

Askerova I. A.,

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,

Doctoral Student, Department of Linguistics and Methodology of Foreign Language Teaching

Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State University

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8341-510X>

## FROM THE PSYCHOLOGY OF LANGUAGE TO THE LINGUISTICS OF EMOTION: THE INTELLECTUAL LEGACY OF O. POTEBCIA AND J. BAUDOUIN DE COURTEMAY

**Summary.** The article investigates the origins and development of the linguistics of emotion within the Ukrainian-Polish scholarly tradition. Particular emphasis is placed on the contribution of the Ukrainian philosopher and linguist Oleksandr Potebnia, founder of the psychological school in Slavic philology, who articulated the inseparable interdependence of thought, emotional experience, and language, and introduced the concept of the inner form of the word. These ideas are interpreted as fundamental premises for contemporary linguistic theories that examine the affective dimension of language and speech. Within this intellectual continuum, the study also analyses the legacy of Potebnia's contemporary, the eminent Polish linguist Jan Baudouin de Courtenay. Commonly recognized as a precursor of structuralism, Baudouin de Courtenay viewed language as a dynamic psychophysiological and sociocultural system that unites the individual and collective aspects of human existence, thereby extending the anthropological horizon of linguistic inquiry. Both thinkers are considered intellectual precursors of modern emotion linguistics in the Slavic academic space. The comparative perspective adopted in the article reveals convergences in Ukrainian and Polish linguistic traditions, reflected in shared methodological principles and conceptual interpretations of the triad "thought – emotion – language". These affinities provided a theoretical basis for subsequent research into linguistic emotionality conducted by Ukrainian and Polish scholars within cognitive linguistics, linguistic conceptology, psycholinguistics, and ethnolinguistics. Revisiting their intellectual heritage and reinterpreting early sources enables the reconstruction of the continuity of emotion-oriented linguistic thought and the delineation of its specifically Ukrainian-Polish dimension within the broader Slavic and European intellectual context.

**Key words:** linguistics of emotions, psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, linguoconceptology, O. Potebnia, J. Baudouin de Courtenay, Ukrainian studies, Polish studies.

**Formulation of the problem in general terms and its relation to important scientific or practical tasks.** The Linguistics of Emotion is an interdisciplinary research locus within contemporary linguistics that is dynamically evolving within the framework of the anthropocentric paradigm. Despite its relative novelty, this field is grounded in a profound historical foundation that unites the achievements of Western European thought with the native humanistic traditions of the Slavic world. The issue of the interrelation among thinking, emotion, language, and culture has long been

an immanent component of Slavic – particularly Ukrainian and Polish – scholarly reflection (cf. Ukr. *A nut without a kernel is nothing, just as a person without a heart is nothing; Everything passes, but love remains after all* (H. Skovoroda); Pol. *A person takes more deeply to heart what causes pain than what merely passes through the mind* (J. Kochanowski) etc.), which formed the foundation for a number of original theoretical and methodological concepts focused on exploring the emotional dimension of language and speech. At the same time, these principles and scholarly sources of the past have not yet become the subject of a comprehensive and systematic analysis through the lens of their influence on the formation of contemporary linguistics of emotion – particularly in the comparative Ukrainian-Polish perspective. This circumstance determines both the relevance and the scholarly novelty of the present study.

**Analysis of recent research and publications on the topic; identification of previously unresolved aspects of the overall problem addressed in this article.** Among the works devoted to exploring the national origins of emotion linguistics, psycholinguistics, and related disciplines, special attention should be given to the studies of Ukrainian and Polish scholars – V. Slipetska [1], V. Papish [2], A. Pajdzińska [3], M. Parys [4], and others – which address the processes of their formation. However, despite containing valuable observations, these studies do not yet constitute a coherent system, which underscores the need for further comprehensive research in this respect.

The **purpose** of this article is to elucidate the historical and scholarly premises underlying the emergence of the linguistics of emotion within Slavic linguistics and to reveal the role of leading Ukrainian and Polish scholars – particularly O. Potebnia and J. Baudouin de Courtenay – in shaping its theoretical and methodological foundations. The study also aims to identify regularities in their research pursuits within the broader European intellectual context.

The **object** of the study is the process of the formation of linguistic emotiology as an interdisciplinary domain of linguistic inquiry, while the **subject** comprises the ideas, concepts, and theoretical-methodological principles that determined the interpretation of the emotional factor in Ukrainian and Polish scholarly traditions at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

**Presentation of the Main Research Material.** Interest in the phenomenon of emotionality arose in the distant era of Antiquity and, for centuries, remained at the center of philosophical

reflection. Later, it also became the focus of psychology, which, by the end of the nineteenth century, had separated from philosophy as an independent science. Within linguistics, however, the inner world of the human being for a long time remained outside the scope of scholarly analysis. The path toward establishing the linguistics of emotion as a full-fledged field of inquiry – particularly within Slavic linguistics – proved to be long and complex. Despite a clear awareness of the importance of emotions as a profound psychological phenomenon, the very possibility of their linguistic analysis evoked an ambivalent response within linguistic discourse: ranging from genuine scientific interest in the subject to skepticism, neglect, or even the tabooing of the issue altogether.

A significant step toward incorporating emotions into the domain of linguistic inquiry was the emergence, in European linguistics of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, of the psychological school. Its representatives – W. von Humboldt, H. Steinthal, W. Wundt, among others – regarded language as a manifestation of human psychic activity, in which the individual's inner world, including emotional states, is inevitably reflected.

In the Slavic scholarly tradition, the psychological approach to language study found its most vivid embodiment in its founder – the outstanding Ukrainian thinker Oleksandr Potebnia. Having absorbed the ideas of his Western European contemporaries, Potebnia became not merely an interpreter of their intellectual heritage but, as Rebrii [5, c. 114] notes, “an original – and still insufficiently appreciated – thinker”. Among the scholars whose works he studied, Potebnia held W. von Humboldt in the highest esteem, referring to him as “the ingenious originator of a new theory of language” [6, c. 49] and emphasizing that “the definition of language as the work of the spirit [...] elevates Humboldt above all preceding theories”. At the same time, the scholar underscored that the key issue of “the relation of the word to thought” remained “unclear” [6, c. 29-30].

In attempting to resolve this and a number of other issues raised by German philosophy and linguistics, the scholar advanced further in his reasoning and formulated an original linguopsychological concept, in which language appears as the most essential element of a nation's spiritual life – a form of national consciousness closely connected with thought, the individual's personal experience, and the cultural community to which one belongs. O. Potebnia aptly observed that language is as much a creation of the individual as of the nation. The laws of language development are inseparably related to individual psychology; yet the laws of language, as a collective creation of the people discovered by linguistics, require to be complemented by a new branch of psychology, whose content should consist in studying the relation between individual and national development. The psychology of people, he argued, must demonstrate the possibility of differences in national characteristics and linguistic structures as a consequence of the general laws of national life [6, c. 48].

In the scholar's view, the search for such differences and distinctive features was to be carried out most effectively through comparative analysis – both within a single linguistic system and by juxtaposing different languages. He highly valued the idea of comparison, considering it heuristic and exceptionally productive, remarking that “the idea of comparing all languages for the purposes of linguistics is as great a discovery as the idea of humanity is for history” [6, c. 49]. According to Yurii Sheveliov, O. Potebnia himself was proficient in several modern and classical languages:

“At home in his childhood he spoke Ukrainian; general instruction at school was conducted in Polish, while Russian was taught as a subject. It was evidently at school that he also acquired German, French, Greek, and Latin” [7, c. 12].

In developing his own research concept, Oleksandr Potebnia attached particular importance to the interrelation between the science of language and the science of the human being and their mental processes, each of which by that time had already achieved significant progress within its own domain. He consistently emphasized the fundamental nature of their interaction and stressed that only through close dialogue could these fields of knowledge enrich one another: “The rapprochement between linguistics and psychology, which makes it possible to seek solutions to linguistic problems within psychology and, conversely, to expect new discoveries in psychology from linguistic research, indicates that each of these sciences has already attained a considerable level of development” [6, c. 48].

In his pioneering and profoundly insightful monograph “Thought and Language” (first edition 1862; second edition 1892, among others), O. Potebnia addressed a range of issues that, from the standpoint of modern science, appear particularly relevant. It is precisely this book that its Ukrainian translator, Prof. O. Rebrii, aptly describes as “a pearl in the necklace of linguo-philosophical works” of the eminent philologist [5, c. 114]. Within the framework of linguistic conceptology of emotions and related fields of emotion studies, which constitute the focus of our research, Potebnia's reflections on the interaction of the three spheres of the psyche – thought, feeling, and will – and their role in the speech process acquire particular significance. In his view, these phenomena exist in an inseparable interrelation and mutual dependence, a point repeatedly emphasized in the analyzed work: “It would be a mistake to regard reason, feeling, and will as entirely independent. Observation shows all too clearly that feelings are connected with the course of ideas, and that from pleasure and displeasure arises the striving to attain the desirable and to avoid the undesirable” [6, c. 58]; “In the unity of the human spirit, feeling and will are inseparable from thought” [6, c. 15]; “The will, through the mediation of thought, at times completely destroys feeling, and at other times suppresses it only for a moment, allowing it to manifest itself with even greater force thereafter”; “Feelings are not only accompanied by thought but are also dependent upon it” [6, c. 54].

According to Potebnia, the locus of these psychic phenomena is the soul: “...feeling, will, and reason share no common concepts other than that of the soul, and therefore the soul is ascribed distinct capacities – to understand, to feel, and to will”. At the same time, the scholar observed with remarkable subtlety and insight: “[...] at every step we encounter cases that compel us to reflect that even our own soul is an unfathomable darkness, in which perceptions and feelings intertwine, the existence of which we do not even suspect” [6, c. 94], however, “[...] everyone who seeks to influence the soul strives to find an explanation for its states” [6, c. 51].

In the triad “thought – feeling – will,” thought functions as a mediator between the emotional and volitional spheres, since it is capable not only of regulating or even suppressing feelings but also of shaping the culture of their expression. Emotions, according to the scholar, do not exist in a “pure form” but are always refracted through the prism of a person's intellectual development, which ensures the capacity for self-control and the subordination of feelings to the will. For this reason, the measure of an individual's worth

lies not only in the development of the intellect but also in the ability to “keep oneself in check”: “In general, to doubt the influence of intellectual development on feeling and will is to doubt the very comprehensiveness of progress and to deny that in an educated society uncontrolled outbursts of emotion are less likely than among savages. It is not without reason that we value a person not only for the development of the mind but also for the degree of self-mastery, which, as has already been noted, is mediated by thought” [6, c. 54].

Language is inextricably intertwined with thought, serving as the very medium through which thinking attains new and more advanced forms. In the researcher’s view, conscious intellectual activity cannot exist without language: “Having accepted spirit as conscious intellectual activity grounded in concepts formed solely by means of words, we realize that spirit cannot exist without language, for it itself is constituted through language, and language within it is the first phenomenon in time” [6, c. 45-46; 8, c. 17].

Potebnia emphasizes that the word presupposes a certain level of development of thought; it emerges only when human thinking reaches a state of sufficient maturity. At the same time, the word itself has its own prerequisites: it is grounded in sensory experience (sense impressions) and in the material form of sound, without which the verbalization of thought becomes impossible: “The word, which presupposes certain stages in the development of thought, in turn rests upon sensory perceptions and sound” [6, c. 64].

As noted above, in this conception language (through the word) appears not only as a form of thought and its instrument, but also as a link connecting the sensory-emotional experience of a human being with their intellectual activity, thereby ensuring the unity of the cognitive and emotional modes of consciousness. In a broader perspective, Potebnia’s conception allows language to be interpreted as a factor in the organization of emotional experience – an experience that becomes conscious only by virtue of the word: “Psychology, like any other science, is compelled to make use of language; yet language designates even the immaterial by means of words that originally expressed what is perceptible to the senses” [6, c. 54].

Potebnia attached great importance to the word, viewing it as a powerful artistic and imaginative phenomenon in itself – a symbolic and aesthetic entity that embodies the creative essence of language: “The word is the organ of thought and an indispensable condition for the further development of the understanding of the world and of oneself precisely because it is, in its origin, a symbol and an ideal, and possesses all the properties of an artistic creation” [6, c. 205]. This interpretation of the word directly correlates with Potebnia’s understanding of figurative thinking as such. According to his conception, mythological consciousness – within which folk culture exists – is characterized by an undifferentiated unity of the figurative and conceptual aspects of language. At the present stage of human consciousness, this unity has become divided into two complementary types of thinking: the abstract-conceptual (scientific and philosophical) and the associative-imaginative (artistic and creative). The archetypes of both can be traced back to myths and to various genres of oral folk art, which, in relation to language, function as derivative modeling systems [9, c. 82].

The scholar emphasized that the true power of language lies not in the use of already “ready-made” figurative words or fixed expressions, but in its capacity to dynamically generate new images through the creative combination of elements – regardless of whether those elements possess inherent expressiveness. In general, the view of language as a form of creative activity occupies

an exceptionally important place in Potebnia’s conception. This idea was noted and highly appreciated by subsequent generations of Ukrainian scholars, including those who continued their research in the émigré academic milieu: “Potebnia regards human language as a form of creativity. When a person speaks, they simultaneously create. Language is created by individuals, by communities, and, further, by entire nations. And since the mode of thinking differs among individuals, among various societies and peoples, it is hardly surprising that the expression of thought – and therefore language itself – differs as well. From this perspective, language plays a crucial role in the formation of what is commonly called national consciousness” [10, c. 395].

It is important to emphasize that, in Potebnia’s conception, the creator of meaning is not only the speaker but also the recipient, since the process of communication represents an interaction between two participants in which both expression and perception possess a creative character: “The word belongs equally to the speaker and to the listener” [11, c. 48]; “...all linguistic phenomena must be considered not only from the standpoint of the one who speaks, but also from that of the one who listens. Both are acts of creation; both are forms of spiritual labor” [10, c. 395].

The creative potential of language – its powerful capacity for image formation – is organically interwoven with the central element of Potebnia’s theory: the doctrine of the *inner form of the word*, which functions as a mediator between its external (phonetic) shell and its content (meaning). By capturing the original image underlying nomination, the inner form is inseparably linked to human sensory and emotional experience. It transforms the word into not merely a sign but also a symbol that preserves the emotional and value-laden “residue” of cultural perception: “The inner form is [...] the center of the image, one of its features that predominates over all others” [11, c. 33]. This concept is of particular significance for contemporary linguistics of emotion, especially in those areas concerned with tracing the historical evolution of terms denoting mental states. The inner form of the word opens the way to reconstructing how language encodes and transmits emotional representations, allowing us to observe the mechanisms through which sensory experience is transformed into sign-symbolic structures – structures that, in general, have evolved from the physical to the psychic, from the concrete to the abstract.

Closely intertwined with the idea of the inner form of the word is that of *evaluation*, since the original image embedded in a word not only names an object or phenomenon but also interprets it through the prism of values and emotional perceptions. Describing the mechanisms of sensory perception, Potebnia stated: “In the data of general sensation, as well as in those of touch, taste, and other senses, two aspects are discernible: (1) the impressions arising from the properties we attribute to external objects and to our own body, and (2) the evaluation of the significance of these impressions for our individual existence, which manifests itself in the feeling of pleasure or displeasure in response to them” [6, c. 69]. With this idea, Potebnia essentially underscores the role of hedonistic evaluation as a universal mechanism for the valorization of sensory experience. This perspective makes it possible to regard his intellectual legacy as an important contribution to the formation of the foundations of modern linguistic axiology.

Thus, Potebnia’s philological theory is both multifaceted and multidimensional: he made an invaluable contribution to the development of linguistic science as a whole, and above all, to

the formation of the philosophical and psychological foundations for understanding language. Yet the scholar's genius, the scope of his ideas, and the depth of his intellectual legacy did not immediately gain broad recognition or due appreciation within the academic tradition; his greatness was evident only to the most perceptive researchers: "The figure of Oleksandr Potebnia, when one comes even slightly closer to it, grows to such immense proportions that it is not easy for the researcher's eye to grasp its entirety or to seize what is most essential, without becoming lost in details that are, in fact, uncharacteristic of Potebnia" [12, c. 5].

V. Simovych, characterizing the phenomenon of Potebnia on the occasion of the centenary of his birth, noted that he was "one of the greatest Ukrainian scholars and a great scholar of the world – the pride and ornament of our nation" [10, c. 394], and also "...the first and greatest linguist and thinker among all the Slavs; to this day no one has equaled our scholar in his profound understanding and analysis of linguistic phenomena" [10, c. 395]. The researcher explained the underappreciation of Potebnia's ideas by several factors: "It is clear that if O. Potebnia's works had been written in another language – not in one of the Slavic languages – and had not been published in such provincial cities (for example, Voronezh), his ideas at the time would have astonished the entire scholarly world of Western Europe, and German scholars would not have had to arrive at them independently" [10, c. 395].

The ideas of O. O. Potebnia, as already noted, far outstripped the intellectual and scientific horizons of his time and today remains an inexhaustible source of inspiration for the further development of linguistic thought. One of the innovative directions that traces its origins to Potebnia's linguistic philosophy is the study of emotionality in Slavic linguistics. Contemporary scholars rightly emphasize that "in O. Potebnia's scholarly legacy we find original insights, and within the system of his linguistic and philosophical views we can discern the beginnings of linguistic emotionology" [13, c. 42]; "O. Potebnia stood not only at the origins of the linguistics of emotion, but – more broadly – at the very foundations of psycholinguistics" [13, c. 39], which serves as additional evidence of the breadth of his scientific thought, the depth and consistency of his reasoning, and the genius of this eminent Ukrainian thinker.

Although in his fundamental works O. Potebnia did not yet employ the modern term *linguistics of emotion*, the issues that now constitute their core occupied a central place in his scholarly interests. Among them, in addition to those mentioned above, were questions of emotional expressiveness and intensity (particularly in the sphere of speech tonality), imagery, and the associative potential of linguistic units. The scholar paid special attention to interjections, which he described as "immediate expressions of feelings," "instant echoes of the state of the soul," and "reflections of emotional agitation," among other characterizations [6, c. 93-94].

As V. Papish quite rightly observes, "Had the psychological and subjective factors of speech, to which O. Potebnia attributed immense significance, been further supported and developed by his followers (including L. Bulakhovskyi himself), the homeland of modern psycholinguistics would be called not America, but Ukraine" [14, c. 57].

Another forerunner of emotionological inquiry within the Slavic linguistic tradition was O. Potebnia's contemporary – the eminent Polish scholar **Jan Niecislaw Ignacy (Ivan Oleksandrovych) Baudouin de Courtenay**. His name is traditionally associated primarily with the emergence of structuralism; however, no less signif-

icant are his views of language as a complex psychophysiological and sociocultural phenomenon. These views may be regarded as providing the intellectual foundations for the development of a linguistic-emotionological approach, which would later evolve within the broader framework of Slavic humanistic thought. His most well-known work in this respect, "A Psychological Characterization of the Polish Language" (1915), was defined by the scholar himself as an attempt to outline "the psychological foundations of linguistic thought – that is, of the linguistic cerebration of people whose minds, together with other parts of their organism, have been linguistically shaped in the Polish manner" [15, c. 32].

One of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay's principal scholarly postulates was his conviction in the absolutely psychic nature of human language. According to the scholar, no language can exist independently of the human being. He shared Humboldt's understanding of language as a dialectical unity in which the individual and the social, the inherited and the acquired, are continuously interdefined and conditioned by one another. Baudouin perceived language as inherently anthropocentric and fundamentally incongruent with the external world; moreover, he did not overlook the paradox that human beings are influenced by certain conceptual constructs that they themselves have previously created and fixed within language: "The entire world, in the linguistic sense, is a projection – that is, a reflection of one's own self outward. In the image and likeness of one's own thinking and psychic states, the human being has unconsciously organized the diversity and heterogeneity of the phenomena of the universe. A person has invested their own psyche into the external world, and the external world is reflected in their psyche [...]. We animate the entire world, we substantivize it, we create beings and substances, and later the animated concepts taken from the physical world we transfer to the states of our own soul – that is, to our experiences, feelings, and personal moods" [15, c. 159].

At the same time, Baudouin de Courtenay emphasized that language is not merely a mechanical repetition of ready-made forms and structures but rather a living and continuous process of creation. Human speech cannot be reduced to imitation – it always involves an element of psycholinguistic activity through which new words, models, and forms emerge: "If there were no continuous psycho-linguistic creative activity, if our entire linguistic practice were limited solely to imitation and reproduction, then phenomena falling under the notions of 'analogy' and 'folk word formation' would be impossible. Creativity, however, consists in the fact that at every moment associations are at work – that is, the combination of representations according to the principle of similarity, on the basis of shared features that unite individual manifestations of speech thinking into organized and systematized groups" [15, c. 179].

These and other views of the scholar undoubtedly had a significant impact on the development of the psychological trend in Polish – and more broadly, Slavic – linguistics of that historical period. Baudouin de Courtenay was, as contemporary Polish linguist Prof. A. Pajdzińska aptly called him, "a forerunner not only of structuralism but also a precursor of modern ethnolinguistics (cultural and anthropological linguistics)" [3, c. 40], which acquired a distinct and original scholarly form on Polish ground.

With regard to the figure of the scholar and the significance of his legacy, the researcher regretfully observes: "...we still know far too little about this eminent Pole; we turn to his works all too rarely today, discuss his boldly formulated theses only occasion-

ally, and seldom ask ourselves to what extent modern linguistics – directly or indirectly – owes its development to him” [3, c. 34].

The underestimation of the scale and multidimensionality of Baudouin de Courtenay’s scholarly persona, much like that of Potebnia, was conditioned by shared historical, scientific, and cultural factors. Baudouin worked far from the principal academic centres – at various times he served as a professor at the universities of Kazan, Dorpat (Tartu), Kraków, St. Petersburg, and Warsaw – often publishing in languages unfamiliar to Western European scholars. Moreover, his vast scholarly legacy lacked a single work that would present a systematic and comprehensive exposition of his new theory [3, c. 34].

The ideas of the Polish scholar, like the kindred views of our eminent compatriot, in many respects belonged to the future: “In the assessment of posterity, Jan Baudouin de Courtenay appears as one of the co-creators of modern linguistics. In relation to the era in which he lived and worked, he was far ahead of his time, directing his scientific ideas and methodological stance toward the future” [16, c. 5-17; 4, c. 96].

Thus, the psychologism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries – fundamentally imbued with anthropocentrism – had an unquestionably innovative character and considerable conceptual weight as a foundation for understanding language, particularly its affective dimension. It laid the solid groundwork for further reflection on the role of emotions in language and speech. However, throughout the first half of the twentieth century, its development within linguistics was significantly hindered and, in some areas, entirely suspended. One of the key factors behind this stagnation was the rise of structuralism, which dominated linguistic thought during that period: by focusing primarily on the formal organization of the linguistic system, its representatives substantially narrowed the scope for advancing the psychological approach, effectively relegating it to the margins of linguistic inquiry.

By approximately the 1960s-1970s, the issues of verbalization and categorization of emotions largely remained on the periphery of linguistic research. The situation began to change with the gradual development of linguistic semantics, when the first attempts were made to provide lexicographic descriptions of emotional vocabulary. From that time onward, interest in words denoting emotions steadily increased – both in theoretical and applied dimensions. A noticeable intensification of attention to the study of emotions occurred with the establishment of the cognitive paradigm in the 1970s-1980s, when language began to be systematically interpreted as a means of representing the inner experience of the human being. This point is aptly emphasized by the Polish scholar Professor A. Rejter: “The breakthrough in linguistic research on emotions was brought about by cognitivism. Previously, the study of emotions had remained at the margins of linguistics, treated either as an aspect of semantic connotations or as a matter of stylistics. Cognitivism, however, brought linguistics closer to psychology – a discipline directly connected with emotions. Moreover, in studies grounded in cognitive methodology, particular importance is ascribed to such phenomena as the human being (as a unity of body and psyche), the semantic connotations of lexemes and concepts, everyday experience, and the cultural and social determinants of all human activity, including linguistic activity” [17, c. 77]. The scholar further adds that an important impetus to the development of emotion-oriented linguistic studies was provided by pragmalinguistics, since its primary focus is language “in action”. Consequently,

phenomena such as situationality, the intentions of the speaker and the addressee, and discursivity, among others, become central to analysis [17, c. 77].

Thus, with the development of linguistics, there occurred a gradual transformation of scholarly conceptions concerning the nature of language and speech, which inevitably led to a new understanding of the role of the emotional factor within them. Emotionality ceased to be regarded as a peripheral phenomenon and acquired the status of a fully legitimate object of linguistic reflection. However, from the earliest stages of its study to the present day, this scientific domain has been viewed as one of the most complex research loci, requiring a departure from traditional approaches and the overcoming of disciplinary boundaries: “Research on emotions is now experiencing its *golden years* – a period of remarkable flourishing following a long phase of scientific neglect. The study of affects no longer appears to be a passing trend, as evidenced by numerous publications [...]. Despite the existing challenges, one should not abandon the exploration of emotions nor the pursuit of deeper knowledge of the aspects related to them” [18, c. 419].

**Conclusions and Prospects for Further Research in the Specified Scientific Field.** In summary, it should be noted that the recognition of emotions as a fully legitimate and independent object of linguistic analysis within Slavic linguistics has a long and complex history of development. This recognition became possible due to a combination of both external and internal factors. A significant contribution to the formation of the Slavic tradition of emotion studies was made by outstanding Ukrainian and Polish scholars, foremost among them O. Potebnia and J. Baudouin de Courtenay, whose ideas laid a solid foundation for subsequent interdisciplinary research in this field. Contemporary linguistics of emotion in the Ukrainian-Polish dimension clearly demonstrates the continuity of scholarly traditions, the commonality of ideas and conceptual approaches, which has led to the emergence of a rich theoretical legacy within each national linguistic paradigm. The further elucidation and systematization of this legacy constitute the prospects of our continued research in this scientific domain.

#### Bibliography:

1. Сліпецька В. Д. Лінгвістика емоцій: формування і розвиток (історико-теоретичний опис; бібліографічний покажчик. Дрогобич: Просвіт, 2017. 354 с.
2. Папіш В. А. Лінгвопсихоакцентуація елітарної мовної особистості: теорія, історія, дискурсивна практика: монографія / переднє слово, наук. ред. проф. Т. А. Космеди. Вінниця-Ужгород: Поліграфцентр “Ліра”, 2022. 456 с.
3. Pajdzińska A. Baudouin De Courtenay – prekursor nie tylko strukturalizmu. *LingVaria*. Rok XV (2020). 2 (30). S. 33-42.
4. Parys M. “Charakterystyka psychologiczna języka polskiego” Jana Baudouina de Courtenay. *Poradnik Językowy*. 2019. Nr 5. S. 89-98.
5. Ребій О.В. Відкриваючи наново Потебню: спостереження вченої і нотатки перекладача. *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна*. 2024. Випуск 100. С. 112-119.
6. Потебня О. О. Думка і мова (Мисль и языъ). Вид. 2. Харьковъ: Типографія Адольф Дарре, 1892. 228 с.
7. Шевельов Ю. Олександр Потебня і українське питання. Спроба реконструкції цілісного образу науковця. *Олександр Потебня. Мова. Національність. Денационалізація. Статті і фрагменти*. Упорядкування і вступна стаття Ю. Шевельова. Нью-Йорк, 1992. С. 7-49.

8. Кравчук Р. В. З історії слов'янського мовознавства (видатні славісти-мовознавці). К.: Державне учебово-педагогічне видавництво "Радянська школа", 1961. 140 с.
9. Кришко А. Ю., Філіппович Т. М., Ставчук Н. В. Психологічний напрям у вітчизняному мовознавстві. *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету*. Сер.: Філологія. 2022 № 53. Том 1. С. 81-85.
10. Сімович Василь. Праці у двох томах. Том 1: Мовознавство / Упорядкування і передмова Л. Ткач. Чернівці: Книги – XXI, 2005. 520 с.
11. Потебня О. О. Естетика і поетика слова. Упоряд., вступ. ст., приміт. І. В. Іваньо, А.І. Колодної. К.: Мистецтво, 1985. 302 с.
12. Чехович К. Олександр Потебня. Український мислитель-лінгвіст. *Праці Українського наукового інституту*. Сергія фільольгічна. Книга 1. Том IV. Варшава: Друкарня oo. Василіан у Жовкві, 1931. 187 с.
13. Сліпецька В. Д. Олександр Потебня і лінгвістика емоцій. *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна*. Серія: Філологія. 2016. Вип. 74. С. 39-42.
14. Папіш В. А. Леонід Булаховський про Олександра Потебню. *Сучасні проблеми мовознавства та літературознавства*. Вип. 24 (2019). С. 55-57.
15. Boudouin de Courtenay J. N. Charakterystyka psychologiczna języka polskiego, 1915; cyt. za: Baudouin de Courtenay. O języku polskim. Wybór prac pod. red. J. Basary, M. Szymczaka, Warszawa. 1984. 453 s.
16. Basara J., Szymczak M. Słowo wstępne. Jan Baudouin de Courtenay. O języku polskim. Wybór prac pod. red. J. Basary, M. Szymczaka. 1984. S. 5-17.
17. Rejter A. W. Język a emocje w ujęciu glottodydaktycznym. *Sztuka i rzemiosło. T. 2. Nauczyć Polski i polskiego*, 2010, Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 238 s. S. 75-83.
18. Łukaszewicz B. Emocje – kultura – język. Wyrażanie emocji negatywnych w polonistycznej praktyce glottodydaktycznej. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa UW, 2022. 478 s.

**Аскерова І. Від психології мови до лінгвістики емоцій: інтелектуальна спадщина О. Потебні та Я. Бодуена де Куртене**

**Анотація.** Статтю присвячено висвітленню становлення лінгвістики емоцій у польсько-українському науковому просторі. Основну увагу зосереджено на ролі видатного українського мислителя О. О. Потебні – засновника пси-

хологічного напряму у слов'янському мовознавстві, який обґрунтував ідею нерозривної єдності мислення, емоційного досвіду та мови, розвинув учення про внутрішню форму слова й окреслив ключові принципи, що сьогодні розглядаються як концептуальне підґрунтя емоціолінгвістичних студій. У цьому ж інтелектуальному контексті проаналізовано спадщину його сучасника – видатного польського лінгвіста Я. Бодуена де Куртене, якого традиційно пов'язують зі структуралізмом, проте серед його наукових концепцій виразно окреслюються глибокі ідеї про мову як складний психофізіологічний і соціокультурний феномен, що поєднує індивідуальний та колективний виміри людського буття. Обох учених можна вважати ідейними предтечами сучасної лінгвістики емоцій у слов'янському науковому дискурсі. Порівняльний аналіз української та польської філологічних традицій, відображені у їхніх працях, виявляє спільність світоглядних орієнтирів і методологічну близькість у тлумаченні взаємозв'язку між мисленням, емоціями та мовою, що свідчить про глибинні паралелі між двома науковими школами. Інтелектуальні традиції, які заклали вчені, стали основою подальшого розвитку досліджень мовної емоційності, реалізованих у межах когнітивної лінгвістики, лінгвоконцептології, психо- та етнолінгвістики в сучасних українських та польських студіях. Подібність ідейних інтенцій Потебні та Бодуена де Куртене простежується і в їхніх наукових долях: обох об'єднує новаторське мислення, яке випереджalo свій час і лише згодом дістало належне визнання. Звернення до їхнього доробку та осмислення витоків формування емоціолінгвістичної думки уможливлюють окреслення польсько-українського виміру сучасної лінгвістики емоцій у загальнослов'янському та загальноєвропейському контексті.

**Ключові слова:** лінгвістика емоцій, психолінгвістика, когнітивна лінгвістика, лінгвоконцептологія, О. Потебня, Я. Бодуен де Куртене, україністика, полоністика.

Дата першого надходження рукопису  
до видання: 16.10.2025

Дата прийнятого до друку рукопису  
після рецензування: 14.11.2025  
Дата публікації: 30.12.2025