UDC 811.161.1

Specificity of the morphemic structure of linguistic terms of Slavic origin

Arkadii V. Lemov

Doctor of Philology,
Professor of the Department of Russian language,
Mordovia State University,
430005, 68 Bol'shevistskaya str., Saransk, Mordovia, Russian Federation;
e-mail: avlemov@gmail.com

Abstract

The article studies the unborrowed linguistic terms of Russian and Old Church Slavonic origin. The theme of the publication develops in morpheme and word-formative analysis of terminological lexemes. The purpose of the research is the identifying of the motivating features of terminological units correlated with changes in their morphematical and derivation structures, with processes of de-etymologization, metanalysis, decorrelation. The descriptive method is used in article (description of morphemic and word-formative structure of the language in its functional forms). The study summary can be used in terminology studies, terminography, as well as in the theory and practice of derivation studies. The terms of the Slavic (Russian and Old Church Slavonic) origin, despite its seemingly morphemic and etymological transparency, in many cases do not have motivation, i.e. do not focus the reader on the concept of terminology. The lack of motivation in such cases entails the loss of word-formation base, and thus leads to a change in morphemic structure of terminological units. In these cases, as a rule, the word becoming a term loses the right to its former morphemic dividedness.

Introduction

Modern comparative linguistics pays attention to Russian verbs related to the act of speaking [Comrie, 1986; Hyug, 2013; Leskov, 2013; Slavkova, 2014], the dual number in Russian language [Cooper, 2000], the graphemic and syllabic length of words in text and vocabulary [Alekseev, 1998]. But in Russian you can see that "researches on the history of Russian vocabulary lie mostly in the depths of theses and numerous collected papers, containing the proceedings of conferences, of the late twentieth century" [Astakhina, 2008, 8].

In Russian linguistic terminology the "the terms of Greco-Latin origin constitute a large layer of terms, which clearly reflect the international character of linguistic research and its results" [Boeva-Omelechko, 2011, 14-15]. In terminology studies the scientists are still discussing if terms must be motivated (that is, if their inner form must orient us towards the content of the named concept).

As a rule, in order to settle this issue, linguists do not use the analysis of the terminological system of a particular branch of knowledge, but they use "common sense" prerequisites. According to the common sense, a term must be motivated. The following logical chain is based on the same "common sense": an unmotivated term is mainly a borrowed unit, the terms of Slavic origin (in the Russian and Old Slavonic languages) are motivated by the native language, and, therefore, unborrowed terms can orient a native speaker if not towards the exact meaning of a special word, then at least towards the elements of this meaning. Of course, one cannot deny the role of an orienting factor of the unborrowed terms: in many cases it is quite obvious. However, the detailed analysis

of terminological systems shows that, firstly, even a borrowed word may quite clearly orient us towards the named concept, and, secondly, the external form of the terms of Slavic origin may not be motivated and even lead to false orientation. Information about false orienting terms can be found in [Lemov, 2000, 59-65; 88-98].

Morphemic structure of the term and its motivation

In many cases motivation of terms of Slavic origin is connected with a prompt about the elements of the meaning of a special words and the derivational and morphemic structure to a native speaker [cf. Khairov, 2014]. This structure usually specifies not the conceptual features of a term, but the elements of the lexical meaning of a substratum word from the native language or closely related (Slavonic, for example) languages, which is used as a professional unit. The content of a scientific concept denoted by the term is revealed only in its definition [Kadis, 2007].

It is a well-known fact that the morphemic structure of a particular word in the language is an inconstant phenomenon because a large number of lexemes in the course of their functioning in different languages and genres lose the old systemic relations with other vocabulary units and acquire new ones [cf. Jiracek, 1985]. As a result of the processes of de-etymologization, restructuring, and decorrelation, the morphemic status of a word changes, and, therefore, new motivational (orientation) characteristics may appear. So, semantic loan translations cause the smallest rejection by the language 'immunity' [Osetrova, 2013, 50]. Some words had lost their dividedness in ancient times before they began to be used as linguistic terms, when they had belonged to the category of commonly used words: *гортань* 'larynx', *глухой* 'voiceless', *слово* 'word', *речь* 'speech'. (*Гортань* 'larynx' was derived with the help of a suffix from the disappeared verb **гъртати* that had the same root as *горло* 'throat'; *глухой* 'voiceless' was derived with the help of the suffix *-x-*; *слово* 'word' – from the verb *слыть* 'be reputed'; *речь* 'speech' – from **ректи*)[1]. Other units underwent restructuring, while functioning as scientific words. So, the stem of the element of the term *заглавное* in the terminological combination *заглавное слово* 'headword' (an entry word in a dictionary) seems to be completely trans-

1 Hereinafter illustrating elements of terms and commonly used units are printed in italics.

parently divided into morphemes: *за-глав-н-*. However, other systemic relations, in which this lexeme began functioning as a term, allow of changing the morphemic status of this unit: *заглавное* has lost its relation with *главное* 'main' and correlates only to *заглавие* 'title'. According to the new correlation the word *заглавие* has only the suffix *-иj-*. The term *определение* 'attribute' underwent decorrelation. It stopped corresponding to the verb *определять* 'to define', and now its morphemic division depends on the term *определительный* 'attributive'.

But there are examples that evidence a complete loss of both dividedness and orienting properties. Cf.: *азбука* 'alphabet', *буква* 'letter', *вид* 'aspect', *второе склонение* 'second declension', *глагол* 'verb', *ер, еры, ерь, запятая* 'comma', *имя* 'name', *кавычки* 'inverted commas', *кратный глагол* 'verb of motion', *лицо* 'person', *мягкий* 'soft', *твердый* 'hard', *речь* 'speech' (in the *language – speech* opposition), мужской *род* 'masculine gender', *слово* 'word', *юс* 'yus', and many others: in the Russian language dominated terms are multi-word (most often of two or three words) [Matveeva, 2012, 105].

Here we can trace back to some extent transparent causes of appearance of some of these terms: *азбука* 'alphabet' – from the name of the first letters of the Cyrillic alphabet, *буква* 'letter' is a derivative from *букы* (the word was derived with the help of a suffix), *запятая* 'comma' – from *запнуться* 'stammer', *кавычки* 'inverted commas' from *кавыка*, *кратный* 'multiple, divisible' – from *крат* 'times'. The terms *мягкий* 'soft' and *твердый* 'hard' are unmotivated (more precisely, falsely motivated) because they neither in the physiological aspect nor in the acoustic one match the characteristics of the sounds denoted by these terms, information about orienting properties of terms can be found, e.g., in [Rozental', Telenkova, 2008].

Ferdinand de Saussure's dichotomy between the abstract and the concrete in the process of linguistic intercourse is presented in the translation from French by a pair of terms *language – speech* with the zero orienting capability. This antinomy, for example, in the conception of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay is served only with the term *language* with comments in each case on what is meant by the mentioned lexeme: "…the distinction of *language* as a specific set of well-known parts and categories, existing only in potentia and as collection of all individual shades, from *language* as a constantly recurring process" [de Courtenay, 1963, т. 1, 77] (Italics added).

It's interesting to know that in the writings of Baudouin de Courtenay "*yazyk-ovedenie* historically precedes *yazykoznaniye* and *lingvistika*" [Shmeleva, 2014, 55], so "*Yazykovedenie* is the primary term, consecrated by prerevolutionary university tradition. That's why it was not in favor with the Soviet government, which preferred to be released from pre-revolutionary nominations" [ibid., 57].

Etymological reflection as an attempt to motivate a linguistic term

This group includes units that are quite specific from the point of view of modern linguistic consciousness. Such units tend to cause the so-called etymological reflection that is very strong when we deal with an ordinary native speaker. In such cases the morphemic structure of a word seems to be very clear, but in fact we observe a significant separation from diachronically generating elements and the semantics of the substratum lexemes that are commonly used, which makes it hardly possible to deal with the former word-formation and, consequently, the morphemic status of the term. Such terms are often calques. Cf.: *беглый* гласный 'unstable vowel', *винительный* падеж 'accusative case', *возвратный* глагол 'reflexive verb', *выразительные* средства 'expressive means', *глаголица* 'Glagolitic alphabet', *дательный* падеж 'dative case', *действительный* залог 'active voice', *залог* 'voice', *зияние* 'hiatus', *знаменательные* слова '*notional* words', *изъявительное* наклонение 'indicative mood', *изъяснительное* предложение 'complement clause', *наклонение* 'mood', *оборот* 'turn of language or speech', *обстоятельство* 'adverbial modifier', *определительное* предложение 'attributive clause', *падеж* 'case', *перевод* 'translation', *переходный* глагол 'transitive verb', *плавный* согласный 'liquid consonant', *подлежащее* 'subject', *положительная степень* 'positive degree', *правило* 'rule', *предложение* 'sentence', знаки *препинания* 'punctuation marks', имя *прилагательное* 'adjective', *приложение* 'apposition', *пробел* 'space', *прописная* буква 'uppercase letter', *родительный* падеж 'genitive case', *сказуемое* 'predicate', *служебный* глагол 'auxiliary verb', *согласный* 'consonant', *сослагательное* наклонение 'subjunctive mood', *страдательный* залог 'passive voice', *строчная* буква 'lowercase letter', имя *существительное* 'substantive', *творительный* падеж 'instrumental case', *устав* 'regulations', etc.

The definitions of the mentioned terminological units make it clear that their inner form has nothing to do with the conceptual content. Of course, *беглая гласная* 'unstable vowel' is not unsteady: there is the interchange of the zero sound and a material one; language means that are not *выразительные* 'expressive' nevertheless *выражают* 'express' something, and what is indicated by this term emphasizes only the particular expression of the expressed. Similarly, every word *знаменует* 'expresses' something and, therefore, there are no *незнаменательные* 'not notional' words; *дополнение* 'object' has nothing to do with *дополнять* 'to add'; all Russian people know that *прилагательное* 'adjective' *прилагается* 'is attached' to something only according to one of the characters of Fonvizin's comedy "The Minor". *Прописная буква* 'uppercase letter' as well as *строчная* 'lowercase letter' is in the *строка* 'line' and *строчная* *'lowercase letter' прописывается* 'is written' like *прописная* 'uppercase letter'; *прописная* 'uppercase letter', in turn, may *печататься* 'be printed', not *писаться* 'be written'. *Оборот* 'turn of language, speech' is defined as *конструкция* 'construction'. In all other cases, if we tried to divide such lexical units into morphemes, we would have to agree that, for example, the names of the cases are motivated by the verbs *родить* *'to give birth'*, *дать* *'to give'*, *винить* 'to blame'*, творить* 'to create'; the names of the voices are motivated by the verbs *действовать* 'to act' and *страдать* 'to suffer', and the term *залог* 'voice' – by the verb *заложить* 'to pledge'; the names of moods – by the verbs *сослагать* 'to put together' and *изъявлять* 'to manifest'. In the same way, it is impossible to assume that *плавный* согласный *'liquid consonant'* is derived from *плавать* 'to swim', *падеж* 'case' – from *падать* 'to fall', *существительное* 'substantive' – from *существо* 'creature' or from *существовать* 'to exist', *предложение* 'sentence' from *предложить* 'to offer', *сказуемое* 'predicate' – from *сказать* 'to say' and so on.

Like commonly used lexemes, terms from a synchronic perspective can be undividable, but motivated (if they have a word-formative structure and when the base of a unit is known and this base synchronically corresponds to the derived word): *звук* 'sound' (from *звучать* 'to sound'), *связь* синтаксическая 'syntactic link' (from 'to link'), *слог* 'syllable' (from *сложить* 'to compose'), *говор* 'dialect' (from *говорить* 'to talk'), *состав* предложения 'sentence structure' (from *составлять* 'to build'), etc.

As for orienting terms, one of their types is connected with the fact that an undividable and special word orients us with the help of its meaning that is commonly used in the language. Such units include, for example: *главное* ударение 'primary stress', *глухой* звук 'voiceless sound', словообразовательное *гнездо* 'family of words', *голос* 'voice', *гортань* 'larynx', *губы* 'lips', *долгий* звук 'long sound', *звук* 'sound', *зубы* 'teeth', *корень* 'root', обстоятельство *места, времени, цели, причины, образа* действия 'adverbial modifier of place, time, purpose, cause, manner' and so on, придаточное *меры, следствия* 'degree, consecutive clause', *настоящее время* 'present *te*nse', *нёбо* 'palate', *общий* род 'common gender' [cf. Steinmetz, 2006], *основа* 'stem', *полное* прилагательное 'long adjective', *простое* предложение 'simple sentence', *семья* языков 'language family', *сила* звука 'sound power', *слабая* позиция 'weak position', *способ* словообразования 'means of word formation', *стык* морфем 'morphemic boundary', *точка* 'full stop', *часть* предложения 'part of a sentence', *число* '*number*', *член* предложения 'member of a sentence', чужая *речь* 'another person's speech', *шёпот* 'whisper', морфемный *шов* 'morphemic boundary', *шум* 'noise', положение *языка* 'tongue position', etc.

The peculiarity of such terms lies in the fact that their definitions and the meaning of the corresponding non-terminological words have one or several common semes. Thus, the synonym for *главное* ударение 'primary stress' is *основное* ударение 'main accent', whereas the lexical meaning of the substratum word *главный* 'main' is interpreted with the help of the word *основной* 'main': "the most important, main" (hereinafter the lexical meaning of commonly used words is given according to the "Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language" by S.I. Ozhegov, N.Yu. Shvedova [Ozhegov, Shvedova, 1997]). One of the meanings of the word *глухой* is "inarticulate, *not voiced*" (italics added). The word *общий 'common'* has the following meaning: "inherent in everything, related to everything". The semes of the commonly used words *шов* 'boundary' and *стык* 'juncture' ("the place of connection" and "the line of contact with something") make it possible to use them as synonymous terms: *морфемный шов* 'morphemic boundary' and *стык морфем* 'morphemic boundary'. The lexical meaning and the content of the terminological concepts of the words *голос* 'voice', *язык* (an anatomic organ) 'tongue', *гортань* 'larynx', *зубы* 'teeth', *губы* 'lips', *нёбо* 'palate' almost wholly coincide. Cf., for

example, the data from explanatory [Ozhegov, Shvedova, 1997] and terminological [Rozental', Telenkova, 2008] dictionaries:

"**Voice… 1.** Combination of sounds produced as a result of vibrations of vocal cords". "**Voice.** The sound produced in the larynx by vibration of strained vocal cords located close to each other under pressure of exhaled air".

"**Larynx…** The upper part of the throat, located between the gullet and trachea, a respiratory organ that takes part in voice production". "**Larynx.** The upper part of the windpipe, which consists of several flexible cartilages vocal cords are attached to".

Conclusion

Thus, the results obtained in the analysis of the material, lead to the conclusion that the terms of unborrowed (Russian and Old Slavic) origin, generally regarded as having an underlying form, the etymological morphemic and transparency, in fact, in many cases do not have terminological motivation, and therefore do not orient the reader to the professional linguistic concept. In such cases the disappearance of the initial word in the derivation chain becomes the result of a lack of motivation, i.e. the loss of derivational base (motivating words), and it leads to change of morphemic structure of terminological units. In these examples, as a rule, the word becoming the term loses the right to the former morphemic division.

References

1. Alekseev P.M. (1998) Graphemic and Syllabic Length of Words in Text and Vocabulary. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 5 (1/2), pp. 5-12.
2. Astakhina L.Yu. (2008) Lingvisticheskoe istochnikovedenie i istoricheskaya leksikologiya [Linguistics source studies and historical lexicology]. *Vestnik Pravoslavnogo Svyato-Tikhonovskogo gumanitarnogo universiteta. Seriya 3: Filologiya* [Bulletin of Saint Tikhon's Orthodox University. Series 3: Philology], 11, pp. 7-17.
3. Boeva-Omelechko N.B. (2011) Natsional'naya spetsifichnost' metayazyka lingvistiki (na materiale sovremennogo russkogo i angliiskogo yazykov) [Na-

tional specificity of metalanguage of linguistics (on the basis of Russian and English languages)]. *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* [Bulletin of the Chelyabinsk State University], 24, pp. 14-16.

4. Comrie B. (1986) Tense in indirect speech. *Folia Linguistica*, 20 (3/4), pp. 265-296.

5. Cooper B. (2000) A fresh look at the origin of an interesting survival of the dual in Russian. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 98 (2), pp. 263-284.

6. Courtenay B. de (1963) Nekotorye obshchie zamechaniya o yazykovedenii i yazyke [Some general remarks on linguistics and language]. In: *Izbrannye raboty po obshchemu yazykoznaniyu* [Selected works on general linguistics]: in 2 vols. Vol. 1. Moscow: AN SSSR.

7. Hyug A. (2013) The lexicalization pattern of the verbs of speaking: categorical compositionality in Russian. *Slavic & East European Journal*, 57 (2), pp. 274-296.

8. Jiracek J. (1985) Thoughts on intralingual and interlingual perintegration in present-day Russian. *Folia Linguistica*, 19 (1/2), pp. 201-206.

9. Kadis R. (2007) The terms "tochnost'" and "pravil'nost'" as applied to the results of chemical analysis. *Journal of Analytical Chemistry*, 62 (6), pp. 506-514.

10. Khairov Sh. (2014) Writers' linguistic observations and creating myths about languages: Cheslaw Milosh and Joseph Brodsky in search of the 'Slavonic Genius of language'. *Modern Language Review*, 109 (3), pp. 726-748.

11. Lemov A.V. (2000) *Sistema, struktura i funktsionirovanie nauchnogo termina* [System, structure and functioning of the scientific term]. Saransk: Mordov. Un-t Publ.

12. Leskov A.S. (2013) An Unlucky Term. *Measurement Techniques*, 56 (8), pp. 861-865.

13. Matveeva E.E. (2012) Formal'no-strukturnyi analiz angliiskikh i russkikh terminov fonetiki [Formal and structural analysis of the English and Russian terms of phonetics]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo oblastnogo universiteta. Seriya: Lingvistika* [Bulletin of the Moscow State Regional University. Series: Linguistics], 1, pp. 101-106.

14. Osetrova O.I. (2013) Kal'kirovanie i razvitie polisemii iskonnykh slov: problema razgranicheniya [Calques and the development of polysemy: the problem of demarcation]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo oblastnogo universiteta.*

Seriya: Lingvistika [Bulletin of the Moscow State Regional University. Series: Linguistics], 4, pp. 49-54.

15. Ozhegov S.I., Shvedova N.Yu. (1997) *Tolkovyi slovar' russkogo yazyka* [Russian language Dictionary]. Moscow: Azbukovnik Publ.

16. Rebrushkina I.A. (2005) *Orientiruyushchie svoistva terminov (na materiale russkoi lingvisticheskoi terminologii). Doct. Diss. Avtoreferat* [Orienting properties of terms (based on the Russian linguistic terminology). Doct. Diss. Absract]. Nizhny Novgorod.

17. Rozental' D.E., Telenkova M.A. (2008) *Spravochnik po russkomu yazyku. Slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov* [Reference book for Russian language. Glossary of linguistic terms]. Moscow: Mir i obrazovanie Publ.

18. Shmeleva T.V. (2014) Pamyat' termina: yazykovedenie, yazykoznanie, lingvistika [Term memory: yazykovedenie, yazykoznanie, lingvistika]. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Filologiya* [Bulletin of Tomsk State University. Philology], 1 (27), pp. 53-62.

19. Slavkova S. (2014) Performative Use of the Verb sprosit′/poprosit′ and molja/pomolja in Russian and Bulgarian: The Pragmatics of Aspect and Tense. *Scando-Slavica*, 60 (2), pp. 231-252.

20. Steinmetz D. (2006) Gender shifts in Germanic and Slavic: semantic motivation for neuter? *Lingua*, 116 (9), pp. 1418-1440.

Специфика морфемной структуры лингвистических терминов славянского происхождения

Лемов Аркадий Владимирович

Доктор филологических наук,
профессор кафедры русского языка,
Мордовский государственный университет,
430005, Российская Федерация, Мордовия, Саранск, ул. Большевистская, 68;
e-mail: avlemov@gmail.com

Аннотация

Статья посвящена анализу морфемной структуры славянских по происхождению лингвистических терминов. Рассматриваются процессы изменения морфемного состава таких терминов, в ходе их исторического функционирования. Делается вывод о том, этимологическая прозрачность многих подобных единиц вовсе не означает наличие у них внутренней формы с синхронной точки зрения, что позволяет классифицировать исследуемые единицы как немотивированные, а следовательно, потерявшие морфемную членимость.

Библиография

1. Астахина Л.Ю. Лингвистическое источниковедение и историческая лексикология // Вестник Православного Свято-Тихоновского гуманитарного университета. Серия 3: Филология. 2008. № 11. С. 7-17.

2. Бодуэн де Куртенэ. Некоторые общие замечания о языковедении и языке // Избранные работы по общему языкознанию: в 2 т. М.: АН СССР, 1963. Т. 1. С. 77.

3. Боева-Омелечко Н.Б. Национальная специфичность метаязыка лингвистики (на материале современного русского и английского языков) // Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. 2011. № 24. С. 14-16.

4. Лемов А.В. Система, структура и функционирование научного термина. Саранск: Мордов. Ун-т, 2000. 199 с.

5. Матвеева Е.Е. Формально-структурный анализ английских и русских терминов фонетики // Вестник Московского государственного областного университета. Серия: Лингвистика. 2012. № 1. С. 101-106.

6. Ожегов С.И., Шведова Н.Ю. Толковый словарь русского языка. М.: Азбуковник, 1997. 944 с.

7. Осетрова О.И. Калькирование и развитие полисемии исконных слов: проблема разграничения // Вестник Московского государственного областного университета. Серия: Лингвистика. 2013. № 4. С. 49-54.

8. Ребрушкина И. А. Ориентирующие свойства терминов (на материале русской лингвистической терминологии): автореф. дисс. … канд. филол. наук. Н.Новгород, 2005. 18 с.

9. Розенталь Д.Э., Теленкова М.А. Справочник по русскому языку. Словарь лингвистических терминов. М.: Мир и образование, 2008. 624 с.

10. Шмелева Т.В. Память термина: *языковедение, языкознание, лингвистика* // Вестник Томского государственного университета. Филология. 2014. № 1 (27). С. 53-62.

11. Alekseev P.M. Graphemic and Syllabic Length of Words in Text and Vocabulary // Journal of Quantitative Linguistics. 1998. Vol. 5. Issue 1/2. P. 5-12.

12. Comrie B. Tense in indirect speech // Folia Linguistica. 1986. Vol. 20. Issue 3/4. P. 265-296.

13. Cooper B. A fresh look at the origin of an interesting survival of the dual in Russian // Transactions of the Philological Society. 2000. Vol. 98. Issue 2. P. 263-284.

14. Hyug A. The lexicalization pattern of the verbs of speaking: categorical compositionality in Russian // Slavic & East European Journal. 2013. Vol. 57. Issue 2. P. 274-296.

15. Jiracek J. Thoughts on intralingual and interlingual perintegration in present-day Russian // Folia Linguistica. 1985. Vol. 19. Issue 1/2. P. 201-206.

16. Kadis R. The terms "tochnost'" and "pravil'nost'" as applied to the results of chemical analysis // Journal of Analytical Chemistry. 2007. Vol. 62. Issue 6. P. 506-514.

17. Khairov Sh. Writers' linguistic observations and creating myths about languages: Cheslaw Milosh and Joseph Brodsky in search of the 'Slavonic Genius of language' // Modern Language Review. 2014. Vol. 109. Issue 3. P. 726-748.

18. Leskov A.S. An Unlucky Term // Measurement Techniques. 2013. Vol. 56. Issue 8. P. 861-865.

19. Steinmetz D. Gender shifts in Germanic and Slavic: semantic motivation for neuter? // Lingua. 2006. Vol. 116. Issue 9. P. 1418-1440.

20. Slavkova S. Performative Use of the Verb sprosit′/poprosit′ and molja/po-moljain Russian and Bulgarian: The Pragmatics of Aspect and Tense // Scando-Slavica. 2014. Vol. 60. Issue 2. P. 231-252.

Specificity of the morphemic structure of linguistic terms of Slavic origin