

SOCIALINĖS ANTROPOLOGIJOS IR ETNOLOGIJOS STUDIJOS

LIETUVOS

22(31)
2022

ETNOLOGIJA

LITHUANIAN ETHNOLOGY

STUDIES IN SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY

LIETUVOS ISTORIJS INSTITUTAS
LITHUANIAN INSTITUTE OF HISTORY

VILNIUS 2022

REDAKTORIŲ KOLEGIJA / EDITORIAL BOARD

Vida Savoniakaitė (vyriausioji redaktorė / Editor-in-Chief)
Lietuvos istorijos institutas / Lithuanian Institute of History, Vilnius, Lithuania

Auksuolė Čepaitienė
Lietuvos istorijos institutas / Lithuanian Institute of History, Vilnius, Lithuania

Vytis Čiubrinskas
Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas / Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas, Lithuania

Jonathan Friedman
Kalifornijos universitetas / University of California, San Diego, USA

Anna Gomóła
Silezijos universitetas Katowicuose / University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland

Chris Hann
Maxo Plancko socialinės antropologijos institutas / Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle / Saale, Germany

Jonathan Hill
Pietų Ilinojaus universitetas / Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, USA

Neringa Klumbytė
Majamio universitetas / Miami University, Ohio, USA

Ullrich Kockel
Aukštumų ir salų universitetas / University of the Highlands and Islands, Kirkwall, UK

Adam Jonathan Kuper
Londono ekonomikos mokykla / London School of Economics, UK

Orvar Löfgren
Lundo universitetas / Lund University, Sweden

Jonas Mardosa
Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas / Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas, Lithuania

Frederico Delgado Rosa
NOVA universitetas Lisabonoje / NOVA University Lisbon, Portugal

Žilvytis Šaknys
Lietuvos istorijos institutas / Lithuanian Institute of History, Vilnius, Lithuania

REDAKTORIŲ KOLEGIJOS SEKRETORĖ / EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Danguolė Svidinskaitė
Lietuvos istorijos institutas / Lithuanian Institute of History, Vilnius, Lithuania

Leidyklos adresas / Address of the Publisher: Redaktorių kolegijos kontaktai / Editorial inquiries:
Lietuvos istorijos institutas El. paštas / E-mail: etnolog@istorija.lt
Tilto g. 17, LT-01101 Vilnius
<www.istorija.lt>

Žurnalas registruotas / The Journal is indexed in:
European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH)
EBSCO Publishing: Academic Search Complete, Academic Search Ultimate,
Energy and Power Source, SocINDEX with Full Text, Sociology Source Ultimate
Modern Language Association (MLA) International Bibliography

Leidybą finansavo Lietuvos mokslo taryba pagal Valstybinę lituanistinių tyrimų ir
sklaidos 2016–2024 metų programą (Sutartis Nr. S- LIP-22-43)

TURINYS / CONTENTS

Pratarmė (<i>Vida Savoniakaitė</i>)	5
Editorial (<i>Vida Savoniakaitė</i>)	9

Teminis skyrius: antropologijos ir etnologijos istoriniai konceptai / Special Section: Concepts in the History of Anthropology and Ethnology

Kamila Gęsikowska

Man and his History in the Evolutionary Approach: The Theory and Sources of the Rudimentary Symptoms of Julian Ochorowicz	13
Žmogus ir jo istorija evoliuciniu požiūriu: Juliano Ochorowicziaus rudimentinių požymių teorija ir jos šaltiniai. Santrauka	30

Irma Šidiškienė

Lituanistinių darbų vertinimo istorijos puslapis: termino ir metodo akcentai Antano Mažiulio recenzijose	32
A Page in the History of the Evaluation of Lithuanian Studies: The Emphasis on the Term and Method in the Reviews by Antanas Mažiulis. Summary	53

Straipsniai / Articles

Viktorija Serbentienė

Ekologijos nuostatos ir praktikos: individualių gyvenamųjų namų statybos sfera	57
Attitudes and Practices of Ecology in the Construction of Individual Houses. Summary	85

Rolandas Kregždys

<i>Sacra sub velo</i> : Pietų aukštaičių papročio puošti kryžių apdangalais ištakos	87
<i>Sacra sub velo</i> . An Apron and Ribbons as Decorative Elements of Roadside Crosses in the Southern Highlands: The Origins of the Custom. Summary	107

Sigita Astikienė

„Kaip įvertinti, ar aš geresnis, ar tu geresnis“: bibliotekininkų apdovanojimų tradicijos	109
‘How to Judge which one of us is the Best’: Librarian Award Traditions. Summary	129

<i>Miglė Lapėnaitė</i>	
Antropologinė karo analizė: mikrolygmens perspektyva etnografijoje	131
The Anthropological Analysis of War: The Micro-Level Perspective in Ethnography. Summary	146

Apžvalginis straipsnis / Review Article

<i>Asta Bartkevičiūtė</i>	
Macikų lagerių patirtys žmonių atsiminimuose: Šilutės Hugo Šojaus muziejaus 2018–2020 metų etnografiniai tyrimai	148
Experiences of the Macikai Camps in People's Memories: Ethnographic Research by the Šilutė Hugo Scheu Museum, 2018–2020. Summary	164

Knygų recenzijos / Book Reviews

The Storytelling Human: Lithuanian Folk Tradition Today. L. Būgienė (ed.) (<i>Ullrich Kockel</i>)	167
Jan Łasicki, Jan Sandecki-Malecki. O bogach i wierzeniach dawnych Żmudzinów, Litwinów i Prusów. M. Wolf (przeł. i opr.) (<i>Małgorzata Rygielska</i>)	170
Lina Pranaitytė. The Coffin in the Attic: Gifts, Debts and the Catholic Church in Rural Lithuania (<i>Ida Harboe Knudsen</i>)	176
Aušra Kairaitytė. Liaudiškasis <i>pamaldumas</i> : naratyvai apie šventuosius XX a. vidurio – XXI a. pradžios Lietuvos kultūroje (<i>Jonas Mardosa</i>)	179
Etnografiniai vaizdai Marijos Znamerovskos-Priuferovos negatyvuose. L. Lapėnaitė (sud.) (<i>Rasa Paukštytė-Šaknienė</i>)	185

In Memoriam

Muziejininkas, Lietuvos liaudies buities muziejaus kūrėjas Vytautas Stanikūnas (1924–2022) (<i>Gita Šapranauskaitė</i>)	190
--	-----

Man and his History in the Evolutionary Approach: The Theory and Sources of the Rudimentary Symptoms of Julian Ochorowicz

Kamila Gęsikowska

The aim of this contribution is to explore Julian Ochorowicz's theory of rudimentary symptoms, a proposition largely based on psychological concepts, balancing between the latest findings in evolutionary biology and anthropology, and exploring the development of man and his history. This concept sought to align the reflection of human nature and culture by introducing a psychological input (the concept of subliminal traditions). The author analyses and reintroduces this concept, somewhat forgotten by researchers, that may have functioned as a bridge, both between evolutionary biology and anthropology, and Polish and West European scientific thought at that time.

Key words: *Julian Leopold Ochorowicz, rudimentary symptoms, evolutionism, anthropology, culture.*

Šio straipsnio tikslas – aptarti Juliano Ochorowicziaus rudimentinių požymių teoriją, kuri iš esmės yra paremta psichologinėmis sąvokomis, derinant naujausius evoliucinės biologijos ir antropologijos atradimus bei žmogaus raidos ir jo istorijos tyrinėjimus. Šia teorija siekta sujungti apmąstymus apie žmogaus prigimtį ir kultūrą, įtraukiant psichologinį aspektą (sublimuotų tradicijų sąvoką). Straipsnio autorė analizuoja ir iš naujo pristato šią tyrėjų kiek primirštą teoriją, kuri galėjo tapti tiltu tiek tarp evoliucinės biologijos ir antropologijos, tiek tarp to meto Lenkijos ir Vakarų Europos mokslo minties.

Raktiniai žodžiai: *Julian Leopold Ochorowicz, rudimentiniai požymiai, evoliucionizmas, antropologija, kultūra.*

Dr Kamila Gęsikowska, Institute of Culture Studies, Faculty of Humanities, University of Silesia in Katowice, Uniwersytecka 4, 40-007 Katowice, Poland, e-mail: kamila.gesikowska@us.edu.pl, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3807-6564>

Introduction

Julian Leopold Ochorowicz (1850–1917) is recognised primarily as an inventor and a psychologist, but also as a researcher of phenomena related to mediumship. Many studies have been published with regard to these areas (e.g. Cygielstrejch 1918; Wajdowicz 1964; Skarga 1975; Adamus-Matuszyńska 2018; Sobolewska 2021). But Ochorowicz was also among the first scholars who not only actively set out to introduce the latest scientific concepts in the 1870s and 1880s into Polish lands, but also created independent theoretical proposals inspired by them. Furthermore, his works were influential not only for Polish science; he gained international recognition (his most important work, *De la suggestion mentale*, 1887, was published in French and translated into English). Since about 1879, Ochorowicz was working on developing the theory of *objawy szczątkowe* (*rudimentary symptoms*),¹ defined as certain institutions, rituals, customs and beliefs, etc., existing in culture in a rudimentary form due to the power of tradition and heredity (Ochorowicz 1880c: 230). His idea was to introduce a theory of the development of man and his history in accordance with the concept of rudimentary symptoms. This proposition was largely based on psychological concepts, balancing between the latest findings in evolutionary biology and anthropology. Although he published several works on this matter, his contribution to the formation of the theory of culture has not been broadly discussed. This article's aim is to analyse and reintroduce this somewhat forgotten concept, which, as I argue, may have functioned as a bridge, both between evolutionary biology and anthropology, and Polish and West European scientific thought at that time.

The intellectual background of Julian Ochorowicz

Before moving on to Ochorowicz's theory, it is important to delineate the intellectual background that impacted his reflections. I will focus mainly on the period prior to the development of his theory and the years in which it emerged, while giving only brief information about the latter part of the scientist's life. This decision is dictated by the fact that Ochorowicz focused on the theory of rudimentary symptoms quite intensely before leaving for France, but his main interest while in Paris shifted to hypnotism, and the development of psychological theories related to it.

Julian Ochorowicz was born in Radzymin (near Warsaw) in the Russian-controlled part of partitioned Poland. After the January uprising (1863–1864),² due to the repercussions, his family moved to Lublin (also in the Russian part).

¹ All the translations are by the author unless otherwise stated.

² The January uprising is regarded as a major event in Polish history that aimed to restore independence and unite the lands partitioned in the years 1772–1795 by Austria, Prussia and Russia.

While at school there, he met Aleksander Świętochowski (1849–1938), a publicist, writer, philosopher and activist, and Aleksander Głowacki (1847–1912), later known under his pen name Bolesław Prus, a famous novelist and journalist, and Ochorowicz's lifelong friend. Soon the three of them became, among others, the paramount and great advocates for the positivist³ movement (Krajewski 1978: 499). Already during his teenage years, Ochorowicz was reading books that inspired his reflections on the matter of the human soul, i.e. *Physiognomy* by Johann Caspar Lavater, *Essays on Phrenology* by Franz Josef Gall, and *Le cerveau et la pensée* by Paul Janet (Skarga 1975: 96). In 1866 he undertook studies in the Main School of Warsaw, at first in the Department of Philology and History, but then he transferred to the Department of Mathematics and Physics. He wrote his first work at the time, which aroused great interest, was publicly acclaimed, and then published in 1869: *Jak należy badać duszę? czyli O metodzie badań psychologicznych* (How Should the Soul be Examined? Or on the Method of Psychological Research). In this work, he put forward the thesis that psychology belongs to the natural sciences, which at the time was quite innovative, as psychology traditionally belonged to philosophy (Krajewski 1978: 499). He won first prize in a contest announced by the Main School of Warsaw, and the person who evaluated his work was Henryk Struve (1840–1912), a philosopher, psychologist, and one of the leading Polish scientists of the time (Skarga 1975: 96). From 1868 to 1875 he was engaged in a publicist campaign supporting the positivist movement in the Polish press, although in 1872 he joined the more moderate wing of positivists, and published numerous articles in periodicals such as *Niwa*⁴ and *Opiekun Domowy*.⁵ In the same year, he published *Wstęp i pogląd ogólny na filozofię pozytywną* (Prologue and General Outlook on Positivist Philosophy). At the time, he was reading the works of Jan Śniadecki (1756–1830), John Stuart Mill (1806–1873) and Herbert Spencer (1820–1903) (Krajewski 1978: 499), as well as those of Alexander Bain (1818–1903), Hippolyte Taine (1828–1893) and Wilhelm Wundt (1832–1920) (Skarga 1975: 97), with whom Ochorowicz worked later in life and whose influence proved to be vital. An important source for his reflection can

³Positivism can be defined by a few core ideas: it focused on phenomena and discovering the connections between them, it aimed to explain a fact by discovering its 'natural' or 'secondary' causes, and finally by discovering the laws behind phenomena (see: Skarbak 1968: 7–8).

⁴*Niwa* was a biweekly (and later weekly) scientific, literary and artistic magazine published in the years 1872–1905 in Warsaw. In the beginning it was an important magazine that published translated extracts from major works by Herbert Spencer or Hippolyte Taine. It was an important thought platform for the wing of moderate positivist thinkers such as Henryk Sienkiewicz, Eliza Orzeszkowa and Bolesław Prus.

⁵*Opiekun Domowy* was a weekly magazine published in the years 1865–1876 in Warsaw. It expressed the concepts and tendencies of positivism. Important writers and thinkers such as Henryk Sienkiewicz and Piotr Chmielowski were its associates.

also be traced to the theory of Charles Darwin: in 1873 he translated into Polish a work by the French biologist, zoologist and anthropologist Jean Louis Armand de Quatrefages de Bréau (1810–1892): *Charles Darwin et ses précurseurs français. Étude sur le transformisme* (1870). The book was published under the title *Karol Darwin i jego poprzednicy. Studyjum nad teorią przeobrażeń* (Charles Darwin and his Predecessors. A Study on the Theory of Transformation)⁶ (Quatrefages 1873). He claimed that Quatrefages' explanations of Darwin's theory, although made by his opponent, are easier for the general public to understand than Darwin's works themselves. Ochorowicz not only translated Quatrefages' work, but also complemented it with information about German (after Ernst Haeckel) and English (after Darwin himself) precursors of Darwin (Ochorowicz 1873: VI–VII); therefore, the phrase '*ses précurseurs français*' was removed from the Polish title. This is an important fact from the perspective of this article, as it shows that the young researcher's keen interest in Darwin's proposition can be traced back to the beginning of the 1870s (he not only translated the work, but also complemented it with additional information). Ochorowicz had a significant impact on the popularisation of the latest scientific thought in the circle of Varsovian positivists; it should, however, be noted that he also faced a fair amount of criticism, especially for 'writing too hastily, in a disorderly way, and without a care for the accuracy of the terms' (Skarga 1975: 99).

He finished his studies in 1872, and in 1873 he travelled to England and France. In 1873 he began studying psychology, natural science and philosophy in Leipzig under Moritz Wilhelm Drobisch (1802–1896), a mathematician, logician, psychologist and philosopher, Gustav Theodor Fechner (1801–1887), an experimental psychologist, philosopher and physicist, Rudolf Leuckart (1822–1898), a zoologist, and Heinrich Ahrens (1808–1874), a philosopher and jurist (Krajewski 1978: 500). He gained a doctoral degree on the basis of his thesis *Bedingungen des Bewusstwerdens, eine physiologisch-psychologische Studie* (Conditions of Becoming Conscious, a Physiological-Psychological Study), published in Leipzig in 1874. Afterwards, he returned home and took up the position of editor-in-chief of *Niwa* (but only for a year). Ochorowicz described this period of his life in his journal, published in 1876: *Z dziennika psychologa. Wrażenia, uwagi, spostrzeżenia, w ciągu dziesięciu lat spisane* (From a Psychologist's Journal. Impressions, comments, observations, written down over ten years). In 1875, he took up the post of *docent* of psychology and natural philosophy in the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Lviv (at the time Lviv belonged to Galicia, in the Austro-Hungarian empire), being the first *docent* of empirical psychology in Polish lands, and one of

⁶The original Polish spellings have been kept without transcribing them into contemporary Polish.

the first in Europe. He gave lectures at the university that, among other things, focused on theoretical and applied psychology, the psychology of history and civilisation, and ethnopsychology, but also the philosophy of physics, and the history of natural philosophy. At the time, he also partook in the work of the Polish Copernicus Society of Naturalists (Polskie Towarzystwo Przyrodników im. Kopernika) in Lviv, and published numerous articles in *Kosmos*,⁷ *Niwa* and *Ateneum*⁸ (Krajewski 1978: 500–501). It was also during this time that the idea of rudimentary symptoms was born.

The development of the theory of rudimentary symptoms

Ochorowicz saw himself as a positivist, and was greatly interested in empirical methods in science: his views and methods were explained in the book *Wstęp i pogląd ogólny na filozofię pozytywną* (Prologue and General Outlook on Positivist Philosophy, Warsaw, 1872). Already in this work, traces of working on the topic of man's history and the problem of progress can be found. The more extensive reflections concerning the problem of the psychology of history start to appear while forging the theory of rudimentary symptoms. Ochorowicz started to work on this theory after his employment at the University of Lviv. The first attempts at presenting the theory to the scientific community can be traced back to 1879. In *Gazeta Lwowska*, No 287, dated 15 December 1879, on page 3, we read that Ochorowicz gave a lecture 'O teorii objawów szczątkowych w zastosowaniu do psychologii narodów' (On the Theory of Rudimentary Symptoms Applied to the Psychology of Nations) at a meeting of the Polish Copernicus Society of Naturalists in Lviv. In March 1880, at another meeting of the society, he gave another lecture, 'Nowe przyczynki do teorii objawów szczątkowych' (New Contributions to the Theory of Rudimentary Symptoms), as announced by *Gazeta Lwowska* No 50, dated 2 March 1880, on page 3. Ochorowicz perfected this theory throughout the year 1880. First appeared the article 'Szkic teorii objawów szczątkowych' (An Essay on the Theory of Rudimentary Symptoms), published in the journal *Kosmos* (Ochorowicz 1880a: 53–73), containing a summary of some theses from a book the researcher was preparing for print. A copy of the article from *Kosmos* was also published in book form in 1880 (Ochorowicz 1880b). The final version of the theory was presented in a two-part article

⁷ *Kosmos* is a scientific periodical published since 1876. It was first published in Lviv, and is currently published in Kraków. Its main focus is on the natural sciences (biology, zoology, botanic, geology, etc).

⁸ *Ateneum* was a periodical published in the years 1876–1901 in Warsaw, which aimed to integrate researchers representing various disciplines and educate society. It published articles from disciplines such as psychology, philosophy, history and literary studies.

published in volume 2, issues 5 and 6, of the journal *Ateneum*: 'Bezwiedne tradycje ludzkości. Studium z psychologii historyi' (Subliminal Traditions of Mankind. A Study from the Psychology of History) (Ochorowicz 1880c: 226–254; Ochorowicz 1880d: 478–511). Many years later, Ochorowicz came back to this theory, and published the book *Bezwiedne tradycje ludzkości. Studium z psychologii historyi* (Subliminal Traditions of Mankind. A Study from the Psychology of History) (Ochorowicz 1898) (Figure). It was probably this book that Ochorowicz was planning to publish in 1880, and which for some reason was not published at the time.

It is recommended to compare all the versions of this theory in chronological order to see how the concept developed and changed throughout the years, but in this article the main focus will be on the version published in *Ateneum* in 1880. The reason for this decision is that it was the most complete version of the theory Ochorowicz was continuously working on during his Lviv period, and as such it may be treated as the most reliable material for explaining its main theses and terms and analysing its sources. Furthermore, the version from 1898 contains some changes, and although it requires a proper analysis, the book will be important here for different reasons, as one cannot help but ask: why did Ochorowicz come back to this theory after 19 years, when his main interests had already shifted? The article will also make an attempt to answer this question.

The psychology of history

In the study of 1880, Ochorowicz did not mention the rudimentary symptoms in the title (which was the case in the previously published works), but emphasised instead the 'subliminal traditions' and the 'psychology of history'. The idea of the psychology of history became an important theoretical framework in which he rooted the concept of rudimentary symptoms. As he wrote, the concept itself was meant to be an alternative to the dominating ways of dividing human history into specific, usually three, periods in time, of which the last one was also regarded to be the finest, most perfect and closest to the thinker's timeline, such as is witnessed in the works of St Augustine or August Comte (Ochorowicz 1880c: 226–227). He commented: 'Having juxtaposed the first division with the last one [St Augustine's and Comte's], one might think that history has turned upside down, and yet neither is gymnastics its property, nor is it used to obey philosophers' commands' (Ochorowicz 1880c: 227).

Ochorowicz thought that such divisions are artificial, abstract, and cannot be applied either to mankind or to its history, 'barely known today in its beginnings, and completely unknown in its epilogue' (Ochorowicz 1880c: 227). He also considered it improper to impose contemporary values and ideas on historical epochs.

The scientist followed the idea introduced by Herbert Spencer that a society is much like a living organism. The analogy between the life of a society and that of a body was based on the premise that both evolve, their structures get more complex, and the increase in size equals an increase in structure (Spencer 1877: 467). Although Ochorowicz agreed with this idea, he also argued that in many cases it cannot be applied so easily to the idea of society. As an example, he pointed to the Polish nobility, whose history could not be treated as representative of the whole nation, as the nation also consisted of other social groups. He also negated the premise that a nation lives through certain 'epochs', of which the last one equals its death, as was suggested by John William Draper (1811–1882) (Draper 1864a; Draper 1864b). He was convinced that even a dead nation may one day, as historical evidence suggests, come back to life (Ochorowicz 1880c: 228).⁹ The idea of *nation* correlated with the idea of *society* for Ochorowicz, and the terms were used by the author interchangeably. However interested in the evolution of societies, he saw them as a bigger picture, as a product of the long evolution of humanity as a whole. Therefore, he considered simple categories applied to the history of societies from the perspective of today as being imposed on the past in a rigid and inflexible way. Thus, his first proposition was to get rid of such 'labels', and turn instead to discovering laws that stand behind the evolution of human history:

... there is no need to prematurely affix labels to historical compartments. What we can do today is, rather, to remove artificial compartments, to discover the relations and psychological laws governing the forces that create history, whatever their causes and *ultimate* ends may be, which we are unable to find, and even less, comprehend (Ochorowicz 1880c: 228).

Ochorowicz's idea was to discover the relations and laws behind the forces that govern history. He proposed to treat history as a 'collective psychological process, viewed from the outside' (Ochorowicz 1880c: 228). By 'collective psychological process', he understood focusing not on individual 'thoughts, feelings and behaviour', which he deemed to be chaotically diverse, but viewing them in the light of statistics and history. Although Ochorowicz did not explicitly refer to Wundt here, his idea is similar to Wundt's concept of 'collective minds', and he probably drew from Wundt's principles of psychology. It has been argued that Ochorowicz explored the topic of the psychology of history and civilisation as well as ethnopsychology many years before Wundt published

⁹This conviction may have also had its roots in the situation of Poland at the time: a country that had lost its independence due to the partitions of 1795, but the people were keeping the culture alive, hoping Poland would regain its statehood one day.

his *Völkerpsychologie* (Krajewski 1978: 500),¹⁰ yet the idea of *Völkerpsychologie*¹¹ appeared much earlier. Already during the 1860s, the philosopher Moritz Lazarus (1824–1903), together with the linguist Heymann Steinthal (1823–1899), founded the journal *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*, which was supposed to promote their idea of folk psychology as an academic discipline. The term itself was coined by Lazarus in 1851 (Klautke 2013: 2–3), and the idea was to discover ‘the “laws” that governed the historical development of the folk spirit’ (Klautke 2013: 18), or the *Volksgeist*. The aim of folk psychology was to examine the relationship between the individual and collective minds. As the *Volksgeist* presented itself in e.g. language, the arts, religion and customs, the employment of empirical research was proposed by both Lazarus and Steinthal, as well as Wundt (Bednarek 1980: 29). During his stay in Leipzig, Ochorowicz had an opportunity to read their works, as well as Theodor Waitz’s *Anthropologie der Naturvölker* (1864), as can be inferred from his correspondence published in *Niwa* ‘Listy z Lipska o współczesnej filozofii niemieckiej’ (Letters from Leipzig on the Modern German Philosophy) (Ochorowicz 1874: 32). Reflection on the problem of the ‘national character’ or ‘national spirit’ was also visibly apparent in Polish thought in the first half of the 19th century (Bednarek 1980: 48–53). Therefore, it can be assumed that Ochorowicz was well aware of this theoretical background when drawing up his own theory, although this aspect of it still requires further examination.

His idea of the psychology of history was based on the aforementioned meaning of ‘collective psychology’, which was supposed to help understand how societies (and humanity as a whole) emerge and live. As Ochorowicz explained, certain ‘drives’ and ‘feelings’ that are common to certain groups of people make them join together as communes and societies (Ochorowicz 1880c: 228–229). He wrote: ‘How to explain the patriotic feelings, the power of national love and jealousy, the influences of education and public life, if not by dissecting these spiritual factors, which are still at work today?’ (Ochorowicz 1880c: 229). This term was focused on depicting the ‘social’ and ‘spiritual’ spheres of collective

¹⁰ Wundt first published his critical essays *Aufsatz Über Ziele und Wege der Völkerpsychologie* (1888), and then during the years 1900–1920 he published the ten-volume *Völkerpsychologie. Eine Untersuchung der Entwicklungsgesetze von Sprache, Mythos und Sitte*.

¹¹ As Egbert Klautke wrote, there are multiple problems with translating the term *Völkerpsychologie* into English: ‘It has been rendered as “folk psychology”, “national psychology”, “anthropological psychology” and “ethnic psychology”, none of which give an accurate translation of the German original, but rather testify to the changing understanding of the term over time. I use ‘folk psychology’ as a historical translation of *Völkerpsychologie*, even though the term is used in contemporary cognitive psychology and philosophy of the mind in a different meaning, i.e. to describe lay-psychological reasoning’ (Klautke 2010: 1). I use the term in the meaning delineated by Klautke, and translate it as ‘folk psychology’.

life, although Ochorowicz was more interested in the 'spiritual' part (such as myths, customs, etc.). He saw some crucial differences between what humans are born with and what they learn throughout their lifetime. He thought that a person is born with a certain set of physical features (e.g. a musculoskeletal system or a brain), as well as a set of hereditary aptitudes and tendencies. He reckoned that this rule can also be applied to humanity as a whole, as it evolved from the animal world, inheriting a variety of physical features, as well as certain aptitudes and tendencies 'which constitute the hereditary foundation for his own heritage' (Ochorowicz 1880c: 229). The term *heritage* (*dziedzictwo*)¹² is mostly used by Ochorowicz in a biological context when he refers to physical features, skills or habits. He also notes that for human evolution, the ability to draw from experience was as important as the biological set-up, whereby certain aptitudes and tendencies arose in the 'collective human', some of which 'may be incomprehensible today if they have outlived their time' (Ochorowicz 1880c: 230).

The term *rudimentary symptoms* and the core thesis of the theory

Aptitudes and tendencies that have 'outlived their time' are the core of Ochorowicz's theory. Without a prior contextual analysis of the term *objawy szczątkowe*, the idea translates into English with great difficulty. The Polish word *szczątek* (plural *szczątki*) may refer to 'a beginning or an end', and was used in the context of emic kinship terms referring to a descendant (*potomek wstępny*), or in a sense of definite annihilation (Kryński, Niedźwiedzki 1909: 576). The word *szczątkowy* is an adjective derived from the word *szczątek*, and refers to 'what remains; what is in decline; what is a trace of something completely unformed, undeveloped' (Kryński, Niedźwiedzki 1909: 577). The dictionary also makes a clear reference to the biological sense of the word *szczątkowy*, and gives an example of certain bones that may be underdeveloped or declining (Kryński, Niedźwiedzki 1909: 577). In this sense, the word *szczątkowy* may be linked to the Darwinian idea of *rudimentary organs*. Ochorowicz explains the idea:

In the theory of the development of organic beings, the concept of so-called *rudimentary organs* has already been established. An organ that is not supported in its activity due to changes in living conditions disappears; heredity, however, does not allow it to bend completely, and leaves it to the eyes of anatomists as a rudiment, as a tangible trace of a long-gone stage [of development] (Ochorowicz 1880c: 230).

This definition follows Darwin's explanations (Darwin 1871: 404–410). Although it is currently more common to speak of 'vestigial' than 'rudimentary'

¹²In Polish, this term may be derived from the word *dziad*, meaning, among other things, an ancestor (Karłowicz, Kryński, Niedźwiedzki 1900: 631, 638–639).

organs, Darwin used the term *rudimentary*. As was mentioned previously, Ochorowicz was very interested in Darwin's ideas, although it is quite difficult to determine whether he drew more from the French translations or the English original. Before Ochorowicz's work appeared, the French edition was published four times (1862, 1866, 1873 and 1876) and had three different translators. It can be determined, however, that in each French edition, *rudimentary organs* were translated as '*organes rudimentaires*'; thus, there is no doubt that the term *organy szczątkowe* that appears in Ochorowicz's work should be translated into English as *rudimentary organs*, regardless of the scientific readership's source.

In coining his own term *objawy szczątkowe*, the Polish researcher transposes Darwin's theory of rudimentary organs, and writes:

Quite analogous phenomena exist both in the world of the spirit and in the mental development of mankind. Institutions, rituals, customs and theories, systems of feelings and drives which, as a result of changes in living conditions, have lost their *raison d'être* in their original form, are gradually disappearing, but are preserved by heredity and by tradition in a derivative form, in the form of remnants and traces of past stages of development. By analogy, we will also call them *rudimentary symptoms* (Ochorowicz 1880c: 230).

I translate the term *objawy szczątkowe* as *rudimentary symptoms*, deriving the first part from the Darwinian *rudimentary organs*, as Ochorowicz himself points to the analogy. In choosing the word 'symptoms' as the translation for '*objawy*', I follow the scientist's explanation of the term. He draws an image of mankind's mental and spiritual¹³ development, which translates into the psychological stance he takes. The word '*objawiać*', from which the word '*objaw*' comes, may be understood as something that is apparent and made well visible (Zdanowicz et al. 1861: 790). It can also be used in a medical sense, as a symptom of something, an apparent and visible sign of internal processes. It fits the description well, since *objawy szczątkowe* are supposed to be the remains of earlier stages of development of the mental and spiritual plane. They make visible and possible to observe what would otherwise remain subliminal and inexplicable. Therefore, I translate the term as *rudimentary symptoms*.

An example of a rudimentary symptom may be the use of flint knives by 'civilised nations' for religious purposes, where, as Ochorowicz writes, without the knowledge that they are remains from the Stone Age, their use in modern times would be incomprehensible. Historical knowledge may give an explanation of such customs and rites. The researcher also noticed that customs and rites change over time in three main ways: their content changes while they keep their

¹³ The Polish term *duch* (spirit) should be understood here in a similar way to the German term *Geist*, although the German term has a much bigger and richer meaning.

form, they lose their content completely while keeping only the form, and finally both their content and their form change (Ochorowicz 1880c: 230–231). With this in mind he concludes:

Considering the facts gathered below, it will not be difficult for us to see that, just like an anatomist-physiologist discovers in rudimentary organs the remains of old stages of development, formerly active living organs, likewise, a historian-psychologist examining the rudimentary symptoms will be able to find in them indications of the essential role they played in the past when they were a serious, normal expression of social functions (Ochorowicz 1880c: 231–232).

The role of the historian-psychologist is to examine the rudimentary symptoms and draw conclusions about their social function and their past. It is apparent that Ochorowicz draws his theory not only from evolutionary biology but also from evolutionary anthropology, which at that time was at its peak. Although the scientist points to several authors who noted the phenomenon of traditions, customs, etc, prevailing in forms that are no longer easily explicable (e.g. the German physician, Rudolf Vichrow), he notes that the most significant impact was made by Thomas Laycock (1812–1876), the English neurophysiologist who introduced the term *ancestral memory*, and Edward Burnett Tylor (1832–1917), the English evolutionary anthropologist who coined the term *survival*.

Laycock's concept of ancestral memory derived from the conviction that habits of individuals, but also whole nations, manifesting in certain movements, gestures, mental forms, ideas and feelings, may be subject to heredity. He explained that heredity happens through a 'modified organisation in the nervous system', which made it possible for certain e.g. ideas to be recreated. Ochorowicz considered this type of heredity to be important to the idea of rudimentary symptoms only when the researcher is faced with a prevalence of certain types of cultural features: those that were important for the culture as a whole in the past, and which prevailed in a diminished form that was once well understood and cannot be readily explained from a modern perspective. This type of heredity was significant to Ochorowicz especially in the realm of gestures. As he explained, gestures could be original, mimicked or inherited, which further separated into two groups, those inherited from animals and those inherited from humans, particularly from ancient primitive peoples (such as thrusting or hitting). However, as the researcher notes, these inherited rudimentary symptoms should be regarded mostly in neutral terms, without making a judgment concerning their usefulness, as they themselves are neutral to our survival as humans, just as it is neutral to have a tailbone (Ochorowicz 1880c: 232–241). Heredity is mainly understood in this theory as biological, and tradition as cultural.

Tradition is connected to the concept of *survival* that Tylor explained as:

processes, customs, opinions, and so forth, which have been carried on by force of habit into a new state of society different from that in which they had their original home, and they thus remain as proofs and examples of an older condition of culture out of which a newer has been evolved (Tylor 1871: 13).

However much Ochorowicz's concept of tradition-based (or cultural) rudimentary symptoms may seem exceptionally similar to Tylor's *survival*, he also makes some crucial distinctions between them. The main difference is explicable through Tylor's most famous example of survival: the case of an old Somersetshire woman who still used a handloom, even though the 'flying shuttle' was the dominant type of shuttle in use at the time. Tylor concluded this example with the following words: 'this old woman is not a century behind her times, but she is a case of survival' (Tylor 1871: 13). While this is an example of survival, it is not an example of a rudimentary symptom, Ochorowicz argued. The old woman indeed had outlived the previous century, and acted in alignment with the traditional, customary ways, but for this to be a rudimentary symptom, her action would have to lose or change its meaning, which was not the case (Ochorowicz 1880c: 243). Rudimentary symptoms would concern only those traditional processes, customs, etc., which do not simply prevail in the same form, but either their form or their content (meaning), or both, change, and are visible only in a diminished form. This makes the phenomena that this term can be applied to a much smaller group than those that can be recognised as survivals. Whether based on heredity or tradition, the key component of rudimentary symptoms is the change in their function that happens on a subliminal level.

Ochorowicz introduces an interesting concept that is an answer to an important question: are we as mankind always aware of how the traditions and features we inherit change throughout time? The scientist proposed two different approaches. As *cognisant* (*świadome*) traditions, he understood those that carry on throughout the ages without any vital changes in their primary meaning. If, however, the tradition changed from its primal form, declined, and the connection between its primal and modern meaning is lost, then such traditions can be regarded as *subliminal* (*bezwiedne*). It is mostly in such traditions, Ochorowicz argues, that rudimentary symptoms can be discovered (Ochorowicz 1880c: 246). Rudimentary symptoms can mostly be traced back to the subliminal part of the collective minds of peoples, and guide the historian-psychologist through what is empirically apparent, e.g. customs, in order to recognise in them traces of the evolution of human nature and culture. In this sense, the psychological approach Ochorowicz employed became a bridge that allowed him to consider the natural and cultural side of mankind as a whole.

Concluding remarks: on the reception of the theory of rudimentary symptoms

Ochorowicz left Lviv in 1882, and his theoretical focus gradually shifted. His various additional activities met with little understanding from the authorities at Lviv University, and since securing a professorship (and thus a salary) seemed far from possible, he decided to leave the country in search of better opportunities (Krajewski 1978: 501), choosing France as the place to move to. His main goal was to study French psychology and learn more about hypnotism, which at the time was studied in scientific circles and applied by physicians. Since losing the stipend, he earned his living by developing numerous technical inventions (mostly those involving telephones and microphones). His technical articles were already being published in the 1870s in journals such as *Kosmos*, *Ateneum*, *Nature* and *Lumière Electrique* (Krajewski 1978: 501). In Paris he made the acquaintance of Théodule Ribot (1839–1916), a professor of experimental psychology (from 1885 he taught at the Sorbonne), and editor-in-chief of the *Revue Philosophique* (from 1876), and Charles Richet (1850–1935), a physiologist and a Nobel laureate in physiology or medicine (in 1913). Richet presented Ochorowicz with an opportunity to introduce his ideas to the French Biological Society, and in the following months he gave several lectures. He soon won acclaim from the French scientific community, and his research was well received and widely praised; the situation was different in the Polish community, where he still received a lot of criticism for his ideas. Nonetheless, when he returned to the country after ten years living abroad, he was, at least for some time, treated like a celebrity; however, his experiments with mediumship stirred another wave of discontent from the medical community, and after being severely criticised (some explicitly called him ‘an ignoramus’), Ochorowicz moved in 1903 to Wisła, a small town in Cieszyn, Silesia, in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. There he resumed his work: in 1905 he was chosen as one of the editors-in-chief of *Annales des Sciences Psychiques*, and in 1906 he was appointed general secretary of the International Institute of Psychology in Paris. He also continued his experiments with hypnotism and mediumship. But the interest in hypnotism was starting to wane in France as well (Skarga 1975: 104–105). In 1912, Ochorowicz moved to Warsaw. Although he was still active in his final years, the amount of criticism he received from the scientific community for researching mediumship phenomena made it difficult for him to continue his scientific career. In 1917 he died of *angina pectoris* (Krajewski 1978: 504).

Despite the fact that the problem of the reception of this theory requires a separate study, it is important to at least delineate the possible range of its impact. Ochorowicz searched for laws that govern both nature and culture, an approach

employed at the time by both anthropologists and biologists. Anthropology, regarded as a science by Tylor, who at the time was preoccupied with seeking laws that govern human evolution, was a natural ally of Ochorowicz's understanding of this process. It should also be noted that Ochorowicz was the first scientist to introduce to Polish readers a translation of Tylor's core term *survival*, and gave a brief but important introduction to *Primitive Culture*, a work that was translated into Polish in its entirety 16 years later, in 1896, by Zofia Antonina Kowerska (1871–1946) as *Cywilizacja pierwotna. Badania rozwoju mitologii, filozofii, wiary, mowy, sztuki i zwyczajów*, with the participation of the prominent and important culture researcher Jan Aleksander Karłowicz (1836–1903).¹⁴ In those 16 years, an intense negotiation of terms that were to constitute a new field of study, the study of culture, took place. Although Ochorowicz proposed the translation of Tylor's *survival* as *przeżycie* (which is similar to the official Polish translation that introduced the term *przeżytek*), and tried to delineate clearly the difference between *survival* and *rudimentary symptoms*, it seems that, at least to a certain extent, the term *rudimentary symptoms* may sometimes have overlapped with Tylor's *survival*. The most apparent example can be found in an article by Henryk Biegeleisen (1855–1934), a Polish ethnographer and historian of literature, who in 1893 explicitly cites Ochorowicz's theory and writes about the prevailing traditions as 'rudimentary symptoms, survivals' (Biegeleisen 1893: 318–319). The most interesting case of the use of this term in translation may undoubtedly be spotted in Herbert Spencer's work *The Principles of Sociology*. Spencer writes:

My inference that the cropping of the hair of felons is a survival, is supported by more evidence than that given in the text. Dr. Tylor, however, prefers to regard it as an entirely modern regulation to insure cleanliness: ignoring the truth, illustrated by himself, that usages often survive after their original purpose has been forgotten, and are then misinterpreted (Spencer 1900: 82).

¹⁴I would like to express gratitude to the reviewers for showing me the direction in which further research may be conducted. The research concerning potential influences between the works of Jan Karłowicz and Julian Ochorowicz is an important direction. At this point it is still difficult to estimate whether such influences took place, but it can be assessed that there were certainly some overlaps between the two researchers in the area of the implementation of evolutionary theories in their own studies. For example, both Karłowicz and Ochorowicz noticed the term *revival*, complementary to the term *survival*, in Edward Tylor's works, and both made an attempt to translate it into Polish (Karłowicz translated it as *odżytek*, Ochorowicz as *odżycie*). Although the implementation of the term was different in their works, it is worth noting that they were both rare examples of researchers who worked on this problem, which was otherwise forgotten in Polish cultural sciences, and not greatly connected with Tylor's *survival* theory during later years. I write about this more extensively in the article 'Odżytek – zapoznany termin polskich nauk o kulturze', which will be published in *Przekładaniec. Journal of Translation Studies* (2022), No 44. However, the problem of the influences of Ochorowicz's theory and its potential range, both in Polish and Lithuanian cultural sciences, still requires further examination.



Figure. Front cover of the book *Bezwiedne tradycje ludzkości. Studium z psychologii historii* by Julian Ochorowicz (Warszawa 1898). National Library of Poland, sign. 48.019. <<https://polona.pl/item/bezwiedne-tradycje-ludzkosci-studjum-z-psychologii-historji,ODk3NzU0MzY/4/#info:metadata>> [accessed on 15 03 2022].

In the Polish text, the term *survival* has been quite deliberately, and in line with Ochorowicz's interpretation, translated as *rudimentary symptom* (Spencer 1890: 77). The term *rudimentary symptoms* was also used in the Polish translation of *L'uomo delinquente* by Cesare Lombroso (1835–1909), where it stands for the word 'avanzi', or 'remains' (Lombroso 1891: 37; Lombroso 1896: 45). It can be found in a few more places, such as an article entitled 'Szczątkowe objawy ekonomiczne' (Rudimentary Symptoms in the Economy) by St Bienias,¹⁵ where the term is treated quite loosely (Bienias 1887: 660–661), or in the book *Adam Mickiewicz. Zarys biograficzno-literacki* (Adam Mickiewicz. A Biographical and Literary Outline) by Piotr Chmielowski (1848–1904), a literary historian, where the term is used with regard to the prevailing tradition of fables in rural communities (Chmielowski 1886: 235–236). It was also used by Iwan Franko (1856–1916), a Ukrainian writer, translator and Slavist, with regard to tales, fables and beliefs (Franko 1892: 755–757).

¹⁵ The identity of the author could not be identified.

Ochorowicz's interest in the latest, even groundbreaking, scientific currents and discoveries was apparent from his early youth and throughout his more mature years. Many of his ideas (especially the technical ones) proved to be truly visionary (e.g. Wajdowicz 1964); while others, from the point of view of contemporary knowledge, can be examined only from a diachronic perspective, as historical propositions. It is hard to estimate how much impact this theory made without carrying out an extensive study, but it may be safe to say that although its range may have been limited, it was used by ethnographers, especially in the context of cultural traditions, and has played an important role in the adaptation of vital anthropological terms and concepts, especially those connected to remains, or survival. This may be one of the reasons why Ochorowicz came back to this theory after 19 years, and finally published it in book form: *Bezwiedne tradycje ludzkości. Studium z psychologii historii* (Subliminal Traditions of Mankind. A Study from the Psychology of History) (Ochorowicz 1898). It should also be regarded as a contribution to the emerging study of culture on Polish grounds. Ochorowicz brought in many important theories and introduced them to the Polish reader, on the basis of which he also came up with an original theory that sought to align the reflection on human nature and culture.

References

- Adamus-Matuszyńska, Anna. 2018. *Koncepcja człowieka i społeczeństwa w myśli filozoficznej Juliana Ochorowicza*. Gdynia, Kraków: Black Antlers.
- Bednarek, Stefan. 1980. *Charakter narodowy w koncepcjach i badaniach współczesnej humanistyki*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Biegeleisen, Henryk. 1893. Ze studjów nad pieśniami i obrzędami weselnymi, *Wiśła. Miesięcznik geograficzno-etnograficzny* VII: 317–335.
- Bienias, St. 1887. Szczętkowe objawy ekonomiczne, *Głos. Tygodnik literacko-społeczno-polityczny* 43: 660–661.
- Chmielowski, Piotr. 1886. *Adam Mickiewicz. Zarys biograficzno-literacki* 1. Kraków, Warszawa: Nakład Gebethnera i Wolffa.
- Cygielstrejch, Adam. 1918. *Juljan Ochorowicz jako psycholog*. Warszawa: skł. gł. w Księgarni Gebethnera i Wolffa.
- Darwin, Charles. 1871. *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life*. New York: D. Appleton and Company.
- Draper, John William. 1864. *History of the Intellectual Development of Europe* 1–2. London: Bell and Daldy.
- Franko, Iwan. 1892. „Bajka węgierska” Wacława Potockiego i „Psia krew”, *Wiśła. Miesięcznik geograficzno-etnograficzny* VI: 745–757.

Karłowicz, Jan; Kryński, Adam Antoni; Niedźwiedzki, Władysław. 1900. *Słownik języka polskiego 1*. Warszawa: Nakładem prenumeratorów w drukarni E. Lubowskiego i S-ki.

Klautke, Egbert. 2010. The Mind of the Nation: The Debate about *Völkerpsychologie*, 1851–1900, *Central Europe* 8(1): 1–19.

Klautke, Egbert. 2013. *The Mind of the Nation: Völkerpsychologie in Germany, 1851–1955*. New York, Oxford: Berghahn.

Krajewski, Seweryn. 1978. Julian Ochorowicz, E. Rostworowski et al. *Polski słownik biograficzny* 23: 499–505. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Kryński, Adam; Niedźwiedzki, Władysław. 1909. *Słownik języka polskiego 6*. Warszawa: Nakładem prenumeratorów i Kasy im. Mianowskiego w Drukarni „Gazety Handlowej”.

Lombroso, Cesare. 1891. *L'uomo delinquente in rapporto all'antropologia, alla giurisprudenza ed alle discipline carcerarie*. Torino: Fratelli Bocca Editori.

Lombroso, Cesare. 1896. *Człowiek-zbrodniarz w stosunku do antropologii jurysprudencji i dyscypliny więziennej*. Warszawa: Nakładem M. Wołowskiego.

Ochorowicz, Julian. 1873. Kilka słów od tłumacza, Adolf Quatrefages. *Karol Darwin i jego poprzednicy. Studjum nad teorią przeobrażeń: V–VII*. Warszawa: Nakładem Księgarni Gebethnera i Wolffa.

Ochorowicz, Julian. 1874. Listy z Lipska o współczesnej filozofii niemieckiej. List pierwszy, *Niwa. Dwutygodnik naukowy, literacki i artystyczny* 3(50): 30–34.

Ochorowicz, Julian. 1880a. Szkic teorii objawów szczątkowych, *Kosmos* 5: 53–73.

Ochorowicz, Julian. 1880b. *Szkic teorii objawów szczątkowych*. Lwów: Nakładem polskiego towarzystwa przyrodników im. Kopernika.

Ochorowicz, Julian. 1880c. Bezwiedne tradycje ludzkości. Studium z psychologii historii, *Ateneum* 5(2): 226–254.

Ochorowicz, Julian. 1880d. Bezwiedne tradycje ludzkości. Studium z psychologii historii, *Ateneum* 5(3): 478–511.

Ochorowicz, Julian. 1898. *Bezwiedne tradycje ludzkości. Studium z psychologii historii*. Warszawa: Druk K. Kowalewskiego.

Quatrefages, Adolf. 1873. *Karol Darwin i jego poprzednicy. Studium nad teorią przeobrażeń*. Warszawa: Nakładem Księgarni Gebethnera i Wolffa.

Skarbek, Janusz. 1968. *Koncepcja nauki w pozytywizmie polskim*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Skarga, Barbara. 1975. Julian Ochorowicz. Pozytywizm i okultyzm, B. Skarga (ed.). *Polska myśl filozoficzna i społeczna* 2: 92–136. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.

Sobolewska, Agnieszka. 2021. *Autoekonomie zapisu Juliana Ochorowicza: codzienne praktyki piśmienne i badawcze psychologa*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Spencer, Herbert. 1877. *The Principles of Sociology* 1. London: Williams and Norgate.

Spencer, Herbert. 1890. *Zasady Socjologii IV: Instytucje obrzędowe stanowiące*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo „Głosu”.

Spencer, Herbert. 1900. *The Principles of Sociology* 2. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

Tylor, Edward Burnett. 1871. *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom* 1. London: John Murray.

Wajdowicz, Roman. 1964. *Julian Ochorowicz jako prekursor telewizji i wynalazca w dziedzinie telefonii*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Zdanowicz, Aleksander et al. 1861. *Słownik Języka Polskiego* 1. Wilno: Wydany staraniem i kosztem Maurycego Orgelbranda.

Žmogus ir jo istorija evoliuciniu požiūriu: Juliano Ochorowicziaus rudimentinių požymių teorija ir jos šaltiniai

Kamila Gęsikowska

Santrauka

Straipsnyje nagrinėjama Juliano Leopoldo Ochorowicziaus (1850–1917) rudimentinių požymių (lenk. *objawy szczątkowe*) teorija. Nors Ochorowiczius visų pirma laikomas išradėju, psichologu ir su mediumizmu susijusių reiškinių tyrinėtoju, jis buvo ir vienas iš pirmųjų mokslininkų, kurie XIX a. aštuntajame ir devintajame dešimtmetyje ne tik aktyviai siekė įdiegti naujausias mokslo idėjas Lenkijos žemėse, bet ir kūrė savo tų idėjų įkvėptus teorinius pasiūlymus. Būdamas aistringas skaitytojas, Ochorowiczius domėjosi garsių to meto asmenybių darbais – Charleso Darwino, Johno Stuardo Millo, Herberto Spencerio, Alexanderio Baino, Hippolyte'o Taine'o ir Wilhelmo Wundto.

Autorė savo straipsnyje daugiausia dėmesio skiria teorijai, kurią Ochorowiczius sukūrė 1875–1882 m. dirbdamas mokslinį darbą Lvivo universitete. Mokslininkas tuo metu aktyviai kūrė teoriją, kuri jungtų antropologinę ir psichologinę mintį, tyrinėjo psichologijos istorijoje aspektą, turėjusį padėti suprasti, kaip atsiranda ir gyvena visuomenės (ir visa žmonija). Šią prielaidą Ochorowiczius grindė „kolektyvinės psichologijos“ sąvoka ir ją suprato kaip „mintis, jausmus

ir elgesį“, kurie yra bendri tam tikroms žmonių grupėms, kurie verčia burtis į bendruomenes ir visuomenes ir kuriuos reikėtų vertinti atsižvelgiant į statistiką ir istoriją. Jis siekė sukurti metodą, kuris leistų žmonijos istoriją tirti remiantis kolektyvine psichologija.

Ochorowiczius, kurį domino žmogaus evoliucija, remdamasis Darwino rudimentinių organų sąvoka sukūrė savo terminą – rudimentiniai požymiai. Pasak jo, rudimentiniai požymiai yra institucijos, ritualai, papročiai ir teorijos, jausmų ir paskatų sistemos, kurios pasikeitus gyvenimo sąlygoms prarado savo pirminę *raison d'être* ir pamažu nyksta, tačiau dėl paveldimumo ir tradicijos išlieka išvestiniu pavidalu, kaip praeities raidos etapų liekanos, pėdsakai.

„Požymius“ Ochorowiczius aiškino kaip numanomas ankstesnių psichinės ir dvasinės raidos etapų liekanas. Šią sąvoką jis taip pat siejo su E. B. Tyloso sukurta antropologine išlikimo idėja, tačiau suvokė ją siauriau; pasak mokslininko, rudimentiniai požymiai yra susiję tik su tais tradiciniais procesais, papročiais ir pan., kurie ne tik išlieka tuo pačiu pavidalu, bet arba jų forma, arba turinys (prasmė), arba ir viena, ir kita keičiasi ir yra mažiau matomi.

Tikrasis šios teorijos poveikis tebėra tolesnių tyrimų objektas. Nors jos taikymo laukas galėjo būti ribotas, tačiau drąsiai teigtina, kad šią teoriją naudojo etnografai, ypač kultūrinių tradicijų kontekste; ji taip pat atliko svarbų vaidmenį pritaikant gyvybiškai svarbius antropologinius terminus ir sąvokas, ypač tuos, kurie susiję su liekanomis arba išlikimu.

Gauta 2022 m. balandžio mėn.