

# THE AXIOLOGICAL LEXICON

OF SLAVS AND THEIR NEIGHBOURS

Vol. 1

THE CONCEPT OF HOME

**THE AXIOLOGICAL  
LEXICON  
OF SLAVS AND THEIR NEIGHBOURS**

(English Version, Abridged)

The EUROJOS project operates under the auspices of the following institutions:

THE INSTITUTE OF SLAVIC STUDIES, POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES  
THE INSTITUTE OF POLISH STUDIES, MARIA CURIE-SKŁODOWSKA UNIVERSITY IN LUBLIN  
COMMISSION FOR SLAVIC ETHNOLINGUISTICS, INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF SLAVISTS

The following volumes have been published by the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University Press in Lublin  
as part of the series

## **LEKSYKON AKSJOLOGICZNY SŁOWIAN I ICH SĄSIADÓW**

[The Axiological Lexicon of Slavs and their Neighbours]

edited by Jerzy Bartmiński:

### **DOM**

**[HOME]**

ed.

Jerzy Bartmiński

Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel

Beata Żywicka

(2015)

### **PRACA**

**[WORK]**

ed.

Jerzy Bartmiński

Małgorzata Brzozowska

Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska

(2016)

### **HONOR**

**[HONOUR]**

ed.

Dejan Ajdačić

Petar Sotirov

(2017)

KONWERSATORIUM / SEMINAR



# THE AXIOLOGICAL LEXICON

## OF SLAVS AND THEIR NEIGHBOURS

Jerzy Bartmiński (ed.)

Vol. 1

# The Concept of HOME

(English Version, Abridged)

Lublin 2018

Vol. 1. The Concept of HOME (English Version, Abridged) contains:

- an introductory paper *The Axiological Lexicon of Slavs and their Neighbours – what does it contain, what principles is it based on, who is it intended for?*
- a synthetic outline of the concept HOME – a universal and culture-specific concept;
- summaries of 18 papers on HOME, published in their full version in the volume *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*. [The Axiological Lexicon of Slavs and their Neighbours], T. 1. DOM. Editors: Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University Press, 504 pages;
- a collected bibliography of all papers in the volume.

All texts translated by Klaudia Wengorek-Dolecka, proof-reading Agnieszka Gicala.

Reviewers of individual papers in the volume *Słownik aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*

vol. 1, DOM, Lublin 2015, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej:

Bogusław Bierwiaczonek (Jan Długosz University of Częstochowa, Poland)

Dejan Ajdačić (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine)

Marcin Czerwiński (Jagiellonian University in Kraków, Poland)

Stanisław Gajda (University of Opole, Poland)

Aloyzas Gudavičius (Šiauliai University, Lithuania)

Galina Javorska (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine)

Aleksy Judin (Ghent University, Belgium)

Irina Lappo (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, Poland)

Petar Sotirov (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, Poland)

Svetlana M. Tolstaja (Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia)

Jörg Zinken (University of Mannheim, Germany)

Vol. 1. *The Concept of HOME* (English Version, Abridged) 2018 has been recommended for publication by:

Alena Rudenka (Belarusian State University, Minsk, Belarus)

James Underhill (University of Rouen, France)

© Copyright by Wydawnictwo UMCS, Lublin 2015

ISBN 978-83-227-9106-6

Maria Curie-Skłodowska University Press

20-031 Lublin, ul. I. Radziszewskiego 11

tel. 81 537 53 04

[www.wydawnictwo.umcs.eu](http://www.wydawnictwo.umcs.eu)

e-mail: [sekretariat@wydawnictwo.umcs.lublin.pl](mailto:sekretariat@wydawnictwo.umcs.lublin.pl)

Sales Department, Phone/Fax: 81 537 53 02, 81 537 53 03

e-mail: [wydawnictwo@umcs.eu](mailto:wydawnictwo@umcs.eu)

Internet bookstore: [www.wydawnictwo.umcs.eu](http://www.wydawnictwo.umcs.eu)

Printed by „Elpil”, Artyleryjska 11, 08-110 Siedlce

# Contents

<i>The Axiological Lexicon of Slavs and their Neighbours</i> . What does it contain, what principles is it based on, who is it intended for? (Jerzy Bartmiński) .....	7
*	
HOME – a universal and culture-specific concept (Jerzy Bartmiński) ....	16
* * *	
The concept of <i>ΣΗΙΤΙ</i> ‘home’ in the Greek linguistic worldview (Christina G. Markou) .....	42
<i>NAMAS</i> ‘house’ and <i>NAMAI</i> ‘home’ in the Lithuanian language and culture (Kristina Rutkovska) .....	48
* * *	
The Polish linguistic and cultural worldview of <i>DOM</i> ‘house/home’ and its profiles (Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel) .....	56
Czech concept <i>DOMOV</i> ‘home’ in the light of linguistic, empirical and text data (Irena Vaňková) .....	65
* * *	
The Russian linguistic and cultural view of <i>ДОМ</i> ‘home/house’ (Ludmila L. Fyodorova, Dorota Pazio-Wlazłowska) .....	71
The concept of <i>ДОМ</i> ‘home’ in the Belarusian language (Jadwiga Kozłowska-Doda) .....	78
The concept of <i>ДИМ/ХЫЖА</i> ‘home’ in the Lemko ethnolect (Małgorzata Misiak) .....	85
* * *	
The concept of <i>ДОМ</i> in the Bulgarian linguistic worldview (Maria Kitanova) .....	91
The concept of HOME in Serbian (Stana Ristić, Ivana Lazić-Konjik) .....	99
The croatian linguistic view of <i>DOM</i> today (Amir Kapetanović) .....	106

\* \* \*

The German <i>HAUS</i> and <i>HEIM</i> (Monika Grzeszczak) .....	111
Linguistic-cultural image of HOME in contemporary British English (Joanna Popielska-Grzybowska, Jo B. Harper) .....	117
HOME <i>à la française</i> : in search of the base concept (Elżbieta Skibińska, Aline Viviani) .....	123
CASA – the Portuguese home (Zuzanna Bułat Silva) .....	129

\* \* \*

NYUMBA ‘house, home’ in the Swahili language and culture (Iwona Kraska-Szlenk) .....	135
The <i>EHEN/AGHIWAN</i> ‘house, home’ of Sahara nomads in the light of the opposition between the house/home and the world (Marta Jackowska-Uwadizu) .....	136
The Hausa GIDA ‘house, home’ in opposition to the bush and the world. The cultural perspective (Nina Pawlak) .....	137
IE ‘home/household’ in the linguistic and cultural tradition of Japan (Katarzyna Wyszpolska) .....	138

\* \* \*

Bibliography .....	139
Authors .....	160

## ***The Axiological Lexicon of Slavs and their Neighbours.* What does it contain, what principles is it based on, who is it intended for?**

Jerzy Bartmiński

We place in the hands of our readers the first books of *The Axiological Lexicon of Slavs and their Neighbours* devoted to the concepts of HOME, EUROPE, HONOUR, WORK and FREEDOM. The *Lexicon* is an attempt at a parallel description of the world of Slavic values against a wider comparative background. The title of the *Lexicon* is somewhat arbitrary as this work describes values which are shared not only by Slavic nations, but also by their closer and more distant (sometimes very distant) neighbours.

Values constitute the core of every culture. It is by recognizing values and defining the attitude towards them that individuals and whole communities can determine their own identity. However, the problem of values raises a number of questions: what is a value and for whom it is a value? Is there a canon of universal values? Is there a canon of values which are important for and constitutive of European culture (with the concepts of freedom and equality, dignity, human rights, democracy and tolerance coming to mind first and foremost)? Is there a canon of values that are important for national cultures – values such as nation, homeland, patriotism – and are these values equally important for all national cultures? Are conceptualizations of existential values such as life, health, work, career or money independent of time and geographical context? To what extent are



the concepts of family, marriage and child still important in today's world?

Aware of the financial and temporal constraints placed on them, the present team of authors have focused their attention on only a few values selected from a large set.<sup>1,2</sup> Five entry words have been chosen to start with: HOME and EUROPE, because regardless of our political and axiological choices, we speak of Europe as a “common home” in which we live and in which we would like to feel “at home;” WORK, because, especially in the era of rampant unemployment, it is a subject of particular concern to people; FREEDOM, because it is the flagship value of our part of the world<sup>3</sup>; as well as HONOUR (DIGNITY), because they go back to the roots of European culture, to Ancient Greece, and had been included in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1948. In all cases, it seemed interesting to see to what extent the understanding of these concepts is the same for all national cultures and to what extent it is culture-specific. The keynote of the *Lexicon* is to seek “unity in diversity”.

<sup>1</sup> The initial research plan had been to conduct a comparative study of a much larger number of entry words, see J. Bartmiński, *Kakie cennosti učastvujut v formirovanii jazykovej kartiny mira Slavjan?* [in:] *Etnolingvistička proučavanja srpskog i drugih slovenskih jezika. U čast akademika Svetlane Tolstoj*, edited by Ljubinko Radenković, Beograd 2009, pp. 59–70; an extended version of this article entitled *Jaké hodnoty spoluutvářejí jazykový obraz světa Slovanů?* “Slovo a Slovesnot” 71, Praha, 2010, pp. 329–339, and the Polish version entitled *Jakie wartości współtworzą językowy obraz świata Słowian?* in the book *Polskie wartości w europejskiej aksjoserze*, Lublin 2014, pp. 21–28.

<sup>2</sup> Work on the *Lexicon* was partly supported by an NPRH grant no. 2/H12/81/2012 entitled *Methods of analysis of the linguistic picture of the world in the context of comparative studies*; principal investigator, J. Bartmiński (co-investigators: Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel and Wojciech Chlebda). The grant was awarded to the Institute of Slavic Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences for the years 2012–2015.

<sup>3</sup> It is not by accident that the first volume of a series of papers devoted to the characterization of so-called Polish memorial sites was devoted to freedom; see *Polskie miejsca pamięci. Dzieje toposu wolności*, edited by S. Bednarek and B. Korzeniewski, Warszawa 2014.

The interest taken in values and their role in national cultures has resulted in many publications, both in Poland<sup>4</sup> and in the West<sup>5</sup> and East of Europe<sup>6</sup>. The idea of our *Lexicon* dates back to the early 1990s, when the concept of HOMELAND was described in a collective work in twelve European languages<sup>7</sup>. In its present version, the idea was conceived as part of a program aimed at comparing Slavic languages after the year 1945. The program, presented by Stanisław Gajda, was

<sup>4</sup> To mention such publications as Renata Grzegorzczkowska and Krystyna Waszakowa (eds.) *Studia z semantyki porównawczej* parts I–II, Warsaw 2000–2003; Anna Duszak and Nina Pawlak (eds.), *Anatomia gniewu. Emocje negatywne w językach i kulturach świata*, Warszawa 2003; Stanisław Dubisz, Jerzy Porayski-Pomsta, Elżbieta Sękowska (eds.), *Język – Polityka – Społeczeństwo. Słownik pojęć politycznych i społecznych krajów Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej*, Warsaw 2004; Małgorzata Marcjanik (ed.), *Grzeczność nasza i obca*, Warsaw 2005, *Grzeczność na krańcach świata*, Warsaw 2007, and *Jak zwracają się do siebie Europejczycy?* Warsaw 2013. Particularly close to the idea of the *Lexicon* are the works of Anna Wierzbicka, especially the book *Understanding Cultures through their Key Words. English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese*. Oxford University Press, 1997 (Polish translation *Słowa klucze. Różne języki – różne kultury* by Izabela Duraj-Nowosielska, Warsaw 2007).

<sup>5</sup> Examples of this include the British book series entitled *Key Concepts* which presents the key concepts of social sciences (several books in the series have been published in Polish by the Warsaw-based Sic! Publishing House: *Nacjonalizm, Władza, Demokracja, Etniczność, Prawa człowieka, Lud, Bieda, Liberalizm, Kultura, Zdrowie, Sprawiedliwość* [Nationalism, Power, Democracy, Ethnicity, Human Rights, People, Poverty, Liberalism, Culture, Health, Justice] and others), the German eight-volume glossary of historical concepts edited by Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, and Reinhart Koselleck: *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*. Stuttgart 1972–1997; Bettina Bock and Rosemarie Lühr (eds.) *Normen und Wertbegriffe in der Verständigung zwischen Ost- und Westeuropa*, Frankfurt am Main 2007; Jerzy Bartmiński and Rosemarie Lühr (eds.) *Europa und seine Werte*, Frankfurt am Main 2009.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. the Moscow book series *Logicheskii analiz yazika* edited by N. Arutyunova, published by the Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences; the volumes *Slavyanskaya konceptosfera v сопоставителном освещении. Leksikon*, edited by Yevgeny Stefansky (Samara 2011), *Evoluciya cennostey v yazikah i kulturah* edited by Irina Sedakova (Moscow 2011) and *Kategoriya ocenki i sistema cennostey v yazike i kol'ture* edited by Svetlana Tolstaya (Moscow 2015).

<sup>7</sup> The book *Pojęcie ojczyzny we współczesnych językach europejskich* edited by J. Bartmiński was published in 1993 in Lublin.

devised at Opole University<sup>8</sup> and was preliminarily outlined in papers by Wojciech Chlebda<sup>9</sup> and Jerzy Bartmiński<sup>10</sup>, who developed it in their subsequent publications<sup>11</sup>. The distinguishing feature of our work is that – firstly – it uses an agreed upon system of conceptual tools and a common terminology negotiated in the course of many meetings; secondly – the descriptions are based on a comparable set of sources, and thirdly – the meanings are defined in similar ways. All of this together creates a common theoretical and methodological ground (*tertium comparationis*) which ensures comparability of the parallel descriptions.

We describe values as “cultural constructs”, i.e. concepts which are axiologically marked and have culture-specific connotations. We draw a distinction between *lexemes* as units of the expression plane, on the one hand – and ‘meanings’, CONCEPTS and IDEAS as elements of the content plane, on the other. Accordingly, we use the following graphic conventions: lexemes are written in *italics*, ideas and concepts in SMALL CAPS, and meanings are given in ‘single quotation marks’.

We have decided to base the analyses and descriptions on three types of data. The first type of data (Systemic) are derived from systemic sources (including dictionaries), the second type (Survey) come from “elicited” sources obtained by the survey method, the third type (Textual) originate from texts excerpted from national corpora

---

<sup>8</sup> Stanisław Gajda (ed.), *Komparacja systemów i funkcjonowania współczesnych języków słowiańskich*, Opole 2000.

<sup>9</sup> Wojciech Chlebda, *Plaszczyzny oglądu językowego obrazu świata w opisie semantycznym języka*, [in:] Gajda (ed.) 2000, pp. 163–178.

<sup>10</sup> Jerzy Bartmiński, *Językowy obraz Polaków w okresie przemian*, [in:] Gajda 2000, pp. 179–195.

<sup>11</sup> Jerzy Bartmiński, *Koncepcja językowego obrazu świata w programie slawistycznych badań porównawczych*, “Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej” vol. 40, 2005, pp. 259–280; Jerzy Bartmiński and Wojciech Chlebda, *Jak badać językowo-kulturowy obraz świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów* “Etnolingwistyka. Problemy języka i kultury” vol. 20, 2008, pp. 11–27; Maciej Abramowicz, Jerzy Bartmiński and Wojciech Chlebda, *Językowo-kulturowy obraz świata Słowian na tle porównawczym. Założenia programu “A”*, “Etnolingwistyka” vol. 21, 2009, pp. 341–342.

and high-circulation newspapers and magazines representative of different political and ideological backgrounds (the material base as a whole is referred to with the abbreviation SST). We have also assumed that the comparison should focus on what are considered to be common conceptualisations in the individual languages (the colloquial, standard language variety), and individual conceptions (otherwise always worthy of attention) should be cited only in exceptional cases. The surveys were conducted in comparable groups of approximately 100 students<sup>12</sup> (with balanced numbers of male and female respondents and students of liberal arts and science programs), who were asked one common question, following the example of the Lublin ASA survey,<sup>13</sup> “What do you think is the essence of the real/true X?”

By introducing the modifier “real/true”, we wanted to orient the responses towards the mental dimension (“How do you perceive and conceptualize X?”) rather than towards the physical dimension (“What is X like?”). What we wanted to achieve was to obtain nationally-specific subjective characterizations of the stereotypes of Europe, home, honour, etc., rather than encyclopaedic descriptions. Encyclopaedic definitions of Europe, home, work, freedom or honour inevitably have to be similar, if not identical, in different languages, because they must relate to the objective characteristics of these concepts, i.e. features which are considered important and typical. The modifier “real/true” shifts the perspective to subjective viewing, to what is important to the respondent.<sup>14</sup> The results of the survey

<sup>12</sup> Here, our study makes reference to the comparative studies of the Americans Katz and Braly and the Germans Sodhi and Bergius, who also surveyed representations of one hundred students of different nationalities, see. Uta Quasthoff 1973, pp. 30–49.

<sup>13</sup> See information on ASA (Axiological Dictionary Survey) in articles by Jerzy Bartmiński and Małgorzata Brzozowska in the book *Język–wartości–polityka* 2006, pp. 8–62.

<sup>14</sup> A broader discussion of the differences between the pictures of a “typical” and a “real” entity can be found in the article by Bartmiński 2001 *Operatory “typowy” i “prawdziwy” w strukturze semantycznej tekstu*, “Prace Filologiczne” vol. 46,

are considered in the articles only in a synthetic way. The reader will find a more detailed discussion of them in a separate volume *Nazwy wartości w językach europejskich. Raport z badań empirycznych* [Names of Values in European Languages. A Report on Empirical Research] edited by Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Małgorzata Brzozowska and Beata Żywicka (in press).

The assumption that the authors of the entry words adhered to, then, was not so much to define the concepts themselves in a logical sense, as to diagnose how users of the particular languages understand the values studied. To achieve this objective, the subjectivist conception of “cognitive definition” was adopted as a tool for the explication of meanings. The purpose of the cognitive definition is not so much to describe the meaning of words in an objective way, as to capture the way speakers understand the meanings of words.<sup>15</sup> That is why the authors based their analyses not only on lexicographic definitions given in language dictionaries (which aspire to objectivity as a matter of principle), but also on personal statements made by language users, i.e. texts elicited by the survey method. Obviously, when account was taken of the different ways in which speakers understood the words studied, the authors were bound to find differences between those understandings, which is why the basic explications needed to be systematically supplemented with descriptions of the various typical ways in which the base images are profiled.<sup>16</sup> The well-

---

pp. 41–47; “typical” – ‘the way it is (in the statistical sense)’, “real” – ‘the way it is and the way it should be (in the speaker’s opinion)’.

<sup>15</sup> According to the author of this conception, the cognitive definition “aims to portray the way in which an entity is viewed by the speakers of the language, to represent socially established and linguistically entrenched knowledge of the world, categorisation of its phenomena, their characterization and valuation.” (Bartmiński 1988, p. 169).

<sup>16</sup> See Bartmiński Jerzy, Niebrzegowska Stanisława, *Kognitivnoye opredelenye, profilirovaniye ponyatiy i subektnaya interpretatsiya mira*. [in:] *Kognitivnaya lingvistika konca XX veka. Materialy Mezhdunarodnoy Nauchnoy Konferencyi 7–9 oktyabrya 1997 v treh chastyakh*. I. Minsk 1997, pp. 4–8.

known Cognitive Grammar concept of ‘profiling’<sup>17</sup> was used here in a modified version developed for the purposes of concept profiling.<sup>18</sup>

Studies on the *Lexicon* have been undertaken by an international team of linguists from almost all Slavic and some non-Slavic, mainly European, countries. The researchers are all participants of the seminar EUROJOS created in 2003 at the initiative of the present author under the auspices of OBTA UW (Centre for the Studies of Classical Tradition at the University of Warsaw). In 2009–2015 EUROJOS was affiliated with the Institute of Slavic Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw, and its work was supported by the Institute of Polish Philology of Maria Curie Skłodowska University in Lublin and the Institute of East Slavonic Studies at Opole University. In the years 2012–2015, our research was supported by the NPRH grant mentioned above. Before *the Lexicon* started to be compiled, we had organized a number of working meetings<sup>19</sup> which resulted in the publication of a series of articles on the pages of the annual *Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury* [Ethnolinguistics. Problems of Language and Culture] (volumes 20–26 from the years 2008–2014)<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Ronald Langacker, *Cognitive Grammar. A Basic Introduction* (The Polish translation, *Gramatyka kognitywna. Wprowadzenie*), Kraków 2009, p. 100 and subsequent pages.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. the book *Profilowanie pojęć*, edited by J. Bartmiński, Lublin 1993, and S. Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, *O profilowaniu językowego obrazu świata*, “Poradnik Językowy” 2015, no. 1, pp. 30–44.

<sup>19</sup> See Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, *O pracach konwersatorium EUROJOS*, “Etnolingwistyka” 21, 2009, pp. 343–345; Anna Niderla, *Konferencja EUROJOS-IV na temat etnolingwistycznych badań nad interakcją i tekstem*, “Etnolingwistyka” 22, 2010, pp. 254–255; Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, *Konferencja EUROJOS-V*, “Etnolingwistyka” vol. 23, 2011, pp. 285–290; *O pracach konwersatorium EUROJOS (czerwiec 2013 - marzec 2014)*, “Etnolingwistyka” vol. 26, 2014, pp. 228–230.

<sup>20</sup> See especially articles by Renata Grzegorzczkova *Punkty dyskusyjne w rozumieniu pojęcia językowego obrazu świat - widziane z perspektywy badań porównawczych*, “Etnolingwistyka” vol. 21, 2009, pp. 15–29; *Jeszcze o rozumieniu JOS-u w perspektywie badań porównawczych: problem inwariantu pojęciowego*, “Etnolingwistyka” vol. 23, 2011, pp. 217–225; Jadwigi Puzyniny, *Z problemów opisu językowego obrazu świata – pytania i wątpliwości*, “Etnolingwistyka” vol. 22, 2010, pp. 39–51; Maciej Abramowicz,

and in the Lublin “Red Series” under the collective title *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów* [Values in the Linguistic-cultural Worldview of the World of Slavs and their Neighbours].<sup>21</sup> The articles included both essays regarding theoretical and methodological problems<sup>22</sup> and reports on analyses of selected concepts – beside the five listed above, also concepts such as EQUALITY, DEMOCRACY, NATION, FAMILY; GOODNESS, INTEGRITY and COURAGE; JOY, CAREER, MEMORY, HEALTH and ILLNESS; GUILT and PUNISHMENT, and HOLIDAY and CELEBRATION; cf. also discussions on the opposition FAMILIAR – STRANGE (in volume 20 of “Etnolingwistyka”) and on the values that make up Europe’s “soul” (in volume 23 of “Etnolingwistyka”).

It remains an open question to what extent the descriptions are comparable and what further perspectives of comparison they open. Professor Svetlana Tolstoy, summing up the meeting in 2012, postulated that in future more synthetic approaches should be adopted in this line of research and proposed that the material collected be

---

Jerzy Bartmiński, Wojciech Chlebda, *Punkty sporne i bezsporne w programie EURO-JOS: Odpowiedź na pytania i wątpliwości Profesor Jadwigi Puzyniny*, “Etnolingwistyka” vol. 23, 2011, pp. 227–233.

<sup>21</sup> Three collective volumes have been published: *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów 1*, edited by M. Abramowicz, J. Bartmiński and I. Bielińska-Gardziel, Lublin 2012; *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów 2. Wokół europejskiej aksjofery*, edited by J. Bartmiński, I. Bielińska-Gardziel and S. Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Lublin 2014; *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów 3. Problemy eksplikowania i profilowania pojęć*, edited by I. Bielińska-Gardziel, S. Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska and J. Szadura, Lublin 2014.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. especially S. Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, *Od separacyjnego do holistycznego opisu językowego obrazu świata. Na marginesie dyskusji nad kształtem artykułów w Leksykonie aksjologicznym Słowian i ich sąsiadów* (in the volume *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów 3. Problemy eksplikowania i profilowania pojęć*, edited by I. Bielińska-Gardziel, S. Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska and J. Szadura, Lublin 2014, pp. 71–102); Nina Gryshkova, *Leksem, pojęcie, stereotyp, koncept, znaczenie, idea – propozycja regulacji terminologicznych*, ibidem, pp. 21–50.

analysed in strictly linguistic terms i.e. against the language system.<sup>23</sup> At the current stage of work, we leave it to the editors, authors of the entries and the readers to design such approaches and develop new comparative perspectives. There is also no reason why the list of entry words should not be extended and parallel semantic descriptions should not be proposed.

The *Lexicon* is addressed to all those who are interested in the problems of values and their rank and role in public discourse at both a national and a transnational level. Our publication is intended to contribute to a better understanding between people speaking different languages and to help them establish closer mutual relations. In a special way, the *Lexicon* is addressed to young students of language arts and anthropology who are particularly predisposed and obliged to work for the elimination of barriers in intercultural communication.

---

<sup>23</sup> Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel and Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska (eds.), *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów, 2. Wokół europejskiej aksjofery*, Lublin, 2014, pp. 262–265.



## HOME – a universal and culture-specific concept

Jerzy Bartmiński

1. The present volume of *The Axiological Lexicon of Slavs and their Neighbours* devoted to HOME offers parallel descriptions of the ways this cultural construct<sup>1</sup> is understood in twenty European and non-European languages. It features articles on Slavic languages (Polish, Czech, Russian, Belarusian, Ukrainian and Lemko, and languages from the Southern-Slavic branch – Bulgarian, Serbian and Croatian) and non-Slavic languages – including those spoken by the close neighbours of the Slavs (German and Lithuanian) as well as those used by their more distant neighbours (Modern Greek, English, French and Portuguese). This part of the *Lexicon* also includes articles devoted to the Japanese language and three African languages: Swahili, Tamasheq and Hausa – by taking a look from afar on the Slavic and European home we hope to avoid European ethnocentrism.

The articles have been written by a team of linguists from fourteen countries: Poland and the Czech Republic, Belarus, Russia and the Ukraine, Bulgaria, Serbia and Croatia, Lithuania as well as England, France and Germany. In the years 2012–2015, the members of the team participated in the international seminar EUROJOS; during those

---

<sup>1</sup> I use the term “cultural construct” to mean ‘an axiologically laden concept equipped with historically determined linguistic and cultural connotations’, i.e. an equivalent of the term “stereotype” usually used in articles by authors from the Lublin School of Ethnolinguistics; more about the terminology used by our research team can be found in Nina Gryshkova 2014.

meetings, certain agreements were made regarding the theoretical and methodological framework of the study. The question was how to describe cultural constructs and values which are commonly thought of as not lending themselves to description or definition. Because the authors did not share this opinion, they readily embarked on this seemingly impossible task. The general tenets of the *Lexicon* as a whole have been outlined in the introductory chapter<sup>2</sup>; I summarized there the most important information regarding selection of material, methods of analysis and the new method of defining concepts. Here, I wish to make a few remarks on the construct of HOME and present the contents of this volume.

Before I do that, however, let me briefly recall that 1) the reconstructions of the concept of HOME presented in this volume were carried out according to the theory of the Linguistic Worldview, using the methodology and the basic conceptual tools developed during the seminar EUROJOS on the basis of some earlier proposals of Lublin Ethnolinguists. 2) The authors agreed that their studies should be based on the same types of language material. Thus, the descriptions of the linguistic and cultural picture of HOME in the different languages studied rely on three types of data abbreviated as SST: systemic (dictionary definitions, pragmatic phraseology, metaphors with lexemes designating home, etymology, derivatives), survey, and textual (including data excerpted from corpora). The surveys, conducted in the years 2014–2015, were modelled on the Axiological Dictionary Survey (ASA, see JWP 2006). 3) The authors agreed on the understanding of the key terms, such as lexeme, concept and construct, lexicographic definition and cognitive definition, profile and profiling, etc. The consensus was not absolute, however, and we failed to build a common “glossary”<sup>3</sup>.

2. The fact that HOME has been chosen as the first entry word for the *Lexicon* can be explained by its unique position in all languages

---

<sup>2</sup> *The Axiological Lexicon of the Slavs and their Neighbours. What does it contain, what principles is it based on, who is it intended for?*

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Gryshkova 2014, pp. 38–46, Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2014, pp. 74–78.

and cultures. Home has a fundamental existential value for man as a shelter and also a socio-cultural value as a “family nest” and a school of life. A historian of religion said that “In their own home, everyone feels as though they were in the centre of the world”<sup>4</sup>. Yuri Lotman places *home* – side by side with *road* and *bread* – among the keywords of every culture.<sup>5</sup> In mythological systems, home is understood as the centre and image of the entire world, *imago mundi*<sup>6</sup>, also an analogue of the human body<sup>7</sup>, with the entailment that “the body gives shelter to the soul”<sup>8</sup>. In *Mitologia Słowiańska* [Slavic Mythology], we read: “Home in traditional culture is the centre of the most important life values, a combination of happiness, prosperity, family harmony, and a community of living persons and their ancestors”<sup>9</sup>. This is why building a home is treated as an act that repeats the creation of the world, with the accompanying rituals of choosing the construction site, *zakładziny* and *zasiedliny* (rituals associated with beginning the construction of a house and moving into the new house) and the establishment of boundaries<sup>10</sup>. According to Gaston Bachelard, a family home, by satisfying the need for personal security and intimacy, connects man mentally and emotionally, in his dreams and memories, with the whole world<sup>11</sup>. Expanding on this concept, the Scottish ethno-linguist James Underhill claims that “Home is a dynamic interaction of the external world, as seen from the inside, with the inner world of the perceiver, who incorporates this external world into what he finds in himself.”<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Lurker 1989, p. 42.

<sup>5</sup> Lotman 1978, p. 46.

<sup>6</sup> Eliade 1988, p. 32; Kopaliński 1990, p.69; Chevalier, Gheerbrant 1969, vol.3, p.172; Heinz-Mohr 1991, p.137.

<sup>7</sup> Cirlot 2012, p.112.

<sup>8</sup> Herder *Leksykon symboli* 1992, p. 32; the idea of the body as home to the soul has its roots in the *Bible* (Job 4.19; 2 Corinthians 5.1).

<sup>9</sup> Toporkov 1995, p. 168.

<sup>10</sup> Kowalski 1998, pp. 84–89.

<sup>11</sup> Bachelard 1975.

<sup>12</sup> Underhill 2014, p. 88.

In his book *Dom. Krótka historia idei*, Witold Rybczyński has summed up the experience of home in Western European (Dutch, French and English) culture emphasizing that the superior value of the bourgeois home is comfort, which is “comprised of many factors – convenience, usefulness, unhindered action, pleasure, familiarity, intimacy, and privacy”.<sup>13</sup> A deeper existential meaning – personal, but also social and cultural – was ascribed to home by Vaclav Havel, the Czech writer and philosopher, whose words could be used as a motto for our book:

“For everyone, home (Czech *domov*) – is a basic existential experience. What a person perceives as his home (in the philosophical sense of the word) can be compared to a set of concentric circles, with his ‘I’ at the centre. My home is the room I live in for a time, the room I’ve grown accustomed to, and which, in a manner of speaking, I have covered with my own invisible lining. I recall, for instance, that even my prison cell was, in a sense, my home, and I felt very put out whenever I was suddenly required to move to another. The new cell may have been exactly the same as the old one, perhaps even better, but I always experienced it as alien and unfriendly. I felt uprooted and surrounded by strangeness, and it would take me some time to get used to it, to stop missing the previous cell, to make myself at home.

My home is the house (*dům*) I live in, the village or town where I was born or where I spend most of my time. My home is my family, the world of my friends, the social and intellectual milieu in which I live, my profession, my company, my work place. My home, obviously, is also the country I live in, the language I speak, and the intellectual and spiritual climate of my country expressed in the language spoken there. The Czech language, the Czech way of perceiving the world, Czech historical experience, the Czech modes of courage and cowardice, Czech humor – all of these are inseparable from that circle of my home. My home is therefore my Czechness, my nationality, and I see no reason at all why I shouldn’t embrace it, since it is as essential a part of me as, for instance, my masculinity, another aspect of my home. Ultimately, my home is Europe and my Europeaness and my planet, its contemporary civilization and even the whole world. But this is not all: my home is also my education, my upbringing, my habits, the environment which I live in and which I take to be my own; if I belonged to a party, it

---

<sup>13</sup> Rybczyński 1986/2015, p. 331.

would unconditionally also be my home. (quoted from Vaňková 2012, p. 61; English translation based on Paul Wilson's translation of Vaclav Havel's speech "On home", published in *The New York Review of Books* December 5, 1991.)

A very personal attitude toward HOME is also represented by authors from Central and Eastern Europe, who, in their descriptions of the Belarusian home (Kozłowska-Doda) and Lithuanian home (Rutkovska), even record personifications of home, in which it is assigned characteristics of a living creature. Communists failed in their attempt to break home away from the family and privacy, to transform it into a so-called *komunalka*, a communal apartment; their endeavour resulted in "insider emigration" to *dachas*, second homes which were the oasis of privacy (Fyodorova, Pazio-Wlazłowska). The idea of home proved to be attractive to politicians; it was even used by the First Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, who in 1987 put forward a proposal of building a "Common European Home"<sup>14</sup>.<sup>15</sup> It is noteworthy that his idea met with the strongest response in Poland; it was, however, interpreted in a different spirit.

<sup>14</sup> The First Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev announced his conception of the "Common European Home" publicly during his visit to Czechoslovakia in 1987. It had a political context; it proclaimed the idea of building a common non-confrontational space for European cooperation, while maintaining political differences; the intention behind it was gradual elimination of US influence in Europe. This idea was supported by the German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, who invoked Charles de Gaulle's vision of a *Europe stretching from the Atlantic to the Urals*.

<sup>15</sup> "Europe is more than a continent. It's a home! And freedom finds its deepest meaning precisely in being a spiritual homeland. With full respect for the distinction between the political realm and that of religion – which indeed preserves the freedom of citizens to express religious belief and live accordingly – I wish to underline the irreplaceable role of Christianity for the formation of the conscience of each generation and the promotion of a basic ethical consensus that serves every person who calls this continent 'home!'" (*Address by the Holy Father Benedict XVI delivered at the Presidential Palace of Prague, 26 September 2009. Apostolic Visit to the Czech Republic: Meeting with the Civil and Political Authorities and the Diplomatic Corpse.* w2.vatican.va).

The philosopher and theologian Józef Tischner wrote: “*Europe is to be the ‘common home of the Europeans’. The metaphor of the ‘common home’ is a metaphor of freedom. It means that the new European freedom is to be similar to that which man enjoys in his own home, where he feels ‘himself and at home.’*”<sup>16</sup>

3. The intention of the originators of the *Lexicon* is that the parallel descriptions of the concept of HOME should show what is common to the different languages and cultures but also highlight language-specific features. An overarching intention is to seek unity in diversity. And what is meant here is not the architectural aspect of home – the appearance of residential buildings, their external shape, room layout, the “technological” aspect of dwelling; the primary matter of this work is the cultural aspect of the concept, mental images of home, understanding its role in human life, in other words the “idea” of home treated in close connection with the ways the concept is captured and harnessed in language.

The first and the most specific question is what the different national names of HOME actually mean – the Greek *oikos*, the Polish and Russian *dom*, the Belarusian *chata*, the Lemko *chyża*, the Czech *dům* and *domov*, the Bulgarian *kyšča*, the Serbian and Croatian *kuća*, the Lithuanian *namai* and *namas*, the French *maison*, the Portuguese and Spanish *casa*, the English *home*, etc.? Do these different lexemes stand for the same concept? To what extent is valuation of home and its various functions similar in the different languages and to what extent is the understanding of this concept affected by historical, cultural and linguistic contexts? In short, are we dealing with an identical conceptualization of the “same” *denotatum*?

Well, let us say this openly: there are no identical *denotata*. There are very different objects referred to, or more precisely, there are multiple references to them. However, a set of *denotata* – as claimed by Renata Grzegorzcykova – can be assigned a certain common con-

<sup>16</sup> Tischner Józef, 1998, *Przestrzeń jako projekt wolności*, in: *Europa. Fundamenty jedności*, ed. Aniela Dylus, Warsaw).

ceptual construct, which in our case would roughly have the following form: ‘a place (room) that people have made to safely stay in (especially at night during sleep and during the period of child-raising)’.<sup>17</sup> We assume that such an “invariant”, or (as we prefer to call it) ‘base image’, can be found in the multilingual material collected by the authors and that the diversity of its verbalizations can be interpreted as a result of manipulating this global conceptual construct through the introduction of specific characteristics which elaborate its general meaning, modify it and expand it in multiple directions to form a network. It is such concretised linguistic-cultural pictures of HOME in the individual languages that we present in this volume.

If we look for an equivalence between the names for home in different languages, we are faced with huge difficulties, because the names seem incompatible, untranslatable. Anna Wierzbicka has shown this many times in her works, for example, comparing the seemingly equivalent words from different languages such as the Polish *ojczyzna*, the Russian *rodina* and the German *Heimat*; the Polish *wolność* and the Latin *libertas*, the English *freedom* and the Russian *svoboda*; or the Russian *dusha* and the English *soul* and *mind*<sup>18</sup>. Underhill says that “French does not have a direct translation equivalent of the English *home*; the concept of HOME is formed differently than in English”.<sup>19</sup> Confrontation of almost every language with any other language in our *Lexicon* leads to a similar conclusion. Is comparison doomed to failure, then? No, it is not. The program of seeking unity in diversity can succeed provided that we agree on the level of generality of description and find an appropriate *tertium comparationis*.

4. Let us take a look at **lexicographic definitions** of HOME in different languages using data cited by the authors of the articles in this volume. It turns out that, firstly, all names for HOME are polysemous; secondly, the number of meanings attributed to them varies from

<sup>17</sup> Grzegorzczkova 2011, p. 224.

<sup>18</sup> Wierzbicka 1999, 1997/2007.

<sup>19</sup> Underhill 2014, p. 94.

language to language (from 2 to 27)<sup>20</sup>; thirdly, the definitions share many common features, confirming the hypothesis that despite the considerable and noteworthy differences in meaning, there exists a common semantic core.

The **Polish word *dom*** is usually assigned 6 meanings ('residential building', 'living space', 'family and household members', 'household', literary 'family line or dynasty', and official 'institution'). The **Czech *dům*** and the **Russian *дом*** are explicated in a similar manner; also, the **Lithuanian *namai*** has a similar semantics. Among South Slavic languages, similar definitions are found in Bulgarian and Croatian, and a slightly more detailed definition in Serbian<sup>21</sup>. According to Christou, the Modern Greek word for **HOME**, *οἶκος*, has four meanings that are similar to the Slavic 'дом, жилище', 'аристократичен род, фамилия, династия, феодадно владение', 'институция за обществена полза', 'предприятие, професионална дейност'.

In Western European languages, lexicographers identify more meanings of the names for **HOME** than in Central European and Eastern European languages.

Contemporary dictionaries list eight meanings of the **French** lexeme ***maison***: I. 'human dwelling' (and its metonymic or metaphoric extensions): 1) 'a residential building designed for people'; 2) 'premises (a residential building or a part thereof) serving as a residence'; 3) household affairs, a household'; 4) 'people living in the same house (family, household)'; 5) 'family line, dynasty'; II. 'institution, company': 6) a general or proper name of a public institution established to meet certain social needs, e.g., *Maison de Presse*; 7) 'a commercial or an industrial company'; III. 8) *astrol.* 'area of the sky'.

<sup>20</sup> The vast range of meanings identified results as much from the actual semantic diversity of the words as from the fact that authors of dictionaries adopt different principles of semantic analysis and different degrees of specificity of description.

<sup>21</sup> See definitions in the respective articles by Maria Kitanova, Amir Kapetanović, Stana Ristić and Ivana Lazić-Konjik in this volume



The **English** word **home** (used as a noun) has as many as 13 meanings. These include, according to the LDCE (as quoted by Popielska and Harper): ‘place where you live’, ‘place where you came from/belong’, ‘place where a family lives and the family itself’, ‘homeland’, ‘a property that can be bought and sold’, ‘a hospice’, ‘an asylum for the homeless’, ‘a place where animals with no owners are looked after’, ‘the place where something was first discovered, made, or developed’, ‘place in some games or sports which a player must try to reach in order to win a point’, ‘Home Office’, ‘Home Counties, the counties around London’, ‘surname’.

A record number of meanings, as many as 27, are listed in the *Contemporary Dictionary of the Portuguese Language* (2001) for the **Portuguese** lexeme **casa**: ‘any type of a habitable structure’, ‘a landed property’, ‘a detached house, often with a garden’, ‘a trade institution’, ‘a company’, ‘a group of people who make up a family or live together’, (spelt with a capital C) ‘the royal family or a noble family’ and 13 others, including ‘a collection of furniture and other furnishings’, ‘a family’s household expenditure, especially spendings connected with rent, energy bills, water rates and telephone bills’, ‘an animal shelter’, ‘a buttonhole’, ‘each of the twelve astrological houses of heaven’, (in sports) ‘a team’s own sports field’ etc.

Let us now take a look at definitions of HOME in non-European languages. In **Swahili**, the word **nyumba** designates ‘a residential house’, ‘an apartment in a block of flats’, ‘a shelter for the family’, and ‘a family community’, but also ‘a wife’ and ‘a room for an animal’ (Kraska-Szlenk). In the **language of the Sahara’s Tuareg**, the concept of HOME is rendered by the lexemes **ehen** and **aghiwan**, with the former designating ‘a tent’, but also ‘marriage’ and ‘a wife’, and the latter literally meaning ‘a cluster of tents’ and ‘the big family’ (Jackowska-Uwadizu). In **Hausa**, the name for home, **gida**, stands for ‘a country house’ as well as ‘a living space in an urban housing development’ and ‘a family community, the family, household members’, and in the recent times also ‘the home country’ and ‘the homeland’ (Nina

Pawlak). And last but not least – the **Japanese** language, which represents yet another conceptualization: the Japanese name for HOME **ie** – combines the meanings ‘a building designed for people to live in’ and ‘a dwelling’ with the meaning ‘family line’, i.e. ‘a community of generations, a group of people related by common descent’ (in many European languages, words for home are used in a similar way to stand for ‘dynasty’) and the (Japanese-specific) meaning ‘craft school’ (Wyszopolska).

What is important here is that all the definitions of HOME mentioned share a certain semantic sequence – from the concrete to the abstract – with the meaning ‘residential building’ always put at the beginning of the explication, followed by the generalized meaning ‘living space’, and then ‘family and household members’, the generalized ‘household’, ‘a family line or a dynasty’, and finally ‘an institution’. In this sequence, there are three essential semantic components which are common to virtually all of the languages studied: ‘building’, ‘family’ and ‘institution’, out of which two are the most important: ‘**building**’ and ‘**family**’ (‘institution’ is a later, secondary meaning). They refer to two principal dimensions of HOME: physical and social.

5. Let us now ask the crucial question of what links these two **dimensions**, the **spatial** and the **human**? What does a bond between a place and a person involve? What is the conceptual key to the nature of this relationship? The answer is simple. A family **lives** in a building: *Porodica stanuje/živi u zgradi* – as Stana Ristić recapitulates her discussion of the Serbian HOME. The concept of **DWELLING/LIVING** is key to the idea of HOME.

At this point, I would like to draw the readers’ attention to the confusing ambiguity of the Polish word for ‘dwelling’ **mieszkanie**. Today **mieszkanie** designates an entity, an object: ‘a place where one lives’, but originally the word referred to the event, or more precisely the action of ‘dwelling’. The change from event to object is natural to the Polish language system, as confirmed by numerous other examples, such as *spanie, jedzenie, budowanie* etc., in which the

original action-related meaning: ‘the fact that one is sleeping, eating, building’ was extended to new object-related meanings: ‘a place where one sleeps’, ‘the things that one eats’, ‘the things that have been built’ etc. The **category DWELLING**, which is crucial to the semantics of HOME, has the status of a concept, i.e. it stands above the lexical level (at the lexical level, it can be expressed with the lexemes *dwelt*, *stay*, *live*, etc., as discussed later).

DWELLING as an event-related and not an object-related category, is, at the same time, a **functional** category. The functional meaning of dwelling space is accented by anthropologists of culture:

*“To study dwelling space as a physical space alone – says one of the authors of a collection of studies devoted to dwelling – makes no great sense. Dwelling in a space, on the other hand, is interpretable and allows one to look at dwelling space as meaningful to someone: ‘someone’s space; with someone inside’ [...] The interiors, the spatial layout of a dwelling mean nothing in isolation from their ‘founders’. They are merely random configurations of matter”* (Brosz 2007, p. 75).

*“It is not the arrangement of objects in space that determines what a dwelling is, but its specific genius loci. The material layer turns out to be only a sort of palimpsest with successive influences and constructs of culture inscribed on it. [Dwelling is] an inhabited space and the action of inhabiting the space and the cultural patterns of managing and taming the space”* (Woroniecka 2007, pp. 16 and 13).

Let us follow this path further. By referring to the valence of the verb **to dwell**<sup>22</sup>, we can reconstruct the basic conceptual model underlying the concept of HOME. This model is a configuration of several facets<sup>23</sup> which make up an ordered whole (a *gestalt*)<sup>24</sup>:

{[SUBJECT] + [EVENT] + [LOCUS] + [FUNCTION]}.

<sup>22</sup> This conception was already presented by Bartmiński 2009, pp. 158–159.

<sup>23</sup> The word “facet” comes from scientific information where it is used in the sense ‘semantic subcategory’; it is semantically close to “aspect”, “dimension” and Langackerian “domain” and is a convenient term due to its considerable semantic flexibility and capacity.

<sup>24</sup> I use the term ‘gestalt’ in the same sense as cognitive linguists, cf. Lakoff and Johnson, 1980/1988, p. 96.

To put it in general terms, the fundamental component [EVENT] expressed by the predicate *dwell* creates a place for the dwelling **subject**, the **space** inhabited and the **function** that this space serves in relation to the subject. Somebody dwells somewhere and meets his needs in this place. The subjects and places can be different but the functions are the same. The model proposed is substitutive and represents a basis for potential transformation.<sup>25</sup> This model is the common denominator of the conceptions of HOME in different languages.

6. The constitutive character of the semantic **facet [EVENT]** is pointed to by both system data as well as survey and textual data. Let us consider the nature of the event described as ‘dwelling’. What is the actual meaning of the words *mieszkać*, *zamieszkiwać* ‘to live, dwell’ and their synonyms, which in Polish include *żyć*, *być*, *przebywać*, *siedzieć*; in Russian *žit’*, in Belarusian *жыць*, *існаваць*, *пражываць*, *знаходзіцца*, *сядзець*, *сяліцца*; in Serbian *stanovati*, *žveti*, *boraviti*, *prebivati*, *iznajmiti* ‘rent’, *privremeno stanovati* ‘live temporarily’, etc.

The verb **to dwell** can be assigned the following semantic components:

1. ‘to stay somewhere for a long time/permanently’
2. ‘at home, in a tamed place’
3. ‘apart from the surroundings and closed away’;
4. ‘so as to meet needs’, such as:
  - sleep and rest;
  - protection from the cold;
  - security;
  - being with other people, and especially taking care of one’s children (nursing, upbringing);
  - usually also the need to satisfy hunger;
  - usually also the need for personal hygiene (washing one-self/having a bath, excretion);
  - usually also the need to hand down cultural patterns: language, beliefs and convictions, norms and values;
  - sometimes also the need to learn a profession, make a living.

<sup>25</sup> More on that subject can be found in Bartmiński 2009, pp. 157–158

7. Let us now refer to **etymological** research. It is commonly thought that “ethnolinguistically relevant” information, i.e. information that provides clues to conceptualization of the world, can be found in etymological investigations which establish the semantic motivation of a name, its onomasiological basis. This is possible for those names which have an “inner form”, i.e. complex words such as *lepianka* ‘mud hut, lit. moulded from clay/mud’, *kamienica* ‘tenement house, lit. made of stone’ or *mrówkowiec* ‘a very large tower block, lit. a building whose inhabitants are so numerous that they resemble ants in an ant hill’

What does etymological research tell us about the names for HOME in the languages studied? The fact that the French *maison* comes from the Latin *mansio* ‘abode, place of residence’; the Spanish and Portuguese *casa* come from the Latin *casa* ‘hut, ‘shack’, ‘country house’; and the English *home* from Old Nordic *heimr* ‘residence’, ‘the world’ – does not contribute much to our understanding of the way HOME is conceptualized in those languages. More interesting is the Serbian and Croatian *kuća*, which derives from the word for corner (which corresponds to the Polish idioms *mieszkać kątem u kogoś* ‘to stay at somebody else’s place [lit. corner]’; *mieć własny kąt* ‘to have one’s own place [lit. corner]’).

An interesting picture emerges from the etymology of the **African names** for HOME. In Swahili, the word *nyumba* ‘home’ comes from the verb *umba* ‘to mould from clay’ (Kraska-Szlenk), so, like its Polish equivalent *lepianka*, it has an onomasiological basis of a clearly physical character. In the Chadic language Hausa, the name for HOME, *gida*, is derived from a root meaning ‘to rest’; HOME, then, is simply ‘a resting place, a place where rest can be taken’ – the name highlights the functional aspect of the concept (Nina Pawlak).

The most interesting case is **the pan-Slavic dom**. We know<sup>26</sup> from etymological studies that the lexeme *dom* is an old Proto-Indo-Euro-

<sup>26</sup> Brückner 1927/1970, Sławski 1952–1956, Vasmer 1950–1958, Pokorny 1959–1969, Ivanov, Gamkrelidze 1984, pp. 741–743, Boryś 2005.

pean word, attested, among others in Latin as *domus*, in Greek as *dómos* and in Old Indic as *dámah*. It is derived from the root *\*dom-/ \*dem-*, which is related to the Old Greek verb *demo* ‘I build’ (hence the Greek *dēmiourgós* ‘builder’). *Dom* has, in its original, latent meaning, the semantic component ‘building’. In Old Polish, the word *budowanie* ‘building’ also combined the meaning ‘action of building’ with the meaning ‘a product of building, a building’<sup>27</sup>. *Budowanie* as an event implies the existence of a builder, the subject who is the agent of the event. In the case of building a home, the subject is a person, people, a group of people, a family, or a man who wants to protect his wife and children. The anthropological background for understanding HOME as an event-related category has been outlined by a philosopher who wrote: “Home is a fruit of the art of dialogue. First, it is a dialogue between man and woman, then a dialogue between builders” (Tischner 1985, p. 135).<sup>28</sup> In this context, it is worth recalling that the semantic component ‘building, creation’ is still present in English, in which – as stated by Popielska and Harper – an important role is played by the concept of renovating/ <creating> a HOME: *doing up the home*, *DIY* (*Do-It-Yourself*). A similar idea is expressed in the popular Russian saying: *Человек должен за свою жизнь построить дом, посадить дерево, вырастить сына* ‘In his life, man should build a house, plant a tree and bring up a son’; in Poland the same is said of a “real man (male)”. In the Lithuanian culture, a special name, *namakuris*, has been coined for an individual who has initiated the creation of a house.

From the contemporary perspective, it is important who has built a home, but it is even more important why and for whom he has built it. Let us return to the relationship between [SUBJECT] and [LO-

<sup>27</sup> SW in the entry for *budowanie* lists a separate, secondary meaning ‘a building’, illustrated with quotations from Skarga: *Trzęsieniem ziemi wielkie budowania upadły* and Wujek: *Bóg to tak pięknie świata budowanie dla nas stworzył. Wiele budowania pospolitego postawił*.

<sup>28</sup> According to Martin Heidegger, dwelling, i.e. the stay of mortals on the Earth, precedes building, i.e. erecting of buildings, because “Only if we are capable of dwelling, only then can we build” (p. 333).

CUS]. Crucial to the understanding of the idea of home is the fusion of the categories 'building' and 'family' into one conceptual whole on the basis of [EVENT]. Although Émile Benveniste, in his celebrated work on Indo-European institutions, distinguished between these categories – he described the Latin word *domus* as 'Haus-Familie' and the Greek *dómos* as 'Haus-Gebäude'<sup>29</sup>, Ivanov and Gamkrelidze, following Pokorný, claimed more convincingly that the Proto-Indo-European root *\*dom-* had originally had a complex meaning of both a place and a human community<sup>30</sup>. To support their position, one can quote other examples of concepts of HOME from different historical and contemporary sources which combine the physical and the socio-cultural dimension into one complex – with special prominence given to the social aspect. Among historical examples, an interesting case is the old Hebrew word *bana*, which simultaneously "expresses the idea of building a home and starting a family"<sup>31</sup>; generally, in the Bible "to build a home is not only to erect walls; it is to start a family, beget offspring and pass onto it religious instruction and examples of virtue."<sup>32</sup>

Contemporary data provide examples such as the Swahili word "*nyumba*, which in its basic sense combines the physical aspect of home as a building (room) and its functional aspect of protecting man (the family) from the outside world" (Kraska-Schlenk); the Tamasheq lexeme *ehen*, which is used to mean 'a tent', 'a house, a room, a living space', and whose "stem *hn* also means a married couple or the wife alone" (Jackowska-Uwadizu); and the Hausa word *gida*, which "is the

<sup>29</sup> "Gr. *dómos* 'Gebäude, Haus' ist also von lat. *domus* zu unterscheiden, welches nicht das Gebäude, sondern das 'Zuhause' als gesellschaftliche Einheit bezeichnet, die sich im *dominus* verkörpert", Benveniste 1993, p. 230. The Greek *oikos* had originally designated 'a family community, a social group' and only with time did it also acquire the meaning of 'a building'.

<sup>30</sup> "Обščeindoevropskaja leksema *\*t'om-* v značenii 'dom', 'stroenie' oboznačaet elementarnuju social'nuju edinicu indoevropskich plemen, kotoraja predpolagaet ob'edinenie i sovместное прожівание ljudej, svjazannyh opredelennymi rodstvennymi uzami,"; Ivanov and Gamkrelidze 1984, p. 741.

<sup>31</sup> Léon-Dufour 1981, p. 224.

<sup>32</sup> Léon-Dufour (ed.) 1985, p. 211).

basic term for the concept of HOME, interpreted both in its physical dimension ('place of residence') and its social dimension ('family, household')" (Nina Pawlak). A similar case is the Japanese word *ie* which, according to Wyszpolska, stands for both a residential building and an extended family, a family line.

### 8. Who, what [SUBJECT] dwells in a home?

A. When speaking of a HOME, one usually has in mind a group of people – prototypically a **family**. This is the case in all the national reconstructions of the concept of HOME. The idea of the **family home** is perpetuated in idioms, collocations and proverbs, attested in responses to the surveys and present in the texts. The Polish idiomatic expressions *dom rodzinny* 'family home' and *dom ojczysty* 'homeland, lit. home of the fathers' have counterparts in all Slavic languages: the Czech *otcovský dům*; the Belarusian *родны дом*; the Russian *отчий дом, родительский дом, родной дом*; the Lemko *родинний дім, рідний дім, рідна хыжа*; the Bulgarian *роден дом* – 'домът, в който съм се родил'; the Serbian *rodni dom, porodični dom / kuća* 'family home'; and also in Lithuanian *šeimos namas* 'family home', *gimtasis namas* 'home of the fathers'. In Western languages, these expressions do not figure so strongly.

B. The "subject" of HOME is the **woman** (which in a way reveals the male point of view), as shown by the following examples of proverbs: the Lithuanian *A home without a woman is empty*; the Serbian *Na ženi kuća stoji* 'The woman is the foundation of a home'; and the Portuguese *A casa sem mulher é corpo sem alma* 'A home without a woman is like a body without a soul'. This is not only a European way of seeing things – even more clear examples of the concept of HOME being identified with the woman can be found in the languages of Saharan tribes; Swahili gives prominence to the figure of **wife**; in this language, the name for home *nyumba* is not only given to a woman or a wife, but also to the woman's **reproductive organs**: *nyumba ya uzazi* 'uterus' (lit. 'home for giving birth'). In the Polish concept of HOME, prominence is given to the figure of **mother** – in the patriotic



profile, the figure of *Matka-Polka* ‘the Polish Mother’. The concept of woman-mother implies the concept of **children**, who are also given prominence as important inhabitants of HOME: a Lithuanian proverb says *A home without children is like a bell without a clapper* (lit. heart). The **man** is given prominence in the concept of the traditional patriarchal home as the *master of the house*: the Latin *dominus*, the Serbian *domaćin* (but also *domaćica* ‘lady of the house’), the Czech *pán domu* (also fem. *paní domu*); the Russian. *глава дома, хозяин* – according to a proverb ‘a home without a master is an orphan’ – *Без хозяина дом – сирота* (*хозяйка* ‘the lady of the house’ has a positive valuation, *домохозяйка* ‘a homemaker, a housewife’ is treated in a dismissive fashion).

C. HOME provides refuge to an **individual**, who – in the words of the Lithuanian authoress – “stands alone before the world, naked, without possessions, without a family, and takes from the world as much as he can, and then drives a stake into the ground and creates his own true hearth and home” (Rutkovska). At the basis of the idea of HOME is the need to be oneself at one’s own place, the need to tame one’s close surroundings and to experience personal comfort (Rybczyński) as well as the need for deeper existential rooting (Vaclav Havel). Such an individualizing treatment of home is strongly accented in the French and English conceptions. At the opposite pole is the conception of *komunalka* which comes from the times of intensive communalization of Russian culture (Fyodorova, Pazio-Wlazłowska). As understood by the French youth, HOME (*maison*) can also be created by **unrelated peers** (Skibińska, Viviand).

D. **Public institutions** that aspire to the name of a house/home figure abundantly in dictionaries of both French and Belarusian (but are absent from colloquial conceptualizations of home in either of these languages); close to institutionalization is the practice of juxtaposing names for HOME with **names of professions**, which is a remnant of the communist conception of the organization of social life, see the Russian expressions *дом хы-*

дожника, писателей, композиторов, журналиста, пионеров 'Painter's/Writers'/Composers'/Journalist's/Pioneers' House', etc.

**E. Domesticated animals and pets.** It is difficult to give an unequivocal answer to the question to what degree HOME is a dwelling place for animals as well as people. On the one hand, we observe a strong tendency to discriminate between names of spaces intended for people and those intended for tame ("domesticated") animals; it is a distinction that is strongly entrenched in the lexical systems of the individual languages, see the Polish lexemes *stajnia* – for horses, *obora* – for cows, *chlew* – for pigs, *klatka dla ptaków* 'a bird cage', *psia buda* 'a dog's kennel', *staw* 'a fish pond', etc. or the Belarusian *хлеў, свінарнік (свінушнік) куратнік, кароўнік, канюшня, стайня, аўчарня, будка*, etc. To call a human dwelling a name that designates an animal's home – such as the Polish *stajnia*, *chlew*, *obora*, *nora*, *klatka* 'stable, pigsty, cowshed, burrow, cage'; the Serbian *svinjac* 'pigsty'; the Czech *bouda*, *stáj*, *chlév*, *klec*; or the Bulgarian *дунка, бърлога* and *кочина* – is to speak disparagingly of it; the only exception here is the positive evaluation of the expression *family nest* (Polish *gniazdo*, Serbian *gnezdo*, Czech *hnízdo*), in which children are born like chicks and from which they fly off into the world like adult birds.

On the other hand, some animals can stay/live at home with people as pets; two prominent members of the category of *pets* (Polish *zwierzęta domowe* lit. 'home animals') are the dog and the cat. In Swahili, animal dwellings are metaphorically conceptualized as human dwellings, and accordingly "[they] are spoken of using names for the human home": the word *nyumba* 'home' is used in word combinations such as *nyumba ya kuku* 'a henhouse, lit. home of hens'; *nyumba ya kondoo* 'a sheepfold, lit. home of sheep'; *nyumba ya mbayu* 'a swallow's nest, lit. home of the swallow' (Kraska-Szlenk).

**F.** Another problem are household deities or **domestic spirits**, both caring and malicious ones, which are extensively described in works on Slavic ethnography and folklore<sup>33</sup> but are not mentioned at

<sup>33</sup> See, e.g., the article *Duhi domashniye* by Vinogradova and Levkiyevskaya 1999.

all in the articles collected in this volume (one exception is the article on the Russian home by Fyodorova and Pazio-Wlazłowska). This suggests that belief in house *spirits* is a thing of the past, but this is not an indisputable truth, because traces of this belief have been preserved in language and culture. Although, on the one hand, it is true that the Roman Lares and Penates survive in the Polish language as a phraseological fossil (*lary i penaty*); the Old Polish *uboże* has disappeared from the language; and *kłobuk*, an equivalent of the Eastern *domovik*, is only known from the folk tales of Warmia and Masuria, it is also true that the mischievous domestic *chochlik* ‘pixie’ borrowed into the Polish language from Belarusian still functions in the language in the sense of a ‘printing gremlin, typing mistake’, and the originally German *skrzat* ‘dwarf’ is used as a playful term for a ‘small child’. Although *domowe węże* ‘house snakes’ have been completely forgotten, the entire Eastern Slavic world remembers *domovik/domovoy* (the entry word *domovoy* with the explanation ‘domestic spirit, goblin’ is recorded in the *Great Russian-Polish Dictionary*, PWN 2004) and the whole Western Slavic world remembers and speaks about *krasnoludki* ‘gnomes/dwarfs’ (Polish children know well Maria Konopnicka’s fairy tale *O krasnoludkach i sierotce Marysi*. Figures of *dwarfs* adorn Polish gardens, which is a fashion adopted from Germany). The topic of domestic spirits awaits a fuller account.

9. The **facet [LOCATION]** and its lexical content has received a detailed and varied treatment in the articles presented in this volume. In this summary presentation of the contents of the volume devoted to HOME, I would like to draw the reader’s attention to the important distinction made in some Slavic and Western languages between the **spatial** (physical) and the **subjective** dimension of HOME. This distinction is drawn in the Czech language between *dům* and *domov*, as demonstrated by Vaclav Havel in the passage quoted earlier in this introduction and as extensively documented in the article by Irena Vanková:

[...] významu ruského či polského lexému *dom* odpovídají dva české výrazy: *dům* a *domov*. **Dům** označuje v primárním významu konkrétum, tj. obytnou budovu (*dům postavený z kamene, panelový dům, rodný dům*), zatímco **domov** se vztahuje k abstraktu zahrnujícímu několik sémantických poloh a spojenému především s bydlením a místem trvalého pobytu (domem či bytem) nebo s rodištěm (místem původu); odkazuje jednak (prototypově) k rodině a k lidem, kteří společně bydlí, jednak k rodnému místu, ať už je dům (a rodina), nebo rodný kraj či rodná země. (The article in this volume)

A similar distinction is made in Serbian between *kuća* and *dom*: one can buy and sell a *kuća* (*kupiti/prodati kuću*) but one cannot buy or sell a *dom* (*\*kupiti/prodati dom*) (Ristić) and in Croatian: *kuća* and *dom* (one can speak of a stone or a wooden *kuća* (*kamena/drvena kuća*), but not a stone or a wooden *dom* (*kameni/drveni dom*) (Kapetanović). It is a distinction that is also known in English: *house* and *home*<sup>34</sup>, and in German: *aus* and *heim*.

The spatial, physical dimension of HOME, its appearance, structure, materials from which it can be built, etc. has a rich vocabulary which is profusely quoted and properly classified in the articles in this volume; the authors list numerous meronyms (see below a discussion on metaphorization of parts of a house) and endonyms that are components of the rich phrasematics (pragmatic phraseology) and phraseology of HOME. We shall not compare them here; this must be left to the reader's decision. An important role in the conceptualization of HOME as a place of residence is played by pieces of household equipment, especially the table and the bed, but also dishes, such as the Russian *samovar* and the English *teacup*, etc., as well as holy pictures in Slavic homes, which is amply attested in texts, but has

<sup>34</sup> Danaher notes, however, that "the decisive trend in English seems to be towards concretizing the meaning of *home* [...]. In its most recent definition of *home*, the *Oxford English Dictionary* contains a special comment that illustrates the extent of this trend toward concretization. 'In N. America and Australia (and increasingly elsewhere), [home] is frequently used to designate a private house or residence merely as a building.'" (Translator's note; David S. Danaher 2015. *Reading Vaclav Havel*. Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press; p 186).

received only fragmentary treatment in the articles of the present volume.

### 10. The facet [VALUES] – the axiology of HOME

All the languages studied highlight the oppositions relevant to the axiological location of HOME between **the familiar and the strange, the near and the far, the internal and the external**, which are captured in a more tangible form in the contrast between **home** and the **world**. HOME is on the side of what is familiar, near and internal, which gives it a highly positive valuation.

The values of home are entrenched in syndromes, designated by formulas such as “family atmosphere” and “family nest” (belonging to the psychosocial domain) or “safe haven” and “one’s own place” (belonging to the existential domain). The syndrome of “family nest” is contested in contemporary feminist discourse (or at least its most radical variety).

### 11. Metaphors of HOME

The concept of HOME is subject to metaphorisation in all of the languages studied. Noteworthy are two opposite directions of metaphorical extension of the basic names of home in the different languages.

**A.** The first type of extension involves mapping a name for home to the nearest **area**, to the **home country** and to **homeland**. This is the case in many European languages: particularly in Czech, as the Czech national anthem begins with the words *Kde domov můj?* ‘Where is my home?’, but also in Polish, Serbian, Portuguese and English. By contrast, no such connotation is found for the French *maison* {do spr.}. A similar process of metaphorization of the concept of home into the concept of homeland is currently under way in Hausa (Pawlak).

**B.** A less common practice is to use a word for home to refer to **Europe** (cf. the conception of *the Common European Home* associated by Gorbachev with the idea of safety and by Tischner with the idea of freedom; this idea is poorly attested in Russian but is often used in Polish pro-European and educational discourse; no examples of

such conceptualizations are reported for Western languages: French, English or German).

**C.** The practice of using names for home to refer to the **world** and **cosmos** has its origins in the distant past<sup>35</sup> – examples of it are found in the Bible and are present in Polish and Russian (folk) culture (*Хау общий дом – Земля*).

**D.** The opposite direction of metaphorisation is **metaphorical narrowing** of the concept of HOME to some of its constituent physical elements (*pars pro toto*). The most frequently metaphorised parts of a home/house, which are assigned a special role in meeting the needs of its residents include the **roof**, which protects people from rain, **walls**, which guarantee protection and safety, the **threshold** and the **door**, which mark the boundary between one's own and the strange space, the **stove** (and *hearth and home*), which satisfies the need for warmth, and **windows**, which play a role similar to that of the eyes in the human body (the Slavic word *okno* derives from the word *oko* 'eye'), providing access to sunlight and the outside world. This functional interpretation of parts of HOME/HOUSE introduces a personal perspective, integrating things and people, subordinating physical categories to human values.

**E. The human body as a HOME/HOUSE.** Examples of metaphorical identification of the individual human being (parts of his body) with a home/house are found in Portuguese (*casa com escritos*, lit. 'a house for rent', 'a widow'), Lithuanian (the proverb *Galva – patarimų namas* 'the head – a house of advice'), Polish (the idiom *nie mieć wszystkich w domu*, lit. 'not to have everyone at home', 'to be not right in the head'), and the ancient (biblical) tradition. In the Lithuanian language HOME is sometimes **antropomorphised** (Rutkovska).

## 12. Cultural narratives about HOME

In the European communicative space, there is a whole repertoire of narratives which transmit certain typical truths and recurrent scenarios of behaviours associated with HOME /HOUSE. In particular, they

<sup>35</sup> According to Eliade (1988: 31–32), it can be traced to the Neolithic period.

model the practices associated with building a home/house, movement *to* and *from home*, being *home/at home*, and leaving home (or chasing someone away from home).

**Building a house** is regarded as a feat that ennobles the builder (the Lithuanian language has a special word, *namakuris*, designating ‘someone who has built a house’). There are guidebooks for people who want to build a house and house building games for children.

**The motif of leaving home and going out into the world** has played a prominent role in the European cultural tradition since *The Odyssey* and the biblical story of the prodigal son. It is present in folk tales, the basic genre of folklore (a typical plot of a folk tale, as described by Vladimir Propp in his *Morphology of the Folk Tale*, begins with the hero leaving his home). Leaving home and going out into the alien world is a condition without which the hero cannot become mature.

**The motif of returning home.** In folk tales and narratives, after years away, the hero returns home more experienced and wiser; he brings the “world” home.

The typical motifs, fixed scenarios, cultural scripts and narratives<sup>36</sup> make up the “**grammar of narration**” about home. Narratives of HOME also feature the image of an ANTI-HOME; they pose the question of when a home ceases to be a home?

**13. Profiles of HOME.** The authors of the present volume devoted to HOME have not yet succeeded in reaching an agreement as to how the very concept of profiling should be understood. Neither have they worked out a consistent method of identifying the actual profiles of the concept of HOME functioning in the official discourses of the different languages studied. This is not surprising, given, on the one hand, the subjective character of profiling and, on the other, the significant flexibility of the ways in which the idea of profiling is operationalised by the individual researchers. In the Polish language, profiles of HOME

---

<sup>36</sup> I use this term in the sense proposed by Irina Sandomirskaya (1999).

have been identified by relating them to axiological and ideological discourses:

- the material profile (free from ideology, focused on the physical aspect of home);
- the community profile of HOME as the “family nest”;
- the national profile of the “Polish home” – home and family as a stronghold of national identity (the Polish Mother);
- the leftist profile (home and family subordinated to the community);
- the feminist profile (home as a cage; woman as mother, wife, and housewife; condemnation of domestic violence)
- the profile of the “mobile home”: emigres’ home (a sense of detachment from home, nostalgia), nomadic home, rejection of the idea of a stable home;
- the religious profile: the heavenly HOME of God the Father

#### **14. Final message**

By basing our descriptions on similar types of material and adopting a common theoretical and methodological ground, we have opened the way for multi-directional comparison: we can now compare any language with any other language, orient the viewing perspective and trace similarities and differences between languages. Anyone can participate in this undertaking: both the authors of the articles as well as readers interested in this topic.

#### **References**

- Bachelard Gaston, 1975, *Wyobrażenia poetycka*, Warszawa.
- Jerzy Bartmiński, 2009, *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*, London, Equinox.
- Benveniste Émil, 1993. *Indoeuropäische Institutionen. Wortschatz, Geschichte, Funktionen*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Boryś Wiesław, 2005, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków.
- Brosz Maciej, 2007, *(Za)mieszk(ow)anie. Przestrzeń konstruowana*, [in:] Woroniecka Grażyna (ed.), pp. 73–87.
- Brückner Aleksander, 1927/1970, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków.
- Chevalier Jean, Gheerbrant Alain, *Dictionnaire des symboles*, 1969, vol.3, p.172;
- Cirlot Juan, 2012, *Słownik symboli*, Kraków.
- Eliade Mircea, 1988, *Historia wierzeń i idei religijnych*, vol. I, Warszawa.



- Gryshkova Nina, 2014, *Leksem, pojęcie, stereotyp, koncept, znaczenie, idea – propozycja regulacji terminologicznych*, in: WJOSS 3, pp. 21–50.
- Grzegorzczukowa Renata, 2011, *Jeszcze o rozumieniu JOS-u w perspektywie badań porównawczych*, „Etnolingwistyka” 23, pp. 217–225.
- Heidegger Martin, 1977, *Budować, mieszkać, myśleć*, Warszawa.
- Heinz-Mohr Gerd, 1991, *Lexikon der Symbole*, Freiburg (5<sup>th</sup> edition).
- Herder *Leksykon symboli*, Warszawa 1992.
- Ivanov Vjačeslav, Gamkrelidze Tamaz, 1984, *Indoeuropejskij jazyk i indoeuropejcy. Rekonstrukcija i istoriko-tipologičeskij analiz prajazyka i protokul’туры*. Tbilisi.
- JWP – *Język, wartości, polityka. Zmiany rozumienia nazw wartości w okresie transformacji ustrojowej w Polsce. Raport z badań empirycznych*. Compiled by Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Małgorzata Brzozowska, Irina Lappo, Urszula Majer-Baranowska, Beata Żywicka. Edited by J. Bartmiński, Lublin 2006.
- Kopaliński Władysław, 1990, *Słownik symboli*, Warszawa.
- Kowalski Piotr, 1998, *Leksykon Znaki świata. Omen, przesąd, znaczenie*, Warszawa.
- Johnson Mark, Lakoff George, 1980/1988, *Metafory w naszym życiu*, Warszawa.
- Léon-Dufour Xavier (ed.), 1985, *Słownik teologii biblijnej*, Poznań-Warszawa (3<sup>rd</sup> edition).
- Léon-Dufour Xavier, *Słownik Nowego Testamentu*. Translated by Rev. K. Romaniuk, Poznań 1981.
- Lurker Mannfred, 1989, *Słownik obrazów i symboli biblijnych*, Poznań.
- Łotman Jurij, *Lalki w systemie kultury*, „Teksty” 1978, no 6.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska Stanisława, 2014, *Od separacyjnego do holistycznego opisu językowego obrazu świata. Na marginesie dyskusji nad kształtem artykułów w „Leksykonie aksjologicznym Słowian i ich sąsiadów”*, in: WJOSS 3, pp. 71–102.
- Pokorny Julius, 1959–1969, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern.
- Quasthoff Uta, 1973, *Soziales Vorurteil und Kommunikation. Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Analyse des Stereotyps*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Rybczyński Witold, 1986/2015, *Dom. Krótka historia idei*, Kraków.
- Sandomirskaya Irina, 1999, *Rodina, Otečestvo, Otčizna v diskusivnyh praktikah sovremennogo russkogo jazyka. Opyt analiza kul’turnoj idiomy*, „Etnolingwistyka” 11, pp. 51–68.
- Sławski Franciszek, 1952–1956, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, vol. I, A–J, Kraków.
- Tischner Józef, 1998, *Przestrzeń jako projekt wolności*, in: *Europa. Fundamenty jedności*. Edited by Aniela Dylus, Warszawa.
- Toporkov Andrei, *Dom*, in: *Slavjanskaja mifologija*, Moskwa 1995, s. 168.
- Underhill James, 2014, *Tłumacząc home i homeland. Od poetyki do polityki*, „Etnolingwistyka” 26, pp. 87–105.

- Vaňková Irena, 2012, *DŮM i DOMOV v češskoj jazykovoj kartine mira*, in: *WJOSS* 1, 47–68.
- Vasmer Max, 1950–1958, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.
- Vinogradova L'udmila, Levk'evskaya Elena, *Duhi domašnie*, in: *Slavjanskije drevnosti. Ètnolingvističeskij slovar*. Edited by N.I.Tolstoy, vol. 2, Moskva 1999, pp.153–155.
- Wierzbicka Anna, 1999, *Język, umysł, kultura*. A collection of works edited by J. Bartmiński, Warszawa.
- Wierzbicka Anna, 1997/2007, *Słowa klucze. Różne języki – różne kultury*. Warszawa.
- Woroniecka Grażyna (ed.), 2007, *Co znaczy mieszkać. Szkice antropologiczne*. Warszawa, Trio.
- Woroniecka Grażyna, 2007, *Introduction to: Woroniecka Grażyna (ed.), pp. 13–27.*

# The concept of ΣΠΙΤΙ ‘home’ in the Greek linguistic worldview\*

Christina G. Markou

The authoress analyses the linguistic-cultural picture of the Greek ΣΠΙΤΙ ‘home’ on the basis of lexicographic, textual and survey data. She traces a thousand years of historical development of the concept, showing interesting semantic changes and changeability of nominations.

In Ancient Greek, the meaning ‘house, dwelling’ was expressed by the lexeme *δόμος*, which, with time, was supplanted by the words *οίκος*, *οικία*, which, in Modern Greek, survive only in the official variant of literary style.

Starting from the 2nd century AD, the lexeme *σπίτι* began to appear in Middle Greek to gradually replace the earlier lexemes *οίκος* and *οικία*. A mediaeval dictionary of folk writing lists 23 different meanings of the lexeme *σπίτι*. The semantics of the modern lexeme *σπίτι* is significantly reduced in comparison with the mediaeval concept. A dictionary of Modern Greek records the following meanings of *σπίτι*: 1. ‘a dwelling house, living space’; 2. ‘people who live together, a family’; 3. ‘family life, marital status’; and 4. ‘a household, household activities’.

The synonyms of the lexeme *σπίτι* include: *κατοικία*, *οίκος*, *οικία*, *οίκημα*, *εστία* ‘fireside, hearth’, *στέγη* ‘roof’ (instead of *στέγη*, the

---

\* Full version see: Christina Markou, *Концепт дом в греческой лингвокультуре*, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, *DOM*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s. 35–59.

Greeks often use a metonymically related word *κεραμίδι* 'roof tile'), *νοικοκυριό* 'household', *κονάκι* (from Turkish *konak*), *γιατάκι* (from Turkish *yatak* 'den, shelter'); *τσαρδί* (from Turkish *çardak* 'shack').

In contemporary literary Greek, the lexeme *σπίτι* has a generic meaning. In linguistic consciousness, it is primarily associated with a stone or brick structure.

The concept of home as "an inhabited space" is illustrated by lexemes that designate a specific type of dwelling place: *μέγαρο* 'palace', *καλύβι* 'hut', *παλάτι* 'residence', *βίλα* 'villa', *εξοχικό* 'cottage, summer house', *διαμέρισμα* 'flat', *μονοκατοικία* 'detached house', *πολυκατοικία* 'block of flats', *αρχοντικό*, *πέτρινο* 'brick house'.

Qualitative features are expressed by lexemes whose meanings actualise the oppositions: rich/poor and old/modern: *μέγαρο* 'palace', *σπιταρόνα* 'large, opulent house', *καλύβι* 'hut', *παλάτι* 'residence', *αρχοντικό σπίτι* 'rich house', *πύργος* 'castle', *παράγκα* 'shanty, ramshackle hut', *φτωχικό* 'poor house'.

*Σπίτι* is a kind of starting point in the spatial model of the world. It is seen as the centre of tamed space which stands in opposition to strange space.

*Σπίτι* has had a significant impact on the formation of the opposition 'internal/external'. At the lexical level, this is reflected primarily in the fact that the opposition inside/outside is used interchangeably with the opposition at home/outside. The opposition familiar/strange provides ground for the development of a secondary opposition known/unknown (cf. *οικείος* 'personal, friendly, familial, familiar, one's own').

In everyday life, *σπίτι* is one of the landmarks in the macrospace of a city or another locality: *στο σπίτι – έξω, στη δουλειά* 'at home – in the street, at work'). In public space, *σπίτι* is opposed to career and social life: *στέλνω κάποιον σπίτι του*, literally 'to send someone home', which means to deprive someone of the possibility of pursuing a career, participating in social life.

The Greeks distinguish the following parts in the external structure of *σπίτι* as a building: *σκεπή*, *στέγη* ‘roof’, *όροφοι* ‘storeys’, *παράθυρα* ‘windows’, *πόρτες* ‘door’, *κατώφλι* ‘threshold’, *τοίχος* ‘wall’, *σκάλα* ‘staircase’, *οροφή*, *ταβάνι* ‘ceiling’, *πάτωμα* ‘floor’, *γωνία* ‘corner’.

The threshold is traditionally understood as a symbolic border between the house and the outside world, between the “familiar” and the “strange” space.

Among the rooms of a house, the most important role, from the point of view of its functioning, is played by *κουζίνα* ‘the kitchen’ and *τραπεζαρία* ‘the dining room’. The kitchen is a symbol of a real home. One of the basic features of an “anti-home” is that it does not have the symbolic common family table.

A home must obligatorily have *σαλόνι* ‘a living room’, *κρεβατοκάμαρα*, *υπνοδωμάτιο* ‘a bedroom’ *μπάνιο*, *λουτρό* ‘a bathroom’, *αποθήκη* ‘a utility room’, and *υπόγειο* ‘a cellar’. Also indispensable are everyday items such as furniture, bedding, etc.

In Modern Greek, the lexeme *σπίτι* serves as a root word from which many adjectives, nouns and verbs are derived, e.g., *σπιτικός* ‘homemade, homely’; *σπιτονοικοκύρης* ‘host, landlord’, etc.

Extremely productive is the lexeme *οίκος*: the stem *οίκο* is a component of nouns related to the social macrostructure: *οικονομία* ‘economy’, *οικολογία* ‘ecology’, and others.

Many **collocations and fixed phrases** express cultural perceptions and stereotypes, for example, *κορίτσι για σπίτι* (literally, ‘a girl for home’, i.e. a girl that is created, meant for family life).

*Σπίτι* also has **metaphorical meanings**. It is conceived of as a part of the system that includes man – home – town – homeland – the world; it constitutes a specific model of the universe, tailored to the size and needs of a human being. When speaking about his internal world, man identifies himself with home and, vice versa, gives parts of home the names of body parts. Home is used as the source domain of metaphorisation to talk about homeland, the state, Europe and the European community, Earth, and the whole world.

**In clichéd texts** (proverbs and sayings) the concept ΣΠΙΤΙ is usually interpreted from a cultural, social and functional perspective, e.g., *Στο σπίτι του κι ο χωριάτης βασιλιάς* 'in his own home even a peasant is a tsar'.

An analysis of **contemporary press texts** excerpted from the newspapers *Τα Νέα* and *Μακεδονία* shows that the concept ΣΠΙΤΙ has several conceptualisations. An aspect that comes to the fore in the textual material is the functional dimension of home. A real home should be spacious, warm, clean and comfortable. The second most frequent conceptualisation that emerges from press reports and news articles is that of home as a building. Journalistic texts and colloquial speech are also rich in examples in which HOME and FAMILY are used synonymously.

The traditional home, in religious discourse, is a stronghold of Christian morality. One of the most topical contemporary issues is that home is no longer sufficiently protected against threats and is no longer able to perform its basic defensive function. Home as 'the family' is associated with cultural memory, tradition and a way of life: the idea of the family and homeland changes along with changes in the cultural components of the stereotypical meaning of home. The basic emotional values implied by the concept of home include cosiness, peace and happiness.

In the present study, the concept ΣΠΙΤΙ was also examined using survey data. The survey was conducted in the years 2014–2015 among students of the Department of Languages, Literature and Culture of the Black Sea Countries at Democritus University of Thrace. 105 students participated in the survey. An analysis of the students' responses to the question ("What is the true ΣΠΙΤΙ") shows that those young people conceptualised HOME primarily as the FAMILY (99 responses, 99.29%). *Σπίτι σημαίνει οικογενειακή εστία* 'Home is hearth'.

The conceptualisation of ΣΠΙΤΙ was associated with **emotional values**: *αγάπη* 'love', *ζεστασιά* 'warmth', *θαλπωρή* 'cosiness' and *ευτυχία* 'happiness' (60 responses, 57%).

The idea of **safety and security** figured importantly in the students' responses: ΣΠΙΤΙ was conceptualised as a harbour and shelter (36 responses, 34%).

ΣΠΙΤΙ was also understood as a space which provides **peace, leisure, and comfort** (33 responses, 32%). Key here were the lexemes *ηρεμία, θαλπωρή, ξεγνοιασιά* and *άνεση* 'tranquility, cosiness, leisure and comfort'.

The students also conceptualised home as **their own private space**, where they can escape from problems, shut themselves out from the outside world. In addition to these pleasing sensations, ΣΠΙΤΙ was also connected with **social values** and **relationships** with other people. In three responses, the lexeme *σπίτι* was associated with the words *φίλοι* and *επισκέπτες* 'friends and visitors'. In only a few elicited texts, the MOTHER was mentioned as an important component of a true ΣΠΙΤΙ. Three students said in their survey forms that the **common table** was an obligatory element of a home. **Homemade food** was also mentioned as one of the characteristic elements of the concept that contribute to the multi-faceted nature of the image of ΣΠΙΤΙ (12 responses). Only **six respondents** (5.6%) highlighted the **physical** dimension of home as its most important feature: a place to dwell in (live in).

In three elicited texts, ΣΠΙΤΙ was not associated with the family home, but with an apartment that a student rents during his or her studies. Three respondents clarified that the concept of ΣΠΙΤΙ stands for internal space, interior decoration. Only four responses mentioned the **aesthetic aspect** of home.

The data collected from dictionaries, texts and surveys lead to the following generalization on the understanding of ΣΠΙΤΙ in Modern Greek and allow us to formulate a cognitive definition of this concept. The integral Modern Greek concept ΣΠΙΤΙ is actualised in five basic dimensions – physical, social, functional, cultural and axiological.

1. The physical dimension: a building, a room, decoration, objects.
2. The functional dimension: a place that protects people from external factors and satisfies human needs, a harbour, a place of refuge.
3. The social dimension: home as the family
4. The cultural dimension: home explicates a whole array of landmarks and values.
5. The axiological dimension: home – good, without a home – bad, unwell.

From a diachronic perspective, the conceptualisation of *ΣΠΙΤΙ* has both permanent and variable parameters. The semiotic status of things has clearly lost its importance. Home, in the sense of hearth and home, has lost its sacredness; the concept of home has become narrowed down to the idea of 'comfort'.

Conceptualization of home as a dwelling space is subject to changes that encompass the social and cultural aspects of the concept. In contrast to traditional notions, today, the concept of home is not inseparably related to ownership and is not necessarily identified with the concept of family. More and more often, the concept of *ΣΠΙΤΙ* comes to represent the private, intimate space.



## **NAMAS ‘house’ and NAMAI ‘home’ in the Lithuanian language and culture\***

Kristina Rutkovska

The Lithuanian picture of a home is today still deeply rooted in folk discourse – the ideal home is a childhood home in the countryside. Lithuanian literary studies even have the concept of “rural literature”, which depicts life in the country. A Lithuanian is attached to the countryside more than anyone else. Just as the Lithuanian language is archaic, so is the Lithuanian attitude towards home. Beside being archaic, Lithuanian vocabulary, recorded in the twenty volumes of the *Dictionary of Lithuanian Language* (*Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, LKŽ), is also multicultural. It contains a wealth of words of foreign origin, borrowed from Prussian, German, Polish, Belarusian, and Russian. These borrowings are a reflection of the nation’s history, which has shaped the Lithuanians’ ethnic worldview. A slightly different vision of home is found in contemporary texts and responses to a survey.

In Lithuanian, two grammatical forms are used to denote a home/house: the singular *namas* and the plural *namai*, both of them polysemous.

*Namas*, according to LKŽ, is 1. ‘a dwelling’; 2. ‘a farm holding, a homestead’; 3. ‘a family, people who live together’; 4. ‘a pigsty’; 5. ‘a small separate space with a kitchen, used in the summer’; 6. ‘an entrance hall’. *A Dictionary of Contemporary Lithuanian* (*Dabartinės*

---

\* Full version see: Kristina Rutkovska, *Koncept DOMU w języku i kulturze litewskiej*, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, *DOM*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s. 61–87.

*lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, DLKŽ), on the other hand, gives only one definition of *namas* – 'a dwelling'.

*Namai*, according to LKŽ, is 1. 'a dwelling'; 2. 'a permanent place of residence'; 3. 'a farm holding, a homestead'; 4. 'a family, people who live together'; 5. 'a state institution, a building in which this institution is housed'; 6. a mollusc shell'; 7. 'the placenta'. DLKŽ lists the following meanings of *namai*: 1. 'a dwelling'; 2. 'a permanent place of residence'; 3. 'a farm holding, a homestead'; 4. 'a family, people who live together'; 5. 'a state institution'.

The definitions quoted above show that nowadays the meaning of the word *namas* is undergoing specialization; the lexeme is currently only associated with 'a dwelling place'. The word *namai*, on the other hand, has preserved five meanings. The base facets of HOUSE/HOME are prominent in the dictionary definitions: a dwelling and the *wider* space that includes other buildings; a family who *always* stay together; a house, which is not only used by the household members, but also serves a social function.

**Synonyms** (quasi-synonyms) highlight other, important features of the concept HOUSE/HOME. A HOUSE/HOME is characterized as a building (physical aspect) which can be constructed from various materials, have a different form, size, and quality. Its quality depends on the size, shape, and construction time; poor, shabby, and neglected houses are compared to animal homes (*laužas*, *landa*, *šunbūda*). A house/home has diverse functions: it is a place where various household chores are done (*apseigos*, *pirkia*). However, its main role is not only as a place of permanent residence or a place where the family live their life (*gyvenimas*), but also a place of ritual importance (*kertė*, *kampas*), to which family members constantly return (*lizdas*) and which is their native land (*tėviškė*). What emerges from these descriptions is the base facet of HOUSE/HOME as a religious centre, the beginning of the world, with which one is bound throughout the entire life.

**Antonymic pairs** include: (1) *namai* 'a dwelling place of the living' – *kapai* 'a place of burial of the dead, a grave'; (2) *namai* 'a place

where one lives and prays' – *lindynė* 'a second-rate inn; a den'; (3) *namai* 'a dwelling place' – *pasaulis* 'the entire globe; the world'; (4) *namai* 'a place where one lives' – *svečiai* 'a place one visits as a guest'. When collated with its antonyms, the lexeme *namai* highlights the function of a house/home as a place of permanent dwelling, complementing this meaning with such nuances as the need to pray at home (a non-pagan interpretation of the sacredness of home). The antonyms also foreground the opposition between familiarity and strangeness, as they contrast home and being at home with the outside world and being a guest: one's house/home is a friendly place, while the wide world is alien and uncomfortable (sometimes even hostile). A house/home is a private space.

**Derivatives** complement the base concept of HOUSE/HOME. They reveal the emotional attitude of Lithuanians to their houses/homes. In Lithuania, people love their homes and generally see them in a positive light, hence, the hypocorisms and diminutives *namunėlis* and *namulyteliai*. Poor houses are spoken of in the same way. A house/home is a place where people are happy to stay or to which they are attached by an everlasting bond, as it is the place they always head to (adverbial derivatives are also diminutives, e.g. the second-grade diminutive *namytužiu*). Household members share both positive experiences (*namauti*, *namykštystė*) and negative ones (*savanamė*). A member of a household is an important person, who has responsible functions at home (*namininkas*); a person who betrays their home or does not have a home is valued negatively (*išnamis*, *benamis*); an individual is also judged by what house they own (*pirtelnikas*, *didžianamis*). There is a certain family hierarchy – the host is the most important person in a household – he is the ruler, a god in his house (*nampatis*, a word which has the same structure as *viešpatis*, *viešpast* 'a ruler, god, host'). The host's children are also expected to behave in a serious manner and take responsibility for the home (*namūnaitis*, *namūnaitė*). Thus, the human being is the foundation of a home, and the home is the highest value for him/her.

A house without permanent inhabitants can perform other functions accepted by society. It can be a place where people gather willingly (*arbatnamis*, *dievnamis*, *kulturnamis*) or a place of confinement of negatively perceived categories of people (*kekšnamis*, *elgetnamis*, *beprotnamis*). The value of the home then lies in the fact that it is a place in which human beings dwell on a permanent basis, a place they love and want to stay in. Derivatives complement the base facets of HOUSE/HOME with additional features. They also give prominence to the value people acquire through their relationship with their home.

The **collocations** of the word *namas* describe the physical characteristics of a house/home and the functions it performs. A picture that emerges from the analysis of the collocations is an image of a building (*medinis*, *mūrinis namas* 'a wooden, brick house') with parts, such as a roof, a porch, shutters (*namas su baltomis langynėmis* 'a house with white shutters', *namas su gonkelėmis* 'a house with a porch'). A house is usually located among other buildings in the homestead and close to nature (*namas prie ežero* 'a house by a lake'). It, again, has an impact on the relationships among the people staying in it (*vieno namo* 'one home; those who live in harmony, have similar preferences; *namų šlovė* 'honour of the house'). New conceptual content appears here, which is subject to stronger valuation – a positive value is attached to a house which is someone's property (*mudviejų namas* 'our common house'). A man builds a house for himself and his family with love and protects its honour.

**Survey data** allow further insight into the characteristics of the concept of HOUSE/HOME. In their responses, students practically make no mention of negative features of HOUSE/HOME. On the contrary, they tend to mythologize it (*rojus žemėje* 'paradise on earth'). The most common is the theme of returning home: the home is a hideout where one can escape from the world and its problems (*vieta, kur visada norisi ir gera sugrįžti* 'a place it is always good to return to'). The modern youth still cherish the family and childhood as the spheres of carefree existence and security (*vieta, kur jautiesi saugus* 'a place

where you feel safe’); a person needs to go back to their beginnings, to the state of being oneself, to love. A home is then a place, where ‘you can be your own expressive and unrestricted self’ (*gali būti individualus, ekspresyvus, nevaržomas*) and where ‘you are loved and respected’ (*žmogus gali jaustis mylimas, gerbiamas*). *Namas/namai* is perceived through the senses: the objects in the house, and its surroundings, though the physical aspects are more strongly connected with the former form of the lexeme (*namas*). The respondents make only marginal mention of the location of the house/home. Irrespective of its actual location, they always place the house/home in the following imagined spaces: homeland, a country, a city, a town, a village or any place a person currently resides in. What emerges from these data is a facet of a movable, cosmopolitan, European home.

**Proverbs** give prominence to the facet of HOUSE/HOME understood as a stronghold, which is a friendly space to its inhabitants (*Geriau į savo bakūžę susirietus, nekaip į svetimus rūmus stačiom eiti* ‘It is better to walk bowing into your own cubbyhole than to walk erect into someone else’s palace’). People should not leave home for a long time, because it is only at home that they can be their own selves. On the other hand, secluding oneself from the world can harm a person – a home may then become a prison (*Kam kalėjimas, jai namai* ‘A prison to some, and to her a home’). Lithuanian proverbs warn people against the strange world and keep guard over patriarchal relations in the family.

**Journalistic texts** present two slightly different visions of HOUSE/HOME. Prominence is given to the facet of HOUSE/HOME as a material structure, a cosmopolitan place which opens its doors wide to the world, a place that is intended for living in, but is stripped of emotions (or controls emotions). What a house/home is (like) depends on the current fashion and a person’s home can be located anywhere: “There is a period in the life of every human being when he is not bound by anything – he stands alone in front of the world naked,

without property, without a family ... he drives a stake into the earth and creates his own true hearth and home."

The features of the Lithuanian base image of HOUSE/HOME are centred around several basic semantic aspects: social, psychosocial, mental, physical and functional. Slightly less weight is put on the existential and locative aspects.

**In the social aspect**, one of the main components of the meaning of *namas/namai* is 'a family living together'. The relationship between home and family is emphasized by numerous synonyms, which, simultaneously enrich the family-related meaning of home with additional connotations: the concept of a home being permanently bound with the family, being the most important place for the family, its earliest beginning. These features are most strongly entrenched in the systemic part of the concept of HOUSE/HOME. Survey data also indicate that a house/home is important as a dwelling place for the family, but contemporary texts prefer to see the home as a place that is open to the world, a place that does not necessarily need to be where the family lives.

**The psychosocial aspect** prevails in responses to the survey – young people are emotionally connected with their families, and thus also with their homes. In the language system, the home is strongly sacralized – it is assigned important ritual functions and regarded with deep affection. Modern texts, however, deprive it of this halo – they do not deny the importance of the warmth of hearth and home, but they accept that it may be inhabited by people who do not necessarily belong to the family. Tolerance and partnership are the preferred values.

**The mental aspect**, which does not feature in dictionary definitions, is repeatedly found in contemporary texts about the home. The idea that a person feels good at home, that they can be themselves, maintain their personality, remember the moments spent at home (together with their family), accompanies all descriptions of home,

but is more strongly represented in the survey material, where it is one of the dominant motifs.

**The functional aspect of home** is related both to the word's archaic meaning 'a dwelling place for a family' and its most recent meaning 'a seat of an institution'. A home is a shelter which protects individuals from the strange world they fear, as confirmed by numerous proverbs, student responses to the survey questions, and contemporary texts.

**The physical aspect.** In dictionaries, the word *namas* is glossed laconically as a building. Systemic data contain references to a variety of houses, made of various materials, beautifully decorated or shabby, large and small. Contemporary texts describe the house as a spacious, bright, well-lit, comfortable and functional structure. Lithuanians still want to build solid and firm houses, but, equipped with modernist innovations, they can build houses which have "no face".

**Two profiles of the Lithuanian HOUSE/HOME.** A first profile is created from the point of view of a simple person who comes from the countryside and is connected with it. For this sort of person, a house/home is a dwelling place for a family, and the family is the cornerstone of a home. Members of a family who live in the same house should trust, sympathize with, support, and help each other. They are bound together by common memories, traditions, and customs. The connection with the home must be a lasting one; a person should always return home, take care of it, and look after those who live in it. When leaving home for longer, one loses a sense of security. A home should be well-lit, cosy, and warm; it should offer tasty home-made food, have its own unique smell and noises. A home is a place where someone is waiting for you, where you can relax, do pleasant things, or even work. Preferably, it should be located in the countryside or outside urban areas, in the bosom of nature. It should be surrounded by a forest or an orchard with a gazebo. This is a **typically rural, romantic vision of a home, based on a lasting relationship with the family.**

A second profile corresponds to the worldview of a modern intellectual who may be connected with the countryside, but is open to the world, has the ambition to create a home wherever he goes, and prefers contemporary European values. For this type of person, a home still remains the place where his/her parents and grandparents live. He/she wants to return home, though only for a short while, and to know that there is such a place on earth. Modern intellectuals, however, do not feel a strong bond with their family homes. They want to build their own homes, in which they will live with their nearest and dearest; a modern intellectual's home is a home for one family. This home should be looked after, because it shapes one's personality and has an impact on one's whole life. A profile that emerges from these data is the profile of **a European home**, located wherever a person is, but still **keeping guard over family relations**, the principles of respect, and equal rights for all its inhabitants.



# The Polish linguistic and cultural worldview of *DOM* ‘house/home’ and its profiles\*

Jerzy Bartmiński

Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel

**Introduction.** In the canon of Polish values, *DOM* ‘house/home’<sup>1</sup> is put next to such values as FAMILY, LOVE, FRIENDSHIP, and higher than FREEDOM, HEALTH and WORK. For Poles, *DOM* is something more than a notion or concept, it is a universal idea and symbol, but also one of the most important key words of the Polish culture. In particular, this applies to the idea of “dom polski” [Polish home], which in the absence of state independence (1795–1918) was treated – along with language and customs – as the “bastion of national identity”, defending against Germanization and Russification. In the 19<sup>th</sup>-century texts of Polish emigrants there is a motive of the loss of home-homeland, which in the modern discourse returns in the context of homelessness and in the vision of a “nomadic” home.

In the Polish literature of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries we may find the presentation of both landowners’ and peasant family homes (*Rodz-*

---

\* Full version see: Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, *Polski językowo-kulturowy obraz DOMU i jego profile*, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, *DOM*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s. 89–121.

<sup>1</sup> It is important to emphasise at this point that the Polish concept *DOM* has a broad semantic scope and covers both English concepts – HOME and HOUSE. Hence, in this article the original Polish concept *DOM* will be used to refer to its broad semantic potential. The equivalent English concepts HOUSE or HOME will be used only in places where solely the former or the latter part of the meaning of the Polish *DOM* is directly evoked.

*ina Połanieckich* by Henryk Sienkiewicz and *Chłopi* by Władysław Reymont). On the one hand, idealised images of the family home were presented in which home was the “centre of the universe” with mother at its heart (e.g. Józef Baran’s *Dom rodzinny*, Tadeusz Różewicz’s *Matka odchodzi*), home was portrayed as a retreat where everyone feels good (Maria Dąbrowska’s *Noce i dnie*), home was seen as a treasury of souvenirs and memories and a place where people’s personality is shaped (*Prawiek i inne czasy* by Olga Tokarczuk), but we may also find images of a toxic home (tyranny of the mothers in Maria Kuncewiczowa’s *Cudzoziemka*), a dissolute home (*Tango* by Sławomir Mrożek), a pathological home (sadism of the father in Wojciech Kuczok’s *Gnój*). Similarly, diverse images of home are delivered in films and TV series: on the one hand, there are positive images of multi-generational homes based on traditional lifestyles (“Dom”, “Klan”, “Siedlisko”, “Dom nad rozlewiskiem”), on the other hand, there are images of pathological homes as in the films “Dom zły” (2009) by Wojciech Smarzowski or “Pręgi” by Magdalena Piekorz (2004).

However, there is a set of features of DOM that are common to all discourses and speech genres, belonging to the “common cultural base”, independent of axiological and political options, present in colloquial language. This image of DOM was described in the first part of the study, whereas the second part focused on different cultural variants (profiles) of the basic image of DOM.

**2. Remarks on the current state of research.** A comprehensive report on the state of Polish research on DOM in the area of humanities was presented by Agnieszka Kościuk in her doctoral dissertation entitled *Językowo-kulturowy obraz domu w polskiej tradycji ludowej (na podstawie „Dzieł wszystkich” Oskara Kolberga)* [The linguistic and cultural picture of home in the Polish folk tradition (based on Oskar Kolberg’s “The Complete Works”)] (2015). The traditional home in the countryside was described in the context of folk culture by ethnologists Danuta and Zbigniew Benedyktowicz in their book *Dom w tradycji ludowej* [Home in the Folk Tradition] (1992). The linguistic

and cultural worldview of *DOM* was presented in works published in the volume *Dom w języku, literaturze i kulturze* [Home in language, literature and culture] edited by Grażyna Sawicka (1997), Elżbieta Sękowska's book *Dom* [Home] (in the series: *Słownictwo Pism Stefan Żeromskiego*, 2002) and, in particular, in the dissertation by Beata Żywicka *Miejsca i wartości* [Places and values] (2007). *DOM* was in the focus of attention of sociologists (e.g. in the volume *Dom we współczesnej Polsce* [Home in modern Poland], eds. Paweł Łukasiewicz and Andrzej Siciński, 1992) and anthropologists (in the volume *Co znaczy mieszkać* [What does it mean to live], ed. Grażyna Woroniecka, 2007; Witold Rybczyński's *Dom. Krótka historia idei* [Home. A brief history of ideas], 2015).

**3. Material basis.** The reconstruction of the Polish concept *DOM* was based – in accordance with the assumptions of the EUROJOS programme – on systemic, questionnaire and textual data. All the most important Polish language dictionaries were included. Questionnaire surveys were conducted three times: in 1990, 2000 and 2010, and the posed question was: “Co według ciebie stanowi o istocie prawdziwego domu?” [What is the essence of a true home according to you?]; each conducted survey included about 100 respondents, half of whom were women and men respectively, all were Lublin-based students of humanities and science faculties. As for the textual data, in addition to the proverbs derived from *Nowa Księga Przysłów Polskich* edited by Julian Krzyżanowski, the study was based on randomly selected (partly at researchers' discretion) 300 contexts extracted from the “trial” version of the Corpus of Polish (150 quotes) and press articles representing different ideological points of view (150 quotes).

**4. Dictionary definitions of the lexeme *dom*.** In the Polish dictionaries, the lexeme *dom* is treated as polysemous. *Inny słownik języka polskiego* ISJP [A Different Dictionary of Polish] edited by Mirosław Bańko (2000), the most precise dictionary in terms of semantics and simultaneously one of few that respects the popular language intuition, assigns 6 meanings to *dom*, of which the basic one, most interest-

ing to us, marked with number /1/ is presented in detail with some “sub-meanings” defined as follows:

- 1.1. ‘a building where one lives or works’;
- 1.2. ‘a flat or a room in which one lives’;
- 1.3. ‘a family and people with whom one lives’;
- 1.4. ‘all matters related to family life’;
- 1.5. ‘a family or a dynasty’;
- 1.6. ‘a place where someone comes from’.

The editors provide each definition with a list of fixed collocations, which collected together in a separate block were given the consecutive number /2/. ISJP separates the quoted basic meanings of the word *dom* and its collocations from the special uses of the lexeme: /3/ ‘Home/house as a social, commercial or service-providing institution, usually occupying a separate building’, e.g. *dom dziecka* [orphanage], *dom starców* [old people’s home/nursing home], *dom akademicki* [hall of residence], *dom kultury* [community centre/cultural centre], *dom towarowy* [department store], *dom publiczny* [brothel], *dom poprawczy* [young offenders’ detention centre]; /4/ *dom wariatów* [madhouse]; /5/ *Biały Dom* [White House – US President’s headquarters]; /6/ *Dom Boży* [God’s house – ‘church’].

The definitions of DOM in other Polish dictionaries vary greatly and the number of meanings attributed to DOM sometimes reaches up to 13. Based on the data extracted from lexicographical sources, Beata Żywicka claimed that the emphasis is put on the basic model of DOM as a “place [...] serving primarily to live in it, having its own residents who make up a family” (Żywicka 2007: 42–43). However, after the analysis of richer systemic, questionnaire and textual data, the authors of the entry DOM in LASiS [The Axiological Lexicon of Slavs and their Neighbours] came to the conclusion that it is the functional, not spatial, aspect of DOM that is put first.

**5. DOM in the light of questionnaire data.** According to the open questionnaire survey (conducted three times in 1990, 2000 and 2010), in which respondents answered the same question “What is the

essence of a true home according to you?”, the essence of a “true” home is determined by love, family warmth and a sense of security. It was emphasised that home is created by a family whose members show mutual support to and understand each other. The idea of a “true” home did not change in the examined period, it concerned social and psychosocial aspects, students pointed to the community ensuring security and emotional bonds.

**6. Higher-order category: *inhabiting*.** The dictionary definitions of DOM indicate three higher-order categories (hypernyms) of concepts: *building*, *flat* and *family*. They are linked by the idea of *inhabiting*, i.e. staying in a familiar place. This is a functional category, not a spatial one. Upon reconstructing the complete understanding of *mieszkanie* ‘inhabiting’, the authors assign to the verb *mieszkać* [to live] the following components:

**6.1. ‘to stay somewhere for a longer period’** (this meaning is systematically entrenched in derivatives from the lexeme *dom*: *domownik* [household member] ‘permanent resident of the house’, *domator* [home bird] ‘a person who likes to be at home’, *zadomowić się* [to settle in, to make a place one’s home] ‘feel good somewhere and stay there longer or permanently’ and *udomowić* [domesticate] ‘to tame, to make a wild animal live among people’;

**6.2. ‘in separation from the surroundings and in a closed space’** (the home space has internal boundaries: *door*, *threshold*, *walls* – but also external: *fence*, *gate*; crossing the home boundaries – entering and leaving – is ritualised and has rich phraseology: *przekroczyć próg domu* [cross the house threshold], *przyjąć kogoś pod dach* [accept someone under the roof], but also *wyrzucić kogoś za drzwi* [to throw someone out the door] etc.);

**6.3. ‘at one’s own place’** (the lexeme *dom* is usually used in texts with possessive pronouns *my*, *your*, *their*; *staying at one’s own place* is contrasted with staying at *other people’s place*, *away from home*, *be one’s guest*, *stay at a hotel*, etc.; arrange something *po domowemu* –

‘according to one’s preferences, in one’s own way’, dressed *po domowemu* – ‘casually, informally’.

The feeling of ‘being at home’ underlies the **metaphorical projection** of the semantics of *dom* onto the surroundings, the country, the national homeland (in this case further on Poland, Europe) and the world, as well as onto abstract spheres such as language, art, and religion.

**7. Who is at home – the subjective aspect of DOM.** Home is a place for people that are close to each other, especially for families with children. The perception of home in strict connection with close people is testified by *Słownik antonimów* [Dictionary of antonyms], which notes the social opposition *home* ↔ *stranger* on the first place. The relationship between home and the family is fixed in the phrase *dom rodzinny* [family home] and metaphorical synonyms: *gniazdo rodzinne* [family nest], *domowe pielesze* [hearth and home], *dach rodzinny* [family roof], *strzecha rodzinna* [family thatch], *ojczysta strzecha* [father thatch]. *Family home* is an attractive place to which one returns willingly, a place which is missed. The person who is mostly credited with participating in the creation of a home is a woman in the roles of a housewife, mistress and mother. At home, in the *family nest* the **mother** takes a privileged position.

**8. The functional aspect of DOM: satisfying needs.** Inhabiting (staying – longer – in separation from the surroundings – at home) serves satisfying elementary needs, which in the language of children are described with a jocular formula: *papu, kaku, lulu* [food, poo, sleep]; however, there are more diverse living and psychosocial needs including: (1) the sense of safety; (2) protection from cold; (3) sleep and rest; (4) being together with the loved ones, with children (nurturing them and bringing them up) and with the family; (5) (usually) satisfying hunger; (6) (usually) personal hygiene (washing/bathing, excretion); (7) (usually) transmitting cultural patterns – speech, beliefs and convictions, norms and values; (8) (sometimes) performing paid work.

**9. The residential aspect of DOM: a place to live.** There are many types of DOM – from a prototypical *detached house*, a *single-family house*, a *cottage* to *an apartment in a block of flats*. The house can be *built, erected; insured; pulled down, demolished; put up for sale, rented*. The names for houses are differentiated according to their appearance, construction and social status of their residents. Peasants lived in *cottages*, farm workers in *czworaki* [living quarters for farm workers], gentry in *manor houses*, magnates in *palaces*; miners in *familoki* [a type of house for many families working in industry], burghers in *tenements*, workers in *blocks of flats*; the Polish families usually dream of a *single-family detached house*.

**Parts of the house** are assigned a special role in meeting the needs of its residents. **Roof** provides protection against rainfall, **walls** – safety, **stove** – warmth; **door** and **threshold** separate from the surrounding and mark the boundaries between what is inside and outside; **windows** provide access to sunlight and the outside world, they function as eyes in the human body (the name *okno* [window] is derived from *oko* [eye]); *roof, threshold, four walls, stove and place behind the stove* become symbols of safety, comfort and intimacy.

The house consists of rooms with a specific purpose: **kitchen, room (bedroom), bathroom** – this order corresponds to the hierarchy of the functions of a house: eating – sleeping – excreting. Essential home appliances such as table, bed, chairs, dishes, clothes, “décor” (TV set, objects related to worship, books) are part of the image of a house. The environmental, chronological and regional diversity of both the appearance and furnishing of a house is amply demonstrated in the texts.

**10. The cultural aspect: DOM as a value – valuation of DOM.** Proverbs expose the axiological opposition *house/home* ↔ *world* in which DOM is valued highly positively: *Chwalmy świat, ale ostańmy doma* [Let’s praise the world, but let’s stay at home]. *Wszędzie dobrze, ale w domu najlepiej* [There’s no place like home]. But the idiomatic expression *wyrwać się z domu na świat* [to break free from home

into the world] suggests a contrast in which *house/home* limits human freedom, whereas the *world* opens the space of freedom. This is an experience attributed to young people as well as to women tired of domestic work.

**11. When does DOM cease to be DOM?** A home ceases to be a home when there is no mutual kindness connecting the household members.

**12. Summary:** DOM is: (1) a place (*building, house, cottage, manor house, studio flat...*), in which (2) someone (*family, "one's own", relatives, mother, children*) (3) lives, i.e. stays permanently/for a longer period of time; (4) separated from the surroundings, in a private space, not public; (5) with a sense of being *at home*, in a *familiar* place, where one feels comfortable, *at ease*, can dress up *casually*; (6) satisfies the most important life needs, including in particular: (6a) the need for safety, (6b) protection from cold (the warmth of *hearth and home*), (6c) sleep and rest, (6d) being with relatives, children; (usually:) (6e) satisfying hunger, (6f) (usually:) personal hygiene; (7) (usually:) transmits to the younger generation cultural patterns: speech, convictions and beliefs, traditional norms and values; (8) sometimes: performs paid work. As a comprehensive mental construct ("gestalt") DOM encompasses the psychosocial, functional, spatial and cultural (axiological) dimension.

**13. Profiles of DOM.** The linguistic and cultural worldview of DOM in the Polish language outlined above constitutes a basic image, which in social communication (in discourse) operates in different variants (profiles) which depend on the subject's point of view, his/her values and communicative intentions.

The following profiles of the Polish concept DOM, which are present in the contemporary public discourse, have been determined in the article:

- (1) the material (physical) profile of DOM as a building;
- (2) the community profile of DOM – family home, with the prominent role of a woman as a wife and a mother;



(3) the patriotic profile: *dom polski* [a Polish home] in which *matka-Polka* [the mother-Pole] is a guardian of the national tradition, bringing up children in the spirit of duties to their homeland;

(4) the feminist profile of DOM as a women's prison;

(5) the mobile home rooted in a painful experience of being deprived of the homeland, proper to 19<sup>th</sup>-century emigrants, also in the cultural myth of the "exile from paradise" and modern "heterotopia", the awareness of empty spaces which serve only as transit, allowing free movement and traveling;

(6) the metaphysical profile: *DOM Boga Ojca* [HOUSE of God the Father], present only in the religious discourse.

Each of the analysed discourses in some way takes a stance on the underlying image of house/home functioning in the popular awareness – it is the reference point for ideological discourses – they either accept and share it, or they question and reject it.

## Czech concept *DOMOV* ‘home’ in the light of linguistic, empirical and text data\*

Irena Vaňková

Concept *DOMOV* represents one of the fundamental values of Czech culture and expression *domov* matches the criteria for cultural key words defined by A. Wierzbicka. Values concentrated in the meanings of lexemes *domov* (‘home’), *domů* (directional adverb ‘home’ as in „go home”) and *doma* (local adverb ‘at home’, e.g. „stay at home”), which express the concept *DOMOV*, mingle with the content of the concepts *RODINA* (‘family’) and *RODNÝ KRAJ* (‘native land’, ‘homeland’), *RODNÁ ZEMĚ* (‘home country’), *VLAST* (‘motherland’), establishing the identity and integrity of a person and the human community.

The Polish and Russian lexeme *dom* has two counterparts in Czech: *domov* and *dům* (‘house’). *Dům* indicates a concrete object – residential building, while *domov* is related to an abstract entity involving several semantic positions and associated with housing, but also with close relatives, friends and familiar places to which one has an emotional attachment; *domov* refers to both for the family (prototypically), both to native place, whether it is home, native country or homeland. Secondary meanings of *dům* and *domov* overlap, both expressions are very frequent and belong to the core vocabulary, as well as formally and semantically related adverbs – *domů* and *doma*. Practical

---

\* Full version see: Irena Vaňková, *Český pojem DOMOV ve světle jazykových, empirických a textových dat*, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, *DOM*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s. 123–148.

aspect of a common (especially family) life and its daily functioning, including the economic aspect, is expressed by the word *domácnost* ('household').

All these expressions come from the Indo-European root (\**domu-*, \**dem* – “to build”): from the old Czech declination forms of the noun *dům* (formerly *dóm*, cf. *jděte domovi* ‘go home’) later evolved lexemes *domov*, *doma* and *domů*. Lexeme *domov* is relatively new, it appeared for the first time in the Jungmann’s Czech-German dictionary (1835). Czech concept *DOMOV* dates back to the period of the National Revival, when the modern Czech nation and modern Czech worldview was constituted; at that time the popular song *Kde domov můj?* ‘Where Is My Home?’ (1834) was composed, and since the establishment of an independent state (1918) has been the official Czech national anthem.

The primary meaning of the expression *domov* is (approximately) ‘a place where a person lives or was born, where he belongs; group of people to whom one feels he belongs to’. Other meanings are derived: ‘building or institution for communal housing’, ‘animal habitation space or shelter, e.g. nest or den’ and ‘habitat occurrence of an animal or a plant’.

**Language data** confirms the positive connotations associated with *domov*, e.g. esp. *všude dobře, doma nejlíp* ‘there’s no place like home’; *cítit se jako doma* ‘feel at home’; *teplo domova* ‘the warmth of home’, *vůně domova* ‘nice smell of home’, *pohoda domova* ‘ease of home’ (collocations often used in Czech advertising, too). It’s worth mentioning the evaluative tautology with the meaning of irreplaceability of *domov*, *doma je doma* ‘home is home’.

In the **empirical research** student respondents share the understanding that *domov* is a place connected with family and loved ones, and the fact that it is a good place and a nice, safe place to return, a place where there is love, background, calm, support, understanding and acceptance, security and stability, warmth, good humor, privacy, a place that is important for people, where they feel relaxed and where one is true to himself. These connotations are apparently

widely shared in the Czech context (this fact is confirmed by the linguistic and textual data). At the same time, however, the students' responses show some specifics, esp. low number of responses are related to *domov* as a place of birth or origin (including connotations of childhood, adolescence, etc.). It is surely related to the young age of respondents, because the text data (eg. the commemorative texts) confirm these connotations.

Few answers were explicitly related to the broader concept of *domov* (*domov* as a home region and homeland). Given that the questionnaire was entered in the Czech Republic, the meaning of homeland appeared sporadically. There was almost no evidence of connotational conjunction of *domov* with the mother tongue and culture, neither transcendent profile appeared, previously confirmed in artistic or spiritual texts.

**Text data** relating to the expression *domov* are very rich and diversified, unfortunately, they had only rarely been included in the research. Lemma *domov* is most frequently documented in the *Czech National Corpus* in following collocations: *dětský domov* (children's home) and *domov důchodců* (nursing home). Also other results confirm the prominent link towards the social institutions providing alternative or temporary accommodation for children, seniors and those in need. Paradoxically, the secondary meaning of the lexeme *domov*, that is linked to institutions designed to replace the real home, is exposed in social communication. These institutions, however, are not felt as a „real home” (they are normally placed in opposition to it). Data show a high incidence of lexeme also in connection with the issue of foster families or homelessness (cf. expression *bezdomovec* 'homeless'); it is possible to include here numerous texts calling for the adoption and support of homeless animals (dogs, cats). Concept *DOMOV* is further exposed in the context of lifestyle (magazines and websites for women, advertising, etc. – cf. also the names of magazines, real estate agencies, companies, restaurants, like *Domov* 'Home', *Spokojený domov* 'Happy Home', *Náš domov* 'Our Home'). We record

the high incidence of the concept in the memories of childhood and youth, our roots, family and native land (celebrity interviews, memoirs, etc.). – It is obvious that the evidence of essential connotations associated with *domov* we find in artistic texts (which represent the model of real situations and experiences most importantly connected with human existentiality, the *conditio humana*).

The data confirm the dual concept of *domov*: 1/ *domov* as a place where **we** currently (and “officially”) **live**, and 2/ *domov* as a place to which we have an **emotional attachment, to which we feel we belong**, although do not live here; it is usually – but not always – associated with birthplace, more precisely place of origin. In the first case we can speak about the **denotational** meaning (“where we live”), in the second about **connotational** (“where one feels at home”).

This is related to the **1st level of profiling** of concept DOMOV, ie. differentiation of 1A. profile of **residing** and 2B. profile of **belonging and emotional bond** (linked esp. with *domov* as a birthplace).

In the **2nd level of profiling** we start from the concept of Václav Havel *soustředné kruhy domova* (‘concentric circles of home’). *Domov* presents the center of the lifeworld: the “I” is gradually shaping circuit of what I’m more or less known, what I feel is mine. – Czech material here confirms **three profiles**: a small private space and community of the closest ones – apartment, house and family (2A), wider spaces – town, city, region (2B), and widest – homeland (2C). Spatial structures can be extended, such as Europe and the planet Earth.

However, we feel them as a metaphorical extension of the basic concept (in the material were documented only marginally).

In the **3rd level of profiling** are differentiated five aspects:

**3A. The materially-practical aspect** associated with the house (which is the prototype and symbol of *domov*); practical aspects of housing are related with the materiality of *domov*: construction and building of the house (as a metaphor for building *domov* in the socio-psychological aspect and others) and what is associated with a related term *domácnost* (household): day care – *domov* and housing is in fact

tied to providing essential family members' needs: hygiene, eating, sleeping, recreation, etc., at home we cook, clean, wash, take care of children etc.

**3B. Spatial aspect** – the spatial anchoring is the basis of the stereotype of *domov*. The dictionary definition uses the hypernym term “place”; respondents from our empirical survey defined the term in the same way. *Domov* is a/ **the place where** we live (and where are our loved ones), and/or b/ **the place where** we were born, lived as a child and to which we feel we belong). In this sense, *domov* is involved in the conceptualization of the opposition near and afar (in the broadest sense of the word).

**3C. Socio-psychological aspect** – *domov* is associated mainly with family (prototypically in the centre with mother and then with father, grandparents, siblings, etc.), then with friends, neighbours, classmates, fellow countrymen, compatriots, and finally the whole nation.

**3D. Cultural and linguistic aspect: language, culture, history, nationality;** “Czech national awareness” conceptualized as *domov* occurs clearly in the experiences of emigrants. Awareness of mother tongue as a specific *domov* and intense experience of cultural traditions, literature, music, etc. is evident from the statements of both ordinary people and artists. An important part of this level is sharing, a sense of belonging to a certain community and allegiance to memory, memories, history and generations of common ancestors.

**3E. Transcendent aspect** is in our culture mainly associated with the Christian concept of *domov na nebesích* ('house in heaven'). Terrestrial and material *domov* foreshadows a spiritual *domov*, where, according to tradition, a man goes after death. *Domov* is in the intentions of popular piety equated with paradise as the seat of God and regarded as a place of repose, love, security, happiness and positivity; as well as a meeting place with beloved deceased: another demonstration of the positive connotations associated with *domov*. Death is often conceptualized as a *návrat domů* ('homecoming').

Paradise is used to be seen as a *domov* and vice versa: *domov* (eg. in the memories of childhood) is seen as a paradise: dreamed-of or lost and wanted again, bygone and to-be-again. Variants of such a concept of *domov* are to be found, however, especially in artistic texts (not in journalistic texts, that ought to have been our main source of text data). Nevertheless, we do not consider this area as marginal at all. The concept *domov* as a dreamed-of paradise is in fact present, for example, in the text of the Czech national anthem.

## The Russian linguistic and cultural view of *ДОМ* ‘home/house’\*

Ludmila L. Fyodorova

Dorota Pazio-Wlazłowska

The concept of *ДОМ* ‘home/house’, which is one of the most important, basic values in human life, has a special place in the Russian worldview. It not only reflects the primary and fundamental relationship between man and his place of residence, his loved ones and the past, but also has a new, extended meaning which embraces all places that are close to man in whatever way.

A principal role in the understanding of this concept is played by the opposition “familiar–strange”. *ДОМ* sets the boundary between man and the natural world and defines the space that is subordinated to it and is different from other people’s HOMES. At the root of the folk image of *ДОМ* is not only the concept of a building, but also that of a community of people living under one roof. These two meanings seem to be fundamental to the perception of the Russian concept *ДОМ*, as reflected in lexicographical sources.

*ДОМ* is a popular theme of literary works (cf. Pushkin, Gogol, Turgenyev, Chekhov, Dostoyevsky, Yesenin, Bulgakov, Trifonov) and films (the directors Kulidzhanov, Segel, Pogodin and others). The concept also encompasses magical folk images which are strongly rooted in

---

\* Full version see: Ludmiła L. Fiodorowa, Dorota Pazio-Wlazłowska, *Rosyjski językowo-kulturowy obraz ДОМУ*, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, *ДОМ*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s. 149–175. The authoresses wish to thank Professor O. Ye. Frolova, Professor I. A. Sedakova and Dr Ye. S. Uzenyova for their help and valuable comments.



culture and are perpetuated in fairy tales and stories, e.g., *избушка на курьих ножках* 'Baba Yaga's house on chicken's legs' and others. The Russian HOME is also inextricably linked to the mythical figure of *домовой* – a protective house spirit.

## **1. The development of the concept of *дом* from private home to collective home and back**

Fundamental to the reception of *дом* was the change in the attitude toward the values it represented initiated by the revolution. Immediately after the seizure of power by the Soviets, *дом* became the object of efforts aimed at desacralisation and destruction of the pre-existing order. These changes led to the socialization of private life, which was reflected both in the emergence of the so-called *коммунальные квартиры* 'communal apartments' inhabited by several families who were forced to share one kitchen and one bathroom, as well as the creation of many institutions which were designed to meet the existential and cultural needs of urban residents (e.g., *дом отдыха* 'holiday house', *Дом культуры* 'House of Culture') or which associated representatives of various professions (e.g., *Дом художника, писателей, композиторов* 'Painter's/ Writers'/Composers' House).

With time, the mechanism that regulated allotment of dwelling space to citizens had changed. After the heyday of communal housing, there came the time for resettlement (*расселение*). The 1990s brought another fundamental transformation – privatisation.

Essential to the Russian concept of *дом* is the institution of *dacha*<sup>1</sup>, a second home, onto which Russians had transferred their traditional perceptions of home as the family nest. This traditional picture perpetuates the images deeply rooted in the literature, e.g., in the works of Pushkin, Turgenev, Chekhov and Bunin, who described mansions and palaces, idealized the quiet life in the landed estate far from the

---

<sup>1</sup> A *dacha* is both a place of rest and a place where one grows flowers, fruit and vegetables.

hustle and bustle of the city. *Dachas* embody the image of private life, a privately owned farm loved and cared for by its hosts, providing a sense of inner freedom and independence in the bosom of nature.

## 2. *дом* as a complex mental construct

### 2.1. The physical aspect

Residential buildings vary depending on the period in which they were built: in city and town centres there often survive gentry mansions and merchant houses which are rich in architectural details. Typical of the 1950s and 1960s are the monumental *сталинки* 'stalinky, Stalin houses' and the low-cost *хрущёвки* 'khrushchyovky, Khrushchev houses'. In today's cities, high-rise blocks (*многоэтажки*) are erected side by side with rich *коттеджи* (from English *cottage*). In villages, traditional wooden houses with carved windows and porches more and more often stand beside new houses made of brick.

### 2.2. Interior layout

A typical rural house consists of a roofed porch, which can be reached by stairs (*крытое крыльцо со ступеньками*), an unheated hallway (*прихожая*), a glass-covered, unheated veranda (*застекленная веранда*), a kitchen (*кухня*) and rooms, as well as a dark closet (*чулан*), a cellar (*подпол, подвал*) and an attic (*чердак*). The threshold (*порог*) is an important place which marks the boundary with the outside world. A particularly important piece of equipment in an old house is the stove (*печь*). Old households usually also have a *banya* (*баня*)<sup>2</sup>, which is an independent building housing a sauna.

Apartments in cities (*квартиры*) are usually smaller than country houses. Depending on the number of rooms, they are referred to as *однушка*, *двушка*, *трёшка* 'a one-room, two-room, three-room apartment'.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Banya* is one of the characteristic Russian cultural concepts.

The exterior of a Russian home is subject not only to objective valuation regarding its physical characteristics and location, but also emotional valuation. Contemptuous and dismissive names for home in colloquial language include: *дыра, лачуга, хибара, клетушка, халупа* ‘hole, shack, hovel, cubbyhole, hut’.

Emotional valuation leads to the formation of the stereotype of the ideal home – a small, rural cottage with bright windows, a porch, an orchard and lilac bushes under the windows.

### 2.3. The social aspect

Home and its residents, who enter into specific relations with one another, are complementary concepts; a home without its residents is empty and defective; a man without a home (*не имеющий крыши над головой* ‘without a roof over his head’) is socially dysfunctional (*бомж* ‘homeless’). The concepts of HOME and FAMILY are closely related. Collocations that point to this reciprocal relationship evoke memories of childhood: *родительский дом* ‘parental home’, *отчий дом* ‘paternal home’<sup>3</sup>.

HOME and FAMILY are sacralised; especially in traumatic situations, they are seen as the highest values that are vital for self-identification of man.

The scope of HOME understood as a community can be expanded to include HOMELAND – a community that is a host of a certain territory.

### 2.4. The functional aspect

The primary function of *дом* is to provide to people a sense of security, both physical and mental. *дом* protects its inhabitants and is a secluded haven, a place one is happy to come back to because it has positively valued features that set it apart from the surrounding space. A home gives its residents a sense of freedom, allowing them to live unhampered by the standards of behaviour which apply in

---

<sup>3</sup> There are also homes for persons living without a family: children’s homes (*детский дом*), dormitories, workers’ hostels (*общежитие*).

the outside world: *быть, чувствовать себя как дома* 'to be, feel at home'.

An important subconcept symptomatic of the Russian perception of home is *жилая площадь*<sup>4</sup> 'dwelling space in a city apartment' (expressed in square meters), which is inextricably linked with the so-called "housing problem"<sup>5</sup>.

The component *дом* also appears in the names of various institutions which are intended to fulfil clearly defined social functions.

## 2.5. The cultural aspect

*дом* has a host who is its creator. The home owner collects various items in order to meet his/her physical and psychological needs and to achieve a sense of "homeliness" (*домашний уют*). These objects serve the purpose of individualising the space; to stay among those objects is the same as to be at home, regardless of where it actually is. Significant for the Russian *дом* is the subconcept of *уют*, which is not limited to what Russians refer to as *домашнее тепло* 'homely warmth, comfort, cosiness'. In addition to the warmth, it is inextricably associated with a small, confined space, a retreat, often also with the kitchen, where the life of the household concentrates.

*Дом* provides a sense of **cultural continuity**: it guarantees preservation of family traditions and is a place where values are handed down to the next generations.

## 2.6. The legal aspect

A house or an apartment can be purchased and owned (*собственный дом, частный дом* 'one's own, private house') or rented (*арендуемая жилая площадь* 'rented living space'). They can also be exchanged, rented out (*обменивать квартиру, снимать квартиру, комнату, жилье*) or inherited (*получить по наследству*).

---

<sup>4</sup> Official style, abbreviation from *жилая площадь*.

<sup>5</sup> A privately-owned apartment and apartment registration (*прописка*) were often an object of impracticable dreams in the Soviet reality.

### 3. The synthetic cognitive definition

*ДОМ* in the Russian language is:

- **the superordinate dimension** – a place where people live;
- **the physical dimension** – a building or a part of a building with a specific structure and specific furnishings;
- **the functional dimension** – a place that gives people shelter and a sense of physical and mental security;
  - a place where people feel well and at ease;
  - an institution which provides strictly defined services to a certain group of people;
- **the social dimension** – a place of residence of people related through kinship and – metonymically – those people themselves, and all the residents of the house (not only those related to each other) as a community;
- **the axiological dimension** – one of the most important values in the Russian worldview that determines the identity of man and is an object of desire and concern as a family nest, a group of people one loves, as well as one's home country, the homeland.

**There are five socially-established viewpoints on *дом*:**

- **the viewpoint of the owner/host**

It is essential for the host to be able to take decisions on all matters related to *дом*.

*дом* is identified with the host; it is a direct and simple relationship – a caring and thrifty host makes a well-kept, prosperous *HOME*: *Хозяин добр и дом хорош, хозяин худ и в доме то же.*

- **the viewpoint of the lady of the house**

Home is a place that requires a lot of work and effort: *Дом вести – не ланти плести.*

Taking care of home is valued positively; a good housewife likes her chores: *Хозяйка в дому – что оладьи (оладышек) в меду.*

- **the viewpoint of young people**

A principal characteristic of this viewpoint is the dichotomy between the family home (*отчий дом, родительский дом*) and home

perceived as temporary accommodation, a place where one lives during one's studies (*общежитие* 'a dormitory').

**– the viewpoint of the elderly**

Home is a place where one keeps in touch with the past, where one keeps objects that constitute material evidence of the past allowing family members to maintain an emotional bond between generations. Seniors also often take care of their grandchildren and help in housekeeping, thus symbolically linking the past with the future and guaranteeing the continuity of existence.

**– the viewpoints of persons deprived of their homes (refugees, emigrants, and others)**

These people often sacralise HOME and idealize the values it connotes – safety, warmth and absolute acceptance.

Today, there's a tendency in Russia to combine the traditional structure of *дом* and the fundamental values it connotes (the concepts *квартира, дача, жилплощадь, баня, уют, гости* 'apartment, dacha, living space, banya, homeliness, guests') with the desire to adapt to European standards.

# **The concept of *дом* ‘home’ in the Belarusian language\***

Jadwiga Kozłowska-Doda

The article presents an analysis and a description of the Belarusian concept of *дом* ‘home’. The analysis is based on systemic data collected from dictionaries of the Belarusian language, survey data obtained in four Belarusian cities (Minsk, Gomel, Brest and Grodno) and textual data coming from ideologically diverse nationwide newspapers and magazines, regional newspapers, messages posted on Internet forums, textbooks of the Belarusian language and literature. The cognitive definition of the Belarusian concept *дом* was built on the basis of features ascribed to *дом* by users of the Belarusian language; in the definition, the features were grouped into facets. The logical-conceptual model used in the description presents the concept of *дом* as a configuration of domains {[subject] + [event] + [locus] + [goal/needs]}; this set was extended to include another important domain, [the way of thinking] resulting from long experience.

*Дом* is a “common word” designating a “common thing” from everyday surroundings. At the same time home represents a huge value to a human being, and for it to possess this value, certain specific conditions have to be met.

The elementary purpose of a home is that it be inhabited. Dictionaries primarily record the following meanings of *дом*: a residential

---

\* Full version see: Jadwiga Kozłowska-Doda, *DOM w języku białoruskim*, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, *DOM*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s. 177–206.

building or a space intended for dwelling, a place where someone stays or where something is located. Respondents to the survey also underlined that home is a place of residence of a person – mainly an individual him/herself or his/her family.

Dwelling in a space had been the primordial activity before man became „mature” enough to build a home. The word *дом* 'building' is derived from the positively marked word for the action of building. The Belarusian peasant used to build his home with his own hands together with his family or with the help of builders, and that is why he valued it above all else. *Дом* is a pan-Slavic word (Proto-Slavic *\*domъ*), a continuation of the Proto-Indo-European *\*dom-*, *\*dem-* which stands for 'a home/a house', 'a building', 'the action of building' 'a room', 'a family'.

The meaning 'live, dwell' is expressed in Belarusian with the verb *жыць*. The concept of living encompasses also the moments of birth and death. Home as a birthplace/a little homeland occupies a high position in the responses to survey questions. Some respondents refer to home, especially the family home, as the “cradle” of man. Belarusians have, of old, wished to be born and die in their own homes. Dying outside one's home is considered a bad omen. It is home that the dead come back to, cf. the traditional rite of *dziady* and the euphemistic names given to coffin which allude to names for a dwelling. According to Belarusian beliefs, a home in the Great Beyond is as important as the earthly home.

Another important element of dwelling is “long-term experience” and “continuous practice”. Dwelling is not merely staying in a space; man develops a relationship with the place he dwells in, without which it cannot become a home and he – its inhabitant. Without this relationship, the place remains an abstract space and the man remains homeless, cf. the tragic histories of people who were deported from their own homes for political reasons before and after World War II or those who had been resettled after the Chernobyl disaster



and then returned to their homes, putting their health and life at risk, because they could not live elsewhere.

Every new space has to be tamed: adjusted to one's needs, furnished to suit one's taste, arranged, decorated with memorabilia, made cosy, given a climate that is close to one's heart And conversely, one's own home may become strange when its proper order has been disturbed.

One needs to settle in one's new home, make oneself at home. This is not an easy task, which sometimes requires a change in one's way of thinking. People who were raised in the countryside, often return from their city apartments to their father's cottages as pensioners to live their until their death.

One does not live in a home temporarily, but permanently or for a long time. A true home stands in opposition to temporary places of residence. An emotional relationship with one's place of residence gives a person strength, allows one to regain balance, makes one want to return to this place.

Having one's own home has always been in Belarus a symbol of prosperity and a good standard of living. Nowadays, it is a great, often unattainable dream. It makes a Belarusian proud to have managed to build or buy his own home.

To a Belarusian, the quintessence of a home is his family home in which he feels safe and free. Despite its – more often than not – poor interior decoration, a Belarusian's home is a real palace to him. The opposition between “one's own” and a “strange” home is very strongly entrenched in idioms, proverbs and texts. The strong emotional relationship with the home means home is often personified. Belarusians apologize to their homes, draw their portraits, etc.

The sense of familiarity is vital to extending the meaning of *дом* to village, city, region, country (my Homeland is my home and my home is my Homeland), the world and even the Universe.

Home is a place that is sectioned off from the surroundings. Various names for homes have a common hyperonym *жыллё, жытло*

'housing, accommodation' derived from the verb *жыць*. Not all places of residence have the same value. The most valued type of home is a detached building: a house/a cottage. *Дом* is a neutral name. The word for *xama* 'cottage' known in East-Slavic languages and Polish dialects originally meant 'a peasant's dwelling built of logs', 'part of a building', 'a peasant's farm, family'. Today, the words *дом* and *xama* [home and cottage], in the meaning 'house', but also 'apartment' and 'family', can be used interchangeably.

According to one theory, the word *xama* [hata] is a borrowing from Iranian *kata*- from *\*kan-* 'to dig' – "the etymological meaning 'dug out'; the word meant a 'room dug out in the ground, a dugout'." Some etymologists derive it from Avestan *kata* 'cubbyhole', 'larder', Farsi *kad* 'home' – "from words for 'hiding'". The action of hiding seems to be an important semantic element in the name of the Belarusian dwelling place. Despite the fact that they shut themselves out in their homes and focus on themselves, Belarusians are perceived as hospitable people.

In cities, people live in apartments, so-called "reduced homes" or "temporary shelters". A temporary shelter can be a room or several rooms in a communal flat without a bathroom, a room or a segment in a dorm or a room in workers' hostel with common restrooms. These places differ from the classic, stereotypical home. Even a large, nicely decorated, privately owned modern apartment in a block of flats or a high-rise building does not have the same value as one's own detached house. This is especially true for older people.

A substitute for such a house is a summer house (often a cottage in the countryside); for many Belarusians it is a continuation of the traditions of their peasant ancestors.

For the respondents to the survey, the building itself in the physical sense was not important at all, despite the fact that each of the elements of a home (its roof, walls, doors, windows, etc.) were generally very important, for example, roof as a shelter can be synonymous with home; windows are the "eyes" of a home etc. The walls separate

the tamed space from the untamed space. The threshold, which plays an important role in many rituals, is a boundary which one has to cross to venture from one's own space into the outside world. The meaning of threshold as a boundary or even an equivalent of home is attested in proverbs.

Household members "lock" in their homes what is the most important for them and what should be inaccessible to outsiders. A Belarusian tries not to talk about domestic matters outside the home. The Belarusian language has perpetuated idioms in which home is identified with breaking the ties with or having an attitude of indifference toward society and the state – agreeing to everything that is going on around.

A home can restrict the freedom of its inhabitants; they can become its captives. Only in this sense is home valued negatively; people who can feel prisoner to their own home include the disabled and women victims of domestic violence. One can become captive to one's own home if one is unable to or not allowed to demonstrate one's position. Restriction of freedom was the ground for the semantic extension of the word for 'cottage/shack' to the meaning 'prison cell' (the term was coined in the twenty-first century in the milieu of political prisoners), probably as a truncation of *press-shack*, which had already existed in the prisons of the USSR.

Once, Belarusian houses had only one room and a kitchen with a stove, where the whole family slept, ate and spent their time. There was also a hall and a pantry. Such houses were built even after the war.

In the 1970s and 1980s houses already had bathrooms and more rooms. The fact that old country houses had no bathrooms led to the widespread use of public baths. Apartments in blocks and high-rise buildings nowadays are equipped with a toilet and a bathroom. The kitchen in the Belarusian home is a place where the inhabitants cook and eat their meals but also a place of private meetings. The bedroom

is not as functionally important as the kitchen or one's own room; indeed some families use their guest rooms for sleeping.

In the Belarusian countryside, the stove, once a symbol of hearth and home, is still often used for heating and cooking. The most important place in a country house, a place of honour, is the corner with holy pictures opposite the stove (door). Today, after work, people no longer gather around the table but around the television set, which can be found in the living room, the kitchen and even the bedroom.

Hand-woven bedspreads add a particular climate to Belarusian houses. Today's youth, however, are not fond of handicrafts. They replace the natural elements of the interior with Chinese or Turkish plastics to keep up with the Joneses (or should we say the Ivanchuks).

Belarusians have always paid great attention to the place in which their home was going to be built. The moment of choosing this place is associated with numerous beliefs and customs associated with the prosperity and well-being, good fortune and unity of family members, continuity of the family line and wealth. The courtyard and the staircase are a continuation of domestic space. The natural surroundings are also an essential component of domestic space, especially in the countryside.

The functional characteristics of home (the place where we satisfy our needs) prevail over its physical features: a home provides a sense of security; protects its inhabitants from the cold; provides a place to sleep and rest in; allows people to satisfy their hunger and take care of personal hygiene (not always); satisfies the need for social contact (e.g. family gatherings); creates conditions for childcare; enables the transmission of cultural patterns (Belarusians do not always avail themselves of this opportunity); can be a workplace; a place of love, readiness to help and acceptance; a place one gladly returns to, a place where one is welcome.

The "real" Belarusian home is a home for a family (it has social features). A loving and supporting family stands in opposition to lonely people. There is plenty of linguistic evidence for the meaning

of home as an ‘institution’ – a place for a non-family community, but this meaning does not appear in the responses to the survey questions.

The traditional Belarusian home, in the sense of ‘family’, must consist of two parents and their children; a lack of any of these elements leads to an imbalance. Each family member, the survey shows, must co-create the home, take care of its tidiness, be responsible for others and care about their safety. They must feel at ease in their own home.

The main position in the household is occupied by the host; it is his role to build a house and take care of it properly. A good host also takes care of the members of his household. A Belarusian home, especially a home of elderly people, is patriarchal, with the man usually being the legal owner of the house. The fact that men are only negligibly involved in household matters follows from the stereotype of what a home is to a woman and what it is to a man, as expressed in the aphorism: A woman’s world is the home; a man’s home is the world.

The stereotypical Belarusian housewife enjoys a slightly lower status than the host. For her, the loss of the host, loneliness means “losing” her home. It is the duty of the housewife to decorate the home in a cosy manner. The Belarusian woman, however, does not want to solely take care of her home, and the phrase *stay at home* ‘not to work professionally’ has a negative connotation.

Home is a private space, where there is no place for strangers, cf. texts describing home confinement of political prisoners, whose homes were occupied all the time by unauthorized people; in a home like that man cannot be himself.

## **The concept of ДИМ/ХЫЖА ‘home’ in the Lemko ethnolect\***

Małgorzata Misiak

ДИМ / ХЫЖА ‘home’ is an important element of the Lemko world. Today, the Lemkos see it as a special place that guarantees preservation of their ethno-cultural identity.

The Lemkos, who belong to the group of East Slavs, have the status of an ethnical minority in Poland. It is assumed that they had developed into a separate group in the Polish territory in a long historical process that involved several waves of colonization: Polish, Wallachian and Ruthenian. Until 1947 they had inhabited the Polish Carpathian Mountains (Beskid Niski and Beskid Sadecki); as a result of resettlement (from 1944 to 1946 to the Soviet Ukraine and in 1947, under the operation “Vistula”, to northern and western Poland), they became a diaspora people scattered over the whole of the Polish territory.

The Lemko language exhibits all the characteristics of East Slavic languages and is classified as one of the south-western dialects of the Ukrainian language. At the same time, some scholars categorize it as a modern Slavic literary microlanguage. The Lemkos who declare their affiliation to the Ukrainian national group believe their native tongue to be a dialect and those who claim to be representatives of a separate ethnic group – take it to be a language. Due to the

---

\* Full version see: Małgorzata Misiak, *Koncept DOMU w etnolekcie łemkowskim*, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, *DOM*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s. 207–235.

ambiguous status of the Lemkos' native tongue, in the present article it is referred to with the term "ethnolect".

Scientific literature considers the problem of the Lemko home from two main perspectives: as one of the elements of Lemko residential architecture subject to historical ethnographic description or as an object of comparative analysis with non-Lemko homes. These works only touch upon the physical aspect of home as a type of building.

The only attempt at a reconstruction of the linguistic-cultural view of home based on the analysis of contemporary prose written in the Lemko language is an article by Natalia Kostiak (Kostiak 2007).

In the present paper, the analysis of the concept of *ДИМ/ХЫЖА* in the Lemko ethnolect was conducted in accordance with the objectives of the research program EUROJOS, using three types of data: systemic, survey and textual (SST).

Systemic data were studied on the basis of dictionaries of the Lemko ethnolect and available school materials.

Survey data were collected in a survey conducted among 67 Lemkos (mean age, 33 years). The following question was asked in the Lemko language: *што то єст для Вас правдивий дим?* 'What do you think is a real home?'

Textual data were obtained from an analysis of 300 contexts excerpted from Lemko magazines and literary works.

In the Lemko ethnolect, the concept of *ДИМ/ХЫЖА* is expressed by several lexical items (and their phonetic variants) recorded in dictionaries and attested in the survey and textual data: *хыжа*; *дим*, *дом* and *дiм*. Two of these lexemes, *дим* and *хыжа*, can be considered representative of the concept of home in the Lemko ethnolect. The Lemko word *дим* is a continuation of Proto-Slavic \**domъ* 'a space where man lives with his family; all that is in a home: family, belongings and possessions'. *Хыжа* is a pan-Slavic word. Proto-Slavic \**chyzъ* was a borrowing from Gothic *hūza* 'home'. This lexeme has become to Lemkos one of the characteristic and symbolic elements that are

used in their contemporary literature to define the so-called Lemko ethnographic and ethnic niche.

Both lexemes are used to refer to [1] 'dwelling place'; [2] 'a building in general'; [3] 'little homeland'; [4] 'family'; [5] 'institution'; [6] 'possessions, property'. The lexeme *хыжа* can additionally stand for 'kitchen'.

The **hyperonym** of *дим* and *хыжа* is the word *будинок* 'a building'. **Hyponyms** can be arranged into several groups: [1] according to permanence of residence: a) lexemes naming buildings that are permanent places of residence, for example, *бльок, хыжа деревяна, мурована хыжа, панельова хыжа* b) words or phrases which contain the semantic component of temporary residence: *академік, барак, бурса, шатро, літнискова хыжа*; [2] according to physical appearance, for example, *бльок барак, хыжа деревяна, мурована хыжа*, and [3] according to purpose (who a particular type of home is intended for, who lives in it): a) homes for people and b) homes for animals *хыжка слимакова* 'snail's shell (lit. snail's little hut)'.

**Opposites** refer to the physical aspect of home: *рудера, барліг, руїна, розвалиско* 'a ruin', *піврозвалина* 'a shanty'.

The **base facets of the Lemko home** are comprised of the following meanings:

[1] *Дим/хыжа* '**building**' – a physical object; a building inhabited by someone; a building in which something has its seat; it is a material value; it always has an owner; it is usually owned by the family who lives or used to live in it. The Lemko *дим/хыжа* is often opposed to former German houses which Lemkos were forced to occupy after their resettlement in 1947. *Дим/хыжа* as a building is sometimes viewed in relation to the traditional Lemko home, with emphasis being put, on the one hand, on the "old age" of the building, and, on the other, – its traditional look. *Дим/хыжа* as a building is part of a property (the building plus its surroundings: fields, farm buildings, animals). [2] *Дим/хыжа* '**people; family, relatives, friends**' – home in its social aspect, understood as the people who live in it and who, as a rule, form



a family. Home is also a community of people who share the same values and who are bound by strong positive emotional ties. It is imbued with family happiness and a family atmosphere; it resounds with music and singing. [3] *Дим/хыжа* – **a safe haven** – a place where people can find peace and safety, where they feel ‘at home’; a place to which they willingly return, where they can rest and pursue their passions and interests. [4] *Дим/хыжа* – **a cultural niche** – home is a place where people can freely manifest their cultural and ethnic origin. At home, people speak their own language, i.e. Lemko; home helps people preserve their traditions and culture; it is at home that the Lemko ethno-cultural identity is transmitted from one generation to the next. [5] *Дим/хыжа* – **the place of origin/birth** – as the place of origin, home is identified with Lemkivshchyna (Lemkovina), the ethnic territory of the Lemko people. For younger generations (born after 1947), home is the place of origin of their family. Home is also a birthplace.

The **synthetic cognitive definition of ДИМ/ХЫЖА** in the Lemko ethnolect consists of the following domains: [1] **the physical domain** – a clear distinction is made between home understood in the traditional sense and a modern home. The modern home reflects the current social and living conditions of Lemkos; [2] **the locative domain** – a traditional home is naturally located either in the “small homeland” (Lemkivshchyna) or in a family village (in Lemkivshchyna);

[3] **the symbolic domain** – the family home (*хыжа*) exists in the mythologised space of ethnic Lemkivshchyna. The home of one’s father (*nianiowa chyža*) is the symbol of homeland (patrimony); [4] **the economic domain** – the most important component of a home are the people who live in it, family members. Attention is drawn to the model of extended family; [5] **the psychological domain** – home gives people a sense of security; household members respect and love one another; home is a peaceful place, [6] **the social domain** – home is where people perform important social tasks, build a commu-

nity, and are nurtured [7] **the cultural (ethnographic and ethnic) domain** – home allows its inhabitants to preserve the awareness of their ethno-cultural origin.

**The base concept of *ДИМ/ХЫЖА* is profiled** from the point of view of the subject. The following profiles can be distinguished: [1] **the profile of the traditional home** – the traditional home is most often understood as a wooden building with its traditional parts. In the social dimension, it is seen as filled with people, primarily a multi-generation family. It resounds with traditional speech, singing, music and prayer; it has an owner and is located in ethnic Lemkivshchyna; [2] **the profile of the “lost” home** – home seen from the point of view of a person who has lost his/her home against his/her will. What is given prominence here is the location of home: in Lemkivshchyna, in a particular (family) village, in the mountains – the Beskid Mountains, the Carpathians, “there”. The “lost” home naturally stands in opposition to the home in the exile, which is a government-allotted house previously owned by a German family. The “lost” home was a friendly place which gave its inhabitants a sense of certainty about their next day. In the physical dimension, it was a well-maintained house, necessarily with a stove; [3] **the profile of the “regained” home** – home seen from the point of view of post-resettlement generations of Lemkos, who “regain” their homes in a symbolic way as awareness of their own origin. Here home symbolizes a return to ethnic Lemkivshchyna. Home in this sense is directly related to the traditional *хыжа* in Lemkivshchyna, often a specific home which once used to belong to the family; [4] **the profile of the “ethnic” home** – the profile of home as seen from the point of view of a member of the Lemko community (the Lemko viewpoint). It is a place where people can use their ethnolect in an unrestrained way; its inhabitants cultivate the traditional customs. The “ethnic” home is responsible for the continuity and preservation of traditional Lemko culture and identity; [5] **the profile of the “modern” home** – the profile of home as seen from the point of view of a contemporary young Lemko-European

who usually lives in a multi-family building. The “modern” home, in contrast to the “traditional” wooden home is a masonry building.

The analysis of SST data shows that the most important feature of the Lemko home is “a group of people, who are close to one another and inhabit the home together”. *ДИМ/ХЫЖА* is primarily a family.

The lexemes *хыжа* and *дум* are very often used to speak of the physical aspect of home. Great importance is attached to home ownership, which undoubtedly is related to the still felt trauma of unjust and undeserved loss of the physical home (the building) due to historical events.

The specific character of the real home in the Lemko ethnolect is that it strongly incorporates the ethnographic and ethnic features of the Lemko minority. The real home is sometimes identified with the Lemko home. Home as family is responsible for maintaining the ethnographic and ethnic identity of the Lemkos.

## The concept of *ДОМ* in the Bulgarian linguistic worldview\*

Maria Kitanova

The concept *ДОМ* ‘house/home’ plays an important role as a cultural constant in the Bulgarian worldview. It is expressed in language in the form of numerous lexical items, word-forming elements, idioms and maxims, and contains conceptual features that are important to the Bulgarian culture. The content of this concept bears marks of dynamic processes which show how these conceptual features have evolved, i.e. how new meanings have been actualized. The key lexemes referring to the concept *ДОМ* in the Bulgarian language are *дом* ‘home’ and *къща* ‘house, cottage’.

**Lexicographic data** The *Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary* records the lexeme *дом* ‘home, a dwelling’, related to the Greek *δόμος* and the Latin *domus*. The Latin word *domus* stands for ‘home’, not as a building but as a symbol of the family. This term has a legal and social character, and is not related to the process of building (construction). The Indo-European root in the Old Indic *dam patih* and the Greek *δεσπότης* (\**dems-pot-*) designates ‘the master, the head of the family’. In the *Dictionary of Old Bulgarian*, the lexeme has the following meanings: *Домъ* 1. home, a dwelling; 2. an (Orthodox) church, a sanctuary; 3. a household, domestic servants, a family; (Зорп. Map. Асем.). Nayden Gerov’s dictionary lists the following meanings: *Дом*

---

\* Full version see: Мария Китанова, *Концептът ДОМ в българската езикова картина на света*, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, *ДОМ*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s. 237–261.

1. home; 2. all those who are at home – domestic servants, the family; 3. possessions, a household; *Какво са по дома, по дома?* ‘How are your family members?’ The *Dictionary of the Bulgarian Language* records the following meanings of the lexeme *дом* – 1. a building or a dwelling place for one family *Тук е нашият дом. Разполагам се като у дома си* ‘Here is our home.’ ‘I feel at home here’; 2. possessions, a household *Сбирам дом и къща* ‘to build a house and home’; 3. a family, a family line; 4. A family nook, homeland *Искам да се завърна у дома си* ‘I want to return home’; 5. a social institution *Детски дом, Почивен дом, Публичен дом, Поправителен дом, Игрален дом, като у дома си* ‘a children’s home’, ‘a house of prostitution’, ‘a holiday home’, ‘a young offender institution’, ‘a gaming house (a casino)’; ‘to feel at home’. Gerov’s dictionary records the meaning ‘family’ in second place, while the *Dictionary of the Bulgarian Language* and the *Dictionary of Old Bulgarian* list it as a third sense of the word. This meaning can nevertheless be found in all the descriptive dictionaries mentioned.

Lexicographic data demonstrate that in the Bulgarian language the idea of home is associated with the family; a home organizes a person’s inner world, it is the centre of this inner world, a person’s own inner space. Home is part of the binary semantic opposition **familiar–strange**, in which there intersect other oppositions: **internal–external**, **good–evil**, **good–bad**, **pure–impure**. Home and the family are a unity.

## 1. Къща

According to the *Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary*, the lexeme *къща* is probably derived from the proto-Slavic *\*katjā* – ‘a house consisting of one room with a fireplace’. The word is found in South Slavic languages. In Gerov’s dictionary, the lexeme has the following meanings: *Къща* 1. a house, a dwelling, a dwelling place for humans; *селска къща, къща в земята* ‘a cottage’, ‘a dugout’; 2. a room in a house in which there is a fireplace *Глядам върта къща. Къща без покрив*

*не бива* ‘to take care of the household’, ‘There is no house without a roof’. In Old Bulgarian (Ман. хр) *кѡшѡта* ‘a house’, *хѡза* ‘a shanty, a cottage’; *градъ* ‘a building’. In a general dictionary of Bulgarian *къща* is defined as 1. a building, a structure inhabited by people; *двуетажна къща* ‘a two-storey house’; 2. the surroundings in which a family lives, a household; *В тази къща нищо не е наред* ‘Nothing is as it should be in this house’; 3. a group of people constituting a family, a single household.

Only the first of those meanings, ‘a building, a structure inhabited by people’, is found in both dictionaries. Gerov’s dictionary does not list the meaning ‘a room in which there is a fireplace’ In the Bulgarian culture, a fireplace has an important function: it is the sacred centre of a house. It is not by accident that the synecdoche *бащино огнище* ‘hearth and home’ (lit. ‘paternal fireplace’) is used as a synonym of *home* and *homeland*

### 1.1. Synonyms

The basic synonym of the lexeme *дом* is the word *къща*. Other synonyms include *здание* ‘a building’, *панелка* ‘a panel building, a block’, *общжитие* ‘a dormitory’, *кула* ‘a tower’, *пристройка*, *дворец*, *вила* ‘a villa’, *барака* ‘a barrack, a shack’, *землянка* ‘a dugout’, *сарай*, *гнездо* ‘a nest’, *пристан* ‘a haven’, *покрив* ‘a roof’, *приют*, *бърлога* ‘a shelter’, ‘a den’, *жилище*, *квартира*, *апартамент* ‘a dwelling’, ‘a flat’, ‘an apartment’. In recent times, the words *фургон* ‘van’, *кемпер* ‘camper’ and *каравана* ‘caravan’ have been used to refer to temporary homes.

There are also collocations: *дървена къща* ‘a wooden house’, *селска къща* ‘a country cottage’, *родна къща* ‘a family home’, *бащино огнище* ‘(paternal) hearth and home’, *роден дом* ‘a family home’, *бащин дом* ‘a father’s (paternal) house’, *домашен кът* ‘a homely nook’, *покрив над главата* ‘a roof over one’s head’, *родно пепелище* ‘hearth and home’.

**Meronyms and endoethnonyms:** *покрив* ‘a roof’, *покрив над главата* ‘a roof over one’s head’, *врата* ‘a door’ (*ден на отворените врати*; *за вас вратата ми винаги е отворена* ‘a doors open day’; ‘my door is always open for you’; *порта, праг* ‘a gate’, ‘a threshold’; *до прага, извън прага* ‘behind (up to) the threshold’, ‘beyond the freshold’; *антре* ‘a hallway’, *прозорец* ‘a window’, *комин* ‘a chimney’, *чердак* ‘an attic’, *мазе* ‘a cellar’, *огнище* ‘a fireplace’, *стълби* ‘stairs’, *веранда* ‘a veranda’, *тераса* ‘a terrace’, *мансарда* ‘a mansard attic’, *гостна* ‘a drawing room’, *дневна* ‘a living room’, *спалня* ‘a bedroom’, *кухня* ‘a kitchen’, *столова* ‘a dining room’, *хол* ‘a vestibule’, *кабинет* ‘a study’, *баня* ‘a bathroom’, *тоалетна* ‘a toilet’, *килер* ‘a closet’, ‘a larder’, *детска стая* ‘a nursery’, *коридор* ‘a corridor’, *балкон* ‘a balcony’, *лоджия* ‘a loggia’, *ъгъл* ‘a corner’.

## 1.2. Derivatives

### А. ДОМ

There are four groups of names derived from the word *дом*: 1) a person: *домошар*, *домошарка*, *домосед*, *домоседка*, *домовница* – ‘someone who likes staying at home’, ‘a stay-at-home’; 2) a feature: *домитен* – ‘of someone who likes living in his own home’; *домашен* – ‘that which comes from home’ ‘homemade’; *бездомен* – ‘homeless’; 3) an activity: *домошарувам* – ‘to scrounge around the house’ (Търновско); *задомявам се* ‘to set up a family; *домувам*, *задомявам се* – ‘to get married’; 4) complex names: *домовладика* – ‘the host’, ‘the master of the house’; *домоначалник* – ‘a house manager’; *доморасъл* – ‘home-bred’; *домотъкан* – ‘homespun’; *домороден* – ‘someone who was born in his own home’; *домочадец* – 1. ‘a family member’, ‘a member of the household’; 2. ‘head of the family’ ‘family members, household members’; ‘a family’.

The semantics of each of these lexemes is associated with movement from the outside to the inside, from a strange community to the family. All derivatives, with a few exceptions, emphasize the indissol-

uble bond between home and familial intimacy. They are all on the left side of the opposition **inside – outside**.

### В. КЪЩА

Like in the case of *дом*, the lexical field of the word *къща* encompasses four groups of names 1) a person: *къщовник* (*къщовница*) *къщник* – ‘someone who takes good care of a house, someone who is thrifty’; 2) an object: *къщичка*, *къщурка*, *къщурчица*, *къщиче* (Банат); *каще* (Самоковско) ‘a little house’; *къщище*, *къщёла* – ‘a large house’; 3) an activity: *къщувам* – ‘to decorate, furnish a house; to organize a household’; *разкъщя* – ‘to destroy someone’s family’; 4) a feature: *къщен* ‘attached to one’s house; homely’; *къщовничество* – ‘good husbandry, housewifery’. It can be seen that *къща*, in most cases, is a synonym of the lexeme *дом*, but, unlike in the case of the latter, the meaning ‘a building, a structure’ is an important part of its semantic content.

### 1.3. Collocations

А. *ДОМ*: *бащин дом*, *роден дом* ‘a paternal home’, ‘a family home’; *публичен дом* ‘a house of prostitution’; *културен дом* ‘a house of culture, a culture centre’; *дом за стари хора*, *старчески дом* ‘old people’s home’; *детски дом* ‘children’s home’; *дом на военниналите* ‘war veterans’ home’; *Дворец на пионерите* ‘Pioneers’ Palace’ (the socialist period), *дом на пенсионера* ‘a retirement home’; *дом-музей на Яворов* ‘Yavorov’s (the Poet’s) House and Museum’; *вечен дом* ‘eternal home, a grave’; *по домашному* 1. ‘like at home’, ‘casually’; 2. ‘like in the family’. Until recently, doors of many houses located in the province carried a sign saying *образцовый дом* ‘a model house’, meaning that that house was taken good care of and the family was happy to live in it. The collocation *бащин дом* ‘paternal home’ and the synecdoche *бащино огнище* ‘paternal hearth and home’ are synonymous. In Old Bulgarian, the lexeme *отъць* meant ‘a father’. *Отъчина* – ‘a native place’, ‘homeland’, lit. ‘fatherland’, the adjective *отъчь* means ‘paternal, relating to a father’ (отъкъ). The lexeme *дом*



stands for 'Homeland': *Трябва да подредим нашия дом* 'We need to organize our home (our state)'. The collocation *вечен дом* is associated with the fact that traditionally Bulgarians perceive a grave as a home for the deceased. Unlike all other cases, in which the home is an inner, domesticated, family space, the *eternal home* is a space in which the dead person is alone, forever separated from his family.

**В. КЪЩА:** The lexeme *къща* occurs in numerous attributive collocations in Bulgarian dialects, in which it designates 1) 'a space with a fireplace': *гуляма къща* 'a big house' (Разградско, Преславско, Сивлиевско); *малка къща* 'a small house' (Шуменско, Преславско, Поповско); *горна къща* 'an upper house' (Етрополско, Панагюрско); *долна къща* 'a lower house' (Szumen, Етрополско, Панагюрско); *ниска къща* 'a low house' (Smolan, Zlatograd); 2) 'a sleeping space/a bedroom': *нощна къща* 'a night house' (Thrace), *горна къща* 'an upper house' (Thrace); *молка къща* 'a small house' (Горнооряховско, Поповско); *вътрешна къща* 'an inner house' (Burgas, Малкотърновско) (Витанова 2012: 75–76). Bulgarian also features collocations such as *лятна къща* 'a summer house, a cottage', *зимна къща* 'a winter house', *мрътовска къща* 'a house for the dead', *къща за гости* 'a house for guests'.

The **antonym** of the lexeme *дом* – “**a non-home**” embraces everything that is outside the home, and, in the traditional Bulgarian culture, also everything that is outside the yard. This may be a street, a field, a forest, a mountain, a body of water, a square, etc. – something that brings out the opposition between **what belongs to the house** and **what does not belong to the house**, between **what belongs to the culture** and **what does not belong to the culture (the tame vs. the wild)**.

#### 1.4. Hyponyms and hyperonyms

In the modern Bulgarian language, one encounters lexemes such as *апартамент* 'a flat, an apartment', *жилище*, *квартира*, *вила* 'a villa', *жилищен блок* 'an apartment block'. Journalists also use

words such as *имение*, *дворец*, *сарай* ‘a palace’ to designate a large house belonging to a very rich man. A mobile home, a house which is not permanent is called *каравана* ‘a caravan, a trailer’, *кемпер* ‘a camper’, or *фургон* ‘a van’.

In the majority of **idioms**, the lexemes *дом* and *хата* are associated with the family. A home is a place in which a family live together and where strangers are not welcome. Living in a strange house is usually seen as a punishment. Everything that happens in the home should stay in the home. The collocations *изгарям къщата* ‘to burn the house’, *затварям къщата* ‘to close the house’, *разтури къща* ‘to destroy the house’ and the verb *разкъщвам* ‘to break apart’ mean that the family itself is disintegrating.

## 2. *ДОМ* in the light of survey data

Data collected in the survey show that the lexeme *дом* is most frequently used in the sense ‘family’, followed by the sense ‘dwelling inhabited by a family’. The former is often associated with *любов* ‘love’. Survey data also clearly demonstrate that women primarily associate the lexeme *къща* with a *house/home*, with *family* and *warmth* ranking second and third, respectively. Men, put the meaning *house/home* in the first position, and *family*, *household* and *domestic warmth* in the second.

## 3. *ДОМ* in the light of texts

**1. *дом* in the light of Bulgarian proverbs and sayings.** *ДОМ* is a key concept of the Bulgarian paremiological worldview. Bulgarian proverbs and sayings portray the relationship between man and his home, family, past, and ancestors. These expressions provide a basis for determining the elementary conceptual features of *ДОМ*: Home is family. Home is a family space. Home is where your own people, the “insiders”, your near and dear live. Home is created and supported by the most important members of the family – the woman and the man. The woman is the one who organizes/decorates the house. She

brings up the children. Her role is to organize life in the tamed space “behind the threshold”. The woman creates intimacy and domestic warmth. In the home, there is a clear hierarchy of relations. The man dominates over the other family members. The man is a bridge between the outside and the inside – the domesticated space called home and family.

**2. ДОМ in Bulgarian fiction.** In literary texts, ДОМ and its inhabitants complement each other – without its inhabitants, ДОМ is empty. A man without a home (a man who has no roof over his head) is socially deficient (homeless). ДОМ is a place where one’s children grow and are raised, where care is taken of elderly family members. ДОМ is family. If, for some reason the family falls apart, ДОМ ceases to exist.

**3. ДОМ in the Bulgarian press.** The dominant aspect of the concept ДОМ as characterized in the press is the social aspect. The words *къща* and *дом* are used in phrases the general meaning of which is ‘a building serving a social, cultural or political function.’ The two lexemes are used synonymously. The following features emerge from the texts: physical – a building or a residential building; social (a group of people sharing specific characteristics – the elderly, orphans); functional (a company or an institution), and cultural.

**The metaphorical meaning of ДОМ.** Metaphorical names for ДОМ found in the texts are associated with the following models: 1) Home/House – Man; 2) Home/House – Plant; 3) Home/House – Animal; 4) Home/House – Object.

**Aspects.** ДОМ has various features: physical (a building, a space), social (a family, people), functional (that which is indispensable for a home/house), and cultural (the values that home is a carrier of). The concept has the following aspects: existential, psychological, social, spatial, cultural, and axiological.

**Profiles.** The reconstruction of the semantic variants of the concept ДОМ in the Bulgarian language shows that one can distinguish two profiles of the Bulgarian ДОМ – a traditional and a contemporary one.

# The concept of HOME in Serbian\*

Stana Ristić

Ivana Lazić-Konjik

This paper presents the concept of HOME in contemporary Serbian. It is shown that the idea of HOME is conceptualized in the language worldview of Serbian speakers as a multidimensional notion, profiled by relevant parameters: physical, functional, social, axiological, and affective, and that it has positive value.

The concept of HOME in Serbian and the ways of its profiling are going to be presented on the basis of the material of the comprehensive *Dictionary of Serbo-Croat Literary and Vernacular Language of the Serbian Academy* (DSA)<sup>1</sup>, as well as of the data obtained from the analyses of contemporary Serbian texts (Ristić 2013; Ristić 2013a; Ristić 2013b), folk proverbs, and elicitation tests (Lazić-Konjik and Milošević, in preparation). With a view to the fact that the material of

---

\* This paper belongs to the Project 178009 of the Ministry of education, science and technological development of the Republic of Serbia. Full version see: Stana Ristić, Ivana Lazić-Konjik, *DOM w języku serbskim*, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, *DOM*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s. 263–290.

<sup>1</sup> Material of the comprehensive Dictionary of the Serbian Academy comprises a dictionary entry of the lexeme *dom* ‘home’ and the entry of its closest synonym *kuća* ‘house’, as well as the lexical units of their derivatives. As a systematic language material it enables a representation of this concept in every pertinent lexical semantic relation: hypero-hyponymic, antonymous, synonymous, together with affixal and semantic derivation, with typical syntagmatic-syntactic co-occurrences and collocations.

DSA corroborates the all-encompassing, multidimensional conceptual image of HOME in Serbian, it will be used for the identification of the most relevant, general parameters for the profiling of this concept in all its aspects: physical, functional, social, emotional and axiological, which underlie the stereotype of this concept in the language world-view of the speakers of Serbian language. The corpus of folk proverbs (Folk proverbs 1969) points to traditional foundation of some of the parameters in contemporary notion of HOME. The corpus of elicitation data represents the concept of this notion, which is closest to its folk image in colloquial language, as the most neutral, original folk idiom.

The definition of *dom* 'home' in DSA, in which the semes of physical object ("building") and social community ("family") are jointly presented, reflects the common way of conceptualizing this concept in Serbian. The structure and hierarchical order of the primary, prototypical meaning show that in Serbian linguoculture lexemes *dom* 'home' and *kuća* 'house' function as synonyms on the verbal-semantic plane. Differences occur at the cognitive and communicative-pragmatic level, which is broadly manifested in the form of marked use of the lexeme *home* and the neutral use of the lexeme *house*. While the concept of HOME in everyday conceptualization includes the social parameter, for the concept of HOUSE this parameter is of secondary importance. In primary interpretation HOUSE is understood as a "building" with the purpose of "accommodation", and only secondarily as "family", which is confirmed by common collocations, such as *kupiti/prodati kuću* (buy/sell a house), *iznajmiti kuću* (rent out a house), in contrast to non-realized, and even unrealizable collocations *\*kupiti/prodati dom* (\*buy/sell a home), *\*iznajmiti dom* (\*rent out a home), as well as by elicitation data, according to which HOUSE in its most general sense is not strictly associated with the concept of HOME: *Kuća je objekat, zgrada. Ne mora da znači da je svaka kuća i dom* (House is a physical object, a building. Not every house is a home).

**Physical aspects.** Physical aspects of HOME are identified with respect to the following motifs: building a house: *sagraditi, podići, iz-*

*graditi, dovršiti, omalterisati dom/kuću* (build, erect, construct, finish, plaster a home/house); *obnoviti, renovirati, popraviti i sl. dom/kuću* (redo, renovate, improve, etc. a home/house); dilapidation of a house as a construction: *razrušiti, srušiti, porušiti i sl. dom/kuću* (devastate, destroy, demolish, etc. a home/house); the motif of home as inner space: *izaći, otići, oputovati iz doma/kuće* (go out of, leave, depart from a home/house); *doći, doputovati, vratiti se domu/kući* (come back, arrive, return to a home/house); *napustiti dom/kuću* (leave a home/house); types of building material for making houses: *kuća od cigala / kamena / drveta / betonskih blokova / zemlje i dr.* (house (made) of brick / stone / wood / concrete blocks / earth, etc.); architectural, construction type: *kuće na stubovima / na jedan / na više spratova, prizemna kuća, niska / visoka kuća i dr.* (houses on stilts / one-storey / multi-storey house, ground-floor house, low / high house); *prodati, iznajmljivati kuću* (sell / rent out a house); *osigurati, obezbediti dom/kuću i dr.* (insure, secure a home/house, etc.).

**Social aspects.** Social aspects of HOME are realized syntactically in syntagmatic links and in predicate units associated with axiological and emotional aspects. Motif of HOME as family is confirmed by the following examples: *porodični dom/kuća* (family home/house), *rodni dom* (native home), *domaće ognjište* (hearth), *steći svoj dom/kuću* (earn (for) one's home/house), *zasnivati dom* (found/make a home), which is also profiled by emotional parameters, as in the following expressions: *oprostiti se sa domaćim svojim* (take leave of one's host), *poštovati svoj dom* (respect one's home), *Domaćine, dome moj* (literally: 'Oh, my host, my home'), in which the concept of HOME is enriched by information concerning the personal pleasure of owning a home, a sense of respect and affection for one's home, towards members of one's family, but also concerning the responsibility for household management. Social aspects in conceptualization of HOME are complemented with other values, which represent an expression of personal, individual experience, knowledge, point of view and perspective. On a plane of social convention HOME is also conceptualized as a conjugal unit with fun-

damental, patriarchal values, according to which the *host* and *hostess* are the pillars of home, family, conjugal unit and founders of a new generation. Proverbs reflect the basic moral and family values of traditional community: writing off a debt: *Ako kuća izgori, dug na odžak izleti* ('If a house burns down, a debt goes out the chimney'); cherishing a spirit of tolerance in a family, unity: *Ako ne budu gosti bijesni, ne će biti kuća tijesna* (literally: 'If the guests are not angry, the house will not be too small'); a great responsibility for making and preserving a family: *Da je kuća dobra, i vuk bi je imao* (literally: 'If the house were good, a wolf would have it'); *Teško je tuđu kuću služiti, al' još je teže svoju steći* (literally: 'To serve in somebody else's house is hard, but to make one's own is even harder'). Elicitation data show that the essence of a "real" home in everyday conceptualization represent the following features: family, warmth, unity, love, safety, place/space inhabited by a family, familial atmosphere.<sup>2</sup> All those features are positive and they profile the concept of HOME as a distinctly positive value, with a dominant social and emotional dimension, placing it at the level of highest values.

**Functional aspects.** Functional aspects of HOME are profiled by fixed syntagmatic co-occurrences with the following meanings: temporary accomodation: *sirotinjski dom* (home for the poor), *starački dom* (old people's home), *dom za nezbrinute osobe* (care 'home' centre); for relaxation: *planinarski dom* (mountain 'home' centre), *kuća za odmor* (holiday house); for entertainment: *gostilni dom* (entertainment house),<sup>3</sup> *luda (ludačka) kuća* (mad house), *noćna kuća* (night house); for some sort of business, line of work, etc.: *dom kulture* (literally: 'culture home', meaning "culture centre"), *dom zdravlja* (literally: 'health home', meaning "health centre"), *dom gospodnji* (house of the lord), *božja kuća* (god's house), *bratska kuća* (brotherly house), *trgovачka kuća* (literally: 'merchant's house', meaning "firm"), *izvoznika*

<sup>2</sup> Practically identical results were obtained for other languages (cf. Bartminski 2011: 236–237).

<sup>3</sup> This is the meaning of less known, outdated, regional, etc. expressions, see DSA, under the entries *dom* and *kuća*.

*kuća* (literally: ‘export house’, meaning “export firm”), *špeditera kuća* (‘trucker house’, meaning “trucker firm”), *izdavačka kuća* (publishing house), *robna kuća* (literally: ‘house of merchandise’, meaning “department store”); parts of the house for specific purposes: *ženski dom* (women’s home); *vatrena kuća*, *ognjena kuća* (fiery house); for doing a service: *military house*.

**Axiological aspects.** Positive connotation based on a sense of comfort is realized by an expression: *biti kod (svoje) kuće* (be at (one’s) home); on a sense of comfort and freedom (a proverb): *Moja kuća moja sloboda* (literally: ‘My house my freedom’); reliability, safety: *kuća od kuća* (lit.: ‘house of a house’); closeness: *Domaćine, dome moj*, / *Evo vuka pred tvoj dvor* (literally: ‘Oh, my host, my home / Here is a wolf at your palace door’ (in a folk song)), *kućo moja*; *stara kućo* (lit.: ‘Oh, my house; old house’); hospitality: *držati (imati, voditi) otvorenu kuću* (keep (have, manage) an open house); *otvoriti kuću* (to open a house); industriousness, persistence: *gledati svoju kuću* (lit.: ‘watch one’s house’), *saviti kuću* (lit.: ‘bend a house’); *kuću (s)kućiti, (s)teći* (make, get a house); parsimony, moderateness (a proverb): *Zrno do zrna pogača*, / *Kamen do kamena palača* (lit.: ‘Grain upon grain a pie, / stone upon stone a palace’); on dignity, respect: *biti od (iz) kuće* (‘be from (of) a house’); on piety, respect: *večni dom / večna kuća* (eternal home / eternal house); moderated hospitality (a proverb): *Nezvanu gostu mjesto za vratima* (‘Uninvited guest gets a place by the door’); a clever, wise thought: *ta je iz doma* (‘that one is from home’, meaning “that remark struck home”; folk proverb); closer to home; unity: *ako ne budu gosti bijesni, neće biti kuća tjesna; nije kuća tjesna, dok nije čeljad bijesna* (a proverb) (literally: ‘a house is not small, while the little ones are not angry’); *dogovor kuću gradi* (‘an agreement builds a house’). Proverbs realized in the form of a curse also exemplify the significance of HOME as a positive value in traditional culture, as the subject of curses represent that which is the most valued: *Kuća mu se kocem zatvorila! Pusta ostala!; Kuća mu se kućerinom zvala!* (literally: ‘May his house be shut by a stick! May it be desolated! May



his house be called a shed!'). Negative connotation with the meaning of unreliability, unsafety, is realized by an expression: *kuća od karata* (house of cards); with the meaning of poverty, misery: *bez kuće i kućišta (biti, ostati), nemati kuće ni kućišta* (be left without a house/ destitute); *Kuća mu je od kamena, / A u kući ni kamena* (literally: 'His house is made of stone, / And no stone in the house'; a proverb); with the meaning of intolerance (proverb): *daleko (dalje) mu (ti i sl.) (lepa, crna) kuća* (lit.: 'may his (your, etc.) (pretty, black, etc.) house be far away'); intolerance, disunity: *dići (dizati) kuću na glavu (na leđa, na sebe)* (turn a house upside down (on its back, on itself)); *raskopati, rasturiti kuću* (dig up, tear down a house); rashness: *podupirati kuću odozgo, s krova* (lit.: 'prop a house from the top, from the roof'); spitefulness (a proverb): *zaigraće mečka i pred tvojom (njegovom i sl.) kućom* (lit.: 'A bear will dance in front of your (his etc.) house, too'); immorality: *javna kuća, bludna kuća, prostitutska kuća, bludni (bludnički) dom* (a brothel, house of ill repute, prostitution house, house of debauchery); aimless wandering, doing nothing (a proverb): *Zašao od kuće do kuće kao vodičar* (lit.: 'He went from house to house like a man who sanctifies water'); with derogatory meaning: *luda (ludačka) kuća, žuta kuća, crna kuća (komunska kuća, stara kuća)* (mad house, yellow house, black house (communal house, old house)).

**Oppositions.** Multi-facetedness of the concept of HOME comes to the foreground in oppositions based on social, emotional (psycho-social), existential and spatial relations. Its realization is marked by basic existential values in the form of binary oppositions: "one's own – somebody else's" and "life – death". On a conceptual-cognitive plane the concept of HOME functions as a source domain in the categorization of other notions, not only according to positive parameters "one's own" and "life", but also according to a spatial parameter of a boundary as its essential value in establishing the opposition "inner space / one's own / friendly – outer space / somebody else's / hostile". The function of a landmark is fulfilled by a doorstep and door. Spatial and social oppositions underlie the antonymous relation of lexemes *home*

and the *world*: *home* is close, friendly, and the *world* is distant, foreign and dangerous, which can be illustrated by the following examples: *svuda je proći, al' je kući doći*; *svuda poći, ali kući doći*; *kod (svoje) kuće (biti)* ('go everywhere, but come home; be, stay at (one's) home).

### References and sources

- Bartminski (2011): Бартмињски, Јежи, 2011, *Језик – Слика – Свет*, Прир. Д. Ајдачић, Прев. М. Бјелетић, Београд: Slovo Slavia.
- Lazić-Konjik and Milošević (in preparation): Лазих-Коњик, Ивана, Јованка Милошевић, у изради, Значење речи дом/кућа у свакодневном језику, (Језик, књижевност, значење, Ниш 2015).
- Ristić (2013): Ристић, Стана, 2013, Стилски аспекти концептуализације појма ДОМ у књижевном дискурсу, *Научни састанак слависта у Вукове дане 42 /1*, Београд: МСЦ, 381–394.
- Ristić (2013a): Ристић, Стана, 2013а, Концепт дома у религијском дискурсу, *Теоллингвистичка истраживања српског и других словенских језика*, Београд: Одељење језика и књижевности САНУ, 293–313.
- Ristić (2013b): Ристић, Стана, 2013б, Стереотип ДОМОВИНЕ у заједничкој концептосфери појмова ДОМА и МАЈКЕ (елементи језичке слике света у тезаурусном речнику савременог српског језика), *Зборник Матице српске за славистику*, св. 83, Нови Сад: Матица српска 2013, 181–198.
- РСАНУ: *Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика САНУ*, Књига IV, 1966 и Књига XI, 1981, Београд: Институт за српскохрватски језик, САНУ.
- Folk proverbs (1969): *Српске народне пословице*, 1969, Дела Вука Караџића, Приредио Мирослав Пантић, Београд: Просвета.

## The croatian linguistic view of *DOM* today\*

Amir Kapetanović

This research is founded on the theoretical and methodological foundations of Lublin ethnolinguistics and the EUROJOS project.

The general lexicon of the Croatian standard language features two stylistically neutral lexemes, *dom* ‘home’ and *kuća* ‘house’, denoting “a roof over one’s head” – a place where people live. These two lexemes cover semantically what other languages only have one word for (e.g. Ita. *casa*, Pol. and Rus. *dom*). Both *dom* and *kuća* stem from Proto-Slavic (\**domъ* < ie. \**domh*<sub>2</sub>; \**kotja*). Croatian-Croatian dictionaries describe both lexemes as complex, multifaceted lexemes (both have five definitions in Šonje 2000).

The primary meanings of these two lexemes are not synonymic: *dom* describes a permanent place of residence of interpersonally connected people (the emotional and psychosocial aspect is accentuated, while the physical aspect is implied: the interior of some kind of structure), while *kuća* describes a structure, which can only become someone’s *dom* if it is moved into (only the physical aspect of the phenomenon is important to the primary meaning).

The difference in the primary meaning of the two lexemes becomes visible immediately in some collocations: it is possible to speak of a *stone* or *wooden house* (*kamena / drvena kuća*), but not of a *stone*

---

\* Full version see: Amir Kapetanović, *Hrvatska jezična slika DOMA danas*, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, *DOM*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s. 291–309.

or *wooden home* (\**kameni* / \**drveni dom*). However, in some secondary meanings ('family') *kuća* and *dom* can be synonyms, although they can give different connotations in connection with the same words (e.g. one returns to his *kuća* every day, but one returns to his *dom* after a long absence with some emotional motivation – the situation is complicated since both *vraćam se doma* / *kući* can be said without any difference in meaning, however here *doma* and *kući* are adverbs and not nouns as in the previous examples).

The remaining meanings of both lexemes show semantic expansion and do not correspond (even when *kuća* or *dom* marks some kind of institution, e.g. there are no attestations of \**kuća zdravlja* or \**robni dom*). *Dom* can be synonymously related in some definitions with the words *zavičaj* ('native town; city/region') and *domovina* ('homeland'). *Dom* and *kuća* can also enter synonymic relations through metaphor / metonymy, e.g. with the words *ognjište* ('hearth'), *gnijezdo* ('nest').

*Dom* and *kuća* do not have any true antonyms, but as words that are usually socially positively valued, they can be antonymic to words used to express a negatively rated living space (e.g. *straćara* 'hovel') or slang words in a metaphoric meaning with a negative evaluation (e.g. *brlog* 'den', *jazbina* 'burrow', *gajba* 'cage', *krletka* 'cage', *svinjac* 'pigsty').

The hyperonyms of these words are *prebivalište* 'place of residence' or *boravište* 'inhabitancy' (for *dom*), *zgrada* 'building' and *građevina* 'structure' (for *kuća*).

There are numerous derivatives and compound words in Croatian motivated by these two words. Phrasemes whose key word is *kuća* are frequent in everyday speech (e.g. *ne gori kuća* 'the house isn't burning' = 'there is no hurry', *biti kao kod svoje kuće* 'to feel at home' = 'to be well acquainted with something, to manage well').

There are many known sayings on the subject of *dom* or *kuća*, and in addition to the same or similar ones in other cultures (e.g. *Svuda e proći, al e doma doći*), there are also Croatian folk sayings in which the value of one's own house/home, the way in which a home

enables peace, comfort, privacy, happiness and freedom, and the importance of concord, tolerance, togetherness and order in the home are emphasized (e.g. *Ako čeljad nisu bijesna, kuća nije tijesna* 'If the folk are calm, the house isn't crowded'; *Teško je tuđu kuću služiti, ali je još teže svoju steći* 'It is hard to serve someone else's house, and even harder to attain your own'; *Teško domu u kom sloge nema* 'It is hard for a home with no concord').

In Croatian texts written in the last 150 years, there are numerous attestations of both words in meanings that can be found in modern lexicographical descriptions. It is possible to find attestations in texts for e.g.:

1. Stereotypical conceptions of the home as a private, comfortable, warm and protected space (*Ojađeno srce njegovo ima samo jedno utočište, samo jedan štit; ... doveo [ju je] u tako ugodan i topao dom, u kojem se ne boji ni urlika zime ni zavijanja vučjeg...;*);

2. The difference between *dom* and *kuća* (*U mojoj kući vaš će biti dom; Niska drvena kuća*);

3. The metonymic use of words for the parts of a house in place of *dom* and *kuća* (*osigurajte svoj krov i svoje ognjište*);

4. Stereotypical dynamic situations and states related to the home, such as leaving and returning to the home, a desolate or lively home (*Bilo joj, kao da za uvijek ostavlja taj stari dom...; Đak Ivica nije se više vraćao u svoj dom...; Bušimski osjeti taj čas kao nikad prije, kako je taj dom iza smeti majčine opustio...; I njihov dom opet je oživio*);

5. Positive stereotypical conceptions of the home as a space of harmonious interpersonal relations and comfortable atmosphere (*O njima se može reći samo jedno: skladnost. Njihov je dom tiha balada o ljubavi i ženskim rukama*);

6. Stereotypical conceptions of how the home gathers together people from different generations who are usually familial relations (*Dom bez okupa ne valja...*);

7. Secondary meanings of *dom* and *kuća* 'family' by which these words are synonyms, and whose meaning is developed through the

metonymy *a place for people who live in that place* (I **čitav** Jožičin **dom** doznao je to isto; u koliku je nevolju uvalio **čitavu kuću**);

8. Other meanings of these two words, such as the marking of relations and lineage with a house (**kuća** Radulovića), the marking of one's place of origin and homeland with *dom* (*koji za mili padoše dom*), and the marking of various institutions and buildings with *dom* or *kuća*.

As part of this research, a survey of 103 university-level students from Zagreb (*Faculty of Philosophy, Croatian Catholic University, and Polytechnic of Zagreb*) was carried out in late 2013. Both men and women were included in the survey, mostly between 18 and 26 years of age, and they answered one question (*Što je po Vašem mišljenju, prava bit doma?* = *What is, in your opinion, the essence of a true home?*) and one sub-question (*Jesu li, po Vašem mišljenju, dom i kuća isto?* = *Are, in your opinion, dom and kuća the same?*). 93 of the subjects surveyed answered 'no' to the sub-question with numerous reasons, 7 subjects answered 'yes', and three subjects did not answer. In their explanations, the majority of subjects perceived *kuća* as a palpable object, and *dom* as something abstract, like that which arises from the building of emotional relationships between people who are close and who live together. These explanations are particularly striking: *many people have a house, but they do not have a home; some families might have multiple houses, but not all of the houses they own are their home; a house can become a home in time; there is only one home; home is only in one place; a house is easier to build than a home, and a home is easier to demolish than a house; the feeling of home does not have to be connected to a house; a house can be a home, but it does not have to be.*

The analysis of answers to the main question resulted in an ordering of the most frequently emphasized characteristics of *dom*, and the 10 most frequent (of 46 identified) are: 1. Family/friendly environment, 2. Safety and security, 3. Love, 4. The warmth of a place or people, 5. A comfortable place and surroundings, 6. Community and togetherness, 7. A space/place in which we live permanently, 8. A place

of support, 9. A feeling of belonging, 10. Understanding. Among others, a rare but interesting attestation (3, 1%) is that of home as a place where one's phone automatically connects to Wi-Fi.

The main conclusion from the results of this survey is that they confirm the conclusions of lexicographic-lexicological analysis and textual analysis on the difference between *dom* and *kuća*, and that the ten most frequently emphasized characteristics of *dom* include the psychical, social, locative, and emotive aspects of the concept. It should be especially emphasized that the characteristic of *dom* as offering security and safety shares first place with family/friendly atmosphere, which differs from the typical results of the same survey among other Slavs (1. *Family*, 2. *Warmth*, 3. *Love*).

## The German *HAUS* and *HEIM*\*

Monika Grzeszczak

The concept HOUSE/HOME has two lexical exponents in the German language: *Haus* and *Heim*. The present article reconstructs the picture of the German HAUS/HEIM, taking into account both of these lexemes. The study was based on three types of data: systemic, survey and textual (SST).

An analysis of the data concerning the lexeme *Haus* yielded 32 defining features of the concept HAUS/HEIM, among which there clearly dominated physical and social features as well as features related to living conditions. The following meanings were recorded:

I. an **edifice** (of any kind); a **building** that may have different shapes (outer forms) and different functions; it is composed of certain specific parts (roof, walls); it is “covered”, i.e. it protects its inhabitants against external factors “from the top”; it is made of a specific material (a house is commonly a masonry building built of brick, stone or concrete) and is solid and durable; it may have different sizes, but is usually medium-sized; it is a single-storey or a multi-storey building; it is separated from the surroundings; it is used (as a rule) by a person to stay in, to **dwelt in**, on a permanent or temporary basis; it constitutes this person’s property (formerly, along with the entire land area owned by that person) or is only rented by them; it is **run/managed**

---

\* Full version see: Monika Grzeszczak, DOM (*Haus i Heim*) w języku niemieckim, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, DOM, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s. 311–342.



in an “organized” manner (well, thriftily); it is the centre of “normal” family life; it is a place in which some activities/work are done; it is equipped with items needed in daily life; it serves “the head of the household” and his family; it is also used for storing things; it is a place where the comfort of all inhabitants is an utmost concern; it is a personal, private area as well as a place/space for socializing (meetings with friends) **II.** all the inhabitants, a family, a household **III.** *formerly* homeland, a native place where someone comes from (place of origin), the place where a person was born; **IV.** metaphorically, among others, the human body (“house of the soul”); also the human heart and soul, and man himself.

The basic set of meanings of the lexeme *Heim*, in turn, includes the following: (a person’s own) home/the place where a person was born, where his near and dear/his family live (family home) or where the person himself lives/has his dwelling place; it is a place where one “belongs”, where one feels safe and at home, in which it is pleasant to stay; less commonly: a house along with its equipment, a household; older meanings include: homeland, a native place, one’s country, the area (a village, a town) where one comes from, where one was born, in which one is/feels at home; a fenced place/area, a bounded space; today also: a public institution/a space inhabited permanently (versus temporarily) by a specific group of people.

In further parts of this article, the author establishes the etymology of the words *Haus* and *Heim*, lists the synonyms and hyponyms of these words which highlight the different functions of a house/home, addresses the question of the superordinate concept, identifies the opposites (antonyms) of the two lexemes, quotes collocations and discusses metaphorical extensions of the words.

According to information gleaned from etymological dictionaries, the lexeme *Haus* stands for something that is covered, wrapped up and concealed; the word also means something that is used for protection or as a *shelter*. *Heim*, in turn, is, etymologically, a place where someone

settles, a camp. It also connotes the meaning of a tamed space, which is close to someone, which someone feels connected to.

Thesauruses distinguish between words which refer to big houses and those which stand for small and simple houses. The former include synonymous compound nouns such as: *Hochhaus* ‘a high-rise building’, *Turmhaus* ‘a tower block’ and *Wolkenkratzer* ‘a skyscraper’, and the latter include *simplicia Hütte* ‘a cottage’ and *Kate* ‘a cottage, a croft’. Numerous synonyms relate to certain aspects of a house: the **physical** aspect (appearance, dimensions, building material, etc.) – *Reihenhaus* ‘a terraced house’, *Villa* ‘a villa’, *Landhaus* ‘a manor house’, *Bungalow* ‘a bungalow’, *Holzhaus* ‘a wooden house’; the **economic** aspect with a focus on the **function of (permanent) dwelling/residing**: *Wohnung* ‘a dwelling, a flat’, *Wohnbau* ‘a residential building’, *Wohnhaus* ‘a dwelling house’, *Domizil* ‘a domicile/a permanent address/a permanent establishment’, *Unterkunft* ‘a place of residence’ [long-term – MG]; the **functional** aspect: *Ferienhaus* ‘a holiday home’, *Wochenendhaus* ‘a cottage, lit. a weekend house’, *Appartementhaus* ‘an apartment house’, *Geschäft* ‘a shop’, *Gartenhaus* ‘a garden house, a gazebo’/(*Garten*) *Laube* ‘a gazebo’ / *Pavillon* ‘a garden pavilion’; the **community-related and social** aspect: *Clan* ‘a clan’, *Dynastie* ‘a dynasty’, *Familie* ‘a family’, *Herrscherhaus* ‘the ruling house’, *Geschlecht* ‘a family line’, *Sippe* ‘a clan, a kinship group’, *Stamm* ‘a family line, a tribe’; the **mental/psychological** aspect: *Zuhause* ‘home/hearth and home’, *Heim* ‘home’, *Daheim* ‘a family home’, *Bleibe* ‘roof over one’s head, a shelter’, *Unterschlupf* ‘a shelter’, *Zuflucht* ‘a refuge’, *Refugium* ‘a refuge, a safe place where someone seeks refuge, *die [eigenen] vier Wände* ‘one’s own four walls’. Most synonyms of the lexeme *Heim* overlap with those of the lexeme *Haus*, especially with regard to its **mental/psychological aspect** followed by the **functional** and **functional-social** aspects (*Heim* viewed as a place of residence/accommodation of a specific group of people).

The most frequently listed **hyperonyms** of the word *Haus* include: *Gebäude* ‘a building’, *Wohngebäude* ‘a residential building’,

*Wohnhaus* ‘a dwelling house’, *Wohnung* ‘a dwelling’; *Bauwerk* ‘an edifice’; and also *Familie* ‘a family’, *Hausgemeinschaft* ‘a house community’; *Geschlecht* ‘a family line’, *Dynastie* ‘a dynasty’, *Haushaltung*; *Hauswirtschaft* ‘a household’. Also for the respondents of the survey, HAUS was primarily a ‘building’, especially a residential building (*Wohngebäude*), and a dwelling, an apartment (*Wohnung*). It was also – more rarely – described as an edifice (*Bauwerk*), a structure (*Konstruktion*), an architectural unit, a work of architecture (*eine Einheit architektonisch, architektonisches Werk*). Superordinate (generic) concepts of the lexeme *Heim* usually quoted in dictionaries include: *Wohnhaus* ‘a dwelling house’, *Wohnsitz* ‘a place of residence’, *Wohnung* ‘a dwelling’; *Wohnstätte* ‘a habitation/place of residence of a particular group of people’; also *heimatlicher Ort* ‘a native place’, *Gegend, aus der man stammt* ‘the area one comes from’. In the responses to the survey question, HEIM was primarily defined as a place of residence of the family (*Wohnsitz der Familie*), homeland (*Heimat*), and a type of institution (e.g., a welfare or a recreational institution) (*eine Art Anstalt*).

Dictionaries record only a few **opposites (antonyms)** of the lexeme *Haus*, contrasting it, on the one hand, with the lexeme *Hütte* ‘a hut’, and, on the other, with the lexemes *Palast* ‘a palace’ and *Schloss* ‘a castle’. This opposition is based on the assumption that a house consists of more than one room and is inhabited permanently, and that a “normal” house is neither too big nor too lavish.

Among the many collocations, an interesting group are those based on alliteration, which describe the economic aspect of HAUS; they include such expressions as *Haus und Habe*, *Haus und Hof*, which designate everything that belongs to a person, one’s entire property. HAUS/HOME is also conceptualized as a place which provides shelter and warmth, a place where food is prepared, whose central point is the hearth: *Haus und Herdstatt*; *Haus und Herd*, *Heim und Herd*, and *Haus und Rauch*. In their figurative, metaphorical senses, the German words *Haus* and *Heim* are primarily used to refer to man and his body,

a grave and a coffin, but also a country or a continent (*das europäische gemeinsame Haus* ‘the common European home’), meanings that are abundantly testified in texts.

SST data confirm that the constitutive, primary feature/function of a HOUSE/HOME (HAUS/ HEIM) is **dwelling/ residing**. This feature has been perpetuated most distinctly in the explication of the meaning of the verb *hausen*, derived from the noun *Haus*, which also today means ‘to live’ (‘wohnen’). HAUS is conceptualized as: 1. a building that comprises certain specific parts (such as a roof, walls, windows, doors, the floor, an entrance and an exit, sectioned off living areas, rooms, a kitchen, a (large) bathroom and a cellar) and has appropriate amenities (running water, gas, electricity, connection to a sewage system, a phone, electrical devices and a heating system). HAUS is solid and safe in the physical sense; its size may vary depending on the financial resources of the owners (parents); it can be a multi-storey building (it usually has two or more storeys); it may consist of one or several apartments. An integral “part” of a house is the garden. A house is a place that provides an adequate standard of living and is tailored to people’s needs (it is comfortably and cosily furnished); it has all the “required/necessary” appliances and “movable goods” (such as, furniture and kitchen appliances), which are an inherent part of the household; 2. a private, bounded space “concealed” from the outside world, in which people keep their private (personal) things; space separated/sectioned off from the public which can be locked to keep off “uninvited guests” 3. a shelter from inclement weather (wind, rain), nature and strangers; 4. a place that is close to a person, a familiar, tamed space that one knows and wants to return to; 5. a place of family life and a place of routine daily activities such as (thorough) cleaning (of the entire house), washing and cooking; 6. a place one is happy to stay in, away from people (and a place where household chores are done thoroughly and conscientiously); 7. a “little homeland”, a place where someone “feels settled” and where he/she feels good (“at home”); 8. a place that provides/gives a sense of security;

9. a place where one wears light, comfortable clothing (clothes, shoes); 10. a place where meals are eaten; generally the food eaten at home is simple (but delicious) and nutritious; a place where food products (such as bread, cured meat, pasta or beer) can be made; 11. a place that is run/managed ("thriftily", "economically"), a household; a place that is kept in order (tidy) and in which the principles of cohabitation are applied; 12. a place where one socializes and entertains (sometimes large numbers of) guests; 13. a place of rest where one can relax/unwind; 14. a place that provides conditions for free development and taking care of one's children; 15. a place where one can work professionally (and pursue other activities).

SST data show that HEIM is understood, primarily, as: 1. a "little homeland", a native, familiar place where someone/something comes from; a place someone feels connected to, with which someone feels a strong emotional bond; a place full of human warmth and love; it is composed of people one loves, people who are "dear" and "important" to one. This primary feature of home is attested, among others, in the meanings of words derived from *Heim*, such as *heimisch* and *Heimat*; 2. a place where one feels good ("feels at home"); 3. a place where a person feels safe; 4. a place where one can take shelter (a place of refuge or "seclusion") from the "outside world" and "strangers"; a "familiar", well-known space which is dear to one; 5. a place to which one ("willingly"/"always") returns/wants to return; 6. a place where a person can stay in peace, calm down; 7. a private, personal space (a place where one keeps one's private belongings – things which one has personal memories of); 8. a cozy place with a warm "atmosphere"; 9. a meeting place of a group of people; 10. a workplace (especially for outworking).

The basic set of features of the German concept HAUS/HEIM extracted from dictionary data and attested in ("elicited" and journalistic) texts are summarized in a table in the final part of the paper. These features constitute the content of the concept and, collected together, form a definition of HAUS/HEIM.

## Linguistic-cultural image of HOME in contemporary British English\*

Joanna Popielska-Grzybowska  
Jo B. Harper

Each of the four British *homes* (English, Scottish, Welsh and Northern Irish) would require a separate study in its own right, thus our study has focused on the English *home*, presenting linguistic-cultural image of the concept of 'home'. 'House' is treated as a co-concept with a clear physical meaning. As Edgar A. Guest said: "It takes a heap o' livin' in a house t' make it home."

The word *home* in English has very broad meaning and numerous connotations. Our studies have had hence to cover items associated with *home* such as a teapot, fireplace, but also social, ethnic and international relations. As we noted at the start, there exist variable models of *home*: first of all the traditional, those associated with World War II, post-war to the 1970s; the 1980s; 1990s and early twenty-first century.

Moreover, the main currents of contemporary research on the British *home* were scrutinised. Works from the turn of the century put emphasis on analysis of human behaviour related to *home* and family, and analysis of the position of women. Scientists unanimously emphasise that the key to the English *home* is the family, where members can find refuge, support and something very appreciated in Britain – a sep-

---

\* Full version see: Joanna Popielska-Grzybowska, Jo B. Harper, *Językowo-kulturowy obraz DOMU (home) we współczesnym języku angielskim brytyjskim*, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, *DOM*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s. 343–372.

aration from the outside world. There is no lack of ethnic, social, environmental, cultural identity issues and even writing about dying at *home*. Finally there is also recognition of spatial-landscape aspects and the British fascination with houserenovations: do-it-yourself (DIY).

*Home* is a word of Germanic origin: Old English *hām* – ‘dwelling, house, estate, village’ – ‘apartment, house, property, village’ of proto-german *\*khaim-* (cf. Old Frisian *hem* – ‘home, village’ – ‘home village’).

According to dictionaries basic meaning is ‘*place of living/place where you live*’, but there is also family, those you love and who together are *home* to the majority of respondents as well.

The same lexeme for *home* can be found not only in the function of a noun, adjective and adverb, but also a verb. The verb *home* indicates a movement towards something or directing our efforts and attention on something. In short we discuss what it means ‘to live’, reporting eight meanings of the verb.

This paper presents synonyms to the noun *home* in terms of physical and social development and to the adjective *home*. Given are the hiponyms, opposita, partonyms, endonyms and derivatives of the most commonly used word-formations, collocations particularly abundant in English, and also phrases, idiomatic phrases/phrasemes and collections.

The biggest difficulty the authors found was in the survey (questionnaire), perhaps due to lack of interest in this type of research or even negative attitude towards them because of touching an intimate subject as the *home* for many British seems to be. We suggest that the Brit’s reluctance to discuss intimate things with strangers is the reason for the low response rate, but we cannot be sure if that is the case. This subject in itself is rather interesting and should be explored attentively. Therefore, we conducted solely 33 interviews, 20 women and 13 with men aged 20–29 and 49–52. The surveyed Britons said *home* was the people one loves, a sense of safety and comfort, and the place where they can always be themselves. *Home* is the house

of parents and grandparents, for the lexeme *home* is incontestably subjective in nature and thus opposed to the idea of *house*. This is “my space”, “my place” and habits learned from family homes, values passed down to children. The *home* was valued unambiguously positively, because it connotes feelings of love and happiness, friendship and well-being.

British *home* base syndromes are:

1. people in general and family, relatives, friends (the people I love)
2. peace of mind/psychical comfort (and physical one)
3. safety
4. place of good memories
5. house/home of parents / grandparents / ancestors
6. the place where you were born / place where you come from

Analysis of all the S-A-T data, both primary and underlying, the meaning of *home* in Britain combines the meeting of the emotional need for love, friendship, comfort, closeness with the people we love at the home hearth and security, to be under the care of relatives – or desired solitude and silence. The key to the cultural semantics of *home* is the idea of being with someone and this applies mainly to people (or animals) albeit not necessarily to a family. But there were also references to the animals, especially a dog (a place that animals live in is also known as *home*: dogs’ *home* or cats’ ‘*home*’ ‘shelter’).

“True” *home* for Britons is therefore a cosy and comfortable place, providing privacy for me and my family, or more generally “me and my loved ones”. It is the *home* of my parents or grandparents, to which one returns and idealises and which bucolic/idyllic nature is still present in literature and media discourse. For the inhabitants of England a “true” *home* is also the nation.

The article discusses in detail:

- The subject for the *home*: *family*, *people I love*,
- *Home* in relation to other values: *home and family*, *home and love*, *home and happiness*, *home and safety*, *home and traditions*, *home and Britishness*,



– The scope of a *home*: *people – family, loved ones; home island; homeland,*

– Features of the *home* (LDCE): *comforting, cosy, comfortable, sweet, guarantees feeling of safety and feeling of being wanted, love, place where you grew up, good and happy memories, an idealised world where you would wish to be able to come back when you run into problems, the home of mum and dad, true home – where my family and friends are, traditional home, having atmosphere, being inhabited for a long time, a traditional British home.*

– *Home foundations: family, people, love, happiness, psychological and physical comfort. In this respect, the authors see an important process in which house becomes home.*

The English *home* connects the idyllic village with the bustle of the city. *Home* must be one's own, but the *home* is primarily a *home* of parents and grandparents, and therefore the sentimental aspect plays a significant role.

Worthy of note is *homeless-at-home* – demonstrating loneliness of people alienated among these with whom they live at *home*.

Within the cultural aspect also very important is renovation – do-it-yourself (DIY) as a way of expressing oneself and national identity, since the English are a 'nation of nest builders'.

Linguistic distinctions include:

– The boundaries of *home* as my / private, my own "place" to which foreigners are not allowed, because I decide "*who comes and goes in it.*"

*Home* as my sanctuary: "*It also signifies a place where I can decide to have my own sanctuary even from my children and husband.*" [questionnaire].

– *Home* as an object of aspirations: *to have a home, longing for it, idealises home as a home of parents, the house of childhood.*

– *Home* as the homeland to be a safe *home* and to which the British are reluctant to let in strangers.

A very clear and significant role is played by the opposition – my/my own – stranger/alien. The proverb “*An Englishman’s home is his castle*” highlights one of the most important features of the English *home* – the fact that it provides a way to isolate from others. In the fortress, however, are people who show each other affection and understanding.

UK as made up of islands is considered here as a country which must be defended by any available means in the literal sense, that is to say if necessary by fighting or in quiet times by exposing values of the English/British culture. It is about being part of Europe but also about being outside, something common to Englishmen probably since the Roman invasion and which in recent years has been put to the test because of the growing influx of immigrants.

The cultural aspect which is also very important for self-identification of the British is their sense of humour. Also, let us not forget the importance of the sporting *home*.

The English have many dos and don’ts in the social sphere. There are, for example, orders what and how to speak when visiting someone’s house. It is necessary to express sympathy when a host recounts the hardships of buying and furnishing the house, while the owner must deny all the praise from the guest.

A separate part of our aim here was profiling the underlying concept of *home*. We did not identify a clear profiling of the concept in British public discourse, despite the apparently distinct ideological orientations of the centre-left and centre-right press. Only in the feminist press can one see a profile of *home* as a “*tool of enslavement of women*”, but more often it is the work place rather than *home* that is the main place of exploitation of women.

Both tabloids and broadsheet newspapers, regardless of their political opinions, insist on the *home* as the hearth, on the *home* décor and doing up the *home* (DIY), the *home* as a place of residence and the country itself, contrasted with a dangerous, ridiculous and incomprehensible “abroad”.

Furthermore, the “*Island home*” appears in the articles regarding sport and politics.

The tabloids take delight in “*home*” stories and gossip, particularly if they are sensational in nature and relate to murder, domestic crime: crimes *at home* – meaning family or the country.

There are also weighty issues of security, protection against intrusion, of a thief or criminal, or even the salesmen. So the most important thing is doing what is good for the *home* (understood as a family and homeland).

However, one can extract a political point of view when talking about the Ministry of Internal Affairs, The Home Office; The Home Secretary or the Home Counties as counties located near London – the main centre of England and the UK.

In conclusion, we can distinguish *traditional British home*, a family living in a house with a garden, preferably two, and two kids, a dog and the family pictures on the mantelpiece. In the morning the lady of the house brings to bed tea with milk and at tea time the family meets over a cup of afternoon tea. In the traditional image the “master of the house” and “lady of the house” are indispensable, but today more often *home* is also a place of one person or a couple, which highlights socio-cultural changes.

From the English point of view *home* has a dimension not only for the family, because the British *home* is also about homeland, with a special resonance and meaning in political and religious discourses. A notable phenomenon in the UK has become homification of the public space, namely the domestication of the public space.

## HOME à la française: in search of the base concept\*

Elżbieta Skibińska  
Aline Viviland

The present article is an attempt at reconstructing the French way of understanding the concept MAISON ‘home’ by using the methodological assumptions of the project EUROJOS. In accordance with those assumptions, the analysis is based on data from three categories of sources: systemic, survey and textual.

The analysis of systemic data is centred around the lexeme *maison* (the closest lexical correlate of the Polish lexeme *dom*). The study takes account of definitions of the lexeme found in three dictionaries of the French language: *Trésor de la Langue Française* (TLF), *Le Nouveau Petit Robert* (NPR) and the online version of *Larousse*, as well as synonyms of the word, its etymology and phrasemes listed in those dictionaries and supplementary data from several other dictionaries.

The word *maison* comes from the Latin word *mansio* in the sense of ‘abode, place of residence’. In the Middle Ages, *maison* was first used to mean a ‘dwelling house’; it also appeared in expressions that referred to a living space or a shelter which, in certain situations, satisfied the need for spending time in a specific way (*maison de chasse*). The word was also used to stand for ‘people who live together or live in the same house’ as well as a ‘building serving a specific purpose’.

---

\* Full version see: Elżbieta Skibińska, Aline Viviland, *DOM à la française: w poszukiwaniu pojęcia bazowego*, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, *DOM*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s. 373–399.

At the end of the eighteenth century, *maison* was increasingly used in the sense ‘institution’ or ‘company’. Since the first half of the twentieth century, the French language has known a construction in which *maison* is used in apposition to another noun in the sense ‘characteristic of a given community (institution, family, company)’. Today, the noun *maison* has two main meanings: (1) ‘a human dwelling’ (more precisely: ‘a residential building designed for people’, ‘a space used as a dwelling’; ‘household affairs, a household’, ‘people living in one house’, and finally ‘a family line, a dynasty’; and (2) ‘an institution, a company’ (‘a public institution set up to meet certain social needs or a seat of a public institution’ – the lexeme *maison* often functions as part of a proper name); ‘a commercial or an industrial company’. In addition to these principal meanings, dictionaries give a third one: ‘an area of the sky, a house’ (one of the twelve areas that the sky is divided into in astrology).

The word *maison* enters into synonymic relations with two sets of words that can be thought of as its hyperonyms: one highlights the meaning ‘building’ (e.g., *bâtiment* ‘a building, an edifice’, *bâtisse* ‘a building’), the other highlights the meaning ‘place where you live’ (e.g., *habitation* ‘a habitation, a dwelling’, *domicile* ‘a domicile, a residence’). The word *maison* itself, defined as ‘a residential building’, can be used as the *genus proximum* in the definitions of many words that name different types or varieties of buildings which serve as human dwelling places, and which could be treated as its hyponyms (e.g., *bungalow* ‘a bungalow’, *cabane* ‘a cabin, a hut’). These words reflect the diversity of *maison* (residential building) in terms of size, opulence, prestige, as well as its architecture, as associated, among others, with the geographical location of the building. Both the hyperonyms and the hyponyms point to the different aspects of *maison*: the physical aspect associated with its appearance (size, shape, elements of building material, e.g., *appartement* ‘a flat, an apartment’, *suite* ‘a hotel apartment’, *galeas* ‘an attic’); the aspect connected with living, e.g., *domicile* ‘a domicile, a place of residence’, *logement*, *demeure*

‘a lodging, a residence’, *gîte* ‘a shelter’, *asile* ‘an asylum’), the social aspect (e.g., *famille* ‘the family’, *descendance* ‘descent, descendants’, *ménage* ‘a household’, *institution* ‘an institution’, *commerce* ‘trade, a shop’, *temple* ‘a temple’); and the psychological aspect – *maison* as a property, a place of one’s own (e.g., *chacunnière* ‘everyone’s own house’, *chez-soi* ‘one’s own home’).

The textual data come from two collections of quotations: the Frantext database, which consists of literary, philosophical, scientific and technical texts (130 quotations selected at random from texts written in the years 1960 to 2012), and electronic versions of the magazines *Le Monde*, *Midi Libre*, *Le Parisien*, *Notre Temps*, *Marie Gala* and *Closer* (150 quotations excerpted in the years 2012–2014).

In these texts, the word *maison* is essentially used in the same meanings as those recorded in the dictionaries, namely (in order of appearance):

1. residential building, as ‘a (more or less) functionally organized space’, for example, *dans le garage de sa maison* ‘in the garage of his house’;

2. an institution established to meet certain social needs, for example, *maison de santé* ‘a sanatorium/a private clinic’, *maison de force* ‘a prison’;

3. premises (living space), for example. *rentrer à la maison* ‘go back home’;

4. a trading company, for example, *la maison Gucci* ‘the fashion house/company Gucci’ *la maison d’édition* ‘a publishing house’;

5. a group of people living together (a family, household members including servants/home staff), for example. *personnel/employés de Maison* ‘home staff’, *gardien de Maison* ‘a janitor’;

6. done at home/by yourself, for example, *une manucure maison* ‘manicure done by yourself/at home’;

7. household affairs, a household, for example, *avoir la maison à tenir* ‘have a home to run’;

8. a family line, a dynasty, for example, *la maison de Brandebourg* ‘the House of Brandenburg’.

9. Of special note is the feature ‘being a property, a thing that one owns, sells, purchases, etc.) which, virtually non-existent in dictionary material (apart from the synonym *propriété* ‘landed property’), occurs at a high frequency in texts. In such uses, the word *maison* appears as a complement of verbs such as *posséder* ‘to possess’, *acheter* ‘to buy’, *vendre/céder* ‘to sell’, etc., or is accompanied by nominal elements: possessive pronouns or attributes.

10. Another feature that emerges from the textual material is that *maison* (a building) is viewed as a point of reference in space (a goal of movement, an element which allows one to situate another element in space, etc.), e.g., *en face de la maison* ‘opposite the house’.

Another basis for the reconstruction of the conceptualization of MAISON are the results of a survey conducted among several groups of French students from various universities and faculties in the spring of 2012 and winter of 2014. Responses of 186 participants (139 women and 47 men aged 17 to 26 years) were analysed; the results should only be considered as a kind of approximation, though, as they show how *maison* is understood by a select sample of young Frenchmen, which is limited geographically (northeastern and eastern France plus several respondents from northwestern France) and in terms of age and education (students); the results do not lead to conclusions that are representative of the whole of French youth, and even less so – the general French population.

Of the meanings listed in the dictionaries, only three figure in the answers of the respondents:

1. a residential building for people;
2. premises (a residential building or a part thereof) serving as a residence;
3. people living in the same house (a family, a household).

What is striking is the complete absence of the “institutional” meaning, which implies that for the respondents, the “real” *maison* is a house, a dwelling.

In the picture of *maison* that emerges from the survey, an important role is played by the physical aspect of the concept, in particular the appearance of a house and the division and organization of its internal space as well as the associated comfort. This way of perceiving *maison* presumably also comprises an axiological dimension, as it gives a clue to the level of importance that the respondents attribute to the functions of the rooms they list, and hence the order of priority of the needs of the residents these spaces meet. Linked to this is the ‘hedonistic’ valuation of these functions, and the corresponding psychosocial feature of MAISON as a place of one’s own, a place where one is at home, *chez soi*, i.e., a place where one feels comfortable and can behave the way they want.

Other elements that make up the psychosocial aspect of the concept, that is, MAISON understood as a community of persons living under the same roof (mainly the family, but also other people that are dear to one another), and a place in which one can feel safe, the opposite of the outside world, figure much more importantly in the surveys than in the dictionaries and texts. Also worth noting is the positive valuation of *maison* as a shelter.

The results of the analyses of material coming from systemic sources, texts and surveys afford the following reconstruction of the way the French understand the concept of MAISON.

1. There are two ways of conceiving MAISON: as a private and as a public space (an institution, a company). This distinction is clear in both dictionary definitions and in textual uses, in which both meanings are present (though they are defined separately in lexicographic sources). What is striking is that no reference to MAISON as a public space is made in the surveys. On the other hand, the survey material has a strong concentration of elements that make up the picture of



MAISON as a safe harbour (a meaning that is practically absent in the texts).

2. When the analysis of MAISON is narrowed down to its understanding as a private space, the following reconstruction of the concept can be proposed:

MAISON is a residential building which, in whole or in part, serves as a long-term shelter for a person and those who are dear to him/her and which can be owned by those people; it is a suitably organized space, which provides comfort (the physical aspect); in this common space, there are certain interpersonal relationships associated with:

(a) the organization of the household or household affairs (the living and social aspects);

(b) living together and a sense of closeness and security (the psychosocial aspect).

3. Next to this narrow conception of MAISON, a broader reconstruction of the concept can be proposed based on dictionary definitions and textual uses of the lexeme, according to which, *maison* is a building that provides a long-term shelter to persons or communities such as a family, but also larger communities such as an institution or a company. A community is characterized by specific properties (customs, principles or values) that distinguish it from other communities. The function of a shelter is associated with a sense of physical and mental safety.

## CASA – the Portuguese home\*

Zuzanna Bułat Silva

I. *Casa* ‘home’ is a key word of Portuguese culture. For the Portuguese, *casa*, apart from a place of residence, also means people, the family, sometimes also all members of a household. Home is an important point of reference for its inhabitants, a place to which one returns. This motif of returning home, *regresso a casa*, as well as waiting for those who are to return, is associated with the maritime history of Portugal, a country of sailors and explorers.

The present analysis of the concept of *CASA* in the Portuguese language is based, in accordance with the methodology of the Lublin School of Ethnolinguistics, on three types of data: systemic, survey and textual (SST). The systemic data mainly come from large dictionaries of contemporary Portuguese. The survey data were collected during a survey conducted in 2012 among students of Universidade Nova in Lisbon (the survey question was: *Para você, qual é a característica essencial duma autêntica casa?*). The textual data were excerpted from two sources: the on-line *Corpus de Referência do Português Contemporâneo* (CRPC) and the contemporary press (four titles, issues from the years 2011–2014).

II.1. The Portuguese lexeme *casa* has a surprisingly large number of meanings. *Casa* is 1) a habitable structure, 2) a landed property,

---

\* Full version see: Zuzanna Bułat Silva, *CASA – portugalski dom*, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, *DOM*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s. 401–431.

3) a detached house, 4) a dwelling, 5) a space in a house, 6) an annexe to the main building, 7) a trade institution, 8) a company, 9) a group of people who form a family or live together, 10) the royal family, 11) a group of people who assist the king or the head of state, 12) a collection of furniture and other furnishings, 13) a family's household expenditure, 14) family property, 15) a public office or institution, 16) a square on a (game)board, 17) a decade, 18) an order in mathematics, 19) a buttonhole, 20) each of the twelve astrological houses of heaven, 21) a team's own sports field, 22) the audience.

2. The Portuguese word *casa* comes from Latin *casa* 'a hut', 'a shack' – clearly visible here is the material aspect of home as a shelter. The lexemes *apartamento*, *domicílio*, *habitação*, *morada*, *moradia* and *vivenda*, all of which refer generally to a 'place of residence', can be treated as **hyperonyms** of the word *casa*. *Edifício* and *prédio*, which mean a 'building', point to the specific shape of this place. The meaning 'family home, the place where one comes from' is highlighted by such **synonyms** as *ninho* 'a nest' and *penates* 'Penates'. Very interesting, due to their relationship with fire and cooking, are meronymic synonyms, such as *lar*, literally, 'a hearth' and *fogo* 'fire'. Another meronym, *teto* 'roof', relates to the protective function of home. **Hyponyms** of the word *casa* include names of various types of houses, such as, for example, *cabana* 'cabin', *choupana* 'thatched cabin', *mansão* 'mansion', or *vila* 'villa'. **Antonyms** of the word *casa* are the negatively marked *casebre* 'shanty', *pardieiro* 'slum', and *tugúrio* 'shack'. Texts also feature such antonyms as *rua* 'street', *escola* 'school', *trabalho* 'work' and *mundo* 'the world'.

The most frequently used **derivative** of the word *casa* is *casar* 'to get married'. Words derived from *casar* include, among others, *casada/o* 'married' and *casal* 'a couple', which show that the concept *CASA* in the Portuguese language is inherently connected with the family. The adjective *caseiro* 'homey, home-made, home-worn' (e.g., *roupa caseira*, 'home-worn clothing, lounge clothing') connotes the features 'traditional' and 'modest'.

Quite a number of **idioms** point to the importance of order and tidiness at home. There are numerous fixed phrases which portray *casa* as a private space, in which a person feels at ease, for example, *sentir-se em casa* ‘to feel at home’. *Casa* is often portrayed as a place in which one can rest, but some phrases (e.g., *feito em casa* ‘made at home’) point to the fact that sometimes home is a workplace. Many expressions presuppose permanence of the prototypical home.

3. For the Portuguese students who participated in the Lisbon **survey** (CASA 2012), a real home is a comfortable place that meets the living needs of its residents and provides a sense of security. The young Portuguese primarily pay attention to the existential aspect of CASA (almost 37%), and only then to its psychological (19%) and physical (16%) aspects. The Portuguese home is given an unequivocally positive valuation – it is mainly seen, however, as a hedonistic value which is meant to meet the needs of an individual.

4. The following base **facets/features** make up the picture of Portuguese *casa*: **1) A functional dwelling space.** This facet occurs 104 times in the survey forms, 75 times in the CRPC corpus and 46 times in the press articles. *Casa* is a place which protects people against inclement weather, allows them to rest and take care of personal hygiene. *Casa* is a place where people eat and prepare food. An important feature of a *casa* is its location – in a quiet and nice area. **2) The family.** Derivatives and proverbs point to the very important role of the family in creating a home. Proverbs also portray home as a place where children are brought up. In the survey, in turn, respondents speak of a good home atmosphere and feelings which the members of the household have for each other (*casa é amor* ‘home is love’). An important feature of the Portuguese home is hospitality. Family appears 63 times in the survey forms, 14 times in the corpus and 5 times in the press. **3) A safe haven.** A constitutive feature of the Portuguese home is safety. In their responses, students say that home is a *porto seguro* ‘safe harbour’ (28 responses). The corpus gives no examples directly indicating that home is a safe place, but this feature is presupposed.

**4) A place of one's own.** This facet is prominent in the survey forms (22 mentions), press articles (13 mentions) and the corpus (14 mentions). It is also attested grammatically (in this sense, the lexeme *casa* is used without an article). A feature that is important for the respondents is the personal character of *casa*. Home is perceived as *espaço da privacidade* a 'private space'. It is more and more often inhabited by an individual, rather than a family. **5) A building.** This facet is most discernible in the corpus (42 mentions) and newspapers (18 mentions). Students, in their survey forms, also point to the physical dimension of home, defining it as *imóvel com as formas e tamanhos diferentes*, 'a property of different forms and sizes' (12 mentions). This facet highlights the material value of home as an object that can be bought and sold. **6) A place of good memories.** A picture of *casa* as 'a place of good memories' is present in the responses to the survey (4 mentions) as well as in the corpus (3 mentions) and press articles (4 mentions). The memories are associated with longing for home (*ter saudades de casa* 'to long for home').

On the basis of the analysis of the SST data we identified 40 features that define the concept *CASA* in the Portuguese language. Grouped under eight aspects (dimensions), they form a **synthetic cognitive definition** of *CASA*

### **I. The superordinate dimension**

an enclosed place, sectioned off from the surrounding space;  
intended for dwelling;  
for a long period of time;

### **II. The social dimension**

groups of people;  
who, most often, constitute a family;  
and bring up their children in this place;

### **III. The existential dimension**

it shelters its inhabitants from bad weather;  
allowing them to rest, especially at night;  
prepare food;  
eat;

and wash themselves;  
it provides its inhabitants with good living conditions and  
sufficient space;  
it reflects the character of its owner;  
it is tidy;  
modest and simple;  
people do certain things there; these things have been done in the same  
way for many years;  
people sometimes work there;

#### **IV. The psychological dimension**

it is one's own, private space;  
its inhabitants feel at ease there;  
they feel safe there;  
nothing wrong can happen to them;  
they want to return there;  
they miss this place when they are in another place;

#### **V. The physical dimension**

most often, it is a building or a part of a building;  
it is well-maintained, in a good condition;  
it is divided into rooms, in which people can sleep, eat, wash themselves,  
relax and prepare food;  
it has specific types of furniture and appliances;  
it has windows which provide sufficient daylight;  
it often has a garden;  
it can be bought and sold;

#### **VI. The psychosocial dimension**

it is hospitable, open to the whole world;  
it offers a good atmosphere;  
it is peaceful;  
people take care of one another;

#### **VII. The locative dimension**

it is situated in a quiet;  
clean;  
and pretty location;  
surrounded by greenery;

#### **VIII. The axiological dimension:**

it is good for people to have such a place.

III. From the analysis of the textual data, there emerge two main profiles of the Portuguese concept *CASA*.

1. The **profile of a traditional Portuguese home** (*casa portuguesa*) represents the historical-romantic point of view, which glorifies simplicity, modesty and living close to nature. This profile was invoked as an ideal and used for propaganda purposes during Salazar's dictatorship. A true Portuguese home, described in the famous Fado song *Casa Portuguesa* is white, with blue-and-white *azulejos* ('tiles') on the outside and a garden full of herbs and flowers. It is not, however, only a building, as the concept of home is extended to cover the nearest area. In the social dimension, having a home imposes on the owner certain rights and obligations towards the neighbours. Home becomes a workplace: food is produced and animals are bred there. What applies here is the concept of an extended family which comprises all those who work, eat and live together at home; a home like this is usually multi-generational. In the profile of the traditional home, the social, psychosocial and physical dimensions have more import than the existential dimension.

2. **The profile of a modern home** represents the point of view of a young Portuguese, most often an inhabitant of a city, for whom home is shelter from the world. A home like this is comfortable; it is equipped with all the indispensable electronics and appliances; it provides its inhabitants with privacy and sufficient space. In this profile, accent is put on the function of home, rather than its appearance. The most important thing for a man is to feel good in his home, though home can also be a source of unrest, mainly for financial reasons. In the profile of a modern home, the existential and psychological dimensions associated with hedonistic values, prevail over the social dimension, which connotes community values.

## **NYUMBA ‘house, home’ in the Swahili language and culture\***

Iwona Kraska-Szlenk

In Swahili, the linguistic correlate of the concepts of HOUSE and HOME is the lexeme *nyumba*, which etymologically means ‘a clay hut, a mud hut’. The functioning of this lexeme was examined on the basis of data from dictionaries, an electronic corpus of the Swahili language, as well as collections of proverbs and literary texts. Similarly to the Polish *dom*, the Swahili word *nyumba* is characterized by a variety of semantic extensions that form a complex network of meanings whose function depends on the linguistic and situational context, and which are interconnected by the relations of metonymy, metaphor, meaning extension or narrowing, and others. All the senses of the word form a coherent whole – an extensive concept with three dimensions: physical (NYUMBA as a building), social (the human “content” of NYUMBA is the family; one of the meanings of *nyumba* is ‘wife’, and *nyumba ndogo* ‘a small home’ stands for a concubine/mistress), and functional (NYUMBA protects humans from the outside world). Home as a shelter has an axiological dimension. Metaphorically, the concept of NYUMBA is projected onto the domain of the animal world, for example, *nyumba ya kuku* is a ‘henhouse’ (literally, ‘house of hens’) and *nyumba ya kondoo* means a ‘sheepfold’ (literally, ‘house of sheep’).

---

\* Full version see: Iwona Kraska-Szlenk, NYUMBA ‘dom’ w języku i w kulturze suahili, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, DOM, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s.433–447.



# **The *EHEN/AGHIWAN* ‘house, home’ of Sahara nomads in the light of the opposition between the house/home and the world\***

Marta Jackowska-Uwadizu

The subject of this article is the cultural picture of *EHEN/AGHIWAN* ‘house, home’ of the Tuareg – a community of African nomads. Describing the material aspect of the house, how it is built, and what symbolic functions it has, the author focuses mainly on the relationship between the house/home and the world as entrenched in Tamajaq (Tamasheq), the language of the Tuareg. In addition to dictionary data, the study is based on corpus data derived from original texts in Tamajaq, as well as texts written in French and English. Interesting supplementary material is provided by data from a questionnaire conducted by the author in Niger in 2012.

Tamajaq has two names for house/home: *ehen* ‘a place of residence (house, tent, cabin)’, also ‘a married couple’, ‘marriage’ or ‘wife’ alone, and *aghiwan*, ‘a cluster of tents’ and ‘the big family’, which differ only in contextual usage.

The concepts of *EHEN/AGHIWAN* in the language of Saharan tribes is based on a clear division between the female and male space. *EHEN*, which is at the centre of the Tuareg world, is identified with the woman, and the very act of building a tent relates to the structure of the universe, giving new life and prolonging the family line and tradition. *AGHIWAN*, in turn, belongs to the man, who is more strongly connected with the desert, with that which surrounds the “*ehen*”.

---

\* Full version see: Marta Jackowska-Uwadizu, *DOM koczowników saharyjskich w świetle opozycji DOM : ŚWIAT*, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, *DOM*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s. 449–467.

# **The Hausa GIDA ‘house, home’ in opposition to the bush and the world. The cultural perspective\***

Nina Pawlak

The concept of HOUSE/HOME in the African language Hausa, is expressed with the word *gida*, which provides a basis for many derivatives and metaphors. In the light of its etymology, the basic meaning of the word *gida* in Hausa is ‘a place of rest’. The author discusses the contextual usages of the word *gida*, word forms based on this lexeme, its synonyms as well as names for parts of the house/home and names for people inhabiting a home who constitute a family.

In Hausa culture, the concept GIDA embraces the physical aspects and spatial organization of the house (a complex of buildings, usually made of clay) as well as the social aspects of the home (the family, household members). Family relationships are subordinated to goals associated with the functioning of home. The Muslim religion promotes the concept of home as a dedicated place for the family, a safe place, a home–stronghold which separates family members, especially women, from others. The dwelling complex referred to with the term *gida* is inhabited by one man (the head of the family), his wife (wives) and their children. The dominant position is occupied by *mai Gida* ‘the host’, ‘the master of the house’.

---

\* Full version see: Nina Pawlak, *DOM w opozycji do buszu i świata. Perspektywa kulturowa pojęcia GIDA w języku hausa*, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, *DOM*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s.469–480.

## IE ‘home/household’ in the linguistic and cultural tradition of Japan\*

Katarzyna Wyszpolska

The author builds an outline of the concept of HOME/HOUSEHOLD in the Japanese linguistic worldview using definitions and examples found in dictionaries of the Japanese language, quotes from classical literature, proverbs and opinions of respondents to a questionnaire. The methodology used in the article is similar to that employed by Lublin ethnolinguists. The discussion is centred around the physical and, then, the social dimension of *IE*. The Japanese *ie* has four main meanings: ‘dwelling’, ‘family lineage’, ‘craft school’, ‘family – household members’. From the uses of the lexeme and compound words with *ke*, there emerges an indigenously Japanese picture of an extended multi-generational household, whose members often share a common profession. Such a conceptualisation of home differs significantly from the experiences of representatives of European cultures. On the other hand, an analysis of compound words with the lexeme *ka* brings to light a picture of home understood as a nuclear family of a well-grounded legal and social status, which diverges from the Japanese tradition and seems to belong to contemporary international culture.

---

\* Full version see: Katarzyna Wyszpolska, *Leksem IE ‘dom’ w językowo-kulturowej tradycji Japonii*, [in:] *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, t. I, *DOM*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Beata Żywicka, Lublin 2015, s. 481–490.

## Bibliography

- Abramowicz Maciej, Bartmiński Jerzy, Chlebda Wojciech, 2009, *Językowo-kulturowy obraz świata Słowian na tle porównawczym. Założenia programu „A”* (10 VI 2009), „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury” t. 21, s. 341–342.
- Abramowicz Maciej, Bartmiński Jerzy, Chlebda Wojciech, 2011, *Punkty sporne i bezsporne w programie EUROJOS. Odpowiedź na pytania i wątpliwości Profesor Jadwigi Puzyniny*, „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury” 23, s. 227–233.
- ACE – Bartmiński Jerzy, 2009, *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*, London, Versita. [Paperbook 2012].
- Adamowski Jan, 1991, *Kulturowe funkcje miedzy*, „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury” 4, s. 65–83.
- Altman Irwin, Werner Carole M. (red.), 1985, *Home Environments*, London–New York.
- Apresjan Jurij, 1980, *Semantyka leksykalna. Synonimiczne środki języka*. Przełożyli Zofia Kozłowska i Andrzej Markowski, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich. [Oryginał rosyjski: Moskwa 1974].
- Apresjan Jurij, 1994, *Naiwny obraz świata a leksykografia*, „Etnolingwistyka” nr 6, s. 5–12.
- Artowicz Iwona, 2005, *Prototyp, stereotyp oraz profile pojęcia ‘dom’ w wypowiedziach młodzieży na podstawie ankiet przeprowadzonych wśród uczniów klas I i II gimnazjum*, [w:] *Studia pragmatyczne 4. Komunikacja i tekst w perspektywie rozwojowej i dydaktycznej*, Warszawa.
- Roger Avery, Goldscheider Frances, Speare Alden Jr, 1992, *Feathered Nest/Gilded Cage: Parental Income and Leaving Home in the Transition to Adulthood*, „Demography”, 29 (3), s. 375–88.
- Arén Eje, Benjamin David N., Saile David, Stea David, 1995, *The Home: Words, Interpretations, Meanings and Environments*, England–U.S.A.
- Bachelard Gaston, 1975, *Poetyka przestrzeni*, [w:] Gaston Bachelard, *Poetyka wyobraźni: wybór pism*, tłum. Henryk Chudak, Anna Tatarkiewicz, Warszawa.

- Bachelard Gaston, 1976, *Poetyka przestrzeni: szuflada, kufry i szafy*, „Pamiętnik Literacki” 1, tłum. Wiktoria Krzemień, s. 233–243.
- Bahlcke Joachim, Schmielewski Ulrich, Wunsch Thomas (hrsg.), 2010, *Das Haus Schafgotsch. Konfession, Politik und Gedächtnis eines schlesischen Adelsgeschlechts vom Mittelalter bis zur Moderne*, Würzburg.
- Barbur Eli, 2010, *Przestrzeń domu straconego*, „Konteksty”, nr 2–3, s. 49–51.
- Bartmiński Jerzy zob. ACE, JSS, JWP, JOM.
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 1980, *Założenia teoretyczne słownika*, [w:] *Słownik ludowych stereotypów językowych. Zeszyt próbny*, red. J. Bartmiński, Wrocław, s. 7–36.
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 1984, *Definicja leksykograficzna a opis języka*, [w:] *Słownictwo w opisie języka*, red. Kazimierz Polański, Katowice, s. 9–21.
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 1988, *Definicja kognitywna jako narzędzie opisu konotacji słowa*, [w:] *Konotacja*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Lublin, s. 169–185. [Przekłady: rosyjski JOM: 55–67; angielski ACE: 67–75; serbski JSS: 93–106, czeski JKK: 83–92].
- Bartmiński Jerzy (red.), 1990, *Językowy obraz świata*, Lublin, Wyd. UMCS. [Wyd. II, poprawione 2004].
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 1989, *Projekt i założenia ogólne słownika aksjologicznego. Projekt listy haseł do słownika aksjologicznego*, [w:] *Język a kultura*, t. 2, red. Jadwiga Puzynina i J. Bartmiński, Wrocław: Wydaw. UW, s. 293–315; wyd. 2. *Język a kultura*, t. 2, *Zagadnienia leksykalne i aksjologiczne*, red. Jadwiga Puzynina i J. Bartmiński, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo „Wiedza o Kulturze”, s. 197–209. [przekład rosyjski JOM: 115–130].
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 1993, *O profilowaniu pojęć w słowniku etnolingwistycznym*, [w:] *Philologia Slavica. K 70-letiju akademika N.I.Tolstogo*, otv. red. V.N.Toporov, Moskva, Nauka, s. 12–19. [Przekład czeski JKK 93–98].
- Bartmiński Jerzy (red.) 1993, *Pojęcie ojczyzny we współczesnych językach europejskich*, Lublin, Instytut Europy Środkowowschodniej.
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 1997, *Dom i świat – opozycja czy współdziałanie*, [w:] *Dom w języku i kulturze*. (red.) Grażyna Sawicka, Szczecin, s. 11–22. [przekład angielski w wersji zmodyfikowanej ACE: 149–161; serbski JSS: 219–243].
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 2001, *Operator „typowy” i „prawdziwy” w strukturze semantycznej tekstu*, „Prace Filologiczne”, t. 46, s. 41–47.
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 2004, *Koncepcja językowego obrazu świata w programie slawistycznych badań porównawczych*, „Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej” t. 40, Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy, s. 259–280. [Przekłady: angielski w ACE: 213–221; serbski JSS: 429–447, rosyjski w tomie *Slavjanskaja koncepcijosfera v sopostavitel'nom osveščennii. Leksikon*, red. E. Stefanskij, Samara 2011, s. 29–43].
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 2006a, *Zmiany rozumienia nazw wartości w okresie transformacji ustrojowej w Polsce*, [w:] JWP s. 8–35.

- Bartmiński Jerzy, 2006b, *Językowe podstawy obrazu świata*, Lublin, Wyd. UMCS [V wyd. 2012]. [Przekłady fragmentów na rosyjski JOM, angielski ACE, serbski JSS, czeski JKK].
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 2007b, *Stereotypy mieszkają w języku. Studia etnolingwistyczne*, Lublin.
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 2008b, *Kakie cennosti učastvujut v formirovanii jazykovej kartiny mira Slavian?*, [w:] *Etnolingvistička proučavan'a srpskog i drugih slovenskih jezika. U čast akademika Svetlane Tolstoj*, red. Ljubinko Radenković, Beograd 2008, s. 59–70. [Wersja czeska rozszerzona i zmodyfikowana: *Jaké hodnoty spoluutvářejí jazykový obraz světa Slovanů?*, "Slovo a slovesnost" t. 71, 2010, s. 329–339].
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 2009, *The Polish OJCZYŻNA (homeland): its base stereotype and ideological profiles*, [w:] ACE: 162–177.
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 2010, *Pojęcie językowego obrazu świata i sposoby jego operacjonalizacji*, [w:] *Jaka antropologia literatury jest dzisiaj możliwa*, red. Przemysław Czapliński, Anna Legeżyńska, Marcin Telicki, Poznań, s. 155–178. [Przekład angielski ACE: 22–37].
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 2014a, *Ankieta jako pomocnicze narzędzie rekonstrukcji językowego obrazu świata*, [w:] WJOSS 3, Lublin, s. 279–308.
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 2014b, *Polskie wartości w europejskiej aksjosferze*, Lublin.
- Jerzy Bartmiński, 2015, *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów – co zawiera, na jakich zasadach się opiera, dla kogo jest przeznaczony?* [w:] LASiS 1, DOM, s. 7–13. [Przekład angielski: *The Axiological Lexicon of Slavs and their Neighbours – what does it contain, what principles is it based on, who is it intended for?*, [in this volume, pp. 7–15].
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 2015b, DOM – koncept uniwersalny i specyficzny kulturowo, [w:] LASiS 1, DOM, s. 15–33. [Przekład angielski: *HOME – a universal and culture-specific concept*, [in this volume, pp. 16–41].
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 2015c, *Perspektywa semazjologiczna i onomazjologiczna w badaniach językowego obrazu świata*, „Poradnik Językowy” 1, s. 14–29.
- Bartmiński Jerzy, Bielińska-Gardziel Iwona, 2012, *Polski językowo-kulturowy obraz domu (cz. I)*, [w:] WJOSS 1, Lublin, s. 9–46.
- Bartmiński Jerzy, Bielińska-Gardziel Iwona, 2015, *Polski językowo-kulturowy obraz DOMU i jego profile*, [w:] LASiS 1, DOM, s. 89–121.
- Bartmiński Jerzy, Bielińska-Gardziel Iwona, 2018, *The Polish linguistic and cultural picture of DOM 'house, home' and its profiles*, [in this volume, pp. 56–64].
- Bartmiński Jerzy, Chlebda Wojciech, 2008, *Jak badać językowo-kulturowy obraz świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów?* „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury” 29, s. 11–27. [Przekład niemiecki: *Wie soll man das sprachlich-kulturelle Weltbild der Slawen und ihrer Nachbarn untersuchen*, tłum. Karl-Hainz Beschoner, [w:] *Europa und seine Werte* (ed.) J. Bartmiński, Rosemarie Lühr, Frankfurt am

- Main: Peter Lang 2009, s. 271–287; białoruski *Jak dasledavac' moŭna-kul'turnuju karcinu svetu slavjan i ih susedzjaŭ?* "Belarusskaja lingvistyka" vypusk 64, Minsk 2010, s. 3–16].
- Bartmiński Jerzy, Chlebda Wojciech, 2013, *Problem konceptu bazowego i jego profilowania – na przykładzie polskiego stereotypu EUROPY*, „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury” 25, s. 69–95.
- Bartmiński Jerzy, Niebrzegowska Stanisława, 1998, *Profile a podmiotowa interpretacja świata*, [w:] *Profilowanie w języku i w tekście*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Ryszard Tokarski, Lublin, s. 211–224. [Przekład rosyjski JOM: 105–114; angielski ACE: 88–94; serbski JSS: 119–130; czeski „Slovo a smysl” R. 4, nr 8, s. 310–321].
- Beck Heinrich, Steuer Heiko (hrsg.), 1997, *Haus und Hof in ur- und frühgeschichtlicher Zeit*. Bericht über zwei Kolloquien der Kommission für die Altertumskunde Mittel- und Nordeuropas vom 24. bis 26. Mai 1990 und 20. bis 22. November 1991 (34. und 35. Arbeitstagung), Göttingen.
- Benedyktowiczowie Danuta, Zbigniew, 1992, *Dom w tradycji ludowej*, Wrocław.
- Bielińska-Gardziel Iwona, 2009, *RODZINA i jej profile we współczesnej polszczyźnie*, „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury” 21, s. 121–138.
- Bielińska-Gardziel Iwona, 2009, *Stereotyp RODZINY we współczesnej polszczyźnie*, Warszawa.
- Bielińska-Gardziel Iwona, 2017, *DOM oczami studentów polskich*, [w:] NWJE 2017, s. 24–32.
- Birdwell-Pheasant Dona, Lawrence-Zúñiga Denise (red.), 1999, *House life: space, place and family in Europe*, Oxford-New York.
- Božić-Šejć Rafaela, 2011, *Dom (na material ruskoj i horvatskoj lingvokul'tur)*, [u:] *Slavjanskaja konceptosfera v sopostavitel'nom osveščenii: Leksikon*, red. Evgenij Stefanskij, Samara, s. 156–160.
- Berardinelli Cleonice, 1999, *Casa na poesia de Fernando Pessoa*, [w:] Jorge Fernandes da Silveira, *Escrever a casa portuguesa*, Belo Horizonte, s. 419–441.
- Brettell Caroline B., 1999, *The casa of José dos Santos Caldas: family and household in a northwestern Portuguese village, 1850–1993*, [w:] *House life: space, place and family in Europe*, Donna Birdwell-Pheasant, Denise Lawrence-Zúñiga, Oxford-New York, s. 39–72.
- Brosz Maciej, 2007, *(Za)mieszk(iw)anie. Przestrzeń konstruowana*, [w:] *Co znaczy mieszkać. Szkice antropologiczne*, red. Grażyna Woroniecka, Warszawa, s. 73–87.
- Brydon Diana, 2007, *Canadian writers negotiating home within global imaginaries*, Adelaide.
- Bryson Bill, 2013, *W domu. Krótka historia rzeczy codziennego użytku*, tłum. Tomasz Bieroń, Poznań.
- Buczyńska-Garewicz Hanna, 2006, *Miejsca, strony, okolice. Przyczynek do fenomenologii przestrzeni*, Kraków.

- Bułat Silva Zuzanna, 2012, *O conceito de casa em português europeu*, [w:] *Avanços em Ciências da Linguagem*, red. Petar Petrov, Pedro Quintino de Sousa, Samartim Roberto López-Iglésias, Elias J. Torres Feijó, Santiago de Compostela, s. 343–358.
- Bułat Silva Zuzanna, 2015, *CASA – portugalski dom*, [w:] *LASiS 1, DOM*, s. 401–431.
- Bułat Silva Zuzanna, 2017, *Badanie ankietowe portugalskiego DOMU (CASA)*, [w:] *NWJE 2017*, s. 119–128.
- Bułat Silva Zuzanna, 2018, *CASA – the Portuguese home*, [in this volume, pp. 129–134].
- Bułat Silva Zuzanna, Stępień Maciej A., 2014, *La imagen lingüística de CASA en español y portugués*, [w:] Zuzanna Bułat Silva, Monika Głowicka, Justyna Wesoła, *Variación, contraste, circulación. Perspectivas lingüísticas en el hispanismo actual*, Wrocław, s. 97–108.
- Butkevičius Izidorius, 1958, *Tradiciniai lietuvių valstiečių gyvenamieji namai*, [w:] *Iš lietuvių kultūros istorijos*, t. 1, Vilnius, s. 157–173.
- Butkevičius Izidorius, 1971, *Lietuvos valstiečių gyvenvietės ir sodybos*, Vilnius.
- Być Małgorzata, 1990, *Stereotyp domu i rodziny w języku polskim*. Praca magisterska wykonana pod kier. J. Bartmińskiego w Zakładzie Języka Polskiego UMCS.
- Chapman Tony, Hockey Jenny (red.), 1999, *Ideal Homes? Social Change and Domestic Life*, London
- Chlebda Wojciech, 1993, *Słownik a „dwuoczne postrzeganie świata”*, [w:] *O definicjach i definiowaniu*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Ryszard Tokarski, Lublin, s. 195–205.
- Chlebda Wojciech (red.), 2010a, *Etnolingwistyka a leksykografia*. Tom dedykowany Profesorowi Jerzemu Bartmińskiemu, Opole.
- Chlebda Wojciech, 2010b, *W poszukiwaniu językowo-kulturowego obrazu świata Słowian*, [w:] Chlebda (red.), s. 7–20.
- Chlebda Wojciech, 2010c, *Wstępne założenia analizy słownikowej w projekcie badawczym EUROJOS*, [w:] Chlebda (red.), s. 219–226.
- Cieślik Krzysztof, Kazimierski Jerzy, 1997, *Anatomia destrukcji. Motyw domu w wybranych utworach Iwana Bunina*, [w:] Grażyna Sawicka (red.), Szczecin, s. 401–407.
- Cywjan Tatiana, 1978, *Dom w folklorystycznym modelu świata (na materiale bałkańskich zagadek)*, „Literatura Ludowa” 3, s. 50–68.
- Czaja Dariusz (red.), 2013b, *Inne przestrzenie, inne miejsca. Mapy i terytoria.*, Wołowiec, Wydawnictwo Czarne.
- Czajkowski Jerzy, 1983, *Zagroda i dom w Beskidzie Niskim i na Pogórzu*, [w:] *Łemkowie. Kultura – sztuka – język*. Materiały z Sympozjum zorganizowanego przez Komisję Turystyki Górskiej ZG PTTK, Sanok, dn. 21–24 września, s. 91–105.
- Czajkowski Jerzy, 1962, *Wiejskie budownictwo mieszkalne w Beskidzie Niskim i na przyległym Pogórzu*, [w:] „Rocznik Muzeów Województwa Rzeszowskiego”, t. 2.



- Czermińska Małgorzata, 1978, *Dom w autobiografii i powieści o dzieciństwie*, w: *Przestrzeń i literatura*. Studia pod red. M. Głowińskiego i A. Okopień-Sławińskiej, Wrocław, s. 229–259.
- Čálek Oldřich, 1999, *Domov nás může zachránit aneb Občanská společnost, domov a psychoterapie*, srov. [http://www.rozhlas.cz/vltava/literatura/\\_zprava/oldrich-calek-domov-nas-muze-zachranit-aneb-obcanska-spolecnost-domov-a-psycho-terapie-705200](http://www.rozhlas.cz/vltava/literatura/_zprava/oldrich-calek-domov-nas-muze-zachranit-aneb-obcanska-spolecnost-domov-a-psycho-terapie-705200).
- Čermáková Eva, 2012, *Krajinami cizích časů. Vnímání prostoru a času usazenými a nomádskými kulturami*, Praha.
- Damborský Jiří, 1993, *Ojczyzna w języku czeskim*, [w:] *Pojęcie ojczyzny we współczesnych językach europejskich*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Lublin, s. 167–176.
- Danaher David S., 2010, *Three key words (domov, svědomí, and klid)*, „Slovo a slovesnost”, 71, 4, s. 250–259.
- Darke Jane, 1994, *Women and the Meaning of Home*, [w:] *Housing Women*, red. Rose Gilroy, Roberta Woods, London -New York.
- Dąbek-Wirgowa Teresa, Makowiecki Andrzej Z. (red.), 1997, *Obraz domu w kulturach słowiańskich*, Warszawa.
- Dąbrowska Agnieszka, 2000, *Językowy obraz domu w powieściach Małgorzaty Musierowicz*. Praca magisterska wykonana pod kier. J. Bartmińskiego w Zakładzie Języka Polskiego UMCS.
- Douglas Mary, 1991, *The Idea of a Home: A Kind of Space*, „Social Research”, 58/1, s. 287–307.
- Dubský Ivan, 1997, *Svět, domov a cesta u Jana Patočky*, [w:] Ivan Dubský, *Filosof Jan Patočka*, Praha, s. 11–33.
- Durif Pierre, Sylvie Berniard, 1969, *Les Français et la maison individuelle*, „Economie et statistique”, No 7, décembre, s. 3–16.
- Duszek Anna, Pawlak Nina (red.), 2003, *Anatomia gniewu. Emocje negatywne w językach i kulturach świata*, Warszawa.
- Farge Sylvain, [b.r.], *Zwischen Struktur und Kognition: Heim und Haus im Vergleich*, [http://www.academia.edu/10672451/Zwischen\\_Struktur\\_und\\_Kognition\\_Heim\\_und\\_Haus\\_im\\_Vergleich](http://www.academia.edu/10672451/Zwischen_Struktur_und_Kognition_Heim_und_Haus_im_Vergleich) [dostęp 18.09.2015].
- Ferenc Teresa, Zbigniew Jankowski, Anna Janko, Milena Wieczorek, 1991, *Cztery twarze domu. Antologia rodzinna*. Wstępem opatrzył Krzysztof Nowicki, Szczecin.
- Fernandes da Silveira Jorge (red.), 1999, *Escrever a casa portuguesa*, Belo Horizonte.
- Finch Janet, Lynn Hayes, 1994, *Inheritance, Death and the Concept of Home*, „Sociology”, 28 (2), s. 417–433.
- Fiodorowa Ludmiła, Pazio-Wlazłowska Dorota, 2015, *Rosyjski językowo-kulturowy obraz DOMU*, [w:] LASiS 1, DOM, s. 149–175.
- Fiodorowa Ludmiła, Pazio-Wlazłowska Dorota, 2018, *The Russian linguistic and cultural picture of DOM*, [in this volume, pp. 71–77].

- Garcia Ramos Rui Jorge, 2004, *A Casa Unifamiliar Burguesa na Arquitectura Portuguesa: mudança e continuidade no espaço doméstico na primeira metade do século XX*, Universidade do Porto (praca doktorska).
- Gaudiešiūtė Vaidė, 2007, *Namas – kaip pasaulio centras*, „Žemaičių žemė”, 3, s. 49–55.
- Gawarkiewicz Roman, 2008, *DOM w językowym obrazie świata młodzieży polskiej i rosyjskiej*, [w:] Roman Gawarkiewicz, Izabela Pietrzyk, Barbara Rodziewicz, *Polski słownik asocjacyjny z suplementem*, Szczecin 2008, s. 235–246.
- Giles Judy, 1993, *A Home of One's Own: Women and Domesticity in England 1918–1950*, *Women's Studies International Forum*, 16 (3), s. 239–253.
- Giles Wenona, 1997, *Re/membering the Portuguese household in Toronto: culture, contradictions and resistance*, „Women's Studies International Forum”, 20, s. 387–396.
- Glyptis Sue, McInnes Hamish, Patmore John A., 1987, *Leisure and the Home*, London.
- Glyptis Susan A., Chambers Deborah A., 1982, *No Place Like Home*, „Leisure Studies”, 1 (1), s. 247–262.
- Głaz Adam, 2014, *Koncepcja etnolingwistyki według Jamesa Underhilla*, „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury” 26, s. 141–154.
- Goddard Cliff, Wierzbicka Anna (red.), 2002, *Meaning and Universal Grammar. Theory and Empirical Findings*, t. 1–2, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Graham Allan, Graham Crow (red.), 1989, *Home and Family*, London.
- Gregson Nicky, Lowe Michelle, 1995, *Home-Making: On the Spatiality of Daily Social Reproduction in Contemporary Middle-Class Britain*, „Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers”, 20, s. 224–235.
- Gregson Nicky, Lowe Michelle, 1994, *Servicing the Middle Classes: Class, Gender and Waged Domestic Labour in Contemporary Britain*, London.
- Gryshkova Nina, 2014, *Leksem, pojęcie, stereotyp, koncept, znaczenie, idea – propozycja regulacji terminologicznych*, [w:] *WJOSS* 3, s. 21–50.
- Gryshkova Nina, 2017, *DIM (DOM) w świetle ukraińskich badań ankietowych*, [w:] *NWJE* 2017, s. 65–75.
- Grzegorzczkova Renata, 2009, Punkty dyskusyjne w rozumieniu pojęcia językowego obrazu świata – widziane z perspektywy badań porównawczych, „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury” 21, s. 15–29.
- Grzegorzczkova Renata, 2011, *Jeszcze o rozumieniu JOS-u w perspektywie badań porównawczych*, „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy języka i kultury”, 23, s. 217–225.
- Grzeszczak Monika, 2015, *(HAUS i HEIM) w języku niemieckim*, [w:] *LASiS* 1, DOM, s. 311–342.
- Grzeszczak Monika, 2017, *HAUS i HEIM w wypowiedziach niemieckich studentów (na podstawie badań ankietowych)*, [w:] *NWJE* 2017, s. 105–114.
- Grzeszczak Monika, 2018, *HAUS and HEIM in German*, [in this volume, pp. 111–116].
- Gumpert Gary, Drucker Susan J., 1998, *The Mediated Home in the Global Village*, „Communication Research”, 25 (4), s. 422–438.

- Gurney Craig M., 1997, *Half of Me Was Satisfied: Making Sense of Home Through Episodic Ethnographies*, „Women's Studies International Forum”, 30 (3), s. 373–386.
- Handke Kwiryna, 1995, *Polski język familijny*, Warszawa.
- Haraven Tamara K., 1991, *The Home and the Family in Historical Perspective*, „Social Research”, 58 (1), s. 253–285.
- Heidegger Martin, 1977, *Budować, mieszkać myśleć. Eseje wybrane*, tłum. Krzysztof Michalski, Warszawa. (*Non) omnis moriar* (*Non) omnis moriar. Cultural and Literary Discourses of Death and Immortality*, ed. I. Wawrzyczek and A. Kędzierska, Lublin: Maria Curie-Skłodowska University Press, p. 71–81.
- Hockey Jenny, Chapman Tony, 1999, *Houses of Doom*, in *Ideal Homes? Social Change and Domestic Life*, London.
- Hodrová Daniela, 1994, *Místa s tajemstvími. Kapitoly z literární topologie*, Praha.
- Hogenová Anna, 2002, *K fenomenologii domova a jinakosti*, [w:] *Kvalita života a tělesnost*, Praha, s. 120–185.
- Hunt Pauline, 1989, *Gender and the Construction of Home Life*, [w:] *Home and Family: Creating the Domestic Sphere*, red. Allan Graham, Crow Graham, London, s. 66–81.
- Hučín Jakub, *Domov jako zrcadlo vlastního já. Psychologie dnes*, 2003, dostępne na: <http://www.rodina.cz/clanek3216.htm>
- Jackowska-Uwadizu Marta, 2015, *DOM koczowników saharyjskich w świetle opozycji DOM: ŚWIAT*, „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury” 26, s. 107–127. [Przedruk w: LASiS 1, DOM, s. 449–467].
- Jackowska-Uwadizu Marta, 2018, *The EHEN/AGHIWAN 'house, home' of Sahara nomads in the light of the opposition between the house/home and the world*, [in this volume, p. 136].
- JKK – Jerzy Bartmiński, 2016, *Jazyk v kontextu kultury. Dvanast státí z lublinské kognitivní etnolingvistiky*. Vebrala, z polskich oryginałów přeložila, komentářem doplnila a úvodní a závěrečnou studii napsala Irena Vaňková; doslov James Underhill. Praha, Karolinum.
- JOM – Бартми́нский Ежи, 2005, *Языковой образ мира: Очерки по этнолингвистике*. Sost. i otv. red. S.M. Tolstaja, podgotovka k pečati E. L. Berezovič, Moskva, Indrik.
- JSS – Бартми́нский Ежи, 2011, *Језик – слика – свет: Етнолингвистичке студије*, Београд, SlovoSlavia.
- JWP – *Јęzyк, wartości, polityka. Zmiany rozumienia nazw wartości w okresie transformacji ustrojowej w Polsce. Raport z badań empirycznych*. Opracował zespół w składzie: Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Małgorzata Brzozowska, Irina Lappo, Urszula Majer-Baranowska, Beata Żywicka, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Lublin 2006.

- Kapetanović Amir, 2015, *Hrvatska jezična slika DOMA danas*, [w:] LASiS 1, DOM, s. 291–309.
- Kapetanović Amir, 2017, *Anketno istraživanje hrvatske jezične slika DOMA*, [w:] NWJE 2017, s. 92–104.
- Kapetanović Amir, 2018, *The Croatian linguistic view of DOM today*, [in this volume, pp. 106–110].
- Kähler Gert, Hintze Bettina, 2005, *Die besten Einfamilienhäuser unter 1.500 Euro/m<sup>2</sup>. Kostengünstig und effizient. Deutschland – Österreich – Schweiz*, München.
- Kearns Ade, Hiscock Rosemary, Ellaway Anne, Macintyre Sally, 2000, *Beyond Four Walls. The Psycho-Social Benefits of Home: Evidence From West Central Scotland*, „Housing Studies”, 15 (3), s. 387–410.
- Kitanova Maria, 2018, *The concept of DOM in the Bulgarian linguistic worldview*, [in this volume, pp. 91–98].
- Klimiuk Maciej, 2010, *Mieszkańcy pustyni, miast i wsi, czyli o nazwach domu w literackim języku arabskim*, „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury” 22, Lublin, s. 161–175.
- Klimka Libertas, 2011, *Lietuvio namai: statybos papročiai ir mitologemos*, [w:] *Inveniens quaero*, Vilnius, s. 721–745.
- Klimka Libertas, 2012, *Namučiai*, „Archiforma”, 1–2, s. 49–57.
- Klimt Andrea, 1989, *Returning „home”: Portuguese migrants notions of temporariness, permanence and commitment*, „New German Critique”, s. 47–70.
- Kobesová Alena, 2014, *Domov v konceptualizaci českých mluvčích (dotazníkové šetření)*. Nepublikovaná bakalářská práce pod vedením Irena Vaňková, Praha.
- Kostiak Natalia, 2007, *Kulturowy stereotyp domu pisarzy łemkowskich w II poł. XX wieku*, [w:] *Łemkowie, Bojkowie, Rusini. Historia, współczesność. Kultura materialna i duchowa*, Stefan Dudra i in. (red.), Legnica-Zielona Góra, Łemkowski Zespół Pieśni i Tańca „Kyczera”, s.451- 464.
- Kościuk Agnieszka, 2015, *Językowo-kulturowy obraz domu w polskiej tradycji ludowej (na podstawie Dzieł wszystkich Oskara Kolberga*, Lublin (mps rozprawy doktorskiej).
- Kovařík Petr, 2004, *Klíč k rodným chaloupkám*, Praha.
- Kozłowska-Doda Jadwiga, 2012a, *Obraz domu białoruskiego. Uwagi wstępne*, [w:] WJOSS 1, s. 89–105.
- Kozłowska-Doda Jadwiga, 2015, *DOM w języku białoruskim*, [w:] LASiS 1, DOM, s. 177–206.
- Kozłowska-Doda Jadwiga, 2017, *Obraz domu białoruskiego w świetle danych ankiety*, [w:] NWJE 2017, s. 46–64.
- Kozłowska-Doda Jadwiga, 2018, *DOM ‘home, house’ in Byelorussian*, [in this volume, pp. 78–84].

- Kraska-Szlenk Iwona, 2010, *Nyumba 'dom' w języku i kulturze suahili*, „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury”, 22, s. 145–161. [Przedruk w: LASiS 1, DOM, s. 433–447].
- Kraska-Szlenk Iwona, 2018, *NYUMBA 'hut, home' in the Swahili language and culture*, [in this volume, p. 135].
- Kulas Dariusz, 2011, *Dom - to, co istotne*, „Anthropos?” 16–17, s. 59–65, wydanie internetowe, dostęp: 01.12.2012.
- Kunce Aleksandra, 2011, *Dom na szczytach lokalności*, „Anthropos?” 16–17, s. 45–58, wydanie internetowe, dostęp: 01.12.2012.
- Lawrence Roderick J., 1987, *What Makes a House a Home?*, „Environment and Behaviour”, 19 (2), s. 154–168.
- LASiS – *Leksykon aksjologiczny Słowian i ich sąsiadów*. Ed. of serie Jerzy Bartmiński. Vol. 1, *DOM*, 2015, eds. J. Bartmiński, I. Bielińska-Gardziel, B. Żywicka, pp. 504. Vol. 3, *PRACA*, 2016, eds. J. Bartmiński, M. Brzozowska, S. Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, pp. 455. Vol 5, *HONOR*, 2017, eds. Petar Sotirov, Dejan Ajdačić, pp. 431. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Legeżyńska Anna, 1996, *Dom i poetycka bezdomność w liryce współczesnej*, Warszawa.
- Levinson Steven, 2003, *Space in language and cognition*, Cambridge.
- Lino Raul, [1933] 1992, *Casas portuguesas: alguns apontamentos sobre o arquitectar das casas simples*, Lisboa.
- Lühr Rosemarie, 1997, *Haus und Hof im Lexikon des Indogermanischen*, [w:] *Haus und Hof in ur- und frühgeschichtlicher Zeit*, (hrsg.) Heinrich Beck, Heiko Steuer, Göttingen, s. 26–49.
- Łotman Jurij, 1987, *Dom w „Mistrzu i Małgorzacie” Michaiła Bułhakowa*, „Pamiętnik Literacki”, 4.
- Łukasiewicz Paweł, Siciński Andrzej (red.), 1992, *Dom we współczesnej Polsce*, Wrocław.
- Madigan Ruth, Munro Moira, 1991, *Gender, House and Home: Social Meanings and Domestic Architecture*, „Journal of Architecture and Planning Research”, 8, s. 116–132.
- Madigan Ruth, Moira Munro, 1996, *House Beautiful: Style and Consumption in the Home*, „Sociology”, 30 (1), s. 41–57.
- Madigan Ruth, Munro Moira, Smith Susan J., 1990, *Gender and the Meaning of Home*, „International Journal of Urban and Regional Research”, 14 (2), s. 625–647.
- Markou Christina, 2018, *The concept of SPITI 'home' in the Greek linguistic worldview*, [in this volume, pp. 42–47].
- Marques Pereira Sandra, 2012, *Casa e mudança social – uma leitura das transformações da sociedade portuguesa a partir da casa*, Lisboa.
- Martinaitis Marcelijus, 2000, *Namai ir kelionė piršlybų bei šeimos dainose*, „Gimtasis žodis”, 7, s. 26–32; „Gimtasis žodis”, 8, s. 18–23.

- Martynowicz Idzi, 1983, *Kurna chata występująca w Bieszczadach, Beskidzie Niskim i na przyległym Pogórzu*, [w:] *Łemkowie. Kultura – sztuka – język. Materiały z Sympozjum zorganizowanego przez Komisję Turystyki Górskiej ZG PTTK*, Sanok, dn. 21–24 września, s. 106–113.
- McCracken Grant, 1989, *Homeyness: A Cultural Account of One Constellation of Consumer Goods and Meanings*, [w:] *Interpretive Consumer Research*, red. Elizabeth C. Hirschman, Provo UT, s. 168–183.
- Misiak Małgorzata, 2015, *Koncept DOM w etnolekcie łemkowskim*, [w:] *LASiS 1, DOM*, s. 207–235.
- Misiak Małgorzata, 2017, *DOM w świetle badań ankietowych w etnolekcie łemkowskim*, [w:] *NWJE* s. 76–80.
- Misiak Małgorzata, 2018, *The concept of ДИМ/ХЫЖА ‘home’ in the Lemko ethnolect*, [in this volume, pp. 85–90].
- Mišetić Ana, 2006, *Koncept povezanosti s mjestom i sekundarno stanovanje*, „Društvena istraživanja”, 15/1–2, s. 27–42.
- Moore Jeanne, 2000, *Placing Home in Context*, „Journal of Environmental Psychology”, 20 (3), s. 207–217.
- Mountcastle Amy, Danon Dona, 2001, *Dolazak „kući”: identitet i prostor u poslijeratnoj Hrvatskoj*, „Narodna umjetnost”, 38/1, s. 105–118.
- Mowl Graham, Pain Rachel, Talbot Carol, 2000, *The ageing body and homespace*, „Area”, 32 (2), s. 189–197.
- NWJE 2017 – *Nazwy wartości w językach europejskich. Raport z badań empirycznych*. Eds. I. Bielińska-Gardziel, M. Brzozowska, B. Żywicka, Przemyśl, 2017, Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Wschodnioeuropejska.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska Stanisława, 2013, *Projekt badawczy ETNO(EUROJOS) a program etnolingwistyki kognitywnej*, „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury” 25, s. 267–281.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska Stanisława, 2014, *Od separacyjnego do holistycznego opisu językowego obrazu świata. Na marginesie dyskusji nad kształtem artykułów w Leksykonie aksjologicznym Słowian i ich sąsiadów*, [w:] *WJOSS 3*, Lublin, s. 71–102.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska Stanisława, 2015, *O profilowaniu językowego obrazu świata*, „Poradnik Językowy”, 6, s. 1–18.
- O’Bryant Shirley L., 1983, *The Subjective Value of ‘Home’ to Older Homeowners*, „Journal of Housing for the Elderly”, 1 (1), s. 29–43.
- Opačić Vuk Tvrtko, 2009, *Recent characteristics of the second home phenomenon in the Croatian littoral*, „Hrvatski geografski glasnik”, 71/1, s. 33–66.
- Parke Ross D., 1978, *Children’s Home Environments: Social and Cognitive Effects*, [w:] *Children and the Environment*, ed. Irwin Altman, Joachim F. Wohlwill, New York–London.
- Patočka Jan, 1992, *Přirozený svět jako filosofický problém*, Praha.

- Pawlak Nina, 2010, *Dom w opozycji do buszu i świata. Perspektywa kulturowa pojęcia gida w języku hausa*, „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury” 22, Lublin, s. 129–145. [Przedruk w: LASiS 1, DOM, s. 469–480].
- Pawlak Nina, 2018, *The Hausa GIDA ‘house, home’ in opposition to the bush and the world. The cultural perspective*, [in this volume, p. 137].
- Pazio-Wlazłowska Dorota, 2012, *Obraz DOMU we współczesnej publicystyce rosyjskiej*, [w:] WJOSS 1, Lublin, s. 69–88.
- Pazio-Wlazłowska Dorota, Rotmistrowa Olga W., 2014, *DOM w aksjosferze współczesnych Rosjan*, [w:] WJOSS 2, Lublin, s. 11–28.
- Perkins Harvey C., Thorns David C., Winstanley Ann, Newton Bronwyn M., 2002, *The Study of ‘Home’ From a Social Scientific Perspective: An Annotated Bibliography Second Edition*, Canterbury-New Zealand.
- Pina-Cabral João, 1991, *A ‘minha’ casa em Paço: um estudo de caso*, [w:] Joaquim Pais de Brito, Brian O’Neill (eds.), 1991, *Lugares de Aqui: Actas do seminário ‘Terrenos Portugueses’*, Lisboa, s. 119–140.
- Pina-Cabral João, 1997, *Houses and legends: family as community of practice in urban Portugal*, [w:] Marianne Gullestad, Martine Segalen (eds.), *Family and kinship in Europe*, London, s. 77–102.
- Pintarić Neda, 2005, *Emotivan odnos prema prostoru u kojemu živimo: jezična slika doma u hrvatskom, poljskom i ruskom jeziku*, „Rasprave instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje”, 31, s. 227–248.
- Pisarek Larysa, 1997, *Obraz domu w „Białej Gwardii” Michaiła Bułhakowa*, [w:] Grażyna Sawicka (red.), s. 409–416.
- Podracký Vladimír, 2004, *Návrat k domovu. Manifest tradicionalismu*, Olomouc.
- Popielska-Grzybowska Joanna, Jo B. Harper, 2015, *Językowo-kulturowy obraz DOMU (HOME) we współczesnym angielskim brytyjskim*, [w:] LASiS 1, DOM, s. 343–372.
- Popielska-Grzybowska Joanna, 2017, *Brytyjski HOME w świetle badań ankietowych*, [w:] NWJE 2017, s. 115–118.
- Popielska-Grzybowska Joanna, Jo B. Harper, 2018, *Linguistic-cultural image of HOME in contemporary British English*, [in this volume, pp. 117–122].
- Prokop Jan, 1992, *Dom polski*, [w:] *Dom we współczesnej Polsce*, (red.) Łukasiewicz Paweł, Siciński Andrzej, Wrocław, s. 42–53.
- Průka Miloslav, 2009, *Péče o oikos. Dům v dějinách myšlení*, Brno.
- Putnam Tim, 1993, *Household Choices: Design in Domestic Consumption*, [w:] *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change*, eds. John Bird, Barry Curtis, George Robertson, Lisa Tickner, London.
- Rembiszewska Dorota Krystyna, 2004, *Dom we frazeologii polskiej i białoruskiej*, [w:] „Polsko-białoruskie związki językowe, literackie, historyczne i kulturowe”, t. VI, Białystok, s. 167–175.
- Reinfuss Roman, 1934–35, *Budownictwo ludowe na Zachodniej Łemkowszczyźnie*, „Lud”, t. XXXIII, Lwów.

- Reis Janeiro, Carlos Alberto, 1998, *A casa e a migração das formas, o flexopragmatismo na arquitectura doméstica com expressão da raiz cultural portuguesa*, Lisboa (niepublikowana praca magisterska).
- Richterová Sylvie, 2004, *Místo domova*, Brno.
- Ristić Stana, Ivana Lazić-Konjik, 2015, *DOM w języku serbskim*, [w:] LASiS 1, DOM, s. 263–290.
- Ristić Stana, Ivana Lazić-Konjik, 2018, *DOM / KUĆA in Serbian*, [in this volume, pp. 91–105].
- Roth Margot, 1991, *Family Language: Keeping Women Close to Home*, „Women's Studies Journal”, 1, s. 1–13.
- Rullo Guiseppina, 1987, *People and Home Interiors, A Bibliography of Recent Psychological Research*, „Environment and Behaviour”, 19 (2), s. 250–259.
- Rutkovska Kristina, 2015, *Koncept DOMU (NAMAI) w języku i w kulturze litewskiej*, [w:] LASiS 1, DOM, s. 61–87.
- Rutkovska Kristina, 2017, *Litewski obraz DOMU w świetle danych ankietowych*, [w:] NWJE 2017, s. 15–23.
- Rutkovska Kristina, 2018, *NAMAS 'house' and NAMAI 'home' in the Lithuanian language and culture*, [in this volume, pp. 48–55].
- Rybczyński Witold, 2015, *Dom. Krótka historia idei*, Kraków.
- Sack Manfred, Hintze Bettina, 2005, *Die besten Einfamilienhäuser. Deutschland – Österreich – Schweiz*, München.
- Sandomirskaja Irina, 1999, *Rodina, Otečestvo, Otčizna v diskusivnyh praktikah sovremennogo russkogo jazyka. Opyt analiza kul'turnoj idiomy*, „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy języka i kultury”, 11, s. 51–68.
- Saunders Peter, 1989, *The Meaning of Home in Contemporary English Culture*, „Housing Studies”, 4 (3), s. 177–192.
- Saunders Peter, Williams Peter, 1988, *The Constitution of Home: Towards a Research Agenda*, „Housing Studies”, 3 (2), s. 81–93.
- Sawicka Grażyna (red.), 1997, *Dom w języku i kulturze*. Szczecin.
- Schittich Christian, 2000, *Im Detail: Einfamilienhäuser. Konzepte, Planung, Konstruktion*. Birkhäuser, Basel-Berlin-Boston.
- Sękowska Elżbieta, 2002, *Dom* [w serii: *Słownictwo pism Stefana Żeromskiego*, t. 3], Kraków.
- Siciński Andrzej, 1992, *O idei domu i jego roli w Polsce*, [w:] *Dom we współczesnej Polsce*, (red.) Łukasiewicz Paweł, Siciński Andrzej, Wrocław, s. 816.
- Sibley David, 1995, *Geographies of Exclusion. Spaces of Exclusion: Home, Locality, Nation*, in *Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West*, London.
- Sikora Jerzy, 1992, *Poetycki obraz domu*, „Akcent”, 50, s. 180–184.
- Skibińska Elżbieta, 2014, *Dom à la française: obraz potoczny a obraz słownikowy (rekonesans)*, [w:] WJOSS 2, Lublin, s. 29–40.



- Skibińska Elżbieta, Viviani Aline, 2015, *DOM à la française: w poszukiwaniu pojęcia bazowego*, [w:] LASiS 1, DOM, s. 373–399.
- Skibińska Elżbieta, Viviani Aline, 2018, *HOME à la française: in search of the base concept*, [in this volume, pp. 123–128].
- Sławek Tadeusz, 2011, *Gdzie? Rozważania oikologiczne*, „Anthropos?” 16–17, s. 1–21, wydanie internetowe, dostęp: 01.12.2012.
- Sławkowa Ewa, 2013, *Bieguni Olgi Tokarczuk: artystyczny obraz domu i świata*, [w:] *Tekst – akt mowy – gatunek wypowiedzi*, (red.) Urszula Sokólska, Białystok, s. 23–31.
- Somerville Peter, 1997, *The Social Construction of Home*, „Journal of Architectural and Planning Research”, 14 (3), s. 226–245.
- Stępień Maciej, 2012, *Hiszpański językowy obraz DOMU*, [w:] WJOSS 1, Lublin, s. 107–122.
- Svatoš Martin, 2004, *Kde domov barokního Čecha?*, [w:] *Kde domov můj. Varianty a parafráze*, (red.) Martin Valášek, Praha, s. 112–124.
- Tabakowska Elżbieta (red.), 2001, *Kognitywne podstawy języka i językoznawstwa*, Kraków.
- Tarkowska Joanna, 2007, *Konceptualizacja Rosji i świata w poezji Josifa Brodzkiego. Dom-miasto-ojczyzna*, Lublin.
- Telus Magdalena, 1997, *HAUS – HEIM we współczesnym języku niemieckim*, [w:] G. Sawicka (red.), s. 77–87.
- Terkenli Theano S., 1995, *Home as a Region*, „Geographical Review”, 85 (3), s. 324–334.
- Tischner Józef, 1985, *Polska jest Ojczyzną*, Paris.
- Tomas Annabel, Dittmar Helga, 1995, *The Experience of Homeless Women: An Exploration of Housing Histories and the Meaning of Home*, „Housing Studies”, 10 (4), s. 493–515.
- Trojanowska Urszula, 2008, *Archetyp domu w dwudziestowiecznej literaturze rosyjskiej*. Lidia Czukowska, Jurij Trifonow, Anatolij Pristawkin, Kraków.
- Tuan Yi-Fu, 1987, *Przestrzeń i miejsce*, Warszawa.
- Underhill James, 2011, *Creating Worldviews. Metaphor, Ideology and Language*, Edinburgh.
- Underhill James, 2014, *Tłumacząc home i homeland. Od poetyki do polityki*, „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury” 26, s. 88–105.
- Valášek Martin (red.), 2004, *Kde domov můj. Varianty a parafráze*, Praha.
- Valentine Gill, 1999, *Eating In: Home, Consumption and Identity*, „The Sociological Review”, 47 (3), s. 491–524.
- Vaňková Irena, 2008, *Mateřský jazyk jako domov řeči. K opozici vlastní – cizí v obrazu mateřského jazyka v češtině*. „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy języka i kultury”, 20, s. 107–122.
- Vaňková Irena, 2010, *ДЪМ и ДОМОВ в чешской языковой картине мира*, [w:] WJOSS 2, s. 47–68.

- Vaňková Irena, 2015, Český pojem DOMOV ve světle jazykových, empirických a textových dat, [w:] LASiS 1 DOM, s. 123–148.
- Vaňková Irena, 2018, *Czech concept DOMOV 'home' in the light of linguistic, empirical and text data*, [in this volume, pp. 65–70].
- Vaňková Irena, Huleja Jan, 2017, Domov v konceptualizaci českých vysokoškolských studentů (K empirickému výzkumu), [w:] NWJE 2017, s. 33–45.
- Vukušić Ana-Marija, 2011, *You're at home – you're not home. Migrant experience of returning „home”*. „Narodna umjetnost”, 48/1, s. 65–83.
- Wardenga Thomas, 1995, *Häuserbuch der Stadt Ratibor (18. und 19. Jahrhundert)*, Schriften der Stiftung Haus Oberschlesien, t. 12, Berlin.
- Wardhaugh Julia, 1999, *The Unaccommodated Woman: Home, Homelessness and Identity*, „The Sociological Review”, 47 (1), s. 91–109.
- Weeber Hannes, Bosch Simone, 2004, *Nachhaltig gute Wohnqualität. Beispielhafte Einfamilienhäuser in verdichteter Bebauung*, Stuttgart.
- Whorf Benjamin L., 1940/2002, *Język, myśl i rzeczywistość*, Warszawa.
- Wierzbicka Anna, 1985, *Lexicography and Conceptual Analysis*, Ann Arbor.
- Wierzbicka Anna, 1992, *Semantics, Culture and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts In Culture-Specific Configuration*, New York.
- Wierzbicka Anna, 1997, *Lexikon as a Key to History, Nation, and Society: „Homeland“ and „Fatherland“ in German, Polish, and Russian*, [w:] Anna Wierzbicka, *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words*, New York-Oxford, s. 156–197.
- Wierzbicka Anna, 1999, *Język, umysł, kultura*, wybór prac pod red. Jerzego Bartmińskiego, Warszawa.
- Wierzbicka Anna, 2006, *Semantyka. Jednostki elementarne i uniwersalne*, Lublin. [Tłum polskie książki *Semantics. Primes and universals*, Oxford 1996].
- WJOSS 1 – *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów 1*, red. Maciej Abramowicz, Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Lublin 2012, Wyd. UMCS.
- WJOSS 2 – *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów 2, Wokół europejskiej aksjofery*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Lublin 2014, Wyd. UMCS.
- WJOSS 3 – *Wartości w językowo-kulturowym obrazie świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów 3, Problemy eksplikowania i profilowania pojęć*, red. Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Joanna Szadura, Lublin 2014, Wyd. UMCS.
- Woroniecka Grażyna (red.), 2007, *Co znaczy mieszkać. Szkice antropologiczne*. Warszawa.
- Wright Gwendolyn, 1991, *Prescribing the Model Home*, „Social Research”, 58 (1), s. 213–225.

- Wyszpolska Katarzyna, 2010, *Leksem IE 'dom' w językowo-kulturowej tradycji Japonii*, „Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury” 22, Lublin, s. 173–182. [Przedruk w: LASiS 1, DOM, s. 481–490].
- Wyszpolska Katarzyna, 2018, *IE 'home/household' in the linguistic and cultural tradition of Japan*, [in this volume, p. 138].
- Zaśko-Zielińska Monika, 1997, *Dom w polszczyźnie i innych językach słowiańskich*, [w:] Grażyna Sawicka (red.), s. 43–52.
- Zborowski Juliusz, 1919, *Język „familijny*, „Język Polski”, IV, s. 54–58, 90–91.
- Żywicka Beata, 2007, *Miejsca i wartości. Zmiany w językowym obrazie przestrzeni we współczesnej polszczyźnie*, Lublin, Polihymnia.
- Алексова В., 2005, *Езикови свидетелства за значенията на дома в представите на румънския народ. 10 години специалност Балканистика*, София, Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски”, сс. 79–86.
- Алефиренко Николай Ф., 2011, *Лингвокультуральная природа ментальности. Язык. Словесность. Культура, 1*, Москва, сс. 23–43, <http://publishing-vak.ru/archive/philology-2011-1-alefirenko.htm>.
- Алфёрова Алена Г., 2008а, *Канцэпт “дом” у славянскіх парэміях*, [w:] *Фальклорная спадчына Р. Шырмы і Г. Цітовіча: вопыт збіральніцкай, навуковай і папулярызатарскай дзейнасці ў кантэксце праблем адраджэння традыцыйнай культуры вёскі: м-лы IV Міжнар. навук. канф., 29–30 лістап. 2007 г., Мінск, Мінск, , сс. 170–173.*
- Алфёрова Алена Г., 2008b, *Семантыка чырвонага кута ў фальклоры*, [w:], *Фалькларыстычныя даследаванні. Кантэкст. Тыпалогія. Сувязі: зб. арт., red. Рыма М. Кавалёва, вып. 5, Мінск, , сс. 121–126.*
- Алфёрова Алена Г., 2009, *Вобраз беларускага народнага жылля ў фальклоры: актуальнасць і перспектывы даследавання*, [w:] „Пытанні мастацтвазнаўства, этналогіі і фалькларыстыкі”, Мінск, вып. 6., сс. 281–286.
- Байбурин Альберт К., 1983, *Жилище в обрядах и представлениях восточных славян*, Ленинград, <http://www.rusarch.ru/baiburin1.htm>.
- Бандарчык Васіль К. (red.), 1973, *Беларускае народнае жыллё*, Мінск.
- Бартминьский Ежи, 2005, *Языковой образ мира: Очерки по этнолингвистике*, Москва.
- Бартминьски Јежи, 2011, *Језик - слика - свет: Етнолингвистичке студије*, Београд.
- Валеева Динара Р., 2010, *Репрезентация концепта дом в русской языковой картине мира. Автореферат на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук*, Казань.
- Валодзіна Таццяна, 2004, *Хата*, [w:] *Славянская міфалогія: энцыклапедычны слоўнік*, red. Сяргей Санько і інш., Мінск, s. 527–528.

- Витанова Марияна, 2012, *Названия за жилища в българските диалекти*, [в:] Марияна Витанова *Човек и свят. Лингвокултурологични проучвания*, София.
- Глозман Борис Г., 2010, *Лингвокультурный аспект изучения фразеологических единиц, репрезентующих концепт „дом” в русском языке. Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук*, Ижевск.
- Дубянецкі Эдуард (уклад.), 2003, *Культуралогія: Энцыклапедычны даведнік* (архетип, архетип культурны, дом), Минск.
- Еўчык Наталя В., 2010, *Матыў дома гнязда ў творчасці Міхася Стральцова*, [w:] *Мова – Літаратура – Культура: матэрыялы VI Міжнароднай навуковай канферэнцыі Мінск, 28–29 кастрычніка 2010 года*, Мінск, , сс. 122–127.
- Казакова Наталья Ю., 2013, *Общечеловеческие ценности родина/дом/семья - Heimat/Haus/Familie в языковом сознании (на материале русского и немецкого языков). Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук*, Москва.
- Казлоўская-Дода Ядвіга, 2015a, *Беларускі дом вачыма студэнцай моладзі*, [w:] *Менталітэт славян и интеграционные процессы: история, современность, перспективы. Материалы IX Международной научной конференции, 21–21 мая 2015 года*, ред. Виктор В. Кириенко, Гомель, сс. 162–168.
- Казлоўская-Дода Ядвіга, 2015b, *ДОМ у беларускай мове*. Lublin, Wyd. UMCS.
- Калеснікава Алена А., 2011, *Ключавыя сацыяльныя паняцці “дом”, “сям’я”, “радзіма” ў канцэптасферы носбітаў беларускай мовы (на матэрыяле парэміялагічных адзінак)*, „Ученые записки УО “ВГУ им. П. М. Машерова”: сборник научных трудов”, ред. А. П. Солодков, t. 12, , сс. 18–188.
- Китанова Мария, 2014, *Представата за дома в българската езикова картина на света*, [в:] *Известия на института за български език*, ред. Максим Стаменов, София, , сс. 54–76.
- Китанова Мария, 2015, *ДОМ в българската езикова картина на света*, [в:] *LASiS 1, DOM*, сс. 237–261.
- Китанова Мария, 2017, *Koncept DOM szwoc’ przmi anketnych danych*, [w:] *NWJE 2017*, s. 81–91.
- Климова С. В., *Дом и мир: проблема приватного и публичного*, <http://anthropology.ru/re/texts/klimova/public.html>.
- Козырева Ольга А., 2003, *Когнитивные аспекты исследования лингвокультурологического поля (на материале поля „дом/жилье”). Автореферат на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук*, Москва.
- Крук Янка, 2000, *Сімваліка беларускага жытла*, [w:] Янка Крук, *Сімваліка беларускай народнай культуры*, Мінск, , сс. 296–309.
- Ланская Ольга В., 2005, *Концепт „дом” в языковой картине мира (на материале повести Л.Н. Толстого „Детство” и „Утро помещика”). Автореферат на*

- соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук, Калининград, <http://cheloveknauka.com/kontsept-dom-v-yazykovoy-kartine-mira>.
- Лассан Элеонора, *О связях между концептами в рамках концептосферы (от дома к судьбе и далее)*, <http://ling.x-artstudio.de/st16.html>.
- Ленсу Якаў Ю., 1995, *Хата – мой сусвет*, „Мастацтва”, № 4, сс. 14–15.
- Ленсу Якаў Ю., 2007, *Таямніцы беларускай хаты*, Мінск.
- Ленсу Яков Ю., 2009, *Дом во времени и пространстве*, Минск.
- Мамедгасанова Арзу А., *Дом, семья, очаг в языковой картине мира разных народов, соотношение концептов*, [www.tverlingua.by.ru/archive/007/section\\_2\\_7/5.2\\_7.htm](http://www.tverlingua.by.ru/archive/007/section_2_7/5.2_7.htm)
- Мамедгасанова Арзу А., 2005, *Концепты „дом”, „семья”, „очаг” как особенности национальной ментальности*, [w:] *Языковая личность в дискурсе: Полифония структур и культур. Материалы международной научно-практической конференции*, ред. А. А. Романов, Москва-Тверь.
- Маслова Валентина А., 2001, *Лингвокультурология*, Москва.
- Маслова Валентина А., 2004, *Когнитивная лингвистика*, Минск.
- Медведева А. В., 2001, *Концепт дом в русской и английской концептосферах*, [w:] *Методологические проблемы когнитивной лингвистики*, ред. Иосиф А. Стернин, Воронеж.
- Мороз Андрей, 2013, *Красный угол без иконы*, [w:] *Мифологические модели и ритуальное поведение в советском и постсоветском пространстве. Сборник статей*, зebrała Александра Архипова, Москва, сс. 117–125.
- Мятліцкая Ганна М., 2012, *Прасторавыя архетыпы як кампаненты мастацкай мадэлі свету (на матэрыяле нашаніўскай пазіі Янкі Купалы)*, „Польмя”, № 6, сс. 140–155.
- Невская Лидия Г., 1982, *Семантика дома и смежных представлений в погребальном фольклоре*, [в:] *Балто-славянские исследования 1981*, Москва.
- Никитина Серафима Е., Кукушкина Елена Ю., 2000, *Дом в свадебных причитаниях и духовных стихах (опыт тезаурусного описания)*, Москва.
- Пеньковский Александр Б., 2007, *О развитии скрытых семантических категорий русского языка (от Пушкина до наших дней): Категория масштаба „в четырех стенах”: Дом человека как малый локус*, [w:] *Язык как материя смысла. Сборник статей к 90-летию акад. Н.Ю. Шведовой*, ред. Майя В. Ляпон, Москва, сс. 285–304.
- Петрова Мария, 1999, *Образ дома в фольклоре и мифе*, [w:] *Эстетика сегодня: состояние, перспективы. Материалы научной конференции. 20–21 октября 1999 г. Тезисы докладов и выступлений*, Санкт-Петербург, сс. 59–61, [http://anthropology.ru/ru/texts/petrova\\_m/aestt\\_23.html](http://anthropology.ru/ru/texts/petrova_m/aestt_23.html).
- Плотникова Анна А., Усачева В. В., 1999, *Дом* [hasło w:] *Славянские древности. Этнолингвистический словарь*, ред. Никита И. Толстой, Москва, t. 2, сс. 116–120.

- Пономарева Татьяна А., *Особенности реализации концепта „Дом” в современной русской поэзии*, <http://www.rusnauka.com/6.NITSB.2010/Philologia/59517.doc.htm>.
- Потураева Евгения А., 2010, *Метафорические обозначения концепта „дом” в русской языковой картине мира*, „Язык и культура”, 1 (9), сс. 58–73.
- Прохарава Святлана М., 1993, *Мой родны кут, як ты мне мілы... (‘радзіма’ ў беларускай мове)*, [w:] *Pojęcie ojczyzny we współczesnych językach europejskich*, red. Jerzy Bartmiński, Lublin, s. 14–156.
- Разова Елена Л., *В поисках дома*, <http://anthropology.ru/ru/texts/razova/home.html>.
- Разова Елена Л., *Дом. Экзистенциальное пространство человека*, <http://anthropology.ru/ru/texts/razova/exist.html>.
- Рещикова Ирина П., *Концепт дом в теории и практике строительства коммунизма*, [http://fst.my1.ru/load/kocept\\_dom\\_v\\_teorii\\_i\\_praktike\\_stroitelstva\\_Kommunizma/1-1-0-26](http://fst.my1.ru/load/kocept_dom_v_teorii_i_praktike_stroitelstva_Kommunizma/1-1-0-26).
- Ристић Стана, 2013, *Стилски аспекти концептуализације појма ДОМ у књижевном дискурсу*, „Научни састанак слависта у Вукове дане”, 42/1, Београд, сс. 381–394.
- Ристић Стана, 2013а, *Концепт дома у религијском дискурсу*, [w:] *Теолингвистичка истраживања српског и других словенских језика*, Београд, сс. 293–313.
- Ристић Стана, 2013b, *Стереотип ДОМОВИНЕ у заједничкој концептосфери појмова ДОМА и МАЈКЕ (елементи језичке слике света у тезаурусном речнику савременог српског језика)*, „Зборник Матице српске за славистику”, св. 83: реферати учесника XV међународног славистичког конгреса у Минску 2013, Нови Сад, сс. 181–198.
- Ристић Стана, Слијепчевић Светлана, 2013, *Етнолингвистичке информације у дескриптивном речнику (на примерима лексема дом, домовина / отаџбина, и мајка*, [w:] *70 години Българска академична лексикографија*, ред. Лилия Крумова-Цветкова, Диана Благоева, София, , сс. 231–237.
- Садоўская Анжэліка Л., 2009, *Паняцце канатацыі ў сучаснай лінгвістыцы і яго роля ў плане вывучэння культурна-нацыянальнай спецыфікі фразеалагізмаў*, „Роднае слова”, № 1, сс. 45–49.
- Самахвал Сяргей, 2008, *Да пытання аб нацыянальна-культурных канатацых лексем ДОМ, ХАТА ў моўнай карціне свету беларусаў*, „Працы кафедры сучаснай беларускай мовы”, вып. 7, Мінск, сс. 97–101.
- Селезнева Елена, 2005, *„Дом” как выражение индивидуальности в постсоветской России*, [w:] *Русистика и современность*: в т. 1, Санкт-Петербург.
- Слепцова Екатерина В., 2009, *Концепт ДОМ в русской языковой картине мира и в тетралогии „Братья и сестры” Ф.А. Абрамова. Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук*, Владивосток.

- Стоянова Е., 2012, *Дом в русской лингвокультуре*, „Епископ-Константинови четения”, т. 18, Календар и време, Шумен, Университетско издателство „Епископ Константин Преславски”, сс. 201–209.
- Сысоў Уладзімір М., 1997, *Свая хатка, як родная матка*, [w:] Сысоў У., *З крыніц спрадвечных*, Мінск: Вышэйшая школа, сс. 350–355.
- Толстой Никита И. (red.), 1995–2012, *Славянские древности. Этнолингвистический словарь*, т. 1–5, Москва.
- Toporkov Andrej, 1995, *Dom*, [w:] *Slavjanskaja mifologija*, Moskwa, с. 168.
- Vinogradova Ljudmila, Levkievskaja Elena, *Duhi domašnie*, [w:] *Slavjanskije drevnosti. Ėtnolingvističeskij slovar’* pod obščej red. N. I. Tolstogo, t. 2, Moskva 1999, сс. 153–155.
- Трубачев Олег Николаевич, 2006, *История славянских терминов родства и некоторых древнейших терминов общественного строя*, Москва.
- Уфимцева Наталья В., 2001, *Сопоставительное исследование языкового сознания славян*, [w:] *Методологические проблемы когнитивной лингвистики*, red. Иосиф А. Стернин, Воронеж, сс. 65–71.
- Фещенко Ольга А., 2005, *Концепт ДОМ в художественной картине мира М.И. Цветаевой (на материале прозаических текстов). Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук*, Новосибирск.
- Фокина Юлия М., *Особенности репрезентации художественного концепта „дом” в концептосферах А.П. Чехова и Джеймса Джойса (на материале малой прозы)*, [www.sgu.ru/files/nodes/50327/013.pdf](http://www.sgu.ru/files/nodes/50327/013.pdf)
- Цивьян Татьяна В., 2006, *Дачи и дачники в русском представлении*, referat prezentowany na spotkaniu *Русские глазами русских – Круглый стол Института русской культуры Московского государственного университета им. М. В. Ломоносова* 07.12.2006; <http://www.imk.msu.ru/Events/roundtables.html#rt06russ>.
- Цивьян Татьяна В., 2006b, *Стереотип дома в свадебном словаре северного Прикамья (по материалам этнолингвистического словаря)*, [w:] *Словесные формулы славянского мира. Метатеория и эмпирия*, Москва, сс. 26–35.
- Цивьян Татьяна В., 2007, *Еще о семиотике дома в свадебном обряде (по материалам этнолингвистического словаря северного Прикамья)*, [w:] *АБ 60. Сборник честь А. К. Байбурина*, Санкт-Петербург, сс. 52–60.
- Цивьян Татьяна В., 1978, *Дом в фольклорной модели мира (на материале балканских загадок)*. „Труды по знаковым системам”, Тарту.
- Шамякіна Таццяна, 2000, *Міфалагема ДОМА ў славянскай культуры*, [w:] Таццяна Шамякіна, *Міфалогія Беларусі. Нарысы*, Мінск: Мастацкая літаратура (Аўтарскі курс лекцый *Славянская міфалогія*, электронная версія, Мінск 2007).

- 
- Šljakov Aleksej, 2014, *Narrativ doma v prostranstve kul'tury osedlosti i nomadnosti*, „Vestnik Kemerovskogo gosudarstvennogo univeristeta” nr 2 (58), t. 2, ss. 219–223.
- Шмелев Алексей, Зализняк Анна, Левонтина Ирина, 2002, *Широка страна моя родная*, „Отечественные записки”, 6, <http://www.strana-oz.ru/2002/6/shiroka-strana-moya-rodnaia>
- Щукин Василий, 2000, *Культурный концепт „ДОМ” в польском и русском языковом сознании*, [w:] *Polacy w oczach Rosjan – Rosjanie w oczach Polaków. Zbiór studiów*, red. Roman Bobryk, Jerzy Faryno, Warszawa, s. 15–27.



## Authors

Prof. dr hab. Bartmiński Jerzy, Instytut Slawistyki Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Warszawie / Instytut Filologii Polskiej Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej w Lublinie; e-mail: jerzy.bartminski@poczta.umcs.lublin.pl

Dr Iwona Bielińska-Gardziel, Instytut Slawistyki Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Warszawie; e-mail: iwbg@wp.pl

Dr Zuzanna Bułat Silva, Instytut Filologii Romańskiej Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego; e-mail: zuzuzannasa.bulat@gmail.com

Dr hab. Ludmiła Fiodorowa, Moskovskij Gumanitarnyj Universitet; e-mail: lfvoux@yandex.ru

Dr Monika Grzeszczak, Instytut Filologii Germańskiej Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego Jana Pawła II; e-mail: monika.grzeszczak@op.pl

Dr Jo B. Harper, sociologist, Polskie Radio, Biuro Tłumaczeń „The Varsovian”; e-mail: joharper5@gmail.com

Dr Marta Jackowska-Uwadizu, Katedra Języków i Kultur Afryki, Uniwersytet Warszawski; e-mail: relleri@wp.pl

Prof. dr hab. Amir Kapetanović, Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics, Zagreb, Croatia; e-mail: akapetan@ihj.hr

Prof. Marija Kitanova, Институтът за български език, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia; e-mail: miyak@abv.bg

Dr hab. Jadwiga Kozłowska-Doda, Instytut Filologii Słowiańskiej Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej w Lublinie; e-mail: j.doda@wp.pl

Dr hab. Iwona Kraska-Szlenk, Katedra Języków i Kultur Afryki, Uniwersytet Warszawski; e-mail: i.kraska@uw.edu.pl

Dr Ivana Lazić-Konjik, Instytut Języka Serbskiego SANU, Belgrad; e-mail: ivana.konjik@gmail.com

Prof. dr Christina Markou, Democritus University of Thrace, Komotini, Greece; e-mail: cmarkou@bscc.duth.gr

Dr Małgorzata Misiak, Instytut Filologii Polskiej Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego; e-mail: malgorzatomisiak@yahoo.fr

Prof. dr hab. Nina Pawlak, Katedra Języków i Kultur Afryki, Uniwersytet Warszawski; e-mail: n.pawlak@uw.edu.pl

Dr Dorota Pazio-Wlazłowska, Instytut Sławistyki Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Warszawie; e-mail d.pazio@ispan.waw.pl

Dr Joanna Popielska-Grzybowska, Instytut Antropologii i Archeologii Akademii Humanistycznej w Puławach; e-mail: joannapopielska@hotmail.com

Prof. dr hab. Stana Ristić, Instytut Języka Serbskiego SANU, Belgrad; e-mail: stana.ristoc@isj.sanu.ac.rs

Doc. dr Kristina Rutkovska, Katedra Polonistyki Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego, Litwa; e-mail: kristina.rutkovska@gmail.com

Prof. dr hab. Elżbieta Skibińska, Instytut Filologii Romańskiej Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego; e-mail: skibin@uni.wroc.pl

Doc. PhDr Irena Vaňková, Ústav českého jazyka a teorie komunikace, Filozofická Fakulta Univerzita Karlova, Praha; e-mail: irena.vankova@ff.cuni.cz

Dr Aline Viviani, Instytut Filologii Romańskiej Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego; e-mail: alineviviani@googlegmail.com

Dr Katarzyna Wyszpolska, Wydział Orientalistyczny Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego; e-mail: wyszpolska\_katarzyna@yahoo.co.jp

Dr Beata Żywicka, Instytut Humanistyczny Wyższej Szkoły Wschodnioeuropejskiej w Przemyślu; e-mail: beata.zywicka@o2.pl

