

Izabella Bukraba-Rylska

Research on Rural Culture. Paradigm Shifts*

Abstract: Contemporary sociology of culture is on the verge of change of its paradigm. From a science the aim of which is to measure the consumption of culture or to interpret culture it is to be transformed into a research discipline studying the way in which the culture is experienced. Thus, the statistical or hermeneutic rules will have to be replaced by the assumptions which look for the corporeality of the human bodies as a source and essence of the culture. “Physical”, not “mental” meanings would be treated as the objects of sociological and humanistic research. Thanks to that the neo-naturalism may become the mainstream of the future in these sciences.

Key words: Cartesian paradigm – participation in culture – understanding of culture – somatic experiencing of culture – neo-naturalism in humanistic sciences

1. Introduction

In the humanities, transformations in individual disciplines and changes taking place in the researched reality affect the methods of studying it. A good example of this correlation is the analysis of rural culture, which has been described by various concepts: local, folk, rural and peasant culture, rural traditions, folklore, folklorism or national postfolklorism, and by the currently widespread terms such as cultural practices and heritage. The following reflections provide for a brief overview of the major theoretical standpoints formulated in Poland after the World War II, along with a proposal of forming a new approach, which, due to its naturalistic orientation, forms a part of a project of radical restructuring not only of sociology or anthropology of culture, but also of the entire humanities (Bukraba-Rylska 2013).

The author is researcher of the Institute of Rural and Agricultural Development of the Polish Academy of Sciences (IRWIR PAN), ul. Nowy Świat 72, 00-330 Warszawa, e-mail: ibukraba@irwirpan.waw.pl.

* The article was prepared within the framework of the project “Local Cultural Heritage in the Experience of Rural Population” funded by the Polish National Science Centre on the basis of the decision no DEC-2014/13/B/HS2/00832.

2. Sociology of culture before 1989

The achievements of Polish sociology of culture allow us to claim that it used to employ categories strongly dependent on the dominant ideology of the time implemented and the reality shaped in accordance with the priorities of the political system (Milczarek 1997). During the times of the Polish People's Republic, under the general banner of "democratization", such terms as "participation in culture" and "cultural activity" were used, which meant gradual disappearance of traditional local cultures and introduction in their place of a uniformed canon of national culture, and from the 1960s onwards, also selected elements of mass culture. Participation in culture was treated as a possibly intensive reliance by the citizens of the offer presented by specialized institutions that made up the model of urban culture. They functioned in a certain spatial-and-hierarchical order and in accordance with the conventions of the "totalitarian" mode of communicating with the society (Fleischer 1988), which is why Kazimerz Wyka's term "inverted quarantine" can be attributed to them with only a small degree of exaggeration. "Under quarantine patients are isolated in order to prevent the spread of the epidemic. In this type of quarantine they are herded together and kept near the loudspeakers, so that no one remains unaffected by the recommended germ (Wyka 1984, p. 54). In keeping with the existing order, sociology of culture developed its cognitive apparatus, using the following terms: "social framework of culture" (i.e. the local, supra-local and nationwide levels of communicating symbolic content), «systems of culture" (i.e. organizational model of a cultural institution), as well as "participation in culture" (i.e. citizens' use of those institutions' offer) (Kłoskowska 1972). This theoretical model corresponded to the empirical reality: "Polish contemporary culture was described in sociological works mostly as a «system of institutions creating specific content, which is pertinent to their purpose and which is disseminated with relevant means»" (Tyszka 1971, p. 10). Furthermore, the model did not remain free from evaluation aspects.

With respect to the rural areas, this led to two important consequences. First, in contrast to the model of urban culture as a construction referring to a set of specific institutions and facts associated with them, the model of traditional culture was deprived of equally clear data and indicators. This resulted in its escaping quantitative description and statistical analysis, and so it had to remain a subject of environmental studies and monographs (Pawelczyńska 1966, p. 152–153). Secondly, the ideological assumptions included in the project of socialist culture translated into actual deprecation and contesting of "peasant" culture, as a range of its values was perceived as inconsistent with the new political system (Siekierski 1983). In place of this authentic and multidimensional axionormative system, which was

difficult to capture with quantitative methods, the term “folk culture” was eagerly introduced. It was a construct of a scientific-and-ideological nature, borrowed from ethnography and reformulated to suit the needs of sociological empirical research. It was characterized by an “antiquarian” approach (allowing primarily for relic content), and it would frequently be narrowed down to selected elements of “secular folklore” (Kotula 1975), therefore devoid of sacral content and metaphysical values, but in turn equipped with political meanings ascribed in a makeshift manner (Bukraba 1990). Its advantage from a sociologist’s viewpoint lay in the fact that it easily lent itself to description (the number of folk bands was taken into account at the time, the frequency of their participation in events, the size of their audience, etc.). As a result of the two phenomena described above, a decision to cherish the modes of communication appropriate to traditional rural culture was regarded as a sign of backwardness and limited lifestyle aspirations. Lack of interest in the offer of specialized cultural institutions was treated as an expression of “disability and cultural backwardness” (Tyszka 1987, p. 107), whereas different aesthetic tastes and skills perceived as inconsistent with the elite and intelligentsia-oriented patterns were denounced and seen as evidence of a kind of “disability” of the undereducated and uncouth recipients (Czerwiński 1988, p. 66).

3. Sociology of culture after 1989

In the sphere of culture, the transformation that took place in Poland after 1989 resulted in decentralization, pluralism of patronage and commercialization. “Administering” was replaced with “self-regulation” and the formula of “participation”, or passive reception of disseminated content, gave way to the premises of “localism” understood as a possibility of individual communities to develop by themselves such culture as they find appropriate (Bukraba-Rylska 2004). The reaction to these processes was therefore a question of whether the previously formed cognitive apparatus, which was adapted to describing “extremely institutionalized, bureaucratic culture, censored and controlled by the state” (Sułkowski 1995, p. 161), would meet its task when confronted with the multiplicity of “local agendas differentiated according to environmental, generational, economic, ethnic and other criteria” (Jawłowska 1993, p. 188). It was clear that after the period of dealing with the phenomenon of “consumption” (specific cultural offer uniformed and transmitted top-down through a network of institutions), processes of bottom-up, independent and diversified creation of cultural orders by particular groups, environments and local communities became the object of researchers’ interest (Engel 1992). At the same time, the previously used term “reception” – relating first to turnout measured solely quantitatively in particular institutions, and to the intensity

of the use of its resources, and then (already in more depth) relating also to the means of “meaning-generating experience” of content available through these institutions (Czerwiński 1965) – was superseded by the term “cultural practices” (Bukraba-Rylska, Burszta 2011). Fundamental changes in research assumptions lay behind this change of vocabulary. While in research of participation in culture the term “reception” was in use, meaning behaviours during leisure time and consisting in “correct” decoding of meanings of works belonging to culture in the narrower sense (identified with activities and products of a symbolic, axiological and autotelic nature (Kłoskowska 1981), the analyses of “cultural practices” drew attention to activities which were no longer about festive and disinterested contemplation of objects classified as “high” culture, but about activities carried out on an everyday basis in “multidimensional life environment of individuals and social groups, as well as the functioning of social institutions that researchers call «living culture»” (Fatyga 2010).

4. Contemporary sociology of culture: between Cartesian paradigm and neo-naturalism

However, the current reality and the latest trends in the social sciences and humanities (Benton, Craib 2003; Habermas 2012; Bachmann-Medick 2012; Turner 2003), entail a substantial correction of also that model, which has been already in force for a quarter of a century. Due to the current spread of the term “cultural heritage” and the contemporary globalization processes, the research on participation in culture in its present form is losing sense (both in its earlier, survey-quantitative version, and the later, “semiotic” one) (Tyszka 1971), but also analysing, or rather, describing various “practices” is as well, especially that most frequently it is carried out in the traditional manner of mental dis-interpretation, completely abstracted from the physicality of objects and corporeality of social actors engaged in these practices. The concept of heritage connotes, after all, a particular kind of relation to culture, called “valence” by researchers (Kłoskowska 1996). It assumes that it is not at all about the possible “understanding” – through better or worse competence, individual preferences or environmentally conditioned tastes – as it used to be emphasised previously. The sphere of emotions and behaviours associated with the reception of culture turns out to be equally important here. The currently observed globalization processes lead to the same conclusion. They cause a free movement of various cultural products, which is not, however, accompanied by an adequate increase in cultural competence that would allow for their correct interpretation (Rifkin 2003). In rural communities it engenders a situation in which objects belonging to the global circulation are frequently better known than those

belonging to the local one (Bukraba-Rylska 2000). Thus, the local cultural heritage becomes the subject of quite a different perception than the one assumed in the traditional paradigm of sociology of culture. Countryside residents therefore do not so much “understand” their culture, as they “experience” it – primarily emotionally and sensually. The category capable of adequately analysing the contemporary reality should therefore be “experience”, yet treated differently than until now, as it must encompass a wider spectrum of phenomena other than only those pertaining to awareness (Wolska 2012).

A chance to form this new approach to the study of culture, however, lies in decisively renewing the humanities, i.e. in breaking with the still dominant so-called Cartesian paradigm (Drwięga 2005; Trochimska-Kubacka 2011), consisting of course in Descartes’ *res cogitans*, but also in Kant’s “transcendental I” and Husserl’s “pure I”. All the tenets contained in this paradigm determined the successes, but also the limitations of traditional analyses. If, until now, the humanities have consequently dematerialized society and culture, the postulates currently reported tend to recognize the fundamental role of materiality (Olsen 2013). If previously the humanities accepted that within the human world all things and bodies lose the ability of physical impact, and causal laws are replaced by sense relations, then today the belief in the natural agency still, or perhaps even primarily, inherent in such objects, despite the existence of a cultural and social sphere, is returning (Rybus, Kornobis 2016). Finally, if last century’s humanities took into account purely abstract meanings, communicated through language, then nowadays scholars call for an abandonment of “cognitive reduction” (Habermas 2000, p. 352), and instead they propose acceptance of specifically expressed physical and emotional “meanings”, even if they have doubts as to whether those “meanings” can be reduced to concepts, or whether they can be verbalized at all.

It seems that Charles Peirce’s semiotic idea offers a convenient starting point for an analysis of meanings manifesting themselves in so many ways, and which are available through broadly understood experience, but not necessarily in a purely intellectual understanding of reality. It is the same with the interpretation proposed by Charles Morris, which is also recognized, although not consistently applied in Polish sociology (Kłoskowska 1981). It is because in Peirce the key role is played precisely by the category of continuity, borrowed from Dewey. Dewey’s naturalistic perspective assumed that there is no continuity gap between mental and biological or physiological processes, which is why rational operations should be considered derivatives of organic operations.

The principle of continuity, transferred onto the area of Peirce’s reflections on meanings, took on the following shape: the researcher assumed that it has a semiotic reference (the idea of translating a sign onto another sign), a metaphysical reference

(the identity of a meaning wandering from one medium to the next, and so the ability of physical meanings to become transformed into emotional and abstract ones) and an epistemological reference (practical cognition is to be subordinated to “habits of action”, and scientific cognition to “habits of thought”. If the semiotic aspect allows for the recognition of meaning as result of a translation of one sign to another sign system, and the metaphysical one refers to the pragmatic interpretation (the meaning of a sign is action, experience or an emotion caused by the sign), then the epistemological dimension assumes a constructive role of meaning for the inter-subjectivity of a community that shares certain habits and uses them in the role of directives for action or learning. It is precisely these threads of Peirce’s idea that make it so attractive for a sociologist and researcher of culture.

It turns out then that the dynamic status of meaning transferred in series of different signs (due to their media), can indeed be described as a process of semiosis synonymous with “life” of thoughts, but it also proves that the activity of a sign is able to go beyond the realms of thought and enter the strictly social sphere of action. This would suggest that the universe of thought is able to influence the social reality through the directives of action and thought coded also somatically or mentally, and what remains identical (despite a change in its mode of manifestation) is the meaning, freely circulating between things, bodies and minds. So although semiosis can be in the most general sense understood as a process of exchange of thoughts, it does not, however, entail that meaning is condemned to only exist in the intelligible sphere. According to Peirce, “We can understand the sign so broadly that its interpretant will be no longer a thought, but an action or an experience, we can even expand its understanding in such a way that the sign’s interpretant will turn out to be the simple quality of a feeling” (Peirce 1997, p. 125) That is why the philosopher allowed the existence of three types of interpretants understood as the effects of signs circulating in a given community. He clearly distinguished emotional interpretants (feelings aroused by the meanings contained in signs), energetic interpretants (for instance physical effort necessary to take an action constituting a reaction to a sign), and only thirdly logical interpretants (intellectual signs – in contrast to the other two, not individual but general, because they take the form of thought or action habit shared in a given group). It is easy to see the relevance of the categories introduced by Peirce to the intuitions of such scholars as Paul Willis, who writes about the transformation and transubstantiations of meaning travelling from the sounds of music to the bodies of the listeners. Also Kirsten Hastrup looks for better ways of expressing somatic and emotional components of human experience than putting them into words.

5. From naturalistic concept of meaning to naturalistic concept of culture

The basic message of Peirce's semiotic, and at the same time pragmatic, concept is consequently naturalistic and reads: "words cause physical effects". It is because thoughts dressed in words affect real phenomena and objects, but one must bear in mind that matter containing thoughts also influences the human body and its emotions. If the philosophical conclusion of such a view of reality can be a definite denial of Cartesian dualism, then the conclusion important for a sociologist must be as follows: in a society it is impossible to separate what is human from what is material. Things and people, subjects and objects remain in fact in constant interaction, ceaselessly exchanging "meanings" expressed materially, somatically or conceptually, and as much variously crystalized in the reception process. The egocephalocentrism principle, key to the Cartesian paradigm, gives way here to the noscorpocircularism principle, typical for the neo-Spinozian ideas popular today. Viewed from this perspective, it should be considered that Charles Morris developed Peirce's idea in an interesting way, remaining also strongly influenced by George Herbert Mead. Morris took from Peirce the belief that to determine the meaning of a given sign is nothing else than to determine the behaviour that the sign causes. With Mead, in turn, he shared the conviction of the inseparability of the processes of experiencing, action and symbolizing, and therefore of the need to examine personality, selfhood and society as a certain continuous process, and not separate phenomena.

Morris shared Mead's understanding of meaning as a reaction, that is as a behaviour of an organism, not an operation associated solely with reflective awareness: "social action in its most elementary stages or forms is possible without any form of consciousness", writes Mead (Mead 1975, p. 30). He was not, however, interested in the finalistic perspective (close to Mead) of the "universe of conversation" as the broadest, ultimate context of human action and thought in the society, nor was he interested (the way Peirce clearly was) in the ultimate logical interpretant. Instead of the universality of shared reactions, Morris dealt more with the interim actions of subjects, responding to stimuli in a manner appropriate to all biological organisms. Thanks to such a naturalistic approach, Morris saw researching the process of semiosis in terms of a decisively interdisciplinary project. For him semiotics was to be a general theory of signs in all their forms and manifestations: animal and human, normal and pathological, linguistic and non-linguistic, individual and social. This in turn led him to the conclusion that only a biological theory can have such a wide range, reducing the statements about signs to statements about the behaviour of living creatures, or, more precisely, to statements about the muscular and glandular reactions of a signs interpreter.

Janina Kotarbińska pointed out precisely this aspect of the American researcher's thought, bringing out its key premise: "it is, therefore, about a biological theory of the sign, about biological semiotics, a discipline, which would form part of natural science and which would allow for explaining and predicting the behaviours of animal organisms. The characteristic of the sign should be formulated in terms describing dispositions towards behaviours caused by the sign in their interpreters" (Kotarbińska 1990, p. 189). It would seem that contemporary cognitive science corresponds with such a conviction, by questioning the previously applied in the field image of a computer-brain performing operations on abstract, quantifiable symbols (computationism). Currently, cognitive science is giving up, in fact, the notion of representation as a derivative of an erroneous dualism, completely unnecessarily mediating the real world in its reflections (copies), and uses modes of cognition which make the human body and its direct relationship with the world the starting point of "corporeal cognition". "It is our organic flesh and blood, our structural bones, the ancient rhythms of our internal organs, and the pulsing flows of our emotions that give us whatever meaning we can find", declares Mark Johnson and stresses that in so conceived "aesthetics of human understanding" there is no place for independently existing abstractions. Each of them is, after all, rooted in the unconscious corporeal experience, the source domain of which are, on the one hand, in its own perceptive and motor patterns, and on the other – the "life qualities" of experience (Johnson 2015). These very specific, sensory qualities constitute the primary data of the "qualitative" experience, they make up its matter and only from that can the conceptual meaning be distilled, which, however, even in the extremely conventionalized conceptual form leave a trace of their origin, like for instance metaphors (Lakoff, Johnson 1988). In the case of semiosis (that is the process of creation and communication of meanings) understood so broadly and not exclusively symbolically, it becomes superfluous then to include consciousness, which is stressed by understanding sociology and anthropology based in the interpretive paradigm. Instead, it is enough to give an account from the reactions of organisms experiencing certain objects.

With regard to researching the reception of culture, which is the focal point of these reflections, one must bear in mind that the definition of culture (or, more precisely: of "cultural heritage" of a given group), evidently referring to the intuitions described above, was at one time proposed by Stanisław Ossowski. In his opinion, "The cultural heritage of a social group would consist in certain patterns of muscular, emotional and mental reactions, according to which the dispositions of the group members become shaped" (Ossowski 1966, p. 64). Significantly, the author also emphasised that "no external objects would form part of this heritage", because in those material objects should only be recognized as "correlates of certain

psychological and muscular reactions, the dispositions for which are transmitted as a cultural heritage of a group” (Ossowski 1966, p. 66). This concept, formulated a long time ago, yet sounding very current due to its consequent “corporealization”, offers a possibility of using such a definition of culture, which would encompass at the same time mental, emotional and behavioural components. For this very reason it will be possible to determine the equally important components of this concept (i.e. meanings and values) in a new, equally “corporealized” way: “meanings” (in reference to Peirce’s previously discussed concept of logical, emotional and physical interpretants) as that which is subject to constant transformations from mental, through somatic, affective phenomena to material ones or vice versa, and the “values” (in accordance with Bourdieu’s suggestions) as “essential and primary dispositions of the body, constituting tastes or feelings of disgust, which are defined as instinctive and in which the most vital interests of the group are deposited” (Bourdieu 2005, p. 583).

The corporealization, i.e. the naturalisation of the process of culture’s perception, requires, however, certain decisively similar adjustments also when it comes to the artefacts that are the objects of reception defined in such a way. According to the proposed perspective those, too, should be looked at as primarily material objects with specific, sensately discernible properties, and only later (if at all) as works equipped with specific cultural meanings. This indication equally applies to elements belonging to the global circulation, as well as to objects belonging to the local cultural heritage. One could risk a hypothesis that in both these cases the recipients – regardless of the level of their formal education and familiarity with culture – will be increasingly condemned to receiving not cultural meanings and senses, but material qualities such as shape, colour, sound, rhythm, which is those, that are subject to purely sensory, not intellectual perception.

6. Conclusions

Such a naturalized vision of culture (culture mainly experienced, and not interpreted) does not seem at all impossible. The phenomena of this kind were described much earlier by researchers who took into consideration perception realized, for example, by an extremely incompetent recipient, for whom the only thing left is to experience “a system of pure quality” (Ingarden 1966), or a particular situation of reception of a work coming from a completely foreign culture. In such cases, according to them, the layer of meanings contained in the “normative” symbols of an object (therefore specific to a given culture and demanding the appropriate knowledge) becomes inevitably blurred, and the main role begins to be played by “orectic” symbols (Turner 2005), which by referring not to the intellect and acquired

competences, but to the primal, “natural” instincts act directly on human senses and emotions. The recipient experiences then, according to Leach, universal reactions that are not mental, but physiological: “particular sensations associated with the biological, animal aspect of the human nature” (Leach 1986, p. 163). If, therefore, the analyses of culture dominated by the interpretative paradigm overlooked the role of emotions and physicality, reducing in this way the process of its reception to consciously carried out and exclusively intellectual acts of decoding of abstract meanings, then the basic feature of the new approach (although, as became evident, finding its base in theories formulated a lot earlier) would be taking into account also somatic, and not solely mental perception.

Taking into account “material” meanings as separate and probably independent from “cultural” meanings requires, however, a repeated rethinking of some important issues. First, in the case of physical meanings, can one continue to refer to the concept of representation, or will it be necessary to conclude that its appropriate split into the “signifier” and “signified” does not occur here. While discussing the Alfred Gell’s anthropological art theory, Agata Rybus rightly points out that its essence lies not in symbolic communication, but agency. The aim of the intricate patterns on the shields of Melanesian warriors is, after all, not informing the enemy of the meanings of their culture, but frightening him (Rybus 2016, p. 31). The enemy will behave appropriately not by becoming overly engrossed in deciphering the encoded information about lineage, clan or the family of his opponent, nor will he contemplate his aesthetic impressions, but he will grab his own shield or spear, or take to his heels.

Secondly, a question regarding the relation between the one and the other sphere of meanings will arise. Sensory experience can reveal its subversive power and completely destabilize the process of deciphering meanings culturally defined (probably exactly due to the direct demonstration of its own meanings drawn from physical qualities). In such a case the phenomenon of “dissensus” analysed by Jacques Rancière arises. It is not the result of alternate understanding of an idea, but of a differently proceeding multisensory reception (Rancière 2008).

Thirdly, one should bear in mind that although the sociology of culture has developed an extensive apparatus for the study of semiosis and semiotics subordinate to understanding, so a conceptual interpretation, it does not have at its disposal similar tools for analysing forms of experiencing sensual phenomena. It was already pointed out by Bogusław Sułkowski (Sułkowski 1972, p. 196), who stressed the easier to conceptualize, because more “intellectual” character of cultural perception on the part of well-educated people and the more difficult to describe due to its “sensory” nature reception of the content of, for instance, literary works by people with lower levels of education, geared for more “visual” qualities of the presented

world (p. 55). However, if, as Bourdieu suggests, we recognize that art as such is something corporeal, that does of course relate to “states of the soul”, but these are at the same time “states of the body”, and therefore if it “enraptures”, “delights” and “moves”, it “finds itself not so much above words, as under them, in gestures and body movements, in situations (Bourdieu 2005, p. 105), then it becomes clear that in descriptions constructed in accordance with these assumptions of the respondents’ attitude to given cultural correlates it must be important to establish, which reactions these are. Does (to use Gombrowicz’s words in “Ferdydurke”) a given object arouse in the recipients “love and admiration”, are they more likely ready to “fly and rush”, or on the contrary: does it “not move”, “not arouse admiration” and “not pierce the soul through” – and why.

And finally, it seems that also a fundamental correction of the role of the social scientists confronted with such a radically different definition of their study subject is indispensable. A sociologist’s or an anthropologist’s attributes can no longer only include professional knowledge, objectivism and detachment from reality, but on the contrary: they should become “organic entities”, as once described by Anna Wyka. She meant such researchers who will use both their intellect, as well as their emotions, intuitions, imagination, sensory impressions and their entire physicality, so they will remain “in an organic relationship with the reality” (Wyka 1993, p. 128). Also Ewa Domańska indicates the need for researchers to refer to their own “source sensations”, and not only to those available to the respondents. According to her, especially anthropologists should use their senses’ evidence, and therefore should make use of the fact that they can themselves “see, hear, smell, taste, feel that they examine” (Domańska 2005, p. 79). Anthropologists themselves formulate this recommendation even more radically. “Today we can only practice anthropology by entering into physical contact with the subject of our research and by analysing this experience”, writes Chris Salter (Salter, 2015, p. 155). Joanna Żylińska has been recently considering the far-reaching consequences of such a decision, while stressing that it is not about creating discourse where, for example, an affect will be the subject of description, but one must allow this affect to influence the research process and the entire scientific work: “if we want to breathe life into our ideas, we must follow various affects which operate at different levels. One must not overlook the fact that various affects cause us to feel write, think and act in different ways (Żylińska 2015, p. 66).

The critical overview presented here of the existing approaches to the study of culture in Polish sociology leads to the following declaration. The aim of the new shape of analysis of cultural experience suggested here is to take a first step towards naturalisation of the subject of sociological research. The current trends in the humanities, as well as processes taking place (even in small local communities) allow

in fact for attempting the implementation of a procedure which is different from the traditional ones. Instead of focusing solely on consciousness in empirical analyses and asking what the respondents know about the culture of their region and how they evaluate it, it is worth complementing this dimension of receptive reactions with other evidence – emotional and sensory, which can be taken into consideration thanks to the application of a broadly understood category of experience. Perhaps such an approach will also allow for other differences to be noted in the perception of culture on the part of rural and urban populations than those associated with the level of their competence.

Without a doubt, a step in the chosen direction means also allowing for the possibility of a shift in the currently dominating paradigm in understanding sociology, as well as in all humanities. It is too early to define its contours in detail, but even now one can distance oneself from the most frequently voiced opinions that it would constitute “anti-cognitive humanities” (Pietraszko 2000), “anti-culturalistic humanities” (Wolska 2012), or in other words “post-humanistic”, “anti-humanistic” or “non-anthropological” humanities (Domańska 2010), or anti-sociological sociology in the sense that it questions the central role of “what is social” (Latour 2010). All these terms have only relative meaning, i.e., with respect to the current, probably too reductive shape of the disciplines. On the other hand, they should not be used with the intention of evaluating, because, as it seems, an attempt to include into the sphere of reflection on the human race and their social and cultural world a wider range of data than allowed until now, is not an impoverishment, and still less, a negation of humanism, but rather its necessary complement.

Bibliography

- Bachmann-Medick D. (2012). *Cultural Turns. Nowe kierunki w naukach o kulturze* (trans. K. Krzemieniowa). Warsaw: Oficyna Naukowa.
- Benton T., Craib I. (2003). *Filozofia nauk społecznych: od pozytywizmu do postmodernizmu* (trans. L. Rasiński). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej TWP.
- Bourdieu P. (2005). *Dystynkcja* (trans. P. Biłos). Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Bukraba I. (1990). *Kultura ludowa na co dzień*. Warsaw: Instytut Kultury.
- Bukraba-Rylska I. (2000). *Kultura w społeczności lokalnej – podmiotowość odzyskana?* Warsaw: Instytut Rozwoju Wsi i Rolnictwa PAN.
- Bukraba-Rylska I. (2004). Kultura w Polsce lokalnej – w mikroskopie i przez lunetę. *Kultura Współczesna*, 4, 96–118.
- Bukraba-Rylska I. (2013). *W stronę socjologii ucieleśnionej*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Bukraba-Rylska I., Burszta W. (eds) (2011). *Stan i zróżnicowanie kultury małych miast i wsi*. Warsaw: Narodowe Centrum Kultury.

- Czerwiński M. (1965). Uwagi krytyczne o socjologii kultury. *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*, 3, 7–31.
- Czerwiński M. (1988). *Przyczynki do antropologii współczesności*. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Domańska E. (2005). *Mikrohistorie. Spotkania w międzyświatach*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.
- Domańska E. (ed.) (2010). *Teoria wiedzy o przeszłości na tle współczesnej humanistyki*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.
- Drwięga M. (2005). *Ciało człowieka*. Cracow: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Engel J. (1992). Kultura Polski lokalnej. In: M. Grabowska (ed.), *Barometr kultury* (pp. 85–96). Warsaw: Instytut Kultury.
- Fatyga B. (2010). Świadomość kulturalna jako świadomość kulturowa. In: W. Burszta (ed.), *Kultura miejska w Polsce z perspektywy interdyscyplinarnych badań jakościowych* (pp. 45–74). Warsaw: Narodowe Centrum Kultury.
- Fleischer M. (1988). Literatura trywialna jako problem semiotyki. In: M. Graszewicz (ed.), *Kultura – literatura – folklor* (pp. 17–38). Warsaw: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza.
- Habermas J. (2000). *Filozoficzny dyskurs nowoczesności* (trans. M. Łukasiewicz). Cracow: Universitas.
- Habermas J. (2012). *Między naturalizmem a religią* (trans. M. Pańków). Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Ingarden R. (1966). *Studia z estetyki*. Warsaw: PWN.
- Jawłowska A. (1993). Kierunki zmiany kulturowej. In: A. Rychard, M. Federowicz (eds), *Społeczeństwo w transformacji* (pp. 181–198). Warsaw: Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii PAN.
- Johnson M. (2015). *Znaczenie ciała. Estetyka rozumienia ludzkiego* (trans. J. Płuciennik). Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Kłoskowska A. (1972). *Społeczne ramy kultury*. Warsaw: PWN.
- Kłoskowska A. (1981). *Socjologia kultury*. Warsaw: PWN.
- Kłoskowska A. (1996). *Kultury narodowe u korzeni*. Warsaw: PWN.
- Kotarbińska J. (1990). *Z zagadnień teorii nauki i teorii języka*. Warsaw: PWN.
- Kotula F. (1975). Folklor sakralny i świecki. *Literatura Ludowa*, 3, 11–22.
- Lakoff M., Johnson M. (1988). *Metaphors We Live By* (trans. T. Krzeszowski). Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Latour B. (2010). *Splatając na nowo to, co społeczne* (trans. A. Derra, K. Abriszewski). Cracow: Universitas.
- Leach E. (1986). Poziomy komunikowania i problem tabu w odbiorze i rozumieniu sztuki pierwotnej. *Polska Sztuka Ludowa*, 3–4, 159–164.
- Mead G.H. (1975). *Umysł, osobowość, społeczeństwo* (trans. Z. Wolińska). Warsaw: PWN.
- Milczarek K. (1997). Kultura zideologizowana – kultura skomercjalizowana. *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*, 3, 47–74.
- Olsen B. (2013). *W obronie rzeczy* (trans. B. Shallcross). Warsaw: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN.
- Ossowski S. (1966). *Więź społeczna i dziedzictwo krwi*. Warsaw: PWN.

- Pawelczyńska A. (1966). *Dynamika przemian kulturowych na wsi*. Warsaw: PWN.
- Peirce Ch. (1997). *Wybór pism semiotycznych* (trans. H. Buczyńska-Garewicz). Warsaw: Polskie Towarzystwo Semiotyczne.
- Pietraszko S. (2000). Procedury humanistyki i jej cele. In: J. Pelc (ed.), *Język współczesnej humanistyki* (pp. 23–42). Warsaw: Polskie Towarzystwo Semiotyczne.
- Rancière J. (2008). *Le spectateur emancipe*. Paris: La Fabrique editions.
- Rifkin J. (2003). *Wiek dostępu* (trans. E. Kania). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Dolnośląskie.
- Rybus A. (2016). Czy rzecz może być sprawcą? In: A. Rybus, M. Kornobis (eds), *Ludzie w świecie przedmiotów, przedmioty w świecie ludzi* (pp. 19–58). Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Rybus A., Kornobis M. (eds) (2016). *Ludzie w świecie przedmiotów, przedmioty w świecie ludzi*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Salter Ch. (2015). *Alien Agency. Experimental Encounters with Art in the Making*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Siekierski S. (1983). Dyskwalifikacja kultury chłopskiej w pierwszej połowie lat pięćdziesiątych. *Przegląd Humanistyczny*, 4, 29–46.
- Sułkowski B. (1972). *Powieść i czytelnicy*. Warsaw: PWN.
- Sułkowski B. (1995). Eksperyment w dziedzinie uspołeczniania kultury. *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*, 1, 154–168.
- Trochimska-Kubacka B. (2011). Ciało człowieka i podmiotowość w koncepcji Merleau-Ponty'ego. In: A. Pobojevska (ed.), *Współczesne refleksje wokół kartezjańskiej wizji podmiotu* (pp. 115–128). Łódź: Wydawnictwo Akademii Humanistyczno-Ekonomicznej.
- Turner B. (2003). *Zarys ogólnej socjologii ciała* (trans. G. Woroniecka, A. Gąsior-Niemiec). In: Turner B. (ed.), *Teoria społeczna. Podręcznik* (pp. 535–556). Warsaw: Oficyna Naukowa.
- Turner V. (2005). *Gry społeczne* (trans. W. Usakiewicz). Cracow: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Tyszka A. (1971). *Uczestnictwo w kulturze*. Warsaw: PWN.
- Tyszka A. (1987). *Interesy i ideały kultury*. Warsaw: PWN.
- Wolska D. (2012). *Odzyskać doświadczenie*. Cracow: Universitas.
- Wyka A. (1993). *Badacz społeczny wobec doświadczenia*. Warsaw: Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii PAN.
- Wyka K. (1984). *Życie na niby*. Cracow – Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Żylińska J. (2015). Czy mamy bać się końca świata? In: R. Nycz (ed.). *Kultura afektu* (pp. 51–74). Warsaw: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN.

Badania nad kulturą wsi. Zmiany paradygmatu

Streszczenie: Przedmiotem prezentowanych rozważań jest rekapitulacja teoretycznych podejść formułowanych w polskiej socjologii kultury na temat kultury wsi w okresie po 1945 r. Pierwszy model, nazywany modelem uczestnictwa, zakładał budowanie jednolitej oferty kulturalnej dla całego społeczeństwa i sprawdzanie stopnia jego upowszechnienia. Drugi model – lokalizmu, stworzony po 1989 r., zakładał oddolne tworzenie życia kulturalnego przez poszczególne środowiska lokalne. W chwili obecnej, na skutek rozwoju zglobalizowanej kultury hiperkapitalizmu, rysuje się potrzeba sformowania kolejnej propozycji teoretycznej. Jak się wydaje, powinna ona odpowiadać na współczesne tendencje spod znaku neo-naturalizmu, jakie zarysowują się w obszarze socjologii kultury, antropologii i całej humanistyki.

Słowa kluczowe: wiejska kultura lokalna, model uczestnictwa, model lokalizmu, humanistyka neo-naturalistyczna.

