

INTERDISCIPLINARY TRANSFER FACTORS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIO-POLITICAL TERMS

Natalia Kemska

Assistant of Foreign Languages Department for Humanities,
Lviv Ivan Franko National University, Ukraine
e-mail: nataliekemska@hotmail.com, orcid.org/0009-0000-0165-9921

Summary

The article is devoted to the analysis of foreign language borrowings that are actively used to create complex terms and term combinations in modern American socio-political terminology. The borrowing of a term is most often caused by the need to nominate a new concept or phenomenon when the recipient language lacks terms to denote its own nomination of a scientific reality. The socio-political terminology is a dynamic system in which conceptual meanings are constantly updated primarily through a permanent process of interlingual influences and borrowings. The dynamics of borrowings is manifested in the fact that they are in motion, change their meaning, become widespread in various fields, and enter into lexical and semantic relations with autochthonous terms.

Interlingual contacts most clearly determine monocultural exchange and interlingual influences of professional terminologies. After all, any terminology can be both a producer and a recipient of international vocabulary, mainly from Latin and Greek classical languages. We believe that borrowings from other languages play a significant role in the process of internationalisation of socio-political terminology.

Key words: interlingual borrowings, autochthonous terms, interlingual influences, language contact, source language, recipient language, professional terminology, heterogeneous formations.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/7613>

1. Introduction

The lexical system belonging to the Indo-European language family is characterised by foreign borrowings. A significant number of borrowings in the modern American *socio-political terminology system* (hereinafter referred to as SPT) are the result of long and rich interaction with other Romance and Germanic languages. The donor language from which the borrowings originate differs from the recipient language in terms of structural-semantic typology and sociolinguistic specificity. Most researchers rightly believe that the vast majority of borrowings into English SPT came from French, which is due to the historical conditions and linguistic contacts between these two countries.

We argue that foreign borrowings are actively used to create complex terms and term combinations in modern American SPT, as a source and means of enriching the term corpus. The processes of internationalisation of the terminological fund of the studied term system are confirmed by the presence of internationalisms in its composition.

Modern specific terminology is based on one of the most important external factors of language change and development, which lies in language contact. At the present stage, the SPT plays a dominant role in interlingual influences, replenishing the interdisciplinary term fund.

Trends towards language interference are particularly explicit in the areas of socio-political terminology. According to researchers, borrowing is a universal linguistic phenomenon that manifests itself in the exchange of linguistic signs between two or more languages contacting in various spheres of activity (Voitenko, 2010).

2. Borrowing from other languages

By borrowing, we mean the use of terms from other languages to express new concepts and phenomena of reality. The term 'borrowing' itself has two meanings in linguistic literature: it refers to the process of using elements of the source language in the recipient language system and the result of this process, i.e. those elements in the recipient language system that were introduced into from the source language system.

In the process of the evolution in any professional terminology, interlingual influences are a key and natural phenomenon, since no language can develop in isolation without contacting with others.

The borrowing of a term is most often caused by the need to name a new concept or phenomenon when the recipient language lacks terms to denote its own scientific reality. In this sense, an important aspect of borrowing may be the unambiguity of the term within a particular terminology system, its conciseness and systematicity. The penetration of a borrowed term into another language is also the result of the close development in intercultural and linguistic contacts in the process of the emergence and implementation of the latest modern scientific technologies (Kerpatenko).

Thus, dynamic socio-economic, political, cultural and scientific contacts between countries require the introduction of international terms and the absorption of foreign-language terminological concepts into the professional language of other scientific fields. Modern American SPT is saturated with heterogeneous formations – Greek-Germanic, Greek-Romance, Romance-Germanic, Scandinavian and others, because permanent interlingual contacts determine cultural exchange and linguistic interaction between two peoples.

3. Interlingual contacts

The analysed SPT is the lexical layer in which interlingual contacts are most evident. In its development, any language could be both a producer and a recipient of areal or even international vocabulary. For example, French has long played the role of 'Latin', the language of science, technology and culture. In the 20th century, English replaced French as the international language, having absorbed a large number of Latin terms and, since the 11th century, French terms and concepts as well. During these periods, English terminology was also enriched by Greek, Latin, Italian, French, Spanish and German borrowings: *coup d'etat*; *refugees*; *buffer state*; *xenophobia*; *exile* etc.

In terminological scientific works, foreign researchers express the following point of view on the phenomenon of borrowing. In particular, G. Paul distinguishes two types of foreign language influence:

- borrowing foreign language material (words, phrases, meanings that are 'common to the whole group' word-forming affixes, less often inflections): *autocracy*; *memo* – *memorandum*; *cratology*.

- borrowing foreign forms; a language 'can only use its own material, but the combination of its elements and their adaptation to the content of the corresponding concept is carried

out according to a foreign model' (Paul G., 1880): *junta* (Spanish); *guru* (Hindi); *furore* (Italian).

In this regard, another foreign researcher, A.E. Haugen, who considers them as lexemes transferred from a foreign language, the form of which 'in the borrowed language should be in a more or less diatonic (from sound to tone) relationship with the foreign language' (Haugen, 1972: 113–119).

In our opinion, a borrowed term should have semantic roots in both terminologies, which indicates a close connection between professional languages. Since the borrowing of the material shell of a term is not yet a sign of semantic interaction between terminological systems, we can talk about semantic shifts, where the interaction of terminological systems involves the establishment of such relations between their elements, in particular semantic derivation: *hybrid warfare*; *political forecasting* etc.

A review of theoretical works gives grounds to assert that the opinion that SPT retains the characteristics of a term only within its own terminology system is controversial in modern terminology studies, since any scientific term (studied by American SPT) functions within the framework of other terminology, which is also a system. The meaning of a term is fixed in another system and supported by the parameters used in it. Intensive language contacts lead to the internationalisation of terminological systems.

Interlingual contacts significantly stimulate the interpenetration of individual terminological elements, leading to innovations at the phonological, morphological, semantic and syntactic levels. Since language is a system where everything is interconnected, if foreign elements enter the language, terminological interference leads to a certain reorganisation of the phonetic, grammatical or lexical systems: *al-Qaida*; *Cold War*; *plebiscite* etc.

4. Interlingual interference

In our opinion, the phenomenon of interlingual interference functions alongside such types of borrowing as calquing and linguistic assimilation. Unlike the traditional view of borrowing and calquing as components, we consider them to be separate types of language interaction. Thus, calquing is a kind of violation in the grammatical principle of word formation, so the recipient language based on the model of the source language, a deviation from the norm of one language under the influence of another. First of all, let us pay attention to calques as words (terms) that calque (mostly completely or partially) the source language in terms of structure: *double entendre* – (French); *red line*; *genocide* etc.

It should be noted that in the process of linguistic interaction, changes occur in the structure and meaning of terminological units, which we define as interference. Interlingual contacts have a much greater influence on the development of ASPT than on the development of other European languages, which is a consequence not only of the quantitative enrichment of the sectoral vocabulary, but also of semantic changes in its structure and functioning. In other words, the emergence of a new concept or phenomenon in the modern American terminology system is often facilitated by interlingual influences and borrowing processes: *barnstormer(n)*; *foreign peril*; *celestial wisdom*; *fountain of life*.

In fact, no language can exist in isolation from others without changing and developing in line with accepted general linguistic trends, since the lexical-semantic system is most susceptible to change, which depends on extralinguistic factors. The researcher, E. Haugen (cited above), proposed, in our opinion, the most reliable classification of semantic borrowings, dividing them into three categories, namely:

1) borrowings among homologues (words of common origin). This phenomenon occurs between words that have a common primary meaning: *kleptocracy*; *plutocracy*; *clash of civilisations*;

2) borrowings among analogues. This is the most common category, which occurs between words that have at least one common seme and are formally similar (designation), which facilitates the borrowing process: *political hermeneutics*; *polycentrism*; *cohabitation*;

3) borrowing among homophones. Words that are pronounced the same but have different meanings and spellings: *trigger*; *whip*; *hawk* (Haugen, 1972: 113–119).

A number of terms have appeared in socio-political discourse that have undergone a certain reinterpretation, for example, the term *primaries* – primary elections in the United States, which was previously used only in specialised scientific and official texts: *blockbuster*; *image-maker*; *speakeriade*; . Thus, the term *pressing*, alongside the sphere of sport, has come to be widely used in political vocabulary to denote a method of influencing a political opponent, and in business it denotes psychological pressure with the aim of adjusting the actions of competitors, or *sandwich* – a person carrying two advertising boards hanging from their shoulders, one in front and one behind (COCA).

5. International terminology

We can conclude that foreign terms are in many cases closely related to the history of the formation of language systems, which influence their culture and functioning. In particular, Professor R.S. Pomirko interprets linguistic interference as ‘the assimilation of borrowed lexical material form into a language through the maximum approximation of its phonetic, graphic, grammatical and lexical-semantic characteristics to the norms of the recipient language, and accordingly distinguishes the following types of lexical assimilation: 1) *phonetic-graphic*; 2) *morphological*; 3) *lexical-semantic*’ (Pomirko; Dudok, 2010: 3–10). The reinterpretation of borrowed terminological units to denote new concepts is a process that covers a wide range of the semantics of a word-term, its inclusion in a specific system of concepts, in our case, the SPT.

It is noteworthy that multiculturalism and bilingualism create a specific situation of cross-cultural contact. As a result of the development of connotative semantics, let us give an example of borrowing in the field of public law: *bribe* < O.F. *bribe*, > *a piece of bread, alms, which later acquired additional semantics – survival through alms and professional begging*. It was these latter meanings that contributed to the emergence of negative connotations such as *fraud*, *robbery*, and *extortion*, which the English language absorbed and realised in the meaning of *stolen goods*, *blackmail*, etc.

It is worth adding that so-called borrowings are of particular interest: *boomerangs*, which were once an integral part of the English lexical system, later returned to French with changed semantics and phonetic form. For example, *bouge* (*a pocket in which money is kept*), once borrowed by English from French, acquired a new meaning in the process of semantic integration – a statement of income and expenditure of the state or enterprise for a certain period (COCA). It was with this meaning and a modified graphic form (*budget*) that it returned to the French language.

Alternatively, the term ‘*the fam*’, which originated in America (*short for ‘family’*), denoted the highest degree of contempt: ‘*He’s sunk in the fam and never appears in public.*’ Changes in the terminological corpus of professional languages and the penetration of foreign borrowings have caused semantic and stylistic changes that bring variability in the semantics of terms, with their emotionally expressive connotations: *to pull the strings*; *swell of discontent* etc.

It is foreign borrowings and interlingual contacts that have led to the replenishment and enrichment of English SPT at both the morphological and semantic-functional levels (Goncharenko, 2010). The process of borrowing SPT is one of those complex lexical-semantic transformations that occur in ASPT mainly as a result of language contacts and influence the dynamics of replenishing the terminological corpus of the SPT sphere. This process is facilitated by the trend of deglobalisation in the modern world, in particular through socio-economic and interlingual influences, which manifests itself in the active transfer of borrowed terminology.

Moreover, lexical borrowing is often considered only as the first stage of foreign language influence, where a word-term is borrowed not completely as a grammatically formed unit, but as a more or less unformed unit of the term corpus, which acquires its form in the system and by means of another language that has borrowed it (Demchenko, 2005: 170–172). Therefore, from this point of view, borrowing is not a process, but rather the initial use of foreign material in a new linguistic format.

When analysing the general problems of borrowed vocabulary, it is worth paying attention to its connection with international vocabulary between these two groups. Linguistic literature cites two approaches that interpret the relationship between these categories differently. Researchers of the first approach do not distinguish internationalisms from borrowings, but believe that the difference between internationalisms and borrowings lies only in the way they are considered (Zatsny, 2006: 28–29).

Representatives of the second approach oppose the identification of these categories and recognise that internationalisms have many features in common with borrowings, but this is not a basis for identifying them (Kyak, 2006).

In reality, these categories are equivalent to each other, because internationalisms are an objectively existing interlingual category of synchrony with their own specific characteristics, while borrowings are a group of facts that are conditional for synchrony and are distinguished on the basis of other, diachronic criteria (Fedorez, 2005). In our opinion, borrowings from other languages play a key role in the process of internationalisation of socio-political terminology, which, according to our estimates, can reach 70–80%, for example: *common good*; *lame duck*; *rogue state* etc.

In professional terminology, various terms are used to refer to borrowings: foreign language inclusions, borrowings, foreign words, barbarisms, internationalisms, etc., among which the term borrowing is the most commonly used. In fact, it mainly refers to both the linguistic process of borrowing and the results of this process: that is, borrowing is both the act by which one language acquires an element of another language and the borrowed element itself (Petryshyn, 2018).

We can argue that the interdisciplinary and international organisation of American SPT is a dynamic system in which conceptual meanings are constantly updated, primarily through a permanent process of interlingual influences and borrowings (Dudok, 2017: 129–135). The dynamics of borrowings are manifested in the fact that they evolve semantically, change their meaning, spread in various spheres, and enter into lexical and semantic connections with autochthonous terms: *hung parliament*; *reconciliation process*; *armistice*; *world government*.

Thus, interlingual contacts most clearly determine monocultural exchange and interlingual influences of professional terminology. After all, any terminology can be both a producer and a recipient of international vocabulary, mainly from classical Latin and Greek: *in situ*; *non sequitur*; *status quo*. That is, terminological borrowings cause and enrich the neological process and are generators of synonyms, homonyms, and polysemic structures. After all, their transcendence is no less intense than that created by lexical borrowings.

Contemporary researchers of terminology highlight the ways in which hidden borrowings enter professional language less noticeably, so to speak, through ‘invisible export’. There is undoubtedly a significant reason for this: the absence in English of borrowings from languages that have maintained or continue to maintain close contact with English (Zhuktenko, 1966).

6. Conclusions

Thus, the above allows us to draw the following conclusions. The analysis, origin and development of individual terms and socio-political terminology systems are determined not only by internal linguistic factors, but also by external linguistic factors, as well as by the ratio of autochthonous and borrowed terms in these terminology systems. Therefore, foreign borrowings in the socio-political terminology are, in terms of their structural-semantic and linguistic-pragmatic parameters, international terminological units that function in other languages with the same socio-political meanings as in English professional language.

Interlingual contacts significantly stimulate the interpenetration of individual terminological elements, leading to innovations at the phonological, morphological, semantic and syntactic levels. Also, the phenomenon of interlingual interference functions alongside such types of borrowings as calquing and linguistic assimilation.

In the process of linguistic interaction, changes occur in the structure and meaning of terminological units, which we define as the phenomenon of interference. In many cases, foreign terms are closely related to the history of the formation of language systems, which influence their culture and functional characteristics, as well as their expressive colouring.

It was foreign borrowings and interlingual contacts that led to the replenishment and enrichment of English SPT at both the morphological and semantic-functional levels. Therefore, we can conclude that the interdisciplinary and international organisation of American SPT is a dynamic system in which conceptual meanings are constantly being updated, primarily through the permanent process of interlingual influences and borrowings. The dynamics of borrowings are manifested in the fact that they are in motion, change their meaning, spread in various spheres, and enter into lexical and semantic connections with autochthonous terms, which undoubtedly determines the prospects for further studies in this direction.

References

1. Demchenko K. V. (2005) *Funktsionuvannia inshomovnykh leksem u tekstakh publitsystychnoho styliu* [Functioning of foreign lexemes in journalistic texts]. *Kultura narodov Prychernomoria*. № 69. S. 170–172 [in Ukraine].
2. Dudok R. I. (2017) *Mizhmovni protsesy interferentsii v terminolohichnii systemi anhliiskoi movy* [Interlingual processes of interference in the terminological system of the English language]. *Terminolohichniy visnyk*. Vyp. 4. S. 129–135 [in Ukraine].
3. Fedorets S. A. (2005) *Anhliiski zapozychennia u movi suchasnoi ukrainskoi reklamy* [English borrowings in the language of modern Ukrainian advertising]: dys. ... kand. filol. nauk. Kharkiv. 203 s [in Ukraine].
4. Haugen E. (1972) *The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing*. *Ecology of language: Essays by Haugen*. Stanford University Press. PP. 113–119 [the USA].
5. Honcharenko L. O. (2010) *Funktsionalnyi aspekt zapozychen* [Functional aspect of borrowings] *Aktualni problemy slovianskoi filolohii*. Vyp. XXIII. Ch. 4. S. 294–300 [in Ukraine].

6. Kerpatenko Yu. V. *Inshomovne slovo: vyznachennia, adaptatsiia, funktsionuvannia* [Foreign Words: Definition, Adaptation, Functioning]. [Elektronnyi resurs] Rezhym dostupu: [http://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/soc_gum/Nz/Fil/2009_81_1/statti/81.pdf] [in Ukraine].
7. Kyiak T. R. (2006) *Zapozychennia ta internatsionalizmy u fakhovykh movakh* [Borrowings and internationalisms in professional languages]. [Elektronnyi resurs]. Visnyk Zhytomyrskoho derzhavnoho universytetu imeni Ivana Franka. Rezhym dostupu: [Http://eprints.zu.edu.ua/1068/1/06ktpifm.Pdf](http://eprints.zu.edu.ua/1068/1/06ktpifm.Pdf) [in Ukraine].
8. Paul G. (2002) *Principien der Sprachgeschichte.*, 1880. 10 vydannia: Tübingen, Niemeyer [in Germany].
9. Petryshyn O. M. (2018) *Pro novitni anhlomovni zapozychennia yak zasib mizhkulturnoi komunikatsii* [On the latest English borrowings as a means of intercultural communication]. Visnyk molodykh naukotsiv. № 6. S. 135 [in Ukraine].
10. Pomirko R. S. (2010) *Kohnityvni mekhanizmy transpozytsii smysliv: metafora ta metonimiia (na materialy anhliiskoi fakhovoi movy ekonomiky)* [Cognitive mechanisms of transposition of meanings: metaphor and metonymy (based on the material of English professional language of economics)]. Visnyk Lviv. nats. un-tu. – Ser. Inozemni movy. Vyp. 17. S. 3–10 [in Ukraine].
11. Voitenko K. I. (2010) *Klasyfikatsiia zapozychen v suchasnykh linhvistychnykh doslidzhen-niakh* [Classification of borrowings in modern linguistic studies] [Elektronnyi resurs] / Rezhym dostupu: http://www.rusnauka.com/7_NMIV_/Philologia/60103.doc.htm [in Ukraine].
12. Zatsnyi Yu. A. (2006.) *Vnutrishni zapozychennia suchasnoi anhliiskoi movy* [Internal borrowings in modern English]. Visnyk Sum DU. № 11. S. 28–29 [in Ukraine].
13. Zhluktenko Yu. O. (1966) *Movni kontakty. Problemy interlinhvistyky* [Language contacts. Problems of interlinguistics]. K.: Kyiv. un-t. 135 s [in Ukraine].
14. COCA – Corpus of Contemporary American English. URL: <https://www.englishcorpora.org/coca/>