

Features of Word-Formative Phenomena Manifested in the Albanian and Russian Legal Terminology

SHEHU Eda

Faculty of Foreign Languages, University of Tirana, Albania

Department of Slavic and Balkans Languages

Russian language branch

E-mail: edashehu_2006@yahoo.com

Received 11.07.2014; Accepted 27.09. 2014

Abstract:

The phenomena of polysemy and homonymy in terminology, which emerge as a link between shades of meaning of words and concepts constitute models which are almost the same in both Albanian and Greek languages. They also express the same mechanism for the generation of terms based on common words. Cases of deviation from same models that guide the work that needs to be done, to break the polysemy or homonymous structures of the term, when it is loaded with concepts, introducing another unit (as newly created or found in the language).

Keywords: *polisemy, homonymy, law terminology, semantic features*

The grammatical and lexical phenomena of the Albanian and Russian legal terminology manifested in every written text, or encountered in the oral communication at this field, in comparison to the phenomena of the general language, are characterised by specific features which are observed not only in this style, but also in the overall

specialized discourse (language) (of every area of knowledge). These features are connected with terms as well as non-terms, i.e. the non-terminological lexis.

As it has been rightly acknowledged, the grammatical phenomena in the specialized discourse, and in any area of knowledge where they appear,

create a restricted circle of units and, within the Albanian standard language, they constitute as a whole a sort of “*micro-grammar*” (Duro, 1986). From this aspect, it may be expedient to assert that they could equalise as phenomena,

such as the verb in the relevant person and number, the noun in various cases etc., but they appear

in limited forms and with a high frequency of use: the manifestation of a part of grammatical phenomena tends to be limited. Such phenomena become always relevant in the specialized discourse, or else the scientific-technical style as it has been called to date in the works of the terminologists (Leka, 1983). We will adopt here the terminological viewpoint by including all styles that contain terms (which express scientific-technical concepts) within the specialized discourse (Leka, 1983).

However, when analysing the grammatical phenomena occurring in the legal discourse, for example, one takes into account both terms and the ordinary words. From this viewpoint, both lexis in the specialized discourse are

characterized by the same features, at the morphological (parts of speech), the word-formative and syntactical level. Of course, such levels as the phonetic-phonological, morphological and others are excluded here, as no distinctions can be detected in the relevant linguistic units (as e.g.: sound, phonemes, morphemes, etc.).

-The prevalence of logical aspects, the scientific treatment of the phenomena of knowledge, makes univocal not only the terms, but to a certain extent the ordinary words as well. As such, polysemantic words like in Alb.: *jam, kam* (*është, ka*); *bëj, kaloj*) in Rus.: *являться, иметь, делать* *приходить* (*to be, to have (is, has); do; pass*) occur mainly in a single meaning or in one of the main meanings in accordance with the text’s scientific and technical content.

The lack of proper stylistic-emotional and figurative evaluations restricts the use of verb moods (the indicative and the subjunctive mood are mainly used), while the optative and admiring mood, etc. are almost completely avoided.

It should be underlined, however, that in both languages what can be observed are mostly quantitative features and those related to the degree of manifestation of the grammatical phenomena starting at the word-formation level, especially on the limited number of prefixes and suffixes involved in the formation of units of the terminological field. The reference here is made to the terms, since other nonterm units are readily retrieved as derivative units from the general language, such is the case of nonterm units, *realizim, zbatim, ndarje* (*осуществление, применение, деление*) (*accomplishment, application, separation*) formed by the suffix – *im* in Albanian and *-ение* in Russian.

As to the aspect of the word-formation of terms, it should be pointed out that only a limited number of affixes are active in both languages. Broadly speaking, this can be justified by the fact that there are a fairly large number of affixes, carrying proper stylistic, evaluative, emotional and figurative connotations, which form lexical units that cannot retain such connotations as nouns. Likewise, a series of affixes are not active in the formation of

terms, but in contrast they are productive in the other styles, especially in the literary style. Our research findings show that approximately 25-30 suffixes (both from the own language stock and foreign origin) as well as 25-30 prefixes are generally active and productive in term-formation, like e.g. *-ение(-ание), -к(а), -ени, -ани*, in Rus. *-im, -je, -or* in Alb. A simple comparison indicates that from approximately 160-200 suffixes observed in Albanian (Xhuvani, 1980) and Russian (Виноградов, 1972) roughly 30 of them are active in the term formation, whereas from 100 prefixes roughly 25 are active in the terminological field in question as much as they are active in the other terminological fields. We will delve deeper on this issue, in both languages, further on. As regards the degree of involvement and productivity of word-formative devices in the term formation encountered within the field, it can be pointed out that these are higher in those texts specialized just at the technical level, since the closer one approaches the subject matter, the more specific the object of study becomes, hence the increase in the number of concepts denoted by the relevant terms.

The present analysis of the features of the word-formative devices is based on a corpus of texts taken from the relevant style. In general, they are examined by investigating the findings as well as the causes of the relevant phenomena. In this case, the analysis is conducted based both on the structural aspect of the units present on the 40-page (“Конституционное право РФ”) textual corpus (where the cases of use 1 in every 10 page are examined adopting the analytical method), and on their functional aspect as well.

Below, we delve in more detail on the features manifested in the word-formation, by providing examples from the corpus, as well as statistical data which make these features more salient.

1. The findings show that, as far as the units formed through different word-formative ways and devices are concerned, in almost none of the cases there are such word-formative devices as prefixes or suffixes, expressing striking stylistic, emotional, diminutive, pejorative or other connotations. This is explained by the presence in this terminological field of units devoid of such connotations. Both

the Albanian and Russian terminology is devoid of such word-formative devices (term-formative) that carry stylistic, figurative connotations like *-aç*, *-acak*, *-uc* (in Albanian) or *-ar*, *-ok*, *-apъ*, *-чак* (in Russian). This means that the primary reason for their non-utilisation relates to the unacceptability in this style of the units formed by means of such word-formative devices.

Additionally, the non-establishment of words (nonterms and terms), which are charged stylistically, emotionally, or figuratively, limits and even avoids the use in this terminological field of other suffixes without such connotations but with the probability to acquire them depending on the speech situation.

2. The sparse use of animate nouns, mainly to denominate the persons performing the action, leads to the usage of only those suffixes within certain units that function as individual lexical units when conjoining with the respective suffixes. These units can be different parts of speech, not just nouns but also adjectives or adjectivised participles. Because suffixes are neither

productive nor active within the compound word, they cannot be defined as distinct word-formative devices, but can be analysed within the units they form. On that account, reference could be made to a number of noun, adjective, or even participle units denominating persons, formed with certain suffixes and belonging to the lexis of the respective style, where equivalents exist across the two languages, as, for example, with the suffixes *-(ë)s*, *-ues*, *-or*, *përfaqësues*, *zgjedhës*, *ligjvënës*, *administrator*, (in Albanian): (*representative*, *elector*, *legislative*, *manager*) and *-тель*, *-ник*, *-ор*: *представитель*, *законодатель*, *администратор* as e.g. with the suffix *-тель*, as a noun: *представитель*, *заявитель*, *избиратель*, *законодатель*; with suffixes *-ник*: *преступник*, with the suffixes *-енн*, *-анн*, as participial adjectives with a noun function: *поверенный* (в делах), *арестованный* *избранный* (cf. *избиратель*) *допрошенный*; adjectives with noun function: *fajtor*, *kompetent* (*виноватый*, *компетентный*) (*culprit*, *competent*).

Some person denominators are also formed by means of foreign

suffixes, as, for example *-ист*, but with a foreign theme. Two kinds of such word-formations can be distinguished:

a) Foreign word + foreign suffix, analysed as such.

b) Foreign word + foreign suffix, identified in juxtaposition with the units, as e.g.:

a) *juri-jurist*, *protokoll-protokollis*, *юри-юрист*, *протокол-протоколист*. (*jury-jurist*, *protocol-filing clerk*).

3. The predominance of verbal adjectives, expressing actions or derivative meanings related to the action, provides for a frequent presence of a very limited number of suffixes, distinguished for a high productivity of unit-formations and a high frequency of use.

Such formations can be divided into two large groups; a part of them being nonterms, but forming part of the bookish lexicon and as such carry semantic properties related to the terminological lexicon, particularly when they enter in collocations with the latter, as, for example: *kryerje* (*krimi*) *совершение* (*преступления*), *shqyrtim* (i

çështjes), *рассмотрение* (дела) [*commitment* (of a crime), *examination* (of a case)], whereas in the other group they appear as themes. These formations can be defined as terms when they express the specific feature of the field, or conjoin in a system with the unit acting as a productive theme, such as: *постановление, свершение* (власти).

A part of them are formed from the verbs which are created intralingually from a foreign theme, as for example: *konstituim -конституирование* (конституировать), *akreditim - акредитирование, (institutionalization, accreditation)*.

It occurs that a particular foreign suffix appears to be productive and active and could be defined as such by the juxtaposition of the units it forms with other units within the word-formative system, behaving as formations with a high word-formative productivity, as, e.g.: *-izëm, -ist* (*-изм, -ист*):

-Adjectival formations from nouns, where in Albanian only a restricted number of suffixes participate in word-formation, as, e.g.; *-or, -tor*, whereas in Russian this number is slightly larger: *-ческ, -ик, -енн, -*

ов: ligjor, shtetëror, pushtetor (Alb.) and *государственный, базовый, выборный, уголовный, гражданский*.

- Adjectival formations from participles, correspond to the articulate participle in Albanian, whereas in Russian dominate the suffixes *-енн, -анн, -ем*, as participle adjectives: *ведущий (-ая речь), определяющий (фактор), данный (закон), определенный (закон)*.

4. The abstract character of the concepts makes necessary the creation of denominations, formed through multiple stages, where as a primary productive theme serves mainly an adjective which denotes a high degree of quality. Accordingly, there are denominations with the suffix *-ость*, especially in Russian, formed from a noun, which in itself is formed by a noun or participle. As such, two groups can be distinguished: a) with adjectival basis derived from a participle: *определенность, обобщенность, защищенность, гарантированность, систематизированность, неизменность*, b) with adjectival basis derived from a noun, as e.g.:

конституционность, общественность, государственность, федеративность. All such formations are characteristic of this style which makes them a distinguishing feature viewed from the aspect of word-formation. It can be claimed, however, that these formations are not exclusively a characteristic of this terminological field, but also of the overall specialized language, and, in particular, they outline the basic feature of the special bookish formations, due to the high abstract notion they convey systematically.

4.1. It could be claimed that, especially in Russian, such composite formations with the suffix *-ость*, as well as with other suffixes, such as *-ство, -ение, -ие*, are regarded as being similar to the above-mentioned formations. What distinguishes such formations is the fact that, semantically, they denote a high degree of abstraction and that they contain noun themes, as e.g.:

многопартийность, законодательство, полномочие, правонарушение.

5. It can be assumed that the above-mentioned formations,

denoting mainly a high degree of abstraction, reflect the synthetic character of Russian, a language with a marked synthesis, equally manifested both within these compound words themselves, and their relationships with the words serving as their word-formative themes within the system. There can be observed, for example, some structural features of these complex units from the aspect of word-formation, as well as their relationships with other relevant words within the system.

The complex character of their form can be detected in their morphemic componential elements, by a direct parsing, as e.g.:

законодательный
(закон+да+тель+н+(ый)),
законодательство:
(закон+да+тель+ство),
систематизированность
(системат+изиров+анн+ость),
самоуправленческий
(само+у+правл+ен+ческ+(ий)).

There are certain cases in Albanian when such formations are calqued from Russian, as e.g.:
законодательство = *ligjvënie* (lawmaking), *законность* = *ligjshmëri*, (lawfulness),
самоуправление = *vetëqeverisje*,

(*self-government*), whereas in most of the cases in Albanian, they occur as individual formations, or periphrastic ones, like: *систематизованность* = *karakter sistemor* (*systemic character*).

Analysing these formations from the viewpoint of word-formative motivation, can help to reveal the richness of micro-systemic relations of the lexicon in question, thus giving evidence to their strict and coherent systemic character, regarding the synthetic character of Russian compared to Albanian, which in the above analysis appears as an analytic-synthetic language.

References

1. Duro A. (1986). Veçoritë e dukurive gramatikore të stilit shkencor-teknik të rusishtes dhe mënyrat e të ushtruarit praktik të tyre në “Studime dhe artikuj rreth teorisë dhe praktikës së mësimdhënies së gjuhëve të huaja”, Tiranë.
2. Leka F.. (1983)., “Udhëzues për përpunimin e terminologjisë tekniko-shkencore”, Tiranë, 1983.
- 3.Рождественский Ю., “Техника, культура, язык”, Москва.

4. Xhuvani A. (1980). “Aleksandër xhuvani”, vepra,1, Tiranë.

5.Виноградов В. (1972). “Русский язык”, Москва.

6.2009, “Конституционное право РФ”, Москва, 1997, “E drejta kushtetuese”, Tiranë.