The Soul in the Axiosphere from an Intercultural Perspective, Volume One

The Soul in the Axiosphere from an Intercultural Perspective, Volume One

Edited by

Joanna Jurewicz, Ewa Masłowska
and Dorota Pazio-Wlazłowska

CONTENTS

Part II: The linguistic conceptualisation of the soul

Part III: The soul in a traditional culture, language, rituals and beliefs

CONTRIBUTORS

Róbert Bohát — Chapter 9. (translated by the author)
Izabella Bukraba-Rylska — Chapter 4. (translated by *Karolina Sofulak)*
Iwona Burkacka — Chapter 16. (translated by *Marek Mazurowski*)
Fang Xiang (co-author) — *Chapter 7. (translated by the author)*
Dorota Filar — Chapter 1. (translated by *Emilia Leszczyńska*)
Anna Gálisová — Chapter 12. (translated by the author)
Galina Kabakova — Chapter 3. (translated by *Peter Chekin*)
Shahla Kazimova — Chapter 24. (translated by *Michał Krawczyk*)
Joanna Kirilova — Chapter 17. (translated by *Daniela Kirova*)
Michail Kondratenko — Chapter 27. (translated by *Vladyslav Kahal*)
Zdzislaw Kupisiński — Chapter 25. (translated by *Michał Krawczyk*)
Veselinka Labroska (co-author) — Chapter 19. (translated by *Vladimir Cvetkoski*
Olga Makarowska — Chapter 18 (translated by *Vladyslav Kahal*
Roman Marcinkowski — Chapter 8 (translated by the author)
Suzana Marjanić — Chapter 28. (translated by *Milica Jelic*)
Agnieszka Maryniak — Chapter 2. (translated by the author)
Ewa Masłowska — Chapter 20. (translated by *Kamila Wysłucha*)
Violeta Nikolovska (co-author) — Chapter 19. (translated by *Vladimir Cvetkoski*)
Dorota Pazio-Wlazłowska — Chapter 5. (translated by *Wladyslav Kahal*)
Lucie Saicová Římalová — Chapter 6. (translated by the author)
Alena Rudenka (co-author) — Chapter 7. (translated by the author)
Maria Skab — Chapter 15. (translated by *Nadia Sadovnyk-Chuchvaha*)
Marian Skab — Chapter 14. (translated by *Nadia Sadovnyk-Chuchvaha*)
Kamila Stanek — Chapter 22. (translated by *Maciej Żurawski*)
Karina Stempel-Gancarczyk — Chapter 26. (translated by *Marek Mazurowski*)
Joanna Szadura — Chapter 21. (translated by *Michał Krawczyk*)

James Underhill   Chapter 13. (author is a British native
                           speaker)
Marina Valentsova   Chapter 10. (translated by *Makhovikova
                           Diana Vladimirovna*)
Irena Vaňková)   Chapter 23 (translated by *Lucie Chlumska*)

INTRODUCTION

Axiosphere of the Soul in Intercultural Perspective is the work of many authors, representing not only different cultures but also multiple disciplines. The essays collected in two volumes form an interdisciplinary discourse (religious, philosophical, historical, ethnocultural and sociocultural, literary and linguistic) focusing on two keywords: soul and values. A multicultural approach to the problem of the soul allows for an insight into its implementation on a microscale, focused on national/regional specificity, as well as on the macro scale, oriented on universal values attributed to the soul from the point of view of human spiritual needs, which can be observed in the cultures of peoples distant from each other in time as well as in space.

This two-volume monograph is a continuation of the international and interdisciplinary debate over the anthropological and linguistic images of the soul in intercultural perspective that opened in 2015 as part of the conference "The World through the Eyes of the Soul – The Soul in the Eyes of the World", which resulted in a two-volume publication under the same title.[1] The contributions included in this volume are the result of the next conference from this series, devoted to axiological problems, which took place in Warsaw in 2017.[2] Due to the fact that many authors

---

[1] *Antropologiczno-językowe wizerunki duszy w perspektywie międzykulturowej* (2 vols.). Vol. 1, *Dusza w oczach świata*, ed. Ewa Masłowska and Dorota Pazio-Wlazłowska; Vol. 2 *Świat oczyma duszy*, ed. Magdalena Kapełuś, Ewa Masłowska and Dorota Pazio (Warsaw: Institute of Slavic Studies and Oriental Studies, University of Warsaw, 2016).

[2] The second international conference of the series *Anthropological and Linguistic Images of the Soul in Intercultural Perspective*, titled *Aksjosfera duszy – dusza w aksjosferze*, was held in Warsaw on October 19-21, 2017, organized by Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences and Oriental Studies, University of Warsaw and The Slavic Foundation. The Multilanguage's (Slavic) publication of the contributions of the conference is located in the repository ireteslav: Joanna Jurewicz, Ewa Masłowska, Dorota Pazio-Wlazłowska (ed.), *Antropologiczno-językowe wizerunki duszy w perspektywie międzykulturowej,* t.3. *Aksjosfera duszy – dusza w aksjosferze*, Warszawa: Instytut Slawistyki PAN, 2018: http://www.ireteslaw.ispan.waw.pl/handle/123456789/1065

participated in both sessions, their articles represent in some cases the further development of previously held views.

The two-volume monograph consists of 39 chapters, in six parts (three in each volume), addressing the fundamental themes of human existence, subject to axiological reflection, which find expression in cultural texts in the colloquial and artistic language, and also have a prominent place in the anthropological, psychological, metaphysical and theological debate.

Volume One consists of three parts:

1) *The soul from the perspective of the humanities*
2) *Conceptualization of the soul in a language*
3) *The soul in traditional language and culture: folklore, ceremonies, rituals and beliefs*

Part One, *The soul from the perspective of the humanities*, opens with a chapter by Dorota Filar dedicated to two extensive narratives about the soul and body from the perspectives of metaphysics and psychology, mutually interacting and shaping the way of thinking of modern man. The psychological perspective (from the point of view of neuropsychology) is also present in the second chapter, in which Agnieszka Maryniak attempts to explain disease processes taking place in the brain causing changes in the personality (the soul). On the other hand, Galina Kabakova's essay refers to the "carnal narrative" about the soul by showing the emotional functions of the soul in relation to other bodily organs (especially the heart) responsible for emotions. The field of emotional expression is related to the article by Dorota Pazio-Wlazłowska, devoted to the metaphor of the soul of the home in Russian lingvoculture. The sociological approach is presented in the articles by Izabella Bukraba-Rylska, about attempts to manipulate the soul of the Polish peasant, and Lucie Saicová Římalová, about the soul of a child in discourse led by mothers on internet forums.

The second part, devoted to the conceptualization of the soul in language, contains 13 essays, in which multilingual images of the soul and the values assigned to it are presented in works based on different levels of language:

a) Phraseology and paremiology: Marina Valentsova reconstructs the axiological idea of the soul in Ukrainian, Iryna Chybor investigates the mythological and Christian imagination about soul in Ukrainian, Anna Galisová explores the interdependence of spiritual values and the concept of the soul in the Slovak language image of the world, Joanna Kirilova directs attention to the functioning of the concept of the soul in the

axiological aspect in Bulgarian, Violetta Nikolovska and Veselinka Labroska study the semantics and phraseology of the lexeme *soul* in the contemporary Macedonian language in confrontation with the definition of the soul of the Byzantine theologian and saint, Maximus the Confessor;

b) Through lexicographical and semantic data: Maria Skab presents the concept of the soul in Ukrainian (with reference to other Slavic languages) on the basis of historical and contemporary, etymological, phraseological and associative dictionaries. Roman Marcinkowski reproduces the meaning of the soul (*nefesz*) based on idioms and metaphors in the Hebrew Bible, and Róbert Bohát shows the role of the soul as a cognitive and experiencing (emotional) subject in the biblical language image of the world. On the other hand, the issues of nomination of disease states indicating the lack of mental balance (disease of the soul) in three languages (Chinese, Russian and English) are introduced by Alena Rudenka and Fang Xiang, and James Underhill presents the interpreter's dilemmas in the synonymous use of *heart/soul* lexemes in texts (using the examples of English, French, German and Czech);

c) At the level of word formation, Iwona Burkacka analyzes the semantics of compound adjectives (such as *magnanimous* or *mean-spirited*) derived from the lexeme *soul,* and Marian Skab presents the functioning of the soul and its derivatives in Ukrainian acts of communication;

d) On the basis of the analysis of internet memes (motivators and especially demotivators), Olga Makarowska examines the image of the values (attributes, qualities) attributed to the soul today in relation to the archetypal features of the concept.

In contrast, different nation-specific linguistic images of the soul in the world of values emerge, especially from ethnolinguistic analyses, in the third part, where cultural codes and language are treated together. Taking into account the belief base and folklore material allows us to discover meanings that are realized in specific cultural contexts. The problem of guilt and the punishment of sin in Polish folk culture is mentioned in two articles: Ewa Masłowska treats the concept of mercy as central in the axiosphere of the soul (passage of the soul to Heaven) and Zdzisław Kupisiński takes up folk images of God's Particular Judgment which awaits the soul after death. Joanna Szadura attempts to reconstruct the traditional image of the presence of the soul in the body, typical of Polish culture, based on the analysis of lexis and dialect texts. Kamila Stanek, on the other hand, introduces the secrets of "the soul's designing" of a child in Turkish tradition by giving him names that contain a message about the soul. The ethical problem in relation to profiling the soul in Czech culture

is investigated by Irena Vaňková based on Czech phraseology and lyrics from contemporary Czech songs. Michail Kondratenko compares the vocabulary in Northern Russian and Upper German dialects, proving that their peripheral location away from cultural centres determines linguistic conservatism and that the analysis of lexis and semantics related to the soul reveals the archetypal layers of tradition and the assessment of the soul as the most important attribute of humanity. Similarly, Shahla Kazimova, in the article devoted to Azerbaijani folk literature, discovers ancient, pre-Islamic layers of totemistic and animistic beliefs included in the way of perceiving the soul. Karina Stempel-Gancarczyk describes the dialogues of the living with the souls of the dead, "heard" at Orthodox cemeteries in Romania and Catholic necropolis in Poland. The analysis of inscriptions placed on tombstones reveals the mediating role of the soul in dealing with the supernatural reality attributed to it by the families of the deceased, who expect its advice, prayers, and support. The cultural-linguistic debate is closed by the confrontational approach to worldviews represented by Christian churches denying the existence of an animal soul in relation to the positions held by pre-Christian and non-Christian religions and Christian folklore, as well as representatives of unorthodox theology (John Wesley) and philosophy (Tom Regan).

The reader will find the continuation of the present discussion in volume two of the monograph, which contains studies from different perspectives: artistic assessments of the soul (in literature and the arts), mystic and theological reflections on spirituality in the Christian religion as well as in the Orient and Ancient Egypt. The contributions of volume two will afford the viewer a wider perspective on the concept of the soul in its ethical, emotional and theological dimensions, in the European and Non-European cultures and languages, in their artistic, philosophical and religious texts.

On behalf of the authors,
Ewa Masłowska

PART I:

THE SOUL FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF HUMANITIES

CHAPTER 1

"METAPHYSICS" AND "PSYCHOLOGY": TWO NARRATIVES OF THE SOUL AND BODY IN POLISH. A LINGUISTIC/CULTURAL APPROACH

DOROTA FILAR
MARIA CURIE-SKŁODOWSKA UNIVERSITY IN LUBLIN, POLAND

1.1. Introduction

This study relies on the definition of language as an interpretation of the world, motivated by experiential and cultural factors. Linguistic-plus-cultural meaning is thus captured as culturally-defined conceptual models, as interpretations of the universe we live in. At the same time, linguistic worldview is not a static, frozen construct. On the contrary, I assume that language as "grand narrative" is an imagistic story of how we perceive reality and how things "happen" in the world.

Linguistic worldview comes in the form of diverse portions of knowledge, offered to the speakers of a given language in the lexicalized content, grammaticalized relations, verbalized axiologies, and historically accumulated experiences, building up a comprehensive conceptualization. The richer the history and the tradition of a given speech community, the larger the complexity and diversity of the views that acquire their linguistic manifestation. Knowledge is not a state and is never exhaustively "formatted" and confined: it is constantly changing. This is particularly visible in the case of words that are "semantically sensitive" to changing worldviews, to collective thinking and individual consciousness, the values and assumptions that one makes about the world and human nature. The lexeme analyzed in this chapter, *dusza* ("the soul" in Polish) is a good example of a word of this kind.

Out of the numerous meanings of the word, for the purpose of the present analysis, I have selected two that I consider fundamental in contemporary Polish:[1]

- "the divine, eternal aspect of a human being" (*dusza₁*).
- "the mental and intellectual aspect of a human being" (*dusza₂*).

The focal point of my interest is that they both belong to **two different narratives**. Each of them comes from a somewhat different source, represents a different understanding of human existence and generally of what it means to be human. For the sake of the analysis, one of them will be referred to as the metaphysical narrative, while the other as the psychological narrative.

1.2. Language as a "grand narrative", a word as "micro-narrative"

Narrative and storytelling "were born with humanity" (Barthes 1968, 327). They have always been the basic forms of cultural and individual expression, even though initially they were linked to the structure of a literary work.[2] Nowadays, however, narratives are understood in a broader sense and encompass the schemas of human thinking and behaviours as natural elements within active human scale (Fauconnier and Turner 2002, 312). Reflection on narratives has been enriched by input from psychologists, linguists, philosophers and neuroscientists.[3] It is claimed in these studies that "describing our lives as well as the processes and events that take place in the world" (Rosner 2003, 12) is a fundamental function of narrative as a universal cognitive procedure:

> Narrative imagining – a story – is a fundamental instrument of thought. Rational capacities depend upon it. It is our chief means of looking into the future, of predicting, planning and explaining. (Turner 1996, 4-5)

---

[1] *Dusza* has many other meanings, including metaphorical ones, that are derived from its semantic potential and textual uses.

[2] I refer here to the entire history of the term "narrative", from Aristotle and Plato to literary theory and contemporary transdisciplinary definitions.

[3] The authors of publications devoted to narratives often elaborate on the development of the theory of narration. The Polish scholars who have published on the topic include Rosner (2003), Trzebiński (e.g. 2002), Burzyńska (2008), Filar (2013, 2015, 2016), and others.

For a long time, linguistics has capitalized on the achievements of frame theory (Fillmore, e.g. 1982 and 1985), scripts (Taylor 1995, 87-88), scenarios (Lakoff 1987, 285-286, Langacker 2008, 531-535) and frameworks,[4] which allow us to describe linguistic meanings within dynamic systems, in the context of events and cause-effect relationships. Many other researchers, including Polish ones, without directly employing the terms related to the study of narratives, use a method of defining that takes into account the "tools" characteristic of a narrative, e.g., the subject, intention and purpose of an action, cause and effect relations, the chronology of events. The conceptual narrative procedure may, therefore, act as a foundation for describing the meaning of a word in a complex, dynamic form that distinguishes a protagonist, uses temporal and causal relations, presents the world through the lens of human intentions, goals and value, and relates to the narrative view of reality as a space-time and cause-effect continuum, motivated by culture and worldview.

I assume that language is **a kind of a grand narrative**,[5] an imagistic story of how we perceive reality and how things "happen" in the world, within an intersubjective cultural space. Interlinked fragments of the

---

[4] Work on schemas is usually associated with Schank, Abelson, and Mandler et al. The authors consider scripts, stories and scenes to be vital elements of the organization of knowledge. Other concepts have also been inspiring, for example, those that analyze certain dynamic systems of knowledge, e.g., the theory of conceptual frames as described by Minsky and Barsalou and–in linguistics–Fillmore's theory of semantic frames (1982, 1985). In Poland, Ryszard Tokarski uses frame theory in his study of the semantics of colours (Tokarski 1995). I have discussed the topic extensively elsewhere (Filar 2013, 47-64), comparing different views and different theories of schemas.

[5] The concept of metanarratives (grand narratives) and micro-narratives (small narratives) comes from the philosophy of history and has been proposed by Lyotard 1997. It can be inspiring for semanticists, but one reservation has to be kept in mind: the terms "grand narrative" and "micro-narrative" themselves must be categorically redefined within the field of linguistics. Language is a "creation" produced by a society that shares a language and culture and, just like other grand culture-shaping narratives, it does not have a single author (Dryll 2010, 178). It expresses meanings that are linked to the most vital problems of the human existence, opinions and values. I do not, however, analyze here the main theme of Lyotard's *The Postmodern Condition*: the crisis of metanarratives and the lack of trust for the "grand narratives" that is typical of postmodernism (see e.g. Lyotard 1997, 20).

"grand" narrative of language understood in this way might be found and read in its smaller elements (e.g., lexical items). The essence of a narrative description of meaning is the assumption that units of language can activate micro-narratives imprinted in their meanings. This is because word meanings contain human attitudes and "scenarios of human behavior" connected with the portion of reality expressed in and through a given word. Therefore, sometimes the histories inherent in lexical meanings are in a way "coiled up", they constitute a micro-narrative "folded stories", apparently without being directly appreciated by speakers. But thanks to our cultural, social, and experiential knowledge, we are easily able to "expand" these histories to their full form most readily accepted by the human mind: in the words of Fauconnier and Turner, to "come up with a story" (2002: 312). Therefore, language, understood here as an interpretation of the world, motivated by experiential and cultural factors, can be analyzed as a narrative. The central element of the model, with consequences for language-entrenched conceptualizations, is the protagonist of the story: a *homo narrator* equipped with the "human scale" necessary for interpreting the universe.

The Polish lexeme *dusza* is an exceptional word since each of its two basic meanings is "woven" into a different story about humans.

1.3. The soul in metaphysics and psychology and the linguistic meaning of *dusza*

The views of philosophers and psychologists evolve constantly; they depend on the findings of the most recent research and on the dominant model of humanity and the world proposed by sciences at a given point in time. How and to what an extent could these views influence the formation of linguistic meanings?

Metaphysics is, in general, devoted to studying the reality beyond our senses and beyond the physical (in Greek, *metá* means "above, after, super", see Kowalczyk 1997). In Polish, the word *metafizyka* (metaphyscs) is often used colloquially to describe things that are "difficult to understand, mysterious or impossible to grasp through one's senses" (Bańko 2000); it can be used to refer to "problems such as life after death, death itself, love or experiencing the presence of God" (Bańko 2000). As it

evolves through the ages, metaphysics has been defined in various ways.[6] In Polish, the presence and influence of Christian metaphysics have been particularly notable.

Today, one can notice "the metaphysical narrative" in systemic and textual meanings of *dusza*, even if "the belief in the existence of divine souls created by God is a part of human philosophy that is not embraced by everyone" (Wierzbicka 1999, 52).

The other relevant meaning of the word *dusza* defines the soul as "the mental aspect of a human being" (Bańko 2000). It is a synonym of "psyche" or "a person's characteristic features and internal processes, emotions, intellect, capabilities and experiences that are specific for the person and that define the person's abilities" (Bańko 2000). "The study of the human psyche and the rationale behind human behaviours" is, in turn, *psychology* (Bańko 2000). The subject of psychological research has evolved significantly,[7] changing from the soul as the state of one's emotions and consciousness to the physiological processes that happen within the nervous system and motivate human behaviour. In contemporary Polish dictionaries, the first meaning being presented (i.e., the basic one) is related to psychological knowledge.

Can we assume that the meanings of *dusza* remain "insensitive" to the evolution of our knowledge about the world? The answer seems obvious, but an objective analysis of the dependencies involved calls for more precise theoretical and methodological assumptions.

---

[6] These various definitions include metaphysics as a study of the basic matters related to existence and its ultimate reason, a study of all that is fundamental, essential and common, as well as a study devoted to God, the human soul and the spiritual world. Other perspectives encompass the preception of the absolute as the source of moral values, *a priori* knowledge (Kant), or intuitive knowledge (Bergson) (based on Kowalczyk 1997).

[7] It was defined as, for example, conscious experiences (the soul as the sum of ongoing processes that happen in the psyche), the development of human higher functions in history and culture, active and intentional experiences, perceptional processes, objectively observed sets of human behaviours, "the unconscious awareness", subjectivity, sociobiological determinants of human nature, physiological mechanisms of the nervous system that motivate human behaviours. The so-called popular psychology and its conception of the human being have also been appreciated in scientific inquiry (see Łukaszewski 2000).

1.4. Linguistic meaning as an interpretation of the world

Questions about the essence of meaning have been asked since antiquity. Nevertheless, meaning–including linguistic meaning–still cannot be considered as fully investigated, nor can the term *meaning* be regarded as fully defined. As many researchers note: "even the most basic issues—for example, the role of cognition in semantics—are points of chronic and continued contention". (Langacker 2008, 27). Contemporary researchers, however, are privileged in that they can rely on well-established traditions and an abundance of various theoretical and analytical approaches.

In this study, I refer to anthropological–cognitive and cultural–perspectives, in which semantics is the description of the way that people perceive the world and express their psychological, biological and cultural experience through language. Contemporary studies of this kind use the achievements of cognitive and cultural linguistics, as well as invaluable finding in the fields of the philosophy of language and cultural anthropology.[8]

The method of analysis adopted in this research comes from studies concerned with the notion of linguistic worldview: they have for years marked one of the most important directions in Polish linguistics. [9]

---

[8] I refer to the inspirations based on the views of Wilhelm von Humboldt, Edward Sapir or Benjamin L. Whorf, as well as numerous works that have shaped the contemporary map of linguistic research–works that belong to the cognitive branch of linguistics, as well as those that focus on cultural and anthropological aspects of language. (To name but a few: George Lakoff, Mark Johnson, Ronald Langacker, Charles J. Taylor, Charles Fillmore, Anna Wierzbicka, Gary B. Palmer and Farzad Sharifian. Many other scholars have studied these topics, but it is impossible to mention them all.)

[9] Sources and inspirations for the studies devoted to linguistic worldview have their roots in German philosophy (mainly the work of Wilhelm von Humboldt) and in American cognitive anthropology (Sapir and Whorf). The present chapter follows, above all, to tradition and research directions marked out by research pursued in Lublin, Poland, especially by two major research teams. One of them has been engaged in two research programs: *Językowy obraz świata* "Linguistic worldview" and *Alternatywne sposoby kształtowania obrazu świata w systemie językowym i tekstach* "Alternative ways of shaping the worldview in the language system and texts" (the scholars involved include, among others, Ryszard Tokarski, Anna Pajdzińska, Dorota Filar, Dorota Piekarczyk, Aneta Wysocka, Katarzyna Sadowska-Dobrowolska and Elwira Bolek). The other group is an ethnolinguistic team (Jerzy Bartmiński, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Ewa Masłowska,

Developed and modified over a few decades, they are based on the assumption that linguistic worldview cannot be defined as a "reflection" of reality in language, but as its subjective (in the sense of subject-oriented) interpretation, where the conceptualising subject is in fact understood intersubjectively and collectively. That interpretation is entrenched and expressed in the lexicon, grammar, and texts of a given language. It is anthropocentrically motivated by people's experiences, biology, and culture, as well as being linked, through reciprocal dependence, with the sphere of values and beliefs concerning humans and their world. In short, it is "ingrained" in the entire body of world knowledge.

At the same time, linguistic worldview is not a frozen construct, or a set of "static images" to be found in language. On the contrary, I assume that language as "grand narrative" is an imagistic story of how we perceive reality and how things "happen" in the world, within an intersubjective cultural space; this is why I regard narrativity as one of the crucial aspects of linguistic worldview. As I see it, linguistic worldview is a "dynamic, multi-layered narrative that resembles the human understanding of the world" (Filar 2013: 186).

1.5. Two narratives about the soul in contemporary Polish

Each of the two key meanings of the lexeme *dusza* (*dusza₁* and *dusza₂*) comes from a different source of knowledge about the world, capitalizes on different beliefs and, eventually, differently interprets the essence of being human. Therefore, each belongs to a different narrative about humans–a narrative that is motivated by worldview, language and culture. These two interpretations were not "born in language", but were instead added to the meaning of words in the long process of accumulating knowledge about humans and of forming beliefs that have migrated to collective consciousness.

On the general level, one can define these two approaches as "platonic spiritualism" and "psychophysical materialism". However, Polish colloquial linguocultural consciousness is closer to two other socially sanctioned views, each of them "promoting" a different image of the soul. Each interprets its provenience in a different way and each views its

---

Joanna Szadura, Urszula Majer-Baranowska, Małgorzata Brzozowska, Marta Nowosad-Bakalarczyk, Beata Maksymiuk-Pacek, Katarzyna Prorok, Urszula Bielińska-Gardziel, Sebastian Wasiuta and several others).

somatic connection to the human sphere as well as the "scenario of events" associated with the soul in a different manner. These two worldviews are:

- a traditional religious interpretation of the world and
- the scientific model of reality based on scientific progress, especially in the fields of philosophy, biology and medicine.

1.6. *Dusza*: "the divine element" versus "the mental aspect"

Depending on what we take the soul to be, its existence might be just a derivative of one's beliefs or it can be scientifically proved. Language follows both of these perspectives.

Firstly, *dusza*$_1$ is **"the divine element of a person"**. It is a linguistic manifestation of metaphysical intuition, which is difficult to verify and which allows for interpreting the nature of humans in a religious perspective. Secondly, *dusza*$_2$ is **"a mental, psychological aspect of a person**, associated with their emotions, mental states and processes, and thinking". This meaning, to a large extent, corresponds to the state of contemporary psychological and medical knowledge about humans. The first meaning introduces a perspective that is, within the present chapter, linked to a broadly defined metaphysics. The second meaning opens a narrative that I call "psychological". Apparently, they do not seem to be in conflict; one may even say that they both "tell the story of the same object", defined in two separate ways. However, a more detailed semantic analysis shows that each meaning implies a different definition of the human being and each tells a different "story about humans". One of the major disparities is the way in which the relation between the soul and the body is defined and understood within each perspective.

It is usually assumed that the image of the human being, as it is expressed in Polish, is dualistic (person as the soul and the body).[10] Wierzbicka maintains that this concept dominated the entirety of Western philosophy and culture for a long time: "Undoubtedly, dualism is a characteristic feature of the traditional, current Western philosophy and it results from its traditionally Christian provenance" (1999, 530). The conviction that a human being "as a whole" is composed of a spiritual and

---

[10] Extensive research confirms this assumption, cf. Grzegorczykowa 1999, Czaja 2005, Maćkiewicz 2006, Filar 1993, 2012, 2014, 2016, Lisczyk 2012, Piasecka 2013 among many others.

a physical sphere and the two aspects have a common subject, the human "I" (which spans the physical and spiritual aspects of life and cognition) is ingrained in "popular philosophy" and expressed in the lexical and semantic layer of the Polish language (e.g., in its phraseology and numerous lexicalized metaphors).[11] How is this spiritual-and-corporeal unity of humans understood? In a simplified description, it might be said that lexical and semantic data present two paths, and each of them proposes a slightly different interpretation of this issue.

The "psychological" meaning of $dusza_1$ is listed first in all contemporary dictionaries. It can be assumed that this is because it is the currently dominant meaning of the word. However, following the process of semantic development of *dusza*, my analysis begins with an investigation of the word's origin. There is ample evidence suggesting that *dusza* is "entangled in a metaphysical narrative".

1.7. The soul in a metaphysical narrative

One of the key meanings of the lexeme *dusza* is associated with **religion**. It is defined as, for example, "the intangible element of a person, considered immortal and believed to leave the human body after a person's death" (Bańko 2000); or: "according to the majority of religious beliefs and trends in idealistic philosophy: an intangible and immortal aspect of a person, which animates the body and leaves it at the moment of death" (Szymczak 1996).

1.7.1. Where does the soul "come from"?

The linguistic "metaphysical narrative" begins with the mystery of the soul's provenance. We say *dusza **ludzka*** "the **human** soul", but within the linguistic/cultural model discussed, human beings are neither the creators of the soul nor the sources from which the soul arises. It is difficult to find a definitive explanation to this problem by means of a semantic analysis of the contemporary Polish lexicon or a survey of contemporary dictionaries of the language. However, some argumentation might be proposed on the basis of etymological data. Grzegorczykowa analyses the results of Polish

---

[11] Human existential unity understood in this way was not and is not an indisputable aspect of philosophy, religion, or psychology. Depending on one's worldview, spirituality and corporeality are analyzed within the framework of dualism, monism, pluralism, or personalism. All of these paradigms are internally complex. (For a broader discussion see Filar 2016.)

etymological research and notes that the Polish semantic unit *dusza* has its morphological roots in the pre-Slavic words *duša* and *duch* (*duch* can mean either "spirit" or "ghost"); in Polish, *dusza* has undergone a semantic concretization and now "refers to 'that "portion" of the spirit that can be identified in a person. It corresponds to the theological-philosophical concept that defines the soul as an entity which achieves individualism in connection with matter" (Grzegorczykowa 1999, 337). Interestingly, a similar reasoning has been documented in a few older dictionaries, e.g., in *Słownik Warszawski* "The Warsaw Dictionary" (Karłowicz, Kryński and Niedźwiedzki 1900), which, among other definitions, proposes that *dusza* is "'**an individual spirit**' that–together with the body–constitutes a human being" (emphasis D.F.).

Many aspects of Polish linguistic/cultural conceptualization have undoubtedly been influenced by the Christian worldview, according to which God "bestows" souls on people. In contemporary Polish, there is no extensive phraseology and there are no lexicalized metaphors or semantic derivatives of the lexeme *dusza* that could clearly support the belief that the soul comes from God. There is only one indication, a minor one, of the belief that souls are God-given: the expression *oddać duszę Bogu* "to give one's soul back to God", in the sense of "die". This could signal that the soul was originally given to a person by God, but only if the verb *oddać* is used in the sense "to give a thing that was for some time at the disposal of someone else back to the owner" (e.g. to give someone's money back to them, to return a book to a library, etc)[12]. The expression *ktoś/człowiek Bogu ducha winny* "someone/a person owes God their soul", synonymous with being innocent, might also be used as evidence of the relationship between the soul and God. However, this problem, as I have already noted, is not interpreted clearly or unambiguously in contemporary Polish. Much more can be seen in various texts,[13] especially in those that use typical, conventionalized images associated with the word *dusza*:

---

[12] In other contexts a verb *oddać* means to 'give', e. g. the expression *oddać komuś ostatnią koszulę* – to "give someone your last shirt" in the sense of sharing everything you have with others.

[13] I do not, however, use religious or theological texts even though they describe the relationship between the soul and God in a very effective way. Nevertheless, they cannot, similarly to other specialized texts that are not based on everyday consciousness, be treated as reflections of common knowledge entrenched in the Polish language.

Boże, czemuś **dał duszę,** co snu musi żebrać, —
I życie, które można tak łatwo odebrać?
I czemuś **mnie** z takiego **utworzył marliwa,**
Że mnie w tę obcą ciemność byle noc porywa?
(Bolesław Leśmian, *Pogrzeb*; emphasis D.F.)

God, why have you **given a soul** that has to beg for sleep, —
And a life that can be taken away so easily?
Why have you **made me** of such a **dead-matter,**
That a mere night sweeps me into that strange darkness?
(Bolesław Leśmian, *Funeral*; emphasis D.F.)

The "speaking I" addresses God who "has given a soul" and "made" humans by doing so. The neologism *marliwo* (translated as "dead-matter") was created from the stem in *umrzeć, umierać* "to die, to be dying" in the variant that is used in forms such as *z**mar**li, u**mar**li* "the dead ones". A characteristic nominal suffix was added to the stem–the same one that can be found in words such as *twor**zywo**, pal**iwo*** (these two mean, respectively, "the substance from which something is made" and "fuel").[14] The human body is, therefore, compared to an ephemeral, perishable "material", in which God's intention "materializes". In (numerous) texts that reflect these typical beliefs, the scenario that is entrenched in popular conceptualization becomes fully visible: someone receives the soul from God who, by merging it with a physical (perishable) body, creates a human being.

The soul is what brings life to this entire system, as is clearly visible in many expressions that use the word *dusza* to refer to "life": e.g., *ujść z duszą* "to make it out alive" (or, literally, "to escape with one's soul"), *paść/leżeć bez duszy* "to collapse soulless, to collapse dead", *wyzionąć ducha/duszę, oddać duszę* "to die" (lit. "to breathe out one's soul"). This is indicated in older dictionaries, e.g., in Linde's dictionary (1807-1814), which connects the word *dusza* with metaphorical "life", whereas *bezduszny* "soulless" means "dead". (In contemporary Polish, *bezduszny* is usually used to mean "heartless, cruel".)

Grzegorczykowa observes that "Polish terms for the spirit and the soul, *duch* and *dusza*, respectively, belong to a group of lexemes that are etymologically linked to the pre-Slavic verb **dъchnǫti,* which means 'to

---

[14] In Polish, *tworzyć* means "to create" and *tworzywo* refers to the material that is used to create something. *Palić* means "to burn" and *paliwo* means "fuel"–something that is used to create fire or propel an engine (cf. Grzegorczykowa 1984, 347).

breathe'" (1993, 333), and thus, just like in the entire family of Slavic languages, they are conceptually motivated by the notion of breath. Breath–as the most fundamental physical aspect of life, a sign of actually being alive–motivates the connection between *dusza* and the concept of LIFE. Undoubtedly, in the case of "the metaphysical narrative about the soul", the etymological foundation and the biblical tradition are important. Pajdzińska (1999) discusses the conceptual, experiential, semantic and religiously motivated links between the concepts of LIFE, BREATH, SPIRIT, and SOUL in Polish (as well as in other languages). Furthermore, she cites numerous fragments of different Polish translations of the Bible, in which the creation of humans is associated with the image of God breathing life into the human body.[15]

The phraseological units *życie doczesne, życie ziemskie* "the earthly life, the worldly life" and *życie wieczne, dusza nieśmiertelna* "the eternal life, the immortal soul", reveal different aspect of life as being associated with the soul in the "metaphysical narrative" from the one linked with the body. The adjectives *doczesny* "earthly" and *ziemski* "worldly" refer to evanescence and ephemerality. In turn, *wieczny* "eternal" and *nieśmiertelny* "immortal" refer to spheres beyond these boundaries. The mortal body and the soul that continues to exist after the body dies–the immortal soul–are present in the popular expression *dusze zmarłych* "the souls of the dead": "the immortal souls of those who are physically dead".

1.7.2. How to describe the soul?

Polish colloquial linguacultural consciousness captures the soul and the body as a dualistically understood whole, as in the expression *duszą i ciałem* "with one's soul and body", which means "**completely**, totally, fully". In Polish, this model operates as the CONTAINER METAPHOR: there is a bodily shell, in which the soul can be found, like in *wielka dusza w małym ciele* "a big soul **in** a small body", and one may, for example,

---

[15] For example, in Jakub Wujek's translation of *Genesis* into Polish: *Utworzył tedy Pan Bóg człowieka z mułu ziemie, i natchnął w oblicze jego dech żywota, i stał się człowiek w duszę żywiącą* "[T]hen the LORD God formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living being"; or, in *The Wisdom of Solomon*: *[Bóg], który weń tchnął duszę, która działa, i natchnął weń ducha żywiącego* "[God] breathed into him an active soul, and breathed in a living spirit" (both Polish quotations come from *The Jakub Wujek Bible*–based on the Vulgate – as quoted in Pajdzińska 1999, 54).

wytrząsnąć/wytrząść czyjąś duszę z ciała "shake one's soul out of the body". The body belongs to the physical, material sphere. It can be defined with physical parameters: colour (cf. a pale, tanned, swarthy body), size (a small or a massive body), shape (a shapely, deformed body), and features that can be recognized by touch (a smooth, rough, soft, lean, toned body), etc.

How to describe the human soul? Wierzbicka describes the meaning of the word *soul* in English (linked to "the metaphysical narrative" discussed here) as connected to the transcendental and religious worldview; it is "one of the two parts of a human being; it cannot be seen" (1999, 527). Nevertheless, in contemporary Polish, there are no lexical units that could confirm or contradict the popular faith in "the invisibility of the soul". Even if contemporary Polish texts refer to the belief that the soul is invisible, in many cases they do not take it literally. As an example, let's analyze one of the aphorisms by Stanisław Jerzy Lec:

> Dusza chyba dlatego potrafi być nieśmiertelna, że jest niewidzialna.
> (Lec, 2006, 249)
> It seems the soul can only be immortal because it is invisible.

Lec alludes to two characteristic features of the soul that are rooted in "the metaphysical narrative": immortality and invisibility. It is interesting that invisibility is simply stated ("it **is** invisible"), while immortality is presented as conditional and modal ("the soul **can/is able to** be immortal").[16] The sequence of cause and effect created in the aphorism ("because") suggests that invisibility is a requirement for immortality and thus all visible beings are subject to death. Is it a metaphysical idea? Or is it a kind of black humor that reveals the nature of human beings who can annihilate anything that they can see (cf. the following Polish expressions: *wyciąć co do jednego, do nogi/co do nogi, w pień, ze szczętem, zabić/ubić wszystko, co się rusza*, which refer to killing everything or everyone that can be seen and counted, everything that is moving)? Is invisibility the only means of survival–whatever the author would like to understand by literal or metaphorical invisibility? The hypothetical character of this thesis is signaled by the appearance of the lexical unit *chyba* "it seems".

---

[16] Cf.: "If we can do something, it means that we have enough strength, experience and abilities to do it when present conditions allow for it" (Bańko 2000, the definition of Polish *potrafić* "can/be able to").

As the analyzed context suggests, the attributes of "invisibility" and "immortality" are conventionalized parts of the meaning of *dusza*, and they are used as a "stable starting point" in the process of using the word. In contemporary texts, they might, however, be reinterpreted in surprising ways that question the literalness of "the metaphysical narrative".

Interestingly, in aiming to tame what is unknowable, members of the Polish linguacultural community try, at times, to "materialize" the soul, make it visible or generally perceptible to one's senses (as in some traditional folk texts). In conventional imagery, the soul is, at times, represented in a "human form"–in a way, of course, that is not fully physical, however it often has biological sex and resembles a dead person (the "owner of the soul"). It might also look like a supernatural being (an angel) possessing certain human features as in one of Julian Tuwim's poems:

> Dusza z ciała wyleciała,
> Na zielonej łące stała.
> Ja pobiegłem, patrzę na nią:
> Nie wiedziałem, żeś ty anioł.
>
> A tyś anioł jak z obrazka,
> Nad twą głową wieńcem łaska,
> Szklane oczy, lniane włosy,
> Suplikacje wniebogłosy.
> (Julian Tuwim 2002, *Piosenka umarłego*)
>
> The soul flew out of the body,
> And stood on a green meadow.
> I ran, I'm looking at it:
> I didn't know you were an angel.
>
> You're an angel, pretty as a picture,
> A wreath of grace above your head,
> Glass eyes, flaxen hair,
> Loud supplications.
> (Julian Tuwim, 2002, *A Dead Man's Song*)

This is a 20th-c. poem but the author uses the stylistics of a medieval song ("The soul flew out of the body")[17] and refers to popular convictions

---

[17]"Dusza z cieła wylecieła"–an incipit of a Medieval Polish song (it is probably a final section in a para-theatrical script) written in a codex of Latin sermons. Today,

based on religion, but not on theology: the soul is an entity that resembles a person. The soul is visible, which is confirmed in the line "I'm looking at it". It has somatic features: the head, the eyes ("glass eyes"), hair ("flaxen hair") and it behaves like a human being (it "stood on a green meadow"). At the same time, it does differ from the typical image of a person because of its angelic aspect ("You're an angel, pretty as a picture"). Iconic representations–and religious paintings in particular–often picture the soul as a material entity (a person). Even when it is a metaphor or an allegory (especially in the Middle Ages), it undoubtedly follows the paths of conventionalized collective imagery.

The visibility/invisibility of the soul and "the form of its existence" can be interpreted in various ways, especially in texts, but they seem to have no unambiguous expression in contemporary Polish. However, even if it is an interesting problem in itself, it is still a secondary issue within the metaphysical narrative, as its most important feature is the fact that *dusza* is "the divine element in a person". It is, then, a moral subject that gives the person an opportunity to experience the world of real values. In Wierzbicka's metalanguage, it can be said, "because of this part [i.e., the soul] a human being can be good" (1999, 526). Many Polish lexical units indicate that the soul itself is also an element that can be subjected to moral judgement–especially with respect to religious values. This belief is embedded in the expressions *grzeszna dusza, dusza zatracona*, *czysta dusza/duszyczka, czystość duchowa, zbawienie duszy* "a sinful soul, a lost soul, a pure soul, spiritual purity, salvation of the soul". *Dusze pokutujące/dusze czyśćcowe* "repentant souls and the souls in purgatory" are particularly interesting expressions. One can help those souls by saying a special prayer–the context associated with these units is clearly religious.

1.7.3. The relation between the soul and the body

In order to understand the unique position of the soul within "the metaphysical narrative", one has to consider–in detail–its relation to the body. The issue is deeply rooted in cultural, philosophical, and ideological beliefs.

Throughout the ages, the attitude to the human somatic sphere has fluctuated between fascination and revulsion, between the cult of the body and the senses and the conviction that the body is in conflict with the

---

this quote is often used as a popular, simple, rhymed saying, with most speakers being unaware of its origin.