

Kruszewski And The Problems Of Loan Words

Nailya I. Gololobova¹, Almira A. Aminova¹, Gelinya Kh. Gilazetdinova¹, Karlyga T. Utegenova²

¹Kazan Federal University

²West Kazakhstan State University, Kazakhstan

Abstract

The paper contains and proceeds the theses of Mikołaj Kruszewski, who was a major representative of Kazan linguistic school, a famous follower and supporter of the founder of this school Baudouin de Courtenay. Modern European linguists highly estimate the works of Kruszewski and have found out that he together with his mentor and fellows had expressed a lot of similar ideas, that were mentioned 30 years later in world recognized works of Ferdinand de Saussure. In the present article we use stipulations of Kruszewski published in his last scientific work "Otcherk Nauki o Yazyke" (Study about language). The aim of the article was to study the phenomenon of loan words and prove two theses, namely "the major character of the language is a word, which is the sign of an object" and that "the words should be classified in our minds in the same groups, as the objects, denoted by them". These theses were proved by analysis of frequent words "natsiya" (nation), "narod" (people), "etnos" (ethnos). In the course of the article these words were analyzed following different characteristics and the conclusion was made as to what extent there exists a solid meaning after the loan words.

Keywords: loan words, Kruszewski, language, meaning, borrowings.

introduction

Leading language theorist Mikołaj Kruszewski in his "Otcherk Nauki o Yazyke" (Study about language) [1] processed the theory of Baudouin de Courtenay, expressed new ideas on the essence of language, proved a number of theses being the basic ones for modern linguistics (concerning the language consistency, the laws of the language development and existence, the factors destroying its system), thus he created the researching methodology, that can be applied to any linguistic phenomenon.

As for his perception of loan words, he referred them to destructive factors of language development. At first sight, his evaluation of loan words is rather controversial: on the one hand, "words, originated in another language or dialect, as compared to our language... will always - to a greater or lesser extent - weaken the harmony of the language system [1: 93-94]", and this phenomenon is denoted as a destructive factor of language development; on the other hand, the same destructive factors could become "useful for the language" [1: 97], as "they supply the language with the new material, essential for language progress not only on structural, but also material and lexical level" [1: 97]. But this contrariety reflects the language contrariety itself: language needs this "new blood", but it should blend with the environment it flows into. Kruszewski noted that "loan words adjust to the environment they enter to such an extent that they enrich the language but slightly damage its system" [1: 94]. These loan words "damage only those native words that exist in the given period of time" [1: 97]. And "destructive elements supply the language with the material which is necessary for its existence as well as its progress" [1:107].

It should be noted, that these and other estimations of Kruszewski regarding loan words are especially true then language develops naturally without predominant impact of extralinguistic factors. That's why the decisive factor when choosing between "primary native" and "primary foreign elements is the historical social context or, as Baudouin de Courtenay noted, "here act simple egoistic and altruistic intentions, desire to facilitate the mental development of people, as well as the social life as a whole" [3, p. 196-197].

It was repeatedly stated that foreign words flood into the Russian language during certain periods, especially in the end of XX century. The Russian language assimilated these words effectively due to its developed morphological and word-building language systems, but concerning particular words,

particular thematic groups (notably abstract nouns and those bordering with them), they beware of the fact that “logic of Logos, succession of new values anticipation are violated” (please refer to Kolesov [3]). During the last two decades the investigation of borrowed words has gained special attention in the works of Russian and foreign linguists, such as Pfandl [4], Rangélova [5], Rathmayr [6], Valter [7], Ogienko [8], Galiullina, Zh. Yusupova, A.Sh. Yusupova [9], Yerbulatova [10], Mugtasimova [11], Galimova [12], Erofeeva, Galeev [13].

methods

Etymological analysis is very important for distinguishing native and borrowed words and the process of their assimilation. The study of meaning of the borrowings is impossible without applying semantic method and the method of componential analysis. Description is seen as one of the necessary step in receiving valuable data.

results and discussion

The aim of our study is to identify how the thesis of Kruszewski manifests itself, namely “the major character of the language is a word, which is the sign of an object” and that “the words should be classified in our minds in the same groups as the objects denoted by them” [1:67]. To do it we will be guided by three provisions of Kruszewski: (1) regarding correspondence of the world of words to the world of thoughts, (2) regarding associations on resemblance and associations on adjacency, (3) on words “production and re-production” and will illustrate that by means of three frequent words (and its derivatives): “narod” (people), “natsiya” (nation), “etnos” (ethnos).

Firstly, we need to find the semantic fields where these notions compete and where they cooperate. We have classified the words with the invariant meaning “human community” according to association on resemblance (semasiological) and on “adjacency with denoted objects” [1:66]:

1. community of people, aggregate quantity	“Natsiya” (Nation), “narod” (people), “narodnost” (national character), “etnos” (ethnos), “plemya” (tribe, clan), “mir” (world), “obtschina” (community), “naselenie” (population).
1a. historically developed, stable community united by a number of attributes (language, territory, etc.)	“natsiya” (nation), “etnos: (ethnos), “narod” (people) + “narodnost” (national character) according to Big Explanatory Dictionary of Russian Language [14], “plemena” (tribes, clans) (Pushkin, Gorky)
1b. the same + the certain period	“Plemya” (clan, tribe) – “narodnost” (national character) – “narod” (people) – “natsiya” (nation).
1c. type of ethnic community, emerged during certain period, which has the common characters and stable cultural peculiarities, as well as recognition of its unity.	“etnos” (ethnos)
2. State, Country	“Natsiya” (nation)
2a. belonging to the state, country	“Natsiya” (nation), “natsionalnost” (nationality)
3. population	“Narod” (people), “naselenie” (population)
3a. working population	“Narod” (people)
4. skit, crowd	“Narod” (people)
5. community of people irrespective of their ethnicity	“Mir” (world), “Obtshina” (community), “obtshestvo” (society), “naselenie” (population), “narod” (folk).

5a. the same but stylistically marked	Greetings, youthful And unfamiliar clan! (Pushkin) What a crowd!
---------------------------------------	--

Modern word usage completely reflects the synonymic contacts mentioned in the classification. The word "ethnos" (from Greek *ethnos*) which during a long time was stylistically marked as belonging to a scientific style, has been recently used in journalism. Words "*natsiya*" and "*narod*" are either used as synonyms in invariant meaning or differentiated as generic and aspectual notions.

It is necessary to note the word "*natsiya*" here. This word was recognized in the Russian language starting from the reign of Peter the Great (from Latin "*natio*"). It has a wide encyclopedic explanation in modern dictionaries, but despite 200 year history of usage in the Russian language it is still not assimilated by Russian people, and it is confirmed by the fact that in Russian Dictionary of Associations [15] there are more entries for the word "*narod*", than for the word "*natsiya*", where there is only one entry. The Russian Dictionary of Quotations [16] for the word "*narod*" gives the quotations from the works of Russian authors, whereas for the word "*natsiya*" they are given only from the translated works.

It is well known that the understanding of the essence of words is varied in time and cultural areas, besides the inner form of foreign borrowings is opaque. The Dictionary of Ethnolinguistic Notions and Terms [17] has a new definition of "*narod*": "aggregate of classes, nations, national characters, which have common historical destiny". Thus, generic and aspectual notional correlation between the words "*narod*" and "*natsiya*" which is quite stable in other languages (Tatar: *Khalyik* – millet, French: *people* – nation) is unstable in Russian linguistic consciousness. The reintegration takes place occasionally between the named words in the language.

Every word prior to its manifestation in language should be felt and processed deeply by its people, as "the essence of the human language is particularly psychic" [2:348], as well as its existence.

The native Russian word "*narod*" has a clear word image, its definition belongs to material world, there exists a precise objectiveness's definition. There are a number of word usages and derivatives, where the positive connotation remains unchanged. the only examples with negative connotations are "*narodishka*" "*narodik*" (derogatory meaning) and "*inorodets*" (with the meaning "stranger, alien").

The family word "*natsiya*" has a number of word chains with the negative connotation: i.e. "*nazi*", "*Nazist*", "*nationalist*", "*nationalistic*", etc. Besides, certain derivatives with the same stem are abstract noun and they can act, following the words of Cherneiko, as empty boxes, where every possible meaning can be contained [18]. That is why then the visual referent is absent, then the following question arises constantly: which phenomenon is denoted by this word.

The definition of the abstract notion is stipulated by the speaker's position, that is why the referent of reality becomes indefinite and tolerates different interpretations.

Following the classification of Chernenko [18] such words as "*natsiya*" are located on the border between specific and abstract nouns in the form of "boundless amounts". Then, while comparing the words "*narod*" and "*natsiya*" from the point of view of their boundlessness and unboundlessness, it is clear that the first word is closer to concrete nouns, and the second one to abstract nouns. If the abstract noun is intended to enter the language it must be processed rationally. This procession is not finished yet, as shown by the word-combinations with adjectives "*natsionalniy*" (national) as compared to the word combinations with adjectives "*narodny*" (people's).

The adjectives "*narodny*" and "*natsionalniy*" have already been registered as synonyms in XIX century. In modern Russian adjectives "*narodny*" and "*natsionalniy*" in combination with concrete and abstract nouns have the meaning of "...related to the notion defined by the core root", "attributed to the notion expressed by the core root", "closely connected to that expressed by the core root", etc. These words have synonymous meaning, but very seldom they can set up synonymous ties, more often despite of the

matching components of the word collocation the expressed meaning does not coincide: *people's culture – national culture, people's language – national language*.

The polysemy of the word “*natsiya*”, various possible collocations of the adjective “*natsionalniy*” and its high frequency usage result in the fact that the meaning of this word does not add much to the representation of the notion that is expressed by this word. That is why it is necessary to give encyclopedic definitions, which are sometimes not enough especially in such cases when the word itself, being somewhere on the border between the concrete and abstract nouns is combined with abstract nouns or nouns denoting emotions and ethical notions which are hard to be defined.

Further more, it is necessary to study the productivity of the word family “*natsiya*”, “*narod*” and “*etnos*” within different periods of time. Until present, the word “*etnos*” has been used only within the framework of scientific and journalistic style.

The amount of members of word family “*narod*” decreases constantly. There were more that 20 single stem derivatives with the given core root and a large number of complex derivatives in the dictionary of the Russian Language of the XI-XII century. But in the Big Explanatory Dictionary of Russian Language [14] there are only ten members of the word family “*narod*”, not taking into account complex nominations.

On other hand, the amount of words motivated by the word “*natsiya*” increases on a permanent basis. The Dahl's Explanatory Dictionary contains only 2 derivative words from the given root, but the Big Explanatory Dictionary of Russian Language [14] contains already more than 20 different derivates, not taking into account such complex words as national-liberation.

SUMMARY

To sum it up the word “*natsiya*” with its derivatives, being semantically close to the word “*narod*”, is replacing the native word family “*narod*”. The derivative “*narodny*” is becoming distinct in the psyche of the language, the core root “*narod*” is losing its supporting collocations, there appear word combinations with false or opaque definitions, new denotata appear easily.

Thus, these word families can be referred to weakly ordered systems, as the activity of words with the root “*narod*” depends on extralinguistic factors, although associations on similarity and contiguity are very strong; as for the word “*natsiya*” there are lots of associations of similarity, but the number of associations on contiguity are not enough. An attempt to confine the semantic meaning of the word “*natsiya*” (in the meaning of the total amount of nation constituting one single state) from the word “*narod*”, and the word “*narod*” in its turn from the word “*etnos*”, as the latter has the cultural component in itself has recently been registered. From this point of view the creation of such complex adjectives as “*etnonatsionalnaya politika*” (ethno-national policy) is transparent in structure, but the definition of the new notion and new language unit differs in Russian and foreign sources. In any case it is clear that the borrowed words can be made to contain different definitions, and “the word with several meanings can evoke different groups of ideas” [1:11].

conclusions

Large amounts of papers are dedicated to the problem of incorporation of loan words into the Russian language, but the results of transferring foreign ideas into Russian linguistic consciousness are not yet summarized. This is the most burning issue, which is necessary to investigate firstly by using the material of abstract lexis and its complementary fields.

acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

Bibliography

1. KRUSZEWSKI, N.V. 1882. Otcherk Nauki o Yazyke [Study about language]. Kazan.
2. BAUDOUIN DE COURTENAY, I.A. 1958. Izbrannye Raboty [Selected works]. Vol. 1. Moskva.
3. KOLESOV, V.V. 2000. O logike Logosa v sphere mentalnosti [On logic of Logos in the sphere of mentality]. Mir russkogo slova. No. 2.
4. PFANDL, H. 2002. Wie gehen die slawischen Sprachen mit Anglizismen um? EUROSPEAK. Der Einfluss des Englischen auf europäische Sprachen zur Jahrtausendwende. Frankfurt -am-Main, Berlin, Wien u.a. Peter Lang. pp.117-154.
5. RANGÉLOVA, A. 2005. Neosémantizmy a neosémantizační pricesy. Neologizmy v dnešní češtině. Praha. pp.159-179.
6. RATHMAYR, R. Anglizismen im Russischen: Gamburgery, Bifšteksy und die Voucherisierung Russlands. 2002. Muhr R., Kettemann B. (eds). EUROSPEAK. Der Einfluss des Englischen auf europäische Sprachen zur Jahrtausendwende. Frankfurt -am-Main, Berlin, Wien u.a. Peter Lang. pp.155-180.
7. VALTER, H., VOVK, O., ZUMP, A., KONUPKOVA, H., KULPA, V. 2004. Slovar: zaimstvovania v ruskom substandarte. Anglitsizmy [dictionary: borrowings in Russian substandard. Anglicisms]. Moskva. P.416.
8. OGienko, I. 2016. Inozemnye element v ruskom yazyke. Istoriya proniknoveniya zaimstvovannykh slov v russky yazyk [Foreign element in the Russian language. The history of borrowed words invasion into the Russian language]. Moskva. P.140.
9. GALIULLINA G.R., YUSUPOVA A.SH. 2014. European Linguistic Borrowings In The Tatar Sprachraum (By Written Sources Of The XIX - XX Centuries). Life Science Journal. Vol. 11, Issue: 10, pp. 697-700.
10. YERBULATOVA, I.K., MUGTASIMOVA, G.R., KIRILLOVA, Z.N., SAHIN, L. 2017. Culture-specific terms as verbal expressive peculiar features of national cultures. Astra Salvensis. pp. 123-130.
11. YUSUPOVA, ZH., YUSUPOVA, A.SH., MUGTASIMOVA, G.R. 2016. Adaptation of Russian Borrowed Words in the Speech of Tatars Living in China // Journal of Language and Literature. Jll, Vol. 7. No. 3.
12. GALIMOVA, G., YUSUPOVA, A., DENMUKHAMETOVA, E., MUGTASIMOVA G. 2016 Tatar proverb language as the reflection of western and eastern. Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods. pp. 161-165.
13. EROFEEVA, I., GALEEV, T. 2017. RUSSIAN-POLISH CROSS-LANGUAGE INTERFERENCE IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING. Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods. Vol. 7, Issue 5. pp. 138-143.
14. BIG EXPLANATORY DICTIONARY OF RUSSIAN LANGUAGE. 1988. St.Petersburg
15. RUSSIAN DICTIONARY OF ASSOCIATIONS. 1984. Moskva.
16. DUSHENKO, K. 1987. Russian Dictionary Of Quotations. Moskva.
17. ISAEV, M. 2001. The Dictionary of Ethnolinguistic Notions and Terms. Moskva.
18. CHERNEIKO, L.O. 1997. Lingvo-filosofski analiz abstractnogo imeni [linguistic and philosophical analysis of abstract nouns]. Moskva.