

CHINESE LEXICON EXPANSION AT THE TURN OF 20TH CENTURY

At the present time, when interaction between two neighboring languages, Chinese and Japanese, which also share a common type of writing system, started to intensify rapidly, and an explosion of interest to researching the processes of lexical borrowing, which by the turn of the 21C have become increasingly active, is observed. The systemic interaction of Japanese and Chinese languages has been rather well studied and described in the Japanese studies, but was relatively rarely considered as a field of scientific knowledge deserving in-depth research in the 20th-century Chinese studies. Nevertheless, in the 21C, at the crest of a new, though not the first, wave of lexical borrowings into Chinese from Japanese, positive shifts outlined in the historical Chinese lexicology as well, which addressed this issue in terms of semasiology and onomasiology.

The situation neglecting the process and the results of borrowing at the turn of the 20C, so dubious for the Chinese linguistics of the previous century, is explained by a number of reasons. In the countries of the Far East, in the so-called region of character-based writing systems, a common system of graphics, based on the original ideographic writing system of China, is functioning. Up to the 19C, the linguistic influence was spreading primarily from China to the East – to Korea and Japan; however, in the Meiji era 明治時代 (1868-1912), the vector has changed, and since the second half of the 19C, Chinese assumed the role of a recipient of new lexical units.

The processes of modernization taking place in that period in Japan have led to a massive replenishment of Japanese with relevant scientific and technical terminology, which was coined and written in characters in accordance with the tradition established in the science of Japan. Such form of new vocabulary fixation facilitated and accelerated the process of further reception of such words by languages of neighboring countries, whereby Chinese vocabulary was replenished with an entire layer of new, formerly absent lexical units borrowed from the West through the Japanese language. The large scale of this process is reflected in the most credible dictionary of loanwords existing in Chinese lexicography "Dictionary of Loanwords in Chinese" (《汉语外来词词典》(1984) [1], which contains 892 lexical units marked as words of Japanese origin.

As applied to Japan, a famous Russian researcher of Japan Eugeny Mayevsky called such cardinal changes in the language vocabulary “the lexical revolution of Meiji” [2, p. 248]. It appears that such status may likewise be assigned to the process of lexicon expansion at the turn of the 20C in other languages of the region of character-based writing systems. Active word-formation activity, which unfolded most massively in Japan at Western literature translation and adoption of Western scientific advances, has led to emergence first in Japanese, then in Chinese and Korean of a great number of neologisms, most of which today already do not refer to highly-specialized terminology, but are considered to be units of the basic vocabulary: 同情'compassion,'背景'background, environment,'能力'ability,'内容'content' and etc.

These units did not refer to the basic vocabulary of that period – a rather scarce layer in general; however, having emerged in the context of the country's modernization, these words constituted an important and integral element of the subsequent period's realia. Over a few decades, a massive growth

of Japanese and then also of the Chinese and Korean languages took place at the expense of lexical units, which are "perceived rather as 'bookish' in style and 'scholarly' in meaning, ... which are known to everyone, although learnt not at home but at school" [2, p. 246].

Thereby, the fixation of new words with characters, which minimized the process of their assimilation, played a dirty trick on them in Chinese science: foreign origin of these lexical units ulteriorly became obscured even for native Chinese speakers. An opinion, that words created from elements of the Chinese language and in accordance with Chinese word-building patterns cannot be deemed loanwords, prevailed in the linguistics of China. According to Wang Li, one of the foremost experts in Chinese language history, "these words are not at all native for Japanese – they are just lexical units adopted from the West. ... Japanese people created new words to express new concepts, which came to Japan from the West, whereas we simply used the already existing Japanese translations so that not to start from scratch" [3, p. 505].

In Japan, the process of European terminology calquing with the use of *kango* under urgent need in nomination of that period is customarily considered as a special type of borrowing, which was called 'substitution,' since the issue was in substitution of the initial semantics of a language unit for a new meaning. At the first stage, the majority of translated words depended on *kango* of the Edo period. Thereupon, the number of new *kango* gradually increased, and a tendency to avoid 'substitutions' emerged. 'Traditional and modified word-building calquing' subsequently took over this function [4, p. 169].

The Chinese linguist classified Japanese loan words as follows. The most important type is represented by native Chinese lexical units, which already existed in antiquity and acquired a new meaning, previously absent with them, in the 19th-century Japan. In modern science, this way of word formation is called **lexical de-archaization**, when entire words or parts of word acquire a new meaning, and with it – also a new life. This is exactly what had been happening in the 19-20C to such units as 革命'revolution,'文化'culture,'机会'opportunity,' 社会'society' and etc., which have primary sources in classic Chinese literature.

The second type is represented by neologisms comprised anew from the units existing in Chinese in their original meaning. Since the Japanese system of such character recording was once borrowed from China, such new units are not recognized in China as words "that came from the West through Japan" [3, p. 508] and are not perceived by native Chinese speakers as foreign lexical units.

And indeed, owing to character fixation of neologisms, which emerged in the favorable intellectual climate of the Meiji-era in Japan, naturally almost at once entered the vocabulary of Chinese young people, receptive to every thing trendy and fresh, the most progressist part of which young people studied during that period in Japan and European countries. Thereupon, through them, those neologisms entered the every day language in China itself.

Although simultaneously with the borrowing through Japanese, Western scientific literature was also translated directly into Chinese, the scale of this process was not that significant. In China, word-formation activity was carried out primarily by missionaries, owing to whose efforts Chinese language was replenished with a wide range of terms from the field of politics and social sciences.

The most significant lexicographic works in this field include bilingual dictionaries by Wilhelm Lobscheid (罗存德) and Karl Hemeling (赫美玲). W. Lobscheid compiled the *English-Chinese Dictionary* 《英华字典》. Since a great number of English terms lacked translation equivalents in Chinese, the lexicographer also acted as a word inventor, thus making a significant contribution to scientific knowledge distribution and popularization of Western concepts in China. Karl Hemeling prepared another source of terminological vocabulary of the greatest importance – the *English-Chinese Dictionary of the Standard Chinese Spoken Language* 《官话》 and *Handbook for Translations, including Scientific, Technical, Modern, and Documentary Terms*.

Since the late 19C, native Chinese speakers also began carrying out translation and word-formation activities – particularly, many prominent thinkers and reformers of the late Qing Dynasty advocating for adoption of Western science and technology in China, including Liang Qichao 梁启超, Yan Fu 严复, Wei Yuan 魏源 and etc., introduced into use quite a great number of new units.

Hence, in the second half of the 19C – the beginning of the 20C, Chinese lexicon had been updated primarily at the expense of the term-building activity of European missionaries, as well as through the word-formation by the progressivist intellectuals of China.

Lexicological analysis of that-period neologisms shows that, in contrast to the contemporary wave of borrowings from Japanese into Chinese comprised significantly of stylistically marked lexical units, colloquialisms, teen slang and argot, lexical units that emerged as a result of the “lexical revolution” were considerably broader in terms of usage areas and quite soon passed to the range of units of the stably actual vocabulary of Chinese life. Although these words did not refer to the basic vocabulary of the period, in general very scarce in terms of composition; however, in the context of the rapidly advancing scientific and technological progress, they quite soon stroke root in the everyday language.

Thereby, from the perspective of description of the ways of Chinese language enrichment, it should be noted that lexical units borrowed in the Meiji era came to the region of character-based writing systems from European languages – that is, they do not represent direct borrowings from Japanese into Chinese, which, strictly speaking, must encompass phenomena of traditional Japanese culture or naming units, which for a long time had been woven into the foreign language's fabric and which have completed the cycle of assimilation in this system, but translate the realia and concepts inherent to the Western civilization, which burst into the Chinese-language environment though Japanese even before their inclusion in dictionaries of Japan.

Today, Chinese scientists recognize the borrowings from Japanese into Chinese of the turn of the 20C as “indirect borrowings” [5, p. 3]. Statements of such units' native nature due to their representation in characters also receded to the background. In this case, we must talk of an intermediated reception of concepts of the Western science and technology with fixation in a form different from European languages, whereby Japanese language acted as an intermediary language and not at all as a donor.

Language contacts are often accompanied by development of the language's ability to act as a source at a lexical unit transition from it to some other language with its subsequent adaptation to new conditions of functioning in the recipient language. At direct lexical borrowing, the material aspect of a language sign, which starts living in accordance with the rules of the new system that has adopted it, is preserved. Such borrowing may be exemplified by the Russian word *сүфле* (<*sufle*>- 'souffle') borrowed from French, where it is represented as *soufflé*.

Since not only form, but also meaning may be borrowed, there are two interpretations of the concept 'borrowing' in Russian linguistics: in a narrow understanding, only the fact of transition of the material exponent of a foreign language sign is taken into account; at such approach, calques, emerging when an element borrowed from the donor language is expressed by means of the recipient language, are not considered as from borrowings. In a broad sense of the term, when the semantics of a foreign element is taken into account, calquing will also refer to one of the types of borrowing.

Description of foreign lexical units – in our case, Japanese loanwords in the Chinese language– is impossible without thorough differentiation of adjacent concepts, which must, on the one hand, account for language-specific traits of the relevant units in the system, and on the other hand, rely on the conceptual and terminological framework that has already established in the linguistics. Lexical units that came to Chinese language through Japanese had been for a long time rather scarcely described in Chinese studies of Russia and West. The main reason for this was, as noted above, a mild interest to this issue from the part of native speakers of Chinese in general and of Chinese linguists in particular. In the 20C, only few Chinese scientists were engaged in studying Japanese borrowings into their native language, which may evidently explain the extremely small number of works on this topic outside China, as well.

V.V. Ivanov introduced into scientific use of sinology the term 'secondary borrowing, 'having characterized the layer of Japanese borrowings as follows: "In Chinese language, there are quite many words that came from Japanese, although most of them represent in Japanese language itself not native Japanese words, but foreign loanwords. In this case, there is a secondary assimilation of foreign-language lexical units – therefore, lexical units of this kind may be called 'secondary borrowings'" [6, p. 45].

V.I. Gorelov, adopting V.V. Ivanov's terminology, applied the term 'secondary borrowings' both to genuine Japanisms and to words that came from Japanese, but representing in Japanese language itself not native Japanese words, but foreign loanwords. Characterizing these lexical units, the sinologist emphasized that "being written in Chinese characters, they are no different from native Chinese words neither in terms of their appearance nor in terms of their word-formation structure. Sometimes they are called 日语汉读 ('Japanese words with Chinese pronunciation')" [7, p. 147].

The term 'reborrowing' existing in sinology is used by some researchers as synonymous to 'secondary borrowing'. Thus, O.A. Bekhtereva refers it to the diachronic process, in course of which a particular element is borrowed by another language in one era and then returns to the original language in another era from the language that had once borrowed it [8].

A number of Russian researchers adhere to the Western Chinese studies tradition and refer Japanese loanwords exclusively to the graphic type. Thus, N.V. Perfilyeva and Hu Peipei consider the concept of graphic borrowing in both narrow and broad senses. In the narrow sense, graphic borrowings in Chinese represent words, whose form of writing (characters) was completely borrowed from Japanese. In the broad sense, the point at issue is preservation of the loanword's original graphic form in Chinese [9].

This approach occupies the main place in Western Chinese studies, where the units of the analyzed type were termed 'graphic loans' by F. Masini [10], 'symbolic loans, emblematic loans' by A. Cook [11] and opposed to 'phonemic loans' and 'phonetic loans,' respectively. Chen Haijin adheres to a similar position and refers Japanese loanwords to the graphic subtype opposing them to phonemic loanwords [12].

Terminology that is not well-established in Chinese lexicology entails serious discrepancies with the vocabulary established in Russian lexicological tradition; neither it coincides with contemporary Chinese researchers' vision of the topic.

First, material borrowing in natural languages may be 'by ear,' often times without regard to the specifics of written form fixation in the source language – it is typical for Indo-European languages, but practically irrelevant for the languages of the Far East analyzed in the present study. Borrowing of words in a graphic form, when reception occurs through written texts, will also be material, which, considering graphic appearance of a lexical unit, is crucial for the languages with the character-based writing systems. In Chinese, new lexical units that came from Japan in the Meiji era were adopted exclusively through written texts: commonality of the writing systems minimized the need in reception of Japanese loanwords, which at the contemporary stage confines to replacing full forms of characters with simplified ones, when in certain cases changes in respective character complexity and not in their complete replacement may be observed.

Second, for the material of Chinese, just like for other natural languages, it appears relevant to differentiate direct (immediate) and intermediated borrowing. In terms of its trajectory, borrowing may be direct or intermediated, when a word is borrowed from a donor language into the recipient language through a second or even a third intermediary language. Considering this factor, the majority of Meiji-era borrowings will refer to intermediated borrowings.

Such approach is found with Chinese researchers – particularly, Cen Qixiang (岑麒祥) considers Meiji neologisms as indirect borrowings (间接外来词 *jiànjiēwàiláicí*) [5, p. 3], since what we can find in Chinese lexicon is a result of intermediated reception of European languages' vocabulary, where by Japanese language acted only as an intermediary language and not at all as a donor itself. In terms of borrowings of the intermediated type – from Western languages through Japanese into Chinese, – we may talk of borrowing from the initial donor language by calquing and adoption of a graphic form from the intermediary language.

Third, at the suggestion of L.P. Krysin, the term 'secondary borrowing' in Russian lexicology is conventionally used to denote lexical units, which emerged in the language "along with a word previously borrowed and assimilated in the language..., coinciding in form with the previously borrowed one, but having a different meaning – up to complete homonymy" [13, p. 43]. Secondary borrowings in Russian are exemplified by the words *директория* (<*directoriya*> - '*directoty*'), *дебиом*

(<debiut>- 'debut'), конференция (<konferentsiya>- 'conference'), студия (<studiya>- 'studio'), резюме (<resiume>- 'resume') and many others, which on centered the vocabulary from outside, had been fully adopted and registered in linguistic dictionaries and reference guides as foreign lexical units, and then were borrowed again, but this time with another, previously unknown meaning.

The analyzed Chinese lexical units represent a phenomenon of another kind— therefore, the term 'secondary borrowings, irrelevant in this context, should be rejected in respect to the borrowings from Japanese into Chinese. Except for lexical de-archaization, all other types of borrowings in a language lack lexical units coinciding in form but different in meaning – and this is exactly how the term 'secondary borrowing' is construed in the 21st-century Russian linguistics, implying multiple transfers of various meanings to one and the same material form, which is not observed with the majority of the borrowings in the analyzed period.

The term 'reborrowing' that implies a situation, when a particular word is formed in a given language from foreign-language elements and thereafter is borrowed back into the language, from whose elements the unit or its contemporary descendant was constructed, appears more adequate.

It appears that in terms of borrowing to Chinese through Japanese, only the cases of lexical de-archaization described above may be referred to 'reborrowings' in the strict sense, where as calquing of concepts of the Western science and technology, which entered Chinese indirectly through Japanese, where they were fixed in a character form, may be deemed 'reborrowing' in a very broad sense. Usage of a coincidental graphic form may be considered as a process of graphic borrowing, as it is customary in Western Chinese studies; however, it is highly questionable to talk about secondary borrowing or reborrowing in this case. It would be more accurate to define the second type of the considered Japanese loanwords in Chinese language as 'graphic reborrowings,' because at semantic calquing, which implies expansion of the semantic potential of elements that already exist in the system at the expense of meanings acquired by them/ transferred to them from their translation equivalents in the donor language, a significant shift or even complete noncoincidence of meanings between what was and what has become is observed, which often induces a cognitive dissonance with native speakers, for the elements familiar to them appear in an uncustomary combination or with an unusual meaning.

REFERENCES

1. Liu Zhengtan 刘正焱. A Dictionary of Loanwords in Chinese. 《汉语外来词词典》 1984.
2. Mayevsky, E. V. Meiji Lexical Revolution. Aktual'nyevoprosyiaponskogoioibshchegoiazzykoznaniiia: pamiati I. F. Vardulia. M., 2005.Pp. 245-255. (In Russian).
3. Wang, Li 王力 A History of Chinese Language 《汉语史稿》 Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company, 2013. (In Chinese).
4. Demich K. I., Kostyrkin A. V. Features of the formation of modern Japanese philosophical terminology in the Meiji era according to lexicographic data // Trudy Institutavostokovedeniia RAN. Problemyobshcheiivostokovednoilingvistiki. Iazykmeniaiushchiisia: semanticheskieigrammaticheskieizmeneniia v iazykakhAziiiAfriki. № 29. 2020. Pp. 167–178. DOI: 10.31696/2587-9502-2020-29-167-178. (In Russian).
5. Cen, Qixiang 岑麒祥 A Dictionary of Loanwords in Chinese 《汉语外来语词典》 1990 .
6. Ivanov V. V. Terminology and borrowings in modern Chinese. M., 1973. (In Russian).
7. Gorelov V. I. Lexicology of the Chinese language. M, 1984.(In Russian).
8. Behtereva O. A. Japanese borrowings in Chinese: periodization and adaptation. Irkutsk, 2016.(In Russian).
9. Perfil'eva N. V., Hu Peipei Methods of assimilation of English borrowings into Chinese // Bulletin of RUDN University. Theory of language. Semiotics. Semantics. 2018. №2. S. 287–301.(In Russian).

10. Masini, Federico. The Formation of Modern Chinese Lexicon and Its Evolution Toward a National Language: The Period from 1840 to 1898. // Berkeley: Journal of Chinese Linguistics Monograph Series No. 6, 1993. 295 pp.
11. Cook, Angela A typology of lexical borrowing in Modern Standard Chinese // *Lingua Sinica*. 2018. 4:6 doi.org/10.1186/s40655-018-0038-7
12. Chen, Haijing A Study of Japanese Loanwords in Chinese. University of Oslo: Master's Thesis. 2014. 125 p.
13. Krysin L P. Secondary borrowing and its description in the explanatory dictionary // *Russian language today*. №3. M., 2004. P. 143–148.(InRussian).