

PECULIARITIES OF TERM SUBCLASSES

M. I. Sadovska

Kyiv, National Technical University of Ukraine

“Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”

marichkasadovska@gmail.com

The article examines the features of term subclasses as well as reviews and analyzes the basic term requirements. The research serves to clarify the matter of distinctive features of terminological subgroups on the basis of works of modern scholars. We conducted a thorough analysis of each terminological subgroup, singled out specific inherent features of particular lexemes and derived the generalized definitions of subgroups. The detailed etymological analysis of the formation of lexical subgroups was performed and, in accordance with this, clear distinction by the appearance of a particular word in a certain period of time was highlighted. A number of the key differences between terminological subgroups and terms themselves were established: prototerms representing a concept are used in parallel with the newly created terms, however, it should be noted that some prototerms entrenched in modern terminology layer of the language and acquired basic terminological features. Eventually, preterms were completely replaced with newly created lexemes as main characteristics of preterms are: form volatility, non-compliance with brevity and often lack of neutrality, in other words, features which do not meet basic term requirements. In addition, key peculiarities of terminological words as well as examples to every subgroup are graphically illustrated.

Key words: term, prototerm, nomenclature, preterm, pseudoterm, terminoid.

Introduction. Language as a tool of creation, transfer and storage of information is tightly connected with the practical activities of its carrier – the human. The professional language, or terminology, is one of its manifestation. Term as a basic unit of terminology comprises specific peculiarities and is fixed in relevant dictionaries.

At the same time, there is a bulk of terminological lexemes which do not meet the requirements of terms and as a result are left behind certain terminological field. The issue of such subclasses of terms has stirred the interest of many scientists. V. Leichyk, R. Kobryn, B. Golovin, S. Grineva, A. Haiutin devoted their time to investigate affiliation of this kind of vocabulary into dictionary.

The topicality of the issue is evident, since with an advance of science and technology, more and more words representing new concepts appear on a daily basis and definitely these are linguists who are to deal with categorization of newly created words.

Aims and tasks. The aim of the article is to analyze the classification of subclasses of terms and their peculiarities, compare their characteristic features with the basic term requirements, provide generalized definitions of each category as well as to illustrate examples of such type of vocabulary.

Over the last decades such subclasses entrenched in terminology: prototerms, preterms, terminoids and pseudoterms. The classification was introduced in the works of A. Haiutin, V. Leichyk and S. Grinev.

One can define **prototerms** as special lexical units which have appeared before science itself and, thus, do not define scientific notions but special concepts, representations.

Prototerms are preserved in craft and everyday vocabulary, which came to our times, since many special concepts became commonly used. Eventually, a part of prototerms consistently entrenched in a special speech with the uprise of scientific disciplines in which substantive representation of craft and some other human

activities are theoretically conceptualized and transformed into the system of scientific notions. The substantial part of prototerms integrates scientific terminology while the other one exists in the form of lexical units of subject areas (fields) which have no scientific and theoretical basis or function as the so-called folk terminology which is used in parallel with scientific terms but without regard to the conceptual system. Thus, many basic terms of the old terminology were once prototerms and have kept a number of their features – the usage of motivating external features or loss of motivation.

Another subclass is **preterms** – special lexical units used to name newly formed notions which do not correspond to basic requirements of terms. Preterms usually are: descriptive phrases – multi-word nominative combinations used to name notions and allow to accurately describe their nature but do not meet the requirement of brevity; coordinate word-combinations; combinations with verbal phrases.

Preterms are used as terms to name their notions which are difficult to choose a correspondent term. The key differences between terms and preterms are temporality features, form volatility, non-compliance with brevity and often lack of neutrality. In most cases, preterms are replaced by terms. However, sometimes the replacement of preterm with a lexical unit which meets term requirements is delayed and the preterm becomes fixed in special vocabulary acquiring stable position and turning into quaziterm.

Terminoids are special lexemes which referred to the so-called natural concept, that is, those which have not fully formed their ambiguous understanding and it does not have clear boundaries and definitions. Therefore, terminoids do not have the terminological properties as exactness of meaning, contextual independence and established character, though they name concepts.

The following subclass is pseudoterms which can be defined as special lexical units which refer to hypothetical, false concepts that are not compliant with truth. Such type of vocabulary rather belongs to minority.

Professionalisms or **jargon words** are semi-formals words or word-combinations which are more common in colloquial speech among people of a certain profession, specialty, but, in fact, are not strictly scientific notions. For instance, *musical acoustics* in following meanings: 1) *sound-reproducing equipment*; 2) *music that is performed without the usage of electronic instruments*; 3) *part of acoustics which is relevant to the composition, performance, and appreciation of music, including the physical characteristics of sounds that may be heard as music, laws governing the action, design, and construction of musical instruments, and the effects of musical sounds upon listeners; musical apparatus within the meaning of: 1) a set reproducing apparatus; 2) recorder or player*);

For a long time in linguistics the issue concerning relationship between terms and professionalisms as a part of special vocabulary has been discussed and still unambiguous resolution to this problem is not adapted. It should be noted that the problem of correlation between terminology and professional vocabulary is represented by at least three points of view:

– the first one identifies the notion of term and professionalism (introduced in the works of M. Shan and A. Akhmanova);

– the second separates the professional vocabulary and terminology according to some historical and thematical features (the M. Stepanov, I. Chernyshev, V. Portiannykova, F. Kluge, V. Zhirmunski and O. Trubachev are the proponents of this view [7, p. 30]);

– the third view, noting the presence of a large common vocabulary of these layers, can explain the existence of parts that do not match (the representatives of this view are A. Kalinin, V. Prokhorov, N. Fomin, V. Sergeeva, N. Medvedev and S. Shelov).

In the article we support the latter point of view, since there are some evident conceptual differences and, thus, highlight the following features that help distinguish professionalisms and terms:

- professionalisms belong to non-normative special vocabulary unlike terms, which are a normative part of special vocabulary of scientific language;
- professionalisms are rarely introduced in general and special dictionaries and exist mainly in common usage, unlike the terms that are fixed in dictionaries and function simultaneously in two areas (fixation and functioning);
- dominant area of terms functioning is writing while professionalisms are mainly used in oral speech and conversations;
- professionalisms have a broader scope of special activities; terms may be even known to people not related to the professional sphere;
- professionalisms arise from professional communication as a secondary form of expression and often function as vocational and conversational doublets of official terms;
- systemic relations of professionalisms of certain scientific field are less expressed in comparison with terms;
- professionalisms are characterized by the desire for expressiveness, imagery, expression, unlike terms which are deprived of connotations;
- professionalisms compared to terms have less specialized word-building means;
- there is an evident tendency to shorten special expressions which are often used in professional conversation, for example, in a dialogue between two musicians one can hear such shortenings as: *keyborder (a musician who plays the keyboard instruments)*, *drummer (musician who plays the percussion instrument)* and so on;
- professionalisms belong to the periphery of relevant terminology system, while terms are within its center.

It should be added that professional vocabulary is fairly large and heterogeneous. The volume and the variety of professional non-normative vocabulary are specified by their formation peculiarities and functioning of correspondent terminology.

Nomenclature is a system of symbolic conventional signs of alphabetical or numeric patterns that are specially created on the basis of denotational type, for instance, *mediator MD 3*, *tuning fork TF-288 / a*, *recorder DSR-351 guitar HW 300 NS*, *pickup humbucker LP -001 model of silver strings 203*, etc..

It should be noted that the issue of nomenclature was repeatedly violated and discussed in many scientific papers over the last decade. However, still linguistic theory of the term has not reached a consensus of the nature and position of the nominative units in the subsystem of special vocabulary.

G. Vinokur was the one who delimited the notions of terminology and nomenclature for the first time. This distinction was rooted in the science of language, and the majority of modern terminologists share Vinokur's point of view with only small adjustments made. G. Vinokur said: "Unlike terminology, nomenclature should be understood as a system of completely abstract and

conventional symbols, the only purpose of which is to give the most convenient means from practical point of view to designate objects, things without direct relevance to the needs of theoretical thought, which operates these things” [2, p. 8]. However, “the name of an object itself is more or less indifferent for nomenclature designations, while the term tends to have a meaningful internal form, this is a very important issue” [2, p. 10].

Another scholar O. Reformatskii, following G. Vinokur, separates terminology and nomenclature, based on the fact that “nomenclature words are countless and label objects of science, but they are not directly correlated with science concepts while terms of every certain science are thoroughly calculated and associated with the concepts of science since they verbally reflect scientific notions” [6, p. 49]. The meaning of nomenclature words is more exact and accurate than the meaning of terms, nomenclature words may mark individual items, so can be proper names. In her turn, A. Akhmanova offers the following definition of nomenclature in “Dictionary of linguistic terms”: “Nomenclature is a set of technical terms, used in this scientific field; names of typical objects of science (as opposed to the terminology which includes the designation of abstract concepts and categories)” [1, p. 270].

O. Moiseev believes that the distinction between the term and nomenclature is indeed caused by the separation of “conceptual” and “objective” terminology, that is, symbols, which clearly display their own conceptual orientation (terms), or objective orientation (nomenclature) [5, p. 133].

This view is shared and developed by B. Golovin and R. Kobrin. They differentiate even three types of nominative units: nomenclature words, industrial and technical terms and scientific terms, although they recognize some conditional differentiation. Nomenclature words, in their opinion, express individual concepts which contain information about one subject of reality and realize objective ties [3, p. 39]. Unlike nomenclature units, industrial and technical terms, express general concepts that reflect the whole class of similar items and actualize subject relatedness, alike nomenclature words. Scientific terms express generalized notions and implement conceptual ties.

Thus, according to B. Golovin and R. J. Kobrin, nomenclature units can be considered as specific types of terminology which correlate with singular notions and actualize objective ties [3, p. 59].

According to the concept, which was developed in terminology by V. Leichyk, nomenclature is an intermediate between terms and proper names. According to his research, terminological units in terms of content are basically opposite to proper names. On one hand there is a large class of nominative language units – classes of objects, general concepts about these objects and related terms; on the other hand – unique items, their single notion and, thus, their own names [4, p. 45]. Regarding expression of terms and proper names it should be noted that there are also key differences. Terms are mostly a designation of class of objects based on identified common, and significant, their characteristics. Proper names are a designation of unique items on the basis of identified minor external features. The third difference between the terms and proper names lies in that the terms are combined in a complex and extensive system of hierarchical relations, and their names are combined in series, can build the system, though, very simple.

Thus, the terms and terminology, on one hand, are proper names and their combinations. On the other hand, terms are characterized by specific features of the content side and the expression side, and occupy different poles of a huge class of nominative language units [4, p. 38-59].

According to V. Leichyk, nomenclature includes a list of product names of any company, any store goods etc. Nomenclature signs, unlike proper names, are not associated with single concepts, and, alike terms, are symbols of general concepts, but not any kind specific notions. Specificity of notions which serve as the expression of nomenclature units lies in that they (the notions) are always members of a range of similar concepts that only differ in insignificant, minor external peculiarities. As V. Leichyk pointed, the existence of a singular nomenclature sign is impossible since nomenclature unit is a part of a nomenclature system [4, p. 30].

Thus, according to the V. Leichyk's concept, nomenclature can be defined as a system of symbols representing object classes and belonging to a homogeneous range, based on deliberately chosen non-essential external peculiarities of these items. Content plane of nomenclature units, as well as terms, are general concepts, and the expression plane, as well as proper names, are insignificant partial peculiarities. In this sense we can claim that nomenclature is a coherent intermediate link in a series of nominative units – between the terms and proper names.

Summarizing the foregoing provisions, we can conclude that the main features of nomenclature signs or nomens which help differentiate them as part of special vocabulary are:

- nomens are correlated with the concepts through terms function in special communication due to the existence of relevant terms, and do not correlate with any concept, but with the one which is a class indicator [1, p. 30];
- they are proper names or occupy an intermediate position between the terms and proper names [1, p. 8];
- nomens enter a rather simple system which is the list of similar concepts that are at the same level of abstraction and reflect the classes of homogeneous objects;
- they have the lowest level of special vocabulary in the sense that their understanding is impossible without relation to other terminological units;
- nomens have enhanced denotation and convention due to the fact that they are the result of artificial nomination, serving for naming special human activities [1, p. 9];
- nomenclature names are characterized by semantic derivation and replication;
- nomenclature signs are on the periphery of relevant terminology, unlike terms that belong to its center;
- nomens are not fixed in dictionaries and exist only in functioning sphere;
- nomenclature name that describes an object corresponds to a description that contains attributes of the object, while the term has a definition which reflects the essential features of the concept.

It should be added that the nomenclature of every subject area is formed according to special techniques and is determined largely by extralinguistic factors.

As a result, professional vocabulary contains nominative units of the least three classes: terms, professionalism and nomenclature signs which have both similar and distinctive features.

Conclusions. Considering all the above introduced points, we could conclude that there is a bulk of lexical units which have a range of terminological features and at the same time do meet all the requirements to terms. However, the topicality of the issue is evident since more and more lexical units appear on a daily basis, which implies relating them to certain vocabulary layer. Another substantial issue is the analysis of word etymology as well as meaning and connotation so that linguists who compile dictionaries could include the newly created words into the word stock of a certain language.

APPENDIX 1. SUBCLASSES OF TERMS

Subclass of term	Characteristic	Examples
Prototerms	- lexical units used before formation of science; - denote special concepts, not the notions;	corsage – корсаж, pin – шпилька, zigzag stich – зигзагоподібна строчка;
Preterms	- lexical units used for naming newly created notions; - do not meet basic term requirements; - commonly act as descriptive phrases, coordinate word-combinations and combinations with verbal constructions;	flat stich – плоский шов, binding strip – зв'язуюча смужка, стрічка (замість гудзика), satin stich – човниковий стібок для вишивки гладдю, wrinkle-free fabric – тканина, що не мнеться;
Terminoids	- name natural notions, do not have exact definition boundaries; - precision of definition, contextual independence and established character;	raincoat – дощовик, swimsuit – купальник;
Pseudoterms	- name hypothetical, wrong notions, which do not correspond to the facts;	peaked cap – капелюшок із козирком;
Professionalisms	- semi-formal words and word-combinations commonly used in colloquial speech among people of certain specialty; - pursuance of expressiveness and visualization; - tendency to shorten special phases; - belonging to the periphery of terminological system;	tool room – інструменталка – інструментальний цех, wrapper - роба – робочий одяг, spool - шпулька – шпульний ковпачок;
Nomenclature	- symbolic, conventional signs specially created on the basis of terms of denotative type;	sewing machine 1-A – швейна машина 1-A, needle 1 – голка 1, stitching № 10 – шов №10.

REFERENCES

1. Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов / Ольга Сергеевна Ахманова. – М.: Сов. энциклопедия, 1966. – 607 с.
2. Винокур Г. О. О некоторых явлениях словообразования в русской технической терминологии / Григорий Осипович Винокур. – М.: Труды МИФЛИ, 1969. – Т.5. – 354 с.
3. Головин Б. Н. Лингвистические основы учения о терминах / Борис Николаевич Головин, Рафаил Юрьевич Кобрин. – М.: Высшая школа, 1987. – 104 с.
4. Лейчик В. М. Номенклатура – промежуточное звено между терминами и именами собственными // Вопросы терминологии и лингвистической статистики / Владимир Моисеевич Лейчик. – Воронеж: изд-во Воронеж. ун-та, 1974. – 240 с.
5. Моисеев А. И. О языковой природе термина // Лингвистические проблемы научно-технической терминологии / Игорь Александрович Моисеев. – М.: Наука, 1970. – 137 с.
6. Реформатский А.А. Что такое термин и терминология: Сб. Вопросы терминологии / Александр Александрович Реформатский. – М.: Высшая школа, 1961. – 216 с.
7. Трубочёв О.Н. История славянских терминов родства / Олег Николаевич Трубочёв. – М.: Высшая школа, 1959. – 180 с.
8. Шелов С.Д. Терминология, профессиональная лексика и профессионализмы / С. Д. Шелов // Вопросы языкознания. – 1984. – №5. – С. 76-86.

REFERENCES:

1. Akhmanova, O.S. (1966). The dictionary of linguistic terms. Moscow, Russia: Soviet encyclopedia [in Russian].
2. Vinokur, G.O. (1969). About certain word formation phenomena in Russian technical terminology. Moscow, Russia: Trudy MIFLI [in Russian].
3. Golovin, B.N.& Kobrin, R.Yu. (1987). Linguistic basics of terminology. Moscow, Russia: Vysshaia shkola [in Russian].
4. Leichik, V.M. (1974). Nomenclature – an intermediary between terms and proper names. Questions of terminology and linguistic statistics. Voronezh, Russia: Voronezh university publication [in Russian].
5. Moiseev, I.A. (1970). About language nature of term. Linguistic problems of scientific and technical terminology. Moscow, Russia: Nauka [in Russian].
6. Reformatskii, A.A. (1961). What is a term and terminology: Questions of terminology. Moscow, Russia: Vysshaia shkola Vysshaia shkola [in Russian].
7. Trubachev, O.N. (1959). The history of Slavic terms. Moscow, Russia: Vysshaia shkola [in Russian].
8. Shelov, S.D. (1984). Terminology, professional lexis and professionalisms. Questions of linguistics. Moscow, Russia: Vysshaia shkola [in Russian].

М. І. Садовська. Особливості підкласів термінів.

У статті досліджуються особливості підкласів термінів, а також розглянуті та проаналізовані основні вимоги до термінів. На основі опрацьованих робіт сучасних вітчизняних та зарубіжних вчених, порівнюються підкласи термінів з усталеними термінологічними лексемами та аргументуються відмінні характеристики даних лексичних прошарків. Кожна термінологічна підгрупа ґрунтовно проаналізована, виокремлені специфічні ознаки притаманні конкретним лексичним підгрупам, а також виведено узагальнені дефініції кожної термінологічної категорії. Здійснено детальний етимологічний аналіз формування представлених лексичних підгруп та відповідно до цього виділено чітке розмежування за виникненням конкретного слова у певний період часу. Також були встановлені ключові відмінності між термінологічними підгрупами та власне термінами, а саме: прототерміни, що репрезентують певну концепцію, використовуються паралельно із новоствореними термінами, однак, варто зазначити, що частина слів-прототермінів закріпилась в термінологічному прошарку сучасної мови і набула основних термінологічних якостей. Претерміни, натомість, згодом повністю заміщують новоствореними лексемами, оскільки перші характеризуються довільністю форми, відсутністю стислості та нейтральності, рисами, не притаманними термінам. Крім цього, в статті ілюстративно продемонстровані ключові властивості термінологічних лексем, а також представлені приклади до кожної підгрупи.

Ключові слова: термін, прототермін, номенклатура, передтермін, псевдотермін, терміноід.

М. И. Садовская. Особенности терминологических подклассов.

В статье исследуются особенности подклассов терминов, а также рассмотрены и проанализированы основные требования к терминам. На основе обработанных работ современных отечественных и зарубежных ученых, сравниваются подклассы терминов с устоявшимися терминологическими лексемами и аргументируются отличительные характеристики данных лексических слоев. Каждая терминологическая подгруппа основательно проанализирована, выделены специфические признаки присущи конкретным лексемам, а также выведены обобщенные дефиниции всех подгрупп. Также были установлены ключевые различия между терминологическими подгруппами и собственно терминами, а именно: прототермины, представляющие определенную концепцию, используются параллельно с новосозданными терминами, однако, стоит отметить, что часть слов-прототерминов закрепились в терминологическом пласте современного языка и приобрела основные терминологические качества. Претермины, в свою очередь, полностью замещаются новыми лексемами, поскольку первые характеризуются произвольностью формы, отсутствием краткости и нейтральности, чертами, не присущие терминам. Кроме того, в статье иллюстративно продемонстрированы ключевые свойства терминологических лексем, а также представлены примеры к каждой подгруппы.

Ключевые слова: термин, прототермин, номенклатура, передтермин, псевдотермин, терминоид.