Terms and phrases of the coronavirus era as a manifestation of linguoecological processes and their fixation in dictionaries
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Abstract. In the modern Russian language a huge amount of terms and terminological combinations appear, which quickly come into use, but do not remain in our language for a long time. The reason for this phenomenon is that to some extent they are alien, they are a kind of mix, a mixture of languages, they are poorly remembered and understandable, especially for older people. And the appearance of such "temporary" words in dictionaries is also an ambiguous question. On the one hand, they should have time to become common before they are forgotten. This is especially true of the words and expressions of the coronavirus era, since the pandemic is a temporary phenomenon. On the other hand, sometimes it is quite difficult to interpret the terms that have come from other languages and carry a definite linguistic and cultural trail. This paper just examines the issues of global changes in the Russian language culture through the prism of such a scientific approach as linguistic ecology. The authors talk about the changed language situation and try to understand whether it is possible to include newly appeared words of the coronavirus era in dictionaries, taking into account the experience of compiling and describing terms of linguistic ecology.

1 Introduction

Modern society dictates certain conditions for the trajectory of the development of the cultural component in our country. With the appearance of such terms as coronavirus, coronavirus infection, corona, there is more negativity in our lives, which is expressed not only in emotional form, but also in language. And here we faced again with phenomena that discredit the reputation of the Russian language, again we are forced to talk about linguoecological problems, problems of "diseases" of our language.

The methodological basis of this study is the fundamental works of scientists:


- in connection with the isolation of concepts and the concept sphere (N.D. Arutyunova (2000); A.P. Babushkin (2001); A. Vezhbitskaya (2001); S.G. Vorkachev, 2021; V.I.
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2 Materials and methods

The solution of the tasks required the complex use of methods and techniques of analysis and synthesis characteristic of modern linguistics: analytical method of observation and generalization of linguistic facts, method of component semantic analysis; method of conceptual analysis; method of linguistic description, method of correlation of linguistic facts; multi-stage definitional analysis, method of linguoculturological and linguocognitive analysis.

The research material was the terms, terminological combinations and various terminological nominations extracted by continuous sampling from linguistic dictionaries, encyclopedias and reference issues, etc.

3 Results

Of course, the appearance of new words always arouses the interest of philologists. And the most interesting fact is that today we are dealing with a huge number of neologisms that we cannot call newspeak, but which we can classify as a whole layer of words associated with the era of the pandemic and characterizing it.

Modern diseases (continuous total Americanization of speech, glamorization of speech, etc.) are a direct threat to the existence of the Russian language. This fact is indisputable today. However, the appearance of coronavirus-themed words only confirms the trend.

Of course, the philologist is interested in how the word gets used in the Russian language: as soon as it came into use, the abbreviations "korona" and "koronka" appeared in the name of the virus, although these words have their own meanings. And this means that we are dealing with such a phenomenon as the expansion of lexical meaning, the appearance of new meanings in words. Scientists have declared the danger of "koronaphobia" (we draw an analogy with Russophobia, xenophobia, etc.).

From the point of view of the Russian language, the strangest thing about the word "coronavirus" is the letter "a" in the middle. By the written rules, we have only the connecting vowels "o" and "e" in compound words. The answer is that the word "coronavirus" is not formed from two roots in the Russian language, but borrowed entirely from the English language, but not just that, but back in the 1970s. The letter "a" here is not a connecting vowel, but part of the base (as in the word coronary). This often happens with the names of viruses: papillomavirus, rotavirus, bokavirus.

In general, a lot of new words related to this disease have also appeared in the English language (and after it came to Russian): boffice - a bed in which someone works lying down; upperwear - a bed that is worn for a video conversation; covidiot - a person who panics too much because of the coronavirus; coronial - a person who was born in the era of Covid-19 (by analogy with the "millennial"). And there are quite a lot of similar examples. And all of them literally poured into our speech, changing their meanings a little and acquiring new ones: "covidiot" (a person who denies the danger of coronavirus), "zoom" (using the Zoom program for remote learning and communication), "quarantier" (the owner of a dog who gives the right to go outside during self-isolation). There are many different illustrations on this topic, including in the teaching of a foreign language.

There are also new words "naruzha" (what is outside the house), "flamingo" (a synonym for general cleaning) and others describing the features of self-isolation. It is also worth noting such language units as kovikuli, Putin's holidays, distance, quarantine, covidivors,
contagiousness, red zone, patient zero, online party, peak, plateau, pogulyanets, self-isolation, sididomtsy, social distance, remote, covid-enok, coronochka, koronyasha, koronakirdyk, korosaurus, koronazyabra, kung-flu, charonovirus, golonosik, maskomet, to disarm, coronafrenic, coronageddon, coronapokalipsis, quarantini, quarantintysya, infodemia, covido, dumscrolling, maskobesie, coronasceptic, zumbombing, obezzumet, vzhoperti, coronoia, shashlichniki, etc.

The history of the word "virus" itself is more interesting. It came into the Russian language only at the end of the XIX century, although, for example, in English, in the meaning of "agent causing an infectious disease" it was first used back in 1728 in relation to another disease.

The word virus comes from Latin, where it meant poison, mucus and similar substances [9]. Linguists reconstruct the history of this root up to the Proto-Indo-European state - the common proto-language of most European, Iranian and Indian languages. Then this root, *uers-, meant something like "melt, flow" and was used in relation to unclean, fetid liquids. In most descendant languages, it acquired the meaning of food, but only in Slavic languages, in addition to the word virus, we unexpectedly find it in another word - cherry.

The word cherry goes back to the Latin viscum. This word denoted the mistletoe plant, known for its sticky pulp, as well as bird glue - a special one for catching birds, which was made from both mistletoe and cherry.

Also, a huge number of new proverbs and sayings have appeared in our language. Most often they are humorous in nature, but they are of great value and deep meaning. For example, "Friendship is friendship, but one and a half meters apart."

According to the author of the study, Professor of the Department of Slavic Philology of St. Petersburg State University Valery Mokienko, antiproverbs are an important reaction of humanity to any shocks, a way of creative treatment of a native speaker with a significant level of proverbs and sayings. Such short sayings, as a rule, are humorous or ironic in nature, using linguistic folklore as a basis [12].

The first examples of the transformation of proverbs on the coronavirus theme appeared a month after the announcement of the pandemic. This proved the universality of this not only social, but also linguistic phenomenon. The sources for the linguistic research of Valery Mokienko and Harry Walter were various online media and blog publications, since it was Internet communication that came to the fore during the coronavirus period and best reflected language changes.

Scientists recorded all cases of proverbs being played in the period from March 2020 to February 2021, also determining the frequency of their appearance in the Internet space. It is worth noting that the dictionary includes not only the most common variants, but also isolated cases that interested linguists. "It is important to understand that no covid proverbs just do not appear: they are born according to the models of proverbs already known to us, use their meaning, finding in it an object for jokes or refutation of eternal wisdom. Antiproverbs cause laughter because every native speaker knows the original source and compares the humorous version with it. We can say that such anti-pedantries are a picture of the covid world in the mirror of the Russian language," says Valery Mokienko [12]:

- One head is good, and two are at least one and a half meters apart (One head is good, and two are better);
- Friendship is friendship, and one and a half meters apart (Friendship is friendship, and service is service);
- By the mask they meet, by the temperature they see off (By the clothes they meet, by the mind they see off);
- One in the field is not sick (One in the field is not a warrior);
- Don't have a hundred rubles, but have an antiseptic (Don't have a hundred rubles, but have a hundred friends).
Every word that came into circulation with the advent of the coronavirus has become an example of word formation and phrase formation against the background of current reality: these are the words "crown", "covid", "quarantine", and new meanings for the word "mask", with which more than 40 anti-phrases appeared in the Czech language alone in the first months of the pandemic, experts say.

Undoubtedly, proverbs and sayings are a natural part of the language in which people creatively convey some wisdom. As a rule, such units of language express instructions or advice. In the case of antiproverbs, well-known plots are played out in a new way, using the general meaning of the expression ("one in the field is not sick" / "one in the field is not a warrior") or creating a laughing effect due to consonance (for example, "an eye for an eye, zoom for zoom" / "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth") [11].

However, it is unlikely that new language units will disappear along with the coronavirus: as a rule, such samples remain in the language for a long time, and such dictionaries are an opportunity to fix and explore the reality that will be of interest to future generations in newly changed circumstances.

Nothing disappears from the language just like that. Of course, jokes about coronavirus will eventually become a thing of the past, but the language models for constructing these jokes will remain and will continue to work on a different basis, strengthening the norms of language.

In addition, antiproverbs is a deep creative process that helps to live through difficult circumstances, using linguistic means for this. And every global change in reality over time is reflected in the language, because "the covid is not as terrible as it is painted" ("the devil is not as terrible as it is painted").

Scientists noticed that the phrases "lemon rate" and "ginger rate" appeared in the language (by analogy with the dollar rate, for example, as something valuable and liquid), indicating an increase in the price of these useful products. The meaning of the phrase "social distance" has changed, which now means not the difference in social status, but the physical distance between people in order to avoid infection.

Valery Mokienko, Professor of St. Petersburg State University together with Harry Walter, Professor of Greifswald University studied how the era of the coronavirus pandemic is reflected in the Russian language. “The Russian Dictionary of Covid Anti-Quarantine Phrases” was the result of the study, which was included in the academic "Dictionary of the Russian Language of the Coronavirus era" prepared by the Institute of Linguistic Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences. It contains more than 3,500 words that came into circulation during the coronavirus pandemic. This dictionary could become an integral part of a large dictionary of linguoecological terms [2]. If we analyze the ratio of words, word combinations and phrases about coronavirus, the picture is as follows (fig.1).

So, we consider the appearance of a whole layer of words, phrases, expressions, anti-phrases an integral part of the linguistic ecology. And in the context of this study, we consider it possible and necessary to address the issue of defining newly appeared terms and term combinations, which turned out to be very relevant and topical, since the conceptual and terminological apparatus of linguistic ecology has not finally developed, needs to be specified; moreover, many terminological nominations are marked only in the sphere of functioning, and, accordingly, are represented, as a rule, by working "conditional" definitions; they are developed in a certain "standby mode" for the sphere of fixation, the most common and normative.
The problem of lexicographic description of terms has been the subject of close attention of researchers for many decades. The way of presenting terms in various dictionaries remains important among all issues. Therefore, turning to the sources, we are faced with the fact that the same term has different meanings in them. In this regard, L.L. Kutina's statement is true: "In scientific language, a scientific concept is realized, in common language – everyday" [8].

The problem of defining terms is connected with the problem of their penetration into the general literary language, their determinologization and the development of other, everyday meanings based on them. And, conversely, words from the literary language began to be included in the terminological combinations of modern sciences (in particular, linguistic ecology, which in its arsenal has borrowings from other sciences, as well as from the general literary language: "linguistic fashion", "purism", "linguistic forecasting", "linguocide", "language policy", "language competence", etc.) [4].

There is an assertion that the definition of a scientific concept and the definition of a term (which is, in fact, a sign of this concept) are not identical things. This means that the definition of the term, while remaining completely scientific, should indicate only those essential features that this term has in a specific terminological system. And such a definition correlates with a formal, and not with a meaningful concept (see the works of T.L. Kandelaki).

Every scientist has the right to his own understanding and vision of the term. It is also well-known and scientifically substantiated that the term is in principle not unambiguous (both in the sense of monosemy and in the sense of understanding the term in its specific meaning in the case of polysemy) [7]. Moreover, the meanings of the terms vary depending on the movement and different forms of scientific meaning. This is especially true for linguistic ecology, since most of the terms are borrowed from biology or constructed by analogy with medical terms [1].

It should be noted that there are certain generally accepted rules for describing term units: taking into account all the symbolic properties of the term (for example, the reflection of polysemy within one scientific knowledge: "culture of speech": 1) rules for building correct speech; 2) science; the correspondence of the definition to the intra-linguistic semantic properties of the term (qualitative or relative meaning, initial or secondary use, etc.: the terminological combination of the disease of the language is an explicit metaphor, which means that the description must correspond to it);

explication in the definition of the term of the method of designation, which, in addition to a specific terminological method, characterizes this term.

The specificity of the term is sometimes seen in the absence of pragmatic components, although most terms still have one, as was shown earlier by the example of linguoeccological terms. Pragmatics includes semantic associations (connotations) that
depend on cultural beliefs and traditions and may be unrelated to the meanings and denoted realities.

It is also necessary to note associations that have been known for a very long time and are not outside the semantics (of the signifier), but within its limits, and their presence does not "oppose" the teaching of F. Saussure on the two-sidedness of a linguistic sign. Linguistics, forming its own metalanguage, constantly uses associations, which are often the only source of the formation of the term. Within the meaning there are also components called the "modal frame" (the so-called relativity in the interpretation of terms). According to researchers, the most important component is the one projected onto the level of knowledge (for example, ideological ideas or ideas about the truth or reality of the denoted - for example, pseudoscience) [5].

Another aspect of the study of terms is their use both terminologically and non-terminologically. According to N.V. Kotelova, it is impossible to agree that "if the same word has" two variants of use (for example, "aggression" and "linguistic aggression"), "it is advisable to distinguish two different meanings from it" [10]. It is possible that the full meanings of the term and the non-term will not coincide, but they can be combined with each other in various combinations and corresponding contexts.

The word-terms in the terminological apparatus of linguistic ecology mostly represent such units that were borrowed from biology, medicine or were created, as already noted, by analogy with the terms of other sciences: for example, naukovit, bytovit, interargon, etc.

The terms-phrases are, as a rule, descriptive in nature, have a transparent internal motivation, which is supported by the well-known semantic meaning of commonly used words, on the basis of which the terminology of ecolinguistics was formed: for example, language consciousness, language education, language taste, language climate, etc.

It is interesting to think that "the meanings of terms are specific in the sense that they express scientific concepts that require a fairly accurate definition in accordance with the level of development of a particular branch of knowledge. Consequently, the very nature of the term excludes or at least limits the semantic ambiguity that is characteristic of commonly used words [7].

The study showed that the percentage of fixed terms and terminological combinations of environmental orientation in dictionaries and reference publications is quite low. Only the basic terms of the scientific field under consideration, which are interdisciplinary in nature, have been identified and relatively precisely defined.

4 Discussion

The subject of discussion, as a rule, traditionally are the following problems:

1) the problem of determining the quantity: how many terms should there be and which ones;
2) the problem of including a term as an independent lexical unit or as a special meaning in the semantic structure of a word;
3) the problem of definition of the term (completeness of disclosure of meaning, type of definition (analytical, descriptive, etc.);
4) the problem of correlation of encyclopedic description and linguistic.

The varieties of terminonymations are due to the dual nature of the term: on the one hand, it belongs to the lexical system of the language, on the other, it is characterized by a special concept designated by it. And if we define a scientific term, then, we can say that a scientific term is a linguistic sign expressing a special scientific concept and reflecting the place of this concept in the corresponding system of scientific concepts, the system of knowledge. Scientific terminology is a system of terms, which is always followed by a system of concepts, which is implemented in its definition [6].
The systematic description of the term, i.e. the description of the term by describing its place in the system of special concepts, is characteristic of modern terminological research of any orientation. The reflection of systemic conceptual relations in the term determines the meaning of the term as a lexical unit. In turn, the term system to which a particular term belongs can be considered as the context in which this meaning is realized. This statement is very well suited to the description of the term system of ecolinguistics.

5 Conclusions

There is no doubt that the idea of creating a dictionary is necessarily present when considering, analyzing any new scientific direction and its conceptual and terminological apparatus in particular. However, it is necessary to evaluate not only the very possibility of creating a dictionary in one case or another, but also its practical necessity and significance. In discussions about linguistic ecology, attention has been repeatedly focused on the fact that ecolinguistic terms are mostly contextual, sometimes even in complex relationships with each other, which means that they require detailed explanations and appropriate comments. Thus, it becomes obvious that it is possible to make "publicly available", "generally understandable" terms and terminological combinations serving the field of language ecology only with the help of a special dictionary. Another question is what this dictionary should be and in what way the dictionary units should be located, explained: should it be an explanatory dictionary or an encyclopedic, or an ideographic, or a combined one, including the features of all these dictionaries and, in our opinion, the most suitable in our case.

To date, the theory and practice of general lexicography has already developed. Modern dictionaries are, as a rule, mixed, synthetic in nature, trying to meet the requirements of universality. And "terminological ideography" is understood today as a branch of practical lexicography, i.e. we are talking about terminological dictionaries of an ideographic type. Most of these dictionaries, which are mainly narrowly focused, are information retrieval thesauri. This is explained, on the one hand, by the fact that scientific terminology is a more complex, more vague and less ordered conceptual system, on the other hand, by the fact that the methodology of ideographic description of scientific terminology has not been developed.

A separate issue of the lexicographic description of a scientific term is the question of the role of a linguist. Until recently, it was believed that the compilation of special dictionaries was a matter for terminology specialists. However, with the advent of terminology and terminography as scientific linguistic disciplines, the role of the terminologist-linguist in the interpretation of the term becomes decisive.

In our opinion, it is quite difficult to present the terms of linguoecology concisely, clearly and concisely in one dictionary entry, since the very nature of the conceptual scientific direction we are studying is complex and ambiguous. It is possible to give a full, exhaustive definition only if there are specific comments and a number of reservations. Otherwise, the newly acquired semantic shades will simply not manifest themselves and the terms we are considering will have nothing to do with ecolinguistics.

The interaction of speech culture as a science with other theoretical and practical disciplines actually testifies to its enormous interdisciplinary potential. However, we believe that the most correct and correct way is to understand ecolinguistics aspeckually, namely in the ecological aspect as part of a healthy language environment. Of course, even in such an authoritative publication, despite the encyclopedic information capacity of the linguistic knowledge presented, terminological lacunae associated with linguoecological problems are inevitable.
That is why the further prospect of studying terms in the linguoecological aspect appears to us in the compilation of a special dictionary based on the results already available in this area, which will systematize and streamline environmental knowledge in the field of linguistics, which will undoubtedly contribute to the further development of this modern direction.
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