

**WOJCIECH SOSNOWSKI**

Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw  
(wpsosnow@uw.edu.pl)

## **ANALYTIC TENDENCIES IN MODERN POLISH AND RUSSIAN**

### **Abstract**

Modern Polish and Russian are characterized by some features which demonstrate an increasing level of analitism. In the process of transformation from synthetic to analytical language, a crucial role is played by prepositional units. In this research, analitism is understood in a traditional way as a morphological and syntactic phenomenon. The fact that the synthetic structure of a language may, in some conditions, turn into an analytical one, as happened in the case of Bulgarian and Macedonian, has been intriguing linguists ever since, and has made me attempt to answer the question: What is the condition of modern Polish and Russian, which are languages with a rich literary tradition and solid grammatical norms, which belong to a group of synthetic languages? The analytical tendencies in morphology include the following: a decrease in the number of cases in all inflected parts of speech; a more frequent use of uninflected nouns and adjectives; the growing importance of nouns with common gender, and, in particular, the use of forms of masculine gender to depict feminine gender; differences in expressing collectiveness in a group of nouns (using collective meaning for forms that have singular meaning; substituting case forms with prepositions; substituting case forms with subordinate clauses; substituting case forms with “helper” words. Analytical tendencies in the area of numeral functioning include: substituting inflected forms of ordinal numerals with cardinal ones; the gradual disappearing inflection of numerals; confusing the forms of noun cases after numerals; the disappearing declination of collective numerals; displacing other cases with so-called simple cases; changing the syntactical position which the numeral should be inflected in; abandoning the declination of first elements of collective numerals. During the study of analytic tendencies in morphology, it was necessary to examine personal pronouns as this part of speech seems to be the most stable as far as other forms except nominative are concerned. Having analysed the material, it can be claimed that analitism in Slavic pronouns is observed at the level of the replacement of short forms with full ones, through the use of various forms after prepositions and eliminating all the alternative forms of personal pronouns. This review of analytic tendencies has also involved studying the article and its role in analytic languages, as the article is the area of a language which should be filled while the inflection disappears. Having analysed the material,

I have concluded that there is a possibility that the article may appear in Polish and Russian.

The most important part of speech in analytic languages is the preposition. An increase in the number of prepositional units is said to be an essential element of syntactic transformation in 20<sup>th</sup> century Polish and Russian i.e. their ongoing transformation from synthetic into analytic languages. In accordance with this tendency, secondary prepositions are gradually replacing proper prepositions and case forms in their traditional usage. The secondary preposition has been defined as a lexical unit, not being a preposition initially but used secondarily in this function. Such a definition requires adopting a functional perspective in the description, more so because the transformation of various language units (nouns, prepositional phrases, adverbs, conjunction, phraseological nexuses) into prepositions takes place gradually and the same set can be interpreted otherwise in different contexts. This comprehensive analysis of two modern Slavonic languages shows that the number of prepositional units in both languages has grown and is still increasing.

**Keywords:** analytical tendencies, analitism, prepositional unit, secondary prepositions; noun-based, adverb-based and participle-based preposition

Modern Polish and Russian are characterized by some features that demonstrate an increasing level of analitism. In the process of transformation from synthetic to analytical language, a crucial role is played by prepositional units.

To illustrate this tendency, modern Bulgarian and its history have been applied as an example of analytical language. In this research, analitism is understood in a traditional way i.e. as a morphological and syntactic phenomenon. It means that grammatical categories which were previously expressed through inflectional forms are beginning to be signalled by separate formal indicators in the form of separate words. In the process of the language becoming more analytical, the role of “helper” words has increased, which has led to the disappearing declination of nominative forms, whose function has been superseded by prepositions and word order. The replacement of one case by another, or the process of eliminating one of the forms in favour of others which are dominant in the declination paradigm, may be viewed as a phase in rearranging the synthetic system into a more analytical one. The condition of each modern literary language is a result of consistent changes that have occurred in it. For this article, the condition of Polish and Russian from the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century has been analysed. The claim that a gradual expansion of the corpus of prepositional units in Polish and Russian led to analitism was met with opposition and outrage from scientists, linguists and language teachers even in the 1990s. My compilation of the corpus of Russian pronouns in 2000 has given rise to further research into the problem of analitism in Slavic languages. At the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, a large number of scientists began collecting bodies of Slavic prepositions due to the fact that this part of speech had been analysed in least detail for particular Slavic languages. The fact that the synthetic structure of a language may in some conditions turn into an analytical one, as happened in the case of both Bulgarian and Macedonian, has been intriguing linguists ever since, and has made me attempt to answer the question: What is the condition of modern Polish and Russian, which are languages with a rich literary tradition

and solid grammatical norms, which belong to a group of synthetic languages? Thanks to observing processes occurring in both languages over the last ten years, comparative analysis and collection of materials, the level of their analyticity has been characterized, and, through comparing some examples, the corpora of prepositional units and other units turning into prepositions has been gathered.

The analysis of both languages, which has been carried out on the basis of the language of mass media, spoken utterance, literary works, has shown some common trends and transformations for both languages. Social, cultural and economic changes in Poland and Russia have increased language democracy, which, as a consequence, has led to considerable changes in language structure. These changes have been gradually codified as a language norm.

Analytical tendencies are the ones which are leading to a decrease of morphemes in a language. It is in accordance with a long-term tradition of Indo-European language transformation in the direction of analitism. Having analysed the history of Slavic languages, it can be observed that the morphological level of Slavic languages is one of the most prevailing. In modern Slavic languages, non-literary forms are spreading to literary language. Examples of analitism in my research also include the unconscious use of one case instead of another. Defining the concept of analitism, I have also made an assumption that the smaller the number of morphemes in a language, the larger the level of analitism. The concept of analitism which I have used is of traditional character, and stands in opposition to the concept of language synthetism.

Having analysed the history of Slavic analitism, and having presented the most important moments in the development of Slavic languages from Indo-European language to modern times, I have discovered some regularities. The works and research of Z. Stieber, D. Staniszeva and J. Rusek have helped me to present the road of the Bulgarian language to analitism and the growing role of prepositions. Together with the form of the common case, the preposition has become the only factor of syntactic relationship which, so far, has been expressed solely through case endings.

While describing the morphological changes in the language, I have assumed that those which are turning into a tendency are a result of a fight among the variant forms within a given language. Having analysed innovations in Slavic languages, it can be observed that their common feature is a tendency towards simplifications. Most frequently, it is a penetration of non-literary language into a literary one. I have based my analysis on research by J. Ziemska, who, in her work, confirms the increasing role of agglutination in Russian, and on the work of Z. Rudnik-Karwatowa dealing with the increase of uninflected prefixes.

Having analysed the literature, scientific research and the gathered language material, it was possible to define the analytical tendencies in morphology. These include the following:

1. A decrease in the number of cases in all inflected parts of speech.
  - the disappearance of partitive genitive: Russian *кубометр леса* instead of *кубометр лесу*; Polish *nalać herbatę* instead of *nalać herbaty*. The

Polish version with the Accusative can be viewed as an example of analytical tendencies, because it can be treated as temporary on its way to eliminating one of the cases in the paradigm (i.e. Accusative).

- simplifications in the noun inflection paradigm: Polish *funduszy* instead of *funduszów*; *sto gram* instead of *sto gramów*, Russian *килограмм апельсин* instead of *килограмм апельсинов*.
  - elimination of variant forms towards simpler forms: Polish *kuchen/kuchni*, *sukien/sukni*, *stajen/stajni*, *kopalń/kopalni*, *kropel/kropli*, *will/willi*, *oczyta/oczami*, *uszyna/uszami*.
2. A more frequent use of uninflected nouns and adjectives: Polish *biopaliwo* (this form seems to be more analytical than *paliwo biologiczne*), *wieczór etno*, Russian *звукорежиссёр*.
    - a tendency not to inflect surnames and personal names: Polish *w Republice Kenia*, ros. *в Республике Кения*.
    - use of the “e” component: Polish *e-lektoraty*; ros. *э-чём, э-почта*. (These forms may be considered partly analytical, as’ in the paradigm of their declension, they deprive the Adjectives of their case-endings, e.g. *nie tam e-poczty* instead of *poczty elektronicznej*.)
  3. A growing importance of the nouns with common gender, and, in particular, the use of forms of masculine gender to depict feminine gender: Russian *наша врач*; Polish *polska komisarz Danuta Hübner*.
  4. Differences in expressing collectiveness in a group of nouns (using the collective meaning for the forms that have singular meaning): Russian *Читатель ждёт новых книг*.
  5. Case forms being substituted by prepositions: Polish *kupiłem książkę bratu / kupiłem książkę dla brata*; Russian *я купил брату книгу / я купил книгу для брата*.
  6. Case forms being substituted by subordinate clauses: Polish *Oczywiste jest więc, że jeszcze w tej dalekiej epoce istniała w języku skłonność, żeby przekazywać opisowo treść czasownikową wyrażaną syntetycznie przez formę bezokolicznikową* instead of *skłonność do przekazywania*.
  7. Case forms being substituted by “helper” words (Polish *jak, jako* / Russian *как*): ... *признал заявление Бориса Немцова как угрозу* (zamiast *угрозой*).

Having analysed the material, I may conclude that changes in the grammatical structure of a language are influenced by increased lexical resources, activating new lexical units e.g. *МГУшники, HRowcy*. New phenomena have to be named and introduced in the language system. “Words, as language signs which refer to bits of reality symbolize real meanings. Both the producer and the receiver of the speech

refer the words used while speaking to a definite designate, therefore, there is the possibility of creating understanding between them.” (Maryniakowa, 1993). It is important to add that the understanding will be easier if a new word is as easy as possible, and it has a minimal number of forms.

In the case of words that are rooted in a language, and which have always existed, such as numerals, the issue is a bit more complicated. Yet, even in this area, some regularities have been found. A numeral is a part of speech whose inflection has changed a lot since old Slavic times, and there has always been a trend towards simplifications. Research into modern numerals has proved that they are one of the most difficult grammatical categories for modern Polish and Russian users, and they often fail to inflect this part of speech in favour of choosing a different form. The analysis of the material from Polish and Russian has shown that the language users have a problem with reconstructing the paradigm of numeral inflection. Analytical tendencies in the area of numeral functioning include:

1. Substituting the inflected forms of ordinal numerals with cardinal ones Russian *Живу в квартире 31 (тридцать один)*; Polish *Peugeot 206 (dwieście sześć)*.
2. The gradual disappearing of the inflection of numerals.
3. Confusing the forms of noun cases after numerals – both the cardinal (mainly in Russian) and collective (also mainly in Russian): Russian: *четыре русских иконы* and *две интересные книги*; *три высокие здания* and *три высоких здания*; *четверо детей*, but more often *пять детей* instead of *пятеро детей*.
4. The disappearing declination of collective numerals (both in Polish and Russian): in the research of Russian, the following form has been found - – *пятеро суток* but also the form – *пять суток*; Polish *dwie pary nożyc*, *Oni mają piątkę własnych dzieci i trójkę adoptowanych*.
5. The displacing of other cases with so-called simple cases, e.g. in dictionaries of usage, it is claimed that the forms: *dwoma paniami*, *dwoma córkami* are not incorrect;
6. Changing the syntactical position which the numeral should be inflected in for the position of the nominative or another simple case (mainly Polish instrumental), Polish: *strona dwieście* used in spoken language, and not *strona dwóchsetna* or *dwusetna*.
7. The abandoning of the declination of the first elements of collective numerals.

In the analysis of analytic tendencies in morphology, it was necessary to examine personal pronouns, as this part of speech seems to be the most stable as far as other forms except nominative are concerned. This claim is supported by the fact that in most Indo-European languages, which are categorized by traditional grammar as analytic languages, personal pronouns have retained a dative form (Bulgarian, English and Spanish).

Having analysed the material, it can be claimed that analitism in Slavic pronouns is observed at the level of replacing short forms with full ones, through the use of various forms after prepositions and the elimination of all alternative forms of personal pronouns. Having presented the gradual simplifications in the paradigm of personal pronoun declination in Slavic languages, I have reached a conclusion that in modern Polish, an overuse of full forms can be observed, e.g. *Podoba mnie się taki wystrój mieszkania. Nie podoba mnie się rozmieszczenie niektórych tematów*, although the stressed form *mnie* is used when this particular pronoun is to be emphasized. In a post-pronoun position, a full form is required, therefore, prepositions expressing this purpose can take the function which was previously expressed by the dative case. This can be observed in the following example: *Uważam, że to jest dla mnie nie potrzebne (Rozmowy w toku 4.02 2003)*. For the time being, the overuse of the longer form should not be treated as a tendency towards analitism, but it may be a phase that is characterised by the elimination of one form of the declension paradigm.

In the 20th century, in the Russian language, there were some forms functioning which were popularized by literature *мою, тобою, нею, собою*. In modern language, they can only be found in poetic language mainly used to equalize rhymes. These forms existed as an opposition to the forms *мною, тобой, ней, собою*. The rule of language economics has eliminated the alternative forms and the next stage will be the transformation of existing forms in spoken language, in this case: *мною, тобой, ней, собою*. The changes in the paradigm of personal pronoun declination are also influenced by a growing reduction, e.g. the forms *меня/мне* in modern pronunciation do not differ.

This review of analytic tendencies has also involved the analysis of the article, and its role in analytic languages, as the article is an area of language which should start to be filled while the inflection disappears. Having analysed the material, I have concluded that there is a possibility that the article may start appearing in Polish and Russian. Its function can be played by:

1. a particle

Among all the groups of particles, the most important role for article appearance is played by strengthening particles, particles with emotional content and a group of particles with modal content, but taking the function of grammatical morphemes namely the form and word-building particles, e.g. in Russian dialects and spoken language: *В отпуск-то когда пойдёте?*

2. a demonstrative pronoun: Polish *Do pociągu wsiadła kobieta. Kobieta ta była ubrana w białą skórzaną kurtkę.*

The observable phenomenon that proves the appearance of new forms existing on the border of a word / empty word / indefinite article is the addition of an undefined element to nouns. In the case of Polish, there is a tendency to overuse the ending *-a*, which is historically connected to the genitive of masculine personal nouns: *widzę pana, pytam nauczyciela*. In the historical development of Polish language, this ending appeared in specific groups of non-masculine nouns, such

as: Polish *Wyślij mi w tej sprawie maila; Puść mi smsa; Kupiłem sobie laptopa; Zakupiłem niedawno pendrive'a*. At the same time, the masculine personal nouns with this lexeme in Accusative should not be treated as analytical. The lexeme –a always expresses singularity and indefiniteness of an object. This lexeme is identical to the indefinite pronoun *jeden*. Having expanded the context for the sentences, we have come up with a model which is similar to a Bulgarian one: *Wyślij mi w tej sprawie maila. Mail ten powinien przyjść do soboty; Zakupiłem niedawno pendrive'a. Pendrive ten kosztował dwieście złotych*.

On the basis of the analysed material, the following conclusions have been reached:

1. The article is one of the basic indicators of analyticity. If we claim that Russian and Polish are becoming analytical, the place of cases should be replaced by empty words called definite and indefinite articles in linguistics.
2. There has been some evidence found that Slavic languages can in their area develop an article (Bulgarian and Macedonian). Slavic languages are characterized by a certain structure which allows for the use of articles (Russian dialects, demonstrative pronouns *ТЪ* in the Old Church Slavonic and its development in individual Slavic languages).
3. Both analysed languages are predisposed by all means to develop an article. They can position it both in front of a word and behind it. The article can have multiple meanings: singularity, collectiveness, generality.
4. Both analysed languages encounter favourable conditions for develop an article, such as:
  - an increasing number of calques from analytic languages, an increasing number of translations from analytic languages;
  - language environment, as both Polish and Russian have direct contact with article languages. It is widely known that one of the theories of Bulgarian analyticism claims that language structure transformation is influenced by the language environment (Turkish language). (Polikarpow, 1979).

In the translations into Polish language, the articles are usually omitted. Nevertheless, in Polish language, a process can be observed which is identical to the one that led to the appearance of articles in other Indo-European languages – in pre-Indo-European language, there were no articles as they appeared in some languages later on. In sentences that follow the demonstrative pronouns *ten / ta / to*, the latter clearly function in a way which is identical to the definite article. Polish: *Co z tą Polską?; Ten Tomek jest nie do wytrzymania; Co mam z tym Robertem zrobić?*

My research has focused on prepositions and prepositional units. Having defined this part of speech, and collected a corpus of Polish and Russian pronouns, it has been possible to observe the following schemes of how Polish and Russian secondary prepositions emerge:

1. Adverb → preposition, e.g. *внутри, возле, вокруг, мимо, вслед*;
2. Participle → preposition, e.g. *благодаря, включая, исключая, начиная*;
3. Noun in the dependent case → preposition, e.g. *путём* + Genitive – *он пришел к этой мысли путем размышлений* (from “The dictionary of structural words”)
4. primary preposition + noun in the dependent case → preposition, e.g. *в лице* + Genitive – *в лице профессора Иванова наука потеряла выдающегося ученого*; *на смену* – Dative – *на смену жаре пришли холода* (from “The dictionary of structural words”);
5. Primary preposition + noun in the dependent case + primary preposition → preposition, e.g. *по отношению к* + Dative – *его чуткость по отношению ко всем нам просто не знала границ*; *в расчёте на* + Genitive – *„в расчёте на жаркий день мы оделись легко* (from “The dictionary of structural words”);
6. Adverb + primary preposition → preposition, e.g. *согласно с* + Instrumental – *книги разложены согласно с инструкцией*, *наряду с* + Instrumental – *в то время дети работали наряду со взрослыми* (from “The dictionary of structural words”);
7. Adverbial participle + primary preposition → preposition, e.g. *невзирая на* + Accusative – *он продолжал работать невзирая на болезнь и усталость*, *несмотря на* + Accusative – *несмотря на свою молодость, он хороший врач* (from “The dictionary of structural words”);
8. Primary preposition + noun in the dependent case + primary preposition (+ noun in the dependant case) → preposition, e.g. *через* + Instrumental + *после* + Genitive – *книга этого писателя вышла в свет только через два года после его смерти*, *от* + Genitive + *к* + Accusative – *несмотря ни на что он продолжал ходить от дома к дому*.

For Polish language, I have used the schemes suggested by Beata Milewska in her work “Secondary prepositions in modern Polish”;

1. obsolete case forms of nouns – e.g. *między, wśród*;
2. obsolete prepositional forms – e.g. *podczas, spośród, wbrew, wobec, wskutek* etc.
3. obsolete forms of the perfect participle, e.g. *wyjąwszy*;
4. other parts of speech which are not prepositions:
  - a) nouns – e.g. *celem, drogą, dzięki, mocą, skutkiem, tytułem* etc.
  - b) adverbs – e.g. *blisko, bliżej, obok, około, opodal, poniżej, powyżej, wewnątrz* etc.



- x) conjunctions – e.g. *niż*;
5. prepositional combinations, namely analytical sequences, which include proper prepositions and other parts of speech:
- a) proper preposition + noun – e.g. *na rzecz, pod pozorem, w ciągu, w świetle, z okazji* etc.
  - b) proper preposition + noun + proper preposition – e.g. *w odpowiedzi na, w odróżnieniu od, w związku z, z uwagi na* etc.;
  - c) noun + proper preposition – *rodem z*;
  - d) d) adverb + proper preposition – e.g. *daleko od, odnośnie do, zależnie od, zgodnie z* etc;
  - e) proper preposition + adverb + proper preposition – *z daleka od*;
  - f) proper preposition + noun + noun – *z punktu widzenia*;
  - g) relative pronoun + proper preposition – *co do*.

Having completed the comparison, it is possible to claim that in contrast to Russian, in Polish language, secondary prepositions can be created on the basis of conjunctions, a proper preposition with two nouns and a relative pronoun with a proper preposition. The comparison of these models gave rise to comparative analysis of the secondary prepositions corpus in Polish and Russian, since in both languages, secondary prepositions have become significantly more important and, thanks to the language of the press, they permeate general national language.

In her work, Beata Milewska claims that prepositional pairs do not belong to the group of prepositions, e.g. *na... przed: na pięć minut przed przyjazdem*. However, it seems justifiable to treat such pairs as prepositional constructions, as they follow a particular pattern which can be substituted by other parts of speech.

In the corpus gathered for this work, I have divided Russian prepositions into: simple adverbial of the second wave, e.g. *внутри*; complex adverbial of the second wave, e.g. *наряду с*; simple adverbial, e.g. *мимо*; complex adverbial e.g. *независимо от*; simple verb based, e.g. *кончая*; complex verb-based prepositional combinations, e.g. *исходя из*; simple name-based prepositions, e.g. *методом*; complex name-based prepositional combinations, e.g. *в адрес*; with two primary prepositions, e.g. *в отношении к*; simple adjective-based prepositions, e.g. *относительно*; and complex ones, e.g. *сходно с*.

In two independently gathered corpora of secondary prepositions, the comparative analysis has found some units functioning as pronouns in both languages:

Russian: *ближе к; в атмосфере; в вопросе; в вопросах; в глубине; в завершение; в защиту; в исполнении; в масштабе; в момент; внизу; во вред; в обществе; в ожидании; в области; в отсутствие; в близости; впоследствии; в пределах; в присутствии; в период; в приступе; в размере; в ритме; вскоре после; в середине; в стиле; в сфере; в углу; в центре; выше; до конца; зависимо от; замещающая; за благополучие; за неимением; из области; из перспективы; как; конца; на боку; на глубине; на исходе; на манер; на краю; на переломе; на пороге; на память о; на примере; насквозь; на склоне; на уровне;*

на страницах; на тему; на фоне; на территории; на стороне; непосредственно к; несогласно с; ниже; обок; опираясь на; под опеку; по делам; под командованием; под начальством; под покровительством; под конец; под прикрытием; под тяжестью; под руководством; под лозунгом; по мнению; под названием; по поручению; по образцу; пополуночи; по принципу; по праву; под предводительством; по ходатайству; прямо к; при виде; родом из; сразу после; с момента; снаружи; со времени; со времён; с периода; с середины; с точки зрения; у ворот; у выхода из; у подножия; у порога; ценой (ценою); чем.

The expressions functioning as prepositions: *чем* and *как* did not fall into the proposed patterns.

During the analysis, I have not found any equivalents for the following units: *celem* (the only equivalent could be the expression „с целью”); *co do*; *lada*; *o krok od*; *pod maską*; *pod płaszczykiem*; *pod wezwaniem*; *pod względem*; *w skali*; *w wydaniu*.

The following prepositional phrases: *на память от*; *на базе*; *у ворот* can be modified: *в память о*; *на базисе*; *у врат*.

In the corpus gathered by Beata Milewska, there are no such secondary prepositions as: *na czele z*; *na drodze do*; *nieopodal od*. The following prepositional phrases have been found: *na czele*; *na drodze*, *nieopodal*.

The Polish secondary preposition *u boku* (*pozostać u boku Wicekróla*) has not been found in any bilingual dictionary.

In accordance with Beata Milewska's record, the following expressions tend to become prepositions in Russian: *для пользы*; *в честь*; *в адрес / по адресу*; *на дне*; *на грани*; *в пользу*; *на предмет*; *на поприще*; *на юге*; *на примере*; *наверху*; *внутри*; *в центр*; *на задах*; *на пользу*; *в знак*; *с начала*; *со стороны*; *под управлением*; *под опекой*; *под патронатом*; *под видом*; *по обвинению*; *на стороне*; *прямо к*; *прямо в*; *прямо из*; *одновременно с*; *в аспекте*; *в сопровождении*; *в категории*; *в направлении*; *в перспективе*; *в позе*; *прямо на*; *совместно с*; *в сторону*; *в компании*; *в заботе о*; *в согласии с*; *с момента*; *время*; *с мыслью о*; *по причине*; *от руки*.

The comparative analysis of the group of Polish and Russian prepositions has allowed me to propose a group of Polish prepositions which can be categorized as being in the process of becoming prepositional. These expressions have not been included in other works on Polish secondary prepositions: *bez pomocy*; *bez towarzyszenia*; *w uzupełnieniu*; *włączając*; *w ilości*; *w osobie*; *dla uniknięcia*; *na chwałę / ku chwale*; *na podobieństwo*; *z przodu*; *na przedzie*; *na czele*; *w trybie*; *aż do*; *w załączeniu do*; *do dyspozycji*; *licząc na*; *w rodzaju*; *w gronie*; *w odosobnieniu od*; *na poczet*; *w tonacji*; *unisono z*; *na warunki*; *w gronie*; *w grono*; *do grona*; *poza granice*; *poza granicami*; *kosztem*; *kończąc*; *metodą*; *na spotkanie*; *na rękę*; *na złość*; *na ukos od*; *na imię*; *na prawach*; *na równi z*; *na zmianę*; *zaczynając od / poczynając od*; *nie bez*; *nie mówiąc o*; *nie do*; *niedługo przed*; *na krótko przed*; *nie licząc*; *wkrótce po*; *pod znakiem*; *na podobieństwo*; *po upływie*; *po linii*; *przy pomocy*; *za pośrednictwem*; *na drodze*; *w sąsiedztwie*; *stosownie do*; *przeszedłszy*; *wierzchu*; *ponad*; *po upływie*; *sądząc po*; *z uwzględnieniem*; *licząc od*; *typu*; *temu*.

Through discussing the role of prepositions and prepositional phrases, it can be

claimed that in accordance with a traditional definition of analitism which treats the latter as a morphological and syntactic process, the main role in the disappearance of the synthetic system is played by prepositions and their derivatives, i.e. prepositional phrases. Thus, in a process of lexicalisation, the function of a pronoun was replaced by a group of noun-based, adverb-based and participle-based prepositions. In such a way, the general morphological and syntactic process was formed which involved transforming synthetic forms into analytical ones.

Research into the preposition has shown that the development of the secondary preposition class makes syntax analytic. In Polish and Russian, secondary prepositions are characterized by concreteness and specialisation of semantic functions. They do not bring new meanings to the system of Polish and Russian (spatial, temporal, contrary, genetic, partitive, inclusive-exclusive, commutative, approximational, distributive, causal, purpose, interest, referential, methodical, adding information, appropriate, comparative, translative, instrumental, meditative, active, subordinate and modal relations). Such meanings were previously indicated through the case form or through a primary preposition. The process of transforming a word into a prepositional form is a process of condensing the predicative energy of a word while the word receives a new material boundary and the process is carried out in accordance with this new boundary. While conducting this research, it has been observed that a re-activation has occurred of prepositions that were once withdrawn from grammar books. In their works, both Milewska and Vsievobodova emphasize that the system of secondary prepositions is open. On the basis of the latest patterns of prepositional phrases, a considerable number of combinations can be found that result in a higher level of language analyticity. The pattern of transformation from a synthetic to analytic system involves the following: synthetic combination – primary preposition combination – secondary preposition combination, e.g. *koleżeńska pomoc / pomoc od kolegów i koleżanek / pomoc ze strony kolegów i koleżanek*.

The transfer of a given word to the category of auxiliaries, where prepositions belong, takes place by way of desemantification and the loss of grammatical markers, i.e. morphological forms and sentence word order.

Among the analysed secondary preposition combinations, some variant forms have been discovered, e.g. Russian secondary preposition *в стиле* may take the genitive and accusative forms e.g. *здание в стиле поздний модерн* and *здание в стиле позднего модерна* or *за спиной* (кого?) and *за спиной* (у кого?). In Polish some alternative forms appear: *analogicznie z* and *analogicznie do*.

In the process of analitism expansion in Polish and Russian, it is crucial to note that the case and combinations of preposition and case are functionally equal. The newly formed prepositional units are the continuation of the oldest tendencies in Slavic languages. Having observed the development of the preposition system in Polish and Russian, I may claim that the system of noun inflection turned out to be too multifunctional, and it had to dispose of some redundant functions, for which a new role needs to be found. An increase in analytic tendencies is accompanied by processes in the semantic area. Prepositional units with their case form have a surplus of semantic content due to the presence of a preposition. The use of a preposition eliminates the possible ambiguity of the syntax structure, and specifies

the general semantic content which is signalled by the case form.

All the mentioned phenomena have allowed me to conclude that despite their synthetic structure, Polish and Russian are characterized by strong analytic tendencies.

### References

- Maryniakowa 1993**, Maryniakowa Irena, *Gramatyka konfrontatywna rosyjsko-polska. Morfologia ze słowotwórstwem*, Warszawa 1993;
- Milewska 2003** – Milewska B. *Przyimki wtórne we współczesnej polszczyźnie*, Gdańsk 2003;
- Polikarpow 1979** – Поикарпов А.А. *Элементы теоретической социолингвистики*, Moskwa 1979;
- Rudnik-Karwatowa 2003** – Rudnik-Karwatowa Z. O najnowszych tendencjach w słowotwórstwie — *Procesy innowacyjne w językach słowiańskich, Prace Slawistyczne 114*, SOW, Warszawa 2003;
- Rusek 1964** – Rusek J., *Deklinacja i użycie przypadków w trójce Chłudowa. Studium nad rozwojem analityzmu w języku bułgarskim*, Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków 1964;
- Sosnowski 2007** – Sosnowski W., O problemach z zaimkiem słowiańskim, *Olympus Czasopismo Naukowe 2/2007*, Warszawa 2007;
- Stieber 1979** – Stieber Z., *Zarys gramatyki porównawczej języków słowiańskich*, Warszawa 1979;
- Staniszewa 1968** – Станишева Д., К проблеме установления в языке систем вариантов (на материале синтаксиса славянских языков) — *Известия на института за български език, Книга XVI*, 1968, Българска Академия на Науките;
- Staniszewa 1982** – Станишева Д., Локална опозиция падежей ВИН.:ЛОК в истории болгарского, древнерусского и белорусского языков, *Годишник на Софийския университет „Климент Охридски”, факултет по славянски филологии, Том 76,1 Езикознание 1982*, София;
- Staniszewa 1980** – Станишева Д., Из историята на българското склонение, *Годишник на Софийския университет „Климент Охридски”, факултет по славянски филологии, Том 74,3 Езикознание 1980*, София;
- Всеволодова М.В.**, *К вопросу о грамматике славянского предлога (Осмысление первичных результатов первого этапа в работе межнационального проекта)*;
- Всеволодова 2000** – Всеволодова М.В. *Теория функционально-коммуникативного синтаксиса: Фрагмент прикладной (педагогической) модели языка: Учебник.* – М., 2000;
- Всеволодова и др. 2003**: Всеволодова М.В., Клобуков Е.В., Кукушкина О.В., Поликарпов А.А. К основаниям функционально-коммуникативной грамматики русского предлога. *Вестник Моск. ун-та*, 2003, № 2. С. 17-59;
- Земская, 2003** – Земская Е.А. Русский язык конца XX века: норма не запрет, а выбор — *Procesy innowacyjne w językach słowiańskich, Prace Slawistyczne 114*, SOW, Warszawa 2003;
- Земская 1983** – Земская Е.А. *Русская разговорная речь (фонетика, морфология, лексика, жест)*. – М., 1983.

COGNITIVE STUDIES | ÉTUDES COGNITIVES, 11  
SOW Publishing House, Warsaw 2011

# LOGIC AND LANGUAGE

