

# Axioms of Interlinguistics in the Context of Language Globalization



Marina S. Kosyreva, Violetta R. Bogoslovskaya, Alexander N. Dolgenko, Sergej F. Murashko, Svetlana V. Rudakova

**Abstract-:** This article is devoted to the critical revision of interlinguistic constants and regularities (axioms) at the beginning of the 21st century in the context of language globalization. Axioms of interlinguistics are analyzed on the example of international vocabulary in modern languages. Authors explain the high speed of lexico-semantic adaptation of globalisms. Special attention is paid to the integration of terminology from global English into subglobal Russian.

**Keywords:** Theory of Language, globalization, interlinguistics, internationalisms.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The globalized scenario of the contemporary dialogue of cultures affects not only the nature of intercultural communication, but also the way in which language science understands its results. The expansion of the international layer of lexicon of the most widespread languages in the world is one of the most noticeable linguistic phenomena at the end of the 20th - beginning of the 21st centuries. And although the experience of the interlinguistic research accumulated from the beginning of the 20th century to the formation of linguistic globalism at the turn of the 20th – 21st centuries is more than a century, not all the ideas formed by theoretical linguistics about the international beginning of the language are united and stable. The general interlinguistic knowledge based on some constant values and regularities at the beginning of the XXI century is subject to revision under the influence of globalization processes. In this article, these axioms of interlinguistics are analyzed on the example of international vocabulary of the Russian language as a subglobal language [1].

The Russian language is traditionally very receptive to foreign-language infusion and by the beginning of the XX century has mastered the main fund of European international

lexicon, having more than a hundred thousand international words [2]. Since then, the number of internationalisms in the Russian language has increased significantly, primarily due to the terminological vocabulary. Here the special terminology prevails quantitatively, the degree of internationalization and the rate of expansion of which is especially high. In addition, the word may be limited to the social or professional sphere of use, may have the character of neologism, archaism, exoticism. Nevertheless, within the limits of the general lexicon and common terminology of the modern Russian language the number of internationalisms is rather considerable.

One of the axioms of the internationalism is the statement that, unlike random lexical coincidences, internationalism is represented in the dictionaries of languages in more or less large layers, and therefore in their sounding in different languages certain natural sound correspondences are outlined. The similarity of sounds does not mean that they are completely identical. But the functioning of the internationalisms does not require a phonological identity. In particular, the phoneme systems in Russian and English differ both in quantitative terms (6 vowels and 35 consonants in Russian with 20 vowels and 24 consonants in English) and in qualitative terms. The similarities and differences characterize phonological oppositions, phoneme composition, position variations of phonemes, etc. However, this does not prevent similarity to the degree of identification.

Identification of similar consonants is considered to be the most indicative and important, because it is the consonant sounds that are consistently replaced by the similar Russian sounds when borrowing foreign-language material from the Russian language. Variations are manifested in cases where one sound corresponds to two similar types [g] and [h] in Western European languages with one Russian [r]. Other character of variations in correspondence are caused by historical-linguistic reasons (distinctions and varieties of sources and periods of borrowings, stereotypes of sound registration of borrowings) or purely phonetic reasons (distinctions in conditions in which these or those sounds meet). As is known, the ratio of the sound of words of Greek origin is affected by the difference in the oldest ways of their penetration into the Russian, English, German and French languages, the struggle of Greek-Byzantine and Latin sound stereotypes and sometimes the formation of the mixed Byzantine-Latin forms in the Russian language when orienting Western languages towards the Latin stereotype.

Manuscript published on 30 September 2019

\* Correspondence Author

**Marina S. Kosyreva\***, Russian Presidential Academy (RANEPA), Moskva, Russia

**Violetta R. Bogoslovskaya**, Russian Presidential Academy (RANEPA), Moskva, Russia

**Alexander N. Dolgenko**, Moscow Academy of the Investigative Committee, Moscow, Russia.

**Sergej F. Murashko**, Moscow Academy of the Investigative Committee, Moscow, Russia

**Svetlana V. Rudakova**, Moscow Academy of the Investigative Committee, Moscow, Russia.

© The Authors. Published by Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering and Sciences Publication (BEIESP). This is an [open access](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) article under the CC-BY-NC-ND license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Correspondence in the vowel field, primarily in Russian and English, is even more difficult: it is believed that this manifests a number of features that contrast English pronunciation with the "continental" pronunciation of European languages. This makes it difficult to recognize internationalisms in their English sounding, although the possibility of identification is preserved to some extent.

The identification of internationalisms and significant differences in their accentuation do not prevent them from being identified: in European languages (perhaps, with the exception of French) there are significant variations in the emphasis. They are traditionally explained by the struggle of native and foreign accentuation stereotypes: there is a variant of accentuation, there are shifts in accentuation in certain internationalisms and entire groups of words. In Russian, along with the diversity of the accent, we are dealing with the mobility of accentuation in the form of formation and derivation. This does not interfere with the perception of native speakers of the language, although it may complicate the perception of Russian internationalisms by non-Russian-speaking communicators.

Another axiom of interlinguistics is the statement that the degree of similarity of international words is higher in the written form than in the oral form. However, in Russian, the graphic design of international vocabulary differs from Western European languages. The difference is already evident at the level of graphic basis (Latin and Cyrillic alphabets). Therefore, the Russian language usually transcribes (less often – transphonishes and transliterates) the borrowed words, while in the West European languages the borrowed words are transliterated, which can lead to their literal coincidence in a number of languages, although such coincidence, of course, is valid only in the written form of speech.

### II. ANALYTICAL RESULTS & DISCUSSIONS

The possibility of natural correspondence and similarity of international words in the oral and written form is usually connected with the existence of parallelism in the morphological structures of these words. Parallelism usually happens only partial as in each language the structure of internationalisms can have features irrespective of whether the words combine international and specific elements or they completely consist of international morphemes.

Historically, the differences are explained by inevitable specificity of derivation in each language, different degree of accuracy of the internationalism transfer by different models of word-forming design of borrowed words and formation of derivatives from them.

The axiom of interlinguistics is considered to be the fact that only the root and prefixes internationality is obligatory for the appearance of the interlinguistic correspondence. The presence of one or two specific suffixes in a word does not prevent it from functioning as an internationalism, if these specific suffixes regularly relate to the suffixes of other languages in a certain class of words. This feature is crucial for derivative integration of international vocabulary [3].

It has long been established by interlinguistics that belonging to the parts of speech of the international layer of European languages lexicon has similar characteristics.

International words in the languages of Europe belong mainly to three parts of speech: within the limits of the general literature international lexicon of Russian, English and French up to 76% of nouns, up to 18% of adjectives, about 5% of verbs and only about 1% of the share of participles, adverbs and interjections. On the one hand, this shows a general pattern of borrowing words: nouns are always easier to adopt than adjectives and verbs [4]. On the other hand, there are also typological limitations: for example, adjectives in other European languages do not always correspond to adjectives, while verbs and adverbs in other European languages correspond to verbs and adverbs. Cases of internationality of interjections were considered to be particularly rare and limited to a few languages. However, in the conditions of language globalization this axiom is constantly denied: such interjections as Wow! or Oops! are very frequent and widespread, and the most common word in global communication is the particle Ok.

The semantic aspect of internationality is manifested in the semantic structures of words, in the laws of portable use, in the volumes of relative meanings, systematic semantic relations, word combinations, etc. Despite the universality of semantic translations caused by universal psychological laws, the models of potential compatibility of meanings in multilingual words differ to a certain extent in different languages. In European languages the tendencies and schemes of translations are closer but not identical. The English language, more than Russian or German, is characterized by the combination in one semantic structure of tribal and specific knowledge. The differences lie in the structure of models of semantic structures and in the frequency of applicability of similar structures in different languages. The portable meaning in a specific word of one language may seem specific from the point of view of the languages being compared, at least the same model of meaning compatibility was characteristic of them. In Russian, a significant group of international words is unambiguous and, as a rule, is used only in their terminological meaning, while their French, English and sometimes German parallels have, along with terminological meaning that came to another language, also other ones. This may be due to different periods of existence of words in languages, the presence and use of other words that convey the meaning of the internationalism.

The semantic structure of international words in the Russian language indicates that the main meanings here are more often the same as in English, if there are discrepancies in the secondary ones. The relationships of international words are more complicated. The main meaning of one corresponds to the secondary meaning of the other or only secondary meanings coincide. Secondary, phraseologically and grammatically related, emotionally colored meanings are the area where the national specificity of semantic structures of international words is mainly manifested. This axiom of interlinguistics demonstrates stability. In real-life situations, not semantic structures, but syntagmatic meanings of the words in context collide with each other.

That is why the distribution of the words in their different meanings in sublanguages of terminosystems is significant. However, if communication goes beyond a single branch of science or technology into the realm of everyday communication, the ambiguity of the word is felt.

But even in this case, if semantic structures do not diverge too sharply, a person can understand without a dictionary many of the meanings of internationalism, which are not characteristic of his native language, due to the visibility of the links with the semantic center of the common meaning of both languages, universal semantic translations, and finally, due to the context. In this respect, the semantic plan is linked to the stylistic one.

The systems of stylistic colors in the main European languages are similar, though not identical. Stylistic characteristics of internationalisms do not coincide in all cases even in case of similar distribution of stylistic layers. Different times of occurrence of the main groups of internationalism in their differences in the degree of development, the presence or absence of synonyms lead to the fact that, for example, in the French language most of the internationalism is stylistically neutral, while their Russian correspondence is often bookish. French, with its convergence of book and neutral vocabulary, as opposed to colloquial vocabulary, is somewhat different from English, with its tendency to use short words of German origin. Therefore, many stylistically neutral words of Western European languages in Russian correspond to the words with book coloring. At the same time, internationalisms of everyday use of the Russian language are matched by similar French words, which have a narrow professional character and are rarely used. Their perception as outdated or, on the contrary, neologisms is not evenly distributed in internationalisms. At the same time, it should be taken into account that many internationalisms based on international material are not perceived as neologisms at all, even at the moment of their appearance in the language. This, in particular, explains the high speed of lexico-semantic adaptation of globalisms in modern Russian language [5].

One way or another, the main layer of international vocabulary is terminology. Each terminological system is an autonomous layer of language vocabulary, so the formation of a term on the basis of a commonly used word is sometimes viewed not as a rethinking, but as a borrowing of the word, and the term itself is similar to a foreign word in the eyes of non-experts [6]. By their very nature, the scientific concepts expressed by the terms tend to be international in nature, as it is in those areas of human activity to which the terms refer that international relations are most widely implemented. Stylistically, terms within their sublanguage tend to be homogeneous and expressively neutral.

In Russian, the terminology has a more separate structure than, for example, in English: Russian often uses separate lexemes in everyday speech and terminology, where English uses only one lexeme.

Here, we use our own word-building capabilities of the Russian language, a higher percentage of borrowed words in Russian terminology compared to the general literary vocabulary is also of great importance. A certain fusion of terminology with a common vocabulary affects the semantics of terms. As you know, the relationship between terms,

including international terms, and vocabulary of general meaning can be different: Some terms are distributed so widely that they are no longer understood as terms proper (e.g., candidate, deputy, drama, physics); others are clearly of a special nature, but are known to masses of educated native speakers (e.g., function, experiment, argument, de facto); and others are known only to specialists (e.g., linguists: agglutination, incorporation, interference, aorist, dissimilation). The more precisely the term is used in the medium of distribution, the more accurate its use is and the more its meaning is expressed by the notion of scientific, rather than domestic, public [7]. The degree of internationality of the meanings of terms is also connected with the belonging of terms to this or that type and with the history and state of terminology in each separate field of specialized human activity.

In the systems of scientific and technical terms the orderliness is usually insufficient. This is manifested in the lack of precision of some concepts, inconsistency of terms with concepts, multi-meaning of terms, lack of proper systematization in their construction, in synonymy and homonymy within terminological systems, etc. It is no coincidence that any research is preceded by the definition of terms. International terms are difficult to interchange with national and specific terms, although in general the increasing move of representatives of science and technology towards internationalisms is undoubted. National and international disorderliness of concepts, lack of coordination in the construction of terms can lead to an incomplete correlation of terms.

The situation is somewhat better in relatively new areas of science and technology (computer technology, Internet technologies, etc.), the concepts and terms of which have spread in many countries almost simultaneously, and more complex in older areas, especially in the humanities with their traditional approximation and insufficient international coordination of a number of concepts. For example, in philology, the use of international terms is complicated not only by different national traditions, but also by differences in concepts and terminology among different scientific schools. Terminological differences are especially noticeable when different concepts corresponding to the given term can seem to coincide in practice, but in essence refer to different phenomena. Such differences are sometimes compounded by differences in cultural connotations and evaluative colors. Although semantic and stylistic correspondence between internationalisms is not always complete, it does not prevent them from being identified in specific situations where languages meet in global communication.

The analysis of the main axioms of interlinguistics leads us to the conclusion that internationalism today is becoming a universal world phenomenon: neither traditional limitations of historical and cultural nature, nor typological obstacles prevent it. Globalization processes in the world culture, devaluation of time and space factors in Internet communication remove restrictions in lexical mobility. As a result, international vocabulary is gradually becoming truly global. Some axioms become theorems thus will require proof.

## REFERENCES

1. About the Russian as a subglobal language. See: Kosyreva, M.S. Globalizmy v russkom yazyke [Globalisms in Russian language]. Moscow, 2016; Ronen, S., Goncalves, B., Hu, K.Z., Vespignani, A., Pinker, S., Hidalgo, C.A. Links That Speak: The Global Language Network and Its Association with Global Fame // Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 111. 2014. № 52. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1410931111>
2. Vinogradov, V.V. Ocherki po istorii russkogo literaturnogo yazyka XVII — XIX cent. Moscow, 1982.
3. On derivational integration. See: Kosyreva, M.S. Realizacia derivacionnogo potenciala globalizmo v vsovremennom russkom yazyke // International scientific journal. 2017. № 4-2 (58). P. 50-52.
4. Meillet, A. La méthode comparative en linguistique historique. Paris, 1928.
5. Dolgenko, A.N., Kosyreva, M.S. Globalizmy kak problema interlingvistiki I ruisiyiki // Izvestiya Volgogradskogo gosudrstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta. 2016. № 2 (106). P. 105-110.
6. See: Averbuch, K.Y. General theory of the term. Moscow, 2006.
7. Dolgenko, A.N., Kosyreva, M.S. Internationalizmy i Globalizmy // Ethnosocium i mezhnacionalnaya kultura. 2016. № 6 (96). P.120-126.