



Quantification in Grammar: Ideas of I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay in the Context of Modern Linguistic Research

Xiaoxu Wang¹, Gulshat Ahmathanovna Hayrutdinova², & Xinxin Zhang³

¹Corresponding author, Department of the Russian language and methods of teaching it, IPMK; 382814943@mail.ru

²Department of the Russian Language and Methods of Its Teaching, IPMK; kgulshat@yandex.ru

³Department of Russian Language, Institute of International Economics and Trade, Jilin University of Finance and Economics of China;
18274043@qq.com

Abstract

The article is devoted to the problem of field structuring of grammatical objects. The study focuses on the field organization of parts of speech in Russian. From the point of view of goal-setting, the study is focused on solving two main tasks: 1) to prove the connection between modern ideas about the internal organization of parts of speech with the interpretation of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay of the category of quantitiveness in language, 2) to present his understanding of the field organization of substantives. The following research methods were used as the main ones: descriptive-analytical, morphological analysis of grammatical forms, the method of field structuring. The material for the study was the subject lexemes available in the Russian language, as well as extracts from the "National Corpus of the Russian Language". It is shown that the study of grammar objects from the standpoint of field structuring is poorly developed, as evidenced by unresolved or ambiguously interpreted questions.

Keywords: Heritage of I.A. Baudouin De Courtenay; Category of Quantity; Principle of Field Structuring; Nuclear and Peripheral Zones; Morphological Categories.

1. Introduction

Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, best known for his phoneme theory and phonetic alternations, was a Polish and Russian linguist and Slavist. Baudouin de Courtenay worked at imperial Russian universities for much of his life: Kazan (1874-1883), Dorpat (as Tartu, Estonia was then known) (1883-1893), Kraków (1893-1899) in Austria-Hungary, and St. Petersburg (1900-1918), and he is remembered as a Russian scientist in Russia (Grachev, 2020; Kolmakova & Chernyshenko, 2020; Schooneveld, 2020). He was professor at the re-established University of Warsaw, once again an independent Poland, from 1919 to 1929. He was born in Radzymin, in the Warsaw Governorate of the Polish Congress, to a distant French family. The French aristocrat, who immigrated to Poland during the reign of Polish King August II the Powerful, was one of his ancestors. Baudouin de Courtenay, a forerunner of the University of Warsaw, entered the main school in 1862. He graduated from his philological and historical faculty in 1866 and received a scholarship from the Imperial Ministry of Education of Russia. He studied at numerous foreign universities after leaving Poland, including those in Prague, Jena and Berlin. He was awarded a doctorate from the University of Leipzig in 1870 for his dissertation in Polish on the Old Polish Language prior to the 14th century. In the mid-1870s, Baudouin de Courtenay founded the Kazan School of Linguistics and served from 1875 as a professor at the local university. He was later appointed as the head of the faculty of linguistics at Dorpat University (1883-1893). He held the same position at the Jagiellonian University in Krakow between 1894 and 1898, only to be appointed to St. Petersburg, where he proceeded to develop his theory of phonetic alternations. He returned to Warsaw after Poland regained independence in 1918, where he founded the center of the faculty of linguistics of the University of Warsaw. He held a permanent position at the Polish Academy of Skills from 1887 and was a member of the Petersburg Academy of Sciences from 1897 onwards. He was one of the co-founders of the Linguistic Society of Poland in 1925 (Pajdzińska, 2019). His research had a significant influence on



the linguistic philosophy of the 20th century, and it acted as a basis for many phonology schools. He was an early champion of the study of contemporary spoken languages in synchronic linguistics, which he established with the structuralist linguistic theory of Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure at the same time. The distinction between statics and dynamics of languages and between a language (an abstract group of elements) and speech (its implementation by individuals) is among the most notable of his accomplishments, contrasting the definitions of language and parole of Saussure. Baudouin de Courtenay, along with his students, Mikołaj Kruszewski and Lev Shcherba, also influenced the popular use of the word phoneme, coined in 1873 by the French linguist A. Dufriche-Desgenettes, who proposed it to the German Sprachlaut as a one-word equivalent. According to Koerner, his thesis on the theory of phonetic alternations may have had an influence on Ferdinand de Saussure's work (Alfred & Nwala, 2019; Aloe, 2019; Liberchuk, 2018). Three major phonology schools of the 20th century originated directly from his distinction between physiophonetic (phonological) and psychophonetic (morphophonological) alternations: the phonology school of Leningrad, the phonology school of Moscow, and the phonology school of Prague. Different positions on the essence of Baudouin's alternative dichotomy were established by all three colleges. Outside the area of Slavic linguistics, the Prague School was best known. Hundreds of scientific works have been published in Polish, Russian, Czech, Slovenian, Italian, French and German during his lifetime. Baudouin de Courtenay was also a keen supporter of the national revival of various national minority groups and ethnic groups, in addition to his scientific work. In 1915, the Russian secret service, Okhrana, arrested him for publishing a brochure on the sovereignty of the people under Russian rule. He remained in jail for three months, but was released. In 1922, without his knowledge, Poland's national minorities suggested him as a presidential candidate, but he was defeated in the Polish parliament in the third round of voting, and Gabriel Narutowicz was eventually elected. He was also an active Esperanto operative and the president of the Polish Esperanto Association. In 1927, without entering any other religious denomination, he officially resigned from the Roman Catholic Church. It was in Warsaw that he died. In the Protestant Reformed Cemetery in Warsaw, he is buried with the epitaph that he sought truth and justice (Hałas, 2019; Ivanovna, Emilyevna, & Fyodorovna, 2019; Stanlaw, 2020).

Baudouin de Courtenay works from four in the morning to ten at night every day. He succeeds in training an entire galaxy of pupils. And while his oratorical abilities are not especially brilliant, his students appreciate his style of teaching very much: it's as if Baudouin de Courtenay is speaking out loud in front of his listeners. This enables him to quickly teach young people how to be active thinkers, coupled with his phenomenal ability to generalize truth. Many of the ideas of Baudouin de Courtenay have an inventive personality and are totally ahead of their time. The key achievement of the scholar is his complete revolution of the field of linguistics: linguists only learned written language before Baudouin de Courtenay (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963; de Courtenay & Stankiewicz, 1972; Koerner, 1972). He is the first scholar in linguistics to pay attention to how people actually speak. The scholar proves that two distinct classes of phenomena are writing and language, and the relation between them is of a purely psychological kind. Therefore, Baudouin de Courtenay distinguishes between 'letters' and 'sounds': terms he brings into scientific usage, that is, graphemes and phonemes. He is also a forerunner of modern speech therapy, researching 'language embryology': Baudouin de Courtenay has been making extensive and in-depth studies of the speech production of his own five children for years, summarizing his findings in the Child Speech Observations work. Baudouin de Courtenay is by no means a scientist limited to his office, far from the problems of modern times, despite the scope of his scientific interests (or thanks to them). He does not shy away from social and political issues: he speaks out openly against war, crime, xenophobia and bigotry, publishes articles and signs petitions (he wrote about 200 editorial columns). As a sacred responsibility of scholars and the intelligentsia, he finds keeping an active social role. He repeatedly openly condemns, as a professor at the University of Saint Petersburg, the persecution of ethnic minorities in Tsarist Russia, and campaigns for the rights (including language rights) of national minorities such as Poles and Jews (de Courtenay & Stankiewicz, 1972; Koerner, 1972). He claims that the Polish language should have equal standing with Russian in the Polish Congress (the central part of modern Poland, which was part of the Russian Empire until 1918) and he frequently speaks and writes about the need for cultural freedom in Poland. In 1913, because of fierce criticism of Great-Russian chauvinism, the scholar spent a few months in jail. Baudouin de Courtenay returned to Warsaw after Poland regained its independence in 1918. Here, he was awarded the title of honorary professor at the University of Warsaw, where he taught until his death in 1929. The active social status of Baudouin de Courtenay and his opposition to xenophobia in independent Poland earned the sympathy of the intelligentsia and national minorities, though at the same time angering nationalist circles. The Church also does not accept the scientist because he is an atheist and talks freely about Baudouin de Courtenay. A party of Polish 'jingoists' tried to interrupt a public lecture by Baudouin de Courtenay in a packed Słowacki Theatre in 1922 in Kraków and throw rotten eggs at him-and all because the scholar



dared to say that at the same time it is possible to be both Polish and German. That same year, Poland's national minorities nominated him for the post of President of the world, unknown to Baudouin de Courtenay. The odds of winning are slim, so the great scholar is more of a demonstrative gesture and a tribute to him. Baudouin de Courtenay loses to Gabriel Narutowicz at the Sejm, who would be assassinated by an ultra-right-wing nationalist a few days later. Baudouin de Courtenay is not ashamed to be accountable for his opinions as a classic Liberal-Internationalist. Without the shadows of xenophobia or megalomania, he is a Polish nationalist, and he still thinks freely, staying true to himself in both Russia and Poland (Koerner, 1972). He is also remembered as an altruistic and unmercenary person, an extraordinarily humble person who cared more than himself for others.

The conceptual ideas of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay and, in general, the scientific heritage of the Kazan linguistic school has been devoted to many studies. Among them are the works of V.A. Bogoroditsky, L.V. Shcherba, E.A. Zemskoy, F.M. Berezina, T.S. Sharadzenidze and others. In the works of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay, as you know, pays a lot of attention to the systematic nature of the language, defends the equality of languages, puts forward the requirement for their objective study, determines the priority of learning living languages (including dialects), etc. From our point of view, the issue of quantitiveness in linguistic thinking occupies an important place in the scientist's concept. According to I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay, the complex of quantitative representations reflects in the linguistic consciousness one of the sides of real life, our being. Consequently, the category of quantitiveness can be considered in accordance with various aspects of its analysis: from the point of view of describing the linguistic phenomena themselves, the research methods used, the process of language acquisition. Thus, the problem of the category of quantitiveness, being connected not only with the study of linguistic phenomena, but also with the issues of linguodidactics, has undoubted relevance.

2. Methods

The object of our research is the field organization of parts of speech in Russian, considered in line with the development of the category of quantitiveness (Olga & Marina, 2019; Rasikhovna Shakirova & Raisovna Galiullina, 2019). The objectives of the study are twofold: firstly, the authors set themselves the task of proving the connection between modern ideas about the internal organization of grammatical classes of words (parts of speech) with the interpretation of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay of the category of quantitiveness in language, secondly, it was necessary to give his own interpretation of the field organization of the class of substantives.

The material for the study was the nouns available in the Russian language, as well as extracts from the "National Corpus of the Russian Language" (Kisselev & Furniss, 2020; Ornelas, 2007; Ponomareva et al., 2016). The main research methods were: descriptive-analytical, morphological analysis of grammatical forms, the method of field structuring.

3. Results and Discussion

From our point of view, within the framework of the designated problem, issues related to the reflection of quantitiveness in morphology have scientific promising, since quantitative thinking in this area reveals itself very diversely. According to I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay, a category of quantitiveness in the morphological subsystem of language, reflect the following phenomena:

- Grammatical class of numerals;
- The category of the number of nouns;
- The grammatical gender of substantives, since it is associated with the reflection of gender, which in turn is associated with the number 2, which, from the point of view of Baudouin de Courtenay, has a high degree of tension;
- The concept of collectiveness, which differs from the usual plurality;
- The degree of comparison (*gradus positivus*, *comparativus*, *superlativus*);
- The time and form of verbs, since here we are faced with the concepts of duration, repetition of an action, its beginning, end, completeness / incompleteness, etc. (Adamska-Salaciak, 2001).

Of interest are other thoughts of the founder of the Kazan linguistic school regarding the category of quantitiveness. So, according to the position of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay, in all the constituent parts of languages, places that are stronger and weaker can be distinguished. In line with the same idea of quantitiveness, the scientist pays attention to the reflection in the language of the law of perspective, or egocentrism. According to this law, "as we move away from the place where



we are or where we feel ourselves, the differences between objects become smaller and more disappear; the more distant is assimilated and absorbed by the closer” (Latyshev, 2017). The scientist illustrates the stated position using the material of the present tense forms of the Russian verb. The law of perspective, or egocentrism, here manifests itself in the fact that “the strengthened (potentiated) present embraces not only the present, but at the same time the past and the future”; “For example, birds fly means that they fly not only now, but have always flown and will fly” (Latyshev, 2017). Therefore, according to the thought of Baudouin de Courtenay, the main meaning of presence assimilates and absorbs the non-basic, more distant from the center, meanings of the temporal form. To prove the thesis, the analysis of the semantics of the Russian pronoun *я* (I) is also involved. plural *мы* (we). In addition, masculine assimilation of feminine and neuter nouns is considered when they designate a variety of denotations on the material of the Polish language (Latyshev, 2017).

Based on the above statements, we believe that the ideas put forward by Baudouin de Courtenay about quantitiveness in linguistic thinking, about the strong and weak parts of the language system, about the law of perspective could serve as an impetus for the formation of modern ideas about language, namely, about the field structuring of such complex linguistic formations, as a system of parts of speech, functional-semantic field, etc. This hypothesis in no way contradicts the already established opinion that the theory of the language field was developed in the works of J. Trier, G. Ipsen, V. Porzig, A.V. Bondarko and others. This is only a factor of a stimulating nature, thanks to which the field theory in linguistics was created.

In this regard, the question arises: how do modern scientists consider the grammatical classes of words from the standpoint of the field approach? A review of linguistic works shows that scientists are very actively engaged in the study of various parts of the morphological subsystem (Gizatullina, Lutfullina, & Hayrutdinova, 2018; Nurullina, Erofeeva, Islamova, & Yuan, 2017; Yaparova, Korneyeva, & Markova, 2018; Zholobov, 2017). However, the principle of field structuring in the study of parts of speech has not yet received systemic coverage. This is evidenced by the fact that in the papers on this problem there are still many unsolved questions (Boldyrev, 1996; Igartua & Madariaga, 2018; Shulga, 2017; Yaparova et al., 2018).

Quite known are the statements of some scientists regarding the organization of the system of parts of speech itself. So, V.A. Plotnikova, characterizing the classes of significant words, distinguishes among them the main and non-main parts of speech. The main parts of speech (the stronger part of the morphological subsystem, according to Baudouin de Courtenay) include nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs.

Well, according to Pesetsky, distinguishes them from the non-basic parts of speech - pronouns-nouns and numerals? The main parts of speech have a complex of features that characterize them as special grammatical classes of words. In addition, the composition of the main parts of speech is constantly replenished due to new formations and borrowed words (Pesetsky, 2013); on the basis of this fact, scientists note the quantitative dominance in the lexical fund of the language of those words that belong to the main parts of speech.

The position of G.I. Panova. According to the researcher, the core and periphery can be distinguished in the system of parts of speech. The core of this segment of grammar is composed of nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs. The remaining parts of speech (numerals and words of the category of state) form the periphery of the morphological subsystem (GI, 2003).

The field principle of isolating the nucleus and the periphery is also present when considering individual parts of speech, as evidenced by the work of V.G. Admoni, V.A. Plotnikova, G.I. Panova and others. In this case, different terms are used: core and periphery, nuclear (prototypical or central) and peripheral word groups. So, as part of the substantives of G.I. Panova singles out “classical” nouns that have all the semantic and grammatical properties of this part of speech and, therefore, constitute its core. These words include nouns such as brother, sister, oak, book, tree, denoting specific objects. The periphery of the grammatical class of nouns is formed by abstract, real and collective nouns, as well as inadequate from the point of view of the category of case, substantives such as dream. Regarding proper names, the opinion of G.I. Panova is ambiguous. On the one hand, proper names are considered a special subtype of specific nouns, on the other, they are referred to the periphery of the noun class (GI, 2003).

Let us turn to consideration from the standpoint of field structuring of another grammatical class of words - adjectives. G.I. Panova believes that the core of these attribute lexemes is made up of qualitative adjectives denoting the internal qualities of objects, which manifest themselves to varying degrees (for example, strong - stronger - strongest). It is to



reflect the different measure of the attribute of the object that the category of comparison is formed, characteristic of the words of this part of speech (GI, 2003).

The field principle of description also applies to morphological categories. So, in the category of the genus of nouns, a morphological core is distinguished - the so-called nouns *nomina sexus*, i.e. words containing this sex of a living object such as father, brother, rooster; daughter, bride, chicken, etc. (GI, 2003). From our point of view, the nouns that make up the core of the gender category have the most significant stylistic resources that are realized in the creative use of linguistic units. It is the nouns *nomina sexus* that contribute to the masculinization or feminization of inanimate substantives, forming the imagery of an artistic text. Here are some textual examples: The Kremlin is still asleep, like an older brother. / But people in the Kremlin never sleep. (N. Tikhonov. "The Ballad of the Blue Package"); ... my dream is everywhere / Will find shelter like an imperious queen. (K. Fofanov. "Dream"). The periphery of the genus category in the studies of G.I. Panova has not been identified. In accordance with the logic of the author's reasoning, on the periphery of this category there should be nouns of masculine and feminine gender, which are not capable of indicating the sex of a living being, i.e. performing in the language only a structural, asemantic function. At the same time, however, the status of neuter nouns such as tree, field, which, according to G.I. Panova, do not belong to the words *nomina sexus*, but are endowed with a semantic function (GI, 2003).

It is also interesting to consider the category of the number of nouns. From the point of view of Bogdanov, the core of the morphological category of number is formed by nouns having both forms of number. Only those nouns which denote discrete countable objects can have grammatical opposition in number. For example: daughter - daughters, window - windows (Bogdanov, Evtyukhin, Knyazev Yu, & Smirnov Yu, 2009). The opposition of number forms, as we believe, is especially clearly realized in a literary text, for example: No matter how high, / At noon, at midnight - all the same: / From the sidewalk in hundreds of windows / You will find her window. (S. Shchipachev. "If you fall in love with a girl ..."). It is worth noting that here the singular form not only actualizes the grammatical meaning of the singularity of the object, but also expresses the contextual meaning "the only, dear, associated with the image of the beloved".

The idea of field structuring found its implementation in the description of case semantics. It is no coincidence that I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay wrote that "the values of tension and intensity of some elements of linguistic thinking are most expressive in the field of semantics." "Some associations of extra-linguistic representations with linguistic representations should be considered from this point of view especially strong, convex, bulging" (Ikhtiyorovich, 2020).

So, when characterizing the semantics of the accusative case, modern scholars distinguish as central (according to Baudouin, "strong, convex") the meaning of a direct object, or patient (in examples such as build a bridge, donate a book) and as peripheral - various adverbial meanings (measures of time: wait an hour, space measures: walk a kilometer, etc.).

Assessing the idea of field structuring as promising in the development of a number of problems of morphology, we consider it necessary, however, to express our point of view on the understanding of the nuclear and peripheral zones when considering the first of the issues raised - the characteristics of grammatical classes of words. In the linguistic literature, the "multi-layered" and variety of properties of parts of speech have already been noted. Given this fact, perhaps for greater clarity of description, the core and periphery, for example, of nouns, depending on the aspect of the analysis, should be investigated. So, in terms of common morphological (part of speech) meaning, the core of this grammatical class of words is formed by common nouns, concrete nouns denoting discrete, countable objects such as horse, bowl, saucer. The peripheral words should include abstract words (kindness, walking), material (oxygen, milk) and collective (students, foliage) from the group of common nouns and proper nouns (Russia, Volga, etc.). In terms of morphological features, the core will be composed of mutable nouns with the full paradigm of number and case, that is, a paradigm of 12-word forms. The periphery, therefore, includes: 1) unchangeable nouns (for example, maestro, taxi), 2) words with other types of paradigms - incomplete (sour cream, trousers) and redundant (which is characteristic only for two lexemes - person and year). From the point of view of the features of inflection (type of declension), the nuclear zone is formed only by nouns of substantive declension (for example, house, sister, steppe). The peripheral groups will include nouns of adjective and mixed declension; words that deviate from the models of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd substantive declension (such as banner, path), as well as unchangeable lexemes (lady, depot, tsunami). If we bear in mind the syntactic features of nouns, then the core of this grammatical class includes the substantives that perform the functions of the subject and complement, which are primary for words of this part of speech. Subject lexemes acting in secondary functions - predicate, definition and circumstances, it is logical to consider as referring to the periphery zone. We believe that consideration of



the internal organization of subject lexemes in accordance with a certain aspect of the analysis gives a clearer, clearer idea of their grammatical features, simultaneously revealing the heterogeneity of these linguistic units.

4. Summary

Among the significant for the concept of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay of the principles of linguistic analysis also received coverage of the category of quantitiveness. In a number of works of the scientist, those grammatical phenomena that reflect this concept are considered. In our article, we tried to confirm the hypothesis that the ideas of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay on the reflection of quantitiveness in the language, on the strong and weak parts of the language system, on the law of perspective served as a kind of impetus for the formation of modern ideas about the field structuring of parts of speech. A brief analysis of linguistic works is carried out, in which grammatical classes of words are considered from the standpoint of the theory of the linguistic field. It has been proved that the problem of describing parts of speech in the indicated perspective has not yet been fully developed: there are many unresolved questions regarding the assignment of certain groups of words to the core or periphery of the grammatical class. The author's position on the field structuring of the grammatical class of Russian substantives is expressed, according to which the nuclear and peripheral zones are distinguished from the point of view of: a) semantics, b) morphological categories and types of paradigms, c) features of inflection (type of declension) and d) syntactic functions.

5. Conclusion

The analysis showed that the consideration of the problem of quantitiveness in language, about which I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay has significant prospects. The principle of field structuring of grammatical objects associated with this problem makes it possible to present them more visually, voluminously, revealing those properties that often remain in the shadows. Analysis of morphological units within the framework of this approach makes it possible to more clearly reflect the basic, essential properties of the characterized phenomena.

Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

- Adamska-Sałaciak, A. (2001). Jan Baudouin de Courtenay's contribution to general linguistics. *Towards a History of Linguistics in Poland: From the Early Beginnings to the End of the 20th Century*, 175–208.
- Alfred, E. O.-I., & Nwala, M. A. (2019). Aspects Of Morpheme Analysis In Obolo Language. *Igwebuik: An African Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 4(3).
- Aloe, S. (2019). Italy in the concepts of the Slavists of the nineteenth century. *Slavianovedenie*, (3), 25–38.
- Baudouin de Courtenay, I. A. (1963). Selected works on general linguistics. *M.: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences*, 1, 384.
- Bogdanov, S. I., Evtyukhin, V. B., Knyazev Yu, P., & Smirnov Yu, B. (2009). Ryzhova (Men'shikova) Yu. V., *Voeykova MD Morfologiya Sovremennogo Russkogo Yazyka [Morphology of the Modern Russian Language]*. St. Petersburg.
- Boldyrev, N. N. (1996). On functional categorization and the prototype structure of verbal classes. *General Linguistics*, 36(1), 101.
- de Courtenay, J. N. B., & Stankiewicz, E. (1972). *A Baudouin de Courtenay anthology: The beginnings of structural linguistics*. Indiana University Press Bloomington.
- GI, P. (2003). *Sovremenniy russkii iazyk. Morfologiya: Slovar'-spravochnik. Chast'1 [The modern Russian language. Morphology: A guide. Part 1]*. Abakan, Khakassk State University Press.



- Gizatullina, A., Lutfullina, G., & Hayrutdinova, G. (2018). Perfect Future In Russian As Means Of Expressing Posteriority. *National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts Herald*, (3).
- Grachev, M. A. (2020). Jan Baudouin de Courtenay as the Researcher of Russian Argot. *Russkaya Rech'*, (1), 91–101.
- Hałas, E. (2019). Cultural Sociology in Poland. In *Handbuch Kulturosoziologie* (pp. 217–229). Springer.
- Igartua, I., & Madariaga, N. (2018). The interplay of semantic and formal factors in Russian morphosyntax: Animate paucal constructions in direct object function. *Russian Linguistics*, 42(1), 27–55.
- Ikhtiyorovich, Z. A. (2020). Formation Of Phoneme Paradigms On The Basis Of Category Of Intensification/Deintensification In The Language. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies*, 24(1), 20–25.
- Ivanovna, B. G., Emilyevna, P. E., & Fyodorovna, N. E. (2019). The Explanatory Power of Systemic Linguistics of GP Melnikov for International Relations. *NORDSCI*.
- Kisselev, O., & Furniss, E. (2020). Corpus Linguistics And Russian Language Pedagogy. *The Art of Teaching Russian*, 307.
- Koerner, E. F. K. (1972). Jan Baudouin de Courtenay: His place in the history of linguistic science. *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, 14(4), 663–683.
- Kolmakova, M., & Chernyshenko, D. (2020). Slovenian studies from Jan Baudouin de Courtenay's personal library in the Department of Slavic Literature of the Russian Academy of Sciences Library. *Slavianovedenie*, (1), 101–109.
- Latyshev, O. Y. (2017). Role Of Baudouin De Courtenay In The Preservation And Development Of Native Languages. *BBK 81.2 C68*, 166.
- Liberchuk, L. (2018). On Language, Political Power and the Regulation of Russian Orthography. *International Relations*, 6(01), 24–30.
- Nurullina, G. M., Erofeeva, I. V., Islamova, E. A., & Yuan, T. (2017). Personification as the Way of Grammatical Gender Category Expression in Art Context. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 6(5), 160–165.
- Olga, I., & Marina, Z. (2019). Language Features of Russian Texts of Engineering Discourse. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 244–255.
- Ornelas, E. (2007). National Corpus of the Russian Language: A Good Example for Minor Languages. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5), 705–706.
- Pajdzińska, A. (2019). Linguistic Worldview and Grammatical Categories. *Ethnolinguistics/Etnolingwistyka*, 30, 41–54.
- Pesetsky, D. (2013). *Russian case morphology and the syntactic categories* (Vol. 66). MIT Press.
- Ponomareva, L. D., Churilina, L. N., Buzhinskaya, D. S., Derevska, E. N., Dorfman, O. V., & Sokolova, E. P. (2016). Russian National Corpus as a Tool of Linguo-Didactic Innovation in Teaching Languages. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11(18), 13043–13053.
- Rasikhovna Shakirova, G., & Raisovna Galiullina, G. (2019). Forming of Morphological Competence of Students through Independent Activity at the Lessons of the Native Language. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 1109–1116.
- Schooneveld, C. H. van. (2020). *Baudouin de Courtenay's methodological premisses for the investigation of language and their relation to present-day linguistics*.
- Shulga, M. V. (2017). On Development of Russian Morphological System. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. Serii 2, Iazykoznanie*, 16(4).
- Stanlaw, J. (2020). Phonemics. *The International Encyclopedia of Linguistic Anthropology*, 1–10.



Yaparova, A. V., Korneyeva, T. A., & Markova, T. D. (2018). Formal substantivization in Russian. *Amazonia Investiga*, 7(15), 114–119.

Zholobov, O. F. (2017). Old Slavic Sermon Language: The Extraordinary Nature of Verb Morphology in Cyril Turovskij's Homilies. *Slověne= Словъне. International Journal of Slavic Studies*, 6(2), 137–162.



© 2020 by the authors. Licensee Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Iran. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0 license). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

