Германські мови

German languages

ПОЛІСЕМАНТИЧНИЙ ТЕРМІН ЯК ЛЕКСИЧНА ТА СЕМАНТИЧНА ОСОБЛИВІСТЬ ТЕРМІНОСИСТЕМИ МІЖНАРОДНИХ ВІДНОСИН

Зоя КУДЕЛЬКО,
Чернівецький національний університет імені Юрія Федьковича,
Чернівці (Україна), zbshevchenko@gmail.com;

POLYSEMANTIC TERM AS A LEXICAL AND SEMANTIC PECULIARITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS TERMINOLOGY

Zoya KUDELKO,
Chernivtsi National University
named after Yuriy Fed'kovych, Chernivtsi(Ukraine),
ORCID ID 0000-0002-3331-6154; Researcher ID B-9106-2017

Зоя Куделько. Полисемантический термин как лексическая и семантическая особенность терминосистемы международных отношений. Цель исследования. Данная научная разведка имеет своей целью осветить полисемантичные отношения в терминосистеме международных отношений, проанализировать многозначность термина как естественное проявление свойственной лексической системе языка тенденции к полисемии. **Методика исследования.** Основным методом данного исследования является аналитико-описательный, также использованы контрастивный и статистический методы. **Научная новизна** работы заключается в том, что комплексно, синтагматически и парадигматически исследуется терминосистема международных отношений, показана взаимосвязь появления полисемантичных терминов в данном профессиональном субъязыке с современными тенденциями развития международных отношений. В процессе анализа терминологии международных отношений выявлено два типа полисемии: внутреннюю и внешнюю. Проведенный анализ позволяет говорить об "обратно пропорциональной" зависимости между длиной терминологического словосочетания и полисемией. Многозначные лексические единицы терминологии международных отношений различаются на основании своей словообразовательной структуры: корневые слова и словообразовательные производные. В ходе исследования установлено, что среди многозначных производных терминов подавляющее большинство составляют суффиксальные образования. Было выделено и изучено три типа многозначности: радиальная полисемия, цепная полисемия и радиально-цепная полисемия. Между значениями полисемантического слова допустимы три типа отношений: пересечение, включение и семантическая омонимия. Результаты анализа терминосистемы международных отношений свидетельствуют, что характерными чертами возникновения новых значений в данной терминологии являются логические отношения подчинения (гипонимии) и перекрещивания (метафоры и метонимии). Преимущественно в основе возникновения многозначных терминов этой терминосистемы лежит метонимия. Полисемия в терминосистеме международных отношений может быть грамматической и терминологической. Полисемия также делится на денотативную, сигнификативную и денотативно-сигнификативную. Исследование терминосистемы международных отношений свидетельствует, что наиболее распространенным видом полисемии в данном профессиональном субъязыке является денотативно-сигнификативный. **Выводы.** Итак, в результате проведенного нами анализа терминосистемы международных отношений мы обнаружили, что: многозначные термины в терминосистеме международных отношений составляют примерно 3% от всего исследованного корпуса ТО; для данной терминосистемы характерны следующие виды многозначности: радиальная, цепная, радиально-цепная; денотативная, сигнификативный и денотативно-сигнификативный; между ЛСВ термина проанализированной терминологии наиболее характерны метонимические связи; по словообразовательной структуре многозначные термины международных отношений делятся на: простые (корневые), производные и сложные.

Ключевые слова: терминология международных отношений, полисемия, полисемантический термин, внутренняя полисемия, внешняя полисемия, радиальная полисемия, цепная полисемия, радиально-цепная полисемия.

Problem statement and its connection with important scientific tasks. The process of formation of new scientific and technical terms, that is the process of naming new concepts of science and technology, mainly follows the general laws of language nomination, but the terminological nomination has its own specifics. One of the specific features of the terminological nomination is its negative attitude to synonymous and polysemantic terms, however, the practice of creating and functioning of terms shows that this linguistic phenomenon is becoming more characteristic of terminology, although one of the requirements for the ideal term is the requirement of no synonyms and polysemantic terms. It would seem that in an industry where names are formed artificially and are often the subject of discussion and debate, the implementation of this requirement is easily achievable. However, in reality there is a regular violation of this requirement: the terminological systems of various fields of knowledge demonstrate numerous examples of synonymy and polysemy of terms. This circumstance is due to the resistance of the language material, which is subject to the requirements of the general language paradigm. As an integral part of common vocabulary, terminology has to follow the laws and processes of development and functioning of language. Therefore, in terminology, all lexical and semantic processes occur, including synonymy and polysemy, but with their own specific features of the implementation of these processes.

The **relevance of this study** is to identify polysemantic international relations terms, allowing fairly objective approaches to improving and normalizing this professional

Актуальні питання суспільних наук та історії медицини. Спільний українсько-румунський науковий журнал.
*(АПСНІМ), 2020, № 3 (27), Р. **40-43***

40

sublanguage, the optimal formation of a similar Ukrainian-language terminology, which is able to focus on the perience of the language-producer. The objective of the ticle is to study the lexical and semantic features of the phenomenon of polysemy in this terminology.

The analysis of the latest research and publications that initiated the solution to the problem. The issues of polysemy have long been the subject of study by many scholars: V.V. Vinogradov, A.V. Superanskaya, Y.D. Apresyan, T.R. Kyiak, V.V. Dubichinsky, Adamska-Sałaciak and others.

Thus, O.V. Superanskaya notes that due to the violati-violation of the traditional relation for the general vocabul-vocabulary *word-subject-concept*, special vocabulary differs from the general in the following aspects: 1) translation into other languages; 2) borrowings; 3) change or clarification of the plan of expression; 4) change or clarification of the content plan; 5) polysemy; 6) homonymy; 7) synonymy; 8) antonymy[1]. As you can see, the properties of the lexical unit of general vocabulary differ from the word of special vocabulary: the lexical unit of special vocabulary has a content plan and expression plan, and its meaning does not consist of the sum of meanings of its constituent elements, which form it, but is given to the indicated unit systemi-systemically[2].

Polysemy, widely represented in the appellate vocabul-vocabulary, is realized in the special lexis in a slightly different way: if in the general vocabulary this phenomenon leads to the expansion and enrichment of vocabulary, in the special lexis it is undesirable, because it violates the language efforts to maintain unambiguous correspondence between the referent and the sign nominating it.

Presentation of the study. The development of polysemantic relations in the system of any terminological system is an inevitable phenomenon, because the content of a linguistic sign develops more actively and faster than its form. The terminology scholars unanimously single out two main reasons for the polysemy phenomenon:

an emergent new concept that has similar features to the concept named by this term;

the development and modification of the concept which causes splitting of the semantics of the term.

Polysemy is considered as a set of semantic ties involved in the synchronous semantic structure of the term. It is assumed that the ambiguity of the term is a natural manifestation of the tendency to polysemy inherent in the lexical system of language.

In the process of analyzing the terminology of interna-international relations, two types of polysemy were identif-identified: 1) internal (within the terminology itself); 2) external (between individual terminological systems). The semantic basis of the first type of polysemy is the differe-differentiation of scientific concepts and the shaking of the semantics of the unambiguous term.

There were studied about 2 500 terms of the international relations term system. The first type of polysemy in-includes about 74 polysemantic terms (which is about 3% of all analyzed), including those 13 terms that have more than 2 meanings within the studied terminology.

The comparison of the polysemy in terms-words and in terminological combinations revealed: a) the complete pr-predominance of one-word terms (their number is 76%, for example: minutes, treaty, capitulation); b) two-component phrases – 24% (for example: treaty of protectorate, treaty of option, national income); c) three-component and four or more components of polysemantic phrases are not detected.

The analysis allows us to talk about inversely proport-proportional relationship between the length of the termino-terminology and polysemy: an increase in the number of components that are part of it, prevent the emergence of ambiguity. In addition, word combinations are a factor that limits the possibilities of polysemy.

Polysemantic lexical units of international relations terminology differ on the basis of their word-formation st-structure. Among them we distinguish:

1) root words: deficit, embargo, paraph, protocol;

2) word-forming derivatives: corruption, directorate, disavow, funding.

During the analysis of the word-forming structure of the derived term, consisting of the derived base and the wo-word-forming affix, it was found that among the multi-valued derived terms the vast majority are: a) suffix formati-formations (81%); b) suffix-prefix (12%); c) prefixal (7%).

In the study of word-formation models of derivative terms, the most frequent were terms with suffixes: -ion / -tion / -ation (25%); -y; -or / -er; -ing (15% each); -ment (12%); -ism (2%).

3) complex: plural population, preliminary list, import quota;

Quantitatively, by structural types, polysemantic terms are distributed as follows: simple or root words – 37%; de-derivatives – 49%; complex – 14%. A small percentage is ambiguity in complex words, and its complete absence in the terms-abbreviations indicates the interaction between the structure of the term and polysemy, which means that the more complex its structure, the less polysemy.

The potential of polysemy lies in the ability of languag-language to reflect not only the things and phenomena of the objective world, but also certain connections and interde-interdependencies between them, on the basis that they are established by a man in the process of socio-historical de-development. These connections can be based on similarity, which leads to the combination of two or more meanings in one word. The meanings of a polysemous word are combi-combined into a semantic unity due to certain relations that have developed between them on the basis of common se-semantic associations (metaphor, metonymy, functional commonality).

According to Yu.D. Apresian there were identified and studied three types of ambiguity:[2]

1) *radial polysemy:* all meanings of the word are mo-motivated by the same central meaning, for example: to exceed powers, to exceed the alloted term, to exceed the alloted date with the general component "to go or be beyond a limit, measure, limiting regulation"[3].

2) chain polysemy (it is very rare in its pure form): each new meaning of the word is motivated by another me-meaning, the closest to it, but the extreme meanings may not

[1] Superanskaya A.V. Obshchaia terminologiia: voprosy teorii [General Terminology: Theoretical issues], Moscow: Nauka, 1989, 243 p. [in Russian].

[2] Anisimova A.G., Malakhova V.L., Abdulrahimov E. "Challenges of translating polysemantic and multiequivalent terms within the framework of economic professional discourse", *Professional Discourse & Communication,* N 1(1), 2019, P. 46–54 [in English].

[3] ApresianYu.D. "Trudnosti postroieniia formalnoi modela yazyka" [Difficulties in building a formal language model] *Kibernetika: Perspektivy razvitiia.* [Cybernetics. Development prospects], Moscow: Nauka, 1981, P. 109–113 [in Russian].

1. The system of rules on the correct and acceptable way to behave on official occasions; 2. A method for connecting computers so that they can exchange information.

3) radial-chain polysemy, for example, *advances:* 1. An increase of price or value; 2. Opening approaches made to secure acquaintance, favor, or an agreement; overtures: a) the furnishing of funds or goods on credit; b) the funds or goods so furnished; a loan; c) payment of money before due; d) the money so paid; 3. Preparation, especially publicity, done prior to the appearance of a public figure or the staging of a public event.

Chain polysemy is quite clearly reflected in the explanation dictionaries in the form of a linearly numbered sequence of meanings: 1; 2; 3… However, the use of this method of ering meanings for radial and, especially, radial-chain ambiguiguity leads to distortion of the hierarchical semantic structure of the corresponding words. Therefore, to describe such words, the following numbering is proposed: 1, 1.1, 1.2 or 1. a); b); 2. a); b) or 1. a.; b.;.

The meanings of polysemous words are formed by the so-called conceptual spheres, i.e. semantic fields, the components of which are connected by some common basis. There are two types of semantic fields:

1) subject or denotation fields, in which the terms are combined in relation to one subject area;

2) conceptual or significant fields, in which terms are combined in relation to one area of concepts or ideas[4]

In the subject fields, words are organized mainly on the principle of *space* and on the principle of the ratio of things: function (purpose) and its arguments (manufacturer, agent, tool, result); a part and a whole. In conceptual fields, mainly on the principle of *time* and on the principle of correlation of concepts: subordination, antonymy etc. These relationships between cts and concepts underlie the formation of new meanings and polysemy in particular.

There are three types of relations between the meanings of a polysemantic word: intersection, inclusion, and semantic homonymy. However, the relations of intersection and inclusiusion unite them in one semantic field, and semantic nymy divides them into different fields. Therefore, for the study of a polysemous word as a field semantic structure, the first two types of relations: inclusion and intersection are of paramount importance.

The relations of inclusion between LSV (lexical-semantic variants) base on their consistent derivation. The center and starting point of the derivation chain is always the main meaning. At the heart of the intersection of LSV is their parallel de-derivation. However, the relations of inclusion and intersection between meanings are most often presented in the semantic structure of polysemous words at the same time. Both at inclu-inclusion, and at intersection of the meanings of a polysemous word the basic meaning is always in the center of a semantic or an associative field formed by them. All other LSV are directly or indirectly subordinated to it. Thus, the polysemy of a word is largely determined by its basic meaning. The essence of direct nominative meaning is to directly compare the linguistic sign with the non-linguistic object, the direct name of which it is.

The main meaning of the word does not require context. It us-usually first comes to mind when a person hears a word. The direct nominative meaning is paradigmatically fixed, and synta-syntagmatically free.

In addition to the main direct nominative meaning, there is also a derivative nominative meaning and an expressive-stylistic meaning. The classification is based on the research of V.V. Vinogradov, V.G. Gak, E.M. Mednikova, D.M. Shmelev.

The derivative meaning of the term developed from the main one by transferring it to new classes of designations. For example: the polysemantic term *embassy* has several lexical-semantic variants. Here are two derived meanings: 1. A group of officials who represent their government in a foreign count-country; 2. The official building used by these officials. The basis of semantic transference is metonymic transposition: su-subject → place.

Expressive-stylistic or figurative meaning is formed in those cases when the main meaning is transferred to a class of designates, quite different from the original, but still similar (in other cases, there is a split into homonyms). Thus, one of the LSV of the term *contract* is "an assignment to murder someone for pay", which is motivated by the sememe "drawing together, making a bargain". This semantic transference is based on a metaphorical transposition of external similarity.

It should be noted that the openness of the word system is stipulated by the possibility of new meanings on the basis of previous ones, through the use of metonymic, metaphorical, functional transfers and other types of semantic change[5].

Characteristic types of relations between LSV correspond to the logical relations of concepts, such as: 1) subordination, on the basis of which specialization and generalization develop; 2) "off-location", which underlies the shift of lexical meaning; 3) the relationship of opposites that lead to the phenomena of enantiosemia; 4) intersection, which generates metaphor and metonymy[6].

The results of the analysis of the terminological system of international relations and the above examples show that the characteristic features of the emergence of new meanings in this terminology are the logical relations of subordination (hyponymy) and intersection (metaphors and metonymy). Me-Metonymy (77%), hyponymy (14%) and, in some cases, me-metaphor (9%) are the basis for the emergence of ambiguous terms in this term system.

Typical types of metonymic transfer in the terminology of international relations are: from the action on the subject (subject, object, phenomenon) – 43%; from the action in its place – 26%; from the effect on the result – 31%. For example: *bankruptcy*: 1. The act or process of becoming bankrupt; 2. The state of being actually or legally bankrupt (action – phenome-non); *fund*: 1. To provide money for an activity, organization, event; 2. An organization established to administer and manage a sum of money (action – place).

Metaphor is based on the use of words or expressions in a figurative sense by similarity, analogy. A metaphorical hypon-hyponymic connection is a connection by similarity based on the commonality of features. An example of such links between the term LSV is the polysemantic term *subsidy*: 1. Monetary

[4] Stepanov Yu.S. "Semantika" [Semantics], *Lingwisticheskii entsyklopedicheskii slovar* [Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary], Moscow: Sovetskaia Entsyklopediia, 1990, P. 438–439 [in Russian].
[5] Ohui O.D. "Tekst, leksyko-semantychna hrupa, polisemichne slovo, semantychni tendentsii ta sproba yikh rekonstruktsii [Text, lexical and semantic group, polysemantic word, semantic tendencies and attempt of their reconstruction], *Naukovyi visnyk Chernivetskoho univ-universytetu. Series: Hermanska filolohiia* [Scientific Bulletin of Chernivtsi University. Series. German philology], Chernivtsi, vol. I, 1996, P. 26 [in Ukrainian].
[6] Gak V.G. "K tipologii lingwisticheskikh nominatsyi" [On typology of linguistic nominations] *Yazykovaia nominatsyia: Obshchiie vo-prosy* [Language nomination. General questions], Moscow: Nauka, 1977, P. 230–293 [in Russian].

assistance granted by a government to a person or group in support of an enterprise regarded as being in the public interest; 2. Financial assistance given by one person or government to another.

Polysemy in the terminology of international relations can be grammatical and terminological. The latter is defined as the term designation of a number of concepts in the conceptual field of a narrowly special field of knowledge or activity; despite the fact that the meanings of the multivalentterm have the same special semes. For example: *customs* 1. Duties or taxes imposed by a government on imported and, occasionally, exported goods; 2. The government agency in charge of collecting these duties or any of its offices. In the meanings of this terminological unit there are the following doublets of common semes: duties (LSV 1 and LSV 2), government (LSV 1 and LSV 2).

These terminological units are an example of associative-conceptual polysemy. Examining the terminological system of international relations, we came to the conclusion that it is associative-conceptual and associative polysemy that is a characteristic feature of this terminology. Associative polysemy is determined by the commonality of the method of interprion of the meanings and the components of the meanings themselves. An example of associative polysemy may be the terminological units of *parity*: 1. Equality; 2. Resemblance, similarity.

It should be noted that polysemy can also be denotative, significant and denotative-significant.

Denotative polysemy is characterized by two or more denotations that have a single signification, perform the same function and have the same name, in other words, denotative polysemy has the following scheme: 2 denotations - 1 signification - 1 terminoform. For example: *embargo*: 1. A government order prohibiting the movement of merchant ships into or out of its ports; 2. A prohibition by a government on certain or all trade with a foreign nation.

Significant polysemy is defined by the following scheme: 0 denotation – 2 significant – 1 terminoform. For example: holding has 2 LSV 1. Land especially a farm, rented from another; 2. Property owned especially stocks or bonds. These meanings were formed through the specialization of the motivating meaning of the common lexical unit *hold*: to take and keep with the hands or arms, or by other means.

Denotative-significant polysemy can be represented by the following scheme: 2 denotations – 2 significant – 1 terminoform. It arises as a result of the metonymic transfer "action – result of action – object of action – property" of the motivating seme or through metonymic transposition "subject of action – action": *currency*: 1. Money in any form when in actual use as a medium of exchange ; 2. Transmission from person to person as a medium of exchange; circulation.

A study of the international relations terminology shows that the most common type of polysemy in this terminology is denotative-significant (67%), more seldom – significant (29%) and the least common denotative (4%).

The above types of formation of polysemantic terms confirm the fact that the content of a linguistic sign develops faster and more actively than its form, which, to some extent, is conservative, which leads to the use of the old form, the old sign for a new concept leading to hereinafter polysemantic terms.

Куделько Зоя. Полісемантичний термін як лексична та семантична особливість терміносистеми міжнародних відносин. Мета дослідження. Дана наукова розвідка має на меті висвітлити полісемантичні відносини у терміносистемі міжнародних відносин, проаналізувати багатозначність терміна як природний вияв властивої лексичній системі мови тенденції до полісемії. Основним **методом дослідження** є аналітико-описовий, також використані контрастивний та статистичні методи. **Наукова новизна** роботи полягає в тому, що комплексно, синтагматично та парадигматично досліджується терміносистема міжнародних відносин, показано взаємозв'язок появи полісемантичних термінів у даній фаховій субмові з сучасними тенденціями розвитку міжнародних відносин. У процесі аналізу термінології міжнародних відносин виявлено два типи полісемії: внутрішню та зовнішню. При порівнянні полісемії в термінах-словах і в термінологічних сполученнях виявлено повну перевагу однослівних термінів. Проведений аналіз дає змогу говорити про "обернено пропорційну залежність між довжиною термінологічного словосполучення і полісемією. Полісемантичні лексичні одиниці термінології міжнародних відносин розрізняються на підставі своєї словотворчої структури: кореневі слова та словотворчі похідні. Під час дослідження встановлено, що серед багатозначних похідних термінів переважну більшість складають суфіксальні утворення. Було виділено і вивчено три типи багатозначності: радіальна полісемія, ланцюгова полісемія та радіально-ланцюгова полісемія. Значення багатозначних слів утворюють семантичні поля, компоненти яких пов'язані якоюсь загальною основою. Вирізняють два види семантичних полів: предметні або денотатні поля та понятійні чи сигніфікативні поля. Між значеннями полісемантичного слова допустимі три типи відношень: перетин, включення і семантична омонімія. Результати аналізу терміносистеми міжнародних відносин свідчать, що характерними рисами виникнення нових значень у даній термінології є логічні відношення підпорядкування (гіпонімії) та перехрещування (метафори та метонімії). Переважно в основі виникнення багатозначних термінів цієї терміносистеми лежить метонімія. Полісемія в терміносистемі міжнародних відносин може бути граматичною і термінологічною. Полісемія також поділяється на денотативну, сигніфікативну та денотативно-сигніфікативну. Дослідження терміносистеми міжнародних відносин свідчить, що найпоширенішим видом полісемії в даній терміносистемі є денотативно-сигніфікативна. **Висновки.** Отже, в результаті проведеного нами аналізу терміносистеми міжнародних відносин ми дослідили, що: полісемантичні терміни в терміносистемі міжнародних відносин складають приблизно 3% від усього дослідженого корпусу ТО; для даної терміносистеми характерні такі види багатозначності: радіальна, ланцюгова, радіально-ланцюгова; денотативна, сигніфікативна та денотативно-сигніфікативна; між ЛСВ терміна проаналізованої термінології найхарактернішими є метонімічні зв'язки; за словотворчою структурою полісемантичні терміни міжнародних відносин поділяються на: прості (кореневі), похідні й складні.

Ключові слова: термінологія міжнародних відносин, полісемія, полісемантичний термін, внутрішня полісемія, зовнішня полісемія, радіальна полісемія, ланцюгова полісемія, радіально-ланцюгова полісемія.

Зоя Куделько *– завідувач кафедри сучасних іноземних мов та перекладу факультету історії, політології та міжнародних відносин Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича. В науковому доробку автора – 47 надрукованих праць, 2 монографії у співавторстві, 2 термінологічних словники у співавторстві. Коло наукових інтересів: термінологія, лексикографія, перекладознавство.*

Zoya Kudelko *– Head of the Department of Modern Foreign Languages and Translation Studies of the Faculty of History, Political Science and International Studies of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Associate Professor. In the scientific heritage of the author – 47 published works, 2 co-authored monographs, 2 co-authored terminological dictionaries. Research interests: Terminology, Lexicology, Translation Studies.*