
A TOOL IN POLISH AND RUSSIAN LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL SPACE

Summary

It would be difficult to overestimate the role of tools in the development of civilization. Tools and language are key elements in human evolution. Moreover, many scientists believe that they have had a significant impact on the development of abstract thinking, and as a result the development of speech. Names of tools constitute a part of the lexicon which reflects the creative actions of human beings, and which in recent decades has been developing very dynamically due to the rapid development of world technology.

This monograph is devoted to Polish and Russian names of tools and the language view of the world captured in these names. Attention is drawn to the semantic field of "instrument", which is filled with structurally different nouns, including different types of derivatives, unmotivated words of Slavic origin, as well as borrowings from foreign languages. Apart from nouns, idioms and proverbs with the names of tools have been analysed. The author has adopted the concept of a prototypical conceptual category of tools' names proposed by cognitive scientists. Components of such a category can belong to it in a greater or lesser extent, can be placed in the centre and stay closer to the prototype or can occupy a peripheral position away from it. In view of this, the author has decided to include into the semantic field under study the names of simple hand tools, as well as the names of more complex devices, machinery and its parts, substances and materials that can be used to perform an action, and finally, the names of musical instruments and weapons.

The research material was taken from the dictionaries of contemporary Polish and Russian languages, as well as Polish and Russian dictionaries of phraseology and proverbs. It consists of about 3030 Polish and 3020 Russian nouns with an instrumental meaning, as well as about 650 Polish and 600 Russian idioms and proverbs, which include names of tools.

The multidimensional analysis of the place and the role of tools in the Polish and Russian cultural and linguistic space is presented in five chapters, which are preceded by an introduction. At the end of the monograph there is a conclusion, a bibliography, an index of the Polish and Russian nouns, idioms and proverbs that are used.

The introduction includes a brief overview of linguistic works on the category of tools' names in the structural and cognitive linguistics, on the reconstruction of a language view of the world and the theory of semantic fields.

In the first chapter (*Narzędzie w rozwoju cywilizacyjnym człowieka*) the role of tools in the development of mankind is described. It presents in general terms the stages in the formation of civilization and the significance of primitive tools to the human ancestors at each of these stages. Attention is also drawn to the theory of the origin of language and human ability of verbal communication, which is often associated with the ability to produce tools. In this part of the monograph the ways of development of agriculture and craftsmanship, the evolution of weapons and musical instruments are briefly discussed. A significant place is given to the protective functions of tools, as well as their rich symbolism in Slavic culture.

In the second chapter (*Motywowane słowotwórczo nazwy środków czynności*) the results of a comparative structural analysis of motivated names of tools, which make up about 70% of the Polish and Russian nouns under study, are presented. They include suffixal, prefixal and suffixal-prefixal derivatives, complex words and names that have been created in the process of semantic derivation. In both languages, the most numerous groups consist of suffixal derivatives motivated by verbs. The highest productivity is presented by such formants as Polish *-arka, -acz, -ica, -ik, -ak*, and Russian *-мель, -ка*. Deverbal names of tools constitute the centre of the derivational category *nomina instrumenti*, as they profile the main property of tools, namely the action to which it is intended. The derivatives are motivated by other parts of speech, which form less numerous groups, profile an object, a result of an action (nouns motivated by nouns) or some feature of a designate (nouns motivated by adjectives). Both Polish and Russian prefixal and suffixal-prefixal names of tools are not numerous contrary to compound words, which prevail in the Russian factual material. The equivalents of many Russian composites are Polish suffixal derivatives or phrases. Compound nouns are names with double profiling, i.e. they point both to the action for which a tool is designed and the object of this action. *Nomina instrumenti*, resulting from semantic shifts, form similar groups in the Polish and Russian analytical material. They are either metaphorical or a metonymic names and are formed on the basis of similar semantic models.

The third chapter (*Niemotywowane słowotwórczo nazwy środków czynności*) is devoted to the description of unmotivated names of tools. Among them there are words borrowed into Polish and Russian from other mainly Indo-European languages, nouns of Proto-Slavic origin, as well as native Polish and Russian words. Tools' names of foreign origin make up over 25% of Polish and over 27% of Russian nouns under study. The majority of them belong to compounds consisting of components of Greco-Latin origin, which in the subject literature are called "artificial borrowings". There are more of such complex words among Russian names of tools.

There are numerous groups in both languages comprised of English, German and French borrowings. There are more names of tools of Italian and Czech origin in the Polish language, whereas in Russian there are more names from Dutch.

There is also a difference in the number of Latin words prevailing in Polish and names of Greek origin prevailing in Russian material, which is a natural consequence of the historical strong Latin influence on Poland and the Byzantine influence on Russia. The borrowings from non-Indo-European languages, including Finno-Ugric, Semitic and Altai, form small groups among the names of tools, but there are twice as many such names in the Russian lexical material.

Chapter Four (*Analiza semantyczna nazw środków czynności*) is devoted to the semantic analysis of the names of tools. At the beginning the definition of a tool is proposed on the basis of lexicographical data and linguistic examination and the prototype of it existing in the conscience of Polish and Russian native speakers is presented. Attention is also drawn to the semantic synonymous, hyperonymous and meronymous relations between the components of the semantic field being analyzed. In addition, in this section the lexical-thematic groups of tools' names are described. The most numerous class among both Polish and Russian names is the names of devices and appliances. Polish names with such a meaning make up 46% and Russian names 55% of all names of tools. Less numerous groups consist of the names of simple tools, machines and household appliances. The names of weapons, musical instruments, substances and parts of machines and devices are represented by small groups of nouns.

In the fifth chapter (*"Drugie życie" nazw środków czynności*) Polish- and Russian-language metaphors constructed on the basis of the names of tools are presented. It is worth noticing that only ca. 5% of all nouns analysed in both languages have a figurative meaning. This is mainly the names of simple tools that develop a metaphorical sense. Most of them are loanwords, suffixal derivatives or words of pre-Slavic origin. The basis for metaphors under analysis is usually the similarity of the tools' function and mode of action, more seldom it is a physical feature, e.g. size. The metaphorical names of people, usually pejorative, are created in this way, i.e. *automat*, *вертушка*, *kolubryna*, *кувалда*. They exhibit human vices and weaknesses, such as stupidity, dullness, awkwardness and garrulousness. Other metaphors are formed on the basis of a model: tool > situation, i.e. *kajdany*, *magiel*; *ножницы*, *ловушка*. The mechanisms of creation of linguistic metaphors in the Polish and Russian languages are similar. The exception is the number of Polish pejorative names of individuals formed from the names of musical instruments, i.e. *fujara*, *bas*, *klarnet*. Russian names of musical instruments do not develop such metaphorical meanings.

Both Polish and Russian names of tools undergo transformations of a metonymic type. The most active are the following semantic models: tool > action, i.e. *bat*, *pałka*; *петля*, *виселица*, tools > face, i.e. *strzelba*, *сабля*, tool > result of an action, i.e. *gong*, *werbel*; *факс*, *карандаш* and tool > content, i.e. *chochla*, *половник*.

The second part of this chapter is devoted to the analysis of phraseology and proverbs with the names of tools as their components. In these phrases the usefulness and functionality of tools come to the fore, and their misuse is associated with ineffective human activity, i.e. *porywać się z motyką na słońce*; *носить решетом воду*. In many proverbs and idioms the important role of tools in daily life and work is highlighted, i.e. *Szewc dratwy, krawiec igły powinien pilnować*; *Без веретена пряжи не спрядешь*. In a number of phraseological units one can observe metonymic motivation. These phrases tend to be based on the model tool > action, i.e. *Zły się bardziej kija boi niż zawstydzienia*; *Кнут коню не помощник* or tool > person, i.e. *ślepy miecz*; *мелкая сошка*. The idioms and proverbs analyzed usually include the names of instruments for fighting and punishment, in addition to the names of domestic, agricultural and craft tools and the names of musical instruments.

The linguistic view of the world is also reflected in free word associations, therefore in the third part of the fifth chapter the reactions of Polish and Russian respondents to selected stimuli words from the category *nomina instrumenti* have been presented. The analysis

of the answers shows that for both Polish and Russian native speakers the most important attribute of a tool is its functionality and usability. The most numerous group of associations comprises verbs naming an action for which a certain tool is intended, i.e. *nożyce – ciąć, игла – шить*. In the second largest group one can find qualitative adjectives indicating the physical features of the artifact, i.e. *igła – ostra, молоток – тяжелый*, and relative adjectives denoting the field of application of the tool, i.e. *młotek – kowalski, игла – скорняжная*, or the material from which it is made, i.e. *młotek – drewniany, ножницы – стальные*. Moreover, both Polish and Russian respondents pay attention to the object of the instrument, i.e. *młotek – gwoździe, ножницы – бумага*. Significant discrepancies between the answers of both language groups can be observed only in isolated associations, which have the character of national connotations related to the literature, history, music or politics of a given country, i.e. *lampa – Łukasiewicza, игла – Виктор Цой*.

The Polish- and Russian-language views of tools do not differ from each other significantly. In both languages the names of instruments most often highlight their functionality and the action for which they are intended. Apart from derivatives in both the Polish and Russian *nomina instrumenti* category there are loanwords and names of Proto-Slavic origin. The similarities are also observed in the way the names being analyzed function as metaphors and components of idioms and proverbs. Differences between Polish and Russian tools' names only become visible at the level of individual lexical units, which conceptualize instrumental meaning differently. Lack of structural equivalence is rooted in the inherent properties of both languages, as well as in extra-linguistic factors such as contacts with other nations, and historical and religious circumstances.