

CZESŁAW ROBOTYCKI
Institute of Ethnology
Jagiellonian University
Cracow

THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF CULTURE IN POLAND. A FINISHED PROJECT

In 1980 a group of ethnographers published a collection of their postulates in "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" ["Polish Folk Art"]. They proposed a different approach to ethnography. The reaction of the community of ethnographers was one of disbelief. However, Aleksander Jackowski "Jacek", editor-in-chief of "Polska Sztuka Ludowa", continued to publish this group's articles and supported its "manifesto" (Benedyktowicz, Robotycki, Stomma, Tomicki, Wasilewski, 1980-1981).

The main point of the manifesto is that there is no science of culture when the scope of research is restricted or anachronistic methods are employed which, in the opinion of the group, was the case with Polish ethnography. Consequently, ethnography must attempt to evaluate its own research potential, and use a new methodology. Furthermore, those who want to address the problems of complex modern culture must additionally face the task of defining new research problems, methods and ways of interpretation. The explanatory power of the paradigm of traditional folk culture has been exhausted and the prospects of anthropology as reinterpretation have appeared.

The manifesto of the group (known in the community as "them") was supported by a few articles in which they substantiated their postulates (Benedyktowicz, 1980; Robotycki, 1980; Stomma, 1976; 1978-1979; 1979; Tomicki, 1975; 1976; Wasilewski, 1979a; 1979b). The manifesto was like a working dictionary of concepts and authors to which its signatories referred most often.

The group organized many field investigations, meetings, discussions and conferences. Organized and conducted without any set patterns and pomp, often entertaining, the meetings attracted new participants, ambitious students and interested people from outside the community of ethnographers. This pattern itself became a target of criticism but the real value of such meetings and there were many of them were hardly noticed.

After 1980 new texts appeared, first in "Polska Sztuka Ludowa", then books, which addressed three types of problems: the analysis and evaluation

of ethnographic discourse to date, the evaluation of broadly understood ethnographic practice and interpretations which expounded cultural sense, meanings and mythical constructions of collective ideas (see: bibliography).

The anthropological option in Polish ethnography has been developing for at least fifteen years. Today, it is an accepted mode of interpretation. It is not a methodological phenomenon which is likely to soon disappear.

Anthropological proposals to change the models of interpretation relate to many important issues: the scope of research, proper methods, the ontological status of culture, the scholar's place, the levels of explanation, competence, languages and the modes of expression. Adoption of one solution with respect to any of the above issues requires consistent transformation of other elements of the interpretive system. Therefore, in the subsequent discussion of the achievements and further options of anthropology in Poland, a logical order has been adopted.

Anthropological interpretation developed in Polish ethnography as independent research options. This was possible because different theoretical ideas appeared at the same time, which made it possible to look at culture from different points of view. The question about the essence of culture and methods of its investigations undermined the realistic model of science. In the realistic model the essence of culture was often looked for outside of culture, for example in economic or social sciences.

Anthropology used different methods to interpret culture. It recognized the semiotic, polysemic and communicative character of culture. It imposed a methodological postulate of a systematic approach to culture. It became necessary to look for the internal rules of culture and more general patterns at a different level to be able to interpret culture (Buchowski, 1986; Robotycki, 1992a; Stomma, 1979; 1981; 1986; Węglarz, 1991).

Other aspects and other possibilities were offered by hermeneutic approaches which stressed the research of symbols and world-views emphasizing the mythical-ritual character of culture (Benedyktowicz, 1980; 1988a; Czaja, 1993; Michera, 1991; 1994a). Other aspects that were interpreted by the researchers included the entanglement of norms and attitudes connected with one's outlook on life (Tomicki, 1977; Robotycki, 1980) and the cosmological-ritual vision of the world (Tomicki, 1975; 1976; 1979). Often the same problem was analyzed from different points of view. For example, the categories of homeliness and strangeness were analyzed from the phenomenological (Benedyktowicz, 1987) and structural (Stomma, 1986; Węglarz, 1994) points of view.

The works, mentioned here as examples of permanent tendencies in research procedures, finally overcame the old paradigms. The actual use of new methods helped make the Polish science of culture more dynamic. Good knowledge of original works by authors of new trends in world ethnology

and ethnography is the basis for positive research alternatives and criticism of Polish achievements (Piątkowski, 1985; Stomma, 1989).

Polish anthropologists, following the directions of change and tendencies in contemporary science, realized that their interests and disputes were only one version of disputes arising on a wider scale (Robotycki, Węglarz, 1983). They were familiar with discussions about the new scope and possibilities of anthropology (Burszta, 1992b; Kaniowska, 1985; 1991; Tokarska-Bakir, 1990). They were interested in problems bordering ethnology and linguistics (Burszta, 1986), ethnology and semiotics (Piątkowski, 1993) and ethnology and art (Piątkowska, 1994; Robotycki, 1992). They studied more general ontological and epistemological problems pertaining to culture (Barański, 1992a; Buchowski, 1990; Burszta, 1992a; Kaniowska, 1994).

On the other hand, the criticism of Polish achievements helped give shape to independent interpretive ideas, helped recall Polish authors with a precursory thinking and in this way differentiated Polish anthropology. This proved to be very significant as Polish problems have different contexts. It deals with a different culture; even today it claims to deal with national culture. It must also take a stand towards basic methodological problem: the usefulness of the so-called peasant model of traditional culture to interpretation. All these facts undoubtedly define the Polish character of a Polish anthropology of culture.

How then is Polish ethnography evaluated by authors belonging to the anthropological trend? First of all, they say that practically all scholars dealing with folk culture and the culture of the folk type (the concept proposed by L. Stomma) were "brought up" in the ethnographic tradition and they continue to research culture in this tradition. For those scholars the concept of "traditional peasant culture" by definition belongs to ethnography, performing there a paradigmatic role. The model and modelling character of this notion, belonging to the metadescription of culture, generates other texts which belong to the same canon. And this does not pertain to "academic ethnography" alone.

Ethnography also comprises amateur texts, museums and folkloric reconstructions. It easily settles into an apocryphal layer of culture and is perceived as such by society. This perception is facilitated by culture itself because it speaks many languages. This perception is also facilitated by the way in which folk culture is popularized in Poland.

Examples of apocryphal texts include many old and modern descriptions of regional culture written by various scholars. Their texts are the result of the authors fascination with distinct local characters. They were and are written spontaneously, without any theoretical background except for fragments of explanatory systems, which often originated at different times and in different branches of science. Among modern works the traditional model of folk culture is the theoretical foundation that is used most often; practically these works are based on the "folklorized" versions of the model.

An ethnographic museum is also, like science, a metatext of culture. Its exhibitions belong to its canon and a historical look at the essence of the museum and the analysis of its functions tell us that we once as creators of museums, today as experts in museum management, are consciously or subconsciously guided by and use, a collection of theoretical judgements. These judgements concern both the scope and nature of cultural reality and how we evaluate the choices and customs of "the other".

The way a museum is perceived by the society and scholars is not indifferent to visual representations of ethnography. The exhibitions help popularize knowledge about culture. When popularized, the knowledge undergoes hypostasis. A statement about reality is taken as reality. Hence, the cliché question about the role of cultural context ceases to be a cliché question when it comes to museum reconstruction and presentation of cultural phenomena. What becomes important is the scale of the context, its relation to the main exhibit, as well as its legibility and intelligibility.

From the point of view which differentiates between high and low culture, it is art museums which collect masterpieces that fit the canon and which reject works that do not fit the canon (daub, trash). Should, then, ethnographic museums which deal in the apocryphal layer of culture, collecting objects which are often a replica, a cultural reject, a daub, trash, adopt a different point of view? This is what is happening. By adopting the autonomy of folk and community cultures, a canon of folk culture can be established. A museum, the metatext sphere, creates such a canon. The traditional peasant culture remains such a canon in Polish museums.

Museum exhibitions rarely take account of the fact that subcultures are in continuous dialogue. This metaphor should reflect the essence of the internal, communicational mechanism of culture. This dialogue is a permanent relation of exchange, transformation, circulation of ideas, meanings, symbols, objects, etc. The same meanings can occur in different forms, simplifications, transpositions, variants, and options.

The scope and possibilities of dialogue are determined by the competence of its participants – the users of culture. They use a complete code (which means complete knowledge of rules and linguistic and cultural meanings) or a limited code (in which the linguistic scope and semantic knowledge are fragmentary and perception of reality is stereotypical). This nature of cultural communication poses new questions: what reality are we dealing with?, with whom is the museum holding the dialogue and what dialogue is it?, who is the recipient of this dialogue?, what kind of response of the recipient is expected? These are important questions because modern culture is returning to forms of pictorial communication, described by G. Vico, in which a picture is first, followed by articulation and interpretation.

The above problems are issues which resulted from the anthropological

look at culture. Their solution belongs to anthropology. They answer questions pertaining to, firstly, the ontology of culture (how does culture exist), secondly, epistemology which analyzes processes of transfer, consciousness and competence, and thirdly, axiology when criteria are determined, choices made and evaluated (see: "*Warsztaty Etnograficzne*" ["Ethnographic workshops"], 1991).

Similar issues pertain to folklore as one element of national culture. Folklore based on the old folk culture is an element that has disappeared from the universe of Polish culture. Under the influence of social processes helping to balance differences and create new, different layers of culture, folklore has undergone many changes and transformations. Attempts at delaying this process are made by ethnographers and regionalists, convinced about the educational and aesthetic values of the old cultural sequences. They do this by reaching amateur, spontaneously formed groups or by acting as instructors working at the commission of institutions and patrons.

Instructors of folkloric groups (ethnographers, ethnomusicologists, choreographers) want the folklore to remain in harmony with tradition. However, what does this mean? How can tradition be defined and criteria of correspondence be determined? Instructors believe that the traditional folklore is that of the turn of the 19th century. The model of traditional peasant culture remains to be the theoretical base for practical work.

Attempts are made to reconstruct or replicate folklore, although in many cases this is ineffective as accounts and reports about the "old times" were blurred, idealized and given a mythical dimension, which is a feature of the internal change occurring in any culture.

We come across the same ethnographers and instructors when they act as members of the jury of many folkloric festivals and contests. They observe and evaluate groups once worked with as their instructors or as teachers of their present instructors. A viscous circle is thus formed, a closed set of ideas circulating between instructors, activists, groups and specific competition audience, who together form the movement of folklore lovers. Thus, ethnographers help create a form of folklore which is the sum of their knowledge, beliefs from around the turn of the century, attitudes to tradition and projection of their own values. At the time of postmodernist chaos this folklore has gained another value as a particularly attractive cultural alternative. Its enthusiasts did not notice its false dimensions, naivety and ethnographic illusion of the phenomenon.

What is needed is awareness that when one participates in maintaining the world of values one creates a cultural fiction, which belongs to critical ironists who find it easier to point to the insoluble paradoxes of such a socially useful character of ethnographic work.

When one attempts to project folk culture, one must remember that she is subjected to the power of positive myth. But the myth is also the source of another paradox bordering folk culture, its investigators and users.

Since the first publications by Jan Maciej Karol Wścieklica, many critical observers, writers and scholars agreed that what intellectuals thought about peasants and what peasants thought about intellectuals did not become either of the class. These opinions did not pertain to external differences but to the understanding of the very core of culture. The traditionally "ethnographic" picture of the Polish village and its empirical reality often passed each other. This antinomy is detected both in scholarly and popular texts.

The dichotomy between, for example, the aesthetic awareness of the so-called "folk" and folk culture, between morality and special values of peasant culture, the adoption of which folk lovers tried to persuade us for a hundred years, became an eyesore every now and then. Often we deal with a quasi reality which, like any other, can be object of analysis. This is another reason for proposing a kind of critical self-evaluation of ethnography, its anthropology. A set of assumptions has to be adopted before we start to practise this anthropology.

The progress of scientific reflection leads to modifications or change of the paradigm. Consequently, texts are eliminated from its canon. Such a process can take a different course. When it is evolutionary, new elements are introduced to the paradigm in force, which, in the case of the model of traditional peasant culture, only leads to eclecticism, which I strongly oppose.

When sentences from outside the system of the theoretical language are included into it, nothing is solved as, according to Thomas Kuhn, knowledge is not universal and cumulative. What is important are changes of entire systems made by criticism and reinterpretation. This opens new research possibilities, changes the perception of entire research areas and the same facts can be put in a new, different light.

Advocates of the paradigmatic concept of the "traditional peasant culture" would agree with their critics that the empirical counterpart of the model, i.e. the autonomous peasant culture, undergoing continuous changes, is today a historical reality. If this thesis is combined with the considerations discussed above, the whole can be summed up as follows.

There is no longer any equivalent of the model of the "traditional peasant culture". In many texts by Polish anthropologists criticism of the disciplinary matrix connected with this model is made. Consequently, canon texts are being replaced at the level of the metadescription of culture in the categories of science.

Anthropological reinterpretation, defining itself by the negation of the ethnographic version of the description of culture, demythologizes these former views. Its work consists in analyzing the theoretical systems, owing to which it is possible to find there figures of thinking, axiological beliefs, judgements inappropriately subordinated to reality, etc. This would not be possible if anthropologists did not pass the stage of methodological analyses, which

enhanced their efficiency and taught them to logically and self-critically analyse their own texts. The work they had to do helped them realize that the tension between reality and possibilities of its description would not disappear, that they also had to look for forms of its description which are different than the ones used so far.

The demythologization of the text of Polish ethnography is done differently. Its authors make us aware that in science there is a place for axiological opinions and the old positivist rationalism (Robotycki, Węglarz, 1983), lack of correspondence between theoretical and empirical levels in explication (Burszta, 1987; Buchowski, 1990). They reject historical fiction and myths of the culture of a Polish village from the 19th century (Stomma, 1986). They point out the differences between the ethnographic picture of folk culture and its real, modern state (Robotycki, 1992; Piątkowska, 1994b).

These ideas, undermined by anthropologists, are persistent among ethnographers who are immune to the radical anthropological propositions. There are authors fighting with the fiction of the so-called genuine folklore and folk art. These are concepts popular among festival jurors (Burszta, 1989; Piątkowska, 1994a; Robotycki, 1990a).

Schematism, figurativeness and stereotypes existing in the old and more recent academic knowledge about folk culture have mythical foundations. This is noticed by critical anthropologists, who, by proper analyses of ethnographic texts, create the anthropology of ethnography, hardly accepted by those who are not capable of an autoironic attitude (Burszta, 1992b; Robotycki, 1993; Piątkowski, 1994; Stomma, 1989).

On the other hand, the "positive" proposal of anthropology penetrating the areas of common awareness, shaped by literature, press, school books and mass media, has been adopted without major problems. Here, the figures of thinking, cliches, and stereotypes seem to be something natural. Forms of analysis using a dictionary and anthropological methods are applied to very different analyses (see: *Mitologie popularne* [Popular mythologies], 1994). There are many anthropological works of this type; I will quote only a few, selected to reveal the spectrum of possibilities that anthropology in Poland has managed to work out.

Thus, there are anthropological analyses of film art (Benedyktowicz, 1992b; 1994; Michera, 1992a; Sznajderman, 1992b; Czaja, 1992a; 1992d), as well as analyses of trivial films about explorers, Batman and vampires (Sznajderman, 1992a; Szpilka, 1988; 1992a; Robotycki, 1992b). Advertising in an equally popular topic, referring to various mythologies or using mythical structures to persuade (*Mitologie popularne* [Popular mythologies], 1994; Czaja, 1994b; Barański, 1995; Szpilka, 1994). Anthropologists also analyzed rock music (Burszta, 1994a; Ciarka, 1988a) and popular music (Burszta, Piątkowski, 1994b), visual arts (Ciarka, 1988b; Piątkowska, 1994b; Robotycki, 1992a;

Sikora, 1994). Hidden meanings were sought in architecture and urbanization (Benedyktowicz, 1991; Czyżewski, 1994) or space (Czyżewski, 1992; Michera, 1994b). There were also works aimed at discovering stereotypes in school books and literature for children (Stoczkowski, 1989), tricks used by journalists in texts addressed to mass readership (Czaja, Robotycki, 1986). There are more and more texts on the popular reception of history (Stomma, 1991a).

This extensive range of problems discussed by scholars is undoubtedly a success of the new look at culture. It is of less importance what path was taken by the development of problems (this should be discussed by future historians). What is important is the very fact that new problems have been advanced and discussed.

Reinterpretation, the re-reading of source texts or texts once written by ethnographers and today considered the canon of ethnography, is an important postulate of the anthropology of culture. Reinterpretation was possible owing to the changes in methodological orientations. The results of this were very interesting – they helped discover what seemed to be exhausted topics, in which the game of symbolic meanings, archetypes and mythical transformations were found. Examples are works on the symbolic dimensions of the house (Benedyktowicz, 1992a), reconstructions of the anthropogenic myth (Tomicki, 1979), mythology of the plague (Sznajderman, 1994a; 1994c), mythical dimensions of the blacksmith (Barański, 1992a) and saints (Benedyktowicz, 1987; Wasilewski, 1987b; Węglarz, 1983a; 1983b).

Anthropology is equally interesting when it starts dealing with its own texts, when it decomposes its own propositions and research results. It is presently the consensus among anthropologists that different structuralisms have been exhausted. However, the importance of structuralism as inspiration and taxonomically effective method is still emphasized (Węglarz, Burszta et al., 1987). Polemics with the great paradigm of ethnology with respect to beliefs, rituals and magic have been carried on by J. S. Wasilewski (1989). A closer look at history is found in L. Stoma (1991a; 1992; 1994) and C. Robotycki (1992a; 1992c).

When anthropology attempts discussion of problems related to the essence and dialogue of culture, it finds itself in dilemmas and questions to which final answers are not provided. But it must address such issues because they make it a science. It is another plane on which anthropology has to face itself (Tokarska-Bakir, 1990). The awareness of the consequences of one's own epistemological attitudes, suspension of values and cultural relativism and, consequently, application of the measure of astonishment to one's own culture, are problems typically addressed by anthropological reflection. There is no scale of correctness here, as some scholars say (Stomma, 1992; 1994; Burszta, Piątkowski, 1994; Robotycki, 1992a). But others (Czaja, 1988) once asked: where do the ironic attitude, skeptic nihilism, the attitude of jester lead to?

Answers to these questions are choices which reach the deepest senses, which in extremes lead either to selfdestruction of one's own science or adoption of values (Tokarska-Bakir, 1992; 1995).

The interests of anthropological interpretation are not restricted; anthropology addresses different topics pertaining to various areas of culture, yet gives preference to modern topics. If it addresses the past, it usually refers to its analogy, historical framework or a sequence of transformations. The ethnographic tradition of anthropology and its bias towards modern times help it address various phenomena from two points of view. "Primitive" and "contemporary" are structure and not a temporal sequences. When analyzing cultural phenomena between these two extremes, one can ask: how does the former exist in the latter?, where is the essence of permanence and transformation? Anthropological interpretation is an answer to these questions (Benedyktowicz, 1992a). Hence, we are not surprised by the scope of problems and boldness of associations that anthropologists presented in their first works (*Szkice i próby etnologiczne* [Ethnological essays], 1985). The ideas presented there were further elaborated in their more mature works.

Polish anthropology postulates further analyses. It draws attention to forgotten fragments of culture. For years it advocated addressing the dark sides of culture. The entire culture of the so-called "People's Poland" in its schizophrenic functioning requires reinterpretation and a richer and truer documentation.

The imperialism of scope to which the anthropology I have described becomes prey can seem suspicious. Its unrestricted scope can, however, be defended. It results from a few reasons.

Firstly, anthropology understood in this way is a science bordering other humanistic sciences.

Secondly, anthropological theses are more and more often quoted in humanism.

Thirdly, the departure point which emphasizes that it is culture which determines the acquisition of common and scientific knowledge is widely recognized.

Fourthly, and most importantly, anthropology has entangled itself in ontological, epistemological and axiological disputes, in this way starting a dialogue with other branches of sciences. In these dialogues anthropology significantly influences the outcome by providing different arguments although it does not define its scope. Hence, the concept of anthropological interpretation as is understood equivalent to contemporary anthropology. The question, what is anthropology – a science or art of understanding, appears every now and then. Let us add that Clifford Geertz's arguments in favour of its interpretative character are universally recognized.

In the general characterization of Polish anthropology presented above I

pointed to four aspects which decided that this approach is different compared with other ways of researching culture.

I explained how folk culture is defined as an object of research, I showed that anthropological procedures lead to the demythologization of cultural facts, and help read source and metacultural texts, including anthropological ones, according to the new fashion. This has resulted in a shift of the research field and emergence of new problems. In sum, it appeared necessary to look for way of interpretation beyond traditionally understood ethnography from which Polish anthropology as a kind of critical reflection originated.

The range of possibilities drawn from other humanistic discipline is very wide. However, the examples quoted help define a more general trend. Interpretations draw a lot from postmodernism and deconstruction, which consist in repeating the same in a different manner, in intertextual dialogue, in ironically quoting oneself. This is the character of, for example, the analysis that looks for cultural senses when poetry, which should be interpreted, is used as the key to the interpretation of the phenomenon (Szpilka, 1991; Benedyk-towicz, 1992a).

The situation with deconstruction, an interpretative practice consisting in undermining the philosophy which is being voiced or the oppositions on which it is based, is similar. A deconstructionist points to rhetorical procedures lying at the base of his reasoning, key concept or tenet (Burszta, 1993). In other words, deconstruction is a game of returns, repetition of the same from a different perspective. And anthropology is like that – it interprets culture and itself in this way.

One approaches anthropology from different theoretical positions and by different paths but always independently. In this essay I did not try to find methodological relationships. Among the authors mentioned are those who are the disciples of the Poznań school of Jerzy Kmita. Most of them, however, were connected with the group which published the 1980 manifesto.

Finally, there is a group of autonomous scholars. Among them are Jacek Ołędzki and others – Krzysztof Kubiak, Zbigniew Libera, Małgorzata Maj, in whose research achievements anthropological preferences can be detected. Their followers have already published in the only Polish anthropological periodical “Polska Sztuka Ludowa. Konteksty” [“Polish Folk Art. Contexts”].

In conclusion, let me point out that:

Firstly, I have presented a certain research proposal, continually discussed, which only shows that it is always topical;

Secondly, I have used the term of the anthropology of culture and I often used the notion of ethnography. In the text I used interchangeably the notions of anthropology and anthropological interpretation. I have done so because I think that ethnography, in its old sense, from which anthropology originated, would not be able to bear the burden of interpretation of the phenomena of

modern culture, which is structurally complex, speaks many languages, and is metatextual. Today, there is no doubt that ethnographic texts also belong to this culture and therefore they also can be the object of analysis. Thus, a wider anthropological interpretation of such culture is necessary;

Thirdly, it is obvious that not every investigator of culture must take a stand similar to that presented above. There are examples of other approaches to ethnography and anthropology. Not everybody must be interested in the programme presented here and in the pragmatics of its accomplishment;

Fourthly, one should not avoid reflection upon the branch of knowledge one practises;

Fifthly, I would once again like to support the claim expressed in the title that the anthropology of culture in Poland is a finished project.

Post Scriptum

The bibliography is incomplete, in fact it is only fragmentary and should be treated as a point of reference to the problems and possibilities of anthropology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barański Janusz

- 1992a *Kowal – mit w akcji* [The blacksmith – a myth in action], "Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Etnograficzne" folio 30.
- 1992b *O heurystycznej wykładni dwóch teorii etnologicznych. Dekonstrukcja sprawy słonia* [On the heuristic interpretation of two ethnological theories. Deconstruction of the elephant issue], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 1.
- 1995 *Czy metafora może być bajką* [Can a metaphor be a fairy tale], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa. Konteksty" 49, No 1.

Benedyktowicz Zbigniew

- 1980 *O niektórych zastosowaniach metody fenomenologicznej w studiach nad religią, symbolem i kulturą* [On some applications of the phenomenological method to the study of religion, symbol and culture], "Etnografia Polska" vol. 24, folio 2.
- 1981 *Odpowiedź na ankietę: etnografia, etnologia czym są...* [Response to the questionnaire: what are ethnography, ethnology...], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 35, No 2.
- 1983 *Symboliczne i kulturowe aspekty monastycyzmu wschodniego. Sacrum i profanum w kulturze...* [Symbolic and cultural aspects of Oriental monasticism. Sacrum and profanum in culture...], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 37, No 3-4.
- 1987 *"Gość w dom, Bóg w dom" i obcy jako bogowie* ["A guest at home is God at home" and strangers as gods], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 41, No 1-4.
- 1988a *Symbol w etnografii* [Symbol in ethnography], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 42, No 3.
- 1988b *Stereotyp – obraz – symbol. O możliwościach nowego spojrzenia na stereotyp* [Stereotype – image – symbol. On possibilities of a new look on the stereotype], "Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Etnograficzne" folio 24.
- 1991 *Widmo środka świata. Przyczynek do antropologii współczesności* [The phantom of the centre of the world. Contribution to the anthropology of modern times], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 45, No 1.

- 1992a (with D. Benedyktowicz) *Dom w tradycji ludowej* [Home in the folk tradition], "Wiedza o kulturze", Wrocław.
- 1992b *Marta i Maria. Uwagi o "Uczcie Babette"* [Marta and Maria. Remarks on "Babette's feast"], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 3-4.
- 1994 *"Tango" taniec uniwersalnej alienacji* [Tango – a dance of universal alienation], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 48, No 1-2.
- Benedyktowicz Z., Robotycki C., Stomma L., Tomicki R., Wasilewski J. S.
1980-1981 *Antropologia kultury w Polsce – dziedzictwo, pojęcia, inspiracje. Materiały do słownika* [Anthropology of culture in Poland – legacy, concepts, inspirations. Materials for a dictionary], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 34, No 1-2; 35, No 1.
- Buchowski Michał
1986 *Magia. Jej funkcje i struktura* [Magic. Its functions and structure], UAM, Poznań.
1987 *Kilka uwag o pewnej brytyjskiej recepcji dzieła Lévi-Straussa* [A few remarks on a certain British reception of Lévi-Strauss' work], "Lud" vol. 71.
1990 *Racjonalność. Translacja. Interpretacja* [Rationality. Translation. Interpretation], UAM, Poznań.
1991 *Obrzęd, rytuał, ceremonia* [Custom, ritual, ceremony], "Rocznik Muzyczny" vol. 4, Włocławek.
1993 *Przeciw skrajnemu relatywizmowi* [Against extreme relativism], in: *Inspiracje postmodernistyczne w humanistyce* [Postmodernist inspirations in humanism], PWN, Warszawa – Poznań.
- Burszta Wojciech
1986 *Język a kultura w myśli etnologicznej* [Language and culture in the ethnological thought], PTL, Wrocław.
1987 *Natura – myśl symboliczna – kultura* [Nature – symbolic thought – culture], "Lud" vol. 71.
1989 *Od folklorizmu lokalnego do "postfolklorizmu" narodowego* [From local folklorism to national "postfolklorism"], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 43, No 3.
1992a *Wymiary antropologicznego poznania kultury* [Dimensions of the anthropological cognition of culture], UAM, Poznań.
1992b *Etnologia dzisiaj albo siła peryferii* [Ethnology today or the power of periphery], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 2.
1993 *Utracona niewinność? Rozterki antropologii postmodernistycznej* [Innocence lost? Irresolutions of postmodernist anthropology], in: *Inspiracje postmodernistyczne w humanistyce* [Postmodernist inspirations in humanism], *op. cit.*
1994 *Yes. Nostalgiczne strefy pamięci* [Yes. Nostalgic spheres of memory], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 48, No 1-2.
- Burszta Wojciech, Piątkowski Krzysztof
1992 *Antropologia współczesna, antropologia współczesności czy antropologia negatywna* [Contemporary anthropology, anthropology of modern times or negative anthropology], in: *Socjologia a antropologia. Stanowiska i kontrowersje* [Sociology versus anthropology. Opinions and controversies], ed. E. Tarkowska, "Wiedza o kulturze", Wrocław.
1994 *O czym opowiada antropologiczna opowieść* [What is an anthropological tale about?], Instytut Kultury, Warszawa.
- Ciarka Ryszard
1988a *Punk-Rock*, "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 42, No 1-2.
1988b *Sacrum, mit, książka...* [Sacrum, myth, book], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 42, No 3.
1990a *Napisy na murach i etnografia współczesnego miasta* [Graffiti and the ethnography of a modern town], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 44, No 2.

- 1990b *Święty obraz w szarym bloku* [A holy picture in a grey block of flats], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 44, No 3.
- 1992 *Film i prawdziwy obraz rzeczy* [Film and the true picture of things], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 3-4.
- 1994 *O sposobach zabijania zwierząt* [On methods of killing animals], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 48, No 3-4.

Czaja Dariusz

- 1988 *Dylematy błazna* [The dilemmas of a jester], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 42, No 4.
- 1990 *Spór o model etnologicznej interpretacji* [Controversy over the model of ethnological interpretation], "Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Etnograficzne" folio 27.
- 1991 *Krajobraz z Tobiaszem* [A landscape with Tobiash], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 45, No 3-4.
- 1992a *Mentalność i mit rewolucyjny* [Mentality versus revolutionary myth], "Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Etnograficzne" folio 29.
- 1992b *Moment wieczny. O "Uczcie Babette"* [An eternal moment. About "Babette's feast"], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 3-4.
- 1992c *Symbol i film. Uwagi metodologiczne* [Symbol versus film. Methodological remarks], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 3-4.
- 1992d *Wenecja i śmierć. Konteksty symboliczne* [Venice and death. Symbolic contexts], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 3-4.
- 1993 *Symbol w antropologii kultury* [Symbol in the anthropology of culture], "Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Etnograficzne" folio 32.
- 1994a *O sztuce zdziwienia i głupstwach popkultury* [On the art of surprise and stupidities of pop culture], in: *Mitologie popularne* [Popular mythologies], ed. D. Czaja, Universitas, Kraków.
- 1994b *Reklamowy smak raju: między archetypem a historią* [The taste of Eden in advertising: between the archetype and history], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 48, No 1-2.

Czaja Dariusz, Robotycki Czesław

- 1986 *Rodzina wiejska na Podlasiu według tygodnika "Przyjaciółka"* [A rural family in Podlasie according to the "Przyjaciółka" weekly], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 40, No 3-4.

Czyżewski Adam

- 1992 *Pejzaż z pamięci czyli w sprawie niedokończonego przypisu* [A landscape from memory or on an unfinished footnote], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 36, No 1-4.
- 1994 *Ochrona ptaków i budowniczowie* [Protection of birds versus construction workers], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa. Konteksty" 48, No 3-4.

Kaniowska Katarzyna

- 1985 *Dychotomia natura – kultura jako szczególny problem etnologii* [The dichotomy nature-culture as a special problem of ethnology], "Etnografia Polska" vol. 29, folio 1.
- 1989 *Socjologiczna wizja ewolucji kultury ludzkiej* [Sociological vision of the evolution of human culture], in: *Problemy metodologiczne etnografii* [Methodological problems of ethnography], PAN–Ossolineum, Kraków.
- 1991 *Surrealizm i etnografia* [Surrealism and ethnography], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 45, No 1.
- 1994 *Problem opisu w etnologii* [The problem of description in ethnology], in: *Pożegnanie paradygmatu? Etnologia wobec współczesności* [A farewell to the paradigm? Ethnology versus modern times], ed. W. J. Burszta and J. Damrosz, Instytut Kultury, Warszawa.

Krupa Maciej

- 1989 *Skrzypek na dachu, czyli Żyd uniwersalny* [Fiddler on the roof or a universal Jew], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 43, No 1.

Michera Wojciech

- 1984 *Dlaczego krowa jest czerwona. O kategoriach widzenia barwnego* [Why a cow is red. On categories of seeing colours], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 38, No 4.
- 1991 *O wieloznaczności symbolu* [On many meanings of symbol], "Rocznik Muzealny" vol. 4, Włocławek.
- 1992a *Wyobraźnia alchemiczna Wernera Herzoga. Egzegeza symboliczna filmu "Szkłane serce"* [Werner Herzog's alchemic imagination. Symbolic exegesis of "Glass heart"], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 3-4.
- 1992b *AntyDäniken* [AntiDäniken], GD, Warszawa.
- 1994 *Śmierć Jasia i Małgosi* [The death of Jaś and Małgosia], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa. Konteksty" 48, No 3-4.

Mitologie popularne

- 1994 *Mitologie popularne* [Popular mythologies], ed. D. Czaja, Universitas, Kraków.

Piątkowska Krystyna

- 1994a *Kulturowe reguły sztuki — spojrzenie na podstawie badań w środowisku wiejskim* [Cultural rules of art — a look based on investigations in a rural community], in: *Pożegnanie paradygmatu?* [A farewell to the paradigm?], *op. cit.*
- 1994b *Kultura a ikonosfera. Etnologiczne studium przykładów ze wsi współczesnej* [Culture versus iconosphere. Ethnological study of examples from a modern village], "Łódzkie Studia Etnograficzne" vol. 36.

Piątkowska Krystyna, Piątkowski Krzysztof

- 1982 *Antropologiczne pojęcie stylu a sztuka ludowa* [Anthropological concept of style versus folk art], "Łódzkie Studia Etnograficzne" vol. 24.
- 1987 *Sztukmistrz z Wersalu czyli o sztuce i kulturze* [A magician from Versailles or about art and culture], "Lud" vol. 71.
- 1991 *Kategorie kultury a ikonosfera* [Categories of culture versus iconosphere], "Rocznik Muzealny" vol. 4, Włocławek.

Piątkowski Krzysztof

- 1985 *Problematyka teoretyczna w powojennej etnografii polskiej* [Theoretical problems in Polish ethnography after 1945], "Lud" vol. 69.
- 1989 *Wybrane problemy metodologiczne stosowania semiotyki w etnologii* [Selected methodological problems of the use of semiotics in ethnology], in: *Problemy metodologiczne etnografii* [Methodological problems of ethnography], *op. cit.*
- 1993 *Semiotyczne badania nad kulturą w etnologii* [Semiotic investigations of culture in ethnology], UMK, Toruń.
- 1994 *Badacz wobec tradycji* [A scholar's view of tradition], in: *Pożegnanie paradygmatu?* [A farewell to the paradigm?], *op. cit.*

Pożegnanie paradygmatu?...

- 1994 *Pożegnanie paradygmatu? Etnologia wobec współczesności* [A farewell to the paradigm? Ethnology versus modern times], ed. W. J. Burszta and J. Damrosz, Instytut Kultury, Warszawa.

Robotycki Czesław

- 1980 *Tradycja i obyczaj w środowisku wiejskim* [Tradition and customs in a rural community], PAN—Ossolineum, Kraków.
- 1981 *Łańcuch szczęścia w pół wieku później* [A luck chain half a century later], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 35, No 1.

- 1990a *Biografia twórcy ludowego jako prawda artystyczna* [Biography of a folk artist as artistic truth], "Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Etnograficzne" folio 27.
- 1990b *Sztuka à vista. Folklor strajkowy* [À vista art. A strike folklore], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 44, No 2.
- 1991 *Wspomnienia z dawnych podróży na "Jug słowiański". Uwagi etnologa do tekstu z początku wieku* [Travel recollections of "Slavonic Yug". Ethnologist's remarks on a text from the beginning of the century], "Rocznik Muzealny" vol. 4, Wrocław.
- 1992a *Etnografia wobec kultury współczesnej* [Ethnography versus modern culture], Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków, Post-doctoral dissertations 232.
- 1992b *Wampiry. Od wierzeń ludowych do filmowych fantomów* [Vampires. From folk beliefs to film phantoms], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 3-4.
- 1992c *Historia i tradycja, dwie kategorie opisu przeszłości* [History and tradition, two categories of the description of the past], "Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Etnograficzne" folio 29.
- 1993 *Etnografia wobec samej siebie* [Ethnography versus itself], "Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Etnograficzne" folio 32.
- 1994a *Reklama z zapomnianym kodem* [Advertising with a forgotten code], in: *Mitologie popularne* [Popular mythologies], *op. cit.*
- 1994b *Moralny i strukturalny aspekt dobra i zła w bajce magicznej* [Moral and structural aspects of the good and bad in a magic fairy tale], in: *Pożegnanie paradygmatu?* [A farewell to the paradigm?], *op. cit.*
- 1994c *"Piwnica pod Baranami" – antropologiczna interpretacja formuły kabaretu* ["Piwnica pod Baranami" – an anthropological interpretation of the cabaret], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa. Konteksty" 48, No 1-2.
- Robotycki Czesław, Węglarz Stanisław
- 1983 *Chłop potęgą jest i basta. O mityzacji kultury ludowej w nauce* [A peasant is a power and that's that. On mythologization of folk culture in science], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 37, No 1-2.
- Sikora Sławomir
- 1986 *Cmentarze – antropologia pamięci* [Cemeteries – the anthropology of memory], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 40, No 1-2.
- 1992 *Fotografia, pamięć, wyobraźnia* [Photography, memory, imagination], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 3-4.
- 1994 *Fotografia schyłku wieku. Fotografia i mit* [Photography at the end of the century. Photography versus myth], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 48, No 1-2.
- Stoczkowski Wiktor
- 1989 *Prehistoria w szkolnych podręcznikach czyli współczesny mit początków* [Prehistory in school books or a modern myth of the beginnings], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 43, No 4.
- Stomma Ludwik
- 1975a *Rytuał pokładzin w Polsce. Analiza strukturalna* [The *pokładziny* ritual [escorting the newly weds to their bedroom] in Poland. A structural analysis], "Etnografia Polska" vol. 19, folio 1.
- 1975b *Stan badań nad obrzędowością polską od połowy XVIII w.* [Research of Polish ritual from the middle of the 18th century], "Etnografia Polska" vol. 19, folio 1.
- 1976 *Mit Alkmeny* [The myth of Alcmena], "Etnografia Polska" vol. 20, folio 1.
- 1978-1979 *Magia dzisiaj* [Magic today], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 32, No 3-4; 33, No 4.
- 1979 *Determinanty polskiej kultury ludowej XIX wieku* [Determinants of Polish folk culture in the 19th century], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 33, No 3.

- 1980 *Wstęp* [Introduction], in: J. St. Bystrzeń, *Tematy, które mi odradzano* [Topics I was discouraged to address], Selected and prepared by L. Stomma, PIW, Warszawa.
- 1981a *Słońce rodzi się 13 grudnia* [Sun is born on 13 December], LSW, Warszawa.
- 1981b *Odpowiedź na ankietę: etnografia, etnologia czym są...* [Response to the questionnaire: what are ethnography, ethnology...], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 35, No 2.
- 1986 *Antropologia kultury wsi polskiej XIX wieku* [Anthropology of the culture of a Polish village in the 19th century], PAX, Warszawa.
- 1989 *Czy w etnografii występują białe plamy* [Are there white spots in ethnography?], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 43, No 4.
- 1991a *Wzloty i upadki królów Francji* [The rise and fall of French kings], Wydawnictwo Łódzkie, Łódź.
- 1991b *Uroda ludzkiej pomyłki* [The beauty of a human mistake], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 45, No 1.
- 1992 *Antropologia kultury, historia i Kubuś Puchatek* [The anthropology of culture, history and Winnie the Pooh], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 3-4.
- 1994 *Historia współczesności* [History of modern times], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 48, No 1-2.
- Szkice i próby etnologiczne*
- 1985 *Szkice i próby etnologiczne* [Ethnological essays], ed. Z. Benedyktowicz and C. Robotycki, "Studenckie Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego" folio 4, Kraków.
- Sznajderman Monika
- 1991 *O etnograficznym surrealizmie* [On ethnographic surrealism], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 44, No 1.
- 1992a *Co się kryje pod tą maską: wokół motywu Człowieka Śmiechu. Parę uwag o Batmanie* [What is hidden behind this mask: a few remarks on Batman], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 3-4.
- 1992b *"Stary Gringo". Motyw Don Kichota w filmie i literaturze* ["An Old Gringo". The motif of Don Quixote in film and literature], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 3-4.
- 1994a *AIDS, kształt mitu* [AIDS, the shape of the myth], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 48, No 1-2.
- 1994b *"The Jardin des Plantes. Postcards" czyli roślinna metaforyka James Clifforda* ["The Jardin des Plantes. Postcards" or the floral metaphors of James Clifford], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 48, No 3-4.
- 1994c *Zaraza. Mitologia dżumy, cholery i AIDS* [The plague. Mythology of bubonic plague, cholera and AIDS], Semper, Warszawa.
- Szpilka Wiesław
- 1988 *Poszukiwanie zaginionej Arki* [In search for the lost Ark], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 42, No 4.
- 1991 *Kultura masowa a etnografia* [Mass culture versus ethnography], "Rocznik Muzealny" vol. 4, Włocławek.
- 1992a *"Batman" opowieść o stworzeniu* ["Batman" — a story of creation], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 3-4.
- 1992b *Zobaczyć świat: Etnografia wobec filmu i kultury masowej* [To see the world: Ethnography and the film and mass culture], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 3-4.
- 1994 *Raj utracony* [Paradise lost], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 48, No 1-2.
- Tokarska-Bakir Joanna
- 1990 *Interpretacja czyli o sztuce antropologii* [Interpretation or on the art of anthropology], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 44, No 1.

- 1992 *Hermeneutyka Gadamerowska w etnograficznym badaniu obcości* [Gadamer's hermeneutics in ethnographic investigations of strangeness], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 2.
- 1993 *Opuszczone ołtarze zamieszkują demony* [Deserted altars are inhabited by demons], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 47, No 3-4.
- 1955 *Dalsze losy syna marnotrawnego. Projekt etnografii nieprzeźroczystej* [A further fate of the prodigal son. A project of opaque ethnography], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa. Konteksty" 49, No 1.

Tomicki Ryszard

- 1973 *Tradycja i jej znaczenie w kulturze chłopskiej* [Tradition and its significance in peasant culture], "Etnografia Polska" vol. 17, folio 2.
- 1975 (with J. Tomicka) *Drzewo życia. Ludowa wizja świata i człowieka* [The tree of life. The folk vision of the world and man], LSW, Warszawa.
- 1976 *Słowiański mit kosmogoniczny* [Slavonic cosmogonic myth], "Etnografia Polska" vol. 20, folio 1.
- 1977 *Norma, wzór i wartość w życiu seksualnym tradycyjnych społeczności wiejskich w Polsce* [Norm, pattern and value in the sexual life of traditional rural communities in Poland], "Etnografia Polska" vol. 21, folio 1.
- 1979 *Anthropogenesis in Slavonic folk beliefs*, "Ethnologia Polona" vol. 5.
- 1981a *Kultura, dziedzictwo, tradycja* [Culture, heritage, tradition], in: *Etnografia Polski. Przemiany kultury ludowej* [Ethnography of Poland. Transformations of folk culture], vol. 2, ed. M. Biernacka et al., Ossolineum, Wrocław.
- 1981b *Religijność ludowa* [Folk religiousness], in: *Etnografia Polski. Przemiany kultury ludowej* [Ethnography of Poland. Transformations of folk culture], vol. 2, *op. cit.*
- 1986 *Drogi w zaświaty. Materiały do eschatologii Azteków* [The road to the other world. Materials for the eschatology of the Aztecs], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 40, No 1-2.
- 1987 *Poza społeczeństwem — w pobliżu boskości. przyczynek do rozważań nad symboliką włosów* [Beyond the society — near godliness. Contribution to the discussion of the symbolism of hair], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 41, No 1-4.

"Warsztaty Etnograficzne"

- 1991 *Ogólnopolska sesja "Warsztaty Etnograficzne"* [National session "Warsztaty Etnograficzne" (Ethnographic workshops)], "Rocznik Muzealny" vol. 4, Włocławek, pp. 145-310.

Wasilewski Jerzy Sławomir

- 1975 *Kategoria przestrzeni w kulturze koczowniczej. Analiza przestrzeni jurty mongolskiej* [The category of space in nomadic culture. Analysis of the space of the Mongolian yurt], "Etnografia Polska" vol. 19, folio 1.
- 1978 *Symbolika ruchu obrotowego i rytualnej inwersji* [The symbolism of rotational movement and ritual inversion], "Etnografia Polska" vol. 22, folio 1.
- 1979a *Po śmierci wędrować. Szkic z zakresu etnologii świata znaczeń* [To wander after death. An essay on the ethnology of the world of meanings], "Teksty" No 3, 4.
- 1979b *Podróże do piekieł. Rzecz o szamańskich misteriach* [Travels to the hell. On shamanic mysteries], LSW, Warszawa.
- 1980 *Podarować — znaleźć — zgubić — zblądzić. Niektóre kategorie języka symbolicznego związanego z opozycją życie — śmierć* [To give — to find — to lose — to get lost. Some categories of the symbolic language connected with the opposition life — death], "Etnografia Polska" vol. 24, folio 1.
- 1987a *Tabu, zakaz magiczny, nieczystość* [Taboo, magic prohibition, unchastity], "Etnografia Polska" vol. 31, folio 1.

- 1987b *Św. Paweł — nawrócenie, odwrócenie i niepewność* [St. Paul — conversion, abandoning and uncertainty], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 41, No 1-4.
- 1989 *Tabu a paradygmaty etnologii* [Taboo versus paradigms of ethnology], Uniwersytet Warszawski, Warszawa.
- 1991 *Antropologia paradygmatem stoi...* [Anthropology is a paradigm...], "Rocznik Muzealny" vol. 4, Włocławek.
- Węglarz Stanisław
- 1983a *Ojcowie pustyni* [Fathers of the desert], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 37, No 3-4.
- 1983b *Pustelnicy — ludowi święci* [Hermits — folk saints], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 37, No 3-4.
- 1987a *Dzieło Lévi-Straussa — dzisiaj* [The work of Lévi-Strauss today], "Lud" vol. 71.
- 1987b *Claude Lévi-Strauss: demon Laplace'a czy uprawiający muzykę Sokrates* [Claude Lévi-Strauss: Laplace's demon or Socrates practising music], "Lud" vol. 71.
- 1991 *Kategorie kultury ludowej jako kategorie etnograficzne* [Categories of folk culture as ethnographic categories], "Rocznik Muzealny" vol. 4, Włocławek.
- 1992 *Koncepcja etnograficznego zróżnicowania kultury ludowej dzisiaj* [The concept of the ethnographic differentiation of folk culture today], "Polska Sztuka Ludowa" 46, No 2.
- 1994 *Chłopi jako "obcy"* [Peasants as "strangers"], in: *Pożegnanie paradygmatu?* [A farewell to the paradigm?], *op. cit.*
- Węglarz S., Burszta W., Studziński J. A., Piątkowska K., Buchowski M., Augustynowicz G.
- 1987 *Claude Lévi-Strauss — po latach* [Claude Lévi-Strauss after years], "Lud" vol. 71, pp. 3-126.

Translated by Zbigniew Nadstoga