Some lexicological aspects
of terminology and terminography

VALENTĪNA SKUJIŅA
Institute of the Latvian Language, Riga

I n 2006 a meeting commemorating the hundredth of the birth anni‑
versary of the Latvian linguist and terminologist Rudolfs Grabis was
organized in the Latvian Academy of Sciences.

In April 2008 terminologists from Lithuania, Latvia and other countries
were invited to participate at the international conference to mark the
hundredth anniversary of Lithuanian lexicographer and the well-known
terminologist and terminographer Jonas Kruopas.

From the 1950s to the 1970s both scholars were the heads of Terminology
Commissions: Jonas Kruopas — in Lithuania, Rudolfs Grabis — in Latvia.

The middle of the 1960s was the time when Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia
began to develop closer contacts on language culture and terminology.
On Moscow's initiative in 1969 the regional conference on terminology
development and preparation of term dictionaries was organized in Riga.
Since then regular conferences have been held in Vilnius, Tallinn and Riga
discussing both theoretical and practical aspects of terminology.

Jonas Kruopas took part at these conferences. He was a member of the
editorial board of the book of conference materials, published in 1973
(BPHTT 1973).

The article written by Jonas Kruopas and his colleague Kazimieras
Gaivenis (Kruopas, Gaivenis 1973) on terminology work and compilation
of term dictionaries in Lithuania shows us a number of similar problems in
national terminology development both in Lithuania and Latvia:
- about the first written sources in 16th century – religious texts;
- about loan translations (calques) as a productive pattern for term
  formation (in Lithuanian — especially from Latin, Polish, German and
  Russian origin, in Latvian — especially from Latin, German and Rus‑
  sian origin);

- about "travelling" of lexical units
  - from LGP (language for general purposes) to LSP (language for special purposes), and *vice versa*;
  - from active vocabulary to passive vocabulary, and *vice versa*;
- about seeking balance between terms from native sources and borrowings;
- etc.

The title of this paper – *Some lexicological aspects of terminology and terminography* – is chosen not only taking into account the main topic of this commemoration conference but at the same time in order to define more precisely (and update) some principles for terminology work in the Terminology Commission of Latvian Academy of Sciences.

From the linguistic point of view, first of all terminology traditionally was treated as a part of lexicology. Before the 1960s in the Latvian State University in the course of lexicology only about 15 minutes were devoted to terminology as a layer of the Latvian word-stock (Laua 1981: 138–141). Beginning with the 1960s, under the guidance of Rudolfs Grabis, scientific studies on the theoretical terminology issues were started at the Institute of Latvian Language and Literature of the Latvian Academy of Sciences. Before that, we can speak about the scientific approach to selecting and forming of terms, beginning with the second half of the 19th century when different textbooks and manuals of various branches of science and technology as well as terminological dictionaries were published in Latvian and when essential problems of formation of terminology (the role of native derivatives and borrowings, the brevity of a term, etc.) were discussed in separate articles written by J. Alunāns, K. Valdemārs and others, so-called the New Latvians (in Latvian – *jaunlatvieši*).

Beginning with the late 1960s, terminology was proclaimed to be a self-contained, interdisciplinary branch of sciences with a term as a specific object for scientific investigation, and the term *terminology* in this sense had obtained a preferred synonym *terminology science* (in Latvian – *terminzinātne*, in Russian – *терминоведение*).

Since that time a number of terminology conferences, seminars and workshops have been organized in different countries and hundreds of books and articles published exactly on terminological issues. Terminology has become a multi-aspectual, large-scaled branch of science with

interlingual significance. Terms are compiled not only in dictionaries but in databases too, including multilingual collections (e. g. ETB database).

Though nowadays terminology is recognized as an independent (inter-disciplinary) branch of science, its close links with linguistics determine the significant role of lingual (intra-lingual) principles in term-formation.

The **lexical aspect** of linguistic principles supposes to respect the specific character of the terminological stratum in the general lexical system of language, the interrelations of terms and non-terms, terminological and general vocabulary, the connections between terminology and professionally, socially, territorially, historically and stylistically limited lexical layers, etc.

Lexical inventory of a language is collected in dictionaries. Lexicography is a sub-branch of linguistics where the theory and practice of term diction-ary preparation are developed and principles and methods for compiling, systematization, analysis and description of words are developed. Let us try to answer the question: is there any difference between a dictionary of common language and a term dictionary? For this purpose, let us compare some entries of 'processual' and 'attributive' content from two explanatory dictionaries: the *Latvian Language Dictionary* (LVV 2006) and *Dictionary of Basic Linguistic Terms* (VPTSV 2007).

ENTRIES FOR EXPRESSING THE 'PROCESSUAL' CONTENT (I)
    LVV (common language dictionary):
tulkot (in English: *to translate*) –oju, –o, –o, pag. –oju, pārej. 1. <u>*Izteikt (ko)*</u>
    <u>*citā valodā*</u> (in English: *to express (something) in another language*). T. no
    oriģināla. Tulkotā literatūra. T. grāmatu krieviski. T. runu.

latviskot (in English: *to Latvianize*) –oju, –o, –o, pag. –oju, pārej. 1. <u>*Pārveidot*</u>
    <u>*atbilstoši latviešu valodai, tās īpatnībām; (pa)darīt latvisku*</u> (in English:
    *to transform according to the Latvian language, its peculiarities; to make
    Latvian*). L. uzvārdu.

    VPTSV (term dictionary):
tulkošana
    a. *translation*
    v. *Translation* f, *Übersetzung* f, *Übertragung* f
    kr. *перевод*
        <u>Vienā valodā</u> (oriģinālvalodā vai avotvalodā) <u>rakstītā vai runātā</u> vārda,

teksta satura, jēgas, domas (ieskaitot zemtekstus u. c.) <u>izteikšana ar citas valodas</u> (mērķvalodas jeb tulkojumvalodas) <u>līdzekļiem</u> (in English: *expressing (the word, text, idea, etc.) from a source language into target language*). ◊ *brīvā tulkošana; burtiskā tulkošana.*
Sk. arī *oriģinālvaloda; avotvaloda; mērķvaloda.*

latviskošana
a. *Latvianization, Lettonization*
v. *Einlettischung* f
kr. *латышизация, летонизация*
<u>Pielāgošana, padarot atbilstošu latviešu valodai, tās īpatnībām, struktūrai.</u> (In English: *transformation according to the Latvian language, in* **conformity** *with the Latvian language*)

ENTRIES FOR EXPRESSING THE 'PROCESSUAL' CONTENT (II)
LVV (common language dictionary):

deklinēt (*to decline*) –ēju, –ē, –ē, pag. –ēju, pārej. 1. *Valodniecībā –* <u>locīt (nomenus)</u> (in English: *In linguistics – to inflect nomina*). D. īpašības vārdu ar noteikto galotni. Šis vārds nav deklinējams.

konjugēt (*to conjugate*) –ēju, –ē, –ē, pag. –ēju, pārej. <u>Locīt</u> (darbības vārdus) (in English: *to inflect verbs*).

locīt (*to inflect*) loku, loki, loka, pag. locīju, pārej... 4. *Gramatikā –* <u>mainīt vārdu formas</u> locījumos vai personās (in English: *In grammar – to change the forms of words in cases, persons*). L. lietvārdu. L. darbības vārdu.

VPTSV (term dictionary):
deklinēšana
a. *declension, declining*
v. *Deklinieren* f
kr. *склонение*
Nomenu (lietvārdu, īpašības vārdu, skaitļa vārdu) un to nozīmē lietotu vārdu (vietniekvārdu, lokāmo divdabju) locīšana, t. i., <u>gramatisko formu mainīšana</u> dzimtē, skaitlī un locījumā.
(In English: *changing of the grammar forms of nomina in gender, number, case*)

Sk. arī *konjugēšana.*

konjugēšana
   a. *conjugation*
   v. *Konjugieren* f
   kr. *спряжение*
   Darbības vārda locīšana, t. i., <u>gramatisko formu maiņa</u> personās, skait-
   ļos, laikos, kārtās un izteiksmēs.
   (In English: *changing of the grammar forms of verbs in persons, tense,*
   voice, mood)
   Sk. arī *deklinēšana.*

locīšana sk. *deklinēšana; konjugēšana*

ENTRIES FOR EXPRESSING THE 'ATTRIBUTIVE' CONTENT
   LVV (common language dictionary):
vienkāršs (*simple*) īp.; **vienkārši** (*simply*) apst. 1. *Tāds, kas sastāv no viena*
   elementa, vienas daļas ... (in English: *such which consists of one element,*
   one part ...) V. teikums. 2. *Tāds, kas nav grūts, nav sarežģīts ...* (in Eng-
   lish: *such which is not complicated ...*) V. uzdevums ... 3. *Parasts, pieticīgs*
   ... (in English: *ordinary, modest ...*) V. ēdiens ... 4. *Tāds, kam nav īpašu*
   privilēģiju ... (in English: *such which has no privileges ...*) V. darba cilvēks.

   VPTSV (term dictionary):
vienkāršā pagātne, imperfekts
   a. *past indefinite*
   v. *Imperfekt* n
   kr. *простое прошедшее*
   Darbības vārda laika forma, kas izsaka <u>darbību, kas ir notikusi</u> pirms
   runas momenta, piemēram, *Es tikko atnācu mājās no skolas ...*
   (In English: *the tense form of a verb expressing an action that took place*
   before the moment of speaking)

vienkāršs teikums
   a. *simple sentence*
   v. *einfacher Satz* n
   kr. *простое предложение*

Teikums, kurā ir tikai <u>viens gramatiskais centrs</u> … (In English: *the sentence with only one syntactic centre*) ◊ vienkāršs paplašināts teikums. Sk. arī *teikums; salikts teikums; gramatiskais centrs.*

As we can see from comparison of entries, the main differences are:

In **LVV** (common language dictionary) there are:
1) only single words as headwords;
2) grammatical forms, references to a part of speech;
3) easy, comprehensive explanations;
4) all meanings in one entry;
5) absence of synonyms in the head of entries;
6) grammatical processual meaning represented by a <u>verb</u>.
(There are no term equivalents in other languages.)

In **VPTSV** (term dictionary) there are:
1) both single words and word combinations as headwords;
2) absence of grammar information;
3) definitions (explanations) with relevant characteristics of the concept;
4) only one concept explained in one entry;
5) synonyms in the head of entries;
6) grammatical processual meaning represented by a <u>noun</u>.
(Term equivalents in other languages are given.)

<u>Conclusion:</u> Taking into account above mentioned peculiarities of common language and term dictionaries, we can conclude that from the theoretical point of view there is a substantial motive to deal with the **terminography** as the specific interdisciplinary subject constituted of fundamentals from lexicology, lexicography and terminology.

In this case, putting aside other peculiarities, let us pay some additional attention to **the role of different parts of speech in terminology**, in general, and in term dictionaries, in particular.

It is well-known that terms are not specific words. Terms are words in a **specific function**: to denote by a word or word combination a unit of concept system of the respective branch of science or of the respective sphere of activity. In other words, we usually say that terms are not substantial items but functional ones.

This specific function of the term is twofold: **to nominate** and **to desig-nate** the concept. Denominating linguistic units usually are nouns (e. g. in linguistics, the nouns *sound, morpheme, word, sentence, transitivity* are used in the function of linguistic terms), or word combinations with a noun as the basic component of these word combinations (e. g. the noun *language* is the basic component of word combinations *natural language, artificial language, sign language* which are used in the function of the terms).

Nouns are the class of words that have the possibility to [de]nominate all different kinds of realia – objects, processes, qualities, quantities, condi-tions, etc. Therefore exactly nouns fit well for the function of terms.

Dominant role of nouns as representatives of appropriate concepts fixed in term dictionaries is undoubted and is emphasized by a number of lin-guists and terminologists. Different views are expressed about other parts of speech, in particular – verbs. In some cases both nouns and verbs we can find as headwords in ISO standards (e. g. in ISO/IEC 2382). Let us com-pare some examples of definitions given for nouns and verbs in these ISO standards, and pay attention to number of concepts and essential features mentioned for concepts in these definitions:

display	A <u>visual presentation</u> of data.
to display	<u>To present</u> data <u>visually</u>.
storage	The <u>retention</u> of data <u>in a storage device</u>.
to store	<u>To retain</u> data <u>in a storage device</u>.
programming	The <u>designing, writing, modifying, and testing</u> of programs.
to program	<u>To design, write, modify, and test</u> programs.

If according to the semantic (and terminological) triangle the concept is mental presentation of the object and the term is lingual presentation of the concept, than how many concepts are presented in these examples? Three, or six? If we compare the "lingual presentation" of concepts in these definitions: "a visual presentation" and "to present visually", or: "the retention … in a storage device" and "to retain … in a storage device", or:

"the designing, writing …" and "to design, write …", – we should conclude that concepts are expressed by words with the same conceptual content only differing in grammatical form pursuant to appropriate part of speech.

Therefore, it seems that more convincing is the view of those linguists and terminologists who consider the nouns as the main representatives of the appropriate concepts in language but verbs assert as terminological units which in point of fact express **the same concept**, differ in grammar (morphological or syntactical) variation or modification and are used for context needs, in discourse. Of course, there are some peculiarities in different subject fields, e. g. in mathematics, technical terminology, or sport.

The substantive nature of a term is based on the adequate nature of a concept. A conception of such terminological item as the *termeme* (Skujiņa 1996) gives to the words of different parts of speech (and/or word forms) a possibility to be allocated a definite place within the terminological vocabulary: the term (noun) as representative of the concept is the central member of the termeme (e. g. the term *translation*) but a verb and other words or word forms (participles, adverbs, adjectives) in point of fact express **the same concept** are secondary members (e. g. to *translate, translating, translated*).

Every scientific activity is based upon principles. In Latvia, for a number of decades the main terminology tasks were carried out and principles were adopted according to E. Wüster's (Wüster 1979) views and Austrian terminology school, in conformity with systemic approach in the framework of the so called "traditional theory" of terminology (Cabré Castellví 2000: 35). These tasks have sufficed to achieve certain goals in national terminology development according to scientific requirements and principles developed in classical interlingual terminology theory. These tasks in were not carried out only for the standardization of terminology but also for enrichment of national lexical system in particular.

As a conclusion I would like to stress that during a number of decades (since about the 1960s) terminology science has become a multidisciplinary subject constituted on fundamentals of linguistics, and its sub-branches – lexicology, lexicography, derivatology, etc., as well as on fundamental elements of logics, philosophy, cognitivistics, ontology, communication science, etc.

Besides (as it is stressed in terminology literature (Cabré Castellví 2000: 55)), while being interdisciplinary, terminology is also transdisciplinary,

since there is no structured discipline without a terminology and no way of expressing and transferring scientific knowledge without terminology. Although for terminology it is characteristic that the diversity of applications of the main scientific principles of term–formation play pivot role up till now.

Now in terminology science we can indicate to a **search for new approaches** that would help account for the complexity of terminological units within the framework both of general and specialized communication, taking into account the syntactical and communicative nature of terms in texts. Nevertheless, it does not mean to deny the traditional approach. It means that the basis for a new theory of terminology would account for both the representational and the communicative function of terminology (Cabré Castellví 2000: 36, 46). The new approach means, first, to assert the main scientific principles, and, second, to focus on the diversity of term applications.

The "new theory" is preferred to be not a solely "linguistic theory for ter-minology" but "terminology theory for terminology" which "would conceive terms as sets of denominative and conceptual units belonging to natural language" and "representing special knowledge within a particular domain, and serving professional communication" (Cabré Castellví 2000: 53).

CONCLUSIONS

1. Since the first written sources during about five centuries Lithuanian and Latvian terminology step by step has become multidisciplinary and rather rich to fulfill all necessary state language functions which become urgent at the end of 20th century and are topical up till now. Closer contacts between Latvian and Lithuanian terminologists began since the middle of 60^{ies} of 20th century when regular conferences on terminology and language culture were hold in Vilnius, Riga and Tallinn. This was the time when terminology was proclaimed as a self-contained interdisciplinary subject constituted on fundamentals from linguistics, as well as on fundamental elements from logics, philosophy, cognitivistics, ontology, communication science, etc.

2. From the linguistic point of view, first of all terminology traditionally was treated as a part of lexicology. The lexicological aspect of terminology supposes to respect the specific character of the terminological stratum in the general lexical system of a language, the interrelations of terms and non–terms, terminological and general vocabulary, the connections be–

tween terminology and professionally, socially, territorially, historically and stylistically limited lexical layers, etc.

3. Lexical inventory of a language is collected in dictionaries. Lexicography is a sub-branch of linguistics where the theory and practice of compilation of dictionaries is developed and principles and methods for compilation, systematization, analysis and description of words are made up.

The theory and practice of the term dictionary compilation is the base for another discipline – terminography. Is there any difference between common language dictionary and term dictionary? Is the terminography only a part of lexicography? Taking into account the peculiarities of common language and term dictionaries, we can conclude that from the theoretical point of view there is a substantial motive to deal with the terminography as the specific interdisciplinary subject constituted of fundamentals from lexicology, lexicography and terminology.

4. One of the peculiarities is the different attitude to the parts of speech in term dictionaries in comparison with common language dictionaries. It results from the specific function of the terms: to nominate and to designate the concept. Nouns are the class of words that have the possibility to denominate all different kinds of realia – objects, processes, qualities, quantities, conditions, etc. Therefore exactly nouns fit well for the function of terms. Adjectives and participles (i. e. forms of verbs) usually are designating term-elements.

5. In some cases we can find both nouns and verbs as headwords in ISO standards. If we compare definitions given to these nouns and verbs (with the same root or stem), e. g. *display* – "a visual presentation"; *to display* – "to present visually", we should conclude that concepts there are expressed by words with the same conceptual content only differing in grammar from pursuant to appropriate part of speech. Therefore it seems that more convincing is the view of those linguists and terminologists who consider the nouns as the main representatives of the appropriate concepts but verbs assert as terminological units which in point of fact express the same concept, differ in grammar modification, and are used for context needs.

6. The substantive nature of a term as a unit of terminology is based on the adequate nature of a concept. A conception of such terminological item as the _termeme_ gives to the words of different parts of speech (and/or word forms) a possibility to allocate a definite place within the terminological vocabulary as units of terminological lexis (in totality).

7. Now in terminology science we can indicate a search for new approaches that would help account for the complexity of terminological units. Nevertheless, it does not mean to deny the traditional approach. It means that the basis for a new theory of terminology would account for both the representational and the communicative function of terminology. The new approach means, first, that terms have to be viewed as units of term system that reflects the appropriate concept system and according to scientific principles, and, second, at the same time – focusing on the diversity of term applications in discourse.

REFERENCES

Cabré Castellví M. T. 2000: Elements for a theory of terminology: Towards an alternative paradigm. – *Terminology*. Vol. 6, No 1, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins PC, 35–57.
ISO/IEC 2382-1 Information processing systems. Vocabulary. Part1: *Fundamental terms*.
ISO 2382-12 Information processing systems. Vocabulary. Part 12: *Peripheral equipment*.
ISO/IEC 2382-13 Information processing systems. Vocabulary. Part 13: *Computer graphics*.
Kruopas J., Gaivenis K. 1973: Ионас Круопас, Казимерас Гайвенис. Терминологическая работа и подготовка терминологических словарей в Литовской ССР. – *Вопросы разработки научно-технической терминологии*, Рига, 23–36.
Laua A. 1981: *Latviešu leksikoloģija*, Rīga.
LVV 2006: *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca* (Latvian Language Dictionary), Rīga.
Skujiņa V. 1996: The Specifity of the Term and the Concept of the Termeme. – *IITF Infoterm. Multilingualism in specialist communication*. Vol. 2. Vienna: TermNet, 1123–1130.
VPTSV 2007: *Valodniecības pamatterminu skaidrojošā vārdnīca* (Dictionary of Basic Linguistic Terms), Rīga.
Wüster E. 1979: *Einführung in die Allgemeine Terminologielehre und terminologische Lexicographie*, Wien.
ВРНТТ 1973: *Вопросы разработки научно-технической терминологии*, Рига.

KAI KURIE LEKSIKOLOGINIAI TERMINOLOGIJOS IR TERMINOGRAFIJOS ASPEKTAI

Per beveik penkis šimtmečius latvių, kaip ir lietuvių, kalba pasiekė tokį lygį, kad dvidešimtojo amžiaus pabaigoje mūsų kalbos buvo visiškai pasirengusios atlikti visas aktualias valstybinės kalbos funkcijas savo šalyse. Reguliarūs latvių ir lietuvių kalbininkų kontaktai prasidėjo nuo dvidešimto amžiaus septintojo dešimtmečio, kai buvo pradėtos rengti terminologijos ir kalbos kultūros konferencijos.

Septintasis dešimtmetis – tai laikas, kai terminologija, iki tol laikyta leksikologijos šaka, dėl gausių teorinių tyrinėjimų tapo savarankiška tarpdalykine mokslo sritimi, besiplėtojančia lingvistikos ir keleto gretutinių sričių – logikos, filosofijos, kognityvistikos, ontologijos, komunikacijos mokslų – sandūroje.

Leksiniu atžvilgiu terminologija laikoma specifiniu kalbos leksinės sudėties sluoksniu, kreipiant dėmesį į terminų ir ne terminų santykį, terminų ir profesinių, socialinių, teritorinių, istorinių, stilistinių ir kitų leksikos sluoksnių sąsajas.

Leksinę kalbos sandarą atskleidžia žodynai. Teoriniai ir praktiniai žodynų sudarymo aspektai – leksikografijos, kaip kalbotyros šakos, tyrimų objektas. Viena iš žodynų rūšių – terminų žodynai. Bendrinės kalbos ir terminų žodynų lyginimas leidžia apibūdinti terminografiją kaip gretutinę discipliną, esančią leksikologijos, leksikografijos ir termi-

nologijos sandūroje. Terminų žodynų specifika atsiskleidžia atrenkant žodynų straipsnių antraštes ir leksiškai bei gramatiškai aprašant. Terminų žodynuose vyrauja daiktavardžiai, kadangi jie pavadina pačias įvairiausias realijas – daiktus (objektus), procesus, savybes, kiekius, aplinkybes ir kt. Daiktavardžiai geriausiai įvardija sąvokas. Kitos kalbos dalys, pavyzdžiui, būdvardžiai, dalyviai (t. y. veiksmažodinės formos) paprastai atlieka termino apibūdinančio dėmens funkciją.

Kartais, pavyzdžiui, kai kuriuose ISO standartuose, pasitaiko antraščių ir su daiktavardžiais, ir su veiksmažodžiais: *display* – „vizualinis pateikimas" ir *to display* – „pateikti vizualiai" (apibrėžčių vertimas pateiktas straipsnio autorės). Kaip matyti iš apibrėžčių, abiem atvejais kalbama apie tą pačią sąvoką, skiriasi tik žodžio gramatinės formos pasirinkimas. Toks dubliavimas yra netikslingas. Pakaktų išreikšti sąvoką daiktavardžiu, o veiksmažodis, reikalui esant, gali būti vartojamas tekste.

Skirtingų kalbos dalių vietą ir vaidmenį terminologijoje padeda nustatyti *terminema*, kurios pagrindinis dėmuo yra daiktavardis, o kitos kalbos dalys (susijusios su ta pačia sąvoka) – antraeiliai dėmenys (plg. *перевод – переводить, переведен, переведенный* ir pan.).

Pastaruoju metu terminologijoje ieškoma naujo požiūrio, pabrėžiant kompleksinį terminologinių vienetų pobūdį, tačiau tai nereiškia, kad atsisakoma tradicinio požiūrio. Dėmesys turi būti skiriamas ir reprezentacinei, ir komunikacinei termino funkcijai, t. y. termino sistemiškumui terminų sistemoje ir vartosenos įvairovei, atsižvelgiant į kontekstą.

НЕКОТОРЫЕ ЛЕКСИКОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ АСПЕКТЫ ТЕРМИНОЛОГИИ И ТЕРМИНОГРАФИИ

В течение около пяти столетий латышский, как и литовский, язык постепенно развиваясь достиг такого уровня, благодаря которому в конце 20го века наши языки полностью были готовы выполнять все актуальные функции государственного языка в наших государствах. Регулярные контакты латышских и литовских языковедов начались с 60ых годов 20го столетия с организацией конференций по терминологии и культуре языка.

60ые годы – время, когда терминология из подобласти лексикологии, благодаря многочисленным теоретическим исследованиям, приобрела статус самостоятельной междисциплинарной области науки, развиваясь на грани лингвистики и целого ряда смежных областей знания – логики, филоссофии, когнитивистики, онтологии, коммуникативных наук и др.

В лексическом аспекте терминология рассматривается как специфический слой лексического состава языка, обращая внимание на соотношение терминов и нетерминов, связи терминов с профессиональным, социальным, территориальным, историческим, стилистическим и другими пластами лексики.

Лексическое богатство языка дано в словарях. Теоретические и практические аспекты составления словарей – объект исследования лексикографии как подобласти языкознания. Один из видов словарей — терминологические словари. Сравнение общелитературных и терминологических словарей дает основу для выделения терминографии как смежной дисциплины на грани лексикологии, лексикографии и терминологии, т. е. терминоведения. Специфика терминологических словарей

выявляется как при выборе, так и при лексическом и грамматическом описании заголовков словарных статей. В терминологических словарях преобладают имена существительные, так как именно при помощи существительных возможно назвать самые разнообразные реалии – предметы (объекты), процессы, качества, количества, обстоятельства и др. Существительные используются как представители понятий. Другие части речи, папр., имена прилагательные, причастия (т. е. формы глаголов) обычно используются в функции определяющего терминоэлемента.

Иногда, например, в некоторых стандартах ИСО, наблюдается наличие заголовков как с существительными, так и с соответствующими глаголами: *display* – 'визуальное представление' и *to display* – 'представить визуально' (перевод дефиниций дан автором статьи). Как следует из дефиниций, речь в обоих случаях идет об одном и том же понятии, лишь отличается подбор грамматической формы слов. Подобное дублирование кажется не целесообразным. Репрезентацию понятия достаточно предъявить, используя существительное, а глагол автоматически согласно системе языка при необходимости может использоваться в тексте.

Место и роль различных частей речи в терминологии помогает предопределить понятие о *терминеме* с существительным как основным компонентом терминемы и другими частями речи (имеющими связь с тем же понятием) – как второстепенными членами (сравн.: *перевод – переводить, переведен, переведенный* и т. п.).

В последнее время в терминоведении наблюдаются поиски нового подхода с акцентом на комплексный характер терминологических единиц. Но это не означает отказа от традиционного подхода. Внимание следует уделить одновременно как на репрезентативную, так и на коммуникативную функцию термина, т. е. на системность термина в терминосистеме и разнообразность в употреблении в зависимости от контекста.

Valentīna Skujiņa
Terminology Commission at the Academy of Sciences of Latvia
Akademijas lauk. 1, Riga, LV-1050, Latvia
E-mail: vaska@lza.lv