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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 asserts, 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.
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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. Reformatskyy, 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. Kryzhansivska 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:

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

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”; чернописаный – 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 – словеный “oral”; по арапски – по сараценску “in Arabic language”; по греку – по эллинску “in Greek language”;  


– due to combination of the same determinates with synonymous attributives, synonymous determinates with the same attributives or synonymous determinates with synonymous attributives: писмена гречкие – писмена елинские “Greek alphabet”; полский языкъ – полский діалектъ “Polish language”; грекий языкъ – еллінский 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: исполнителнаг знаменованї соузи – подчинителнаг знаменованї соузи “conjunctions of purpose”; подобоначертателное разсужденїе – правильное уравненїе прилагателныхъ имень “forms of degrees of comparison created on the basis of regular model”; стропотное разсужденїе – неправильно уравненїе прилагателныхъ имень “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 – кріска (Pol.) “dash (punctuation mark for the smallest without breath pause between the words)”;

b) 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: первообразны мѣстоименї – оуказательны мѣстоименї “personal and personal demonstrative pronouns”; вопросительное мѣстоименїе – вопросительное имен “interrogative pronoun”; именныи падежъ – косвеный падежъ “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): залогъ (Serb.) – родъ “mood of the verb”; мимошедшее врема (III) (Serb.) – прествервениное врема “Past Perfect Tense”; дифонги (Gr.) – двогласны писмена “dyphtongs”; вариа (Gr.) – таха “heavy (dull) or lowering stress”; орографія (Gr.) – правописанїе “orthography; синоптія (Gr.) – сопоставленины “synonyms”; проліфіс (Gr.) – предвзатїе “context incomplete sentence”; хирограф (Gr.) – рукописанїе “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: неущественное имъ (неч.) – существителное имъ (ест.) “noun”; нарицаемое имъ (неч.) – нарицательное имъ (т.) “common noun”; мѣстоименї (неч.) – мѣстоименїе (ес.) “pronoun”; нарвмикъ мѣста (неч.) – нарвмикъ мѣстна (ес.) “adverbs of place” etc.;
– terms from different languages are taken as an example: налагаемое им (nec.) – прилагательное им (т.) “adjective”; зиждителное им (nec.) – прилагательное им (ec.) “possessive adjective” etc.;

b) selection of equivalent terms from two different languages as a model for two exact calqued: возвратительное мѣстоименіе (Lat.) – сложное мѣстоим. (Gr.) “reflexive pronoun”; виновный падежъ (Serb.) – винительный падежъ (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: указательны нар – нар – оуказанї “demonstrative particles”; гласна писмена – гласны литеры “vowels”; родъный падежъ – родительный падежъ “genitive case” etc.

6. Pair of borrowed names: писмо – лїтера “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: рукописаный – 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 – авсопски “in Latin language” etc.;
   c) development of the identical scientific meanings in poly semantic generally used words-synonyms (related and non-related): знаменованіе – значение – толкъ “meaning”; мовене – бесъда – мова “speech”;
   d) forming of terminological combinations with identical or synonymous definite ones and identical or synonymous attributives: литеры русские – писмо русское – характеръ русский “Ukrainian alphabet”; звзное 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 писаніа “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: етимологія (гр.) – истиннословіе (Gr.) – основчате “morphology”; мимошедшее время (I) – (Serb.) – протеженное время (Gr.) – преходящее время “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”; дієслівный залогъ (Gr.) – дієствительный родъ (Serb.) – дієствительный залогъ “active voice” etc.;
b) the only and the same foreign term served as a model and identical attributives were added to synonymous hyperonyms: изъвителное наклоненїе – изъвителный образъ – изъвителное изложенїе “indicative mood”; повелительное наклоненїе – повелительный образъ – повелительное изложенїе “imperative mood”;

c) one foreign term-model was translated by synonymous components and the attributives were with common stem: им – разъсудный степень – разсудителный степень “the comparative degree of comparison of adjectives”; превосходное им – превышъшїй 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: нарфкїя имприциїа (нєс) – имприциїа нарфкїя (єс) – нарфкїя преценїа “negative particles”; имложный родъ (нєс) – имложительный залогъ (єс) – посредственнїй 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 мїстоимъ – возносительное мїстоименїе – отвїцателное имъ “demonstrative pronoun”; сопрженын союзъ – раздллющї союзъ – раздлителнаг знаменованї соузи “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 – словенцизына “old Slavonic language”. The second row is the following: слогъ – складъ – свллбаба “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 свллбабныъ from свллбаба 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 изложенїе – непредѣлный образъ – неопределённое наклоненїе “the infinitive of the verb”.

8. Row of three borrowed names: литеры – писмена – скриптъ appeared mostly because of the efforts to divide the usual plural form of nouns литера and писмо in the meaning “letter” and omonimous plural 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.) – алфабетъ (Gr.) – боуква (Germ.) – абецадло (Pol.) “alphabet”;
   b) due semantic syncretism of some specific and borrowed names which developed scientific meanings on the basis of generally used: имъ – назвиско (Pol.) – прозвиско – титулъ (Lat.) “person’s proper name”;
   c) due to combination of identical and synonymous definite with related attributive adjectives: больша литера – великое писмо – вящшее писма “capital letter”;
2. Consciously:

   a) due to creation of calqued equivalents to borrowed names in the works of different authors: просовто (Gr.) припяване – припъво – прияв “prosody, accent logy”; молитвенно изложение (Serb.) – молитвенный образ – молитвенное изложение “desire mood”;

   b) due to the searchings of native language equivalents to exactly and non-exactly calqued terminological combinations: наръже ослабление ( nec from Gr.) – наръжение разсуждение ( nec from Gr.) – наръжение количества ( c from Gr.) – наръжение напрежение “adverbs of quantity”; упълногласна союз ( nec from Gr.) – вопросная сюз ( ec from Gr.) – недоуме поленаг знаменова союз – наръжение недоуме “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 – значитись – називатись – описатись – сказоватись “have meaning”; выплакати – изъяснят – объяснит – сказовати – полковати “interpret”;

   b) identical (synonymous) attributives were added to synonymous (identical) hyperonyms: прироженный языкъ – прироженный диалектъ – прироженное мова – итмчистий языкъ – итмческий диалектъ “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: винословны союз (ec from Gr.) – винословна знаменова союз – пресовокупительная союз ( e from Gr.) – наносителная знаменова союз – виновная сюз “conjunctions of reason”.


Eight component rows are the result of:


   b) extra linguistic factors ( adverbs of manner were subdivided into some smaller groups without unified names by grammarians of that time): наръже изборане – наръжение иподієнене – наръжение разнистя – наръжение собрание – наръжение оуподоблене – наръжение оускорение – наръжение чина – наръжение числа.

One nine component row: граматика – граматичка – писменница – наука граматична – грамотичное учение – грамматическое художество – чинох граматичны – 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: апелевати – звати – іменовати – називати – наименовати – наніцати – прозивати – проименовати – речи – титуловати “to name”. The same situation is with an eleven component row: невчтиве слово – непотребне слово – корчене слово – непристойне слово – гніле слово – срамотне слово – фукливе слово – шкарадне слово – шкемба мова – шкембада мова – шкемба 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