

TURDUBAEVA A.A.
Master student of J. Balasagyn KNU
ТУРДУБАЕВА А.А.
Ж. Баласагын атындагы КУУ,
магистрант
ТУРДУБАЕВА А.А.
магистрант КНУ им. Ж. Баласагына

PRINCIPLES OF THE SYSTEMS APPROACH IN COMPARATIVE TERMINOLOGY

Салыштырмалуу терминологиядагы тутумдук мамиленин принциптери

Принципы системного подхода в сравнительной терминологии

Abstract. *The article deals with the comparative analysis of terminologies. The work touches upon the concept of a systems approach in comparative terminology. The author examines an indication of the methodological method of comparison in general and the formulation of the principles of comparative terminology analysis. As the main methodological method of comparative analysis of terminologies, a systemic comparison can be adopted, including both the identification of systemic relations between elements within the same terminology, and the determination of the connections of the corresponding multilingual elements and terminological systems among themselves.*

Аннотация. *Макалада терминологияга салыштырмалуу анализ берилген. Изилдөөдө салыштырмалуу терминологиядагы тутумдук мамиле түшүнүгү козголгон. Автор салыштыруунун методологиялык ыкмасынын көрсөтмөсүн жана салыштырмалуу терминологиялык анализдин принциптерин түзүүнү изилдейт. Терминологияны салыштырмалуу талдоонун негизги методологиялык ыкмасы катары, бир эле терминологиядагы элементтердин ортосундагы тутумдук байланыштарды аныктоону дагы, ошондой эле тиешелүү көп тилдүү элементтердин жана терминологиялык тутумдардын бири-бири менен болгон байланышын аныктоону камтыган тутумдук салыштыруу кабыл алынышы мүмкүн.*

Аннотация. *В статье проводится сравнительный анализ терминологии. Анализируется понятие системного подхода в сравнительной терминологии. Автор рассматривает указание на методологический метод сравнения в целом и формулировку принципов сравнительного терминологического анализа. В качестве основного методологического метода сравнительного анализа терминологии может быть принято системное сравнение, включающее как идентификацию системных отношений между элементами в рамках одной и той же терминологии, так и определение связей соответствующих многоязычных элементов и терминологических систем между собой.*

Key words: *comparative analysis of terminology, system approach, system comparison, system relation, terminological systems, terminology.*

Урунттуу сөздөр: *терминологияны салыштырмалуу талдоо, тутумдук мамиле, тутумдук салыштыруу, тутумдук байланыш, терминологиялык тутумдар, терминология.*

Ключевые слова: *сравнительный анализ терминологии, системный подход, системное сравнение, системное отношение, терминологические системы, терминология.*

The objects of comparative terminology - multilingual terminology - are generally recognized as systemic formations that fully meet the communicative needs of specialists and cover by their means the entire conceptual continuum inherent in the consciousness of scientists. Compared to disordered terminology, a system of terms is a qualitatively new object with its own internal laws. Precisely because each of the compared terminologies represents a system, its separately taken element may not be absolutely equivalent to its correspondence in a foreign-language terminology system: their system-forming, system-acquired and systemically neutral properties may differ, although on the whole multilingual terminology systems of the same specialty are equivalent to each other.

Therefore, the comparative analysis of terminologies must be systematic. It is necessary to clarify the concept of a systems approach in comparative terminology. This should include an indication of the

methodological method of comparison in general and the formulation of the principles of comparative terminology analysis. As the main methodological method of comparative analysis of terminologies, a systemic comparison can be adopted, including both the identification of systemic relations between elements within the same • terminology, and the determination of the connections of the corresponding multilingual elements and terminological systems among themselves. The foundation of the systemic comparison should be considered.

Determination of similar identical and distinctive features of the compared terminological systems, as well as their respective elements. Benchmarking procedures have been developed and described in Soviet comparative studies. The sequence of comparative analysis of terminological systems consists in determining the ways by which terminological nomination and linguistic correlation are realized in sublanguages; establishing the comparability of these methods; systemic comparison of the aggregate of means of expression. As you can see, the three-stage methodology of comparative-terminological system analysis goes back to the methodology of contrastive studies described by V.N. Yartseva. However, in our work, the very appeal to the logical and mathematical terminological material of translations from English into Russian removes the need for the second stage of preliminary analysis, since here, due to the strictly deductive construction of the sublanguage, the basis for comparing the terms foreign (FL) and target (TL) language is always their invariant meaning given by a strict definition. ... The implementation of the first stage is determined by the "measure of language learning." The peculiarities of the English and Russian languages have been investigated, apparently, in equal measure, therefore, the comparison of the terms systems of the FL and the TL has a two-sided character. In a two-sided approach to the languages being compared, "both languages being compared appear as a reference for comparisons." The most important is the third step, that is, the actual systemic comparison.

Main principles of the systems approach in comparative terminology can be defined as follows:

- 1) The principle of the consistency of the object. Only systems of terms are compared as integral formations and terms as members of the system.
- 2) The principle of complexity. The establishment of relations between systems should be multifaceted, complex, carried out at the lexical, semantic and grammatical levels.
- 3) The principle of comparative consistency. The ultimate goal should be to represent the relationship between the terminological systems of the FL and the PL as a system of similarities and differences at all levels under study, that is, as a system of a higher order; this is the first basic methodological requirement of general systems theory.
- 4) The principle of classification system. The consistency of similarities and differences should be shown by their classification; consistent analysis of classification or typology is the second basic methodological requirement of general systems theory.
- 5) The principle of oppositions. A systematic study of similarities and differences should reveal such pairs of theoretical and systemic differences as symmetry-asymmetry, orderliness-disorder, allomorphy and zoomorphy, etc.
- 6) The principle of parameterization. The choice of the parameters of comparability of terminological systems in each specific case is determined by the tasks and material of the study, as well as by the needs of practice.
- 7) The principle is textual. The research material must be collected from the sphere of functioning (texts of the FL and PL), and not from the sphere of fixation (dictionaries, etc.). In the comparative analysis of translations, the terminologist deals with speech works. Since comparative terminology presupposes certain generalizations, the establishment of a translation standard, it studies regularly recurring phenomena that correspond to the systems of the studied sublanguages or are part of these systems. Thus, the "system of a higher order" (a system of similarities and differences) is revealed when comparing the terminological systems of the IL and the TL "not in their final abstracted form, but in their functioning in speech." Therefore, the question about the relation language and speech in comparative terminology cannot be reduced to an unconditional opposition, as well as in translation theory.
- 8) The principle of completeness. All terms used in a continuous text selection, both those that are in the core / periphery of special terminological systems, and general scientific terms should be subjected to comparison: all of them, by their entry into the texts of this information area, are related to special vocabulary and due to the dynamism and openness of terminological systems can eventually become their full members. But, most importantly, the distillation of terminology fundamentally contradicts the orientation of comparative terminology studies towards translation, towards the consumer-translator of

special texts, the creation of terminological banks that adequately reflect the linguistic reality of this information area.

9) The principle of combining qualitative and quantitative techniques. The types of ratios of the studied parameters of terminological systems should be subjected not only to a qualitative, purely linguistic, but also quantitative analysis.

Lexical and semantic system of the language: The subject of semantics (from the greek "Semantikos"-meaning, denoting) as a scientific discipline is the study of the meaning of signs. The term semantics was first introduced into linguistics in 1897 by M. Breal. In the scientific literature, another term is used, semasiology, which we understand as a designation of only one of the aspects of semantics.

Modern science considers meanings as the most important component of the language, one of its indispensable ingredients. Expression and perception of meaning are, in essence, the main and final goal of any language, provide its most important function, communicative. In contrast to the plane of expression of language ("external" form), the plan of content (meaning, "internal" form) is, as it were, directly addressed to a person and therefore for a long time remained without proper attention. The meaning was considered by linguists by virtue of its psychic nature as something "self-evident", and if it was studied it was "incidentally", in connection with the description of the dictionary and grammar. The decisive turn towards semantics in various directions and schools of modern linguistics is one of the clearest evidence of the relevance of studying the semantic structure of the language. In recent years, there has been a noticeable increase in interest in the general question of semantics, as well as in the semantic analysis of vocabulary, morphological categories, word-formation and syntactic structures, and the category of poetic language. In a number of domestic and foreign works on linguistic semantics, based on modern scientific theory, the basic concepts of the unit and category of semantics were more strictly and clearly defined, a program of semantic analysis was developed, and prospects were outlined. Development of the science of semantic structure to the circle of such "exact" linguistic disciplines as phonology.

Meaning is the main category of semantics, its central concept. To determine the meaning of certain units of a sign (semiotic) system, including language, which represents "the most complete and perfect of communication systems", this means to establish regular correspondences between certain "segments" of text and meaning that are correlative for a given unit, to form rules and to reveal the patterns of transition from the text to its meaning and from the meaning to the text expressing it. Such text ("signifier", signs) and sense ("signified", meaning) plan of expression and plan of content are specific to each language; they reflect the centuries-old practice, as it were, "deposited" in the system of the national language, the peculiarities of the cultural and historical development of the people. The factors that determine the meaning point to the main aspects of studying it as a linguistic phenomenon, conceptually (logical) content and the process of reflection in the mind of objective reality. These aspects of the study of meaning are considered, respectively, by linguistic, logical and philosophical semantics (epistemology), each of which has its own special, specific tasks. A kind of "cell" of the lexical-semantic system, revealing the systematicity of vocabulary (its various "dimensions") and reflecting the corresponding "piece", a segment of reality, is an elementary unit, which can be called tentatively as a "word-concept" i.e. word in one of its meanings.

Polysemy (polysemy) is one of the most important "dimensions" of the lexical and semantic system, one of the manifestations of the regular connection of elementary lexical units that form a certain hierarchy of polysemantic primary and secondary semantic functions in the structure of a polysemy word.

Systemic connections of vocabulary are reflected in such internally related categories as synonymy and antonymy; they cover wide layers of vocabulary, and first of all words (units) with the meaning of quality, attribute (property), action-state, relationship, etc. playing an extremely important role in the language, constituting the core of its abstract vocabulary.

As you can see, the vocabulary-semantic system of the language, being a necessary component of the general system of language, reflects in our minds the essential properties of the extra-linguistic and plays an important role in organizing and regulating the relationship between a person (more broadly, a linguistic society) and the world around him, in cognizing the laws of objective reality ...

The relationship between reality and language is one of the most complex, important and poorly researched in linguistics. According to the theory of linguistic relativism (linguistic relativism), the absolute reality of the world is analyzed in different ways, reflected, and divided into the semantic system of different languages: in accordance with the system of a certain language, relative to it. Depending on the peculiarities of the linguistic system of specific languages, reflecting the development of the corresponding cultures, linguistic "representations of reality" are created, arises from or from another

vision of the world, its objective, absolute reality and a necessary component of the general system of language, reflects in our consciousness the essential properties of extra-linguistic reality and plays an important role in organizing and regulating relations between a person (broader linguistic society) and the surrounding world, in understanding the laws of objective reality.

Some characteristic properties and features of the lexical system are determined by the properties of the reflected world, the facts of the "pre-system" ("segments of reality"): "something", and moreover objectively, ontological initial, determinative, exists "before the language", objectively independently of the language, although it is perceived through it.

The English researcher J.S. Mill, approaching the solution of the problem under consideration from the point of view of logical nomination, noted that not every subject has its own special purpose. For an individual person, remarkable in any respect of the locality, etc., individual, single names are required, which can denote only one thing; to designate things that, according to Mill, we do not often have to talk about, we use a combination of several words or common names, that is, those, each of which denotes an indefinite number of other similar objects. "If we say this stone, then the word "this" and "stone", each separately, can mean many other objects, besides the one in question, their connection can, in accordance with their meaning, designate at a given moment only the object that I have in mind." Modern linguistics proceeds from the premise that language is a system organized in a certain way, that is, an organic whole, the elements of which are naturally related to each other and are in certain relationships.

The lexical and semantic system of the language is not only the least studied, but also the most complex in its organization and structure. This system includes such a large number of elements connected by a wide variety of relationships that their systematicity seems difficult to visualize or even questionable. And nevertheless, it is still a system: otherwise, we would not be able to choose the necessary words with relative ease and, by comparing them with each other, use them in speech or perceive their meaning.

The complexity of the lexical system of the language as its characteristic feature and at the same time the objective difficulty of its study is, as it were, compensated by another: the lexical system is never used by anyone in its entirety. In fact, we always deal with its limitation, and often very significant (compare, for example, the phased introduction of vocabulary in the learning process, limitation of the language of a specialty to common and terminological words of a certain branch of science and technology, etc.). Qualitative words, words with an abstract meaning, present great difficulties in the description. The complexity of the semantic analysis of vocabulary lies in the fact that the result of the analysis is presented using the same material (metalanguage), which is at the same time the subject of analysis (in contrast, for example, from phonetics, where sound is characterized using a different "material", that is, words), in that the analysis of vocabulary is difficult to carry out "without a trace" due to the immensity of the entire system, so that the practical one has to be limited to certain fragments of this system. Of great importance for structuring the lexical system was the analogy between phonology (with its strictly described system) and semantics. At the international symposium in Magdeburg (1964) the following position was put forward: just as phonology should establish a system of sounds, semantics should describe a system of meanings. The application in the lexical semantics *mutatis mutandis* of the concept system and research apparatus, developed primarily by phonologists as the most "visual" system, allows to significantly improve the lexical-semantic analysis, to better understand the patterns of vocabulary simultaneously both as a specific system and as a manifestation of the general system of the language as a whole. Objective reality, or some relatively ordered "pre-system" ("system of realities"), can be approached both from the point of view of the speakers of a given language, through their linguistic perception, subjectively, and from the point of view of what this reality is objectively, independently from (to) its perception by speakers of a given language. It is important to keep in mind that the reflection of the objective world in the language of its semantics has its own specifics, its forms, categorically different units. The preconditions of the system (elements of the "pre-system") become the facts of the system through their understanding in the language, highlighting what is essential for it. The structural features of the lexical and semantic system, the specific nature and direction of psychological associations, the adopted system of concepts (scientific "naive"), the specifics of national culture, and finally all social practice leave their mark on the reflection of reality in linguistic semantics.

Objective differences that exist in things (realms) are specifically reflected in linguistic semantics as a result of their corresponding assessment from the point of view of standards accepted in the language community (or many and even all language communities). Reflections of the objective world in the lexical-semantic system is inevitably associated with its "phenomenon of language", the representation in units of various categories of words, or parts of speech (cf. a horse runs and a horse runs), and lexical

categories proper (cf. for example, the use of conversions as designation of the same action: The student passes the exam to the professor - The professor takes the exam from the student). All this creates a different vision of the same realities, emphasizes the specific differences in the linguistic reflection of objects, in comparison with what they represent independently, "before the language."

References:

1. Reformatkiy AA, Introduction to linguistics, M., 1967.
2. Ufimtseva AA, Word in the lexical and semantic system of language, M., 1968.
3. Shmelev DN, Modern Russian language. Lexicon, M., 1977.
4. Smirnitky AI, Lexicology of the English language, M., 1956.
5. Shansky NM, Lexicology of the modern Russian language, 2nd ed., M., 1972.
6. Apresyan Yu. D., Lexical semantics, M., 1974.
7. Gak VG, Comparative lexicology, M., 1977.
8. Shmelev DN, Problems of semantic analysis of vocabulary. M., 1973.
9. Stepanov Yu.S., Names. Predicates. Suggestions. Semiological grammar, M. 1981.
10. Volodina M.N. Cognitive-informational nature of the term and terminological nomination: Diss. Cand. philol. sciences. - M., 1998 .-- 178 p.
11. Grinev S.V. Terminological borrowing (a brief overview of the current state of the issue) // Issues of borrowing and ordering foreign language terms and terminology. - M. : Nauka, 1989 .-- S. 108-124.
12. Kimyagarova R.S. Types and types of adaptation of borrowed vocabulary in the English language of modern times (XVII-XX centuries) // Vestnik Mosk. un-that. Ser. Philology. - 1989. - No. 6. - S. 69-78.

Рецензент: Мамбаева С.К. – кандидат филологических наук, доцент Кыргызско – Турецкого Университета «Манас».