

Krystian Jachimczak
Uniwersytet Łódzki

Profiling of the image of a human in the Polish and Russian language (based on lexicographic material)

Summary. The aim of the study is to reconstruct the method of profiling the image of a human in the image of the world in the Polish and Russian language, based on selected lexicographic sources from the 1st half of the 20th century until the turn of the 20th and 21st century. The basis material is data drawn from dictionary entries of lexemes belonging to the word-formative nest *człowiek*, that is *człowiek* [a human, a man], *człowieczeństwo* [humanity], *człowieczy* [adj. sg. human], *człowiecze* [adj. pl. human or vocative case: Human!] and *ludzie* [humans, people], *lud* [people, folk], *ludzki* [adj. human, humane], *ludzik* [a little man, a figurine]. I also study their Russian equivalents: *человек, человечность, человеческий, человеческий, люди, людской*. The research was conducted using the methodology of a linguistic image of the world. The collected material was ordered using facets. The main purpose of the study was to prove the thesis that although the Polish and Russian languages are close both genetically and geographically, significant differences in the conceptual sphere can be observed between them due to the different history. The result of the study is confirmation of the adopted thesis: there are significant differences between the profiling of the image of a human in the Polish and Russian language, as proven by the different hierarchy of the facets. In the Polish material, the most examples represent the facets: *origin, axiological sphere, nature, activity, human as a species*, whereas in the Russian material they are: *professional relations, universal human relations, nature, axiological sphere, human as a species*.

Keywords: linguistic world image, profiling, comparative linguistics, Polish language, Russian language

Profilowanie obrazu człowieka w językach polskim i rosyjskim (na podstawie materiału leksykograficznego)

Streszczenie. Celem opracowania jest rekonstrukcja sposobu profilowania obrazu człowieka w polsko- i rosyjskojęzycznym obrazie świata na podstawie wybranych źródeł leksykograficznych od 1 poł. XX wieku do przełomu wieków XX i XXI. Podstawę materiałową stanowią dane zaczerpnięte z artykułów hasłowych leksemów należących

do gniazda słowotwórczego *człowiek*, tj. *człowiek*, *człowieczeństwo*, *człowieczy*, *człowiecze* oraz *ludzie*, *lud*, *ludzki*, *ludzik*. Badałem także ich rosyjskie odpowiedniki: *человек*, *человечность*, *человечный*, *человеческий*, *человечий*, *люди*, *людской*. Badania prowadzone były z zastosowaniem metodologii językowego obrazu świata. Zgromadzony materiał uporządkowany został za pomocą faset. Głównym celem badań było udowodnienie tezy, iż mimo że języki polski i rosyjski są bliskie genetycznie, a także geograficznie, to ze względu na odmienną historię uwidaczniają się pomiędzy nimi znaczące różnice w sferze pojęciowej. Rezultatem pracy jest potwierdzenie postawionej tezy: istnieją znaczące różnice między sposobami profilowania obrazu człowieka w językach polskim i rosyjskim, o czym świadczy odmienna hierarchia faset. W materiale polskojęzycznym reprezentowane największą liczbą przykładów są fasyty: *pochodzenie*, *sfera aksjologiczna*, *charakter*, *działalność*, *człowiek jako gatunek*, natomiast w materiale rosyjskojęzycznym: *relacje zawodowe*, *relacje ogólnoludzkie*, *charakter*, *sfera aksjologiczna*, *człowiek jako gatunek*.

Słowa kluczowe: językowy obraz świata, profilowanie, językoznawstwo porównawcze, język polski, język rosyjski

Introduction

This article is of confrontative nature. Its object is the image of a human in the Polish and Russian language, recreated based on data drawn from selected dictionary sources. It uses the methodology of researching the linguistic world image. The purpose of the analyses conducted from that perspective is determination how the given community perceives, categorizes and interprets the surrounding reality (Grzegorzczkova 2015: 12–13; Rak 2010: 491–492).

In the article, I intend to reconstruct the method of profiling the term of a human in the Polish and Russian world image based on selected lexicographic sources from the 1st half of the 20th century until the turn of the 20th and 21st century.

Adoption of the comparative perspective is supported by the fact that on one hand, the Polish and Russian language are related and close to each other also in geographical terms, which could suggest existence of similarities, but on the other hand – considering different historical experiences of the communities (nations) using those languages, different approaches to a human in the linguistic world image should be expected.

Indications for statement of such a hypothesis can be found in the already existing research of confrontative nature. It includes, for instance, studies by Renata Grzegorzczkova, who compared the Christian term called in the Polish language *pokora* [*humbleness*, *humility*] and in the Russian language *смирение*, proving that they are only seemingly equivalent (Grzegorzczkova 1993). Similar conclusions are drawn also by Anna Wierzbicka, who compares the Polish *los* [*fate*] and the Russian *судьба* (Wierzbicka 1991).

The linguistic world image can be considered one of the basic terms of ethnolinguistic cognitivism (Grzegorzczkova 2015: 8). Among the definitions, most

often referred to are those by Jerzy Bartmiński and Ryszard Tokarski (Bartmiński, Tokarski 1986: 72), J. Bartmiński (Bartmiński 1990: 110) and R. Grzegorzczkowa (Grzegorzczkowa 1990: 43). Based on them, Maciej Rak proposed adoption of the following understanding: "a linguistic world image is a supra-individual (social) interpretation of the reality from the position of reason (of an ordinary man), existing in the conceptual structure in the mind and expressed on various linguistic levels" (Rak 2010: 487). Jolanta Maćkiewicz perceives the linguistic world image as an "image of the world as recorded in the language" (Maćkiewicz 1999: 8). Acknowledging that assumption, the researcher proposes to understand the linguistic world image as an "abstract, idealized model of the reality, functioning as an element of the linguistic competence" (Maćkiewicz 1999: 10). According to her, "in that understanding, the term 'linguistic' means 'included in the general language'" (Maćkiewicz 1999: 10).

The research program of the linguistic world image encompasses the term *profiling*. Stanisława Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska calls it "one of the most popular and at the same time most ambiguous terms in the linguistics in the last twenty years" (Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2015: 30). The linguist rightly observes that researchers who discuss the topic of the linguistic world image refer to its "American" understanding, as formed by Ronald Langacker (Langacker 1987, 1997), or the understanding adopted by Jerzy Bartmiński (1990, 1993a, 1993b). In the present study, I refer to the "Lublin" approach and consider profiling to be: "a subjective (that is, having its subject) linguistic and conceptual operation, consisting in a characteristic shaping of the image of the object by referring to it in specific aspects (sub-categories, facets), such as, e.g., origin, characteristics, appearance, functions, events, experiences, etc. within the framework of a similar type of knowledge and in accordance with requirements of the given point of view" (Bartmiński, Niebrzegowska 1998: 212). In that context, a profile can be understood as: "not only a variant of a meaning, but rather a variant of a notion of the term, shaped by the choice of facets, their ordering according to implication rules and filling them with content according to the assumed knowledge of the world, at the same time being a variant created by the dominating factor, the dominant feature" (Bartmiński, Niebrzegowska 1998: 217).

The basis for the study is material drawn from entries in chosen Polish and Russian dictionaries. In selecting the sources, I adopted the same perspective as the one presented by Jerzy Bartmiński and Wojciech Chlebda (Bartmiński, Chlebda 2008: 22), who claim that:

[...] lexicography is in a way an institution which can stimulate acts of national self-identification, participate in self-identification processes and sanction results of such acts and processes, with dictionaries having the function of accumulation of lexical and semantic elements of the linguistic world image and sanctioning them. However, this does not mean that the world image resulting from the composition of networks of dictionary entries and definitions of meanings of the units making up those networks is a "true" image in the sense of adequacy to the image actually stored in the minds of carriers of the given culture. The results

of preliminary research of dictionaries allow us rather to talk about a specific "lexicographic world image", which should be confronted with the image obtained based on the analysis of non-dictionary linguistic, near-linguistic and textual sources, as outlined here.

Dictionaries are therefore one of the possible sources to excerpt material. I am aware of their specifics. However, due to the restrictions imposed by the form of an article, I shall confront the results of the analyses of other types of sources only in the future.

In order to offer the broadest possible view of the problem in question, I decided to adopt a panchronic perspective. Following Przemysław Łozowski, I understand it as "a methodological overview of linguistic data, in which the language becomes an uninterrupted record of human experience, and its elements are subjected to continuous categorization contestation as a resultant of cognitive tensions" (Łozowski 2018: 165–167).

I considered publications both from the turn of the 20th and 21st century and those from the mid-20th century or even from the first half of the 20th century. I used the following sources: Polish – *Słownik języka polskiego* [*Dictionary of the Polish language*] edited by Witold Doroszewski and *Wielki słownik języka polskiego PAN* [*The Great Dictionary of the Polish language at the Polish Academy of Sciences*] edited by Piotr Źmigrodzki, as well as Russian – *Толковый словарь русского языка* [*Tolkovuyu slovar' russkogo yazyka*] edited by Д.Н. Ушаков [D.N. Ushakov], *Словарь русского языка* [*Slovar' russkogo yazyka*], edited by С.И. Ожегов [S.I. Ozhegov], *Словарь современного русского литературного языка* [*Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo yazyka*] (*Большой академический словарь* [*Bol'shoy akademicheskiiy slovar'*]) edited by В.И. Чернышёв [V.I. Chernyshyov] and *Современный толковый словарь русского языка Ефремовой* [*Sovremennuyu tolkovuyu slovar' russkogo yazyka Yefremovoy*] edited by Т.Ф. Ефремова [T.F. Yefremova].

The excerpted sources are dictionaries from the 20th century (Ushakov, Ozhegov and SJPDor) and the 21st century (Yefremova and WSJP PAN). I took into account words from the word-formative nest *człowiek* [*a human, a man*], that is *człowiek* [*a human, a man*], *człowieczeństwo* [*humanity*], *człowieczy* [adj. sg. *human*], *człowiecze* [adj. pl. *human* or vocative case: *Human!*] and *ludzie* [*humans, people*], *lud* [*people, folk*], *ludzki* [adj. *human, humane*], *ludzik* [*a little man, a figurine*]. The excerpted entries include different parts of speech: nouns, adjectives and adverbs. In the Russian part, I researched their equivalents: *человек, человечность, человеческий, человеческий, люди, людской*. I considered definitions and examples, paying particular attention to collocations present in dictionary entries. I decided to omit words with similar meanings but not belonging to those two families, such as, for example *гуманность*. I also did not analyse examples recorded in lexicographic sources but not containing the lexemes which were of interest to me, e.g., *что-то идёт во весь мир* [*something spreads throughout the world*], in contrast to the included *что-то идёт между людьми* [*something spreads among people*]. I analysed 440 Polish collocations and 293 Russian ones, that is 733 uses in total.

For obvious reasons, I quote only a small part of them in the article. I am aware of the significant disproportion of the material, it is, however, due to reasons beyond my control – the Russian dictionaries record much less examples of uses. It also should be noted that if the material is analysed using ranking lists, such disproportions will not affect the final results.

Because some of the dictionaries were created in a different, not democratic system, an ideologization tendency can be observed in the entries. This can be observed for example in the dictionary edited by Doroszewski, which records examples typical for socialist newspeak, e.g. *the sentence Working masses of USSR [...] secured the total victory of socialist ownership over the capitalist one, thus bringing about liquidation of antagonist classes, liquidation of a human by a human* is used to illustrate the use of the lexeme *człowiek* [a human, a man] understood as ‘homo sapiens, the most advanced living creatures in the primates order [...]’. This definition shows also the encyclopaedical approach in SJPDor. The impact of the former system is even more visible in the Russian dictionaries, for example those of Ozhegov, Ushakov and BAS, which include quotes from Lenin or Stalin.

The collected material was grouped into facets. By a facet, following Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, I mean a “bundle of traits which constitutes an explication, discovered by analysis of the material and not imposed externally, and secondarily used also as a network to order the material and facilitate comparison of descriptions” (Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2015: 32). That is why I selected them based on the collected material and not in the opposite way. It should be also noted that the classification was developed based on the Polish material, therefore, in the case of some facets, there are no collocations representing them on the Russian part. Assigning the material to individual facets sometimes proved problematic. A part of the lexical units was allocated to more than one facet, e.g., *strzęp człowieka* [a wreck of a man], which describes both the physical condition (that is appearance) and the mental condition (categorized by me in facet 5. MENTAL SPHERE). Some facets required an internal subdivision, which resulted in determination of sub-facets. On the other hand, the abundant content of some sub-facets resulted in their categorization as separate facets (facet 9. AXIOLOGICAL SPHERE was established that way). I am aware that the arbitrariness of such decisions is not insignificant for the reconstruction of the manner of profiling of the image of a human.

Presented below are the facets distinguished based on the collected material. In determining them, I drew, although very generally, from the works of Yuri Апресян (Апресян 1995) and Jerzy Bartmiński (Bartmiński 1996).

1. AGE.
2. QUANTITY.
3. APPEARANCE.
4. BIOLOGICAL SPHERE.
 - 4.1. ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY.

- 4.2. HUMAN AS A SPECIES¹.
5. MENTAL SPHERE.
 - 5.1. CHARACTER.
 - 5.2. KNOWLEDGE AND EDUCATION².
 - 5.3. MENTAL PROCESSES³.
 - 5.4. MENTAL STATE.
6. AXIOLOGICAL SPHERE⁴.
7. ACTIVITY⁵.
8. HUMAN AND SOCIETY.
 - 8.1. HUMAN RELATIONS.
 - 8.2. COMMUNITY⁶.
 - 8.3. PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS⁷.
 - 8.4. HISTORIC EVENTS, HISTORIC PROCESSES⁸.
9. HUMAN AND FATE.
 - 9.1. SELF-AGENCY.
 - 9.2. SUBMISSION TO FATE.
10. HUMAN AS AN INDIVIDUUM⁹.
11. LIVING CONDITIONS, ORIGIN OF A HUMAN.
 - 11.1. LIVING CONDITIONS OF A HUMAN.
 - 11.2. ORIGIN.
12. HUMAN AND RELIGION¹⁰.

¹ Distinction of this sub-facet was based on the presence of quite a large group of lexical units referring to individual stages of the evolutionary development of humans and also generally to the human as a species.

² This sub-facet includes those lexical units which describe the reality related to knowledge, skills mastered by humans.

³ Here, I assigned material which refers to all activity and processes in the mental sphere of a human (in contrast to facet no. 4).

⁴ I distinguished this facet due to the extensive material concerning a human as the carrier of "humanity" (being a human).

⁵ To this facet, I assigned lexical units referring to all activities of a human which are not of mental nature.

⁶ This sub-facet was distinguished due to the quite large group of lexical units in which a human is present as a member of a community.

⁷ To this sub-facet, I allocated the material in which the semantic emphasis is put on professional relations, providing services to someone, and not on activity in general (as in the Activity facet).

⁸ Quite a large group of lexical units describing historic events or locating a human in relation to history resulted in the need to separate them from the rest of the material in this facet.

⁹ To this facet, I assigned those semantic units in which a human is considered an individual, a subject, with emphasis on the uniqueness of a human being, but also those in which a human is only a performer of an activity, a subject, replacing the personal pronoun.

¹⁰ This facet is not very extensive neither in the Polish nor in the Russian material, but due to its significant difference from the rest of the material, I decided to separate the material in which a human is presented in relation to the religious sphere.

Profiling of the image of a human in the Polish language

I considered the collected material from the quantitative angle: I focused on the most extensive facets, which play the key role in reconstructing the manner of profiling the image of a human. I present the complete data in form of a table.

Table 1. Polish material is ordered according to the volume of the material in the facet

No.	Name of the facet	Name of the sub-facet	Number of examples	Percentage distribution ¹¹
1.	Living conditions, origin of a human	Origin	64	14.5%
2.	Axiological sphere	-	60	13.6%
3.	Mental sphere	Character	45	10.2%
4.	Activity	-	29	6.6%
5.	Biological sphere	Human as a species	27	6%
6.	Human and society	Professional relations	26	5.9%
7.	Living conditions, origin of a human	Living conditions of a human	26	5.9%
8.	Appearance	-	25	5.7%
9.	Human and society	Human relations	22	5%
10.	Human and society	Community	22	5%
11.	Human and society	Historic events, historic processes	17	3.9%
12.	Quantity	-	13	3%
13.	Biological sphere	Anatomy and physiology	13	3%
14.	Age	-	11	2.5%
15.	Human as an individual	-	8	1.8%
16.	Mental sphere	Knowledge and education	7	1.6%
17.	Mental sphere	Mental processes	7	1.6%
18.	Human and fate	Submission to fate	7	1.6%
19.	Human and religion	-	6	1.4%
20.	Human and fate	Self-agency	3	0.7%
21.	Mental sphere	Mental state	2	0.5%
IN TOTAL			440	

Source: own study

The most significant sub-facet is 11.2. ORIGIN. For a common user of the Polish language, it proves very important where the given person comes from.

¹¹ Rounded up to one decimal place.

Often recorded are lexical units related to geographical location, the place where a person lives. For example: *lud krakowski* [inhabitants of Cracow], *lud Paryża* [inhabitants of Paris], *ludy Afryki* [peoples in Africa], *ludy bałkańskie* [Balkan peoples], *ludy tureckie* [Turkish peoples], *ludy basenu Morza Śródziemnego* [peoples in the basin of the Mediterranean Sea], *ludy Północy* [peoples of the North], *człowiek z miasta* [city-dweller], *lud góralski* [highlanders], *lud Polski* [Polish people], *lud rzymski* [Roman people], *ludy bałkańskie* [Balkan people], *ludy bałtyjskie* [Baltic peoples], *ludy europejskie* [European peoples], *ludy Bliskiego Wschodu* [peoples of the Near East], *lud śląski* [inhabitants of Silesia region], etc. There are often collocations in which people (understood as 'those living in the given area, with a common culture and a common language, not having a national awareness or a state tradition') are in a relation to something else or are presented together with it, e.g. *inne ludy* [different peoples], *ludy i kraje* [peoples and countries], *ludy i kultury* [peoples and cultures], *ludy i plemiona* [peoples and tribes], *ludy ościenne* [neighbouring peoples], *obce ludy* [foreign peoples], *ludy żyjące gdzieś* [peoples living somewhere], *ludy zamieszkujące coś* [people residing somewhere]. In the case of this sub-facet, worth noting are collocations related to social origin. For example: *pochodzić z ludu* [be of the people], *lud pracy* [people of work], *lud pracujący* [working people], *lud wiejski* [rural people, country folk], *lud miast i wsi* [people of towns and villages], *lud miejski* (*mieszczanie*) [town-dwellers (townspeople)] or the definition of *lud* [people] 'usually no plural form, working social classes, mainly laborers and peasants'.

Almost equally important in a human, to a common user of the Polish language, are the values which they (do not) carry (facet 6). Dictionaries record a series of collocations referring to various traits of the human nature, from the definition, e.g. *człowiek* 'a person representing the best human traits, a socially valuable, ethical, noble individual', *człowiek* 'someone who behaves decently and in their actions, is guided by the good of others', to collocations, e.g. (*postępowanie*) *pełne ludzkości* [(action) full of humanity], *czcić w kimś ludzkość* [to honour humanity in someone], *któs wyprowadził na człowieka kogoś* [someone made someone a good man], *któs wyszedł na ludzi* [someone turned out a good man], *ocalić, rozwijać człowieczeństwo* [to save, develop humanity], *wydobyć ludzkość* [to bring out humanity], *przyjmować coś/kogoś z ludzkością* [to welcome something/someone with humanity], *któs wychował na człowieka kogoś* [someone raised someone to be a man], *któs wrócił do ludzi* [someone came back to people], *mogą być z kogoś ludzie* [someone can become a good man] 'to become a good man, to turn out to be a good man, to win a position; someone will be a useful, decent man', *postępuj jak człowiek* [act like a man] 'speak, behave, act like a man, reasonably, tactfully, calmly, with dignity, well, etc., be humane, polite, understanding, etc.'.

Important is also 5.1. CHARACTER. This aspect is exposed by lexical units denominating permanent mental traits of a human, both positive and negative ones. For example: *człowiek zarozumiały* [an conceited man], *człowiek zasad* [a man of principle], *ambitny człowiek* [an ambitious man], *człowiek czynu* [a man of action],

człowiek przyzwoity [a decent man], *człowiek zły* [a bad man], *są ludzie i taborety* [there are people and stools], *człowiek podstępny* [a devious man], *człowiek lekkomyślny* [a reckless man], *człowiek przewrotny* [a perverse man], *człowiek inteligentny* [an intelligent man], *człowiek lekkomyślny* [a reckless man], *człowiek porządny* [a respectable man], *człowiek niepospolity* [an exceptional man], *dusza człowiek* [a saint of a man], *pracowici ludzie* [hard-working people]. Important are also those examples which describe the attitude of a man towards the reality surrounding them, having its source is their internal nature, e.g., *człowiek czynu* [a man of action] or *oszczędnością i pracą ludzie się bogacą* [no work, no pay; through saving and work people become rich], *zdadni do żołnierstwa ludzie* [people fit to be soldiers].

Another significant aspect is 7. ACTIVITY. Lexicographic sources record a significant group of collocations related to *człowiek* in the context of activity performed by them. For example: *człowiek pracuje* [a man works], *lud pracujący* [working people], *lud zbrojny* [armed people], *człowiek pióra* [a man of letters], *człowiek nauki* [a man of science], *człowiek do biura* [a man for office work], *człowiek do zbiorów* [a man for harvest], *lud myśliwych* [hunting people], *lud rybaków* [fishermen], *lud rzemieślniczy* [craftsmen], *ludzie teatru* [people of theatre], *człowiek do budowy* [a man for construction work].

The next sub-facet, which should be considered one of the most important in reconstruction of the manner of profiling of the image of a human, is 4.2. HUMAN AS A SPECIES. In dictionaries, multiple semantic units can be found in which the human is presented as a species, in contrast to other animals, e.g. *człowiek* 'homo sapiens, the most developed living creature in the primates order, having - contrary to animals - the ability to think, speak, make production tools and use them in collective work', *człowiek* 'a living being, able to talk, think and create cultural goods', *ludzkie plemię* [the human tribe], *rodzaj ludzki* [humankind], *ród ludzki* [human family]. Slightly different are examples in which the development level of humans as a species is important, for example: *człowiek jaskiniowy* [a cave man], *człowiek kopalny* [a fossil man], *człowiek neandertalski* [a Neanderthal man], *człowiek pierwotny* [a primitive man], *ludy koczownicze* [nomadic peoples], *lud osiadły* [settled people], *człowiek cywilizowany* [a civilized man] or *ludy pierwotne* [primitive peoples].

Other facets can be considered less important. Among them, worth mentioning are: 8.3. PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS, e.g. *zatrudnić człowieka* [to hire a man], *człowiek* 'colloquially, an employee', *zasoby ludzkie* [human resources], *zwolnić człowieka* [to dismiss an employee], *ludzie* 'colloquially, usually in the expression: his people, someone's people, etc.: those who are dependent on someone, someone's supporters, subordinates'; 11.1. LIVING CONDITIONS OF A HUMAN, e.g. *człowiek ubogi* [an impoverished man], *człowiek biedny* [a poor man], *nędza ludu* [deprivation of the people], *ludzkie jedzenie* [humane food] or *ludzkie warunki* (egzystencji, leczenia, pracy, życia) [humane conditions (of existence, medical treatment, work, life)]; 3. APPEARANCE, e.g. *chuderlawy człowieczek* [a scraggy little man], *ludzie czarni* [black people], *lud biały* [white people], *ludy kolorowe* [peoples of colour], *elegancki człowiek* [an elegant man]; 8.1. HUMAN RELATIONS, e.g., *coś idzie między ludzi* [something

spreads among people], *człowiek człowiekowi wilkiem* [*a man is a wolf to another man*], *prawa człowieka* [*human rights*], *uciekać od ludzi* [*escape from people*] and 8.2. COMMUNITY, e.g., *cała ludzkość* [*the whole mankind*], *ludzkość osiągnęła coś* [*the mankind achieved something*], *przyszła ludzkość* [*the future mankind*], *ratować ludzkość* [*to save the mankind*], *zbawić ludzkość* [*to redeem the mankind*]. The remaining facets are less or marginally important.

A fact worth noting because it is slightly surprising from the perspective of the Polish history and culture is that dictionary sources record very few examples for facet 12. HUMAN AND RELIGION (*człowieczeństwo* (*Jezusa*) *Chrystusa* [*the humanity of (Jesus) Christ*], *lud Boży* [*God's people*], *ludy chrześcijańskie* [*Christian people*], *ludy islamu* [*Islamic people*], *ludy pogańskie* [*pagan people*], *syn człowieczy* [*son of man*]).

Based on the collected and analysed material, one can reconstruct the manner of profiling the image of a human in the Polish language.

A human, a man¹²:

- comes from somewhere, lives in the given area (11.2.)¹³,
- is (not) a carrier of values (6.),
- has specific character traits, positive or negative ones (5.1.),
- performs some actions (7.),
- is a separate and unique species (4.2.),
- remains in relations with other people, rooted in the professional sphere (8.3.),
- lives in specific conditions (11.2.),
- has a specific appearance (3.),
- remains in relations with other people, not necessarily of professional nature (8.1.),
- is part of a community (8.2.),
- remains in a relation to historic changes, participates in them or experiences their consequences (8.4.),
- is perceived from the angle of being alone or in a larger group (2.),
- is subject to biological processes taking place within them, is part of the natural world, is made of smaller parts (4.1.),
- is at a specific age (1.),
- is an individual, performer of an activity (10.),
- acquires knowledge and education (5.2.),
- is the subject of mental processes (5.3.),
- is an individual in a relation to what happens to them, while being able to show initiative or passively accept what happens (9.1., 9.2.),
- is a spiritual being, having a religious sphere (12.),
- is in a specific mental state (5.4.).

¹² From the most important aspect to the least important one.

¹³ Numbers in parentheses indicate the facet number.

Profiling of the image of a human in the Russian language

The Russian material, ordered according to the quantitative criterion, is presented in the following table:

Table 2. Russian material is ordered according to the volume of the material in the facet

No.	Name of the facet	Name of the sub-facet	Number of examples	Percentage distribution ¹⁴
1.	Human and society	Professional relations	49	16.7%
2.	Human and society	Human relations	45	15.4%
3.	Biological sphere	Human as a species	35	12%
4.	Mental sphere	Character	34	11.6%
5.	Axiological sphere	-	31	10.6%
6.	Human and society	Community	17	5.8%
7.	Living conditions, origin of a human	Origin	15	5.1%
8.	Human as an individual	-	14	4.8%
9.	Appearance	-	11	3.8%
10.	Activity	-	9	3.1%
11.	Quantity	-	8	2.7%
12.	Age	-	7	2.4%
13.	Living conditions, origin of a human	Living conditions of a human	5	1.7%
14.	Mental sphere	Knowledge and education	4	1.4%
15.	Biological sphere	Anatomy and physiology	3	1%
16.	Human and fate	Submission to fate	2	0.7%
17.	Human and religion	-	2	0.7%
18.	Mental sphere	Mental state	1	0.3%
19.	Mental sphere	Mental processes	-	-
20.	Human and society	Historic events, historic processes.	-	-
21.	Human and fate	Self-agency	-	-
IN TOTAL			293	

Source: own study

The most numerous sub-facet in the Russian material is 8.3. PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS. Lexicographic sources record a significant group of connections in which the words *a human/a man, people* are synonymous to an

¹⁴ Rounded up to one decimal place.

employee, professional staff, e.g., *человек* 'официант в трактире, ресторане; половой', *Человек из ресторана, человек, рюмку водки!*, *люди* 'то же, что кадры', *люди* 'лица, используемые в каком-либо деле; кадры', *рабочий человек, бригада пополнилась людьми, человек* 'лицо, персона как единица обслуживания за столом (обедом, ужином и т.п.)'. Important is also the aspect of being in a service relation, e.g., *человек* 'любой слуга мужского пола; лакей', *людской* 'прил. к люди в 5 знач.; ант. господский', *люди przestarz.* 'в дворянском и буржуазном быту – прислуга, работник', *изба для людей (людская), люди* 'дворовые, слуги, работники в барском доме', *к вам человек с докладом, людской стол, людской* 'предназначенный для людей, дворни, прислуги', *люди* 'в дворянском, богатом доме: слуги'.

Another important sub-facet is 8.1. HUMAN RELATIONS. A human/a man is presented here in relation to other people and the ties between them are important, e.g., *молодой человек* colloquially 'обращение к юноше, лицу молодого возраста или jokingly к мальчику', *добрые люди* 'обращение, призыв к окружающим', *на людей посмотреть, себя показать, на людях и на людях* 'в присутствии других, так, что все видят, слышат', *на люди показаться (появиться, выйти)* outdated 'показаться другим, появиться среди других', *стесняться при людях, что люди скажут?, выйти (выбиться, пробиться) в люди* outdated 'достичь после усилий хорошего общественного положения', *думать о людях (т.е. не только о себе)*.

Important is also 4.2. HUMAN AS A SPECIES. Here, a significant group are lexical units in which humans are presented as a special species, different from others, for example *люди* 'живые существа, обладающие мышлением, речью, способностью создавать орудия труда и использовать их в процессе общественного производства', *человек* 'живое существо, в отличие от животного обладающее даром речи и мысли и способностью создавать и использовать орудия в процессе общественного труда', *человек* 'живое существо, обладающее даром мышления и речи, способностью создавать орудия и пользоваться ими в процессе общественного труда' or *человеческий* 'прил. к человек в 1 знач.' (живое существо, в отличие от животного...), *женской половине человеческого рода ни одна, хотя бы самая передовая, буржуазная республика не дала ни полного равенства с мужчиной по закону, ни свободы от опеки и от угнетения мужчины*. Important are also examples in which a human is perceived through the aspect of development of its species, for example: *человек разумный, первобытные люди* or *первобытный человек*.

Significant is also 5.1. CHARACTER. A large group of examples can be observed which denominate permanent mental characteristics of a human, both positive and negative ones, for example: *добрый человек, люди доброй воли, невыносимый человек, свет не без добрых людей, хороший человек, человек он не плохой, добрые люди помогли, добрые люди* 'люди, доброжелательно, сочувственно настроенные', *несчастный человек, гадкий человек, смешной*

человечек or *ни себе, ни людям* 'о том, кто не пользуется сам и не даёт пользоваться другим'. Characteristic is the emphasis on the fact that a man is imperfect by nature, e.g., *все мы люди, все человеки или все мы человеки* colloquially 'шутливая погов. в извинение каких-нибудь слабостей или недостатков'.

Also mentioned should be facet 6. AXIOLOGICAL SPHERE. A human/a man is shown here as the carrier of values, for example: *человек это звучит гордо, вот человек!* colloquially *поступить человечно, человек* 'личность как обладатель лучших интеллектуальных или моральных качеств', *человек* 'то же, как носитель каких-нибудь внутренних качеств, свойств, личность', *человечный* 'гуманный, достойный человека, отзывчивый, внимательный к чужой личности', *поступать по-людски, рассуждать по-человечески* or to the contrary, e.g. *в нем нет ни капли человечности, вы так низко пали, что у вас не осталось и следа человеческого чувства, что он за человек?*

Other sub-facets are not so significant in reconstruction of the manner of profiling the image of a human. From among those not yet listed, worth noting are: 8.2. COMMUNITY, e.g., *люди* 'лица, принадлежащие к какой-либо общественной среде, группе и т.п.', *люди планеты Земля, люди* 'лица, принадлежащие к какой-н. общественной среде, группе, имеющие какой-н. общий признак', *молодые люди* 'молодые мужчины, а также вообще молодёжь', *человечество* 'человеческий род; люди'; 11.2. ORIGIN, e.g. *дворовые люди* 'живущие в качестве слуг при господском доме крепостные крестьяне, лишённые земельных наделов', *ваш папенька, покойник, мне благодетель, в люди меня вывел, вывести в люди кого* outdated 'помочь занять хорошее общественное положение', *простые люди* 'небогатые и непритязательные, а также вообще трудовой народ'; 10. A HUMAN AS AN INDIVIDUAL, e.g. *человек* 'любое лицо; всякий', *человек* 'употр. в знач. местоимения: всякий (т.е. любой человек), никто (т.е. никакой человек), кто-нибудь (т.е. какой-нибудь человек) и т.п.', *ему ничего не стоит обидеть человека, человек никогда не должен себя ронять, я этого человека никогда не видал*; 3. APPEARANCE, e.g. *красивый человек, рослый человек, смешной человек*. 7. ACTIVITY, e.g. *рабочий человек, люди искусства, люди науки, учёный человек, человек* 'в России при крепостном праве: дворовый слуга, служитель, лакей, а позднее официант, слуга'. The remaining facets are marginally important.

It should be noted that some facets on the Russian part have no examples assigned, which is the consequence of the adopted procedure of distinguishing facets based on the Polish materials. Those are 5.3. MENTAL PROCESSES, 8.4. HISTORIC EVENTS, HISTORIC PROCESSES, 9.1. SELF-AGENCY.

Based on the collected and analysed material, the manner of profiling the image of a human in the Russian language can be reconstructed.

A human/a man¹⁵:

- remains in relations based on performing some work for someone (8.3),
- is in relations with other people (8.1),
- is part of nature, different from other species, is a subsequent stadium in the development of its species (4.2),
- is a being distinguished by some character traits, both good and bad ones (5.1),
- is (not) a carrier of values (6),
- is part of a community, is perceived collectively (8.2),
- comes from somewhere, lives somewhere (11.2),
- is perceived as an individual, is the performer of an activity (10),
- is distinguished by a specific appearance (3),
- takes an action, not necessarily related to exercising their profession (7),
- is perceived through the aspect of being alone or with other people (2),
- is at a specific age (1),
- lives, resides in specific conditions (11.1),
- acquires knowledge and education (5.2),
- is part of nature, subject to biological processes, their body is divided into smaller parts (4.1),
- passively accepts what happens to them (9.2),
- is a spiritual being, having a religious sphere (12),
- is a being which has its internal world in a specific state (5.4).

However, a human/a man:

- is not a being in whom mental processes take place (5.3),
- is not in a relation to the course of history, does not feel its consequences (8.4),
- is not able to make an effort to change what happens to them (9.1).

Conclusions

As expected, both similarities and differences are visible between the reconstructed methods of profiling the image of a human in the Polish and Russian language.

Table 3. Comparison of the manner of profiling the image of a human in the Polish and Russian language

No.	Profiling of the image of a human in the Polish language	Profiling of the image of a human in the Russian language
1.	Origin	Professional relations
2.	Axiological sphere	Human relations
3.	Character	Human as a species

¹⁵ From the most important aspect to the least important one.

4.	Activity	Character
5.	Human as a species	Axiological sphere
6.	Professional relations	Community
7.	Living conditions of a human	Origin
8.	Appearance	Human as an individual
9.	Human relations	Appearance
10.	Community	Activity
11.	Historic events, historic processes	Quantity
12.	Quantity	Age
13.	Anatomy and physiology	Living conditions of a human
14.	Age	Knowledge and education
15.	Human as an individual	Anatomy and physiology
16.	Knowledge and education	Submission to fate
17.	Mental processes	Human and religion
18.	Submission to fate	Mental state
19.	Human and religion	
20.	Self-agency	
21.	Mental state	

Source: own study

Both for Poles and Russians, significant in a human is 6. AXIOLOGICAL SPHERE and perception of the human in the context of the species (4.2. HUMAN AS A SPECIES).

It is worth noting that, based on the lexicographic sources, it is important for both Polish and Russian speakers to perceive a man through the aspect of their relations with other people. Although it should be emphasized that the Russians place this aspect higher, with simultaneous omission of historic issues (8.4. HISTORIC EVENTS, HISTORIC PROCESSES), which I shall discuss in more detail in the following part of the article.

Similarities comprise also the fact that in both those languages, the sub-facet 12. A HUMAN AND RELIGION belongs to those of marginal importance. The same applies to aspects related to fate (9.2. SUBMISSION TO FATE, 9.1. SELF-AGENCY), 5.4. MENTAL STATE and 5.3. MENTAL PROCESSES.

Significant differences between the methods of profiling are visible in the five most important sub-facets. The first five facets do not include the key sub-facet in the manner of profiling a human in the other language. This clearly indicates differences in the understanding of a human/a man by the two nations. Most important for Poles is 11.2. ORIGIN, while for Russians 8.3. PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS.

In my opinion, it is interesting and noteworthy that presentation of a man in the context of their work for others, of being in a relation of duty-state (8.3. PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS), which is the key aspect of the Russian method of profiling of the image of a human, has a very rich history and goes back not so much to the previous system (as supported by examples from works or speeches by Stalin and Lenin) but rather to a much earlier, pre-revolutionary period.

Interesting is the position of 6. AXIOLOGICAL SPHERE. It is important for both Poles and Russians (as mentioned above), but for Polish language users it is one of the key ones, while for Russian speakers only the fifth one.

A very important difference is the lack of examples in several facets in the Russian language: 8.4. HISTORIC EVENTS, HISTORIC PROCESSES, 9.1. SELF-AGENCY and 5.3. MENTAL PROCESSES. Most striking is the lack of material for the first of the listed sub-facets, since in the Polish language, it is in the middle of the ranking list. This is probably the result of the specifics of the Russian dictionaries, influenced by the history and the communist system under which they were published.

Interesting is the fact that although on the Polish part, in the context of the relation between a man and their fate, examples of both 9.2. SUBMISSION TO FATE and 9.1. SELF-AGENCY (although less numerous) can be found, there are no examples in that sub-facet on the Russian part.

An obvious difference is the place of each individual sub-facet. There is no facet which would take the same place in the hierarchy of importance in both those languages while reconstructing the manner of profiling of the image of a human.

The analysis of the lexicographic material confirms the initial hypothesis. Although the Polish and Russian languages are related and geographically close to each other, significant differences can be observed in the reconstructed methods of profiling of the image of a human. Users of both those languages perceive a human differently, and also have a different hierarchy of the aspects which to them are most relevant in the image of a human.

Sources

BAS – В.И. Чернышёв (eds), *Словарь современного русского литературного языка* [*Slovar' sovremennoo russkogo literaturnogo yazyka*], vol. 1-17, Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of USSR, Moscow-Leningrad 1950-1965, <https://www.academia.edu/seoar-ch?q=%D0%A1%D0%9B%D0%9E%D0%92%D0%90%D0%A0%D0%AC%20%D0%A1%D0%9E%D0%92%D0%A0%D0%95%D0%9C%D0%95%D0%9D%D0%9D%D0%9E%D0%93%D0%9E%20%D0%A0%D0%A3%D0%A1%D0%A1%D0%9A%D0%9E%D0%93%D0%9E%20%D0%9B%0%98%D0%A2%D0%95%D0%A0%D0%90%D0%A2%D0%A3%D0%A0%D0%9D%D0%9E%D0%93%D0%9E%20%D0%AF%D0%97%D0%AB%D0%9A%D0%90> (access: 26.11.2022).

- Ozhegov – С.И. Ожегов [S.I. Ozhegov] (eds), *Словарь русского языка [Slovar' russkogo yazyka]*, Moscow 1949–1950, <https://dic.academic.ru/contents.nsf/ogegova/> (access: 26.11.2022).
- SJPDor – W. Doroszewski (eds), *Słownik języka polskiego*, vol. 1–11, Warsaw: PWN, 1958–1969, <https://doroszewski.pwn.pl> (access: 26.11.2022).
- Ushakov – Д.Н. Ушаков [D.N. Ushakov], *Толковый словарь русского языка [Tolkovyy slovar' russkogo yazyka]*, vol. 1–4, Moscow 1934–1940, <https://dic.academic.ru/contents.nsf/ushakov/> (access: 26.11.2022).
- WSJP PAN – P. Żmigrodzki (eds), *Wielki słownik języka polskiego*, IJP PAN, Cracow, since 2007, <https://wsjp.pl> (access: 21.11.2022).
- Yefremova – Т.Ф. Ефремова [T.F. Yefremova] (eds), *Современный толковый словарь русского языка Ефремовой [Sovremennyy tolkovyy slovar' russkogo yazyka Yefremovoy]*, Moscow 2000, <https://dic.academic.ru/contents.nsf/efremova> (access: 21.11.2022).

Literature

- Апресян Ю.Д. [Apresian J.D.], 1995, *Образ человека по данным языка попытка системного описания, "Вопросы языкознания" [Obraz człowieka po danym języka popytka systemnego opisanija, "Woprosy jazykoznanija"]* 1, pp. 37–67.
- Bartmiński J., 1990, *Punkt widzenia, perspektywa, językowy obraz świata*, in: J. Bartmiński (eds), *Językowy obraz świata*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, pp. 109–127.
- Bartmiński J., 1993a, *O profilowaniu pojęć w słowniku etnolingwistycznym*, in: V.N. Toporov (eds), *Philologia Slavica. K 70 letiju akademika N.I. Tolstogo*, Moscow: "Nauka" edition, pp. 12–19.
- Bartmiński J., 1993b, *O profilowaniu pojęć w słowniku etnolingwistycznym*, in: J. Bartmiński (eds), *Profilowanie pojęć. Wybór prac*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, pp. 7–17.
- Bartmiński J., 1996, *O "Słowniku stereotypów i symboli ludowych"*, in: I. Bartmińska, J. Bartmiński, S. Niebrzegowska (eds), *Słownik stereotypów i symboli ludowych*, vol. I, [part] 1, Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, pp. 9–34.
- Bartmiński J., Chlebda W., 2008, *Jak badać kulturowo-językowy obraz świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów?*, "Etnolingwistyka" 20, pp. 11–27.
- Bartmiński J., Niebrzegowska S., 1998, *Profilę a podmiotowa interpretacja świata*, in: J. Bartmiński, R. Tokarski (eds), *Profilowanie w języku i w tekście*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, pp. 211–224.
- Bartmiński J., Tokarski R., 1986, *Językowy obraz świata a spójność tekstu*, in: T. Dobrzyńska (ed.), *Teoria tekstu. Zbiór studiów*, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, pp. 65–81.

- Grzegorzczkova R., 1990, *Pojęcie językowego obrazu świata*, in: J. Bartmiński (eds), *Językowy obraz świata*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, pp. 41–59.
- Grzegorzczkova R., 1993, *POKORA, PYCHA i pojęcia pokrewne*, in: J. Bartmiński, M. Mazurkiewicz-Brzozowska (eds), *Nazwy wartości. Studia leksykalno-semantyczne*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, pp. 23–39.
- Grzegorzczkova R., 2015, *Co to jest językowy obraz świata i dlaczego warto go badać?*, "Poradnik Językowy" 1, pp. 7–13.
- Langacker R., 1987, *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, vol. 1: *Theoretical Prerequisites*, Stanford.
- Langacker R., 1995, *Wykłady z gramatyki kognitywnej*, H. Kardela (ed.), Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Łozowski P., 2018, *Panchronia, czyli język jako symbol doświadczenia*, in: P. Stelmaszczyk (ed.), *Metodologie językoznawstwa. Od diachronii do panchronii*, Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, pp. 165–176.
- Maćkiewicz J., 1999, *Co to jest językowy obraz świata*, "Etnolingwistyka" 11, pp. 7–24.
- Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska S., 2015, *O profilowaniu językowego obrazu świata*, "Poradnik Językowy" 1, pp. 30–44.
- Rak M., 2010, *Czym nie jest językowy obraz świata?*, in: R. Przybylska, J. Kąś, K. Sikora (eds), *Symbolae grammaticae in honorem Boguslai Dunaj*, Cracow: "Biblioteka LingVariów", t. 9, pp. 485–495.
- Wierzbicka A., 1991, *Język i naród: polski los i rosyjska sud'ba*, "Teksty Drugie" 3 (9), pp. 5–20.

