LEGE ARTIS
Language yesterday, today, tomorrow
Vol. IV. No 1 2019

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE FRAME OF KNOWLEDGE

IN ENGLISH AND POLISH: PRELIMINARIES

Agnieszka Uberman

Institute of English Studies, University of Rzeszów, Poland

Abstract: The discussion aims at presenting the frames of KNOWLDEGE and WIEDZA as specified by native speakers of English and Polish. The concept of knowledge is briefly presented from the general perspective and different types of knowledge are listed. The notion is also introduced with reference to sematic primes. A frame is characterised as a cognitive construct also encompassing scripts, also including cultural scripts available in different language and culture communities.

Key words: KNOWLEDGE, WIEDZA, semantic prime, metaphor, cognitive frame, cultural script

1. Introduction

Knowledge is a broad and omnipresent concept, which can be interpreted from a variety of viewpoints. Wierzbicka (2007: 49) rightly points out that:

> *every society has certain evaluative words that provide a framework of orientation in daily life and guide people's judgement and behaviour. Sometimes speakers are conscious of some of these words and regard them as a badge of belonging. Sometimes, however, a "guiding word" is so ingrained in the thinking of the speech community that it is not perceived as distinctive, but rather taken for granted like the air that people breathe.*

Knowledge in English seems to be this kind of 'guiding word' and a cognitive concept that indeed is often taken for granted.

This paper aims to investigate how the perception of *knowledge* is conceptualised by English native speakers and how it is perceived as distinctive from the Polish point of view using the analysis of associations with the concept within the framework of frame semantics.

The discussion opens with the analysis of what is meant by 'knowledge' (section 2 entitled *Deciphering knowledge*), how it is defined, and what types of knowledge are specified in expert literature.

It is worthy of note that from the Natural Semantic Metalanguage viewpoint KNOW is a universal prime present in human languages the world over. As such a common concept, it is interesting to find out to what extent it is conceptualised differently in diverse language communities (English and Polish).

The concept is also addressed from the perspective of metaphorical representation and interpretation in language (section 4 *Metaphors of knowledge*). Selected expressions and phrases containing the lexeme *knowledge* are analysed and their meanings in Polish are specified, wherever equivalents are available. Similarly, proverbs in which knowledge is featured are provided and briefly discussed.

It is worthy of mention that cultures of language communities encode and condition the language used by particular groups of users, therefore it is essential to pay attention to cultural scripts, which tend to differ in diverse cultural settings. They are a reflection of how groups of people perceive reality and show diversity wherever various concepts are treated in a dissimilar manner. Scripts, including cultural scripts representative of a particular language and culture community, are treated as inclusive in the representations of cognitive frames.

In order to sketch the outline of frames, the construct is characterised from the cognitive semantic point of view. Owing to the fact that frames are knowledge structures, which

are based on associative frameworks, two groups of respondents were requested to list their associations with the concept under consideration, i.e. 'knowledge'.

The data gathering procedure, the methodology of the research study as well as the groups of native speaker English and Polish respondents are also briefly presented in section 5: *The frame of KNOWLEDGE*. We believe that the responses provided by the participants will enable the author to outline the core of the frames of KNOWLEDGE and WIEDZA respectively. In the discussion that follows the data are analysed and preliminary conclusions drawn (sections 6 and 7: *Discussion* and *Conclusions*) in search of similarities as well as points of divergence.

2. Deciphering knowledge

The nature of knowledge and attempts to specify what knowledge is have been a subject of research undertaken by many scholars. As noted in Strickland (2001: 391), John Locke was among the first to refute "the *a priori*, or nonexperiential, account of knowledge" and developed an empirical theory of knowledge. Its nature is described as follows:

> *Knowing originates in external and internal sources of sensation and reflection. The objects or ideas present to **consciousness** are divided into simple and complex. Simple ideas are primitive sense data, which the mind passively receives and cannot alter, delivered by one sense (seeing blue), by several senses (eating an orange as a synthesis of **taste**, **touch** and **smell**), by reflection (hunger), or by a combination of sensation and reflection (pleasure and **pain**). The objective orientation of simple ideas follows from the fact that we cannot add or subtract from their appearance or conception in the mind. In relation to simple ideas, at least, the mind is passive, a "blank" or "white" tablet upon which sensations are impressed. Complex ideas are formed by actively combining, comparing, or abstracting simple ideas to yield "modes, substances, and relations". Modes are class concepts or ideas that do not exist independently, such as beauty. Substance is a complex idea of the unity of substrate of the simple qualities we perceive. And relations are the powers in objects capable of causing minds to make comparisons, for example, identity and cause and effect. The difficult is that complex ideas do not relate to perceivable existents, but hopefully, complex ideas do express elements or characteristics of the real world.*

What is stated as disputable is the relation of the knowledge of ideas to the knowledge of the physical world. Knowledge is thus considered to be relational; "it consists in the

perception of the agreement or disagreement among ideas" (Strickland 2001: 391). Contemporary researchers address the nature of knowledge and attempt to specify its characteristics. Fromm (1983: 28), quoted by Goatly (2007: 11), claims that

Knowing begins with the awareness of the deceptiveness of our common-sense perceptions ... most people are half-awake, half-dreaming and are unaware that most of what they hold to be true and self-evident is illusion produced by the suggestive influence of the social world in which they live.

As noted by Maasen and Weingart (2000: 2),

Virtually every aspect of life is affected by the increase of knowledge, both in quantity and quality. A huge industry has evolved dealing with the production, acquisition, and diffusion of knowledge. Experts and expertises abound. <...> the growing importance of knowledge for the reproduction of societies certainly spills over to non-Western countries as well. Therefore, this development has become an issue both within and outside the academic circles, and it has been given a label: 'knowledge societies'.

Knowledge is a concept that is wide-ranging. It has also expanded over the years and covers a plethora of issues. A resource so inaccessible to many in the past, knowledge has now become a much more widespread phenomenon. As noted by Merriam and Bierema (2013: 4) "the "knowledge society" has replaced the industrial society and has great implications for learning and educational systems across the globe and throughout the lifespan". They also point out that it is not just a mere combination of various facts, knowledge is much more multidimensional. As the authors further note (ibid., 4):

While we are inundated with bits and pieces of information <...>, for information to become useful and meaningful, it needs to be weighted, organized, and structured into meaningful units of knowledge; information and data are the building blocks of knowledge. It is with knowledge that we build new insights, new understandings, and even new products, all of which can contribute to a more enriching context for learning. There are some caveats about this seemingly utopian concept of the knowledge society. Some places in the world are so torn by strife, poverty, and illiteracy that a knowledge society has not evolved, leaving these countries far behind and utterly unable to compete in the developed world. And some groups of citizens, discriminated against because of gender, race or ethnicity, disability, or age, are marginalized in their own societies and prevented from meaningfully participating in the knowledge society.

It is essential to realise that in a similar way to many objects, goods, and properties, knowledge can be obtained more easily by those society members who are better-off and more privileged in various senses of the notion, including financial, social, geopolitical, gender aspects, to mention but a few. Obvious as it may seem, acquiring knowledge can be a complex, expensive, and time-consuming process. Where it is readily available, some individuals may not appreciate it or the simple fact that is so accessible. In many parts of the world, there is no free, general education; moreover, it is denied to some groups. However, those who are underprivileged are often much more willing to acquire even the most basic knowledge in order to somehow improve their position and status. It is also essential to note that in certain countries only limited information and knowledge are provided to their citizens. Political and/or religious regimes often control mass media to such an extent that the availability of and access to unbiased, not manipulated or unlimited information and sources of knowledge are restricted. People are fed with such information and data that are considered essential and sufficient, thus creating a worldview, which has nothing to do with real life. Worse of all, in a large number of places access to sources of knowledge is not available at all. However, it is important to stress that irrespective of the place of residence, the knowledge that individuals acquire, whether consciously or not, influences and shapes their worldview. As defined by Bartmiński (2009: 213):

The linguistic worldview conception is semantic, anthropological and cultural in nature. It is based on the assumption that language codes a certain socially established knowledge of the world and that this knowledge can be reconstructed and verbalized as a set of judgements about people, objects and events.

Thus, it is embedded in and expressed by the language used in a given lingual community.

2.1 Defining knowledge

Knowledge, as defined in *The American heritage dictionary of the English language* (2000: 971) is:

1. The state or fact of knowing. 2. Familiarity, awareness, or understanding gained through experience or study. 3. The sum or range of what has been perceived, discovered, or learned. 4. Learning, erudition. 5. Specific information about something. 6. Carnal knowledge.

Similarly, the Merriam-Webster online dictionary (*s.a.*) characterises the notion as:

1. a: (1) the fact or condition of knowing something with familiarity gained experience or association; (2) acquaintance with or understanding of a science, art or technique; b: (1) the fact or condition of being aware of something; (2) the range of one's information or understanding; c: the circumstance or condition of apprehending truth or fact through reasoning: cognition; d: the fact or condition of having information or of being learned; 2. a: the sum of what is known: the body of truth, information, and principles acquired by humankind.

The synonyms provided for the notion under consideration, i.e. *knowledge*, include: *lore*, *science*, *wisdom*, *learning*, *erudition* as well as *scholarship*. The explanation attempting to differentiate between the various options is stated as follows (ibid.):

Knowledge, learning, erudition, scholarship mean what is or can be known by an individual or by humankind. Knowledge applies to facts or ideas acquired by study, investigation, observation, or experience. Learning applies to knowledge acquired especially through formal, often advanced, schooling. Erudition strongly implies the acquiring of profound, recondite, or bookish learning. Scholarship implies the possession of learning characteristic of the advanced scholar in a specialized field of study or investigation.

Similarly, *The American heritage dictionary of the English language* (2000: 971) notes the synonyms for *knowledge* to be *information*, *learning*, *erudition*, *lore*, and *scholarship*, stating that they "refer to what is known, as through study or experience". *Knowledge* is noted as the broadest in meaning, supporting this argument with Herbert Spencer's words: "Science is organised knowledge". The relations between the enumerated synonyms are specified as follows:

Information[1] often implies a collection of facts and data: "A man's judgement cannot be better than the information on which he has based it" (Arthur Hays Sulzberger). Learning usually refers to knowledge gained by schooling and study: "Learning…must be sought for with ardour and attention to with diligence" (Abigail Adams). Erudition implies profound, often specialized knowledge: "Some have criticized his poetry as elitist, unnecessarily impervious to readers who do not share his erudition" (Elizabeth Kastor). Lore is usually applied to knowledge about a particular subject that is gained through tradition or anecdote: Many American folktales concern the lore of frontier life. Scholarship is the mastery of a particular area of learning reflected in a scholar's work: A good journal article shows ample evidence of the author's scholarship.

In second language acquisition and language learning, the distinction is often made between explicit and implicit knowledge. As pointed out by Ellis (2009) this distinction originated in cognitive psychology. He notes (ibid., 3) that implicit and explicit learning is distinguished in two fundamental ways, i.e.:

(1) Implicit learning proceeds without making demands on central attention resources. <…> 'generalizations arise from conspiracies of memorized utterances collaborating in productive schematic linguistic productions'. Thus, the resulting knowledge is subsymbolic, reflecting statistical sensitivity to the structure of the learned material. In contrast, explicit learning typically involves memorizing a series of successive facts and thus makes heavy demands on working memory. As a result, it takes place consciously and results in knowledge that is symbolic in nature (i.e. it is represented in explicit form).
(2) In the case of implicit learning, learners remain unaware of the learning that has taken place, although it is evident in the behavioral responses they make. Thus, leaners cannot verbalize what they have learned. In the case of explicit learning, learners are aware that they have learned something and can verbalize what they have learned.

Many experts question the presence of a dual system and support the belief that a single system can produce various learning outcomes. A decisive opinion relating to this issue will not be sought as this aspect is beyond the scope of the present discussion.

It should be pointed out that there are various types of knowledge that experts distinguish, such as declarative or procedural knowledge, general, specialist, specialised or scientific knowledge, objective knowledge, rational knowledge, word knowledge and world knowledge, cultural knowledge, linguistic and extralinguistic knowledge, encyclopedic knowledge, conceptual knowledge, practical, knowledge, tacit and explicit knowledge, etc. (Collins 2010; Gascoigne & Thornton 2013; Graff 2015; Jarvis 2009; Kertész 2004; Kirkness 2004; Kövecses 2000; Lakoff & Johnson 1999; Langacker 1987; Pawlak 2006 and many others). The intricacies of the various aspects of knowledge, between which experts differentiate, will not be further investigated. The preceding discussion has aimed at exposing the plethora of knowledge types. It is evident that those varieties are derived from the perspective of the analysis that a given researcher decides to adopt. The aim of the present study is to

explore ordinary people's conceptualization of knowledge, particularly as reflected in English and Polish.

Having defined what the notion entails, it is essential to note that knowledge is a universal human concept; therefore in the following section we will consider it briefly through the prism of Natural Semantic Metalanguage.

3. Natural Semantic Metalanguage

Wierzbicka studied diverse languages and proposed that certain underlying concepts are shared universally by humans irrespective of the linguistic means at their disposal. The Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) theory that she developed with her colleagues is based on the assumption that in every natural language there exist conceptual primitives that are a "manifestation of a universal set of fundamental human concepts" (1996: 13). Natural Semantic Metalanguage, as pointed out by Goddard (1997: 198), "began as an approach to lexical semantic analysis based on reductive paraphrase, that is, explication of a word's meaning by means of an exact paraphrase composed of simpler words than the original". Thus, the items used in individual explications are semantically basic; hence they cannot be further defined. Goddard and Wierzbicka (2002: 41-42) also note that "an important research tool in NSM approach to syntax is the "canonical context", i.e. a sentence or sentence fragment, which is composed predominantly (or exclusively) of semantic primes and which is hypothesised to be expressible in any language".

A part of the NSM is formed by a group of 'mental predicates'. As Wierzbicka states "cross-linguistic investigations <…> allow us to state that the innate and universal theory of mind includes the following major constituents: THINK, KNOW, WANT, and FEEL" (1996: 48). She notes that the fundamental status of the above quoted concepts is reflected by their role and importance in grammar in the following words (ibid., 49):

KNOW plays an essential role in the systems of mood – with the "declaratives" being used on the semantic component 'I know', and the "interrogative" on the components – 'I don't know – I want to know'. Clearly, KNOW – as well as THINK – is also the basis of "evidentials" ('I know because I see', 'I know because I hear', 'I think, I don't say: I know', and so on.

While considering the above mental predicates Goddard and Wierzbicka (2002: 59-60) note that:

Aside from favouring personal substantives (i.e. I, YOU, SOMEONE, PEOPLE/PERSON) as "subjects", the primes KNOW and THINK share some interesting similarities so far as valency options and complementation possibilities are concerned. <...> they are both hypothesised to allow a propositional complement (in English, <u>know that S</u>[2] and <u>think that S</u>) <...>, a substantive topic (in English, <u>know about Y</u> and <u>think about Y</u>). Both can take a substantive complement (<u>know something, think something</u>).

Hence, the explication, i.e. the valency options available to the semantic primitive KNOW are as follows:

     X knows (that) - -

     X knows something

     X knows something about someone/something

However, as noted by Goddard (2018: 56), with more research conducted with reference to semantic primes, "KNOW is one of the verbs whose NSM syntax has been recently adjusted". According to the most recent analyses experts believe that KNOW has the following four basic frames (ibid, 58):

I KNOW
someone KNOWS something
someone KNOWS something about something
    (including: knows a lot about…, know more about…)

The above-presented basic grammatical frames for KNOW are explained as follows (ibid, 56):

The first frame is I KNOW. For example, someone say something to you, and you reply I KNOW. It's a dialogical, first-person use of KNOW, often used in response to somebody else. As far as we can tell, people can say this kind of thing in all languages. It is extremely common in English.

The second frame is a third-person frame: 'someone KNOWS it.' This time we are attributing something like knowledge to someone. We can also say, using the third frame, that 'someone KNOWS something.' And finally, using the fourth frame, we can say that 'someone KNOWS something about[3] something.' For example, if we want to talk about people (experts) who know a lot about something. These are the basic four frames for KNOW.

The research has also led the experts to realise that contrary to earlier claims, in numerous languages, the exponent of KNOW, which can be applied with reference to 'knowing someone' is not included in the above outlined four frames, because 'know someone' is not "a semantically primitive use of KNOW" (Goddard 2018: 58). Hence, the claim expressed by Wierzbicka (2002: 93) with reference to the Polish equivalent of the English *know*, i.e. *wiedzieć* stating that "like many other languages, Polish seems to distinguish lexically between, roughly speaking, "propositional knowledge" and "personal knowledge". The exponent of the former is *wiedzieć*, and of the latter, *znać*" and they should be treated as allolexes of the same prime is no longer valid. A complex lexical meaning of 'know (someone)' can be explicated as follows (Goddard 2018: 59):

I KNOW him/her (= this someone):
I know some things about him/her (= this someone)
* because I was with him/her for some time before*
because of this, I can think like this: "he/she is like this"

The status of the concept of knowledge clearly shows its central position in human cognition and the description of the world. Because of its core locus KNOW is further indivisible in terms of semantic primes, as it constitutes one of them. Nevertheless, knowledge as a broad concept evokes certain associations, which provide various metaphorical extensions and which can create a complex cognitive frame. In the following part of the discussion, the focus shall be placed on the design of the outline of the construct in question, i.e. the frame of knowledge. However, before we analyse the way in which Polish and English native speakers conceptualise the notion relative to their background experience and cultural setting, attention will be focused on metaphorical language use and representation.

4. Metaphors of knowledge

It is the intention of the author to find out whether the perception of knowledge is conceptualised differently by Polish and English native speakers, and whether the linguistic representations of the concept specified by the two groups of respondents are distinctive from one another. It would be also interesting to learn whether the lexical expressions used in both languages are based on parallel metaphors. Selected examples of expressions containing the lexemes *knowledge* and *wiedza* shall be presented and interpreted.

In their classical work, Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 5) clearly point out that "the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another". Experts in the field unanimously agree that metaphor in the cognitive linguistic view is defined as "understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain" (Kövecses 2002: 4). It has been universally understood that metaphor is not regarded as merely a manner of speaking. As noted by Taylor, Cuyckens and Dirven (2003: 7):

Metaphor cannot therefore be regarded simply as a rhetorical embellishment of an otherwise predominantly "literal" mode of expression, and which is restricted in the main to the creations of poets and orators. On the contrary, metaphor is an important means whereby more abstract, intangible domains of experience can be conceptualized in terms of what is more concrete and more immediate.

Kivistö and Pihlström note that "the variety of the metaphors applied in the epistemic and inquiry-related matters" include among others those, which are "drawn from *architecture*, *buildings* and *the accumulation of knowledge*" (2017: 781). They add that metaphors related to visual perception are equally widespread; "this is the so-called *spectator theory of knowledge*". The authors quote Dewey who "rejected the view <…> that the subject pursuing knowledge is merely a passive spectator of an objective world whose structure is independent of the process of inquiry. Instead, the object of knowledge is <…> partly constructed through inquiry" (2017: 781-782).

Another aspect is highlighted by pragmatists and naturalists who consider the character of human knowledge to be *antifoundational* and *fallible*. Science is compared to a "*cable* consisting of threads none of which is very strong by itself – and all of which may in fact be relatively slender – but which together form a strongly interwoven system", while scientific inquiry is likened to "*walking on a bog*: one can never have more than partial confirmations of hypotheses; there is no resource to an absolutely solid "bedrock of fact, "and therefore we can never stand firm but must, in order to avoid sinking into a bog, constantly move on, take new steps forward" (Kivistö & Pihlström 2017: 782). Metaphors based on a similar imagery of lack of stability are those employing *ship* or *boat*: "scientists are like sailors afloat on the sea who have to constantly reconstruct their vessel during the voyage itself, unable to dock in any safe harbour to do the work". The same source also metaphorically refers to the concept as the *web of belief* (ibid.). *Fishing* is a popular metaphor for knowledge seeking and so are a *map* and *navigation*. A different perspective is presented through the metaphor of knowledge as *capital*, which conceptualises it as an entity of instrumental value. Kivistö and Pihlström (ibid., 783-784) point out that:

> *Knowledge conceived as capital becomes something that can be managed and measured; we can invest financial resources in it and also expect some good return for this investment. <...> the metaphors of capital and resources objectify knowledge as a thing that can be controlled and benefited from, and thus these images subject knowledge to an accounting discourse and turn it into a property that can be owned, stored, and measured. The capital metaphor connects knowledge to instrumental uses and models in management thinking that imply external control of knowledge production; such instrumentalising control may be detrimental to academic freedom.*

The metaphor index provided by Kövecses (2000: 216-223; 2002: 281-285) does not list any instances where the lexeme *knowledge* is included, but it does provide examples of metaphors within the frame of KNOWLEDGE, such as:

IDEAS ARE (VALUABLE) COMMODITIES:

e.g., "there is always a *market* for good ideas"; "a *worthless* idea"; "a source of *valuable* ideas"; "the idea has no chance in the *intellectual marketplace*", etc.;

MEANINGS ARE OBJECTS:

e.g., "to *share* experiences";

MENTAL ACTIVITY IS MANIPULATION: "the mind is a workshop where a variety of "activities" take place: we *work* on a problem, *store* ideas in memory, *look* at questions *from all sides*, *hammer out* a solution, *put things on the back burner* for a while, and so forth" (Kövecses 2000: 196);

THE MIND IS A CONTAINER:

e.g., "to *get into* someone's head"; "have a head like a *sieve*".

In another publication, however, Kövecses (2010: 369-375) specifies a single metaphor including the term *knowledge*, i.e. KNOWING IS SEEING:

e.g., "I *see*"; "*transparent* idea", "*murky* argument", etc.

He also lists other instances of knowledge-related metaphors such as:

IDEAS ARE FOOD:

e.g., "*raw* facts"; "*half-baked* ideas"; "*warmed-over* theories"; "to *chew over* the suggestion"; "to *swallow* that claim"; "to *devoured* the book", etc.;

IDEAS ARE OBJECTS:

e.g., "the message *came across*";

IMAGINATION IS FIRE:

e.g., "The painting *set fire to* the composer's imagination"; "imagination *caught fire*"; "imagination is *on fire*"; "The story *kindled* the boy's imagination";

LINGUISTIC EXPRESSIONS ARE CONTAINERS FOR MEANING OBJECTS;

THE MIND IS A BRITTLE OBJECT:

e.g., "her ego is *fragile*"; "she is easily *crushed*"; "he *broke* under cross-examination"; "the experience *shuttered* him";

THE MIND IS A MACHINE:

e.g., "How can a man understand the *workings* of woman's mind?"; "the brain is *ticking over* more briskly";

THE MIND IS THE BODY:

e.g., "in one's mind's *eye*";

THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS:

e.g., "the *foundation* of the theory"; "The theory needs more *support*"; "to *construct* a *strong* argument"; "to *put together* the *framework* of the theory", etc.;

THINKING IS COOKING:

e.g., "to *stew over* something";

THINKING IS LOOKING:

e.g., "*look* before you leap";

and UNDERSTANDING IS DIGESTING:

e.g., "to *digest* all these ideas".

Other metaphors that have not been enumerated above are also present in general as well as academic discourse. Many are dependent on the cultural setting in which a given society or community is immersed. The above set is representative of the English language and cultural tradition. In the following part of the discussion only expressions, which contain the lexeme *knowledge* will be considered. Other examples of knowledge-related metaphorical language deserve a detailed study of their own and will be undertaken as separate research.

4.1. Expressions and proverbs containing the lexeme 'knowledge'

From a narrower perspective, the term itself is a component of linguistic expressions. Let us now study briefly those selected expressions in English in which *knowledge* is present. Polish equivalents available for the quoted phrases and expressions will be provided.

General knowledge is defined as "knowledge about a lot of different subjects", while the phrases **first-hand/personal knowledge** describe "knowledge from experiencing something yourself". **Basic knowledge** refers to "knowledge of the basic aspects of something", as opposed to **in-depth knowledge**, which describes "detailed knowledge about all of a particular subject". **Intimate knowledge** is "knowledge about something because you are involved in it", **inside knowledge** stands for "knowledge that you have because you are part of a group", while **background knowledge** refers to "knowledge that you need before you can understand or do something" (LDCE 2012: 969) or

"knowledge of someone's past or environment that might prove relevant" (TTEM 2002: 902). Similar collocations can be found in Polish as well.

To be secure in the belief / knowledge is an idiom describing the feeling of confidence (Knowledge, *s.a.*), while **to be safe/secure in the knowledge** refers to the situation of "feeling safe or secure because one knows something specified". In Polish, the phrase one may provide to refer to the latter expression is **pewny, że**… (WSAP 2002: 1049), but it is security that is foregrounded, not knowledge, of which there is no mention.

To one's knowledge means "according to what one knows" whereas **to the best of one's knowledge** is "used to say that a person thinks something is true but that there may be something he or she does not know which makes it untrue" or "as truthfully as possible" (Knowledge, *s.a.*). In Polish, both of the above are interpreted as **o ile wiem / o ile mi wiadomo** (Jaworska 2002: 331) and the meanings overlap with their English counterparts. **Without someone's knowledge** is used to say when "something was done the person specified did not know about it" and has a Polish direct equivalent **bez czyjejś wiedzy** (ibid., 331).

The phrase **common knowledge** is defined as "something that many or most people know" (Knowledge, *s.a.*), while **public knowledge** designates "something that people know because it has been reported in the news". Both expressions are rendered in Polish as **rzecz powszechnie / ogólnie / publicznie znana; wiadoma** (Jaworska 2002: 330) and they refer to the same concept, even though the exact Polish equivalent for knowledge, i.e. *wiedza* is not named, but it is evoked.

A **thirst for knowledge** describes a "desire to learn more" (LDCE 2012: 969) and in Polish is known as **głód wiedzy** (WSAP 2002: 653).

An individual's extensive knowledge about "the different parts of something" is referred to as **somebody's breadth of knowledge** (LDCE 2012: 969), which could be rendered in Polish as **rozległość wiedzy** (WSAP 2002: 137).

Working knowledge describes practical abilities and its Polish counterpart is **wiedza praktyczna / praktyczna znajomość** (Jaworska 2002: 331).

The tree of knowledge (of good and evil) – known in Polish as **drzewo wiadomości dobrego i złego** (ibid., 330), refers to "the tree which God planted, together with the Tree of Life, in the garden of Eden". It was from this tree that Eve picked the forbidden fruit and gave some to Adam, and this deed was the reason for which "they were later driven from the garden and the woes of mankind began" (BDPF 2002: 1199).

The overall observation that becomes visible from the examples quoted above is that in both languages, the concepts are similarly treated and to a great extent they overlap not only in meaning but also in structure. The expressions in English and Polish largely correspond in denotation as well as construction.

The English collocations listed in the opening paragraph are not set phrases in Polish but equivalents that can be easily produced for the first four expressions as **wiedza ogolna**, **wiedza z pierwszej ręki**, **podstawowa wiedza**, **dogłębna / szczegółowa wiedza**. No exact equivalents exist for the remaining three.

Language is also rich in numerous sayings and proverbs. They are maxims, which are entrenched in human culture. Society's wisdom is said to be imitated in proverbs. They are sayings, which reflect the truths long held by a given society, and are considered as wisdom that has been handed down through generations. As accurately summarised by Kochman-Haładyj (2017: 140), "in Linguistic Culturology proverbs are perceived as signs of specific ethnic and national cultures <…> the proverb system of a language reflects a certain way of life of a given culture and represents a set of values of people

speaking the language." What this seems to entail is the fact that cultural scripts (addressed in section 5 below) also reflect the worldview of the particular culture and language community.

A few examples of proverbs, which are formed with the concept of 'knowledge', are presented below.

Doubt is the key of knowledge; and *Knowledge is a wild thing and must be hunted before it is tamed* both refer to the sources of knowledge. Its importance is foregrounded in the proverb *Knowledge has bitter roots but sweet fruits* (Fergusson 1983: 75).

Proverbs: *Knowledge is the mother of all virtue; all vice proceeds from ignorance*; *Knowledge is power*; *Knowledge is no burthen* all make reference to the value of knowledge (ibid., 136). Similar connotations are evoked by the proverbs *Blind is everyone who lacks knowledge*; *A man of knowledge increases strength*; *Knowledge is better than money in the bank*; *Knowledge is better than riches*; *Knowledge is light, ignorance a cloud*; *Lack of knowledge is darker than night* or *He who has knowledge has power* (RBWP 2006: 245).

Inadequacy of knowledge is stressed by the following examples: *Knowledge makes one laugh, but wealth makes one dance*; *Knowledge without practice makes but half an artist* (Fergusson 1983: 136). The dangers of insufficient knowledge are expressed also in *Knowledge and wisdom are far from being one* – "knowledgeable people may lack the wisdom to make sound judgements" (Manser 2007: 161).

Zeal without knowledge is a runaway horse; *Zeal without knowledge is the sister of folly* both designate the fact that "uninformed enthusiasm will only lead to disaster" (ibid., 319). Wilkinson lists a third variety of the proverb, i.e. *Zeal without knowledge is fire without light* (TTEM 2002: 740).

The dangers of knowledge are highlighted in the proverb *Knowledge is folly, except grace guide it* (Fergusson 1983: 137).

Ignorance is highlighted in the proverb *A little knowledge is a dangerous thing* (RBWP 2006: 245). The proverb means that "incomplete knowledge can embarrass or harm someone or something" (TDAI 1998: 201).

Its durability is expressed by the Arabian saying *Knowledge acquired as a child is more lasting than an engraving on stone* (RBWP 2006: 245). However, to be more long-lasting knowledge has to be revised: *Knowledge comes through practice*; *Knowledge is a treasure, but practice is the key to it* or *Questioning is the door of knowledge* (ibid., 245). *Knowledge and timber shouldn't be much used until they are seasoned* is a saying which means that "knowledge is not useful until it is tempered by experience" (Manser 2007: 160). *Experience is the mother of knowledge* (Apperson & Manser 2006: 184).

As noted by Wilkinson, *Knowledge has no enemy but ignorance* (TTEM 2002:121) and this saying most clearly illustrates the lack of boundaries to learning. However, appearances can be deceptive, as expressed by the proverb *Don't judge a man's knowledge of racehorses by the clothes he wears* (ibid., 943).

In Polish, the concept 'wiedza' is a part of the proverbs *Ciekawość pierwszy stopień do wiedzy* ("curiosity is the first step towards knowledge") and *Prawdziwa wiedza to znajomość przyczyn* ("true knowledge is the awareness of causes"), both of which emphasise the virtue and necessity of knowledge (Polish proverbs, *s.a.*). Similarly to the English proverb *Knowledge is power*, its Polish equivalent *Wiedza jest potęgą* (KP 2008: 197) stresses how substantial it is in life.

Correspondingly to *A little knowledge is a dangerous thing*, ignorance is condemned in the Polish proverb *Niedostatek wiedzy jest rzeczą niebezpieczną* (ibid., 196).

Niedostatek nauczycielem wiedzy (ibid., 195) ("poverty is the teacher of knowledge") can be interpreted to mean that knowledge is acquired irrespective of material wealth. It has to be noted that the lexeme 'wiedza' itself is infrequently featured in Polish proverbs, even though numerous maxims are devoted to the concept in question.

It can be concluded from the brief analysis above that no significant differences between the contrasted languages can be observed. It clearly shows that knowledge is a valuable asset, a sought-after quality as it provides safety and its lack is unwelcome. It evokes positive connotations and its possession enriches an individual. As such a valued feature it is quite amply documented in language. It proves to be a productive concept, which is represented by and reflected in a sizeable chunk of the lexicon. As opposed to the English corpus, Polish proverbs containing the considered lexeme itself are not numerous. Nevertheless, the maxims representing the concept of knowledge are quite voluminous.

In the further analysis an attempt will be made at finding convergent as well as divergent ways in which knowledge is conceptualised by adult native speakers of Polish and English. The data provided by respondents will be helpful in outlining the core elements of the cognitive construct in the form of a frame.

5. Methodology: The frame of KNOWLEDGE

Pertuck (2013: 1) succinctly summarises the origin of frame as a construct in language study and analysis:

Fillmore (1975) introduced the notion of a frame into linguistics as an alternative to "checklist" theories of meaning. Instead of representing the meaning of a linguistic form in terms of a checklist of conditions that must be satisfied for the form to be appropriately or truthfully used, word meaning is characterized in terms of experience-based schematizations of the speaker's world – frames[4]. A semantic frame is a representation of an event or state of affairs whose parts are identified as frame elements and whose underlying conceptual structure speakers access for both encoding and decoding purposes. Thus, the semantic frame, parts of which are indexed by words that evoke the frame (Fillmore 1985), is a cognitive structuring device used in the service of understanding.

As originally proposed by Fillmore in 1981 a frame is a construct that is characterised by internal relationships. Fillmore (1982: 111) suggests:

> *By the term 'frame' I have in mind any system of concepts related in such a way that to understand any one of them you have to understand the whole structure in which it fits; when one of the things in such a structure is introduced into a text, or into a conversation, all of the others are automatically made available. I intend the word ' frame' as used here to be a general cover term for the set of concepts variously known, in the literature on natural language understanding, as 'schema', 'script', 'scenario', 'ideational scaffolding', 'cognitive mode', or 'folk theory'.*

As Goddard (2007: 69) briefly summarises Fillmore's conception, "the meaning of a word can only be understood against a background frame of experience, beliefs, or practices that "motivate the concept that the word encodes".
Fontenelle (2009: 38) states that:

> *The 'frame' in frame semantics represents a sort of situation, an aspect of reality in which various keywords, e.g., see, behold, spot, in the case of the 'perception frame', are contrasted with one another and can be classified as a function of the relationships which hold between the various actants or frame elements <…>. A frame-based lexicon aims at describing the combinatory potential of a given lexical item, which boils down to explicitly indicating how each frame element can be realized, syntactically as well as lexically, at the surface level.*

Once a frame element is triggered, an entire frame becomes available. Experts provide numerous features of this cognitive paradigm. Despite the differences in its interpretation (Burkhanov 1999), some of the shared, commonly recognised properties include the following (Uberman 2006: 40):

> *Frame is a particular kind of knowledge structure, <…> a complex knowledge structure, frame allows to operate with large knowledge structures, frame is a socially-significant phenomenon, <…> a system of closely interrelated elements, <…> a conceptual structure of a prototypical nature.*

Frames as knowledge structures are known to be networks of interrelated concepts; once a trigger is provided, the entire structure is made available[5]. Owing to the presence of the parameter of prototypicality, it is hoped that the presented conceptual structures reflect the linguistic reality of the analysed language communities.

According to Widawski (2003), if the language is treated as a reflection of the society that employs it in (and for) communication, then the lexicon of this language is a way to understand the culture of its users. This clearly entails that particular culture and language communities can design their own worldview and understanding of the surrounding reality. As Wierzbicka (1996; 2006) and Goddard (2004) note, cultural scripts represent shared ways of thinking as reflected in ways of speaking entrenched in the speech and culture community. Wierzbicka (2006: 23) states that: "widely shared and widely known ways of thinking can be identified in terms of the same empirically established universal human concepts" and she adds that cultural scripts reflect the way people in a particular culture and society think, speak, and act.

Cultural scripts refer to "representations of cultural norms which are widely held in a given society and are reflected in the language" (Wierzbicka 2007: 56). As Goddard (2012: 1039) points out: "In this sense, cultural scripts can be compared with what are known in the ethnography of communication research tradition as 'norms of interaction' and 'norms of interpretation', i.e. widely shared assumptions about how – and why – it is good or bad to speak in certain culturally construed situations". However, Goddard (ibid., 1039) stresses the fact that:

> In a more technical sense, the term 'cultural script' refers to a particular technique for articulating cultural norms in a fashion that is clear, precise, translatable, and accessible to cultural insiders and cultural outsiders alike. <...> this outcome is possible because cultural scripts in this sense are formulated in a highly constrained metalanguage of semantically simple words (semantic primes) and grammatical patterns which appear to have equivalents in all languages.

Duranti (1997: 27) views culture as knowledge of the world, i.e. not only of facts, objects, places, and people, but also as culture community members sharing "certain patters of thought, ways of understanding the world, making inferences and predictions". Whatever people communicate is to a certain extent culturally-conditioned.

The interrelation is clearly supported by Levisen and Waters (2017: 240) who state that "on a larger scale of things, words are ordering our shared discursive universes through relative fixities and a complex set of hierarchised keywords with interrelated cultural scripts. Theses fixities form the basis for narratives, stereotypes, mythologies, and local truths". The cultural scripts representative of a given speech community are believed to be a constitutive part of a frame[6].

The main aim of the present study is to learn whether the outlines of the frames of respectively KNOWLEDGE in English and WIEDZA in Polish are similar or if significant differences can be identified. The outlines of the frames have been produced on the basis of the analysis of data provided by mostly adult volunteers – native speakers of Polish and English. A group of 50 Polish and 50 English respondents (two of whom are still in their teens) were requested to provide a list of ten first associations with the concept of KNOWLEDGE and WIEDZA respectively. This data-gathering procedure resulted in obtaining approximately 500 responses in each language (some respondents provided fewer than ten associations). Obviously, the number of lexemes and associations is not sufficiently substantial to be able to generalise about what the entire English and Polish language corpora hold and how complex the frames may actually be, nevertheless the present attempt is aimed at shedding some light on the issue under consideration. The data provided by respondents in Polish have been presented in this discussion together with the English equivalents available for the listed Polish lexemes or phrases.

Thus the obtained and analysed results cannot be considered representative of the entire language community or speech population, nevertheless, they might provide some insight into how the phenomenon of knowledge is conceptualised by working adults, as only three respondents (two English and one Polish) are students or undergraduates (two English-speaking teenagers and one Polish student). Moreover, three Polish respondents are already retired but were in the workforce their entire adult lives.

Frames represent knowledge structures, which are characterised by associative networks. For this reason, the data-gathering procedure was limited to requesting respondents to provide associations they have with the concept under scrutiny. No larger corpora (dictionaries, language corpus, etc.) were consulted in the study, as such detailed treatment and analyses require large-scale research, which shall be undertaken in the future.

6. Discussion

In the following sections, the outlines of the frames of WIEDZA in Polish and KNOWLEDGE in English will be briefly presented.

6.1 Polish frame of WIEDZA – an outline

The gathered data permit an attempt to outline the cognitive construct represented in the Polish language.

The respondents were asked to provide the first 10 associations that come to their minds and that are evoked when they hear the concept WIEDZA. The respondents are adults (30 females and 20 males) representing different professions, such as: doctors, art historians, journalists, secretaries, insurance agents, bank managers, sales representatives, etc. It was the author's intention to avoid responses from teachers. The reason not to include teachers in the poll was the fact that by definition this professional group deals with passing on knowledge to learners. As a consequence, their understanding and conceptualisation of the considered notion tends to be more specific or professionally-biased rather than general. One group member is a student and three are retired. The request was addressed in Polish: *Proszę podać pierwsze dziesięć skojrzeń z pojęciem WIEDZA* and the responses were also provided accordingly. For text clarity, the most representative synonyms in English are listed together with the original Polish answers.

The most recurrent individual notion, listed by 35 respondents, was **nauka** (the term in Polish covers the concepts of **learning and/or teaching,** as it refers both to self-study as well as to being taught), followed by **uczenie się przez całe życie / ciągłe dokształcanie** (**continuous (lifelong) learning**) (2) and **gromadzenie wiedzy (gathering knowledge)** (2). Considered in conglomerate, this group of provided responses amounts to 39. This means that nearly 80% of respondents believe that knowledge (i.e. **WIEDZA**) is part of learning or results from learning.

Książka/książki (book/books) (32) seem to be the primary source of knowledge. However, if we decide to incorporate in this group other mentioned collections of, printed resources, such as **encyklopedia (encyclopaedia)** (7), **biblioteka (library)** (5), **literature (literature)** (4), **podręcznik/podręczniki (schoolbooks)** (2), **słownik(i) (dictionaries)** (2), and **czasopismo (magazine/journal)** (2), the overall inventory proves the most numerous (54), as outlined by the addressed group of respondents.

Szkoła (school) was quoted by 22 respondents. However, by merging **uniwersytet / uczelnia (university/higher education institution)** (7), **studia / student (studies/students)** (12), and **egzamin / wynik egzaminu (exam (results))** (2) into a superordinate category, i.e. **educational institutions and people in education** group (43), makes this collection the second most numerously represented option related to knowledge. The group of educational institutions and people involved could also be expanded by adding **profesor/profesura (professor/professorship)** (4) and a **doktorat (PhD)** (1).

Other individually noted institution-related concepts include: **wykład (lecture)**, **listy (letters)**, **project (project)**, **myśli (thoughts)**, **filozofia (philosophy)**, **trening (training)**, **lekcja (lesson)**, **zeszyt (notebook)**, **znaczenie (meaning)**, **pisanie (writing)**, **poszukiwanie (search)**, **mapa myśli (mind map),** and **stypendium (scholarship)**.

Mądrość (wisdom) (27) was another regularly noted individual notion, with related **inteligencja (intelligence)** (16), **umysł (mind)** (9), **mózg (brain)** (5), **artykuły / publikacje** (articles/publications) (4), **otwarty umysł (open mind)** (2), and **myślenie (thinking)** (2).

Doświadczenie (experience) was mentioned by 18 respondents, and **nauczyciel (teacher)** was associated with knowledge by 14 people. Surprisingly, only 9 respondents listed the **internet (**also spelt **Internet)** as a knowledge-related notion.

Knowledge is also associated with **rozwój (development)** (14), **umiejętności (skills and abilities)** (10), **czytanie (reading)** (9), **ciężka praca (hard work)** (8), **zdobyte wykształcenie (acquired education)** (8), **świadomość (awareness)** (7), **fakty / widomości (facts/news)** (7), **podróż/podróżowanie (travels/travelling)** (7), **poznanie (cognition)** (6), **wykształcenie (education)** (6), and **łatwość rozwiązywania porblemów / radzenia sobie w trudnych sytuacjach (the ease of solving problems/dealing with difficult situations** (5).

A few respondents consider knowledge to be tied to **starszy wiek (older age)** (4), **pieniądze (money)** (5), **status / prestiż (status / prestige)** (5), **szacunek (respect)** (3), **ciekawość (curiosity)** (3), and **czas (time)** (3) – most probably spent on learning and accumulating knowledge. The time spent on education results in **erudycja (erudition)** (3), **zrozumienie (understanding)** (4), **kompetencja (competence)** (3), **oczytanie (being refined)** (3), and **kulturalny** (most likely familiar with **culture)** (4). Three respondents listed **władza (power)** (3) as a knowledge-related concept.

There were very many instances of aspects of knowledge that were mentioned by two individuals each. These include: **kwalifikacje (qualifications)**, **mądrość życiowa (life wisdom)**, **otwartość na świat (openness)**, **sukces (success)**, **poświęcenie (dedication)**, **szerokie horyzonty (wide horizons)**, **globus (globe)**, **niepodległość / niezależność (independence)**, **nowe / nowoczesna technologie (new technologies)**,

komputery (**computers**), **pamięć / zapamiętywanie (memory / memorising), praktyka (practice), poświęcienie (sacrifice / devotion), możliwości (opportunities), ciekawe fakty (interesting facts)**, dobra praca (good job), rozmowa (conversation), słuchanie (listening), przyszłość (future), badania naukowe (research), odkrycie (discovery), satysfakcja (satisfaction), dzielenie się wiedzą (sharing knowledge), nauka na błędach (learning from own mistakes)**.

The remaining types of knowledge listed by Polish native speakers include: **wiedza wirtualna** (**virtual** knowledge) (1), **wiedza powszechna** (**common** knowledge) (1), **wiedza praktyczna** (**practical** knowledge) (1), **wykorzystywanie wiedzy w praktyce** (using knowledge **in practice**) (1) as well as **wiedza bezużyteczna** (**useless** knowledge) (1).

The most numerous group, however, is formed of individual concepts enumerated only once in the corpus of the gathered data. Among them the following features can be found: **wytrwałość (resilience)**, **chęci (willingness)**, **bycie systematycznym (being systematic)**, **tolerancja (tolerance)**, **odpowiedzialność (reliability)**, **uniwersalność (universality)**, **pewność siebie (self-confidence)**, **determinacja (determination)**, **bycie rozsądnym (being reasonable)**, **organizacja wiedzy (organising knowledge)**. Knowledge is also considered as related to: **korzyść (advantage)**, **zainteresowania (interests)**, **realizacja (realisation)**, **pasja (passion)**, **poczucie humour / dowcip (wit)**, **mędrzec (sage), mentor (mentor), zmiana (change), intelekt (intellect)**, **talent (gift), atrybut (attribute), docenienie (appreciation), profesjonalizm (professionalism), awans (promotion)**, as well as such universal concepts as: **społeczeństwo (society), media (media), cywilizacja (civilisation), dobre samopoczucie (well-being), harmonia (harmony), prawda (truth), szczęście (happiness), pokój (peace)**.

The negatively-loaded associations include: **ignorancja (ignorance)**, **manipulacja (manipulation), brak wiedzy (lack of knowledge)**, and **głupota (stupidity)**.

6.2 English frame of KNOWLEDGE – an outline

Input provided by native speakers of English (coming from Great Britain, USA, and Australia) has allowed the present author to outline a rudimentary frame of KNOWLEDGE. The obtained responses create a construct that is basic in nature. This is caused by the fact that the data-gathering procedure relied only on respondents' associations and this corpus was not expanded by input derived from printed language sources. They were requested to list their first ten associations with the concept KNOWLEDGE. Some respondents noted that the first few ideas were easy to provide, but to list 10 was quite a demanding task. Similarly to the Polish study participants, the English-speaking respondents (23 females and 27 males) are also members of the workforce and include: bankers, lawyers, caretakers, journalists, artists, to mention but a few. Two participants are still learning/studying.

Unlike the Polish frame, the English-speaking respondents most frequently (28 instances) mentioned **facts/storehouse of facts/news/information** group, including **retained information**. **Understanding/comprehension** was enumerated 22 times.

Learning and **teaching** are well-represented in connection with knowledge (24), as **learning** is noted by 17 individuals, **lifelong learning** by 3, and **teaching** by 4 respondents. It seems important to note that the individual involvement necessary for absorbing knowledge is emphasised in the choice of 'learning' over knowledge being imparted through 'teaching'.

However, if treated jointly, the **education process and institutions** group would reach a score of 66 and would be considered the most recurrent, as **learning** was mentioned by 17 respondents, **education** by 15 (including **extended education**), **schools/universities** (including **college** and **academia**) by 11, **studying** by 8, **teachers/students** by 6, **teaching** by 4, **lifelong learning** by 3, **exam** by 1, and **basic level learning** by 1 respondent.

Experience seems quite essential with reference to knowledge as it was listed by 16 individuals and **life lessons** was the notion additionally mentioned by 3 respondents. **Intelligence** was associated with knowledge by 16 respondents (including **IQ**), **wisdom** by 10, skills (including **transfer of skills** as well as **applicable skills**) was listed by 7, **cognition** by 4, **brain** by 2, **ability** by 2. Interestingly, three respondents associated knowledge with **knowing what you know**, three with **recognising what you do not know**, and two more with **know-how**. Being **smart/clever** was noted as knowledge-related by 10 respondents, two of whom additionally mentioned **book smart** and **street smart** as essential. Being **learned** is an important feature for 4 respondents.

Research (5) and **discovery** (5) together with **development/growth** (5) were stressed by nearly a third of all respondents.

Knowledge is associated with **power** (13) by a quarter of the poll. **Books** (12), **encyclopaedia** (1), **library** (2) and **reading** (3) make a relatively small group (18 responses only).

Surprisingly, **expertise** was mentioned only 5 times and **qualifications** only twice in the researched group.

However, English native speakers value **critical thinking** (5), **enlightment** (4), **seeking the truth** (4), and **curiosity/being inquisitive** (4) with reference to knowledge. Food-related metaphors, such as: **hunger for knowledge** and **thirst for knowledge** were mentioned once each.

In order to retain gathered knowledge **awareness** (4), **memory** (4), and **creativity** (2) are essential.

Various **types of knowledge** are copiously enumerated including: **evidence-based** knowledge (3), **acquired** knowledge (3), **applied** knowledge (3), **practical** knowledge (3), **working** knowledge (2), **common** knowledge (2), **first-hand** knowledge (1), **public** knowledge (1), **carnal** knowledge (1), **specialist** knowledge (1), **useful** knowledge (1), **prior** knowledge (1).

One respondent is **safe in the knowledge** that **a little knowledge is a dangerous thing**. This can be clearly explained by the fact that some of the features of the analysed concept include: **complexity** (2), being **dynamic** (2), **interesting** (2), **intellectual** (2), **considered** (1), **stimulating** (1), **factual** (1), **objective** (1), **impartial** (1), **infinite** (1), **limitless** (1), **positive** (1), but also **limiting** (2), **debatable** (1), **never fully achievable** (1), related to **uncertainty** (1), **propaganda** (1), **brainwashing** (1), **conjectures to be tested** (1) or **ignorance** (3). One respondent considers it as **bubble gum for the brain**. Knowledge is associated with **sharing** (3), **opportunities** (2), **analysis** (2), **open mind** (2), **common sense** (2), **effectiveness** (1), **fulfilment** (1), **enjoyment** (1), **confidence** (1), **security** (1), **responsibility** (1), **progression** (1), and **balance** (1). It is considered **crucial to survival** (1).

Knowledge is also connected with **perception** (2), **freedom** (1), **trust** (1), **modesty** (1), **realisation** (1), **intuition** (1), **reflection** (1), **self-direction** (1) and **making informed decisions** (1). **Turning knowledge into practice** (2), and **the ability to distinguish between views** (1) as well as referring to knowledge as **privilege** (1) seem to be underappreciated.

7. Conclusions

Considering knowledge frames as constructed on the basis of a limited poll is a difficult, if not an unachievable, task. Undoubtedly, a large-scale study would yield more conclusive results. Nevertheless, the data gathered from native speakers of both the analysed and contrasted languages make it possible to outline a sketch of these cognitive constructs.

It is noteworthy that Polish native speakers seem to proclaim 'knowledge' as more institutionalised. Learning, teaching, schools, and books are far more frequently recalled by Polish respondents. However, the English-speaking respondents provided a great number of individual features associated with knowledge, both positive as well as some that are negatively-loaded. Only a few such instances were evoked by Polish native speakers. Also, what is surprising in the contemporary technologically-advanced world, technology was barely mentioned by English native speakers (1) and the Internet was not listed at all. In the Polish frame this association is much more visible (Internet – 9; technology-related items – 4).

Old age and experience seem to be more readily associated with knowledge by Polish respondents; elders were mentioned only 3 times by English native speakers.

Another difference that is observable is the reference to power, which is clearly much more noticeable in English.

As noted in expert literature various metaphors of knowledge are available, in this study the most pronounced was METAPHOR IS POWER, literally specified as such by most English native speakers who readily associate those two concepts.

Interestingly, in Polish one example of an animal is used to designate knowledge, i.e. **an owl**, which is apparently noted for wisdom and symbolises this notion in Polish tradition. In the gathered corpus of English, one respondent referred to **a salmon**, explaining the association with reference to an "Irish legend that there is a salmon that is the fountain of all knowledge". Nature-related associations are also provided by three native speakers of English in the instances **the fountain of knowledge** (2) and **a tree of knowledge** (1). No similar references are made by Polish respondents.

The differences between the two designed outlines of frames are quite easily noticeable and reflect the target language cultural scripts. The Polish frame seems more institution-, experience- and teaching-oriented, while the English provides more wide-ranging features of the concept and tends to promote the individual. This can result from the historical past of both language communities. However, based on the obtained data, it has to be noted that the frames are similar in that they refer to **wisdom, intelligence, education**, and **learning**, all of which can be considered the common core of the analysed concept. The number of respondents in the poll is not significant enough to draw definite conclusions. Nevertheless, the results obtained from the analysed data allow us to tentatively state that certain notions are fundamental for the concept in the considered linguistic communities. The research participants specified related notions included within the overarching concept, as well as, on rare occasions, also listing proverbs, which are the expression of the linguistic worldview of a given speech community.

The lexical expressions and proverbs analysed prior to the discussion of frames also contribute to the understanding of KNOWLEDGE and WIEDZA in the respective language communities. Knowledge is valuable; it gives an individual safety and allows the leading of a prosperous life. It is the driving force of development. It truly represents power, and despite the differences visible in the compared languages, it is essential to universal human well-being as well as interpreting and understanding the world we live in.

Notes

1. The underlines have been introduced to reflect italics employed in the dictionary entry to highlight forms of nouns as well as to make examples stand out.

2. The underlines have been introduced here to reflect the italicised examples and explanations provided by Goddard and Wierzbicka (2002).

3. The underline has been introduced here to reflect the italicised form introduced by Goddard (2018).

4. The underlines have been introduced here to reflect the italicised forms used by Petruck (2013).

5. Compare: Uberman (2016; 2018).

6. Compare cognitive scripts of conflict, confrontation and war (Panasenko et al, 2018).

List of abbreviations

BDPF – Brewer's dictionary of phrase and fable

KP – Księga przysłów

LDCE – Longman dictionary of contemporary English

RBWP – The Routledge book of world proverbs

TDAI – NTC's thematic dictionary of American idioms

TTEM – Thesaurus of traditional English metaphors

WSAP – Wielki słownik angielsko-polski / English-Polish dictionary

References

Apperson, G.L. & Manser, M.H. (2006). *Dictionary of proverbs*. London: Wordsworth Editions.

Brewer's dictionary of phrase and fable. (2002). Room, A. (ed.). London: Cassell.

Bartmiński, J. (2009). *Aspects of cognitive ethnolinguistics*. London: Equinox.

Burkhanov, I. (1999). *Linguistic foundations of ideography*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo WSP.

Collins, H. (2010). *Tacit and explicit knowledge*. Chicago – London: The University of Chicago Press.

Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dewey, J. (1960). [1929]. *The quest for certainty: An examination of the relation between knowledge and action*. Boston: Putnam's.

Ellis, R. (2009). Implicit and explicit learning, knowledge and instruction. In *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching.* Ellis, R.,

Loewen, S., Elder, C., Erlam, R., Philp, J. & Reinders, H. (eds.). Bristol – Buffalo – Toronto: Multilingual Matters, p. 3-25.

Fergusson, R. (1983). *The penguin dictionary of proverbs.* London: Penguin Books.

Fillmore, Ch.J. (1975). An alternative to checklist theories of meaning. In *Proceedings of the first annual meeting of the Berkeley linguistics society*. Cogen, C. et al. (eds.). Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society, p. 123-131.

Fillmore, Ch.J. (1985). Frames and the semantics of understanding. In *Quaderni di semantica*, 6 (2), p. 222-254.

Fillmore, Ch.J. (1982). *Frame semantics. Linguistics in the morning calm*. The Linguistic Society of Korea (ed.). Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Company, p. 111-137.

Fontenelle, T. (2009). A bilingual lexical database for frame semantics. In *Multilingual FrameNets in computational lexicography: Methods and applications*. Boas, H.C. (ed.). Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 37-58.

Fromm, E. (1983). *To be or to have*. New York: Bantam.

Gascoigne, N. & Thornton, T. (2013). *Tacit knowledge*. London – New York: Routledge.

Goatly, A. (2007). *Washing the brain. Metaphor and hidden ideology*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Goddard, C. (2004). "Cultural scripts": A new medium for ethnopragmatic instruction. In *Cognitive linguistics, second language acquisition, and foreign language teaching*. Achard, M. & Neimeier, S. (eds.). Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 143-63.

Goddard, C. (2007). *Semantic analysis: A practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goddard, C. (2012). 'Early interactions' in Australian English, American English, and English English: Cultural differences and cultural scripts. In *Journal of pragmatics*, 44, p. 1038-1050.

Goddard, C. (2018). *Ten lectures on Natural Semantic Metalanguage. Exploring language, thought and culture using simple, translatable words*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Goddard, C. (1997). The universal syntax of semantic primitives. In *Language sciences*, 19 (3), p. 197-207.

Goddard, C. & Wierzbicka, A. (2002). Semantic primes and universal grammar. In *Meaning and universal grammar. Theory and empirical findings*. Vol I. Goddard, C. & Wierzbicka, A. (eds.). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, p. 41-85.

Graff, H.J. (2015). *Undisciplining knowledge: Interdisciplinarity in the twentieth century*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Hermann, B. & Syjud, J. (2008). *Księga przysłów*. Chorzów: Videograf Edukacja.

Jarvis, S. (2009). Lexical transfer. In *The bilingual mental lexicon: Interdisciplinary approaches*. Pavlenko, A. (ed.). Bristol – Buffalo – Toronto: Multilingual Matters, p. 99-124.

Jaworska, T. (2002). *Słownik frazeologiczny angielsko-polski i polsko-angielski*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Naukowo-Techniczne.

Kertész, A. (2004). *Cognitive semantics and scientific knowledge: Case studies in the cognitive science of science*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Kivistö, S. & Pihlström, S. (2017). The metaphors of knowledge and academic impact. In *Metaphilosophy*, 48 (5), p. 780-797.

Kirkness, A. (2004). Lexicography. In *The handbook of applied linguistics*. Davies, A. & Elder, C. (eds.). Malden – Oxford – Carlton: Blackwell Publishing, p. 54-81.

Knowledge. Available at: https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/knowledge

Kochman-Haładyj, B. (2017). Contrastive analysis of religiosity in American and Polish proverbs from a linguo-cultural perspective. In *Proverbium: Yearbook of international proverb scholarship*, 34. Mieder, W. (ed.). Vermont: The University of Vermont, p. 131-157.

Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture, and body in human feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor. A practical introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor. A practical introduction*. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago – London: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh. The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. New York: Basic Books.

Langacker, R. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar. Vol I. Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Levisen, C. & Waters, S. (2017). An invitation to keywords studies. Guidance for future research. In *Cultural keywords in discourse*. Levisen, C. & Waters, S. (eds.). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, p. 235-242.

Longman dictionary of contemporary English. 6th ed. (2012). Harlow: Pearson Education.

Maasen, S. & Weingart, P. (2000). *Metaphors and the dynamics of knowledge*. London – New York: Routledge.

Merriam, S.B. & Bierema, L.L. (2013). *Adult learning: Linking theory and practice*. John Wiley & Sons: ProQuest Ebook.

Merriam-Webster online dictionary. Available at:

https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/

Panasenko, N., Greguš, Ľ & Zabuzhanska, I. (2018). Conflict, confrontation, and war reflected in mass media: Semantic wars, their victors and victims. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. *The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Poland, III (2), December 2018, p. 132-163. DOI: 10.2478/lart-2018-0017

Pawlak, M. (2006). *The pace of form-focused instruction in the foreign language classroom*. Kalisz – Poznań: Wydawnictwo UAM.

Pertuck, M. (2013). Advances in frame semantics. In *Advances in frame semantics*. Fried, M. & Nikiforidou, K. (eds.). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, p. 1-12.

Polish proverbs. Available at: http://przyslowia-polskie.pl/przyslowia

Spears, R.A. (1998). *NTC's thematic dictionary of American idioms*. Chicago: NTC Publishing Group.

Stone, J.R. (2006). *The Routledge book of world proverbs*. London – New York: Routledge.

Taylor, J., Cuyckens H. & Dirven, R. (2003). Introduction: New directions in cognitive lexical semantic research. In *Cognitive approaches to lexical semantics.* Cuyckens, H., Dirven, R & Taylor, J. (eds.). Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 1-28.

The American heritage dictionary of the English language 4th ed. (2000). Boston – New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

The facts on file dictionary of proverbs. (2007). Manser, M.H. (ed.). New York: Facts On File.

The Gale encyclopedia of psychology. (2001). Strickland, B.R. (ed.). Farmington Hills: Gale Group.

Uberman, A. (2016). Death in metaphorical language. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. *The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, I (2), December 2016, p. 171-211. DOI: 10.1515/lart-2016-0013

Uberman, A. (2018). Frame analysis of the concept of death across cultures. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. *The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, III (1), June 2018, p. 417-447. DOI: 10.2478/lart-2018-0011

Uberman, A. (2006). *Modelling the English lexicon in applied linguistics*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.

Widawski, M. (2003). *The anatomy of American slang*. Chicago – Warszawa: Ex Libris.

Wielki słownik angielsko-polski. English-Polish dictionary. (2002). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Wierzbicka, A. (2006). *English: Meaning and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wierzbicka, A. (2007). Reasonably well: Natural semantic metalanguage as a tool for the study of phraseology and its cultural underpinnings. In *Phraseology and culture in English*. Skandera, P. (ed.). Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 49-78.

Wierzbicka, A. (2002). Semantic primes and universal grammar in Polish. In *Meaning and universal grammar*. *Theory and empirical findings*. Vol II. Goddard, C. & Wierzbicka, A. (eds.). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, p. 65-144.

Wierzbicka, A. (1996). *Semantics: Primes and universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilkinson, P.R. (2002). *The thesaurus of traditional English metaphors*. London – New York: Routledge.

Contact data		**Field of interest**
Agnieszka Uberman Associate Professor Institute of English Studies, University of Rzeszów Al. mjr W. Kopisto 2B 35-315 Rzeszów, Poland e-mail: ag.uberman@wp.pl		Cognitive linguistics, applied linguistics, metaphorical language use, linguo-cultral differences.

Résumé

'Knowledge' is a complex concept and it can be analysed from a variety of viewpoints. The article discusses the cognitive frames of KNOWLEDGE in English and WIEDZA in Polish. The discussion starts with the outline of the core of the concept and provides its various definitions as well as some of its multiple types that have been identified by scholars. As a universal human concept 'knowledge' is often taken for granted and is omnipresent in human culture and language. It has been identified by Natural Semantic Metalanguage as a mental predicate (KNOW), which is a semantic prime present in most human languages. This presence is reflected in numerous linguistic expressions,

proverbs, and metaphors. The nature of metaphorical language pertaining to 'knowledge' is presented in sections 4 and 4.1, which characterise not only the knowledge-related metaphors embedded in language but also expressions, phrases, and proverbs in which the lexeme *knowledge* is a constitutive part. In order to learn whether Polish and English native speakers conceptualise 'knowledge' differently, the frames of the concept were designed on the basis of associations provided by native-speaker respondents. Because language is embedded in culture, attention is also drawn to the presence of cultural scripts, which are an integral part of cognitive frames. Having received and analysed responses from a total of 100 native speakers of English and Polish (50 respondents in each group) the outlines of the frames were designed. Knowledge proved to be an essential concept inextricably related to learning and development. The differences that can be observed between English and Polish frames focus on individuality, institution, and power, however for both language groups the connotations are fundamentally positive.