

Uwagi do artykułu prof. Ireny Bajerowej

Remarks on the article by Irena Bajerowa

SUMMARY

The author presents her view that in order to talk of a scientific or scholarly school it is relevant to take into account the theoretical and methodological assumptions shared by the members of such a school, rather than – as Irena Bajerowa does – its activities concerned with university instruction or with education at large.

If that is how a scientific or scholarly school is conceived of, then the author would rather speak of two linguistic scholarly milieus, rather than of a Cracow or Warsaw school of linguistics. Within each of those milieus various schools can be distinguished, with some scholars not belonging to any such school at all.

The author believes that the contrast between the Cracow and Warsaw milieus was drawn too sharply, and tries to support this view by pointing to a number of important authors from the Cracow milieu whose works dealt with contemporary Polish and correct Polish usage, as well as to authors from the Warsaw milieu who wrote extensively on the history of Polish language.

The author then goes on to describe the scholarly views of Professor Witold Doroszewski. She stresses that Doroszewski's ontological monism was accompanied by his biologism in approaching language mechanisms and processes, a practical consequence of which was the establishment of a centre for research on aphasia. Doroszewski's epistemological realism, on the other hand, influenced his rejection of a structuralist theory of signs. It was characteristic of Professor Doroszewski that he engaged in interdisciplinary research and that also one of his theoretical postulates called for that type of research on language.

Also in the article by Professor Bajerowa, on which author of the current paper comments, was the matter of the relationship between a scholar's *Weltanschauung* and their scholarly activities. The obvious impact of the *Weltanschauung* on the choice of the field of research, theoretical assumptions and methodology of a given scholar is nothing bad in itself. What is bad, however, is when the scholar accepts as incontrovertible truths what is only hypothetical in nature. A scholar then makes him- or herself immune to new ideas and does not accept different theoretical assumptions and research methods of other researchers, including his own disciples.