50th Anniversaries

In 2005, it has been 50 years already from the day when the first volume of „Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej” [“Studies in the Polish and Slavic Philology”] was published.

The initial idea was to set up and publish a journal presenting works and achievements in this discipline, and that it should be a yearly publication. From the start, and for many subsequent years the Journal was issued in that very form and with such contents, and the publishing was under the patronage of the Komitet Słowianoznawstwa Polskiej Akademii Nauk [Slavic Studies Committee of the Polish Academy of Sciences] (after 1990 the publication was transferred to the Institute of Slavic Studies). At present its publication is more or less regular, and it definitely is more regular than it used to be in various periods: sometimes breaks of a year or two occurred, but then in another year two or three overdue volumes might have been published. Despite all obstacles, continuity was maintained and the character of the publication was consistent throughout the entire half of century – altogether 40 volumes were published in that time.

There is a whole list of eminent personalities who directed and presided over the Journal and the editors of the Studies in the Polish and Slavic Philology’ publication [SPSP]: among them were: Władysław Kuraszkiewicz, Tadeusz Lehr-Spławiński, Zdzisław Stieber, Witold Taszycki, Antonina Obrebska-Jabłońska and Karol Dejna. Gradually, younger generations of editors were incorporated to participate in the work and supplement the composition of the Editing Committee; they were often involved as the Secretaries to the Editing Committee, and some of those scholars were later promoted to the position of the Editor-in-Chief. (Please note that at the end of this volume there is the list of individuals that worked in SPSP’s editing committees).

Those scholars who initially set up SPSP intended to set up the Journal as a medium for publication of linguistic works chiefly for those scholars in the Polish and Slavic philology who were somehow involved and associated, albeit informally, with the Polish Academy of Sciences. Those other scholars in the discipline, who were involved in the organizations of the Polish universities, could publish their works in their respective university periodicals and scholarly and scientific journals that had been in the operation before SPSP emerged.
The first issued volumes of SPSP presented papers originating predominantly from Kraków, Poznań and Warsaw, and that was in a tight correlation with the inspiring activities of the Editors-in-Chief-of-the-time who were in close contact, and were bound to, those very scholarly centres. But shortly, the group of co-operating authors begun to grow in numbers, and involved also scholars from other scholarly centres – from Poland and from numerous foreign scholarly institutions.

Reviewing of all the forty volumes published so far suggests that the papers were submitted by authors from a variety of scholarly circles and institutions from a number of Polish cities: Białystok, Bielsko-Biała, Bydgoszcz, Częstochowa, Gdańsk, Gliwice, Katowice, Kielce, Kraków, Lublin, Łódź, Olsztyn, Opole, Poznań, Słupsk, Sosnowiec, Szczecin, Toruń, Warszawa, Wrocław. Statistics show the numbers of articles and papers published in classification by city of author’s origin; that classification clearly favours Warsaw (120) and Kraków (85), farther behind are Poznań (28), Lublin (15), Toruń (10), Gdańsk (8) and Łódź (8).

The group of authors who are permanently associated with the journal is composed, which seems only natural, of scholars working with the Slavic Institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences PAN as well as of a number of scholars closely associated with that Institute. Here is the list of names of nineteen scholars who, during the last half century, published at least ten of their works in SFPS: Mieczysław Basaj (most papers together with J. Siatkowski), Wiesław Boryś, Wanda Budziszewska, Irena Dulewiczowa, Kazimierz Feleszko, Iryda Grek-Pabisowa, Zbigniew Greń, Kwiryna Handke, Elżbieta Kędelska, Małgorzata Korytkowska, Violetta Koseska, Jadwiga Majowa, Leszek Moszyński, Hanna Popowska-Taborska, Ewa Rzetelska-Feleszko, Irena Sawicka, Janusz Siatkowski, Zdzisław Stieber, Zuzanna Topolińska, Jadwiga Zieniukowa. Further to those listed above, there are many other authors who published their works in this journal (please see below: “Contents of Vols I–XL…”).

In turn, the foreign authors publishing their papers in our SFPS were the scholars from the Slavic centres mainly in Europe and other continents, like the centres in Arlington, Belgrade, Berlin, Bochum, Bonn, Bratislava, Brno, Budapest, Budziszyn, București, Cambridge, Chicago, Dzierżinsk, Frankfurt am Main, Hamburg, Homel, Jerusalem, Kiev, Kioto, Köln, Leningrad (today: St. Petersburg), Leipzig, London, Lublana, Lviv, Minsk, Moscow, Münster, New Haven, Nottingham, New York, Novi Sad, Oxford, Olomouc, Ostrava, Paris, Prague, Salzburg, Sarajevo, Skopje, Sofia, Tartu, Týnovo, Uzhhorod, Wien, Zadar, Zagreb, Zitomir (Żytomierz).
In all the fifty years’ long history of “The Studies in the Polish and Slavic Philology”, authors from many a foreign countries were permanently present. Further, it is worth noting that there were two periods of more intensive inflow of their works to be published in the Journal: the first in the early period of the Journal’s existence, and the second in the last decade, after 1990.

The first peak of supplying the papers can be predominantly attributed to the persons and personalities of the scholars who at that time managed and edited the Journal, and who belonged to the generation that had rebuilt the Polish humanities and sciences after the Second World War. In the quest to fulfil their noble tasks, those scholars were supported by their contemporaries and peers – scientists and scholars from other countries. Published in 1965, the fifth volume of SFPS is demonstrative in the point, where texts of almost all world eminent Slavists of the older and middle generations living at that time were printed. The list of those authors included Jaromil Bělíč (Prague), Samuil Bersztejn (Moscow), Hans Holm Bielfeldt (Berlin), Dalibor Brozović (Zadar), Ion Constantin Chițimia (Bucurest), Jiří Damborský, Éti- enne Decaux (Paris), Ernst Eichler (Leipzig), Joseph Hamm (Wien), Fried- helm Hinze (Berlin), Olexa Horbatsch (Frankfurt am Main), Milka Ivić (Novi Sad), Pavle Ivić (Novi Sad), Roman Jakobson (Cambridge), Péter Király (Bu- dapest), Rudolf Kolarič (Novi Sad), Miroslav Komárek (Olomouc), František Kopečný (Brno), Iwan Lekow (Sofia), Tine Logar (Lublana), Vaclav Machek (Brno), Frido Michałk (Bautzen), Kiril Mirczew (Sofia), Eugen Pauliny (Bratislava), Milivoj Pavlović (Novi Sad), Heinz Šewc-Schuster (Leipzig), George Y. Shevelov (New York), Josef Skulina (Brno), Ján Stanislav (Bratislava), Edward Stankiewicz (Chicago), Stojko Stojkow (Sofia), Jozef Štolc (Brno).

That very volume included also a number of texts written by eminent and recognized Polish scholars of the older and middle generations: Tadeusz Brajerski, Karol Dejna, Witold Doroszewski, Hubert Górnowicz, Leon Kacz- marek, Maria Karpluk, Władysław Kuraszkiewicz, Jerzy Kuryłowicz, Tadeusz Lehr-Spławiński, Leszek Moszyński, Antonina Obrębska-Jabłońska, Leszek Ossowski, Stanisław Rospond, Mikołaj Rudnicki, Halina Safarewicz, Jan Safarewicz, Franciszek Sławski, Paweł Smoczyński, Witold Taszycki, Halina Turska, Stanisław Urbańczyk, Alfred Zaręba and their disciples: Andrzej Bogusławski, Bogusław Kreja, Kazimierz Polański, Hanna Popowska-Taborska, Janusz Siatkowski, Mieczysław Szymczak and Zuzanna Topolińska.

Thus the Fifth Volume of “The Studies in the Polish and Slavic Philology” was a kind of a Jubilee book on the 35th anniversary of Zdzisław Stieber’s scholarly work and so the volume included such texts like a paper by
Karol Dejna entitled “On 35th anniversary of scholarly work of Professor Zdzisław Stieber, PhD” and “The Bibliography of Zdzisław Stieber’s scholarly work – years 1929–1963”, written by Krystyna Kallas.

In the entire history of the “Studies in the Polish and Slavic Philology” Mr. Zdzisław Stieber was the longest serving Editor-in-Chief (1967–1980). Thus the 20th volume of the Journal (issued in 1981) was devoted to the 50th anniversary of his scholarly work. Exactly like it was the case previously, numerous foreign Slavists sent in the prolific harvests of their papers: Ján Doruľa (Bratislava), Ernst Eichler (Lepizig), Blaže Koneski (Skopie), Stojka Maksimovska (Skopie), Yves Millet (Paris), Alexander M. Schenker (New Haven), George Y. Shevelov (New York), Gerald Stone (Oxford), Svetlana M. Tolstaja (Moskwa), Emil Vrabie (Bucurest), Dragomir Vukičić (Sarajevo), Arkadz’ Žuraǔski (Minsk). The Professor’s disciples and co-workers rushed in with supplies of their works, too.

The second peak of the papers’ supply from the foreign authors has been observed after 1990. Those authors were predominantly a new generation of Slavists from a variety of countries. At present, their contacts with SPSP base on much more than exclusively – as it was the case in the past – personal contacts with eminent personalities of writers and editors-in-chief of the Journal. Recognizing that Slavic journal and its location has become such an important Slavistic centre in Europe has become a major attractant for authors.

From the very start of its existence, “The Studies in the Polish and Slavic Philology” has been a journal open to all authors of the Polish and Slavic linguistic papers provided only that the submitted papers represented high scholarly level and were skilfully and clearly produced by its authors. There were never barriers set to any authors due to their age, for long years the good rule of accepting papers from young scholars recommended by their scholar guides was strictly observed.

The SPSP’s openness was further enhanced by the fact that neither subjects nor topics of the forthcoming or planned volumes were imperatively defined. There were always two major sections included in the journal: one was „Studies in the Polish Philology” and the other one was „Studies in Slavic Philology”. Note worthily, both sections had broadest possible frames of scholarly scope to the extent even that all theoretical and methodological approaches adopted by the respective authors were fitting and acceptable. Further, for long, the Editing Committee has continued including other sections in the Journal: “The Reviews”, and “Remembered” (Obituaries of late scholars), to mention just two. Further, as and when needed, consecutive volumes may include other albeit short lived, ad hoc sections
created, for example: “Arguments” “Discussions” and, recently, “The National Minorities”, “The Language and the Nation” or “Varia”.

Thus the review of what the volumes of the Journal contain is also, to a degree, a presentation of modification and development of the linguistics in the world, and in Poland, in the second half of the 20th century and at the beginning of the 21st century. While in the first volumes the historical – linguistic, dialectological and comparative subjects prevailed, those were soon considerably broadened by publication of works on specific Slavonic languages, first mainly Czech, Macedonian and Bulgarian, but later also other, mainly South- and Eastern-Slavonic languages, For long, the structuralist approach dominated. But with the progress of time, first occasionally only, papers inspired by other new theories, like the transformation-generative grammar, were produced, and promptly published. During the last two or three decades of 20th century, the papers published in the Journal represent a very broad and variegated spectrum of theoretical and methodological approaches including the cognitivism. What is characteristic for the recent years is the sociologically conditioned thinking and a variety of interdisciplinary approaches to subjects.

From its origins, the Journal of SPSP has been closely bound to a number of posts of the Polish Academy of Science, mostly with those involved in Slavic linguistic studies which then, in turn, prolifically contributed to creation of the Slavic Institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences in its present form.

In 2004 the Slavic Studies celebrated their 50th anniversary of existence in the Polish Academy of Sciences. That was a good reason for the Slavic Institute to issue – albeit in small number of copies – a special volume under the title of “50 years of Slavic studies in the Polish Academy of Sciences (1954–2004). A Jubilee Volume of the Slavic Institute of PAN”.

The 50-years-long co-existence of the SPSP and the Slavic Studies of PAN, represented by the Institute of Slavica Studiem, fully justified the publication of a special, fortieth volume of SPSP which, apart from the usual sections, opens at its front part with reprints of articles from the Jubilee Volume (those which discuss the Slavic subjects in a broader manner and not only the linguistic issues of that scholarly discipline) as well as the texts of speeches given at the conference that was organized to accompany celebrations; those texts, together with further reprint of a greater part of Joanna Rapacka’s work, constitute a separate part of that volume: it can be called: ”The state and perspectives of Slavic Scholarly discipline”.
New Research Perspectives in Palaeoslavic Studies

(Summary)

In the introduction the author limits the scope of the concept of Palaeoslavic studies to the analysis of Old Church Slavonic texts of the period of Cyril and Methodius. He includes in this, however, early medieval descriptions of such texts. Other very early Slavonic texts do not belong in Palaeoslavic studies, such as Old Czech texts that are contemporary with the descriptions of texts from the period of Cyril and Methodius. The pace of development in Palaeoslavic studies is connected, as its history indicates, with successive discoveries of manuscripts and their printing. A major discovery, which opened up new scholarly perspectives, was the discovery in Sinai in 1975 of many Old Slavonic texts, written in classic glagolics, including the closing section of the Sinai Psalter containing hitherto unknown canticles from the Old Testament, large extracts from Euchologium Siniaticum, and a missal. The author gives several concrete examples illustrating this. The second important factor is the publication in the last few years of critical editions of many of the oldest descriptions of texts that were written in the period of Cyril and Methodius.
A Concept of the Linguistic Image of the World in the Programme of Slavistic Comparative Studies

(Summary)

The author presents a programme of comparative research adopting the concept of linguistic image of the world, which has become popular in recent years, in particular among the linguists in Poland and in Russia. The author discusses three ways of solving the key issue conditioning effectiveness of such research being the tertium comparationis (TC): starting from the name (then the words are combined with their meanings, for example the word dunaj in the Slavonic languages), starting from an object (a thing – then the question refers to the ways of naming, for instance the names of a rainbow in various languages represent the varying conceptualizations) and starting from the notions connecting names and objects (for instance the notions of ‘the homeland’, ‘state’, ‘fate/plight’, ‘citizen’ etc. in various languages). It is possible to assume TC as the starting point for particular notions (“concepts”) when comparisons within certain cultural circles are made. For example, for the Mediterranean (European) circle, when compared are concepts like the Latin-originating ‘patria’, ‘civitas’, ‘fortuna’, and Greek ‘polites’. For the contrastive research involving languages which are not similar and typologically distant from one another, it seems that adopting the semantic metalanguage is the most appropriate – and a good example has been worked out in this by Anna Wierzbicka. At the higher level of comparisons, above lexical level, comparative analyses of entire lexical-semantic fields are possible (like colours, genders of speech, feelings and emotions and so on). Further, it is possible to confront the superior semiotic oppositions of the type masculine/feminine, ‘ours’/alien etc.

The author proposes to start comparative research first the etnonyms – and more precisely: national autostereotypes and heterostereotypes – as well as the language pictures of the time, place, values and means of expression (speech genders). The author provides a list of a number of names of values (freedom and tolerance, independence and separatism, globalism and regionalism, patriotism and nationalism etc.) that he considers worthy being researched upon in the first place due to the fact that those create real barriers in the cross-cultural communication.
Do ‘Slavic Literary Studies’ exist?

(Summary)

The author presents changes that the Slavic literary studies went through after the collapse of the Communist block. She makes the point that together with the fall of the myth of Slavonic unity that was imposed on the scholarly circles by the Communist ideology within the framework of the Socialist community of states and nations, and in view of the Slavistic literary studies’ progressing marginalization, a question emerges whether there is still any sense in further continuing with that scholarly discipline and if so, is there need to redefine its goals and aims. One of the solutions voiced in the article is to merge that scholarly discipline of the Slavonic literary studies into the domain of socio-cultural studies where mere literature ceases to be the aim of the research. Although the risk is real that such practice may lead to drop in level of the emerging works and dilettantism of the cultural studies by the literature experts, it nevertheless returns the correct size to the texts that when confronted with results of the research and studies in the international scale represent low to mediocre level of artistic achievement. On the other hand, their value lies in the fact that they document the consciousness of the societies in which they were produced.
Literature as Metalanguage of Culture

(Summary)

In this study, in the way consciously disputatious, a relation between Slavic linguistics and Slavic history of literature is presented. It indicates the contemporary crisis of the research within the field of the history of literature as well which arises from an epistemological state created by postmodernism. The article aims at defending a traditional position of the Slavic history of literature which is increasingly replaced by unprecisely defined “neo-slavistics”. This tendency evokes ceratin threats. All of them are related both with a possibility of loss of the essence of the research and the return to the “noble-minded dilettantism” which was typical, according to the author, for the initial period of the Slavic history (theory) of literature.

The alternative proposal frames “literature as metalanguage of culture” within the Slavic-oriented research. It, however, means the need for the acceptance of the new anthropological strategy of reading literary texts. This perspective creates a new reality in which the texts are seen not only as elements of culture within aesthetic terms but in the first place as records of the “state of consciousness”. It opens new perspectives both within research and teaching methods.
Regional culture studies of the Southern Slavic areas

(Summary)

This work focuses on a very contemporary need of regional studies of the Southern Slavic countries. It provides two definitions of this region: a macroregion consisting of several national cultures, as well as separate regions representing a part of a broader nation with a very specific culture. Entire Yugoslavia, before and after the war, until its dissolution in the 1990's fits perfectly into the first definition of a macroregion with a status of the country. Second meaning, that of a cultural region as a part of a nation or country, matches the multicultural character of the entire Southern Slavic territory.

The political principle of the ideals of brotherhood and unity, which was the basis of Tito's Yugoslavia, has made it possible to partially recreate regional territorial separation. In this country, there was a structure of republics and autonomical circuits which was based on either nationalities or ethnicity of their citizens. Therefore, Macedonia and Montenegro were essentially the nationality based republics, while Bosnia-Hercegovina, Kosovo and Vojvodina represent the multiethnical and multicultural republics.

Being an objective researcher allows to look at the regions of the Southern Slavic territories without limitations of the ideals of the national integration. These are invaluable resources for slavists both from the historic and more recent perspectives as these two aspects cannot be considered separately.

Regional, multicultural, interdisciplinary research has multiple aspects to it. It can be conducted individually or in groups depending on the area of specialization of the researchers to ensure that their findings complement each other. Necessary basis is created by the studies of the history of the creation of separate regions, their languages as a medium of documentation of the changes in the perception of the world by the people. Civilizational achievements are also crucial to study as well as the development of texts, ethnic culture – both material and spiritual, such as common beliefs, customs, oral literature, art, economy and sociology.

Recent cultural situation in Bosnia, Dalmatia and Montenegro has been used as an example of the researched regions being either multicultural themselves or representing a part of national territories.
On need to study social and political functions of language – as exemplified by and in the Slavonic countries

The article presents examples of conflicts that emerged in the Slavic linguistics which, similarly to the lexical disputes within the Slavonic world emerge from profound ideological and religious differences and are further incended by their authors’ varying perception of tradition – another words are based on the socio-political differences, and are then transplanted into the world of science (viz. discussions on the language differentiation between the Kaszub and the Silesian ethnic groups, the language and linguistic conflicts in the domain of functioning of the Serbo-Croatian language, fierce disputes between the Bulgarians and Macedonians, Czechs and Slovaks, problems with defining stratification of factions of the contemporary Slovenian language or with the status of the Ukrainian and Belarus languages). In order to succeed with the objective record of the phenomena of the type, the author proposes to include the elements of culture, politology, history and sociology into the linguistic analyses. However, at the same time the author warns that as the problems to be analysed are often of very complex nature, a scholar not equipped with his or her profound linguist knowledge will inevitably fail to succeed in the study, similarly as the socio-linguistic methodology used by the scholars to date also fails to suffice for the purpose. Thus the author refers to the definition of the philology as it was presented by Jan Baudouin de Courtenay who considered it to be an inter-disciplinary science whose purpose was the deep, profound and complex study of other cultures, societies and humans through texts and the language of a particular group.
The classifications and descriptions of speech sounds given by Antoni Malecki in his *Larger Grammar of Polish Language* (Summary)

The subject of this article is Antoni Malecki’s conception of description of some vocalic and consonantal questions given in his *Larger Grammar of Polish Language* (Lvov 1863). The definitions, repartitions and descriptions of vowels’ and consonants’ articulation are analyzed, as well as the relation between a phone and a letter. The vowels’ twofold forms are also described in this study. It has been ascertained that the classifications and descriptions given in the grammar are highly incorrect. Malecki’s statements often aren’t precise and explicit and all his remarks prove the grammarian’s irresolution. It seems that he oscillates between the contemporary and historical point of view – the conscious of the various origin of particular sounds has left its impress on the way of description. The bases of classification, as in the others Polish grammars of the 19th century, aren’t homogeneous – Malecki assumed three criteria: genetic, sound and articulatory, however he often uses them inconsistently that led to their mixing. Also the descriptions of vowels’ twofold forms may make serious reservations. Still it has to be remarked that Malecki hasn’t made the same mistakes as the grammarians before him and for example he distinguishes a phone and its graphic sign. However he understands the term *letter* differently than we do it today – he defines digraphs as the letters too, which proves that for Malecki this term is rather similar to nowadays’ *phonogram*. Nevertheless it should be remarked that in the examined grammar the vowels and consonants were defined correctly and above all in a quite modern way, for the role of speech organs in making sounds was also considered.
The Warsaw Dictionary (Słownik warszawski): 
The Concept – Implementation – Perception

(Summary)


The Concept of the Dictionary which was worked out by Jan Karłowicz has not been basically amended. From the very outset, the Dictionary was being prepared a handy, concise dictionary which is being proved by a number of comments made by its editors and reviewers. Therefore Przyczynki do projektu wielkiego słownika polskiego (Contributions to the concept of the Great Dictionary of the Polish Language) by J. Karłowicz are therefore not the introduction or the preparation to the Warsaw Dictionary (Słownik warszawski), but are a proposal of a separate work and another publication.

Implementation of the plans has been conditioned by changes to the personnel in the Editors’ Group. In particular, the role that W. Niedźwiedzki played in the group escapes unequivocal evaluation. Comments made by that Editor suggest that he planned to enlarge the contents of this Dictionary and intended to implement at least some of the proposals included in the reviews (for instance to provide information on the source of a quote cited in the Dictionary). The final form of the Dictionary places it between the great academic dictionary and the dictionary devised for practical use.

Perception of the Dictionary went through changes – from enthusiastic expectation preceding its publication, through discussions over its faults and its merits of its prospects and initial volumes, to, finally, just a few evaluations of the total, complete work. One should remember that the Warsaw Dictionary was being produced amidst great expectations. It was expected to be a work that would save richness of the Polish language that
was in such jeopardy during the period of the occupation of the country by the three alien superpowers of the time, and when the Polish peoples’ national identity was under pressure and endangered. Our present perception of the Dictionary is biased by negative opinions voiced by the lexicographers of the second half of 20th century, that was formulated in the context of the Słownik języka polskiego (The Polish Language Dictionary) edited by W. Doroszewski. It was possible to challenge elements of that interpretation only when the fragment of the hardly available (or lost) dictionary instruction was found and quoted (Wskazówki dla współpracowników; Instructions to Co-workers). Its part has been recorded and thus saved from extinction in W. Niedźwiedzki’s letter to the editors of the „Kurier Warszawski” newspaper dated 26 November 1903.

Still, there are many issues associated with the history of the greatest Polish Language Dictionary. The key issues mentioned in the forehead of this article require further research and verification which must be based upon the lexicon material contained in the Dictionary.
Life of words –
a rate of lexical-semantics transformation
in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century Polish

(Summary)

The subject of this article are the words which in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century fell into disuse, changed meanings or – according to the author the most interesting – came back to the contemporary Polish people language, in spite of being in the language archives before. The author refers to the linguistic works concerned “out of fashion” words published dozens of years ago and investigates present state of these words in Polish. She indicates the reasons of these words coming back to contemporary Polish, like: political, social and economic transformation after 1989 year in Poland, changes connected with fashion, likes and dislikes etc. In the second part of this article the author treats of one type of the lexical units – compositions which fell into disuse during the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. She presents them in several semantic groups, eg. culinaries, cosmetics, clothes and shoes, school, house and its equipment, social life. She pays attention to the fact that going out of one word or composition may give occasion to going out of another words connected with it and also may cause entering the new words which denominate some new things appeared instead of not using things.
Conceptualizing of Fear in the Croatian Language

(Summary)

Fear, being one of the Basic and primordial states of the psyche, can be observed in humans and animals alike. It is a common, omnipresent, natural, and universal sensation and emotion, as is confirmed by numerous expressions traditionally lasting in particular languages.

Proceeding with analysis of the word connections and collocations existing traditionally in the Croatian language – in particular those that express fear, the analyst becomes able to select and separate a system of metaphors used to conceptualize that sensation.

One of the most basic metaphors is the metaphor FEAR IS AILMENT (ILLNESS), that is often accompanied by the metonymic identification of symptoms of fear with the sensation itself, for example: biti blijed (‘to be pale’), oduzimati nekome dah (‘to take someone’s breath away’), imati pune gaće (‘to hale pants full of …’), hladan znoj probija nekoga (‘sweating with cold sweat’) and so on. Further to symptoms, there are also other analogies between fear and the ailment: both phenomena may spread and be transferred upon others (strah se širi, prenosi – ‘fear spreads, transfers’), and also some attempts are made to fight them (izliječiti strah – ‘to cure fear’), and in extreme case fear may lead to death (umrijeti od straha – ‘to die of fear’).

In the Croatian language, a considerable part of the word collocations base upon the metaphor of THE FEAR IS A LIVING CREATURE, which enables to speak about feelings and sensations from the group of fear as abort categories of ideas or notions that in their literal meaning refer to the living things (strah se rodi, hrani, probudi – ‘the fear is born, the fear lends on something, or wakes’). It is a compound metaphor which includes some sub-metaphors FEAR IS A HUMAN and FEAR IS AN ANIMAL (strah se ugnijezdio – ‘fear has inhabited a nest’). Within the sphere of the metaphor FEAR IS A HUMAN rest other sub-metaphors of a more detailed nature: FEAR IS AN ENEMY (boriti se sa strahom – ‘to fight (against) fear’, pobijediti strah – ‘overcome fear’) and FEAR IS THE RULER (strah vlada – ‘fear governs’, strah kraljuje – ‘fear rules’).

Most of the metaphors interacts with the spatial metaphors like with the following one: FEAR IS AN OBJECT (proizvoditi strah – ‘to produce fear’, prikriti strah – ‘cover up one’s fear’), FEAR IS WATER (preplavljen strahom –
‘flooded by fear’, *tonuti u strahu* – ‘to drown down in fear’), A HUMAN BEING IS A CONTAINER TO HOLD FEAR IN (*uliti nekome strah u kosti* – ‘to pour fear into someone’s bones’, *netko je pun straha* – ‘someone is full of/filled up with fear’) and FEAR IS A VESSEL TO HOLD A MAN IN (*držati koga u strahu* – ‘to keep/hold one in fear’, *duboki strah* – ‘deep fear’).

Further, the spatial metaphors enable also conceptualization of a movement, which serves the purpose of expressing either the beginning or the end of feeling the sensation, for instance *strah odlazi, dolazi* – ‘fear goes away and comes in’.

The metaphors of fear that have been presented in this paper are only a part of a picture of that sensation in the Croatian language, although – judging from the quantity of textual confirmations – it is the considerable part of the picture.
Liturgical tradition and influences of living language in the sixteenth century aprakos – gospel of Russian edition

(Summary)

A problem of the influence of language on a Church Slavonic liturgical tradition was characterized in this article. A subject of the analysis is the sixteenth century aprakos – gospel of Russian edition from Vosislivik, which is now kept in the National Library in Warsaw (sygn. 2532). The analysis comprised some phonetic and one inflected processes, the modifications connected with them, which were observed in the religious text and their graphic form. Those processes became the germ of Russian literary rule. There are: denasalization of nasal vowels, evolution of Eastern Slavonic equivalents of \( *_{\partial}^{\partial}, *_{\partial}^{l} \), vocalization of strong jers and reduction of weak jers, appearance of consonant z instead of Proto–Slavic sequence \( *dj \) and ending \(-t\partial\) in the third person sg. and pl. present tense.

The particular linguistic features were realized in this manuscript with different intensity. Many of records, which reflect denasalization of previous nasals (for example \( \text{ривш} 8/22, \text{сков} 20/7, \text{жатка} 35/12-13, \text{пазынк} 36/7 \)) or vocalization and reduction of historical jers (for example \( \text{тыкн} 28/2, \text{ежалъ} 36/19, \text{чтн} 82/9, \text{чка} 264/20 \)) testifies great influence of living language. There are some records in this text, which show that vowel \( e \) is frequently used instead of weak jers (for example \( \text{дери} 179/19, \text{ьк веми} 119/17, \text{множество} 206/21 \)). Expansion of living language is also confirmed by definitely predominant in the text the verbal ending \(-t\partial\) in the third person of present tense (for example \( \text{потрккть} 10/4, \text{съмереть} 10/5, \text{научить} 15/12-13 \)) and few records of the equivalents \( *_{\partial}^{\partial}, *_{\partial}^{l} as ed, ol \) sequences (for example \( \text{кнмш} 54/17, \text{четвертою} 60/21, \text{исполъ} 66/14-15, \text{столп} 273/4 \)) or with repeated fullness (for example \( \text{веркн} 24/5-6, \text{церквк} 77/4, \text{домъжника} 279/22 \)). Regular occurrence of sequence \( \dot{zd} \) from Proto–Slavic sequence \( *dj \) (for example \( \text{дож} (\text{декк}) 4/1, 11, \text{предн} 14/15, \text{дажать} 20/20 \)) brings the aprakos – gospel nearer to Church–Slavic model.
The Indo-European and Nostratic Sources for the Reconstruction of the Category of the Person in the Slavic Languages

(Summary)

The purpose of this paper is a reconstruction of the Indo-European pronouns through a developing and completing of the reconstruction done by V. M. Illič-Svityč (Опыт сравнения ностратических языков [...], Moscow 1971). The Author of this paper adopts the existing of the following forms of the Proto-Indo-European pronoun morphems:

the 1st pers.: sing. – nominal me and verbal: +m, +mi, +meF/+moF, coll.: nominal ne and verbal: +me/+mo, +mes/+mos;

the 2nd pers.: sing. – nominal te and verbal: +t, +ti, +teF/+toF, coll.: nominal Ge and verbal: +te, +tes;

the 3rd pers. sing. and coll. – nominal: se (rationalia) and te (irrationalia), verbal: sing. +s, +si, +seF/+soF, coll. -o-nt – a participle form (similar to that in Finnish languages) and he forms his ideas:

1. In any part of the Nostratic languages (including any part of the Indo-European languages) the opposition se : te was neutralized, what caused:

   a) the turn of the initial vowel of the adjective pronoun with the form of the nominative singular sos m, sâ f < *se (primary pronoun for the 3rd person) under the influence of tod n < *te (the forms in the nominative with s- are preserved in the Oldindian, Avesta, Gotian languages and reconstructed in Greek); in the Old-Church-Slavic exists the demonstrative pronoun te, ta, to (retained relictly as the personal pronoun),

   b) the turn of the Function of the pronoun of the 3rd Person with the genitive form (sing.) se-Ge (secondary in proportion to the genitive form (sing.) te-Ge of the 2. sing. te), where the second element was the pronoun for the 2nd person like in the genitive from me: me-ne), which became the reflexive pronoun, at first for the 3rd pers. sing. and pl. (cf. the trace e. g. German sich, currently the form of the accusative (and secondary the dative sing. and pl.) as a reflexive, was otherwise in the 1st and 2nd person sing. and pl. expresses the personal pronoun) and later in the 1st and 2nd person sing. and pl. (and du.) too.
2. In the time, when the pronoun *t-* in the Indo-European functioned as the pronoun for the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person sing. and pl. (rationalia + irrationalia), the verbal endings for the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person sing. with +*s*-, according to the parallelism of the verbal morphems to the nominal morphems, where replaced with the endings with +*t* (a influence of the morphem of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person pl. on the form for sing. is possible). This primitive state ist preserved in the Tocharian, Hittite and Phrygian languages.

3. The old endigs of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} pers. sing. with +*s* were introduced into the 2\textsuperscript{nd} pers. sing., the syncretism to avoid. This is known, that the both of endings are found in the form of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person sing. (Germ. 1. *bin*, 2. *bist*, 3. *ist*).
Master Polikarp in Slavic countries

(Summary)

The motif of a conversation with Death, appearing as a human being, was already known in antiquity. A large number of works on this theme appeared in Europe between XII and XVI centuries. Latin originals were often translated into Slavic languages. The interlocutor of Death was often called Polikarp, what could be the name of the original author. The preserved copies of Latin manuscripts state he came from Ireland.

Glagolitic Croatian text, preserved in two copies from XV century, is connected with the oldest Latin manuscripts, “the first editing”. The translator is faithful to the Latin original almost completely. The Polish version, with Latin title *De morte prologus*, has more common features with “second editing” group of manuscripts, that are somewhat younger. The text in Church-Slavonic Russian from XVI century is thought to be a translation of Polish version, but it is closer to travesty, as following differences suggest: the Polish version being rhymed, and Russian in prose, calling Polikarp in the former *master*, and in the latter *philosopher*, the place from where Death comes in Polish is *szkoła*, in Russian: *carstwo* etc. There is a possibility of texts translated from German *Dvojeslovija/prenija života i smerti* influencing the abovementioned versions. The German original, through Russian diplomats, came to Novgorod from Lubeck. Even less connected with *De morte prologus* is – widely considered to be a translation from Polish – XVII century Ukrainian work *Slovo o ljutoj smerti*... Possibly it is an independent travesty of western Latin themes, that made their way to Ukraine. Czech versions – *Rozmlauvání člověka se smrtí* from XVIth century and its later version, *Hádání člověka se smrtí* in turn, are closer to the Polish dialogue, although they are not connected by the name of the protagonist (like Russian and Croatian versions are). Despite thematic similarity they certainly come from different Latin originals, and what is more, they have a sense of a much different local atmosphere.
Perfective / Imperfective and Phasal Meanings
(based on Russian Language Examples)

(Summary)

The paper proposes the interpretation of two contextual meanings of Russian aspect. The author examines the factual and the processual meaning. The theoretical background of this paper is the theory of the Ju. Maslov, V. Chrakovski and E. Padučeva. The main aspectual meanings give different ways of viewing the internal temporary structure of a situation: ‘a synchronic view of the situation’ and ‘a retrospective view of the situation’. They are described as the phasal meanings (the meaning of the initial phase, the intraterminal phase, the final phase etc.). These definitions show differences in the semantics of different types of perfective (delimitatives, ingressives, semelfactives etc.) and imperfective Verbs. The presentation of each class is supplemented by graphs showing the relationships between the variables on the time axis.
Croatian discussion  
on the status and name of the language  

(Summary)

The article reviews the progress of a discussion in the circles of the Croatian linguists on what the status of the Croatian language is and on the essence of the name of the language that is contemporarily used by the Croats. The discussion started fiercely at the end of 1990s, already after the disintegration of the old Yugoslavia and the Serbo-Croatian language and results from a clash of varying views and opinions on the extent of the language community that presently uses the language. In the concise form, the article presents the points made by both proponents and opponents of the language unity of the Croats, the Bosnians, the Serbs and the Montenegros. The quoted points made in the discussions refer to the linguistic, socio-political and legal arguments adopted when the languages are differentiated as and when those languages emerged as separate entities. The linguistic criteria involve such elements like the grammatical structure and composition of the lexicon of particular idioms, their genesis, dialectal base and the scope of inter- and mutual-comprehensibility of the texts in the Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegroan languages. The criteria of the socio-political character refer to the symbolic function of the language in the process of building the structure of national identity of each and every national community. Further, factors of the legislating nature regulating the languages were also taken into consideration, especially as for the right of every nation and ethnic group to protect and develop its own language. In addition to that, the text of the article presents the problems and solutions in the domain of terminology that were adopted by the Croats after the mid 1960s, the ones that were aimed at eliminating the usage of the phrase: “the Serbo-Croatian language”. Those proposals were also remembered in the present discussion. In the conclusion of the article its author makes the point that the sharpness of the discussion conducted in the Croatian circles on the status and the name of their language results less from the requirement to defend the language in the international scene, but is used predominantly to reinforce the coherence of the society; that point is further supported by the quoted latest memorandum of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts (dated February 2005) on the risks that the Croatian language presently faces.
Corpora of Slavic languages

(Summary)

The aim of this paper is a presentation of corpora of Slavic languages. A corpus for almost every Slavic language either was compiled or shall be finished very soon. Some languages can be studied with help of several corpora. To the knowledge of the authors the exceptions are: Bielorussian, Kashubian (if we agree that it is a language not a dialect) and Macedonian. The corpora are mostly accessible via Internet and meet the standards set by British National Corpus: their size ranges from 30 to 100 million running words, are balanced and morphosyntactically annotated. Interestingly, there is no interdependence between the position of a certain language and the quality of its corpus. Countries with relatively little population (e.g. Slovenia) can afford large and sophisticated corpora, while even if there are several corpora of Russian, none of them meets the standards which are nowadays required.