

## SYNONYMY IN THE UKRAINIAN LINGUISTIC TERMINOLOGICAL LEXICON OF THE XVI–XVII CENTURIES

© *Yakymovych-Chapran D., 2013*

У статті зроблено аналіз поглядів українських та закордонних термінознавців на проблему синонімії в термінолексичі. Розглянувши синонімічні ряди назв мовознавчих понять, зафіксованих в українських писемних пам'ятках XVI–XVII ст., автор стверджує, що в ранні періоди розвитку термінолексичи синонімія була дуже поширеним явищем і відіграла позитивну роль. Подано перелік екстралінгвістичних та інтралінгвістичних причин виникнення синонімічних рядів обсягом від 2 до 11 членів.

**Ключові слова:** українська мова, дублети, лінгвістична термінологія, синонімія, кальки, запозичення, питома лексика, XVI–XVII ст.

The article is devoted to the analyses of the views of the Ukrainian and foreign terminologists of the problem of synonymy terminological lexicon. The author observes synonymic rows of scientific linguistic names, used in the relicts of the Ukrainian language of the XVI–XVII c., and ascertains, that in early periods synonymy was wide-spread and played positive role. The intra- and extralinguistic causes of appearance of the synonymic rows are also counted over.

**Keywords:** Ukrainian language, doublets, linguistic terminology, synonymic, calques, borrowings, XVI–XVII.

Taking into consideration constant growing of integration of science and social life and based on the previously mentioned reasons language intellectualization terminological studies have taken one of the leading places in lexicological researches of Ukrainian scholars since 1950ies. First of all modern terminological systems were worked up and general theoretical basis (some principles of which are still very debatable) was worked out bearing in mind the most significant achievements of world linguistic opinion. Later due to Ukraine's independence historical and terminological elaborations became possible. Besides being of unprejudiced and non-ideological character they promoted further working out in the sphere of term theory.

Synonymy belongs to semantic universalisms which are differently treated in the terminological studies. It is treated by Ukrainian and foreign scholars in various ways. Some of the scholars fully neglect it (for example, G. Rondo [22, p. 62], A. Kryzhanivska [7, p. 12–13] or T. Kyyak [3, p. 9]), others admit positive influence of synonymy on the development of terminological systems (for example, V. Nalepin [9, p. 14], A. Superanska, N. Podolska and N. Vasilyeva [17, p. 49], S. Gaida [20, p. 75], T. Panko, I. Kochan and H. Matsyuk [10, p. 183], T. Sokolovska [16, p. 171] and others). It is interesting that most of modern researchers yield to the second from the mentioned views but they stress that revelation and sources of synonymy in terminology differ from its revelation and sources in generally used language [4, p. 261; 21, p. 130; 5, p. 20; 2, p. 24; 20, p. 73; 10, p. 180–186; 6, p. 112; 18, p. 221]. However, they are not unanimous in differentiation or

identification of such basic notions as “doublets” and “synonymy”. Thus, some scholars believe that as term-synonyms coincide with the same notion they can be classified as duplicates [2, p. 24; 14, p. 16–17 and others]. Others on the contrary are very doubtful about the existence of such thing as duplication in general and in the terminology in particular [17, p. 48–49; 20, p. 73, 74]; a Canadian scholar G. Rondo is close to the conception of these researchers and he does not use the term *doublets* at all and does not differentiate any varieties within synonymy considering even short forms of terms as synonyms [22, p. 31]. Other group of scholars agrees with the existence of synonyms and doublets within the terminological lexicon [10, p. 180 and others], but they are not certain about which lexemes must refer to synonyms and which must refer to duplications. A. Reformatsky, for example, suggested that words meaning the same but having different stems should be synonyms and morphological, phonetic, orthographic, syntactical variants of the same word should be duplications [12, p. 192], whereas T. Panko with co-authors stress that only synonyms are typical for social sciences and differ between themselves on the level of connotation components, frequency of usage, sphere of usage etc. [10, p. 180]. Thus, there is no full consent among the modern researchers of terminological systems about differentiation or identification of notions “synonymy” and “doublets”. The situation becomes more difficult because nowadays scientific style includes many sub styles and main genres typical for the style are also divided into sub genres. There are also many scientific societies which create their theories and schools and which study the same phenomena thus forming their own systems of these phenomena denomination. This in its turn does not unite views on synonymy and duplication in terminology. There will always be scholars who will give their significant arguments for identification of mentioned phenomena (because it is true from the conceptual point of view) and there will also be opposite opinions and arguments which will reflect just lexicological point of view on the problem.

Concerning special lexicon of ancient times everybody who researched synonymy, duplication and variety in terminological lexemes of that time admits that these phenomena were very wide spread and despite being difficult for comprehension are definitely positive [1, p. 27; 13, p. 47; 20, p. 75; 8, p. 56; 19, p. 249 and others]. The positive role of synonymous rows from the historical point of view according to scholars concerns the fact that lexemes which belong to these rows are firstly the fund to choose the most adequate denominations for this or that notion in the future [8, p. 56; 11, p. 237], and, secondly, help to differentiate notions [13, p. 47].

It should be mentioned that the term *duplication* prevails in the historical terminological studies. A. Kryzhanivska stresses that ancient synonyms are the result of vocabulary surplus and they are duplicates and not synonyms in the very understanding of the word [7, p. 17]. Diachronic prospective reveals to the scholars some regularities of functioning of synonyms-duplicates and also variants in the mass of terminological lexicon which is very often unnoticed under synchronic examination. N. Romanova, in particular, stresses: “notions which appeared earlier have the biggest number of duplications in diachrony” [13, p. 47], and G. Snetova admits: “Duplication is one of the moments in the development of synonymous or variety pair, it is a state of identification of all meanings of members of variety and synonymous rows of any language units” [15, p. 45]. One more valuable observation belongs to the latter and it explains the appearance of a great quantity of duplication and variety denominations in ancient special lexicon: together with willingness of that-time-book-lovers to find the exact word to denominate a certain notion (that is told about by many scholars and what can in our opinion be characterized as a conscious extra linguistic factor) the researcher also sees the reason for this phenomenon in “interaction of different lexical semantic layers in the choice of necessary nominative unit for the needs of new terminology” [15, p. 44] (which is for certain an elemental inner language factor).

We are strongly convinced that conceptual approach should prevail over the lexicological approach in the historical studies of the terminological lexicon. This is based on not full division of styles in the Middle Ages and interference of different lexical semantic layers into the process of terminological lexemes formation. Thus, one can admit that any word became of terminological character only on the grounds that it could render scientific notion in the texts. Two or more quite different or with common stem words defining the same notion may be called doublets as well as synonyms because from historical terminological point of view they are

almost identical phenomena and when going too deep into the lexicological nuances in this case the researcher risks to lose terminological problem and face with the lack of information about small semantic tints taking into consideration the age of the researched object and lack of evidence about functioning of this or that word in all texts of that time (but inaccessible now) leave alone oral functioning of the lexeme which is not known to us at all.

The object of the suggested research is synonymy in Ukrainian linguistic terminological lexicon of the Middle Ages and the subject is synonymous rows of names of scientific notion in linguistics found in the monuments of Ukrainian language of XVI – XVII centuries.

Synonymy is represented in six out of eight thematic subgroups of linguistic lexicon (synonymous rows are not represented in the subgroups of names of notions of morphemes and word formation may be because these branches were not worked out at that time). Quantitative and percentage relation between the general number of notions of every linguistic branch that were worked out at the mentioned period and notions which needed two or more names to be defined is the following:

№	Linguistic branch	Notions/total	Notions with doublet names	Percentage relation of notions with doublet names to general number of branch notions
1.	General linguistic notions	48	19	39,6%
2.	Phonetic notions	34	9	26,5%
3.	Graphic and orthographic notions	54	16	30%
4.	Lexicological and lexicographical notions	30	17	56,7%
5.	Morphological notions	121	47	38%
6.	Syntactical notions	13	2	15,4%

The volume of synonymous rows is from two components to eleven components.

Two component rows which are the most numerous (55 pairs) contained either genetically identical or different nominative units:

1. Pairs of two Ukrainian names (under Ukrainian names we understand those names that appeared in Ukrainian language although they may include Ukrainian as well as foreign by origin components) appeared for various reasons:

a) spontaneously:

– because of presence in the language of some models for formation of word with certain semantics; consequently different forming parts were added to the same stems: *московски* – *по московску* “in Russian language”; *чернописанный* – *чернопишемый* “written in black ink (contrary to parts of text written in red ink)”;

– due to adding of the same (doublet) forming parts to different (but synonymic) stems: *устный* – *словный* “oral”; *по арапски* – *по сараценску* “in Arabic language”; *по грецку* – *по эллинску* “in Greek language”;

– due to reduction of composites and terminological combinations: *скоропись* – *скорость* “cursive hand”; *латинский языкъ* – *латина* “Latin language”;

– due to combination of the same determinates with synonymous attributives, synonymous determinates with the same attributives or synonymous determinates with synonymous attributives: *писмена грецкие* – *писмена елинские* “Greek alphabet”; *полский языкъ* – *полский діалектъ* “Polish language”; *грецкий языкъ* – *еллинский діалектъ* “Greek language”;

b) as a result of conscious terminologically creative activity of various grammarians aimed at searching of the most adequate names for certain notions and unification of nominative paradigms for better systemization of special lexicon: *исполнителнагѡ знаменованіа союзи* – *подчинителнагѡ знаменованіа союзи* “conjunctions of purpose”; *подобоначертателное разсужденіе* – *правилное оуравненіе прилагательныхъ именъ* “forms of degrees of comparison created on the basis of regular model”; *стропотное разсужденіе* – *неправилное оуравненіе прилагательныхъ именъ* “suppletive forms of degrees of comparison”.

## 2. Pairs formed of Ukrainian and borrowed names:

a) appeared spontaneously due to parallel development of scientific linguistic meanings in the semantics of general borrowed and specific words-synonyms: *точка* – *пунктъ* (Lat.) “full stop”; *черта* – *криска* (Pol.) “dash (punctuation mark for the smallest without breath pause between the words)”;

б) were formed consciously:

– by searching of native language equivalent name to the borrowed name in works of various authors: *часть слова* (Serb.) – *видъ слова* “part of speech”;

– by searching of equivalent to the borrowed name in the work of one author (then native language word is a inner row gloss in comparison with borrowed word): *етимонъ* – *выводъ* “origin (etymological or word-formative) of the word”.

3. Pairs of Ukrainian and calqued names represent the results of conscious terminological activity with the earlier fixation of calque as a proof to which Ukrainian equivalent is offered: *первообразныа мѣстоимена* – *оуказательныа мѣстоименіа* “personal and personal demonstrative pronouns”; *вопросителное мѣстоименіе* – *вопросителное има* “interrogative pronoun”; *итмѣнный падежь* – *косвеный падежь* “indirect case”.

4. Pairs of borrowed and calqued names show the desire of linguists of that time make the scientific name understandable to everybody and these pairs mostly serve as inner row glosses in the texts (although this is not always): *злогъ* (Serb.) – *родъ* “mood of the verb”; *мимошедшее времѣ* (III) (Serb.) – *пресъвершенное времѣ* “Past Perfect Tense”; *дифѡнги* (Gr.) – *двогласныа писмена* “dyphthongs”; *вариа* (Gr.) – *тажка* “heavy (dull) or lowering stress”; *орѡграфіа* (Gr.) – *правописаніе* “orthography”; *синонима* (Gr.) – *сполименныи* “synonyms”; *пролиѡис* (Gr.) – *предвзѣтіе* “context incomplete sentence”; *хирокграфъ* (Gr.) – *рукописаніе* “manuscript”.

## 5. Pairs of two calqued names as a result of activity of various scholars. They appeared for two reasons:

a) selection of more accurate equivalent to non-exact calqued before:

– the same foreign term is taken as an example: *иущественное имѣ* (нес.) – *существителное имѣ* (ест.) “noun”; *нарицаемое имѣ* (нес.) – *нарицателное имѣ* (т.) “common noun”; *мѣстоимѣ* (нес.) – *мѣстоименіе* (ес.) “pronoun”; *нарѣчіа мѣста* (нес.) – *нарѣчіа мѣстна* (ес.) “adverbs of place” etc.;

– terms from different languages are taken as an example: *налагаемое имѧ* (нес.) – *прилагателное имѧ* (т.) “adjective”; *зиждителное имѧ* (нес.) – *притѧжателное имѧ* (ес.) “possessive adjective” etc.;

b) selection of equivalent terms from two different languages as a model for two exact calqued: *возвратителное мѧстоименіе* (Lat.) – *сложное мѧстоимѧ* (Gr.) “reflexive pronoun”; *виновный падежь* (Serb.) – *винителный падежь* (Gr.) “accusative case”; *средній родъ* (Lat.) – *средній залогъ* (Gr.) “zero state (except verbs not used without postfix -ся)” etc.;

c) usage of synonymous components for translation of the same foreign term-example: *оуказателныѧ нарѧчіѧ* – *нарѧчіѧ оуказаніѧ* “demonstrative particles”; *гласнаѧ писмена* – *гласныѧ литеры* “vowels”; *родъный падежь* – *родителный падежь* “genitive case” etc.

6. Pair of borrowed names: *писто* – *лѧтера* “a letter” the only one in the mass of linguistic terminological lexicon of the XVI – XVII centuries. It appeared spontaneously may be due to the fact that one of the doublets borrowed long ago from ancient Slavonic was referred to as a specific poly semantic word whereas fresh then Latinism was of term meaning.

Three component synonymous rows as two components ones have genetically identical and different lexemes and terminological combinations:

1. Rows of three Ukrainian names in their majority mostly appeared spontaneously due to:

a) usage of several word-formation models for creation of words with identical semantics when synonymous affixes were added to the same stem: *рукописанный* – *рукописателный* – *рукописный* “written in hand”;

b) adding of synonymous affixes to the same and synonymous stems: *руски* – *по руски* – *по просту* “in Ukrainian language”; *по латыне* – *латински* – *авсонски* “in Latin language” etc.;

c) development of the identical scientific meanings in poly semantic generally used words-synonyms (related and non-related): *знаменованіе* – *значеніе* – *толкъ* “meaning”; *мовене* – *бесѧда* – *мова* “speech”;

d) forming of terminological combinations with identical or synonymous definite ones and identical or synonymous attributives: *литеры русские* – *писто русское* – *характеръ русский* “Ukrainian alphabet”; *звѧзное слово* – *сложное слово* – *складаное слово* “word with abstract meaning” (the only row where spontaneously appeared names and results of author’s terminological activity are combined) etc.;

e) using two structurally different names of the one notion: *писало* – *писанье руки* – *способ писанѧ* “handwriting”.

2. Rows of borrowed calqued and specific names appeared as a result of conscious terminological creative activity of Ukrainian grammarians; the borrowings are recorded earlier and are the most frequent whereas calqued and specific element represent inner row gloss within foreign name: *етимологіѧ* (гр.) – *истиньнословіе* (Gr.) – *осмочастіе* “morphology”; *мимошедшее времѧ* (I) – (Serb.) – *протѧженное времѧ* (Gr.) – *преходѧщее времѧ* “imperfect”; *грамматикъ* (Gr.) – *грамотикий* (semi calqued from Greek) – *писменникъ* “linguist”.

3. Rows of three calqued names as a result of authors’ terminological activity appeared due to the following facts:

a) scholars chose term from different languages as a model: *изложеніе* (Serb.) – *наклоненіе* (Gr.) – *образъ* (Lat.) “way”; *дѧтелный залогъ* (Gr.) – *дѧственѧый родъ* (Serb.) – *дѧствителный залогъ* (з гр.) “active voice” etc.;

b) the only and the same foreign term served as a model and identical attributives were added to synonymous hyperonyms: *изъяснителное наклоненіе* – *изяснителный образъ* – *изяснителное изложеніе* “indicative mood”; *повелителное наклоненіе* – *повелителный образъ* – *повелителное изложеніе* “imperative mood”;

c) one foreign term-model was translated by synonymous components and the attributives were with common stem: *имѧ* – *разъсудный степень* – *разсудителный степень* “the comparative degree of comparison of adjectives”; *превосходное имѧ* – *превышший степень* – *превосходителный степень* “the superlative degree of comparison of adjectives”.

4. Rows of two calqued and one specific names appeared because authors tried to improve the names offered in the works of precursors. First appeared non-exact calqued names, then appeared exact calqued names and only after appeared final Ukrainian nominative units: *нарѣчіѧ отрицаніѧ* (нес) – *отрицателнаѧ нарѣчіѧ* (ес) – *нарѣчіѧ прещеніѧ* “negative particles”; *шложный родъ* (нес) – *шложителный залогъ* (ес) – *посредственнй залогъ* “reflexive state”.

5. Rows of one calqued and two specific names as a result of searching (not always successful) the most adequate native correspondent: *оуказателное мѣстоимѧ* – *возносителное мѣстоименіе* – *отвѣщателное имѧ* “demonstrative pronoun”; *сопрѧженнаѧ союзи* – *раздѣляющіѧ съюзи* – *раздѣлителнаѧ знаменованіѧ союзи* “disjunctive conjunction”.

6. Rows of two Ukrainian and one borrowed words are not numerous. One seems to have appeared spontaneously due to reduction of two-word terminological combination with the help of morphological syntactic transformation and then with the help of borrowed Polish noun: *словенский языкъ* – *словенское* – *словеницзна* “old Slavonic language”. The second row is the following: *слогъ* – *складъ* – *силлаба* “composition” and it shows the process of gradual terminization of two generally used words. One of them lost all its sememes except scientific one during its functioning since Kyivska Rus and other being poly semantic developed scientific linguistic meaning in the XVI century. The third member of the row was of Greek origin and was borrowed later as a terminological lexeme. Derivation potential of the word may have played some role in its appearance because very soon derivative adjective *силлабный* from *силлаба* is found in the documents.

7. Row of one borrowed and two calqued names contains one name borrowed from Serbian language whereas two other are calqued from Latin and Greek consequently: *необавное изложеніе* – *непредѣльный образъ* – *неопредѣленное наклоненіе* “the infinitive of the verb”.

8. Row of three borrowed names: *литеры* – *писмена* – *скрипть* appeared mostly because of the efforts to divide the usual plural form of nouns *литера* and *писмо* in the meaning “letter” and omonymous plral forms of nouns *литеры* and *писмена* in the meaning “writing”, and as a result Latin mono semantic term was borrowed.

Four component rows are not so numerous as two or three component ones. They also appeared:

1. Spontaneously:

a) due to some advantageous when borrowing from certain foreign languages within this or that period of development of the language-recipient: *азбука* (old Slav.) – *алфаветъ* (Gr.) – *боуква* (Germ.) – *абцадло* (Pol.) “alphabet”;

b) due semantic syncretism of some specific and borrowed names which developed scientific meanings on the basis of generally used: *имѧ* – *назвиско* (Pol.) – *прозвиско* – *титულъ* (Lat.) “person’s proper name”;

c) due to combination of identical and synonymous definite with related attributive adjectives: *болишаѧ литера* – *великое писмо* – *вѣщшее писмаѧ* “capital letter”;

## 2. Consciously:

a) due to creation of calqued equivalents to borrowed names in the works of different authors: *просодія* (Gr.) *припѣваніє* – *припѣло* – *припѣтіє* “prosody, accent logy”; *молитвенное изложеніє* (Serb.) – *молитвенный образъ* – *молителное наклоненіє* “desire mood”;

b) due to the searchings of native language equivalents to exactly and non-exactly calqued terminological combinations: *нарѣчіє* *ослабленіє* (nec from Gr.) – *нарѣчіє* *разсужденіє* (nec from Gr.) – *нарѣчіє* *количества* (с from Gr.) – *нарѣчіє* *напрѣженіє* “adverbs of quantity”; *втглагольныє союзи* (nec from Gr.) – *вопросныє сѣюзи* (ec from Gr.) – *недоумѣтелнагѡ знаменоваїє союзи* – *нарѣчіє* *недоумѣніє* “interrogative particles”.

Five component rows are mostly the result of spontaneous intra lingual processes when:

a) identical scientific meanings appeared in the semantics of several words-synonyms from generally used language (Ukrainian and foreign genetically): *значити* – *значитисє* – *називатисє* – *описатисє* – *сказоватисє* “have meaning”; *выкладати* – *изъяснати* – *объяснати* – *сказовати* – *толковати* “interpret”;

b) identical (synonymous) attributives were added to synonymous (identical) hyperonyms: *прирожденый языкъ* – *прирожденый діалектъ* – *прирожденая мова* – *втчистый языкъ* – *втческой діалектъ* “native language”.

The only exception is the row which appeared as a result of terminological activity of Ukrainian grammarians and which contains both calqued and created nominative units: *винословныє союзи* (ec from Gr.) – *винословнагѡ знаменованіє союзи* – *пресокупителныє союзи* (e from Gr.) – *наносителнагѡ знаменованіє союзи* – *виновныє сѣюзи* “conjunctions of reason”.

Six component rows mostly appeared as a result of inner linguistic factors activity: *языкъ* – *діалектъ* – *вымова* – *мова* – *гласъ* – *слово* “language”; *зватисє* – *именоватисє* – *називатисє* – *наречисє* – *титуватисє* – *прозиватисє* “have name; be named”; *апелляціє* – *именоване* – *називанье* – *название* – *нареченіє* – *нарицаніє* “naming”. Only two rows are the example of mutual interlacing of spontaneous and conscious factors of terminological formation: *буква* – *литера* – *письмо* – *писмевцо* – *писменце* – *характеръ* “a letter”; *лексисъ* – *лексіконъ* – *дикціонарь* – *леѣик* – *реченникъ* – *рѣчникъ* “a dictionary”.

Two seven component rows appeared spontaneously due to the development of scientific meanings in the semantics of generally used words-synonyms: *глаголь* – *мовленье* – *реченіє* – *рѣчь* – *слово* – *словко* – *словце* “a word”; *имє* – *назвико* – *назвище* – *прозвико* – *прозвище* – *промѣнокъ* – *порекло* “a surname”.

Eight component rows are the result of:

a) intra linguistic factors (terminization of certain meanings of poly semantic words): *имє* – *назване* – *назвико* – *назвище* – *прозвико* – *прозвище* – *титулъ* – *титуловане* “name”;

b) extra linguistic factors ( adverbs of manner were subdivided into some smaller groups without unified names by grammarians of that time): *нарѣчіє* *избраніє* – *нарѣчіє* *втдѣленіє* – *нарѣчіє* *разнства* – *нарѣчіє* *сѣбраніє* – *нарѣчіє* *оуподобленіє* – *нарѣчіє* *оускореніє* – *нарѣчіє* *чина* – *нарѣчіє* *числа*.

One nine component row: *граматика* – *грамматичка* – *писменница* – *наука граматичная* – *грамотичное учение* – *граматичное художество* – *чинокъ граматичный* – *грамматическое художество* – *грамматическая наука* “linguistics” – appeared due to conscious author’s term formation caused firstly by desire to create a native language equivalent to the borrowed name and secondly by desire to avoid unwanted polysemy of Greek word *граматика*, which in the language of the XVI–XVII centuries meant.: 1) “linguistics”; 2) “a textbook o study a certain language”.

The appearance of a ten component row was caused by spontaneous inner language factors: *апелувати – звати – именовати – називати – найменовати – нарицати – прозивати – проименовати – речи – титуловати* “to name”. the same situation is with an eleven component row: *невчтивое слово – непотребное слово – корчемное слово – непристойное слово – гнилое слово – сромотное слово – фуклиное слово – шкарадае слово – нѣкчемна мова – шкарада мова – шпетна мова* “vulgarism”. In the first case the mentioned specialization of the sememes of generally used words-synonyms played its role whereas in the second case a tendency to euphemization of names of language phenomena played its role being not very decent from the point of usage.

The analysis of opinions of scientists concerning synonymy and its realization in the terminological lexicon and reasons for its appearance as well as character of realization of this semantic universality in the special lexicon of Ukrainian language of the XVI–XVII centuries proved that:

1. The phenomenon of synonymy does not have unique approach in the scientific circles nowadays and there are discussions about semantics of the words *synonyms* and *doublets*.

2. The data of the historical terminological linguistics prove that there is no use in distinguishing notions “synonyms” and “doublets” taking into consideration the specificity of scientific language existing in the language of old times and because it is impossible to renew now all semantic nuances of words used long ago.

3. Synonymy being for sure a positive fact in ancient terminology was widely spread (among 300 linguistic notions used by the scholars of that time 110 have doublet names).

4. The appearance of synonymous rows ( from two to eleven components) in the researched thematic group of special lexicon was caused by the following reasons:

a) spontaneous intra linguistic factors:

- parallel development of terminological meanings in the semantics of several generally used words-synonyms;

- the formation of terminological combinations by adding synonymous (identical) attributives to identical (synonymous) hyperonyms;

- advantages when borrowing given by a language-recipient to different languages in different times;

- existence of several models needed for formation of words with certain semantics and as a result different formation particles were added to identical stems;

- adding identical (doublet) formation particles to non related synonymous stems;

- reduction of composites and terminological combinations;

- tendency of language to euphemise the names of some negative phenomena from the social linguistic point of view;

b) conscious extra linguistic factors:

- search for the most adequate names for certain notions and willingness to unify nomination paradigms for better systemization of terminological lexicon;

- willingness to make a foreign name understandable for everybody through calquing ( having exactly and non exactly calqued; and sometimes the terms from different languages were taken as an example) or creating native language equivalent to the borrowed one.



## List of abbreviations

Germ. – Germanic  
Gr. – Greek  
Lat. – Latin  
nec. – non exactly calqued  
Pol. – Polish  
Serb. – Serbian  
Old Slav. – old Slavonic  
ec. – exactly calqued

1. Даниленко В. Лексика языка науки: терминология : автореф. дисс. на соискание уч. звания д-ра филол. наук / Валерия Даниленко. – М., 1977. – 44 с. 2. Квитко И. Терминоведческие проблемы редактирования / И. Квитко., В. Лейчик, Г. Кабанцев. – Львов : Изд-во при Львов. гос. ун-те Вища шк., 1986. – 150 с. 3. Кияк Т. Лингвистические аспекты терминоведения / Тарас Кияк. – К., 1989. – 104 с. 4. Коваль А. Науковий стиль сучасної української літературної мови. Структура наукового тексту / Алла Коваль. – К. : Наук. думка, 1970. – 308 с. 5. Косов А. Некоторые различия системной организации терминологии по сравнению с организацией общей лексики / А. Косов // Термин и слово. – Горький : Изд-во ГГУ им. Н. И. Лобачевского, 1980. – С. 13–22. 6. Краснопольська Н. Синонімія у термінології менеджменту / Н. Краснопольська // Українська термінологія і сучасність : зб. наук. праць. – 2005. – Вип. VI. – С. 111–114. 7. Крыжановская А. Сопоставительное исследование терминологии современного русского и украинского языков / Анна Крыжановская. – К. : Наук. думка, 1985. – 204 с. 8. Малевич Л. Особливості української термінології донаукового періоду / Леся Малевич // Мовознавство. – 1999. – № 4–5. – С. 51–58. 9. Налепин В. Термин и терминсистема как предмет лексикологии : автореф. дисс. на соискание уч. звания канд. филол. наук / В. Налепин. – М., 1975. – 16 с. 10. Панько Т., Українське термінознавство / Таміла Панько, Ірина Кочан, Галина Мацюк. – Л. : Світ, 1994. – 216 с. 11. Процик І. Розвиток української фізичної термінології в 20-их роках ХХ століття (на матеріалі словника з механіки Тадея Секунди) / Ірина Процик // Вісник Львівського університету. Серія філологічна. – 2000. – Вип. 29. – С. 236–242. 12. Реформатский А. Мысли о терминологии / Александр Реформатский // Современные проблемы русской терминологии. – М., 1986. – С. 164–198. 13. Романова Н. Язык науки как результат и источник познания / Н. Романова // Методологические и философские проблемы языкознания и литературоведения. – Новосибирск, 1984. – С. 42–56. 14. Романова Н. Лингвистическая терминология в системе и развитии / Н. Романова, М. Черемисина. – Новосибирск: НГУ, 1987. – 91 с. 15. Снетова Г. Русская историческая терминология / Галина Снетова. – Калинин: Изд-во КГУ, 1984. – 86 с. 16. Соколовська Т. Синонімія та антонімія як базові парадигматичні класи в українській термінсистемі з генетики / Тетяна Соколовська // Українська термінологія і сучасність : зб. наук. праць. – 1998. – С. 171–174. 17. Суперанская А. Общая терминология. Вопросы теории / А. Суперанская, Н. Подольская, Н. Васильева. – М. : Наука, 1989. – 248 с. 18. Тур О. Явище синонімії в українській термінології землеустрою та кадастру / О. Тур // Українська термінологія і сучасність : зб. наук. праць. – 2005. – Вип. VI. – С. 221–224. 19. Яремко Я. Розвиток синонімічних рядів в українській військовій термінології козацької доби / Ярослав Яремко // Українська термінологія і сучасність : зб. наук. праць. Вип. VI. – 2005. – С. 249–253. 20. Gajda S. Wprowadzenie do teorii terminu / Stanislaw Gajda. – Opole: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna im. Powstańców Śląskich. 1990. – 146 s. 21. Guilbert L. La créativité lexicale. – Paris: Larousse, 1975. – 182 p. 22. Rondeau G. Introduction à la terminologie / Gui Rondeau. – Chicoutimi: Gaëtan Morin éditeur, 1984. – 238 p.