TYPES OF SEMANTICAL RELATIONSHIPS IN THE TERM SYSTEM OF ENGLISH TRANSLATION

Tetiana Yefymenko
Ph.D., Assistant Professor, V. O. Sukhomlynskyi National University of Mykolaiv,
Ukraine
e-mail: efimenkot2712@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0002- 7793-9505

Anzelika Solodka
Doctor of Science, Professor, Head of the Department of German Philology and Translation,
V. O. Sukhomlynskyi National University of Mykolaiv, Ukraine
e-mail: a.solodkaya1967@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0003-1703-7996

Summary
This scientific work focuses on the terminology of translation studies, namely on its semantic and structural characteristics. The study of translation terminology in English, analysis of the structure and semantics of terms, knowledge of their synonyms and variants is not only theoretical but also practical interest in developing the abilities of specialists in the field of translation theory and practice. The material of the study was the types of semantic relations in the terminological system (monosyllabic terms and terminological phrases), selected from indexes to textbooks and books on translation theory, written by European authors such as Jeremy Mandy, Mary-Snell Hornby, Alessandra Rickardi Encyclopedia of Translation Studies 2005 and 2009 edited by Mona Baker and edited by Mona Baker and Gabriel Saldana, respectively. Definitional analysis allowed to identify the types of semantic relations in the terminological system, selected by the method of continuous sampling; the selection criterion was the presence of a textual definition, historical method.

The study of terminological vocabulary sometimes touches on aspects that are inaccessible to traditional semantic analysis, hence the need for a cognitive approach. Terms express concepts that relate to any field of human activity or human knowledge, they are combined into a terminology system that reflects the system of knowledge in the field of translation studies. Representation of this system of knowledge is impossible only within the framework of traditional semantic analysis, in particular, as types of terminological fields. A broader view requires the use of a cognitive approach, which makes it possible to present a broad cognitive basis for the mechanisms of knowledge accumulation, processing, storage and presentation as cognitive models.

The aim of this work is a comprehensive study of the mechanisms of lexical units that form the types of semantic connections in English translation terminology.

Keywords: types of semantic relations, textual definition, terminology, lexical unit, accumulation.

1. Introduction

Intensive development of the theory of translation as a direction in linguistics contributes to the emergence of many new terms. Modern translation studies is characterized by a variety of theoretical concepts, which, of course, contain a significant layer of types of terminological connections and terminological vocabulary. Theoretical understanding of English translation terminology, which is a subsystem of the developing system of terminology of linguistics, is of undoubted practical importance. She makes extensive use of all the resources of the national English language: word-formation elements (anti-illusionist translation, subtitling), neologisms (protocols of thinking aloud), phrases (documentary translation, simultaneous translation), rethinking of generic compensation, pragmatic translation), abbreviations.

Scientific terminology is a large and intensively developing layer of vocabulary, which actively interacts with other layers of the vocabulary of the language, especially with common vocabulary. The urgency of studying the laws of formation of terminological vocabulary, its types, structure and semantics has become one of the most important tasks of modern linguistics.

The purpose of this work is to comprehensively study the types of semantic relations of lexical units and systematize the connection of words that form the English-language translation terminology.

The purpose of the work involves the solution of the following tasks:

1) to characterize the specifics of the terminology of the English-language theory of translation in terms of the ways of its formation and non-equivalence with respect to translation terminology;

2) identify and describe the ways of forming English translation terms and their most common structural and semantic models in modern English;

3) highlight the semantic fields in the terminological field of English-language translation studies;

4) to establish systemic types of semantic connections and relationships between the terms under consideration.

According to researchers, more than 90% of new words that appear in modern vocabulary are special vocabulary. The term is the central unit of special vocabulary, the main object of study of terminology and the subject of the description of terminological lexicography. Therefore, it is important to study the formation of the terminological system and types of its semantic connections in English, as there is a constant process of transition of common vocabulary into terms and, conversely, the transformation of terms into common words.

The scientific novelty of the work lies in the fact that for the first time the types of semantic relations in the terminological system, typical for the English-language translation terminology, are described.

Research methods are correlated with its purpose and objectives. In the study of terminological material, taking into account its specificity, various linguistic techniques and methods were used:

– method of direct linguistic observation and description;
– method of analysis of dictionary definitions;
– method of component analysis;
– method of systematization and classification.

2. Terminological field of English translation studies

The cognitive aspects of research, characteristic of modern linguistics, are especially interesting for terminology, where each term has a clear, precise structure of knowledge" *(Novodranova, 1998: 13)*. Since the cognitive approach often relies on the semantic analysis of vocabulary, we note the closeness of this approach and traditional semantic analysis.

Let us turn once again to the definition of the term "term" or "terminological unit" is understood as "an elementary, composite or complicated sign, which, speaking within the framework of a specific scientific and business communication, embodies in its signified a concept related to a specific subject area of science, technology, as well as cultural, administrative or political activities" *(Piotrovsky, 1985: 69)*. This definition emphasizes that the main feature of a term is the inclusion of its designatum in a system representing an organized set of special concepts and relationships.

This system is called a "terminal field", which "acts as a systemic formation of the content plan". In terms of expression, the "term field" corresponds to a set of lexical units, as well as word-forming morphemes and formal syntactic devices that express paradigmatic and syntagmatic connections between lexical units. The totality of all these means of the plane of expression is called the "terminal system". The combination of a "terminal field" or "signified" with a "terminal system" or "signifier" is a two-sided sign formation, which is called a "terminological lexical and semantic system" *(Piotrovsky, 1985: 70-71)*.

In terminology, the term "term field" corresponds to a certain semantic space, which is a linguistic analogue of the subject area. The semantic space includes semantic areas, each of which is divided into "semantic fields", which, in turn, are divided into "semantic microfields" up to the selection of individual points corresponding to "semantic features" *(Gorbunov, 2004: 59)*. The result of such a multi-stage division is the hierarchical system of the term field, between the terminological units of which there are semantic relations that are characteristic of the subject area under study.

Each word in the language is included in a certain lexic and semantic field, and not only one. Polysemantic words, in particular, can be included in different fields *(Filin, 1982: 229)*. The words included in the field are characterized by the presence of a common integral semantic feature, which is usually expressed by an archilexeme - a lexeme with a generalized meaning *(LES, 1990: 380)*.

The individual semantics of a word is revealed through its opposition to other members of the field in which it enters according to certain characteristics. It is in the distribution of words in some semantically united groups that the systemic nature of the vocabulary of the language is manifested *(Mednikova, 1974: 48)*.

The terminology of English-language translation studies has a field structure in which we distinguish between the core, presented in the form of a term system, which is an ordered set of interdependent exact names of the concepts of a separate field of knowledge, and the periphery, represented by special nominations that do not meet all the requirements for the term.

An analysis of the empirical material made it possible to identify a number of special nominations consisting of three or four elements and, therefore, not meeting the requirement of brevity. In the English translation terminology we are considering, the maximum number of words that make up a terminological phrase is **four** (*cultural stereotypes in translation, translation in international marketing, implied in translation rules*).

The core of English translation terminology is presented as a term system or term field, in which we distinguish the following semantic fields:

1) the science of translation;

2) translation (both process and result);

3) the identity of the translator and his characteristics.

The field approach explains that the concept of translation/interpreting can be considered from two points of view: translation as a process and translation as a result.

Here are examples of terms and terminological phrases that are part of the semantic field of the term translation:

adapted translation;

amplified translation;

back translation.

The semantic field of the *translation* term consists of the following semantic microfields:

1) the quality of the translation;

2) translation techniques;

3) participants of the translation;

4) professional associations of translators;

5) concepts and categories of translation.

Since one of the main requirements for translation is its quality, the semantic field of the term "quality of translation", which is a microfield in relation to the semantic field of the term "translation", turned out to be very meaningful. Examples of terms included in this semantic field:

evaluation of translation quality;

quality control;

editing;

accuracy;

adequacy.

The semantic microfield of translation concepts and categories includes the following terms:

context;

macrocontext;

microcontext;

contextual restrictions;

cotext.

Thus, the terminological field of English translation studies includes a core filled with interrelated and interdependent terms, and a periphery, which includes multicomponent terminological phrases called pre-terms.

3. System connections of words in the terminological system
of English translation studies

The systemic nature of the dictionary is found in the distribution of words according to their lexical meanings into groups of words. These groups of words received different names from different scientists: verbal field, semantic field, lexical and semantic paradigm, language field, conceptual field, semantic group, lexical-semantic group, etc. and, accordingly, a different definition *(Kharitonchik, 1992: 92).* But the similarity of these names lies in the fact that the unification of words into a semantic group, field or paradigm occurs on the basis of their close relationship and interdependence in terms of content, on the basis of one or another connection of the concepts they denote.

Among the most important types of structures of semantic fields, Ch. Fillmore names contrastive sets and taxonomies, which are also known as antonymic pairs and hypero-hyponymic series. Since, along with synonymic groups, they reflect the fundamental paradigmatic relations between lexical units, it is therefore necessary to describe them in more detail.

3.1. Hyper-hyponymic series

The term hyponymy is not among the traditional terms of semantics and was created relatively recently by analogy with antonymy and synonymy. However, the type of relationship between lexical units, called by this term, has been known for a long time and "recognized as one of the most important constitutive principles for the organization of the vocabulary of all languages" *(Kharitonchik, 1992: 97)*.

This is a relation of inclusion or domination, in which one word (hyperonym) denotes a class of entities denoted by another word (hyponym), i.e., the hypernym has a broader meaning. "Hyponymy" (from the Greek hypo - under, below and onima - name) is one of the main paradigmatic relations in the "semantic field", reflecting the hierarchy of the units that make up this field.

Such words, which are connected with each other by relations of subordination and domination, form hyper-hyponymic series, or, according to C. Fillmore, taxonomies. "Linguistic terms corresponding to specific concepts act as hyponyms in relation to a term that correlates with a generic concept - a hypernym" *(Gorbunov, 2004: 73)*.

For example, general translation theory is a hypernym in relation to the terminological system, which name separate areas of sections of the general theory of translation and are its hyponyms: applied translation theory and descriptive translation theory.

Another example of this kind of structure in the terminological system of translation studies is *institutional translation* - translation carried out by order of state structures, to which the term *public seetor interpreting* is subject - interpretation for state and municipal needs. The first term, unlike the second, includes both oral and written translation. For example: the term system *professional norms* is a hypernym in relation to the term system *accountability norm*, *communication norm* and *"relation" norm*, which are varieties of the above hypernym. Hyponyms for the term context are the terms *microcontext* and *macrocontext*, which appear in the same nest in our dictionary.

Hyper-hyponymic relations connect translation terms into separate groups, which, as a result, form the basis of the semantic space of the term system of the English translation theory.

3.2. Meronyms and golonims

The analysis of the empirical material allowed us to reveal the sufficient prevalence of this type of hierarchical relations in the terminological system of translation studies, which reflects the numerous specific connections that exist between concepts perceived as a whole and concepts that are constituent parts of this whole. The whole is called the term *holonyme*, and the part is called the term *meronyme (Gorbunov, 2004: 73)*.

For example, the term *translation theory* is a *golonim* in relation to terms that name separate sections that make up separate parts of the theory of translation as a whole, namely:

general translation theory and *partial theories of translation*. These term systems are meronyms in relation to the term systems of *translation theory*. Another example of this kind of hierarchical relationship is the *round-trip translation* and *back translation* terminological systems, where the latter will be a meronym.

For the terms *translation, editing and proofreading*, the preterm *quality control in translation* will be considered as a golonim.

Since translation, as a process, consists of several stages, the following terms will be meronyms for the term translation: *understanding, deverbalization, re-expression and verification*.

3.3. Synonyms and variants

The consequence and embodiment of change, evolution, restoration and renewal of the language system, one of its fundamental properties is variance. It should be noted that the concept of variability, or variance, is not originally linguistic. On the one hand, variance is a characteristic of linguistic modification, which is the result of the evolution of the use of different linguistic means to denote similar or identical phenomena. On the other hand, this term characterizes the ways of existence and functioning of language units and the language system as a whole *(Solntsev, 1984: 31-43)*.

The main characteristics of variance are the concepts of variant, invariant, variation. The presence of a variant, as a rule, implies the existence of a sample, formally unchanged, in which the general properties of the class of objects formed by the variants are displayed *(BES Linguistics, 2000: 80)*.

Until now, many questions of the theory of variance in linguistics remain insufficiently developed. Scientists interpret the central concepts of this theory in different ways: *variance, variant, invariant*. However, it should be noted that the assessment of the place and role of word variants in the structure and functioning of the language is unanimous. If more than a quarter of a century ago, A. L. Voronov stated his views on variant modifications of a word as a certain excess in the language, as a lack of natural language, as an abnormal phenomenon, today variance is considered as an integral property of a functioning language, without which its development is unthinkable. Linguistic variance is a consequence of linguistic evolution, an indicator of linguistic redundancy, but redundancy that gives impetus to movement and development *(Valgina, 2001: 24)*.

V. G. Gak distinguishes three types of factors underlying linguistic variability:

1) *internal* (system-structural, system pressure);

2) *external* in relation to the language system, but internal in relation to the language as a whole (development of civilization, termination or establishment of contacts between groups of native speakers);

3) *external* in relation to the language system, but internal in relation to the language and its functioning: logical and psychological factors associated with the general patterns of human communication and thinking *(Gak, 1998: 4-5)*.

A typical example of the manifestation of the second type of factors is the terminological system functional equivalence, introduced by the German linguist and teacher of translation A. Neubert *(Neubert, 1994: 15)*. Defining this terminological system, A. Neubert emphasizes that the relevance of the translation of a particular unit depends on the situation in which the priorities must be set by the translator.

When describing the type of equivalence, when words in the source language and the target language are equally perceived by readers in both languages, V. Koller uses the term pragmatic equivalence *(RE, 2005: 77)*, and Y. Naida introduces the term dynamic equivalence *(RE, 2005: 77)*. In other words, dynamic equivalence is focused on the reaction of the recipient and seeks to ensure equality of impact on the reader of the translation. However, these three term systems do not exhaust the synonymic series. The dynamic nature of this subsystem is emphasized by the

fact that other options, in particular the functional equivalence term systems, were not reflected in the Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies due to extralinguistic factors.

The very idea of variability implies variability, modification of something while maintaining some specific properties; it follows that variability is not just variability, but such a modification that does not lead to the emergence of a new essence. An example of a variant of *machine-aided translation* would be *machine-assisted translation*. The terms *computer-aided translation* and *computer-assisted translation* can also be considered as variants.

The terms *computer-aided translation*, *computer-assisted translation*, and *machine-aided translation* are synonymous *(RE, 2005: 134)*. Automated translation involves, to one degree or another, the participation of a translator, with this type of translation, the program simply helps a person translate texts.

The term *machine translation* has a very different meaning; it implies the implementation of the translation without the direct participation of the translator. *Machine translation* is the process of translating texts from one natural language into another using a special computer program. Instead of *machine*, the word *automatic* is sometimes used, which does not affect the meaning. Thus, according to V. M. Solntsev, variability implies both variability and constancy, acts as a unity of the changeable and the constant *(Solntsev, 1984: 32)*.

It is necessary to clarify the content of the concepts of variability and variance. Variance is a general language property, and variance is a property of language units, but in a broad sense, these terms seem to us to be synonyms. Variation is a fundamental and pervasive property of a language; from a generally accepted point of view, it is a form of existence of linguistic units.

In modern linguistics, it is noted that the possibility of variation is inherent in the very nature of language. G. G. Ivleva points out that variation is one of the ways of the existence of a language *(Ivleva, 1983: 121),* since the vocabulary of any language is limited and incommensurable with the infinite variety of objects and phenomena of reality, for which lexical and semantic units are intended language - words.

The question of the variability of terms and terminological systems is closely related to the question of lexical synonymy. About what synonyms are, there are the most controversial opinions set forth in linguistic works. T. I. Arbekova calls synonyms, single-field categorically identical dictionary units, coinciding in volume in one or more dictionary meanings *(Arbekova, 1977: 122)*. In a study devoted to the analysis of semantic and functional relationships and words and their synonymy in modern English, V. G. Vilyuman points out that the necessary and sufficient synonyms for recognizing words are the semantic and functional features common to these words, and the problem of synonymy is reduced to identifying based on the compatibility of words of similarities and differences, similarities and differences in their meanings and functions *(Vilyuman, 1980: 36)*.

Understanding the essence of synonymic relations is closely related to understanding the essence and structure of the linguistic meaning of a word. D. N. Shmelev defines synonyms as lexical units that are opposed according to such features that turn out to be insignificant under certain conditions, and they can be considered as synonyms *(Shmelev, 1977: 193)*.

The author focuses on the fact that synonyms can be defined as words belonging to the same part of speech, the meanings of which contain identical elements, while the differing elements are stably neutralized in certain positions. In other words, words that are opposed only by such semantic features, which in certain contexts become irrelevant, can be recognized as synonyms *(Shmelev, 1977: 196)*. This variety of definitions is explained by the fact that in the language there are various types of semantic rapprochements, which are reflected in the corresponding definitions of synonyms *(Kharitonchik, 1992: 100)*.

Basically, the term system is considered with the same structure and meaning, in which the key word (either translation or interpreting) is unchanged. The attribute changes, which, as a rule, carries a synonymous or close meaning. For example, in the term system of *judicial interpreting* and *légal interpreting*, the key word is the word **interpreting**.

Consider the community interpreting terminology system (dialogue interpreting, public sector interpreting or public service interpreting). In the dictionary, you can find that all four terminological systems mean the type of interpreting which takes place in the public service sphere to facilitate communication between officials and lay people: at police departments, immigration departments, social welfare centers *(RE, 2005: 33).* These terminological systems are understood as interpretation for state and municipal needs, carried out, as a rule, in police stations, immigration services, and social protection centers. These term systems are synonyms.

In the course of the study, the following pairs of synonyms were also identified: *rewording* and *intralingual translation, transmutation* and *intersemiotic translation*, *relay interpreting* and *indirect interpreting*, *amplified translation* and *expanded translation*, *loan translation* and *calque*.

Let us dwell on the term *back translation (reverse translation)*. There is a misconception that round-trip translation means the same thing as back translation. It is worth noting that *round-trip translation* is the process of translating a word, phrase or text into another language, then translating the result at least once more without reference to the original text, until it ends up back in the language it started in. This often results in something substantially different to the original (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Round-trip_translation).

It follows from the definition that *round-trip translation* is the process of translating a word, phrase or text into another language, after which the result is translated at least once again, without reference to the original text. The final version of such a translation is presented in the language from which the translation was made. As a rule, as a result, the final product differs significantly from the original. Synonyms for the term *back-translation* are *retranslation* and *inverse translation*, which, unlike round-trip translation, imply translation only from the target language to the source language.

The studied material also shows the following pairs of synonyms: 1) live-communication translator and oral translator; 2) fidelity and faithfulness.

Synonymy is fixed lexicographically: in the analyzed encyclopedia, the synonym is presented either in brackets, or there is a cross-reference (in the encyclopedia article on machine-aided translation there is a cross-reference to machine translation), or it is expressed in the following words: it is referred to as (in the dictionary entry under community interpreting synonyms dialogue interpreting or public service interpreting are presented in this way).

According to many linguists, the English language is extremely rich in synonyms. The reason for this wealth is seen in the historical development of the vocabulary of the English language and intensive borrowing from French, Latin and Greek *(Kharitonchik, 1992: 105).* That is why in English you can find pairs of synonyms in which one word is native and the other is borrowed. For example, for the term system whispered interpreting, the term chuchotage (whisper, whispering), which was borrowed from French, is synonymous. The term lacuna, which is a transposition of the French term lacune, introduced into scientific use by French linguists J.-P. Vinay, J. Darbelne and A. Malblanc, also acts as a synonym for the English term lexical gap.

In addition, synonymy (semantic variation) constantly arises in the field of terminology in connection with the simultaneous use of national, borrowed, including international terms, including Greek-Latin, and more recently English, French and other foreign language terms.

For example, the English term system *whispered interpreting* corresponds to the borrowed French term *chuchotage*.

So, despite the requirements for an ideal term, in translation terminology, as in any other, there are synonyms and variants. Both linguistic and extralinguistic factors influence the formation, meaning and use of translation studies terms. It should also be noted that the study of variance is of great importance for solving such applied problems as the optimization of learning the theory and practice of translation, improving the accuracy of translators' work, as well as the accuracy of automated translation.

4. Conclusions

The theory of translation, as a scientific discipline, has been rapidly developing in recent years, and, consequently, a new terminology is being born in this area. This process is closely connected with the expansion of the nominative function of the language and with the change in the methods of nomination.

The need for the exchange of various kinds of information, along with the development of the theory of translation, is predetermined by the objective conditions for the development of society and should become a significant reason for the emergence of a terminological community of the Ukrainian and English languages in the sublanguage of linguistics, which represents the necessary lexical means for communication and description of this field of activity.

The analysis of semantic relations in the terminological system of English-language translation studies revealed the originality of its structure, which consists in combining terms into different types of structural groups. The specificity of the terminological system of English-language translation studies is manifested in the originality of all the previously considered types of relations: synonymous, dichotomous, hyponymic, etc., united in a single whole – a semantic field or group, the totality of which constitutes a continuous semantic space of the language.

The study showed that at different stages nominative processes go in the directions that are characteristic of the language system at the given period. All this made it possible to assume that the trends inherent in the English-language translation terminology are characteristic of the development of the modern English language as a whole.

The further perspective of the study is seen in a more detailed study of certain characteristics of English translation terminology, in particular, the etymological analysis of terms, as a result of which it will be possible to trace the current trends in the appearance of terms in the terminological system. It also seems promising to study the causes of synonymy in the terminology of English translation studies.

References

1. *Arbekova T. I. (1977). Leksikologiya anglijskogo yazyka [Lexicology of the English language]. Moscow: Nauka. [in Russian]*
2. *Filin F. P. (1982). Ocherki po teorii yazykoznaniya [Essays on the theory of linguistics]. Moscow: Nauka. [in Russian]*
3. *Fillmor Ch. Dzh. (1983). Ob organizacii semanticheskoj informacii v slovare [On the organization of semantic information in a dictionary]. Moscow [in Russian]*
4. *Gak V. G. (1998). Yazykovye preobrazovaniya [Language transformations]. Moscow: Nauka. [in Russian]*

5. Gorbunov Yu. I. (2004). Francuzskaya grammaticheskaya terminologiya: Opyt tezaurusnogo issledovaniya [French Grammar Terminology: A Thesaurus Study Experience]. Moscow: Izd-vo RGPU. [in Russian]

6. Haritonchik 3. A. (1992). Leksikologiya anglijskogo yazyka [Lexicology of the English language]. Minsk: Vysshaya shkola. [in Russian]

7. Ivleva G. G. (1983). O faktorah razvitiya leksicheskogo sostava [On the factors of the development of lexical composition]. Filologicheskie nauki. [Ukrainian]

8. Lingvisticheskij enciklopedicheskij slovar. Yazykoznanie. (1990). Pod red. V. N. Yarcevoj. Moscow: Sovetskaya enciklopediya. [in Russian]

9. Mednikova E. M. (1974). Znachenie slova i metody ego opisaniya. [The meaning of the word and methods of its description]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola. [in Russian]

10. Neubert A. (1994). Competence in Translation: a complex skill, how to study and how to teach it. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola. [in Russian]

11. Novodranova V.F. (1998). Kognitivnye aspekty terminologii [Cognitive aspects of terminology]. Tambov.

12. Piotrovskij R. G., Bilan V. N., Borkun A. K. (1985). Metody avtomaticheskogo analiza i sinteza teksta: Uch. posobie dlya in-tov i fak. inostr. yaz. [Methods for automatic analysis and synthesis of text] Minsk: Vysshaya shkola. [in Russian]

13. Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. (2005). New York: Routledge.

14. Shmelev D. N. (1977). Sovremennyj russkij yazyk: Leksika. [Modern Russian language: Lexics]. Moscow.

15. Solncev V. M. (1984). Variativnost kak obshee svojstvo yazykovoj sistemy [Variation as a general property of the language system]: Yazykoznaniya. [in Russian]

16. Valgina N. S. (2001). Aktivnye processy v sovremennom russkom yazyke [Active processes in modern Russian]. Moscow: Nauka. [in Russian]

17. Vilyuman V. G. (1980). Anglijskaya sinonimika. Seriya «Biblioteka filologa» [English synonymy. Philologist's Library series]. Moscow: Nauka. [in Russian]

18. Yarceva N. V. (2000). Yazykoznanie [Linguistics]. Moscow: Bolshaya Rossijskaya enciklopediya.

19. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Round-trip_translation