

## On the Development of Wordstock\*

Ján Horecký

Investigation of the wordstock indicates that an inherent feature of all languages is constituted by dynamic development closely linked with the dynamic development of the given linguistic community, or community in general.

In general, the development of the wordstock undertakes four basic directions, so-called transnominations which are linked to the basic non-derived and, as a rule, non-motivated naming units.

In addition to the basic nominational type four transnominational types can be identified (characterized also in the terms denoting them by the prefix *trans-*)

1. transformation – derivation, composition, conversion and extension
2. transposition – shifting the meaning on the basis of metaphorical and metonymical relationships
3. transfer – borrowing naming units from other languages, often with gradual adaptation
4. translation – literal translation, calquing

However, not all these directions are equally used in all languages or on all the stages of development of particular languages. While prevailing in contemporary European languages are derivation and above all extension (the rise of multiword lexical units), typical for many Oriental languages is transposition (Krupa 1990). Classic examples are the Malay name for the *sun* – *matahari* where *mata* is the eye, *hari* the day, hence the eye of the day, or the Indonesian naming unit *bunga uang* – *interest (as a charge for a loan)* (literally: blossoms of money), *bunga api* – *sparks* (blossoms of fire). Even within one linguistic community there can once prevail transformation (e.g. in older Slovak *hámrik*, *dach*, *gánok* (hammer, roof, covered passage – all from German), at other times, namely in the period of the developing national consciousness in Central Europe, excessive derivation or composition, often camouflaged by calquing. An ordinary example is the word *conscientia* calqued into German in the form *Gewissen*, into Russian as *совесть*, into Slovak as *svedomie*, into Hungarian as *lelkiismeret* (conscience of the soul), or e.g. *omnipotens* – *allmächtig*, *všemohúci*, *mindenható*. At the beginning of the 20th century translation from German, later from Russian, prevailed. At present the loans come mostly from English.

Even in the period of extreme transfer for which the contemporary borrowing from English can be considered, the development in Slovak is not straightforward. This can be illustrated on the fate of English words with the suffix *-ing*.

No matter how the English words in *-ing* came into existence we can distinguish their two basic meanings: action-related and object-related. If the action of the verb is to be transferred into the category of substantives, the English words are often replaced in Slovak by deverbal nouns: *camping* – *kempovanie*, *tramping* – *trampovanie*, *monitoring* – *monitorovanie*. Some English naming units can be derived from two-word naming-units in which the *-ing* form functions as a deverbal noun. In such cases the determined member is suppressed and only the determining member with the suffix *-ing* is borrowed: *dancing room* – *dancing*, *fitting piece* – *fitting*.

However, the English *-ing* words are often translated into Slovak more freely and their form is based on native motivation – hence, translation is not used. E.g. *looping* has its Slovak equivalent in ‘premet’, the athletic terms *skipping* and *lifting* have their equivalents in ‘nízky poklus’ (literally: low running) and ‘vysoký poklus’ (high running).

If the ending *-ing* can be considered for an onomasiological base, corresponding to it in Slovak is the formant *-stvo*: *yachting* ‘jachtárstvo’, *sailing* ‘plachtárstvo’. Also *boxing* used to be translated as ‘pästiarstvo’ (literally: fisting). Similarly, *consulting* could have its equivalent in ‘poradníctvo’, *marketing* in ‘trhovníctvo’. In some other cases, the word *služby* ‘services’ is used as an onomasiological base: *catering* ‘palubné služby’ (literally: services on board); thus *marketing* could be ‘trhové služby’ (literally: market services). With names of the action character the words *proces* ‘process’ or *metóda* ‘method’ could be used: *scanning* ‘prehľadávací metóda’, *rating* ‘škálovacia metóda’, *rooming* in ‘izbová metóda’, *facturing* ‘fakturačný obchod’.

Understood could also be a certain oscillation between transfer and translation. In computer technology, for example, both terms are used, *track ball* and ‘ovládacia guľa’, *resetovať* and ‘znovunastaviť’, and *display* has its synonym in *obrazovka* as well as *zobrazovacia jednotka* (literally: *displaying unit*). In sport terminology both *bungee jumping*, *bungee-running* and *skok na lanu* (literally: jumping on a rope), *beh na lanu* (literally: running on a rope) co-exist. In few cases the English naming unit is substituted by borrowing from another language, mainly from Latin: *update* – *aktualizovať*, *aktualizácia*. Relatively smoothly transferred from English are words of Latin origin: *division* ‘divízia’, *conference* ‘konferencia’ (in sport).

Noteworthy within transfer is above all multiple borrowing. From the Latin word *discernere* the adjective *diskrétny* is derived, borrowed through French (*discret*) in the meaning ‘tactful’, or ‘unobtrusive’, but also the adjective *diskrétny* with the meaning ‘separated, unconnected’, derived from the Latin participle *discretus* in mathematical texts. Twice borrowed into Slovak was also the Latin word *legionarius* ‘legionár’: once as a name for the member of Roman legions, the other time as a name of a sportsman who plays in the services of a foreign sports club, or represents another state.

The naming unit *auditor* is derived from the Latin verb *audire*. It can denote the investigating military judge, or member of the higher court of justice in older periods, while prevailing at present is the meaning of a specialist for audit for checking and inspecting the accounting documentation. In the first case it was borrowed from Latin, in the second case from English. But there can also be found double borrowing: from the English word *to scout* in the meaning “to seek, to search for, to inspect” (undoubtedly from the Latin verb *audire* through the French form *écouter*) there arose the Slovak word *skaut* as a name of the member of a certain youth organization (in German it was to a certain extent formed as calque (translation loan) in the form *Pfadfinder* – *pioneer*, literally the one who searches for the road, the traces (cf. pathfinder). From the same word the English word *scout* came into existence, borrowed into Slovak in its adapted form *skaut* (undoubtedly also under the influence of the already existing name of the youth organization) for denoting a man sent out to search for new players or competitors suitable for being recruited or attracted to a strong club.

When studying the outlined tendencies of the development of the wordstock in more detail a double dependence becomes evident: the dependence on the structural possibilities of the receiving language, and the dependence on the cultural-social background.

The first type of dependence is manifested, for example, in Chinese where the phonotactic rules and the structure of the word or morpheme form a strong barrier for the transfer from languages with a different phonotactic structure (e.g. from English, but also from Latin, and so calquing is used but also formation from native sources by transformation or transposition). Also in Chinese the influence of the social background is manifested above all in the fact that while in China the domestic ways of word-formation are used, in Taiwan and Hong Kong the transfer is used to a larger extent (e.g. in astronomical terminology). Similarly, the word *telegram* is calqued in Hungarian as *távirat* (far-writing), in Bengal as *durbarta* (*dur*-far, *barta* – announcement, not writing).

The differing utilization of the particular developmental tendencies can also be conditioned by the fact that two (genetically and typologically) closely related languages belong to two different cultural areas. This can be seen when comparing Slovak, Czech and Hungarian. Czech reflects the contact with the neighbouring German in naming units like *Obergericht* ‘vrchní soud’ (High Court, literally: upper court), *Oberrat* ‘vrchní rada’ (high counsel), *Oberkommando* ‘vrchní velitelství’ (high commander’s office), while in Slovak rather the situation existing in Hungarian or in Latin is reflected. That is why in Slovak the equivalents are *hlavný súd* (main court), *hlavný radca* (main commander), *hlavné veliteľstvo* (main commander’s office). Cf. also the naming units referring to the positions held at the Hungarian royal court: the Latin *pincernarum regalium magister* (literally: master of royal wine-cellars) is in Hungarian *főpohárnok*, in Slovak *hlavný pohárnik* ‘main butler’. Similarly *főkamarásmester* ‘hlavný komorník’ (main chamberlain), *főlovászmester* ‘hlavný koniar’ (main groom) – more recently *főispán* ‘hlavný slúžny’ (main administrative officer).

However, the dividing line does not always go between Czech and Slovak, or German and Hungarian cultural backgrounds. The name for the high position in the military, originally for the regiment commander, in Czech and Slovak is *plukovník*, and in Russian analogously *полковник* (*polkovnik*) (i.e. with the same motivation as in French and English *colonel*), while in German there is *Oberst* (with the motivation: highest). On the other hand, as an equivalent to English *conspiration*, Czech has *spiknutí* (with an unclear motivation), Slovak *sprisahanie*, Hungarian *összeesküvés* based on Latin *coniuratio*, but also in German there is *Verschwörung*.

A distinct difference in motivation is manifested, for example, in the pair of German *Rühreier*, Czech *míchané vejce* (literally: stirred/mixed eggs) as against the Slovak *praženica* (literally: (what is) fried) and Hungarian *rántott tojás* (literally: fried egg), or German *Wäsche*, Czech *prádlo* (both motivated by: to wash) against Slovak *bielizeň*, Russian *biljo*, Hungarian *fehérnemű* (the latter three containing the motivation: white).

The assumption that the development of wordstock depends on the cultural and social conditions is supported by the yet not codified and basically nonstandardized Romany. During the process of migration from the Indian territories through the Balkans and to Central Europe the Romany language literally absorbed words from the languages through the areas of which it was moving. Hence, in Slovak Romany, in addition to New Indo-Aryan words there can be found Greek elements (*lulud’i* ‘little flower’, *eňa* ‘nine’), but also Rumanian (*foros* ‘town’), Hungarian (*kerek* ‘wheel’, *del* ‘south’), and, of course, to a large extent Slovak (e.g. many names of plants, *lilija* ‘lilly, rose’, *bandurki*, *grule* – (dialectal for) ‘potatoes’, together with the novel form *phuvale* – *phuv* ‘earth’). The names of some contemporary realia are formed by calquing or description: *advertisement* – *sikhaviben* – from ‘to show’, *restaurant* – *chabuno kher* – from ‘eating house’. But many are simply taken over from the Slovakized words of Latin origin: *telegramos*, *telefonos*, *prokuratoris*

(prosecutor), *redakcija* ‘editorial office’, *kultura*, *gratulacija* ‘congratulations’. Of course, prevailing in West-European or American variants of Romany will be the ‘international’ words motivated by Graeco-Latin elements or transferations from local languages (namely in America).

A brief survey of the outlined area shows that the hypothesis of the four main directions of developing the wordstock, as well as of their unequal and unbalanced utilization in concrete languages, depending on the linguistic as well as cultural conditions, can constitute a fruitful tool within the research of wordstock.

**Note:**

\*First published as “Rozvíjanie slovnej zásoby.” In: *Medzikultúrne interdisciplinárne aspekty vo výučbe cudzích jazykov pre profesionálnu sféru*. 2. – 4. októbra 1997. Red. D. Breveníková et al. Bratislava, Ústav jazykov Ekonomickej univerzity v Bratislave 1997, pp. 29 – 34.

**References:**

KRUPA, Viktor: *Metafora na rozhraní vedeckých disciplín*. Bratislava: Tatran, 1990.

In *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* [online]. 2007, vol. 4, no. 1 [cit. 2007-04-03]. Available on web page <[http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL08/pdf\\_doc/6.pdf](http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL08/pdf_doc/6.pdf)>. ISSN 1336-782X.