

HANNA KRAIEVSKA

Vinnitsa National Pirogov Memorial Medical University, Winnica
krauewska@yandex.ru

The question of dialogue of cultures as a form of language contact

Ukrainians and other Slavic nations, particularly the Poles, have close ethnic and cultural affinity. Of course, their languages have much in common. We will try to trace it in the language of one of the Ukrainian regions – Podillia.

The location of Podillia land and historical facts show that this region has long been the interaction point of different nations. The interpenetration of linguistic elements took place along with the cultural exchange. Consequently, Podillia dialect was influenced by Polish, Eastern Roman languages and to a lesser extent – by Turkic population, which had contacted with the residents of the region for several centuries (Апріох 1994: 74).

The vocabulary of the language is of great interest to researchers, as this language level is the most sensitive to changes occurring in the context of linguistic, ethnic and cultural bonds of Podillia residents with other nations. Our attention was attracted to the terminology of folk crafts, including woodworking, to which different studies are dedicated. Woodworking crafts terminology of the dialects of the Central Podillia has never been analyzed from the point of view of its origin.

Sources

Materials for the study were taken from records of 66 dialects of the Central Podillia. However, this was followed by clarification of the region settlements, where woodworking crafts function and folk terminology of specific industry can be recorded. For this purpose the modern regional ethnographic studies and investigations from the end of the last century were analyzed. The respondents were joiners, carpenters, coopers who use the basic terminology. In order to collect the lexical material a programme-questionnaire was created for the recording of the folk craft terminology. The questionnaire, which included 1305 questions, was aimed at recording the dialect language, simulating most precisely each folk craft.

We recorded about 3500 language units used in the folk crafts terminology. In terms of origin, the gathered vocabulary is characterized by heterogeneity: its main core is the specific vocabulary, though foreign language elements make up its significant part. The borrowed words could enter in Podillia dialect directly from the donor's language through trade relations and settlements of native speakers in Podillia lands.

The aim of the work

In the following survey we set the objective to present the composition and peculiarities of the words borrowed from Polish in woodworking terminology. The woodworking terminology integrates lexical thematic groups (hereinafter – LTG) „Carpentry”, „Wheelwright”, „Timbering”, „Cooper”, each of which them consists of lexical-semantic groups (hereinafter – LSG) „Names of individuals according to the type of activity”, „Place of work”, „Material”, „Tools”, „Processes”, „Products, parts, designs”.

Previous research

Most nomens were borrowed from Polish to describe woodworking products of LSG „Products, parts, designs” of LTG „Wheelwright”: *va'sag* ‘wooden case of a wagon’ – *wasag, fasag*, (ECYM, T. 1, 1982: 336); *l'ushn'a* ‘wooden wagon part’ – *luśnia* (ECYM, T. 3, 1989: 332).

The LSG „Products, parts, designs” of the LTG „Timbering” are present in dialects: *fra'muga* ‘window frame part’ – *framuga* (Пустовіт 2000: 953; ECYM, T. 6, 2012: 126–127). The lexeme *tru'na* ‘product made of boards for burying people’, is evidently a borrowing of the form that functions also in Polish – *trumna* (ECYM, T. 5, 2006: 656) which, however, originates from the German *Truhe* (Brückner, 1927: 577–578).

One borrowed word represents the LSG „Names of individuals according to the type of activity” of the LTG „Wheelwright” – *s'tel'makh* ‘craftsman, who produces wooden transport’. It was borrowed from the Polish word *stelmach*, which originates from German *Stéllmacher* (ECYM, T. 5, 2006: 407).

Woodworking tools, functioning in all LTG of woodworking crafts tend to be more common: *'barda* ‘woodworking tool with a wide blade, a type of axe’ – from German *bardo* (Трубачёв 1966: 153); this lexical element functions in Polish; *'gymbel* ‘woodworking tool with a semicircular cutter for initial wood slicing’ – from German *hobel* through Polish mediation (ECYM, T. 1, 1982: 492); *'pylka* ‘tool for sawing wood’ – borrowed from German *fila* (ECYM, T. 4, 2003: 368); this lexical element is present in Polish as well – *pila*.

Many names of products of woodworking crafts (LTG „Timbering”, „Carpentry”) were borrowed from German through Polish mediation: *drush'l'ak* ‘utensil

used for draining something' – from German *Durchschlag* through Polish mediation (ECYM, T. 2, 1985: 136); *kant* 'longitudinal board section' – from German *Kante*, possibly through Polish mediation (ECYM, T. 2, 1985: 365); *'tafel*' 'wooden door part' – from German *tafel* (ECYM, T. 5, 2006: 528) through Polish mediation; *'tybel*' 'nog' – from Polish *tybel*, originating from *Döbel* (ECYM, T. 5, 2006: 564); *'nary* and its version *'mary* which through Polish and Czech mediation were borrowed from German *bahre* 'plank-bed, coffin', a bond with *mor* 'die' is suggested (ECYM, T. 3, 1989: 393). The lexeme *gra'barka* 'wagon for soil transportation' has a changed form which apparently is a derivative of the Polish *grabarz* and originates from German *grabaere*, *grabarz* (ECYM, T. 1, 1982: 578, Sławski, T. 1, 1952: 333; Kluge – Mitzka 1967: 266).

A separate group of vocabulary is represented by the borrowed words of LTG „Forging”, though widely used in the wooden wagon production (LTG „Wheelwright”): *'ryfy* 'metal shackles of the central wheel part' – from German *reif* (ECYM, T. 5, 2006: 85) in Polish *rafa*; *try'rynky* 'metal shackles holding the drawbar in the steering pole' – from German *teerring* (ECYM, T. 5, 2006: 520); in Polish there is a lexical element *trarynki*.

An interesting pattern can be observed in the distribution of lexical elements in the Central Podillia dialects. Some of them operate in most examined settlements (*shur'shebka*), and some gravitate to the Western area (*v'is'n'ak*, *'tafel*). Obviously, this is because in the event of adoption of culture-bond terms, which did not exist in the region, their nomination was borrowed as well, 'which is why' they were spread among all residents of the area (map № 1). If a foreign lexical element, naming items that previously existed in the region, was correctly identified, in this case the borrowed word functioned in some narrow areas (map № 2, 3).



Map № 1

‘Woodworking tool with a semicircular cutter for initial wood slicing’

◐ — струг

◑ — струґач

△ — ґимблик

▨ — в’іс’н’ак

■ — віс’н’ак

— — the line that marks the area of distribution of words



Map № 2

‘Woodworking tool’

○ – ‘гимблик

● – ‘гимби’л’

△ – шер’хебел’

▲ – шур’шебка

▴ – шер’шебок

▵ – шер’шебел’

▾ – шер’шебка

— – the line that marks the area of distribution of words

▹ – шер’шенок



Map № 3

‘Wooden door part’

△ – ‘тафел’

▲ – ‘тафл’а

⊘ – ф’ил’онка

⊚ – ф’ел’онка

— – the line that marks the area of distribution of words

It is difficult to set a time when foreign language elements have been taken over, but their ability to adapt to the laws of the recipient’s language proves the long standing of the borrowed words. Many lexical elements found their place in the language paradigmatics and syntagmatics, were integrated into the derivative system and became the basis for new word formation.

The phonetic, morphological, accentological adaptation of the borrowed words

It was found that when adapted into the Ukrainian language many nouns underwent the phonetic, morphological, accentological adaptation: *'barda, bar'da, bar'dyna, bar'dynka, bar'dach, bar'dychka, bar'bash* 'woodworking tools with a wide blade and long beard, a type of axe'; *fra'muga, far'muga, fer'muga, for'muga, fra'muga* 'window frame part'. Some lexical elements were adapted to the grammatical forms of the recipient's language: feminine – *tru'na*, masculine – *t'runo*, feminine – *'tafl'a*, masculine – *'tafel'*.

The borrowed words underwent assimilation and became the basis for the formation of new words: *'gymbyel'* 'woodworking tool with a semicircular cutter for initial wood slicing' → *'gyembl'y'vaty* 'process of its use'; *trach* 'worker who saws logs into boards manually' → *tra'chovn'a*: 'place where the sawing of logs into boards is performed manually'. Frequently, composites with the second component *-bel'* originating from German *hobel – plane* (ECYM, T. 1, 1982: 192) can be observed: *'zanzubel'* 'one of the types of woodworking tools', *shpuntubel'* 'one of the types of woodworking tools'.

Most prefixless terms to describe processes, formed from foreign stems, demonstrate the functioning of suffix *-uvaty*: *fel'tsu'vaty* 'process of use of a fillister plane', *geymbl'u'vaty* 'process of use of a plane', *shpuntu'vaty* 'processing of wood by fillister plane', etc.

Sometimes in the process of borrowing the meaning of lexical elements became different from that in the donor language: the noun *gra'barka*, which means 'wagon for soil transportation' in the dialect of the Central Podillia, was borrowed from Polish *grabaere* 'digger' (ECYM, T. 1, 1982: 578), the lexical element *bar'da* 'plane' originates from German *bardo* 'bearded' (Трубачёв 1966: 153).

Conclusions

Historically, the Central Podillia was the interaction point of different cultures. This is certainly reflected in the language of the region's residents. Podillia dialect is rich in the borrowed words within different lexical-semantic groups. The borrowed words are also present in the terminology of traditional folk crafts. A big number of foreign language elements of folk crafts can be explained by the fact that foreign craftsmen together with the presented vocabulary enriched the traditional folk crafts terminology. The machinery, technology, and the names were borrowed from neighboring countries due to various factors. The long standing of the borrowed words is proved by their adaptation to the laws of the recipient's language.

References

- Артюх Л., 1994, Поділля: Історико-етнографічне дослідження НАН України, Київ: Видавництво НКЦ «Доля».
- ЕСУМ – Етимологічний словник української мови, ред. О. С. Мельничук, том 1–7, Київ: Наукова думка, 1982–2009.
- Мельничук О. С., 1974, Словник іншомовних слів, Київ: Головна редакція української радянської енциклопедії Академії наук Української РСР.
- Пустовіт Л. О., 2000, Словник іншомовних слів: 23000 слів та словосполучень, Київ: Довіра.
- Трубачёв О. Н., 1966, Ремесленная терминология в славянских языках (Этимология и опыт групповой реконструкции), Москва: Наука.
- Фасмер М., 1964–1973, Этимологический словарь русского языка, том 1–4, перевод с немецкого и дополнение О. Н. Трубачёва, Москва: Прогресс.
- Brückner A., 1927, Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego, Kraków.
- Kluge F., 1960, Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. 18. Aufl. Bearbeitet von W. Mitzka. Berlin; 20. Aufl., 1967.
- Sławski F., 1952–1982, Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego, Kraków.
- Machek V., 1957, Etymologický slovník jazyka českého a slovenského, Praha.

LIST OF SETTLEMENTS STUDIED

1. Hromadske Lityn District.
2. Bahrynivtsi Lityn District.
3. Luka-Barska Bar District.
4. Zhyhalivka Kalynivka District.
5. Ivaniv Kalynivka District.
6. Kamianohirka Kalynivka District.
7. Mykulyntsi Lityn District.
8. Maidan Vinnytsia District.
9. Medvezhe Vushko Vinnytsia District.
10. Shchitky Vinnytsia District.
11. Kotiuzhyntsi Kalynivka District.
12. Brytske Lypovets District.
13. Pysarivka Vinnytsia District.
14. Obidne Nemyriv District.
15. Verbivka Lypovets District.
16. Skala Orativ District.
17. Lopatynka Orativ District.
18. Komarivka Bar District.
19. Zhuravlivka Bar District.
20. Kotiuzhany Murovani-Kurylivtsi District.
21. Verbovets Murovani-Kurylivtsi District.
22. Biliakivtsi Zhmerynka District.
23. Potoky Zhmerynka District.
24. Kamianohirka Zhmerynka District.
25. Kukavka Mohyliv-Podilskyi District.
26. Khomenky Sharhorod District.
27. Hnivan Tyvriv District.
28. Pyliava Tyvriv District.
29. Mukhivtsi Nemyriv District.
30. Rakhny Lisovi Sharhorod District.
31. Torkiv Tulchyn District.
32. Dubovets Nemyriv District.
33. Chukiv Nemyriv District.
34. Kleban Tulchyn District.
35. Volovodivka Nemyriv District.
36. Vasylivka Illintsi District.
37. Krasnenke Illintsi District.
38. Ometyntsi Nemyriv District.
39. Ziankivtsi Nemyriv District.
40. Kunka Haisyn District.
41. Bubnivka Haisyn District.
42. Hraniv Haisyn District.
43. Kyvachivka Teplyk District.
44. Yaryshiv Mohyliv-Podilskyi District.
45. Hontivka Chernivtsi District.
46. Busha Yampil District.
47. Rusava Yampil District.
48. Sainka Chernivtsi District.
49. Stina Tomashpil District.
50. Vilshanka Kryzhopil District.
51. Velyka Kisnytsia Yampil District.
52. Bolhan Pishchanka District.
53. Zhuravlivka Tulchyn District.
54. Zabolotne Kryzhopil District.
55. Kapustiany Trostianets District.
56. Obodivka Trostianets District.
57. Honorivka Pishchanka District.
58. Olianytsia Trostianets District.
59. Trostianchuk Trostianets District.
60. Balanivka Bershada District.
61. Chervona Hreblia Chechelnyk District.
62. Tartak Chechelnyk District.
63. Mala Mochulka Teplyk District.
64. Polohy Teplyk District.
65. Potashnia Bershada District.
66. Dymivka Chechelnyk District.

SUMMARY

The question of dialogue of cultures as a form of language contact

Key words: the Central Podillia dialect, woodworking crafts vocabulary, borrowed words, language contact.

Słowa kluczowe: dialekty Centralnego Podola, leksyka obróbki drewna, zapożyczone słowa, interakcja werbalna.

An attempt to analyze the impact of Polish on the formation of the folk production terminology was made in this study. The object of study is the popular production terminology, namely woodworking terminology, which was collected by the author from 66 dialects of the Central Podillia during expeditions in 2007–2009. The work examines the structure, operation features, the semantic organization of Polonisms appearing in the woodworking crafts vocabulary of the Central Podillia dialects. It was found that when adopting to the Ukrainian language many nouns underwent the phonetic, morphological, accentological adaptation, during which some of them received different meaning.