

BORROWINGS AS A PRODUCTIVE SOURCE OF THE TERMINOLOGY OF COSMETOLOGY AND AESTHETIC MEDICINE

Abstract: The article focuses on the analysis of borrowing as a productive source of the formation and replenishment of terminology of cosmetology and aesthetic medicine in the diachronic aspect. The main stages of the borrowed vocabulary formation are distinguished, and the most productive lexical funds of the terminology replenishment are characterized. The role of internationalisms and their advantages in the process of the formation and replenishment of terminology of cosmetology and aesthetic medicine are described.

Author information:

Iryna Boiko

PhD student, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv
Department of Foreign Languages for Natural
Sciences

✉ i.boiko.online@gmail.com

🌐 Ukraine

Keywords:

Borrowing, term, terminology, etymological analysis,
vocabulary, source language, host language.

Medical terminology, and its branches of cosmetology and aesthetic medicine in particular (hereinafter referred to as CAM), reflect the history of the world civilization development. Various groups of terms are means of information transmission, and therefore they determine separate historical and cultural periods. Since terms absorb the information of many past epochs, the need to analyse the diachronic aspect of CAM terminology is obvious.

The meaning of the word “aesthetic” is “to look pleasing” and the meaning of the word “cosmetic” is “to beautify an appearance”. Aesthetic Medicine comprises all medical procedures that are aimed at improving the physical appearance and satisfaction of the patient, using non-invasive or minimally invasive cosmetic procedures. There is a variety of treatments offered these days: chemical peels, microdermabrasion, laser hair removal, dermal fillers, Botox injections, etc.

Cosmetology includes range of products intended to be rubbed, poured, sprinkled, sprayed on or otherwise applied to the human body or any part for cleansing, beautifying, promoting attractiveness, or altering the appearance without affecting structure or function. Among the products included in this definition are skin moisturizers, lipsticks, nail polishes, eye and facial makeup products, hair products as well as any material intended for use as a component of a cosmetic product.

Aesthetic medicine and cosmetology use the latest achievements of trichology, ophthalmology, nutrition, and pharmacy, allowing the most balanced solution of the correction of appearance problems.

Cosmetology and aesthetic medicine are considered to be modern and popular branches of the globalized world. The infancy stage of their development was from 1980 to 1990.

CAM terminology is constantly evolving, successfully adapting to the globalization conditions. It is based on the centuries-long experience of medical science and has a special system of organization, as long as it has assembled and organized material of different languages. The CAM vocabulary is of particular interest due to the interaction of extra- and intralinguistic factors that have played a significant role in its development.

The aim of this paper is to study the assimilation of the borrowed CAM terminological elements using etymological analysis. To reach this goal, the following tasks has to be accomplished: 1) to consider the main aspects of the process of borrowing; 2) to analyse the formation of CAM terminology and 2) to study the correlation of Greek, Latin, German, and French elements in CAM terms in comparison with the native English ones. The research is based on the material of electronic etymological dictionaries. In modern linguistics, the analysis of etymological composition of the

language and the ability of borrowed vocabulary to integrate into the host language by assimilation are determined as interesting research issues.

It is well known that professional terminology is the most dynamic part of the lexical and semantic systems of language, and it is not surprising that many scholars from different countries have been involved into investigating it, for example, German [Paul 1960, Richter 1919], English and American [Haugen 1950, Hoenigswald 1962, Weinreich 1953, Bloomfield 1933] researchers, as well as Russian and Ukrainian scholars [Diakov, Kyiak, Kudelka 2000, Motchenko 2001, Krysin 2004, Ovadyuk 2013, Tokareva 2003]. It is widely recognized nowadays that the process of borrowing plays an important role in the formation of professional terminology.

The process of borrowing refers to the ability of the lexical fund of a host language to adopt new words from another language called in this case a source language. According to Grinev (1993), the borrowing is a term denoting a linguistic unit which is partially (only form, structure or content) or fully borrowed from another language.

The general causes of borrowing are formulated in the L. P. Krysin's work as follows: striving to use euphemisms (common in medical terminology and its branches – cosmetology and aesthetic medicine) [Moller 1933, p. 19-20; Paratesi 1964, p. 38-39]; nomination needs; the necessity to substantially differentiate close, but, nevertheless, different concepts; the need to specify concepts; if there is a system of borrowed terms used by a particular professional environment and it has been taken from one source language, then it is necessary to borrow new terms from the same source language [Krysin 2004, p. 188-189].

One can agree with Hope [1962] that the context of lexical transitions from one language to another can be identified as “psychological borrowing climate” [Hope 1962]. The development and changes of word meaning are affected by both the laws of the language system and extralinguistic social changes. They can be considered in synchronic and diachronic aspects. The external (extralinguistic) one includes close political, economic and cultural relations between the host language and the source language; influence of the culture of one nation on the culture of another one; simplification of professional international communication; the authority of the source language.

The internal (linguistic) reasons of borrowing include the following ones: the need for the nomination of a new concept; the need to specify concepts; the tendency to use one borrowed word instead of a description; the elimination of homonymy and polysemy in the native language; the semantic “load” of the native vocabulary, etc.

It is worth noting that borrowing is always a gradual process that requires a long time [Hussey 1995]. Borrowings can take place directly from another language (without passing receiving languages) or indirectly (through other languages). In contrast to direct borrowing, in the indirect one the words move from source language to another language (as a direct borrowing), and then from that language to the third one. Each transition to a new language develops the word, changing its phonological or spelling structure, so that it more closely matches the phonological and spelling system of the host language [Katamba 1994]. The process of assimilation can be so deep that a borrowed vocabulary is not recognized by the speakers of the host language. The origin of a word can be determined only through etymological analysis.

We differentiated five main stages of the borrowed vocabulary formation in the terminology of CAM following Krysin [Krysin 2004] To explain the stages more clearly, appropriate examples are provided.

1. The use of the borrowed word in the text with its original spelling and grammatical form, without transliteration and transcription, e.g.: “While most café au lait spots are harmless, multiple café au lait spots and those with other skin changes may lead your doctor to suspect an underlying genetic disorder ...”. *Café au lait spot* is a French term, while *spot* comes from old English [Online etymology dictionary].

2. The process of word adaptation to the rules of the host language, transliteration or transcription by compliance with morphological and word-building characteristics of certain linguistic units. For example, such word as *або курсив, або лапки, щось одне! Краще – слово курсивом, а значення – у лапках прямим!* *plastic* is derived from Latin *plasticus* and/or from Greek *plastikos*

“able to be molded” and has adapted the English language rules. The following prefixes from Greek and Latin have been transliterated: *ultra-* (from Latin “beyond, on the other side, on the farther side, past, over, across”) and *micro-* (from a Latinized form of Greek *mikros* – “small, little, petty, trivial, slight”). Due to these processes, the terminology of CAM has obtained such terms as *ultrasonic facial peeling* and *microdermabrasion*.

3. The borrowed vocabulary “does not stand out” and merges with the common language, for example, *ampoule* has been derived from Latin meaning *ampulla* (“flask, vial”) and does not “stand out” from the common English language; *calorie* derived from Latin *calor* meaning “heat” has already merged into English; *blonde* coming from Old French *blont*, which means “*fair, blond*”, is widely used in the English language.

4. Stabilization of the borrowed word in the host language. The word from a certain field overcomes stylistic restrictions, passes acclimatization period in the social sphere and expands into the sphere of usage. For example, the word *powder* derived from Latin *pulverem* meaning “dust, powder”, has overcome the sphere of usage not only in the cosmetology industry (e.g., *face powder*) but also in the food industry (*cooking powder*).

5. The fixation of borrowings in the interpretative dictionary is a final stage of their entry into the host language. This stage confirms that the word is recognized by the lexical system of the host language. For example, word *mesotherapy*, which is formed by the prefix *meso-* (from Greek *mesos* – “middle, in the middle”) and a word *therapy* (from Greek *therapeia* – “curing, healing, service done to the sick”) are fixed in known dictionaries, e.g., Colin’s dictionary (“Mesotherapy – is a cosmetic procedure in which minute doses of medication, vitamins, etc, are injected repeatedly into the mesodermal tissue under the skin to promote fat loss”) [Collins Dictionary].

Following Grinev [Grinev 1982], we distinguish such methods of borrowing as lexical, formal, and morphological. **Lexical borrowing** means transferring the material form of the word and its meaning, for example, *dermis* (from Greek *derma* – “skin”), *epidermis* (from Greek *epi* – “upon, at, close upon” and *derma* – “skin”), *hypodermis* (from Greek *hypo* – “under, beneath” and *derma* – “skin”).

Formal borrowing involves metaphorical transfer, that is, the material form of the word is borrowed and its meaning in the host language changes. English metaphorical terms include, for example, such word-combinations as *bat ears* (when the patient’s ears resemble the ears of a bat); *bunny lines* (wrinkles located on both sides of the nose, which make a face look like that of a hare); *gummy smile* (a type of a smile, when the upper lip does not cover the patient’s gums).

Some metaphorical CAM terms are borrowed from classical languages – Latin, Greek and from both of them at the same time. An example of the metaphorical term borrowed from Latin is *agger nasi* – “a small ridge on the lateral side of the nasal cavity”. The metaphoric transfer is based here on the similarity of notions: *agger nasi* looks like a “heap” on the face (from Latin *agger*, Eng. “heap”, prefix *ad* – Eng. “toward” and *gerere*, Eng. “to carry, bring”).

There are term metaphors borrowed from Greek (or Latinized terms from Greek), for instance, *uranoschisis* – “a cleft of the hard palate”. The metaphoric transfer is based here on the similarity of appearance: Greek *ouranos* (Eng. “sky vault”) denotes the “upper part”, and Greek term *schisis* means “cleft”. Another example is *arthrodiait* defined as a “gliding joint in which the opposing surfaces are nearly planes and in which there is only a slight, gliding motion”. The metaphoric transfer here involves similarity of functions (Old Greek *arthrōdes* means “well-articulated”).

Moreover, there are terms-metaphors of simultaneous Greek and Latin origin, for example, *concha auriculae* – “the large hollow of the external ear, between the front part of the helix and the antihelix”. The metaphoric transfer here arises from the similarity of notions (Latin *concha* means “shellfish”, Greek *konkhe* means “mussel”, while Latin *auricle* denotes “ear”). Another example is of French and English origin: *caterpillar flap* is a tubed flap transferred end-over-end (in stages) from the donor area to a distant recipient area. The metaphoric transfer shows in this case the similarity of denoted processes (*caterpilose* comes from Old French words *cate* – Eng. “cat” and *pelose* – Eng. “hairy” and Old English *flap* – “something that hangs down”).

Formal borrowing indicates the new phenomena that caused certain associations of the researcher. Commonly, a researcher uses a word from the classical language with a meaning that agrees with the association caused by the nominated object.

During the process of **morphological borrowing**, a root or a word-building morpheme is transferred in the following ways: 1) through direct borrowing, when the word undergoes no changes except acquiring phonetic characteristics common for the English language, e.g.: *thorax* (from Latin *thorax*), *retina* (from Latin *retina*), *aloe vera* (*aloe* from Greek *aloe* and *vera* from Latin); 2) borrowing of the word root with further transformation of endings according to the language rules: Lat. *cavitas* – Eng. “cavity”; Lat. *vestibulum oris* – Eng. “oral vestibule”; Lat *ductus* – Eng. “duct”; 3) borrowing of affixes from classical languages and their usage in terms: *tele-* (*telediagnosis* – from Greek *tele*, Eng. “far off” and *diagnosis*, Eng. “discerning”); *anti-* (*antiperspirant* – from Latin *anti*, Eng. “against” and “to breathe”). The third way provides a basis of terminological modelling, when the terms are consciously formed using certain established affixational patterns, e.g.: Greek suffix *-itis* indicates inflammation process (*cellulitis*, *dermatitis*, *fasciitis*); Greek suffix *-osis* marks the painful condition of noninflammatory character, abnormal increase or spread (*spongiosis*, *ichthyosis*, *mycosis*).

In addition to Greek and Latin models, etymological analysis of CAM terminology has revealed hybrid terms, which are assimilated borrowings from classical languages and borrowings from other languages.

The hybrid terms are formed by the following language combinations: Latin and English (*facial cleft* – from Latin *facialis*, Eng. “of the face” and Old English *cleofan* meaning “to split”); Greek French (*bacterial plaque* – from Greek *bakterion*, that is, “small staff” and French *plaque* – “metal plate”), English and Latin (*moon face* – from Old English *mona* and Latin *facies* meaning “appearance”), English and French (*cheek augmentation* – from Old English *ceace* meaning “jaw” and Old French *augmentacion*, that is, to “increase”), German and English (*droopy eyes* – from Old English *ege* and Proto-Germanic *drup-*).

We can state that borrowings from the Greek language are mainly mediated: first they penetrated into Latin, and then, from Latin into English: *ichthyosis* (from Greek *ikhthys*, “fish” in English), *leontiasis* (from Greek *léōn*, Eng. “lion”), *keratin* (from Greek *keratos* meaning “horn of an animal; horn as a substance”). The stage of Greek vocabulary development is characterized by the preference for different literary language word models in order to eliminate polysemy using separate single-word nominations. The flexibility and the ability to connect the word base and word building elements to describe scientific concepts easily are the features of the Greek language, e.g.: *acne* (from Latin *aknas*, which comes from Greek *akmas*, Eng. “point”); *epidermis* (from Latin *epidermis*, coming from Greek *epidermis*, Eng. “the outer skin”, and *epi*, Eng. “on” + *derma*, Eng. “skin”); *dermatitis* (from Latin *derma*, Eng. “skin beneath the epidermis”, derived from the Greek *derma*, Eng. “skin”); *eczema* (from Greek *ekzema*, Eng. “something thrown out by heat, any fiery pustule on the skin”), *edema* (a Latin name derived from the Greek *oedema*, Eng. “swelling tumor”), *epithelium* (a Latin name derived from Greek *epi*, Eng. “upon” + *thele*, Eng. “nipple”).

Latin has appeared to be the most productive source of replenishing CAM terminology. For example, the following terms have been borrowed from this language: *comedone* (from Latin *comedo* meaning “to eat up”), *extraction* (from Latin *extrahere*, that is, “to draw out”), *follicle* (from Latin *folliculus* – “a little bag”).

English vocabulary has been borrowing words from other languages to replenish the English medical picture of the world during all periods of its development. With the beginning of the era of national medical languages, French, German and English replaced Latin as vehicles for international communication. Although English retains much lexical material marked by Germanic influence, a considerable amount of its vocabulary constitutes the words of French origin. Most of the words of French and German origin we use today were brought over during the Norman conquest of England in 1066. Some examples of CAM terms of French and German origin are as follows: *cosmetic* (from French “cosmétique”); *cellulite* (from French *cellulite*, “a small cell”); *waltzed flap* (from German *waltz* and Old English *flappe* – “a blow”). Thus, English CAM terminology is filled with borrowed

terms and terminological elements, modelled on Greek, Latin, French and German components with an orientation towards English main phonetic and morphological properties.

Among numerous borrowings in CAM terminology, a group of internationalisms has been distinguished. Internationalisms are the words expressing the notion of international significance, which exist in many world languages (related and unrelated), maintaining a close or common meaning and phonetic and morphological structure [Mykhaylenko 2004, pp. 38-39]. According to Danilenko, “the internationalisms are easier protected from polysemy, its their advantage, since most term elements unambiguously denote certain meaning; they do not cause false associations because they do not motivate terminology nominations but interpret the denoted concept with the help of its components” [Danilenko 1977, p. 35]. The listed terms-internationalisms occur in a few languages, they express the same or similar etymology and meaning, e.g.: *detox* (from Latin *de*, Eng. “concerning”, Latin *toxicus* meaning in English “poisoned”); *epilator* (from Latin *pilus*, Eng. “hair”); *telemedicine* (from Greek *tele*, Eng. “far” and Latin *medicina*, Eng. “the healing art”).

It should be noted that Old Greek and Latin have formed the so-called international lexical fund, which remains the source of elements for new terminology. International terms, formed by Greek and Latin elements, such as *tele-*, *macro-*, *meso-*, *hyper-*, *anti-*, *phyto-* usually follow English basic morphological laws. Their structural and semantic predictability, which satisfies the requirements of scientific definition, contributes to the fact that they are recognized throughout the world and gradually become “proper elements” in different languages [Dudetskaya 2007].

The agglutinative character of Greek and Latin stems, roots and prefixes, their ability to build different combinations to express special concepts, has been extremely efficient for the formation and replenishment of CAM terminology. There is a tendency there to use international terminological elements and components to nominate new concepts. For example, the terms *cosmetology* and *dermatology* formed, respectively, from Old Greek *kosmetike* (“art of beautifying”), *derma* (“skin”) and *logos* (“study, knowledge, word”) emphasize the generic binary nature of CAM terminological system. According to this model, the terms in different languages are formed, since terminological elements, and the relations between them [Lotte 1982, p. 65] have acquired an international character.

However, such a character of these terms “does not reflect the recognition of a word as a “native word” of the host language. They still keep the roots and semantic meaning of the source language, but are inevitably assimilated phonetically and morphologically by the host language influence” [Babkin 1970, p. 229]. For example, the terms *transplantation*, *symptom*, *inflammation*, *pathology*, *prosthetics* were borrowed from Latin and Greek, but phonetically and morphologically they have already adapted to English.

CONCLUSIONS

This study confirms that borrowing is one of the productive sources of CAM terminology replenishment. The main stages of the borrowed vocabulary formation were distinguished, and lexical, formal, and morphological types of borrowing were characterized. Most of CAM terms are borrowed from classical languages – Latin, Greek or both. The borrowings from the Greek language are mainly mediated: first they penetrated into Latin, and then, from Latin into English. Among numerous borrowings, a group of internationalisms has been distinguished based on Old Greek and Latin words which constitute the so-called international lexical fund.

The analysis of hybrid terms has allowed us to reveal the following language combinations in the terminology of CAM – English Latin, English Greek, English French and English German. Thus, we can state that German and French are also productive sources of CAM terminology. Although English is a Germanic language, half of its vocabulary is of Romance origin, and, not surprisingly, medical English tends to follow the Romance pattern. French and German replaced Latin as vehicles for international communication.

References:

1. **Babkin, A. M., 1970:** Russian phraseology, Leningrad, 263 p.
2. **Bloomfield, L., 1933:** Language. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 566 p.

3. Collins Dictionary. Definition, Thesaurus and Translations. Free Online Dictionary. Available at: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com>. Date of access: 5.10.2017.
4. **Danilenko, V. P., 1977:** Russkaya terminologiya: opyt lyngvystycheskogo opisaniya, Moskva: Nauka, 246 s.
5. **Diakov, A. S., Kiyak, T. R., Kudelka, Z. B., 2000:** Fundamentals of terminology, semantic and sociolinguistic aspects, Kyiv: KM Academia, 218 p.
6. **Dubovsky, Yu. A., Latysheva, H. E., 1988:** Ekstralingvisticheskaya obuslovlennost variativnosti rechi, Socialnaya i stilisticheskaya variativnost angliyskogo yazyka, Pyatigorsk, ss. 11-18.
7. **Dudetskaia, S. H., 2007:** Metaforizatsiya kak sposob terminoobrazovaniya (na materiale angliyskoy terminologii cherepno-chelyustno-litsevoy hirurgii i stomatologii, Samara, 24 s.
8. **Grinev, S. V., 1982:** Terminologicheskie zaimstvovaniya. Priloshenie, Voprosy zaimstvovaniya i uporyadocheniya terminov i terminoelementov, Moskva, s. 116.
9. **Haugen, E., 1950:** The analysis of linguistic borrowing, Language, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 210-231.
10. **Hoenigswald, H., 1962:** Bilingualism, presumed bilingualism, and diachrony. Anthropol. Linguist, Vol. 4, pp. 1-5.
11. **Hope, T. E., 1962-63:** Loanwords as cultural and lexical symbols. Archivum Linguisticum, 14, pp. 111-121; 15, pp. 29-42.
12. **Hussey, S., 1995:** The English Language: structure and development, London and New York: Longman, 188 p.
13. **Katamba, F., 1994:** English Words, New York: Routledge, 282 p.
14. **Krysin, L. P., 2004:** Russian word, own way and strange: Studies on modern Russian language and sociolinguistics, Moscow: Languages Slavic culture, 888 p.
15. **Lotte, D. S., 1982:** Voprosy zaimstvovaniya i uporyadocheniya inoyazychnyh terminov i terminoelementov, Moskva: Nauka, 152 s.
16. **Moller, Chr., 1933:** Zur Methodik der Fremdwortkunde Text, Acta Jutlandica, V. Aarhus. Kobenhavn, p. 32.
17. **Motchenko, I. V., 2001:** Osnovnyye tendencii v angliyskoy meditsinskoy terminologii, Moskva, 215 s.
18. **Mykhaylenko, V., 2004:** Alhorytm intro-perekladatskykh stratehiy u multymediyomu formati, Aktualni problem perekladu, T. 25, Dnipropetrovsk: Nauka i osvita, ss. 38-39.
19. Online etymology dictionary. Available at: <http://www.etymonline.com>. Date of access: 10.10.2017.
20. **Ovadiuk, O. V., 2013:** Zapozychennia iak zasib zbagachennia anhliyskoi movy, Naukovyi visnyk kafedry YUNESKO Kyivskoho natsionalnoho lingvistychnoho universytetu, Filologiya, pedagogika, psykhologiia, Vyp. 27, s. 207-212.
21. **Paratesi, G., 1964:** Semantica dell'eufemismo. L'eufemismo e la repressione verbale con esempi tratti dall'italiano contemporaneo, Torino: Giappichelli, 195 p.
22. **Partridge, E., 1966:** A short etymologic al dictionary of modern English, London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 4246 p.
23. **Paul, H., 1960:** Principles of history of language, Moscow, 191 p.
24. **Richter, E., 1919:** Fremdwortkunde, Leipzig, 162 p.
25. **Rinzler, C. A., 2009:** The Encyclopedia of Cosmetic and Plastic Surgery. Available at: https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=N5nWmFCbYqcC&printsec=frontcover&hl=ru&source=gbs_vpt_buy#v=onepage&q&f=false. Date of access: 5.11.2017.
26. **Tokareva, M., 2003:** Stanovlenie, razvitie i sovremennoe sostoyanie angliyskoy terminologii nefrologii i urologii, Omsk, 207 s.
27. **Weinreich, U., 1953:** Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems, New York: Linguistic Circle of New York, 148 p.