the

---

48 Full account: Tieszen 2018 (in print).

UK, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, and Spain, sometimes also Ireland and Scotland.

Oppositions: Europe is contrasted with Asia and, culturally (in terms of religion), with Islam; Europe is also juxtaposed with America because of its unique lifestyle and a diminished role of religion in public life.

The position of the USA vis-à-vis Europe: The students who took part in the survey know that modern America's roots are in Europe, which is a "miniature USA", similar to the USA in mentality, but different in its cuisine, culture, and individual imagination. According to journalists, it is the US that guarantees European security and the freedom of its nations. Americans can look up to Europe for its good pension system, greater professional mobility, and shorter working hours.

Characteristics: The American press frequently mentions a strong anti-Semitism which has been present in Europe for a thousand years, but has recently become stronger, especially in France where Judeophobia put down new roots among Muslims . Europe has also experienced a recent surge of Islamophobic, nationalistic, and populist sentiment (the latter being similar to American populism). Nationalism has become the mainstream ideology of the governing forces in Central Europe and has jeopardised the continent's stability more than Brexit. The EU is becoming weaker.

The students surveyed in 2017 characterised Europe in many aspects:

— the cultural aspect, ca. 28% of responses: the stronghold of literature, technology, religion; its culture is very old and ethnically diverse; music, art, beautiful architecture; numerous monuments; narrow and cobblestoned streets, brick houses, small towns; fairy-tale rusticity; mixture of languages, bilingualism, multilingualism; a characteristic accent, correct use of language, less slang;

— the historical aspect, ca. 13% of responses: a rich history, a mixture of the old and the modern; the Vikings, the Roman Empire, Greece, the Pope and the Vatican, kings and queens, revolutions; diversity: many immigrants and refugees; a few centuries ago it was a superpower and the pinnacle of cutting-edge progress;

— the social aspect, ca. 11% of responses: Europe is socially more advanced than the majority of countries in the world; an aggregate of various people, peoples, languages, and ideas; coexistence of different regional cultures; liberalism; acceptance of various sexual orientations (LGBT); pretentious upper classes, whites with racist inclinations and the feeling of cultural dominance; oppressiveness; Europeans impose their culture, cuisine, fashion, language, values, and social policy on the rest of the world; they interfere with other parts of the world;

— the aspect of day-to-day life, ca. 9% of responses: good food, tea; smoking; high-quality goods; tourist attractions; peace, beautiful courtly and monarchist ceremonies;

— the political aspect, ca. 8% of responses: a divided but integrating continent; leftist inclinations, progressive but with a stigma of imperialism and colonialism;

— the psychological aspect, ca. 4% of responses: open to new inspirations and ideas; passionately keen on travelling; individual lifestyles and thinking; relaxed life.

European values: Europe is like "the sun in the global universe" because everything that is important to the USA and the world comes from Europe; it is characterised by unity in diversity, multiethnicity, innovativeness, a combination of beauty and sophistication, attention to social decorum; a high esteem for art.

Origin (roots): the students derive Western values from the system of Judeo-Christian beliefs; they see the beginnings of Europe in the Vikings, the Roman Empire and Greece, also in revolutions, the Pope, kings and queens.

Profiles of Europe: in the Republican discourse warnings are being issued that Muslim immigrants and refugees can bring about a rupture in Western Christianity. In the Democratic discourse, attention is paid to the assimilation of Muslims in Germany and France and to their increasing secularisation.

Additional comment: from the American perspective, it is believed that the radical secularisation of public life in France pushes religion to the margin of society (as opposed to the USA) and feeds its extreme forms; however, the "Europe without God" kind of narrative is not found as it is in Sweden.

12.11 Europe in Ancient Greece[49]

General information: according to sources from the 9th to the 4th centuries B.C., the concepts important to Greeks (*Héllenes*) emerged first, before Europe. The geographic concept paved the way for the concepts in the axiological and political sense.

Geography: The world of Greek merchants and traders was divided into Europe, Asia, and Libya. The Greeks of the 8th century B.C. associated Europe with northern Greece. In the 5th century B.C., Europe covered the area stretching west to the Pillars of Hercules, east to the shores of Asia Minor, north to Scythia, and south to the shores of Libya.

Oppositions: In Antiquity (cf. Herodotus's *Histories*) Greeks were contrasted with Asian barbarians, or, in more general terms, Hellenism with barbarianism. In Greek culture, an individual person was the most important, free, and equal to others before the law; in Asian culture, an individual meant nothing.

The position of Ancient Greece vis-à-vis Europe: For Herodotus, Athenians were Hellenes, and Hellenes were Europe. Europe meant freedom and equality before the law.

Characteristics: The criterial features of Europe were freedom and equality before the law; connotative features were: a happy life, the courage of its citizens, freedom of speech in public places, the right to individual development (*areté*, *autarkia*), tolerance, the right to rest after work, a country open to foreigners and offering access to education, free trade, the right to engage in friendships with equals and people from other cultures.

Values: The highest political, social, and cultural values for the Greeks were freedom, equality, and the law: these have become the defining semantic features of Europe.

Origin: The myth of Europa's abduction by Zeus (mentioned in the *Iliad*) was not a *porquoi story* and was not connected to the idea of Europe.

12.12 Europe in contemporary Greek linguaculture[50]

General information: In the Greek worldview, Europe (as a mental space) has retained its fundamental axiological elements over

---

[49] Full account: Korus 2018 (in print).
[50] Full account: Genev-Puhaleva and Ioannidou 2018 (in print).

the course of three millennia. However, in today's narration, the Ancient Greek legend of a beautiful princess tends to be replaced with that of an ailing old woman. Since Greece became an EU member state in 1981, an idealised image of Europe *sensu largo* became entrenched as a space of cooperation, solidarity, and mutual help (by analogy to family members sharing a common home). However, with the backdrop of the 2008–2016 financial crisis, that image changed: the real Europe is an entity that is complex, heterogeneous, and full of contrasts. Greeks play a special role in it: that of an ideal and a victim at the same time.

Geography: A conventionalised synonym of Europe is "the old continent". It is identified with the West (Great Britain, Germany, France) or with the EU (as a political entity, a coalition of states). A stable distinction is that between the affluent North and West on the one hand, and the less affluent South and East.

Oppositions: Europe is above all contrasted with Asia (*άλλος κόσμος* 'a different world') and America (*Νέος Κόσμος* 'the New World'). Europe *sensu stricto* is contrasted with Byzantium and Western (Latin) Christianity with Greek Christianity. For traditionally-minded Greeks, the heir to the Byzantine Empire is Russia. Another juxtaposition is that of Europe vs. the Balkans, i.e. "civilised space" vs. "wild, barbaric space".

The position of Greece vis-à-vis Europe: Greece is portrayed either as "the cradle of European civilisation" or as an entity located on the outskirts of Europe and totally distinct from it. Usually, Greece is not included as a component of the cultural concept of EUROPE but is regarded as a developed European country, compared with ex-Yugoslav states, Albania, and Turkey. Greece is a "bridge" between the East and West. A current trend is a critical attitude towards the EU, especially towards the German hegemony ("Germanophobia"). Europeans visit Greece as tourists but also as art collectors — and rob the country of its treasures.

Characteristics: A high culture; wealth, industrial development; well-being and a high standard of living; the "European ideal" is capitalism with its free-market economy, private entrepreneurship, and entrepreneurial spirit, flow of goods, strong common currency, but also with negative aspects, such as consumerism, self-interest, and a desire for profit — those stand in contrast to the Greek spirituality.

Values: "democratic socialism", solidarity, trust, equality; "European" means of good quality; "a European" is someone cultured, with a nurtured spirituality and democratic mentality.

Origin: Greece is proud of being "the cradle of European civilisation".

Profiles of Europe: In the sociodemocratic (the PASOK party), neoliberal, and pro-European discourses, the "European project" is viewed as promising. Democratic socialism and fundamental values (solidarity, trust, equality) are emphasised, albeit with a simultaneously distant perspective. In the nationalistic anti-European discourse (the Golden Dawn party), Europeans are treated as colonisers and occupants. It is postulated that "Europe be returned to national states". The nationalist right wing movement professes Ancient Greek values and elements of Greek Orthodox tradition. Their hero is Vladimir Putin. The left wing criticises nationalist and xenophobic thinking for damaging the neoliberal project. In the discourse of the Communist Party of Greece, Europe is portrayed as being manipulated by the global capital.

12.13 Europe in Lithuanian linguaculture

General information: above all, today's Lithuanians associate Europe with politics: it is synonymous with the European Union, which unites free states, guarantees their peace and security, stands by democratic principles and humanist ideals; it is imagined to be one huge state with a common currency and many perspectives for its citizens.

Geography: officially Europe is the "European continent" from the Iberian Peninsula all the way to the Ural Mountains; it is commonly identified with the EU (*Europos Sąjunga*) but most frequently with the West (*Vakarai*).

Oppositions: Before the Christian baptism of Lithuania (1387–1388), the country was opposed to Europe in religious and cultural aspects. In the 19th century, Lithuania was opposed to America, a symbol of a better, happier life (its place now is taken by the EU). Actively used, present-day oppositions are those between Western Europe (*Vakarų Europa*) and Eastern Europe or between Europe and undemocratic countries.

Lithuania's position vis-à-vis Europe: the Baltic worldview has many features in common with Scandinavian worldviews. The multicultural Grand Duchy of Lithuania (1240–1795) came close to the principles now professed in Europe (tolerance, respect for ethnic distinctiveness and identity). In the interwar period (between WWI and WWII), Lithuanians would obtain an education at Western European universities. When it came under the Soviet occupation (1940), Lithuania became isolated from Europe; since it regained independence (1990), it has viewed itself as a part of Europe.

Characteristics: the cradle of civilisation; a rich, ancient culture, a multicultural symbiosis of a variety of traditions, nations, languages, and customs; precious architectural monuments; multilingualism, power, civilisation, modernism; peace, security, universalism, unity; negative expressions referring to Europe include: "a rotten culture", "a sinking ship", "Gayrope".

Values: an acquiescent society, based on tolerance, equality, and cooperation; democracy, human rights, freedom, tolerance, solidarity.

13. Commentary on the cultural definitions of Europe

In all linguacultures examined, with no exception, Europe is endowed with objectively motivated characteristics: material affluence, technological progress, a high level of culture, art, education, and science. But at the same time, subjective culture-specific judgements appear, grounded in the history of mutual relationships. Germans feel European whereas Russians do not. Lithuanians view Europe in highly positive terms; Ukrainians and Serbs are ready to join the EU as a stronghold of security and wealth. Byelorussians and Bulgarians are in two minds: appreciative but distanced; the Chinese view of Europe links memories of colonialism with an admiration of inspirational progress. Greeks and Americans are in peculiar positions: Greeks are the "founding fathers" of Europe, but are now marginalised and victimised by European hegemons; Americans are descendants of immigrants from

Europe and now guarantee security and protection to the "old continent". The cultural concept of Europe most similar to the Polish one is Croatian.

Do national concepts of Europe share something? According to Wojciech Chlebda, editor of the 2nd volume of LASiS, a common denominator seems to exist, but it can only be detected at a higher level of abstraction, as a three-dimensional viewing frame for Europe: the locational dimension (a continent located in a specific place in world topography), the institutional dimension (the European Union), and the axiological dimension (a set of variable characteristics and values) (Chlebda 2018 [in print]).

This schematic framework is filled with content in both similar and different ways in various linguacultures. The similarities involve, firstly, reference to the political complexity and the internal divisions of Europe — those divisions assume different shapes: Germans, Poles, Byelorussians, and Russians contrast the opulent , fully "European" West with the poorer East; Poles and Czechs also foreground the idiosyncracy of Central (East-Central) Europe; Serbs, Croats, and Greeks emphasise the distinction into the north and south, as well as the specifics of East-Central Europe (including the opposition between Europe and the Balkans).

Secondly, all the investigated linguacultures ascribe to Europe certain obvious features from the domain of everyday life (materialwealth , technological advancement, a high level of culture, art, education, and science) but also less unequivocally evaluated political features: freedom, democracy, and the rule of law. There are also ambivalent socio-cultural features: *multiukulti,* equality of the sexes, tolerance of "others", freedom of moral conduct or moral laxity (accepted in Germany but not in the East, e.g. in Poland or Russia), Western secularism, abandonment of religion and Christian values (critically viewed in Poland, Russia, Bulgaria, and Croatia, especially in right-wing discourses).

The greatest diversity can be observed in the axes of oppositions that emerge in various linguacultures: Germans tend to contrast Europe with Islam; Russians, Poles, Ukrainians, and Byelorussians juxtapose Europe with Asia (or Russia, especially Soviet Russia); Bulgarians, Serbs, and Croats see the clear-cut division between Europe and the Balkans.

Another dimension is the heterogeneity of culture-internal images of Europe, their diversification into variants (profiles) that by definition tend to function on the supranational level. The Polish view of Europe can be divided into two variants: pro- and anti-European, similarly to the Russian, Byelorussian, or Croatian images.[51],[52] The least diversified is the Ukrainian view of Europe, which results from the officially declared "European choice" and the subjugation of criticism (although critical voices have begun to appear as a result of the EU's restrained stance on Ukraine).

An important matter for the future of the process of integration is the transnational nature of certain discourses: liberal, leftist, ecological, feminist, religious. Polish feminists and ecologists are closer to their German colleagues than to Polish nationalists; leftist defenders of equality and democracy from various countries (nations) are closer to one another than to representatives of other options in their respective states; the anti-European Catholic discourse in Poland, associated with Radio Maryja,[53] is close to the anti-

---

[51] Bartmiński and Chlebda (2018, in print) claim the Polish view can be divided into more than two.

[52] Wojciech Chlebda says: "In each of the national discourses, Europe appears to be an ambivalent space, a space of variable value (a fluid axiology). Within a single national discourse, its component discourses can — depending on the values professed by its authors but also on their vested interests — attribute opposite axiology to Europe: Europe (+) is referred to as a (common) home, civilisation, progress, tradition, modernity, and humanism; Europe (–) is portrayed as an enemy, a stranger, a symbol of moral decline, regress, abandonment of values" (Chlebda 2018 (in print)).

[53] A conservative religious and political radio station, closely aligned with the ruling party. [trans. note]

European discourse of the Russian Orthodox Church.[54] In short: the profiling of Europe overrides national boundaries, with culture-based profiles being on the international scale closer to one another than those based on history, politics, or ideology.

One final distinction that must be made is between ideological profiles, functioning in public media, and non-ideological colloquial conceptualisations in silent circles of public opinion, revealed only in sociological research. In Poland, the contrast is especially stark: if in public discourse pro- and anti-European options are nearly equipollent,[55] research by the social opinion agency TNS Polska shows that the attitude of Polish society is decidedly pro-European.

14. The situation with the concept of HOME/HOUSE (Polish DOM) is different. This concept is shaped mainly by culture, rather than politics. The wealth of lexicographic data is enough to see the closeness of the cultural counterpart concepts in various languages.

Consider the four meanings of the Polish *dom* listed in SJP online:

— building for apartments or a workplace;
— a flat, apartment, or room where one lives;
— family, household; also: apartment with its tenants;
— all matters to do with the family and household.

Dictionaries of individual languages define the corresponding words (Greek *οικος*, Lithuanian *namai* and *namas*, Russian *dom*, Byelorussian *dom/khata*, Lemko *chyża*, Czeck *dům* and *domov*, Bulgarian *kyšča*, Serbian and Croatian *kuća*, German *Haus* and *Heim*, English *house* and *home*, French *maison*, Portuguese *casa*) in largely compatible terms (cf.

---

[54] Cf. the declarations of Patriarch Kirill of Moscow and the then President of the Polish Episcopal Conference, Bishop Józef Michalik, signed at the Royal Castle in Warsaw in 2012 as a "call from both Churches, Catholic and Orthodox, to Polish-Russian reconciliation".

[55] The Law and Justice party government (in March 2018) represents the latter option.

Bartmiński 2015). There is a recurrent semantic sequence that proceeds "from concrete to abstract", i.e. in the beginning there is reference to the building designed for living, then to an apartment or room with the same purpose, then to the family and generally the household, the kin or dynasty, and finally a certain type of institution.

All lexicographic definitions in the languages that have been investigated are linked by a four-fold cognitive model that consists of the following components: 'building', 'family', concepts of 'living', and 'function'. The model can be represented as a configuration of four facets, linked into a *gestalt*: [participant] + [event] + [location] + [function]. This is a substitution-based model, filled with specific (compatible) content on the communicative level.

The central element of the model is [event], which opens onto the human participant, the space being inhabited, and the function of that space in relation to the participant. In short, someone lives somewhere and satisfies their needs in that place.

The [participant] may be an individual or a group of people close to one another — prototypically a family, with the foregrounded position of the mother.

The [event] is realised in Polish through the predicate *mieszka* 'lives, dwells', which means (a) 'is somewhere for a long time/permanently'; (b) 'in their own, familiar place'; (c) 'separated from the surroundings and closed'; (d) 'so that one can satisfy the following needs' [functions]: (d1) sleep and rest (d2) protection from cold; (d3) security; (d4) company, especially (d5) care of children (nursing, upbringing); optionally also: (d6) satiating one's hunger; (d7) personal hygiene (washing/bathing, voiding excrements); (d8) transmission of cultural patterns: language, beliefs, norms, and values; (d9) professional training; and (d10) work.

The component [location] pertains to the physical house as a building: it is designed, constructed, furnished, redecorated, sold and bought, etc.

The base image of HOME/HOUSE, at the level of specific social discourses, undergoes intentional modification (profiling). Bartmiński and Bielińska-Gardziel (2015) identify six variants or profiles of the image: (1) the material (physical) profile as a building; (2) the communal profile of the family home in its general human dimension, with an emphatic position of the woman (wife and mother), a multigenerational home; (3) the patriotic profile of the "Polish home" that cherishes the memory of national history, with the "Polish Mother"[56] as the guardian of patriotic tradition; (4) the feminist profile of a home as a woman's prison; (5) the mobile home, based on the myth of expulsion from the Paradise and the feeling of existential homelessness; (6) the metaphysical "Our Father's Home".

In individual national linguacultures, the base cognitive schema of HOME/HOUSE is profiled in specific ways by highlighting some of its aspects and downplaying others.

15.1 The Byelorussian HOUSE/HOME as the Slavic prototype[57]

General information: Byelorussian linguaculture seems to have preserved the most typical (prototypical) and archaic characteristics of the Slavic HOUSE/HOME, i.e. the rural, peasant type.

Base structure: Byelorussian linguacultural home is a configuration of a few basic domains: the actual living quarters (building), function (habitation, dwelling), and people, for whom the building is something ordinary but also has a great value.

The sense of inhabiting/dwelling in a given place: living in a house is expressed as *zhytsyo* 'life', which embraces birth and death. The house as one's birthplace is called the "cradle" (*kalyska*) of a person: Byelorussians have wished to be born and die in their own houses for a long time. Death outside one's

---

[56] The notion comes from the 1830 poem *Do Matki Polki* (*To the Polish Mother*) by the Polish Romantic poet Adam Mickiewicz. [trans. note]

[57] Full account: Kozłowska-Doda 2015 and Kozlouskaya-Doda 2015.

home is considered a bad omen. The souls of the deceased return to the home, a belief perpetuated in the feast of *Dziady* (Forefathers' Eve)[58] and in *dom* as a euphemism for a coffin.

Relationship between people and the house/home: To live in a place means more than to be there for a long time; rather, it means to develop a peculiar kind of relationship with the place, to make it familiar, cosy, *domesticated*, to adapt it to one's needs, decorate with keepsakes, and make it feel like home. Without that, a person can remain *home*less in one's own house or apartment — recall the traumatic experiences of people relocated after the Chernobyl disaster, returning to the old places despite jeopardising their health and lives because they could not imagine living elsewhere. Many elderly city-dwellers return to their childhood huts and houses to die there.

An emotional link with one's house and home gives one strength and helps maintain emotional balance. Houses can even be personified: Byelorussians apologise to their houses, draw their images, etc.

Values associated with HOUSE/HOME: one's own house is a status symbol, a sign of success. Although in many cases it is poorly equipped, for Byelorussians their house is a real palace. It is the place where one feels safe and free.

The social aspect: the quintessence of home for a Byelorussian is the family home. The traditional Byelorussian home must consist of two parents and children — the lack of either is felt as an imbalance. The traditional Byelorussian home, especially among the older generation, has a patriarchal structure: the leading role is played by the man who is supposed to build the house and take good care of it. Also, the man (husband and father) looks after the household. The woman (wife, mother, landlady) has a lower status: her duty is to make the house cosy. These asymmetrical roles are well reflected in the saying *The home is the woman's world, the world is the man's home*.

Spatial characteristics: the home, ideally, comes with a house (*dom/khata*): it is a place isolated from its surroundings. Apartments in the city are treated as "reduced houses", "temporary

---

[58] Lit. 'grandfathers'. The feast commemorated one's dead ancestors. [trans. note]

abodes" that deviate from the image of "true" house and home. An ersatz house/home for a Byelorussian is also the summer house (*dacha*, *letsishcha*), for many a continuation of their peasant ancestors' tradition.

Parts of the house: tnce the house consisted of only one room and the kitchen with a stove, where the whole family would eat, sleep, and spend time. The kitchen, in the Byelorussian house, is a place for cooking, eating, being with the family, and seeing friends.

Each of the house's elements has a role to play: the roof affords protection and, linguistically, functions as a synonym of the house;[59] windows are the house's "eyes"; the walls separate the familiar from the unfamiliar space. The border-line between the two is the doorstep, an important element in many customs and rituals.

Accessories and furnishings: the stove, once a symbol of the hearth, is used to this day for heating and cooking. The central and most esteemed place in the traditional country house was the corner with holy icons opposite the stove (or the door). Today, after work, people gather in front of the TV.

Functions of the house: the house affords the feeling of security, the possibility for sleep and rest; it protects from cold; provides a space for satiating hunger; often (but not always) provides conditions to maintain personal hygiene; allows its tenants to be together; provides conditions to nurture and bring up the children; can function as a workplace; it is a locus of love that one gladly returns to, where one is welcome.

However, a house can limit one's freedom and become a prison: such may be the fate of disabled people and women — victims of domestic violence.

Relation to the environment: Byelorussians tend not to talk about family and domestic matters outside one's home. Collocations and fixed expressions suggest that the Byelorussian home (and especially house) affords the feeling of isolation from the surroundings and the events outside. It is a private space with no room for strangers. In spite of that, Byelorussians can be hospitable.

---

[59] Cf. also the English *under one's own roof* or its Polish equivalent *pod własnym dachem* [trans. note].

Metaphorical extensions: The feeling of familiarity, close-ness to one's own space, gives rise to extensions of the notion of HOUSE/HOME onto one's village, city, region, country (*My homeland is my home; my home is the homeland*), the world, or even the universe. Interestingly enough, a prison cell can be called *khata* (a 21st century usage among political prisoners).

15.2 Idiosyncratic features of the other cultural concepts of HOUSE/HOME

In some languages two aspects of HOUSE/HOME — physi-cal (a building) and psychosocial (a familiar place, one's own space) — have distinct lexical exponents: cf. the Czech *dům* and *domov* (Vaňková 2015: 124), Serbian and Croatian *kutsya/kuća* and *dom* (Ristić and Lazić-Konjik 2015: 264–266; Kapetanović 2015: 293–297), German *Haus* and *Heim* (Grzeszczak 2015: 337–339), English *house* and *home* (Popielska-Grzybowska and Harper 2015: 368–369). The distinction is absent from either Polish or Russian, where both senses are activated in a single meaning of "a building/place inhabited by people close to one another".

A peculiar development took place in the Russian lan-guage. When the Communists attempted to destroy the idea of the family home and replace it with the so-called *komu-nalka*, a council flat shared by a few families, it led to the emergence of the *dacha*, a summer house outside the city, conceptualised as a place of inner emigration that allowed people to have a private space for themselves (Fiodorowa and Pazio-Wlazłowska 2015: 155). The Lemko DOM, in turn, is a stronghold of ethnic identity (Misiak 2015: 207).

15.3 The idea of HOUSE/HOME *from the viewpoint of its individual inhabitant* was most aptly expressed by the Czech writer and philosopher Václav Havel in terms of a concentric and expanding space that humans familiarise and domesticate:

For every person, *domov* is one of the basic exsitential experiences. What one considers to be their home (in the philosophical sense) may be compared to a system of concentric spheres, with one's own "self" in its centre. My home is the place I live in at a certain time, the place I've become used to and, so to speak, have embraced with a my own invisible "coating" of sorts (I remember that even a prison cell was home to me and I always felt discomforted when I was transferred to another cell: even if the new one was the same or better than the previous one, I thought of it at first as alien and hostile, I felt deprived of my roots and placed in an unfamiliar environment, and I needed time to make it mine and familiar, to domesticate it and to shake the sorrow of losing the old place).

My *domov* is the building (*dům*) where I live, the inhabited location or city where I was born and happen to be now living, my *domov* is my family, the world of my friends, the social and spiritual space where I exist, my profession and workplace. My *domov* is, of course, the country I live in, the language I speak, the spiritual atmosphere of my country transmitted through that language. The Czech language, the peculiar Czech worldview, the Czech historical experience, Czech models of heroism and cowardice, Czech humour: these are all inalienable components of my understanding of *domov*. In this way, my *domov* is my Czechness, my belonging to this very nation — I know no reasons why I should not regard that layer of my *domov,* too, as mine. It is natural and obvious to me to the same extent as my identity as a man. Apart from that, my *domov* is Europe and my feeling of being European; it is also our planet. (after Vaňková 2012: 61; transl. A.G.)

16. Conclusions

1. Cultural (cognitive) definitions of both cultural concepts (EUROPE and HOUSE/HOME), reconstructed on the broad S–Q–T basis, bring us closer to the cognitive content of those concepts as they function in the social imagination of specific national languages. Definitions of this kind, as has been noted, are texts of culture (in the sense of the Moscow-Tartu school): they contain a record of socially conventionalised knowledge of a given mental object, of beliefs pertaining to the world and to humans in it; they relate to the norms and values professed by a given cultural

group as the speaking and conceptualising subject. Cultural definitions of EUROPE and HOUSE/HOME can be treated as "narratives" about those entities–mental objects.

2. In the purely linguistic aspect, the attractiveness of the notion of the "European home" derives from the semantic richness and multidimensionality of its two components. The popularity of the slogan[60] is certainly motivated politically (an aspect I will not discuss here), but it is instructive to consider the relationship between the two cultural concepts, the dynamic nature of their combination, and the resulting transfer of its content from the domain of mere ascertainment to that of active postulates. The source of this creative tension is the huge, and relatively stable semantic potential of HOME, on the one hand, and the immense semantic changeability of EUROPE. In the slogan "the European home"/"Europe as home", politics meets culture, a mobile and fluid ambiguity of EUROPE meets the stable tradition preserved in HOME. Cultural concepts of EUROPE (especially when it is identified with the European Union) differ from one linguaculture to another, from one nation to another, and even within one national concept they are entangled in the dispute between Euro-enthusiasts and Euroskeptics, whereas the specific images and profiles of HOME are relatively well-entrenched, smoothened out and similar to one another in various linguacultures.

3. The extended cognitive definitions of the cultural concepts HOME/HOUSE and EUROPE show the degree of the similarity between them, which helps explain the meaning of the metaphorical expression "European home"/"Europe as home". Of many characteristics of the source-domain concept HOME, the metaphor selects only some and maps them onto the target-domain EUROPE.

---

[60] See *Fundacja Europa Haus*, dedicated to promoting cooperation in Europe (europahouse.pl; accessed March 16, 2018).

The basis for such metaphorical transfer — besides the obvious membership of the two concepts in the category of "locations" and the spatial closeness of each to human participants — is social similarity: European nations are to be linked by the kind of relationship that is found in the family home. Europe may be here the "native realm", warm and safe, as in Czesław Miłosz's biographical essay *Rodzinna Europa* (Miłosz 1959, English translation Miłosz 1968).[61] This, however, is a postulated kind of similarity, based on an idealised image of "true" home. In reality, the "typical" home may depart from the ideal, while the "actual" home in reality may even be its contradiction (as in Wojciech Smarzowski's 2009 film *Dom zły* (The Dark House) or William Sach's 2002 *Spooky House*). We are thus not so much "given" the model of the "European home" as it is, but rather "entrusted" with it as something to fulfil.

The functional similarity of Europe and home as safe places is also subject to interpretation: in politics, this is viewed as international security, in philosophy as "being at home", the feeling of personal freedom.

However, in the metaphorisation process, the physical characteristics of the house also play a role: Europe must be "built" on the "foundations" of human rights, freedom, and democracy.

The actual house, in reality, is divided into spaces (the living room, the kitchen, the hall), it has walls, windows, and doors. These are the characteristics that have been extensively relied on in Europe-oriented discourses, e.g. in the context of admitting new members and in present-day immigration discourse it more and more often serves to support xenophobic argumentation. Its major aspect is the

---

[61] The notion of Europe as family is more conspicuous in the Polish title, Rodzinna Europa, than in its English rendering as *Native Realm*. In the former, the adjective *rodzinna* (fem.) is ambiguous between 'to do with the family' and 'native' or 'home' (as in *rodzinne* (neut.) *miasto* 'home town'). [trans. note]

idea of closure, of separating oneself from the environment by raising walls and shutting the gates. One's house may turn into a fortress (*My house is my castle*,[62] *Festung Europa*) invincible to alien interlopers.

4. The semantic values of HOME/HOUSE and EUROPE have enormous potentials for persuasion. Both are multifarious and multidimensional concepts, malleable into profiles and admitting of dialogue. The openness and negotiability of the idea of "the European home" is in fact supra-ideological. It is capitalised on both in the leftist and in the Christian spirit. The former takes us back to Kurt Tucholsky's 1932 slogan *Europa ist ein großes Haus*, revived many decades later by Mikhail Gorbachev, while the latter harks back to Józef Tischner's idea, also mentioned above, of Europe as the "'common home' of Europeans" (Tischner 2017 [1998]: 49). This perspective was confirmed in 2009 by Pope Benedict XVI during his Apostolic visit to the Czech Republic: "Europe is more than a continent. It is a home! And freedom finds its deepest meaning in a spiritual homeland" (Benedict XVI 2009).

The idea of building a European home is as topical as ever, despite being contested by politicians focused on national matters[63] — and perhaps exactly for this reason.

---

[62] Also *My home is my castle*.

[63] Cf. the words of the Polish Prime Minister Mateusz Morawiecki: "In today's Europe, national interests play a far more important role than ideological calls for a 'European home'" (*Gazeta Polska*, interview with Prime Minister Morawiecki by Katarzyna Gójska-Hejke and Tomasz Sakiewicz, "Ja antykomunista, ja bankowiec", Dec 13, 2017, p. 9).

REFERENCES

Abramowicz, Maciej, Jerzy Bartmiński, and Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel (eds.). 2012. *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Ajdačić, Dejan (ed.). 2015. *O vrednostima u srpskom jeziku. Zbornik etnolingvističkih radova*. Beograd: Alma.

Ajdačić, Dejan. 2017. Typy kolekcji wartości i ich profilowanie. *SlovoSlavia. Studia etnolingwistyczne*: 131–148.

Apresjan, Yuriy (ed.) 2006. *Yazykovaya kartina mira i sistemnaya leksikografiya*. Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskikh kul'tur.

Anusiewicz, Janusz. 1991. Kulturowa teoria języka. *Język a Kultura* 1: 17–30.

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

Anusiewicz, Janusz, Anna Dąbrowska, and Michael Fleischer. 2000. Językowy obraz świata i kultura. Projekt koncepcji badawczej. *Język a Kultura* 13: 11–44.

Arutyunova, Nina D. 1991. *Logicheskiy analiz yazyka: Kulturnye kontsepty*. Moskva: Nauka.

Bartmiński, Jerzy (ed.). *1988. Konotacja*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo.

Bartmiński, Jerzy (red.). 1990. *Językowy obraz świata.* Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS. [subsequent editions: 1999, 2004]

Bartmiński, Jerzy. 1993. Wprowadzenie. In Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Encyklopedia kultury polskiej XX wieku. Współczesny język polski.* 13–23. Wrocław: Wiedza o Kulturze. [later published as 2001. Język w kontekście kultury. In Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.) *Współczesny język polski*. 13–22. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.]

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

Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2009. *Aspects of Cognitice Ethnolinguistics.* Ed. Jörg Zinken, trans. Adam Głaz. London and Oakville, CT: Equinox. [paperback published in 2012 in Sheffield and Oakville, CT: Equinox]

Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2014. Basic assumptions of Slavic ethnolinguistics. In Sebastian Kempgen, Tilman Berger, Peter Kosta, and Karl Gutschmidt (eds.) *Die slavischen Sprachen. The Slavic Languages. Ein internatio-nales Handbuch zu ihrer Struktur, ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung. An International Hand-*

book of their Structure, their History, and their Investigation. Band 2/Volume 2. 1165–1175. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2015. *Polskie wartości w europejskiej aksjosferze*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2016. Słowa klucze, kulturemy, koncepty kulturowe. *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 3: 21–29.

Bartmiński, Jerzy and Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel. 2015. Polski językowo-kulturowy obraz domu i jego profile. In Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, and Beata Żywicka (eds.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 1 *DOM* (LASiS 1). 89–121. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Bartmiński, Jerzy, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, and Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (eds.). 2014 *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów* Vol. 2: *Wokół europejskiej aksjosfery.* Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Bartmiński, Jerzy and Wojciech Chlebda. 2018 (in print). Obrazy Europy w języku polskim i w tekstach polskich dyskursów publicznych. In Wojciech Chlebda (ed.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 2. EUROPA (LASiS 2). 89–121. Lublin–Opole.

Bartmiński, Jerzy and Monika Grzeszczak. 2014. Jak rekonstruować kanon wartości narodowych i europejskich? *Etnolingwistyka* 21: 21–44.

Benedict XVI. 2009. Address by the Holy Father. Meeting with the civil and political authorities and with the members of the diplomatic corps**.** Apostolic visit of His Holiness Benedict XVI to the Czech Republic (September 26-28, 2009). Presidential Palace of Prague Saturday, 26 September 2009. https://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/speeches/2009/september/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20090926_autorita-civili.html [accessed March 16, 2018]

Bernández, Enrique. 2008. *El lenguaje como cultura*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.

Bielińska-Gardziel, Iwona, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, and Joanna Szadura (eds.). 2014. *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów.* Vol. 3: *Problemy eksplikowania i profilowania pojęć*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Bielińska-Gardziel, Iwona, Małgorzata Brzozowska, and Beata Żywicka (eds.). 2017. *Nazwy wartości w językach europejskich.*

Raport z badań empirycznych. Przemyśl: Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Wschodnioeuropejska.

Bogdanovic', Marijana. 2015. O kontseptu Evropa u savremenom srpskom yeziku i kulturi. In Dejan Ajdačić (ed.) *O vrednostoma u srpskom yeziku. Sbornik etnolingvistickikh radova*. 98–124. Beograd: Alma.

Bühler, Karl. 1934. *Sprachtheorie*. Jena: Verlag von Gustav Fischer.

Chilton, Paul and Mikhail Ilyin. 1993. Metaphor in political discourse: The case of the 'Common European House'. *Discourse and Society* 4(1): 7–31.

Chilton, Paul and George Lakoff. 1995. Foreign policy by metaphor. In Christina Schäffner and Anita Wenden (eds.) *Language and Peace*. 37-55. Aldershot: Dartmouth.

Chlebda, Wojciech (ed.). *Etnolingwistyka a leksykografia*. Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu *Opolskiego.*

Chlebda, Wojciech. 2018 (in print). Europa w trzynastu obrazach. In Wojciech Chlebda (ed.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 2. EUROPA (LASiS 2). Lublin–Opole.

Chruszczewski, Potr. 2001. *Językoznawstwo antropologiczne. Zadania i metody*. Wrocław: Polska Akademia Nauk Oddział *we Wrocławiu.*

Czachur, Waldemar. 2017. Lingwistyka kulturowa i międzykulturowa. Pytania badawcze, zadania i perspektywy. In Waldemar Czachur (ed.) *Lingwistyka kulturowa i międzykulturowa. Antologia*. 7–38. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Czelakowska, Anna. 2017. Wiedza kulturowa a opis leksykograficzny w jednojęzycznym słowniku języka polskiego. *LingVaria* XII, 2(24): 19–36.

Czerwiński, Maciej. 2018 (in print). Językowo-kulturowy obraz Europy we współczesnej Chorwacji. In Wojciech Chlebda (ed.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 2. EUROPA (LASiS 2). Lublin–Opole.

Dąbrowska, Anna. 2005. Współczesne problemy lingwistyki kulturowej. In Małgorzata Czerwińska et al. (eds.) *Polonistyka w przebudowie*, vol. II. 99–110. Kraków: Universitas.

Dąbrowska, Anna. 2017. Język i kultura a glottodydaktyka. In Dorota Filar and Piotr Krzyżanowski (eds.) *Barwy słów. Studia lingwistyczno-kulturow*e. 125–142. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Długosz, Natalia. 2018 (in print). O bułgarskim językowo-kulturowym obrazie Europy In Wojciech Chlebda (ed.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 2. EUROPA (LASiS 2). Lublin–Opole.

Dobry słownik. Ed. Łukasz Szałkiewicz, Artur Czesak, and Sebastian Żurowski. https://dobryslownik.pl/

Duranti, Alessandro. 2000. *Antropología Lingüística*. Los Angeles: Ediciones AKAL.

Dystynktywny słownik synonimów. 2004. Alicja Nagórko, Marek Łaziński, Hanna Burkhardt. Kraków: Universitas.

Encyklopedia języka polskiego. 1999. Ed. Stanisław Urbańczyk and Marian Kucała. 3rd ed. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Encyklopedia PWN. 2002. Warszawa: PWN.

Fiodorowa, Ludmila and Dorota Pazio-Wlazłowska. 2015. Rosyjski językowo-kulturowy obraz domu. In Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, and Beata Żywicka (eds.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 1 *DOM* (LASiS 1). 149–175. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Fleischer, Michael. 1996. *System polskich symboli kolektywnych. Wyniki badań empirycznych*. Wrocław.

Frolova, Olga. 2018 (in print). Kontsept Evropa v russkoy yazykovoy kartinye mira. In Wojciech Chlebda (ed.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 2. EUROPA (LASiS 2). Lublin–Opole.

Genev-Puhaleva, Iliana and Alexandra Ioannidou. 2018 (in print). Koncept Europa (EUROPA) w nowogreckim językowym obrazie świata. In Wojciech Chlebda (ed.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 2. EUROPA (LASiS 2). Lublin–Opole.

Gianninoto 2018 (in print). Europe, Europeanization and related words in Mandarin Chinese. In Wojciech Chlebda (ed.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*. vol. 2. *EUROPA*. Lublin–Opole.

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

Głaz, Adam. 2015. Przekład tekstu — przekład pojęć — przekład kultur(y). In Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Marta Nowosad--Bakalarczyk, and Tomasz Piekot (eds.) *Działania na tekście. Przekład — redagowanie — ilustrowanie*. 59–71. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Golubovska, Iryna. (in print). *Modern Ukrainian Linguistic Conceptology*: *Present State and Possibilities of the Development*.

Goodenough, Ward. 1957. Cultural anthropology and linguistics. In Paul Garvin (ed.) *Report of the Seventh Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Study*. 167–173. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University.

Gorbachev, Mikhail. 1987. *Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World*. New York etc.: Harper and Row, Publishers.

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*. Vo. 3: *Problemy eksplikowania i pro-filowania pojęć*. 21–50. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Grzeszczak, Monika. 2015. DOM (Haus i Heim) w języku niemieckim. In Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, and Beata Żywicka (eds.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 1 *DOM* (LASiS 1). 311–342. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Jakobson, Roman. 1971 [1953]. Results of a joint conference of anthropologists and linguists. In Roman Jakobson. *Selected Writings II. Word and Language*. 554–567. The Hague–Parin: Mouton.

Kapetanović, Amir. 2015. Hrvatska jezična slika doma danas. In Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, and Beata Żywicka (eds.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 1 *DOM* (LASiS 1). 291–309. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Kiklevich, Aleksandr and Alla Kamalova (eds.) 2010. *Kontsepty kul'tury v yazyke i tekste. Teorya i analiz*. Olsztyn: Centrum Badań Europy Wschodniej UWM w Olsztynie.

Kłoskowska, Antonina. 1993. Kultura. In *Encyklopedia kultury polskiej XX wieku*. 17–50. Wrocław: Wiedza o Kulturze.

Kononenko, Vitaliy. 2004. *Kontsepty ukrainskogo dyskursu.* Kyiv–Ivano-Frankivsk: Min-bo osvity i nauки Ukrainy.

Korus, Kazimierz. 2018 (in print) Pojęcie EUROPA w starożytnej wolnej Grecji. In Wojciech Chlebda (ed.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 2. EUROPA (LASiS 2). Lublin–Opole.

Kozłowska-Doda, Jadwiga. 2015. Dom w języku białoruskim. In Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, and Beata Żywicka (eds.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 1 *DOM* (LASiS 1). 177–206. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Kozlouskaya-Doda, Jadwiga. 2015. *Panjatstse DOM u sucjasnay belarusskay move. Pojęcie DOM we współczesnym języku białoruskim*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Krzeszowski, Tomasz P. 1994. Parametr aksjologiczny w przedpojęciowych schematach wyobrażeniowych. *Etnolingwistyka* 6: 29–51.

Kusse, Holger. 2012. Kusse, *Kulturwissenschaftliche Linguistik. Eine Einfuhrüng.* Göttingen: UTB GmbH.

Lappo, Iryna. 2018 (in print). EUROPA oczami Białorusów. In Wojciech Chlebda (ed.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 2. EUROPA (LASiS 2). Lublin–Opole.

LASiS. *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*. Series ed. Jerzy Bartmiński. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

vol. 1: *DOM*. 2015. Ed. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka.

vol. 2: *EUROPE*. 2018 (in print). Ed. Wojciech Chlebda. Lublin–Opole.

vol. 3: *PRACA*. 2016. Ed. Jerzy Bartmiński, Małgorzata Brzozowska, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska.

vol. 4: *WOLNOŚĆ*. 2018 (in print). Ed. Maciej Abramowicz and Jerzy Bartmiński.

vol. 5: *HONOR*. Ed. Petar Sotirov and Dejan Ajdačić.

Levitskiy A. E., S. I. Potapenko, and O. P. Vorobyeva (eds.). 2013. *Lingvokulturologiya: perspektyvy i napravleniya. Monografiya*. Lugansk: Izd-vo GU "LNU imeni Tarasa Shevchenko".

Ligara, Bronisława. 2008. Leksykultura w ujęciu Roberta Galissona a nauczanie kompetencji kulturowej. In Władysław Miodunka and Anna Seretny (eds.) *W poszukiwaniu nowych rozwiązań. Dydaktyka języka polskiego jako obcego u progu XXI wieku*. 51–60. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Łozowski, Przemysław. 2014. Język a kultura w programie etnolingwistyki kognitywnej Jerzego Bartmińskiego. Między Sapirem a Malinowskim. *Etnolingwistyka* 26: 155–176.

Maslova, Valentina. A. 2001. *Lingvokulturologiya*. Moskva: Izdatel'skiy tsentr "Akademiya".

Miłosz, Czesław. 1959. *Rodzinna Europa*. Paryż: Instytut Literacki.

Miłosz, Czesław. 1968. *Native Realm. A Search for Self-definition*. Trans. Catherine S. Leach. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company.

Miodunka, Władysław (ed.). 2004. *Kultura w nauczaniu języka polskiego jako obcego*. Kraków: Instytut Studiów Polonijnych i Etnicznych Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Misiak, Małgorzata. 2015. Koncept domu w etnolekcie łemkowskim. In Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, and Beata Żywicka (eds.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 1 *DOM* (LASiS 1). 207–235. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Moldovan, Aleksandr. 2008. *Puti slavistiki v sovremennom mire. XIV MSS, Ohrid, 10–16 sentabrya 2008*. Moskva: Rossiyskaya Akademya Nauk.

Musolff, Andreas. 2016. Metaphor scenario analysis as part of Cultural Linguistics. *tekst i dyskurs — text und diskurs* 9: 47–69.

Nagórko, Alicja. 2004. *Metody kontrastywne a etnolingwistyka (lingwistyka kulturowa)*. In Eva Fórián (ed). *Multikulturowość, tożsamość narodowa na Węgrzech i w Polsce*. 23–33. Debreczyn.

Oksaar, Els. 1988. *Kulturemtheorie. Ein Beitrag zur Sprachverwendungsforschung*. Göttingen: Komm. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

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

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

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

Pisarek, Walery. 2002. *Polskie słowa sztandarowe i ich publiczność*. Kraków: Universitas.

Pisarek, Walery. 2016. Słowa ważne i ważniejsze. *Przegląd Humanistyczny* LX, 3: 11–20.

Plas, Pieter. 2006. Slavic ethnolinguistics and Anglo-American linguistic anthropology: convergences and divergences in the study of the languages-culture nexus. *Etnolingwistyka* 18: 135–143.

Popielska-Grzybowska, Joanna and Jo B. Harper. 2015. Językowo-kulturowy obraz domu (*home*) we współczesnym języku

angielskim brytyjskim. In Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, and Beata Żywicka (eds.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 1 *DOM* (LASiS 1). 343–372. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Pruvost, Jean and Marie-Thérèse Lino (eds.). 2003. *Mots et lexiculture: hommages à Robert Galisson*. Paris: Honoré Champion.

Putnam, Hilary. 1975. *Mind, Language, and Reality. Philosophical Papers*, Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Puzynina, Jadwiga. 1992. *Język watości*. Warszawa: PWN.

Rak, Maciej. 2015. *Kulturemy podhalańskie*. Kraków: Biblioteka LingVariów.

Rezanova, Zoya I. (ed.) 2007. *Kartiny russkogo mira: prostranstvennye modeli v yazuke i tekste.* Tomsk: UFO_Plus.

Ristić, Stana and Ivana Lazić-Konjik. 2015. Dom w języku serbskim. In Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, and Beata Żywicka (eds.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 1 *DOM* (LASiS 1). 263–290. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Rudenka, Elena. 2014. *Etnolingvistika bez granits. Vvedenye v lingvisticheskuyu antropologiyu*. Minsk: BGU.

Sabitova, Zinayda. 2015. *Lingvokulturologiya*. Moskva: Flinta.

Sapir, Edward. 1949 [1933]. Language. In *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture, and Personality*. Ed. David G. Mandelbaum. 7–32. Berkeley — Los Angeles — London: University of California Press.

SD 1995–2012. *Slavyanskiye drevnosti. Etnolingvisticheskiy slovar'*. Ed. N.I. Tolstoy. Vols. 1–5. Moskva: Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya.

Selivanova, Olena S. 2010. *Lingvistichna entsiklopedya*. Poltava: Dovkillya-K.

Serebrennikov, Borys P. (ed.). 1988. *Rol' chelovecheskogo faktora v yazyke. Yazyk i kartina mira*. Mockva: Nauka.

Sharifian, Farzad. 2015. Cultural Linguistics. In Farzad Sharifian (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Culture*. 473–492. London and New York: Routledge.

SJP online. *Słownik języka polskiego PWN*. https://sjp.pwn.pl (accessed 15 Jan, 2018)

Sprengler, Oswald. 1918. *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*. Wien: Verlag Braumüller.

SSiSL 1996–2017. *Słownik stereotypów i symboli ludowych.* Ed. Jerzy Bartmiński and Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska. Vol. 1(1) 1996; vol. 1(2) 1999; vols. 1(3) and 1(4) 2012; vol. 2(1) 2017. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Stepanov, Yuriy. 1997. *Konstanty. Slovar' russkoy kul'tury. Opyt ussledovanya.* Moskva: Akademicheskiy proyekt.

Tabakowska, Elżbieta. 2004. *Językoznawstwo kognitywne* a *poetyka przekładu.* Kraków: Universitas.

Tambor, Jolanta. 2008. *Mowa Górnoślązaków oraz ich świadomość językowa i etniczna.* Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Tieszen, Bożena. 2018 (in print). The concept of EUROPE as perceived and projected by students at the University of Wisconsin — Milwaukee, USA, and American magazines between 2015–2017. In Wojciech Chlebda (ed.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów,* vol. 2. EUROPA (LASiS 2). Lublin–Opole.

Tischner, Józef. 2017 [1998]. *Krótki przewodnik po życiu.* Kraków: Znak. [fragments of 1998. Przestrzeń jako projekt wolności. In Aniela Dylus (ed.) *Europa. Fundamenty jedności.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Fundacji ATK.]

Tolstaya, Svetlana M. 2006. Postulaty moskovskoy etnolingvistiki. *Etnolingwistyka* 18: 7–27.

Tolstaya, Svetlana M. 2008. *Prostranstvo slova. Leksicheskaya semantika v obshcheclavyanskoy perspektivye.* Moskva*:* Indrik.

Tolstaya, Svetlana M. 2010. *Semanticheskiye kategorii yazyka kul'tury. Ocherki no slavyanskoy etnolingvistike.* Moskva: Knizhnyy dom Librokom.

Tolstaya, Svetlana M. 2013a. Kody kul'tury i kulturnye kontsepty. In Nikita I. Tolstoy and Svetlana M. Tolstaya (eds.) 109–113. *Slavyanskaya etnolingvistika. Voprosy teorii.* Moskva: Institut slavyanovedeniya RAN.

Tolstaya, Svetlana M. 2013b. Nikita Ilyich Tolstoy i ego put' k etnolingvistike. In S. M. Tolstaya and T.А. Агапкина (eds.) *Ethnolinguistica Slavica. K 90-letiyu akademika Nikity Ilyicha Tolstogo*. 10–25. Moskva: Indrik.

Tolstaya, Svetlana M. 2015. *Obraz mira v tekste i rituale.* Moskva: Russkiy font sodeystva obrazovaniyu i nauke.

Tolstoy, Nikita I. and Svetalana M. Tolstaya. 2013. *Slavyanskaya etnolingvistika. Voprosy teorii.* Moskva: Institut slavyano-vedeniya RAN.

Tolstoy, Nikita I. 1990. Yazyk i kul'tura. Nekotorye problemy slavyanskoy etnolingvistiki. *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* L–2: 238–253.

Tolstoy, Nikita I. 1995. *Yazyk i narodnaya kul'tura. Ocherki po slavyanskoy mifologii i etnolingvistike*. Moskva: Indrik.

Tucholsky, Kurt. 1989. Berliner in Österreich? Nein: Sozialisten bei Sozialisten! In *Gesammelte Werke. Ergänzungsband 2: 1911-1932*. Ed. Fritz J. Raddatz. Hamburg: Reinbek bei Hamburg.

Underhill, James. 2012. *Ethnolinguistics and Cultural Concepts: Truth, Love, Hate and War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Underhill, James. 2016. Who wants walls? An ethnolinguistics of insides and outsides. In Piotr Blumczynski and John Gillespie (eds.) *Translating Values. Evaluative Concepts in Translation*. 11–36. London and New York: Plagrave Macmillan.

Vaňková, Irena 2012. Ř a pohoda domova. Glosy o češtině a českém obrazu světa ve světle klíčových slov, In *Ř! Česká národní identita v současném umění. Katalog k výstavě v Galerii Vysoké školy uměleckoprůmyslové v Praze*. 59–66. Praha: Vysoká škola uměleckoprůmyslová.

Vaňková, Irena. 2015. Český pojem domov ve světle jazyko-vých, empirických a textových dat. In Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, and Beata Żywicka (eds.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 1 *DOM* (LASiS 1). 123–148. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS. 123–148.

Vaňková, Irena and Jasňa Pacovská (eds.). 2010. *Obraz člověka v jazyce.* Praha: Univerzita Karlova **v** Praze, Filozofická fakulta.

Vorobyev, Vladimir V. 2008. *Lingvokultorologiya. Teoria i metody.* Moskva: Izd-vo Ros. un-ta druzhby narodov.

Wengeler, Martin (ed.) 2006. *Linguistik als Kulturwissenschaft*. Hildesheim — Zürich — New York: Olms Wiedmann.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1997. *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words. English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yavorska, Galina. 2018 (in print). EVROPA v ukrainskikh tekstakh. In Wojciech Chlebda (ed.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 2. EUROPA (LASiS 2). Lublin–Opole.

Zaliznyak, Anna A., I. B. Levontina, and A. D. Shmelev. 2005. *Klyuchevye idei russkoy yazykovoy kartiny mira.* Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskoy kul'tury.

Zaliznyak, Anna A., I. B. Levontina, and A. D. Shmelev. 2012. *Konstanty i peremennye rysskoy yazykovoy kartiny mira.* Moskva: Yazyki s avyanskikh kul'tur.

Zarzycka, Grażyna. 2004. "Mały leksykon kultury polskiej dla cudzoziemców." Opis koncepcji. In Władysław T. Miodunka (ed.) *Kultura w nauczaniu języka polskiego jako obcego*. 151–161. Kraków: Instytut Studiów Polonijnych i Etnicznych Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Zawadzka-Koch, Dominika. 2018 (in print). In Wojciech Chlebda (ed.) *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, vol. 2. EUROPA (LASiS 2). Lublin–Opole.

Zgółka, Tadeusz. 2006. Etnolingwistyka praktyczna. *Etnolingwistyka* 18: 129–134.

Zhayvoronok, Vitaliy V. 2006. *Znaki ukrainskoy etnokul'tury: slovnik-dovidnik.* Kyiv: Dovira.