

Grappling With Both Sides

Katarzyna Kłosińska

Department of Polish Studies, University of Warsaw



**Katarzyna Kłosińska,
PhD, DSc**

is a linguist and researcher at the University of Warsaw. For 16 years, she has broadcast sketches about Polish language usage on Polish Public Radio Three. Since 2014 she has headed Poradnia Językowa PWN, a “language clinic” that offers answers to questions about proper language usage submitted by the public. Since 2018 she has been the research editor of the Linguistic Observatory at the University of Warsaw. In 2019 she became chair of the PAS Council for the Polish Language. katarzyna.klosinska@uw.edu.pl

The Polish word *obojętny* “indifferent” has quite an interesting – and even edifying – history. As recently as the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, the adjective described something that could be grabbed or handled from both sides. Although many Poles might not notice it, this is still visible in the form of the word today: *obo-* (a form of *oba* “both”) and *-jęty* (a form of *jąć* “take”). And so back then a pot or a sword, for instance, might have been described as *obojętny* (here: “two-handed” or “two-handed”). The adjective could also express the more abstract meaning of something two-sided, ambiguous – an unclear statement or word, for instance. Someone unable to maintain an upright posture might be described as *chwiejący się obojętnie* (“teetering from one side to the other”), and the priest Dawid Pilchowski penned an appeal in the late seventeenth century for the country’s laws to be *jasne, wyrozumiałe, nietrudne i nieobojętne* (“clear, comprehensible, simple and not variously interpretable”). And so, from things that could be grabbed on two different sides, speakers began to apply the word to things that could be interpreted in two different ways. With time, this twofold interpretation – begin able to swing one way or the other, so to speak – began to be perceived as a lack of any distinctiveness. And so, until quite recently *obojętny* could describe something lackluster, indistinct, bland (e.g. *obojętna potrawa* “a tasteless dish”).

From such duality to the point of indistinctness, it was only a short step to another shift in meaning – whereby an *obojętny* person was someone who sought to serve two different masters, who was duplicitous and deceitful (the kind of person who “wishes to please everyone”; is “two-sided; both hair-cutter and beard-shaver; is hard to understand; is affable to everyone and knows how to fawn up to anyone” – as the seventeenth-century lexicographer Grzegorz Knapski explained). Next, being able to take both sides came to be interpreted as not being in favor of either of them – and so in modern Polish, we use *obojętny* to describe someone dispassionate, who doesn’t care, who does not react vibrantly to what is happening. Interestingly, we also use it to describe issues we are not passionate about.

The chain of semantic shifts from “able to be grabbed from both sides” through “leaning to one side or the other” to “favoring neither side, lacking any distinctiveness” could be seen as carrying a warning: that trying to have things both ways ultimately might leave one considered uninspiring and lackluster by others. In other words, the approach summed up in the Polish idiom *Panu Bogu świeczkę i diabłu ogarek* “give the candle to God, but the candle-end to the devil” (roughly equivalent to the English “trying to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds”) just might leave you indifferent to others, and others indifferent to you. ■

Marco Carlone,
Vestigia delle Terme di Tito.
Abduction of Hippodamia,
Quadro from the vault
decorations of room 27, 1776



PIOTR LIGIER, FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM IN WARSAW