

УДК 001.4:811.111

АРТЮХ В.М.*(Полтавський університет економіки і торгівлі)***TERMINOLOGY STUDIES: APPROACHES AND FINDINGS**

У статті розглядаються підходи до вивчення терміна. Автор здійснює огляд існуючих концептуальних засад у термінознавстві. На основі аналізованих критеріїв пропонується визначення економічного терміна.

Ключові слова: термінологічна система, термін, критерії, функціональний підхід, нормативний підхід.

Артюх В.М. Терминологические студии: подходы и результаты исследований. В статье рассматриваются существующие подходы к изучению термина. Автор осуществляет обзор существующих концептуальных положений в терминоведении. На основании проанализированных критериев предлагается определение экономического термина.

Ключевые слова: терминологическая система, термин, критерии, функциональный подход, нормативный подход.

Artyukh V.M. Terminology studies: approaches and findings. This article considers approaches to terms study. The author reviews the existing conceptual propositions in terminology. On the basis of analysed criteria the definition of economic term is suggested.

Key words: terminological system, term, criteria, functional approach, normative approach.

As economic activity increases, there have been more and more terms arising to denote different concepts and notions concerning this field of human life. As a result, some scholars have made contribution to the research of terminology. Terms have been investigated in many aspects. Linguists and terminologists have drawn demarcation between term and nomen [Лемов 2000, с. 30-32; Суперанская 1978, с. 73-83; Keizer, Abu-Hanna, Zwetsloot-Schonk 2000, p. 18], have specified the distinctive features of terms, professionalisms and professional jargonisms [Борисова, Донской 1984, с. 34-40; Кольбух 2008, с. 96]. The above mentioned findings provided theoretical platform for defining terms and nomens as codified units while professionalisms and professional jargonisms not as such.

Though a lot has been done in the study of terminology still there are many facets left for the description and discussion. The present paper is an investigation of terms study approaches and corresponding findings.

It is a well-known fact that in most terminology studies scholars stick to either of the two approaches – functional or normative. According to functional approach which was introduced by G.O. Vinokur (and later developed by his successors M.N. Volodina, A.S. Gerd, V.P. Danilenko, B.N. Golovin and others), any word can be terminological unit denoting a specialised concept.

Antinomy of term within a functional approach is in its dual nature that is caused by its belonging to the General English Language and a certain sublanguage. It is expedient to explain this by two factors: as a unit of *logos* term must comply with the requirements of terminology system, i.e. “eliminating of indefiniteness, intellectual clarity, aesthetic, emotional and modal neutrality and also orderliness and strict systemity”, while as a unit of *lexis* it is “an obedient child” that strives for variation, whose content is defined within the given lexical-semantic system and by its combinability [Морковкин 1988, с. 181].

That is why current linguistic studies within functional approach focus on different aspects of *term-logos* and *term-lexis*. Thus, it is proven in a number of works that the boundary between term and non-term is tenuous. And sometimes it is difficult or impossible to distinguish one from another as most of the terms are coined not artificially with the help of “quasilexical means” [Лемов 2000, с. 57] but on the basis of general language lexicon [Афинская 2001, с. 51; Kageura 2002, p. 26]. In this connection V.M. Pererva suggested functional parameters for identifying “lower bound” that differentiates term from non-term and “upper bound” that distinguishes between terminological word-combinations and non-terminological ones [Перерва 1978, с. 193-194].

The priority of general language lexicon in producing terms and their functional realisation is of different vectors. Terms’ entry into the economic or other terminology is preconditioned by motivation factor since language motivation is confirmed as term’s characteristic feature that elucidates unoriginality of terminological system towards the general language [Макарихина 1984, с. 43]. This causes a number of language phenomena: transfer of general language words into terminology system

and vice versa [Крыжановская, Симоненко 1987, с. 45; Суперанская 1978, с. 82]. Accordingly, terminologisation, determinologisation or reterminologisation occur [Журавлева 1988, с. 21-22, 124; Лейчик 2006, с. 29].

Opposite to functional approach stands out the definition of term within normative approach. D.S. Lotte and representatives of normative approach (O.S. Akhmanova, T.L. Kandelaki, O.O. Reformatskiy and others) consider terms to be special words characterised by univocity, precision, definition, systemity, absence of synonyms, shortness and other features. Such requirements to terms are considered normative though it is acknowledged that those are the ones to an “ideal” term [Циткина 1988, с. 9] as they are almost impossible to be achieved due to some intra-and extralinguistic factors.

Notwithstanding the difference between the two approaches it is clearly seen from the contemporary works on terminology that all scholars stick to the normative criteria of term identification. Thus, the criterion of *systemity*, that presupposes its conceptual belonging to a certain sublanguage, is used by scholars to define term as a special subject unit of a certain subject field.

Term represents a certain concept referring to the realia, object of the reality and interconnections between them [Рогач 1999, с. 152]. Concept, accordingly, is “a mental construct, formed on the basis of an object” [Суперанская 2005, с. 15] in the process of cognition. It is abstracted by fixing general distinguishing characteristics of individual objects and term is “a form and means of concept existence” [Журавлев 1988, с. 129]. Thus, “concept is embedded, so to speak, in term’s structure, organically blended with a language complex of the term” [Климовицкий 1978, с. 111].

However, the analysis of term and concept expressed by it, revealed complexity of dialectical correlation between the two [Крыжановская, Симоненко 1987, с. 16; Лейчик 2006, с. 66] which is preconditioned by its linguistic nature since every term reflects general, not individual characteristics of an object or logical-object connections between them.

Every term reflects different stages of approximating to the truth since with extending of knowledge of an object of study, new and new attributes of the known terms are added [Авербух 1988, с. 30], it can be invariant and variant which causes various treatises of concept, expressed by term [Котелова 1978, с. 36-37], as a result there can be polisemy which in its turn causes breakup of polisemy with subsequent intrasectoral, intersectoral and intersystem homonymy [Англійський економічний термін ... 2008, с. 143, 164-165].

The criterion of *conceptuality* [Суперанская 1978 с. 79] is closely connected with *the definition* of term since logical normativeness presupposes that terminological unit will perform its gnoseological function that is to keep and fix scientific knowledge and convey information [Ткачева 1989, с. 31] about a certain object, realia, phenomenon or process of theoretical and practical activity, i.e. term must refer to a concept of a certain subject field the meaning of which is expressed in its definition.

Definition is referred to as “logical definition of a concept, stating of a precise meaning of a concept, its distinctive features” [Головин, Кобрин 1987, с. 62]. Usually scholars underline that definition of a term is made through the formula *definition per genus et defferentiam* [Keizer, Abu-Hanna, Zwetsloot-Schonk 2000, с. 18; Суперанская 1978, с. 76], whereby since *definiendum* is a term there must be terms in its *definiens* as well [Лемов 2000, с. 41-42, 73].

So the distinctive features of each term must be expressed in a certain way either through genus-species features [Лемов 2000, с. 41-42], or synonymic description [Голубовская 1989, с. 11–12], but not to cause tautology, inconsistency, logical circle in the definitions, breaking of systemity, norm, substitution of concept definition, use of little-known terms [Волкова 1986, с.140-144; Краткий словарь... 1966, с. 62].

Specifying the existence of term’s definition, scholars underline that motivated terms have definition. In contrast, weakly motivated or nonmotivated terms can have no definition at all since their sign structure does not include designation of objects or their properties [Лейчик 2006, с. 66, 178]. It must be noted that motivation is understood here as “measure of correlation between the form and lexical meaning of the word (...). The more the internal form of the lexical unit correlates with the meaning, the more motivated the given word is” [Бялик 1985, с. 9].

According to the generally accepted characteristics term is *a special sign* that performs a significative function of designation of a certain denotatum. Sign is a material-ideal unit [Головин,

Кобрин 1987, с. 31], the ideal side in which represents the reality in human mind and the material one is realised in physical form of a word (which is morphophonological).

Thus, every term as a bilateral material-ideal unit with its plane of content (concept which it represents – a semantic category) and plane of expression (language form in which it represents this concept) [Суперанская 2005, с. 19]. But since term is coined mostly on the basis of a language substratum [Лейчик 1986, с. 89] (if it is not forged artificially), it has inherited word property – asymmetry of a language sign [Лемов 2000, с. 137]. In this case we can speak about lexical-semantic paradigm (synonymy, antonymy, polysemy, and homonymy) of a term coined within terminological system and subordinated to the internal rules of the national literary language. In this connection scholars point out that term is not univocal [Котелова 1978, с. 37].

Since word can have several lexical-semantic variants, when coining a term, a terminologist chooses such a variant which describes best of all the scientific and technical realia or object of the economic activity as a result of which the phenomena of polysemy or homonymy within one or several terminological systems occur [Головин, Кобрин 1987, с. 48-53]. Human factor also influences appearance of asymmetrical dualism when there is a choice of several words made to denote and express a concept which causes the phenomenon of synonymy [Головин, Кобрин 1987, с. 53-58; Крыжановская, Симоненко 1987, с. 41; Перерва 1978, с. 198].

Syntagmatic asymmetry of a language sign is in analytical structures of syntactical models which are typical for making terminological word-combinations when two components of plane of content correlate with one component of plane of expression, for instance, *to make a deduction* – „відрахувувати/відрахувати“ [Шимків 2004, с. 110].

The criterion of logical normativeness presupposes stating of hierarchical connections between the terms which are defined as genus-species or hyper-hyponymic. Such connections show the systemity of the term and its place in terminological system but not all the terms for the moment of certain phenomenon research are interconnected with the other terms and, therefore, in some cases to specify the norm of the term is difficult.

Going by fundamental works of scholars in which term identification criteria are highlighted, in our research we adhere to *systemity, specificity, definition, precision, optimum length, fixed notion, euphony, stylistic neutrality, asymmetry, codification*.

As for asymmetry of term most scholars acknowledge its existence in any sublanguage [Головин, Кобрин 1987, с. 48-59; Лемов 2000, с. 121-135, 137-144; Перерва 1978, с. 197]. That is why synonymy, antonymy, polysemy and homonymy can be considered undesirable for the English economic terminological system but irrefutable which proves language nature of terminological units.

The generalised and analysed criteria enable defining of *economic term*. *Economic term* is a word or word-combination, expressing the notion of theoretical and practical activity represented in its definition, having a set of integral and differential linguistic and psycholinguistic properties that give it status of a term.

To conclude, in current terminology studies there is a sufficient theoretical framework which underpins the two major approaches to the terminology study – functional and normative. The scholars make endeavours to reveal different aspects of special subject units relying on the identification criteria within the normative approach. Since terminology is in perpetual development, more and more questions arise concerning communicative, cognitive, pragmatic and the like aspects of terms. Therefore, possible further research suggested is to specify and clarify the properties of terminological units within specialised communication.

Література

- Авербух К.Я. Терминография: традиционное и специфическое / К. Я. Авербух // Теория и практика научно-технической лексикографии : [Сб. статей.] – М.: Рус. яз., 1988. – С. 27-34. *Англійський економічний термін* (структурний, семантичний, функціональний та лексикографічний аспект) [монографія] / Артюх В.М., Глоба О.В., Іщенко В.Л., Хван А.В. – Полтава: РВВ ПУСКУ, 2008. – 327 с. *Афинская З.Н.* Определение и толкование терминов (на материале экономической литературы) / З.Н. Афинская // Вестник МГУ. Сер. 19. Лингвистика и культурная коммуникация. – Москва: МГУ. – 2001, № 1. – С. 51-59. *Борисова Л.Т.* Профессионализмы и профессиональные жаргонизмы в отраслевом терминологическом словаре / Л.Т. Борисова, Я.Л. Донской // Термины в языке и речи: [междуз. сб. научн. тр.]. – Горький: ГГУ, 1984. – С. 34-40. *Бялик В.Д.* Структурно-семантические особенности и мотивированность терминов в современном английском языке (на материале терминологии вычислительной техники): автореф. канд. филол. наук: спец. 10.02.04 „Германские языки“ / В.Д. Бялик. – К., 1985. – 25 с. *Волкова И.Н.* Моделирование определений в терминологических стандартах / И.Н. Волкова // Современные

проблемы русской терминологии. – М.: Наука, 1986. – С. 140-161. Головин Б.Н. Лингвистические основы учения о терминах / Б.Н. Головин, Р.Ю. Кобрин. – М.: Высшая школа, 1987. – 105 с. Голубовская И.А. Структурно-семантические особенности глагольной полисемии: автореф. дис. ... канд. фил. наук: спец. 10.02.19. „Теория языка“ / И.А. Голубовская. – К., 1989. – 27 с. Журавлев В.К. Терминоведение в аспекте диахронической социолингвистики / В.К. Журавлев // Терминография: традиционное и специфическое // Теория и практика научно-технической лексикографии. [сб. статей]. – М.: Рус. яз., 1988. – С. 129-131. Журавлева Т.А. Особенности терминологической номинации [монография] / Т.А. Журавлева. Донец. гос. ун-т; [Отв. ред. А.М.Шахнарвич]. – Донецк: АООТ Торг. Дом. "Донбасс", 1998. – 252 с. Климовицкий Я.И. Термин и обусловленность определения понятия в системе словарей / Я.И. Климовицкий // Проблематика определений терминов в словарях разных типов. – Л.: Наука, 1978. – С. 107-114. Кольбух О. Питання взаємозв'язку термінологічної та професійної лексики в системі економічних понять / О.Кольбух // Нова філологія. Збірник наукових праць. – Запоріжжя: ЗНУ, 2008. – №31. – С.95-98. Котелова Н.З. Семантическая характеристика терминов в словарях / Н.З. Котелова // Проблематика определения терминов в словарях разных типов. – Л.: Изд-во „Наука“, 1978. – С. 30-44. Краткий словарь по философии / Под общ. ред. И.В.Блауберга, П.В.Копнина, И.К.Пантина. – М.: Политиздат, 1966. – 360 с. Крыжановская А.В. Актуальные проблемы упорядочения научной терминологии / А.В. Крыжановская, Л.А. Симоненко. – К.: Наукова думка, 1987. – 164 с. Лейчик В.М. О языковом субстрате термина / В.М. Лейчик // Вопросы языкознания. – М.: Наука, 1986. – № 5. – С. 87-96. Лейчик В.М. Терминоведение: предмет, методы, структура. Изд. 2-е, испр. и доп. / В.М. Лейчик. – М.: КомКнига, 2006. – 256с. Лемов А.В. Система, структура и функционирование научного термина (на материале русской лингвистической терминологии) / А.В. Лемов. – Саранск: Изд-во Мордов. ун-та, 2000. – 192 с. Макарихина О.А. Мотивированность и идиоматичность терминов // Термины в языке и речи: Межвуз. сб. научн. тр. – Горький, 1984. – С.41-47. Морковкин В.В. О лексикографическом обеспечении профессионально ориентированного обучения русскому языку нерусских студентов / В.В. Морковкин // Теория и практика научно-технической лексикографии: [Сб. статей.]. – М.: Рус. яз., 1988. – С. 180-185. Перерва В.М. О принципах и проблемах отбора терминов и составлении словника терминологических словарей / В.М. Перерва // Проблематика определений терминов в словарях разных типов. – Л.: Изд-во „Наука“, 1978. – С. 190-204. Рогач Л.В. Когнітивний аспект семантики лінгвістичної термінології // Записки з романо-германської філології: Збірник наукових праць факультету романо-германської філології ОДУ. – Випуск 5. – Одеса: Латстар, 1999. – С. 151-158. Суперанская А.В. Терминология и номенклатура / А.В. Суперанская // Проблематика определений терминов в словарях разных типов. – Л.: Изд-во „Наука“, 1978. – С. 73-83. Суперанская А.В. Общая терминология: терминологическая деятельность / А. В.Суперанская, Н.В. Подольская, Н.В. Васильева. – М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2005. – 288 с. Ткачева Л.Б. Поиск, обработка и оформление внутриотраслевых терминов / Л.Б. Ткачева // Терминологическая система как объект лексикографии. – М.: Изд-во „Русский язык“, 1989. – С. 30-33. Циткина Ф.А. Терминология и перевод (к основам сопоставительного терминоведения): [монография] / Ф.А. Циткина. – Львов: Изд-во при Львовском гос. ун-те издат. объединения «Вища школа», 1988. – 157 с. Шимкєв А. Англо-український тлумачний словник економічної лексики. – К.: Вид. дім „Києво-Могилянська академія“, 2004. – 429 с. Kageura K. The Dynamics of Terminology. A descriptive theory of term formation and terminological growth / K. Kageura. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. – 2002. – 322 p. Keizer de N.F. Understanding Terminological systems I: Terminology and Typology [Електронний ресурс]: / N.F. de Keizer, A.Abu-Hanna, J.H.M. Zwetsloot-Schonk // Methods of Information in Medicine. № 39. 2000. – P. 16-21. – Режим доступу: <http://kik.amc.uva.nl/home/aabuhanna/Understanding1.pdf>

УДК 81'25: [811.161.2: 811.111]

БАРМІНА Є. О.

(Севастопольський національний технічний університет)

ВТРАТИ ІНФОРМАЦІЇ ПРИ ВІДТВОРЕННІ ДЕБІТИВНОЇ МОДАЛЬНОСТІ У ПЕРЕКЛАДІ

Барміна Є. О. Втрати інформації при відтворенні дебітивної модальності у перекладі. У статті розглядаються втрати інформації щодо дебітивної модальності при перекладі українських медійних текстів англійською мовою. Встановлено, що втрати інформації зумовлені відмінністю граматичної кодифікації мови оригіналу і мови перекладу та міжкультурною асиметрією.

Ключові слова: втрати інформації, переклад, дебітивна модальність, міжкультурна асиметрія.

Бармина Е. А. Потери информации при передаче дебитивной модальности в переводе. В статье рассматриваются потери информации про дебитивность при переводе украинских медийных текстов на английский язык. Установлено, что потери информации обусловлены различиями грамматической кодификации языка оригинала и языка перевода и межкультурной асимметрией.

Ключевые слова: потери информации, перевод, дебитивная модальность, межкультурная асимметрия.

Barmina E.A. Loss of Information in the Process of the Debitive Modality Rendering. The article deals with the loss of information as to the debitive modality in the process of translation of Ukrainian media texts into English. The author demonstrates that the loss of information takes place as the result of the difference in the grammatical structure of the source and target languages and intercultural asymmetry.

Key words: loss of information, translation, debitive modality, intercultural asymmetry.