I. Rozprawy i analizy

Ida S t r i a
ORCID: 0000-0002-7715-0758
(University of Warsaw)

Linguistic worldview in multilingual groups as an indicator of developing a communal identity: The case of Esperanto

Linguistic worldview is a language-entrenched interpretation of reality that emerges in a speech community inseparable from its culture. Therefore, the task of ethnolinguistics is to reconstruct not only worldviews but also communal identities. Drawing from both linguistic and co-linguistic data, researchers may be led to a culturally embedded speech community – not necessarily a monolingual one. A case in point are speakers of Esperanto, who form a multilingual voluntary diaspora. The status of Esperantists as a stable speech community could be investigated within the ethnolinguistic framework, with a view to finding a homogenous cultural worldview that attests to their communal identity. This article presents two pilot studies which suggest that active Esperanto speakers hold a coherent worldview based on the sense of belonging to the community and its shared culture.

Key words: linguistic worldview; Esperanto; communal identity

1. Introduction

Esperanto is an international auxiliary language initiated in 1887. Over the years it has developed into a full-fledged language with a robust community and has become a tool of self-identification of a multilingual voluntary diasporic minority (see Blanke 2001; Duličenko 2001; Fiedler 2002; Stria 2015, 2017b). The construal of the communal identity of such a group could be achieved by employing methods known from ethnolinguistic research.

Finding a homogenous cultural worldview of Esperanto speakers that would point to its status as a stable multilingual speech community en-

trenched in its own culture is a task that might reveal some of the charac-
teristics of Esperanto interaction. The community has not been intensively
studied so far; therefore, the present paper draws on both ethnolinguistics
and sociolinguistics in an attempt to collate data from diverse studies and
suggests that committed Esperanto speakers present a coherent worldview
based on the sense of belonging to the community and its shared culture,
which on the whole could substantiate the status of the group as a speech
community.

2. Ethnolinguistics and communal identity

The task of ethnolinguistics is to reconstruct not only *linguistic world-
views* but also *communal identities*. It is thus "an inquiry into collective iden-
tities and narratives interpreting the reality" (see Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska
2017: 11). Identity is understood here as "the common part of the self-
identification of individual members of a given community abstracted from
their identities together with the set of symbols, values and beliefs that they
share, reference to which is treated as a sign of belonging to this community"
(Bartmiński and Chlebda 2008: 13).[1] This common part is recurrent and
partly reproducible.

2.1. Linguistic worldview

The idea of the linguistic worldview (*Weltansicht*) explicitly appeared
in the first half of the 19th century in the works of Wilhelm von Humboldt
(see Głaz et al. 2013: 11–24; Underhill 2009). He claimed that speakers of
various languages form their particular worldviews under the influence of the
inherent specific structure of their language and "simultaneously cultivated
language by leaving their own personal impressions upon it" (Underhill 2009:
122). *Weltansichten* are culture-dependent, developed in speech communities
with a shared system of beliefs and values along with their corresponding
symbols (cf. Underhill 2009: 55ff.).

This conception has come to be mistaken with the conception of *Weltan-
schauung*, that is, socially constructed worldviews, which may be different
in the same language (e.g. socialist and Christian views of German-speaking
people) but the same across languages (e.g. liberal views of English and
German speakers). However, they still form a part of the linguistic worldview
as understood by Jerzy Bartmiński.

---

[1] All quotations translated by the author.

According to the latest definition of Bartmiński (2012: 23), the linguistic worldview (henceforth LWV) is

> a language-entrenched interpretation of reality, which can be expressed in the form of judgments about the world, people, things or events. It is an interpretation, not a reflection [...]. The interpretation is a result of subjective perception and conceptualization of reality performed by the speakers of a given language; thus, it is clearly subjective and anthropocentric but also intersubjective (social). [...] It influences [...] the perception and understanding of the social situation by a member of the community.

The LWV in fact is one of a set of seven interrelated concepts, namely: the LWV itself, stereotypes as its components, cognitive definition as a tool for describing linguistic stereotypes, profiling, the values of the subject (also in the sense of *Weltanschauung*), the subject's point of view and perspective, and finally the subject. The focal point is the dynamic character of the LWV, which is a social, changing interpretation. Fragments of the LWV are reconstructed through description of stereotyped judgements (profiling) about an object, which are then joined together in bundles (facets) to create a cognitive definition of that object/notion. The definition's structure largely depends on the viewpoint and perspective of the speaking subject. Therefore, the subject can be reconstructed by a detailed profiling of a notion.

This indicates that the facets cannot be reproduced and reconstructed without a subject or a community with a common cultural background. And if profiling a notion may lead the researcher to the speaking subject, then at the same time drawing from both linguistic and co-linguistic data may lead back to a culturally embedded communicative community.

2.2. Language and culture

It is generally agreed that culture is an inseparable part of worldview. Therefore research material should be drawn as much from typical linguistic sources (dictionaries, texts, corpora) as from co-linguistic data (traditions, culturally determined behaviour, clichéd symbolic representations) (Maćkiewicz 1999; Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2017). Jerzy Bartmiński argues that cultural patterns should be included in the experiential frame along with conceptualisations (2012: 89).

Jerzy Bartmiński admits that the linguistic worldview can have two interpretations: subject- and object-oriented. The object-oriented interpretation requires language to influence culture, "for without it one cannot participate in culture or in social life" (Bartmiński 2012: 12). According to Łozowski (2013: 352), the subject-oriented interpretation suggests that conceptualisations entrenched in language derive from cultural experience.

All this follows closely the assumptions of Humboldt for whom thinking and language are complementary: they are embedded in culture and at the same time influencing it (Andrzejewski 1989: 153f.; Underhill 2009: 65f.).

This would suggest that a common (cultural) background is a prerequisite to form a common LWV. Only a speech community or a community of practice could develop and maintain a *Weltansicht*. What follows in reverse is that an existence of a stable LWV among Esperanto speakers (however fuzzy due to their heterogeneity) could attest to their communality.

3. Multilingual groups

Speech communities need not be monolingual. On the contrary, cases of multilingual[2] communities are abundant. Here an interesting question would be how stable their worldviews are depending on the language used. If one assumes that language influences or suggests worldviews, should we treat temporary, occasional groups of native speakers of different languages speaking for example English at a meeting as a community having some common – partly, at least – worldview? Let us take as an example foreign exchange students, living and studying together in one city for one semester. It might so happen that they would develop a temporary common worldview. It would, however, last only as long as the group itself. In contrast, multilingual societies (living on a delimited territory for a longer time with the same languages over the years, established traditions and a common cultural and historical background) most probably develop consistent and sustainable worldviews.

Where might Esperanto – an international, deliberately constructed language – be placed on this continuum? Unquestionably, Esperantists are not an ethnic, a national or a territorial group. Even as a voluntary diaspora they communicate on a rather irregular basis. However, even as an artificially devised language, it has been developing naturally in a large, living community. Formally, typologically, or even sociolinguistically it may be seen as nearly equal with "natural" languages (see below). Another approach to demonstrate the status of Esperantists as a communicative community could be also an ethnolinguistic one, that is, finding a common stable worldview to construe their communal identity.

---

[2] Multilingualism is understood here in the sense of speaking more than one language in any combination, be it more than one native language or one native language and any number of L2 languages.

4. Esperanto as a natural language

Esperanto is an international auxiliary language deliberately constructed on the basis of elements from chosen natural languages by L. L. Zamenhof and first published in 1887. The language is artificially made; yet, it may be formally and structurally treated as natural (this approach is described in more detail in Stria 2015).

Additionally, Esperanto has a large and dynamic community – a reasonable estimate would be between 40,000 fluent speakers (Gledhill 1998: 10) up to ca. 2 million speakers of diverse proficiency according to Corsetti (2012: 69) and Wandel (2015). Some of them are even third-generation native speakers.

The feature most often required of a language to be considered natural is the existence of native speakers (not necessarily monolingual; cf. Lindstedt 2006). Esperanto is the only artificial language which has about 1,000-2,000 of them (Corsetti 2012: 70). The nativisation of Esperanto and its continuous usage in families contributes to the lexical and stylistic expansion to new domains. Nevertheless, Esperanto native speakers constitute much less than 1% of the community (at least 10% is needed to consider a language on its way to being creolised; Liu 2006: 57). As Fiedler (2012) remarks, they are not norm providers. They might repeat idiosyncratic or erroneous patterns of their parents and about 50% abandon Esperanto at some point in adulthood (Rašić 1994).

Therefore Esperanto speakers cannot rely on the *denaskuloj* (literally 'from-birth-people') in the community. The shared norms are rather negotiated within the core of the movement, which comprises an overwhelming majority of L2 speakers (similar to the international usage of English). And since Esperanto's sociolinguistic position cannot depend on its native speakers, other factors must be taken into consideration to substantiate the status of a speech community.

5. Community through identity

The communicative/speech community perspective views a decisive factor in structured homogeneity, that is, shared characteristics of a group, such as co-presence, social class, gender, age, and ethnicity. Many a definition is therefore not applicable to Esperanto.[3] Territorial distribution (Esperanto

---

[3] An extensive discussion of the term *speech community* may be found in Patrick (2002).

is more of a diaspora language), frequent and regular interaction (Esperanto users keep in touch primarily through written messages or meet at occasional congresses; although lately internet communicators allow for more spoken contact) or ethnicity do not shape the community. Neither do native speakers, whose importance is emphasised by generativists.

Instead, Esperanto speakers (at least those engaged in the Movement) may be viewed in terms of communities of practice, i.e. "collection[s] of people who engage on an ongoing basis in some common endeavour", which "emerge in response to common interest or position, and play an important role in forming their members' participation in, and orientation to, the world around them" (Eckert 2006: 683).

A second difficulty is to determine what the relation between an Esperanto speaker and an Esperantist is. Galor (2001) observes that different people have different relations to Esperanto; there are people who know Esperanto but do not use it, those who simply speak it for various reasons, and thirdly, language activists. Similarly, Wood (1979) writes that the Esperanto movement consists of supporters not speaking Esperanto, simple users not active in the Movement, and "mainstream" Esperantists.

Caligaris (2016) asked participants in her two studies (Castelsardo with 25 participants and Fai della Paganella with 65 participants) about the identity of an Esperantist: *Laŭ vi, eblas konsideri sin Esperantisto ĉar...* ("In your opinion, one can consider oneself an Esperantist because..."). In Castelsardo 12 (almost a half) responded that it was sufficient to speak Esperanto, without identifying with its ideals and 13 (a little over 50%) that one would have to speak it as well as identify with its ideals. The numbers in Fai della Paganella were markedly different: 1/3 thought it sufficed to speak Esperanto, while as many as 40 (61.5%) considered it of equal importance to speak it and identify with the ideology behind it (Caligaris 2016: 218, 342).

It would seem that only Wood's "mainstream" Esperantists (i.e. active Esperanto speakers engaged in the Movement) would correspond to what is traditionally considered a speech community. In the core of the Esperanto movement two main phenomena are observable: shared values and identity through language and shared language norms.

Esperanto was designed as a common language among people of different origins speaking different languages. It spread not as a communicative necessity but as a voluntary choice because of its "internal idea", that is, the hope to propagate peace on the basis of a culturally neutral language. The reasons behind studying it have been changing, of course. However, one of the major reasons has always been the ideology. Half of Catalan Esperantists stated that they agreed with the idea behind Esperanto (Alòs

i Font 2012, 35; only one main reason was supposed to be given). Galor and Pietiläinen (2015: 43) argued that for 67% the most important reason for continued interest in Esperanto was its ideals, for almost 47% willingness to make the world better through using it and for 46% interest in other countries and people (more than one response was allowed). According to Caligaris (2016: 211, 331), the respondents participate in the ideals behind the planned language (16/28 in Castelsardo and 48/65 in Fai della Paganella) and believe that Esperanto might become an international language (14/28 in Castelsardo and 32/65 in Fai della Paganella). The preference for this particular language over any other is here more important than membership by ethnicity (Wood 1979: 433) or nationality.

The small number of native speakers in Esperanto gives equal status to all users – L2 speakers are as much valued in deciding on language norms. The standards are rather established in cooperation with the speakers. Their contribution to the development of language (see especially the role of translators in Fiedler 2006) creates a sense of importance and belonging, and strong language loyalty. Fiedler (2002: 64) argues, too, that "the Esperanto speakers are, while learning the language, also becoming members of the community and participants in its culture". This suggests that Esperanto speakers, irrespective their proficiency level, form a community of L2 users rather than one of L2 learners (see Pavlenko 2003). Some authors choose to call the community a *quasi-ethnic* one, emphasising the existence of common culture (Melnikov 1992).

Esperanto speakers maintain their identity also through an outright rejection of English. The need to resist English influences might stem from different sources. On the one hand, small languages fight against the domination of a larger, internationally used language to survive locally. Striving for recognition strengthens the sense of belonging and the identity of the speakers (Kimura 2010, 2012; Krägeloh and Neha 2014). On the other hand, Esperanto as a language designed to facilitate international communication must face competition globally. Purism is therefore a means to create a sense of unity.

In conclusion, Esperantists are a varied group of both speakers and supporters. Nevertheless, core, "mainstream" Esperantists (that is, advanced speakers actively participating in the movement) constitute a community of practice negotiating the social meanings of Esperanto and creating their communal identity through shared values and norms. Their status might furthermore be reinforced by means of ethnolinguistic research.

6. Reconstructing the worldview

Scholars reconstructing the LWV propose as a material basis diverse sources from system data to live instances (Grzegorczykowa 1999; Anusiewicz et al. 2000; Bartmiński 2012; cf. Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska 2017). Jerzy Bartmiński (2012: 71) explicitly expresses his conviction that in order to obtain "content adequacy", the researcher may refer to several different types of data: the language system, texts, questionnaires with native speakers, as well as sociological and ethnographic data. However, cognitive definitions based on only one type are also acceptable. These assumptions have been developed to the fullest in the EUROJOS project (EUROJOS 2008; Abramowicz et al. 2009). The project postulates that the examination is to be based on a wide array of data to show the dynamicity of a language. Dictionaries are the source of general definitions; stylistically neutral examples should be extracted from texts and corpora balanced with respect to style and political orientation (this follows the assumption that *Weltansicht* is not the same as *Weltanschauung*); questionnaires should be administered to at least 100 respondents.

7. Pilot studies

I would like to present two cases of similar ethnolinguistic surveys (both investigating the linguistic worldview of advanced Esperanto speakers; conducted fully in Esperanto), yet different in that one tries to find a consistent *Weltanschauung* and the other focuses rather on *Weltansichten* of the speakers:

– Stria 2016 (henceforth Lille-15): conducted in 2015 during the 100th World Esperanto Congress (July 25–August 1, 2015, Lille, France) and through the mailing lists of Interlinguistic Studies at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland (32 advanced Esperanto speakers including two native speakers);

– Eurojos-17: a now on-going online survey by Koutny and Stria as part of the EUROJOS-2 project (37 advanced Esperanto speakers, no native speakers by 12 Sep 2017).

Both questionnaires contained 7 complex questions about personal data in Part II. In order to verify the level of Esperanto against the declared level, the participants also answered questions about frequency of usage of known languages and the preferred language in daily use for various activities. Additionally, Eurojos-17 contained a question about the participants' activity

in the Esperanto Movement. In part I (about the LWV) Lille-15 contained 16 complex open questions, while Eurojos-17 contained 24 questions in 7 groups.

The questions of Lille-15 were designed to cover several areas of interest (for details see Stria 2016, 2017a). They concerned typical cognitive categories (prototypicality, e.g. 'list 5 animals and 5 vegetables'), cross-culturally varying linguistic stereotypes (personifications of the sun, life etc., symbolic values of animals and plants, colour stereotypes), lexicalisations and collocations, Esperanto culture and finally the stereotype of an Esperantist.

Prototypicality of plants and animals (Qs 2, 5 and 12) proved to be a difficult task to study. Esperanto speakers do not typically concern themselves with this area and therefore often do not know the needed names. In several cases, they clearly transfer from their native languages. Similarly, colours (Qs 1 'What is the colour of. . . ' and 11 'What/who is of this colour?') are known to vary cross-linguistically and cross-culturally. The pool of the respondents did not contain enough speakers of languages and cultures from outside Europe to confirm the assumption that Esperantists do not categorise colours in the same way. Moreover, metaphorical values of animals and plants in Q10 and Q13 differed across languages. This pilot study showed that Esperantists transfer their LWVs from their native languages in all of the chief domains but the cultural one.

Questions pertaining to Esperanto culture attest the strength of Esperanto culture among active Esperantists, even though it is not taught as a part of an educational system. Moreover, the stereotypes that active Esperantists have of themselves are sufficiently consistent and strong.

For example, Q4 (with 7 prompts) tested knowledge of concepts that should be recognisable only to active members of the community. The respondents were asked to supply short descriptions to given situations.

A. *Li ĉiam estis aktiva esperantisto, sed ĵus forlasis la movadon. (Kion li faris?)* [He was always an active Esperantist, but has just left the movement. (What has he done?)]

B. *Kiam ili estas inter esperantistoj, ili ofte parolas en sia denaska lingvo. (Kion ili faras?)* [When they are among Esperanto speakers, they often speak in their native language. (What do they do?)]

In the above questions, expected answers were: *kabei(ĝ)i*, from the initials of Kazimierz Bein (pseudonym *Kabe*), who was a very well-known Esperantist until suddenly entirely abandoning the language, and *krokodili* 'to crocodile', i.e. speak one's native language when Esperanto is supposed to be used. *Kabei* (an intransitive verb) was given 26 times and *kabeiĝi* (a reflexive form) 4 times. This cultural concept is thus known to 29 out of 31 who responded. The only ones who paraphrased the prompt not knowing the expected answer

were the two young native speakers not active in the Movement ('stopped being active' and 'lost interest'). All 31 respondents knew the expression *krokodili*. This is not unexpected, as this word is also widely known outside Esperantoland as an example of original Esperanto culture and linguistic creations.

Although some participants did not respond as expected, many responses drew from Zamenhof's literary works and his collection of proverbs, Esperanto sayings and cultural keywords. The answers confirmed the assumption that native speakers would not be able to recognise some concepts if not being active Esperantists (this is also shown in Koutny 2010).

Questions 6, 7 and 8 concerned the stereotype of an Esperantist, as the Esperantists themselves see it. Q8 asked about a "true" Esperantist. The most frequent answers were 'uses the language' (11), 'knows the language well' (9), and 'works for the benefit of Esperanto' (9). The stereotypisation index [Si] of the two most frequently given characteristics of a true Esperantist was very high (29.85; in comparison, that of a German was 18.16 in Bartmiński 2012: 182).

Q6 was a BUT-test that required respondents to imagine a stereotypical Esperantist and to provide a contrasting feature. Out of 6 most frequent ones, 4 features coincided with those of a "true" Esperantist.

In question 7, the participants were asked to list cultural symbols of an Esperantist. There is a strong relationship between Esperanto with the green star (26), the green flag (20), and the hymn *La Espero* (14).

Lille-15 showed that the view of an Esperantist seems to be a rather homogenous well-developed set of features. The autostereotype is solid and concerns the language. The most common features in the BUT-test confirm the view of a "true" Esperantist as speaking the language fluently and being active for Esperanto and the Movement.

In Eurojos-17 we asked, among others, about JUSTICE and EQUALITY (other questions pertained to MOTHER, FAMILY, LOVE, FRIENDSHIP, TOLERANCE, and LANGUAGE).

A. According to you, what is the essence of true justice?

For 15 respondents justice is the same as equality and the same opportunities for everyone. 11 participants thought instead of objectivity (judgment of situation according to circumstances, giving to those who deserve), yet 7 of (economic) compensation for "the weak".

B. According to you, what is the essence of overt injustice?

The answers to this question confirmed the previous ones (16: 'inequality', 'different opportunities', 'discrimination'; 9: 'bias'; 6: 'lack of (economic) resources and assistance'). However, one new feature appeared, that is 'suffering, repression' (5 answers).

What, then, is EQUALITY? 24 (!) respondents wrote that it is the same chances and opportunities, respect and understanding. Only 4 responses pertained to economic situation and another 4 to objectivity.

Eurojos-17 suggests that JUSTICE is seen variously because Esperanto speakers are not a homogeneous group and come from different environments. It should rather be treated in categories of *Weltanschauung* according to the political orientation of participants. Meanwhile, EQUALITY is consequently presented as equal chances.

On the one hand, questions about political or ideological views were not expected to yield a uniform worldview, as Esperantist come from diverse backgrounds and belong to several speech communities at the same time. On the other hand, these worldviews seem to be surprisingly consistent and supporting the observation that Esperanto speakers choose to speak the language because of its "internal idea" (Caligaris 2016: ch. 5) and that they likewise choose their identity of an Esperantist.

These pilot studies imply that non-native Esperanto speakers indeed transfer their LWVs from their native languages in several domains; as Block (2009: 144) puts it: "in the FL [foreign language] setting, there is usually far too much first language-mediated baggage and interference for profound changes to occur in the individual's conceptual system and his/her sense of self in the TL [target language]". In the cognitive domains Esperanto clearly remains an L2 (or L3..., not to use the marked label of a "foreign" language). However, at the same time there exists a homogeneous, culturally embedded LWV of Esperanto, understandable for non-native speakers. Partial or even full immersion in Esperanto culture seems therefore possible, even though Esperanto speakers do not stay in TL-mediated environments. Block (2009: 144) argues that a TL identity might be achieved by "disembedding the TL from a faraway native culture [...] and framing it as an international resource within reach of learners". Esperanto is treated as an international culturally neutral auxiliary language by its learners. They nevertheless naturally become part of the community through immersion in the language's own culture.

8. Co-linguistic data

Jerzy Bartmiński and Wojciech Chlebda (2008: 13) write that communal identity may manifest itself in a common "reference base", that is "a set of

authority figures, symbolic dates and works, emblematic events, readings etc.". The identity of Esperanto speakers is manifested in frequent references to Zamenhof (the creator), *la Unua Libro* (the First Book, i.e. an introduction to Esperanto published in 1887), *la Fundamento* (16 rules grammar rules from 1887, a mini-dictionary from 1894 and example sentences, also from 1894, published together and declared "untouchable" in 1905) and some canonical names (Grabowski, Kabe), works (original literature as well as translations), and events (Montevideo 1954, Rauma 1980) known to more advanced speakers.

The results of the Lille pilot study (the importance of green, the flag and the star) are borne out by co-linguistic data. Many Esperantists display a habit of wearing t-shirts portraying Zamenhof and declaring knowledge of Esperanto, green t-shirts with the five-pointed star, green clothes in general, pins with the Esperanto star, having pictures and busts of Zamenhof home as well as the flag, and taking pictures with so-called ZEOj (Zamenhof-Esperanto objects, e.g. street names, busts, statues). Traditionally World Esperanto Congresses cannot go without singing the hymn and reading Zamenhof's speeches out loud.

9. Conclusion

It may be stated that members of the Esperanto movement (as opposed to speakers of other artificial languages) constitute a speech community in a loose sense or rather a community of practice bound by shared ideologies and values. The community consists of fully endorsed L2 users, who shape their identity as multicompetent and cooperative speakers of an international language (see also Fiedler 2017; Stria 2017b).

Obviously, the community's worldview may not be treated fully on a par with those of ethnic developed languages, which are acquired from birth, taught in schools and are used on everyday basis. Esperantists do not have a common consistent cognitive *Weltansicht* due to their very different backgrounds.

However, the worldview relating to the autostereotype and the common cultural base – that is, pertaining to the communal identity – proved to be rooted. This allows for a claim that active Esperantists may be called a speech community and not merely a temporary group of multilingual people speaking one language at a given time, as one would call a tourist and a local speaking English in Madrid or participants of a one-off international lecture.

Interestingly, the fact that also the *Weltanschauung* of advanced Esperanto speakers is surprisingly rather consistent – although they at the same time belong to other communities – results from the motives for which many learn Esperanto in the first place, that is, for example, the *interna ideo* (the internal idea of Esperanto; hope to propagate peace on the basis of a culturally neutral language) or the *Praga manifesto* (a document that establishes widely shared principles of the Esperanto movement, among others, democracy, linguistic rights, linguistic diversity).

It may be cautiously concluded that the core of the Movement presents a coherent worldview based on the feeling of belonging to the community, its culture and norms. Conversely, this consistency of worldviews may attest to the communal identity of active Esperanto speakers and is thus one more criterion that allows us to confirm their status as a speech community.

References

Abramowicz, Maciej, Jerzy Bartmiński, and Wojciech Chlebda. 2009. Językowo-kulturowy obraz świata Słowian na tle porównawczym. Założenia programu A. *Etnolingwistyka* 21: 341–342.

Alòs i Font Hèctor. 2012. Catalan Esperantists: Pacifists in a globalised world. *ICIP Working Papers* 3: 1–64.

Andrzejewski, Bolesław. 1989. *Wilhelm von Humboldt*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.

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

Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2012. *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*. London, Sheffield: Equinox.

Bartmiński, Jerzy and Wojciech Chlebda. 2008. Jak badać językowo-kulturowy obraz świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów? *Etnolingwistyka* 20: 11–27.

Blanke, Detlev. 2001. Vom Entwurf Zur Sprache. In *Planned Languages: From Concept to Reality*, ed. Klaus Schubert. 37–89. Brussel: Hogeschool voor Wetenschap en Kunst.

Block, David. 2009. *Second Language Identities*. London: Continuum.

Caligaris, Irene. 2016. *Una lingua per tutti, una lingua di nessun paese: una ricerca sul campo sulle identità esperantiste*. Ariccia: Aracne Editrice.

Corsetti, Renato. 2012. The Movement for Esperanto: Between creolization and the Report Grin / La Movado Por Esperanto: Inter Kreoliĝo Kaj La Raporto Grin. *InKoj. Philosophy and Artificial Languages* 3 (1): 58–78.

Duličenko, Aleksandr. 2001. Planlingvo: inter lingvokonstruo kaj etna lingvo. In *Studoj pri interlingvistiko: Festlibro omaĝe al la 60-jariĝo de Detlev Blanke = Studien zur Interlinguistik: Festschrift für Detlev Blanke zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Sabine Fiedler and Haitao Liu. 109–115. Dobrichovice (Praha): Kava-Pech.

Eckert, Penelope. 2006. Communities of practice. In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, ed. Keith Brown. Vol. 2: 683-685. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

EUROJOS. 2008. Językowo-kulturowy obraz świata Słowian i ich sąsiadów na tle porównawczym (EUROJOS). http://ispan.waw.pl/default/pl/projekty-naukowe/eurojos.

Fiedler, Sabine. 2002. On the main characteristics of Esperanto communication. In *Lingua Franca Communication*, ed. Karlfried Knapp and Christiane Meierkord. 53–86. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Fiedler, Sabine. 2012. The Esperanto *denaskulo*: The status of the native speaker of Esperanto within and beyond the Planned Language Community. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 36 (1): 69–84.

Fiedler, Sabine. 2017. Lingua-franca-Kommunikation – wirklich ein Fall des Let-it-pass? (Eine Analyse von Reparaturen in der Esperanto-Kommunikation). In *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Interlinguistik*, ed. Cyril Brosch and Sabine Fiedler. 57–71. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag GmbH.

Galor, Zbigniew. 2001. Esperanto-movado: ĉu perdita komunumo? In *Studoj pri interlingvistiko: Festlibro omaĝe al la 60-jariĝo de Detlev Blanke = Studien zur Interlinguistik: Festschrift für Detlev Blanke zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Sabine Fiedler and Haitao Liu. 504–523. Dobrichovice (Praha): Kava-Pech.

Galor, Zbigniew and Jukka Pietiläinen. 2015. *UEA en konscio de Esperantistoj*. Dobrichovice (Praha): Kava-Pech.

Głaz, Adam, David S. Danaher, and Przemysław Łozowski (eds.) 2013. *The Linguistic Worldview: Ethnolinguistics, Cognition, and Culture*. London: Versita.

Gledhill, Christopher. 1998. *The Grammar of Esperanto: A Corpus-Based Description*. München: Lincom Europa.

Grzegorczykowa, Renata. 1999. Pojęcie językowego obrazu świata. In *Językowy obraz świata*, ed. Jerzy Bartmiński. 39–46. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Kimura Goro, Christoph. 2010. La kornvala kaj Esperanto: entreprenoj similaj? In *La arto labori kune: festlibro por Humphrey Tonkin*, ed. Detlev Blanke and Ulrich Lins. 171–177: Rotterdam: Universala Esperanto-Asocio.

Kimura, Goro Christoph. 2012. Esperanto and minority languages: A sociolinguistic comparison. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 36 (2): 167–181.

Koutny, Ilona. 2010. Esperantlingva bildo de la mondo. In *La arto labori kune: festlibro por Humphrey Tonkin*, ed. Detlev Blanke and Ulrich Lins. 290–305. Rotterdam: Universala Esperanto-Asocio.

Krägeloh, Chris and Tia N. Neha. 2014. Lexical expansion and terminological planning in indigenous and planned languages. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 38 (1): 59–86.

Lindstedt, Jouko. 2006. Native Esperanto as a test case for natural language. In *A Man of Measure: Festschrift in Honour of Fred Karlsson on His 60th Birthday*, ed. Mickael Suominen. *SKY Journal of Linguistics 19 (special supplement)*: 47–55.

Liu, Haitao. 2006. Neutrality of international languages. *Journal of Universal Language* 7(2): 37–64.

Łozowski, Przemysław. 2013. Language vis-à-vis culture in Jerzy Bartmiński's cognitive ethnolinguistics. In *The Linguistic Worldview: Ethnolinguistics, Cognition, and Culture*, ed. Adam Głaz, David S. Danaher, and Przemysław Łozowski. 351–370. London: Versita.

Maćkiewicz, Jolanta. 1999. Co to jest 'językowy obraz świata'. *Etnolingwistyka* 11: 7–24.

Melnikov, Aleksandr. 1992. *Specifaj kulturaj scioj de la esperantista kvazaŭetno kaj ilia respeguliĝo en la koncerna lingv(aĵ)o*. Rostov-na-Donu: Esperanto-Klubo Rostov-Don.

Niebrzegowska-Bartmińska, Stanisława. 2017. Jakie dane są relewantne etnolingwistycznie? *Etnolingwistyka* 29: 11–30.

Pavlenko, Aneta. 2003. 'I never knew I was a bilingual': Reimagining teacher identities in TESOL. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education* 2(4): 251–268.

Rašić, Nikola. 1994. *La rondo familia: sociologiaj esploroj en Esperantio*. Pisa: Edistudio.

Stria, Ida. 2015. Esperanto as a natural language. *Język, Komunikacja, Informacja* 10: 32–42.

Stria, Ida. 2016. Inventing languages, inventing worlds. Towards a linguistic worldview for artificial languages. Dysertacje Wydziału Neofilologii UAM w Poznaniu 29. Poznań.

Stria, Ida, 2017a. Haben Esperanto-Sprecher ein gemeinsames Weltbild? Zu den Ergebnissen einer Fragebogenstudie. In *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Interlinguistik*, ed. Cyril Brosch and Sabine Fiedler. 103–110. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag GmbH.

Stria, Ida. 2017b. Language attitudes among Esperanto speakers. *Język, Komunikacja, Informacja* 12: 146–158.

Underhill, James W. 2009. *Humboldt, Worldview and Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wandel, Amri. 2015. How many people speak Esperanto? Esperanto on the Web. *Interdisciplinary Description of Complex Systems* 13(2): 318–321.

Wood, Richard E. 1979. A voluntary non-ethnic, non-territorial speech community. In *Sociolinguistic Studies in Language Contact*, ed. William F. Mackey and Jacob Ornstein. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Językowy obraz świata w grupach wielojęzycznych jako wskaźnik wykształcania tożsamości zbiorowej – przypadek esperanta

Językowy obraz świata jest osadzoną w języku interpretacją rzeczywistości. Powstaje we wspólnocie komunikatywnej nierozerwalnie związanej ze swoją kulturą. Zadaniem etnolingwistyki jest zrekonstruowanie nie tylko obrazów świata, ale także tożsamości społecznych. Opierając się na danych językowych i przyjęzykowych, badacz może przebić się do kulturowo osadzonej wspólnoty komunikatywnej – niekoniecznie jednojęzycznej. Niewątpliwie esperantyści są wielojęzyczną, dobrowolną diasporą. Wykazanie, że esperantyści mają status stabilnej wspólnoty językowej może oprzeć się na danych etnolingwistycznych, na poszukiwaniu jednorodnego kulturowego obrazu świata potwierdzającego ich wspólnotową tożsamość. W niniejszym artykule przedstawiono dwa badania pilotażowe, które sugerują, że aktywni esperantyści prezentują spójny obraz świata oparty na poczuciu przynależności do wspólnoty komunikatywnej i jej kulturze.

Słowa kluczowe: językowy obraz świata; esperanto; tożsamość zbiorowa