

L.M. Kharitonova, K. Kaletkenova

*Ye.A. Buketov Karaganda State University, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: maks_141191@mail.ru)*

Terminosystems of literature as an object of comparative study

The study of various aspects of terminal science, such as the status, functioning and scientific description of thermosystems formed in different cultural, linguistic and scientific traditions, is becoming increasingly relevant today, including for solving issues of optimization of the process of translation of terms from one language to another. The present article is concerned with some of the problems of studying terminology in literature due to the specifics of humanitarian knowledge and literature as a science. Modern scientific communication requires comparative study of the conceptual-terminological «tools» developed in different languages as a universal means of consolidating the results of cognitive activity. Justification of the specificity of the composition of terminology systems, semasiological structure of values and logical-formal connections of terms, methods of their definition are considered as essential aspects of the study of the research apparatus of literature, which allows to characterize the peculiarities of linguistic and professional thinking in different cultural and linguistic traditions.

Keywords: literature, terminology, terminosystem, comparative analysis.

The intensive development of humanitarianism in the integrated space of world science contributes to the active development of processes of scientific interaction and communication. Introduction of new information technologies and telecommunication facilities creates the basis for carrying out scientific activity at a qualitatively new level, provides an opportunity to implement new models of distributed scientific environment built on technologies of remote access to information resources and computer communication facilities. In this context, the processes of linguistic, cultural and scientific communication are significantly intensified, which leads to the need to systematize and standardize the systems of scientific terms developed in different languages, which function in the professional sphere. The study of various aspects of terminal science, such as the status, functioning and scientific description of thermosystems formed in different cultural, linguistic and scientific traditions, is becoming increasingly relevant today, including for solving issues of optimization of the process of translation of terms from one language to another. This important problem requires both theoretical research in the field of terminology and the solution of practical lexicographic problems of an applied nature.

By scientific terminology, following D.S. Lotte, we will understand ordered sets of terms used in a certain field of knowledge, contrasted with disordered [1; 72]. It should be noted that various aspects of terminal science are actively studied in modern linguistics. Researchers are interested in the general linguistic issues of terminology formation semantic and functional-stylistic principles of terminology systems. Principles of formation of thermosystems of developing sciences, ordering of structure of thermosystems of already established sciences and socially communicative spheres, structuring of general features and methods of thermosystems formation are also considered.

In general, the whole set of scientific concepts of terminology study can be conditionally divided into normative and descriptive [2; 7]. The normative approach developed in the works of the first domestic terminology in the 1930s-1940s (Timofeyeva, Shmelyova, Superanskaya, Podolskaya, Vasileva). The researchers formulated the basic characteristics of the term from formal, functional and semantic perspectives, such as unambiguity and completeness, consistency of semantics and lack of synonyms, conformity with language norms, brevity, invariance and systemicity. This approach identifies terminology from the sphere of natural language and considers it as a set of special lexical units separate from the general language. Later, a descriptive approach to terminology was formed (Greenev-Greenevich, Leychik). Within this approach, the term is understood both as a unit of language and as a unit of professional speech. Some basic characteristics of the term have been rethought, and terminology has become to be studied by methods of linguistic theories.

The terminology of the humanities as a specific field of scientific speech became the subject of terminal science relatively recently, as this discipline was originally developed due to the need to solve the applied problem of standardization of scientific and technical terminology. However, recently there has been a significant increase in interest in the study of meta-languages in the social and human sci-

ences, which is due to a number of extralinguistic factors that determine the peculiarities of modern social and cultural development of society.

At the same time, because of its specificity, humanitarian terminology appears to be a more complex subject to study. Researchers note that compared to natural scientific terminology, it is characterized by such characteristics as greater conceptual inaccuracy, multi-value, valuability, stronger and more tangible connection with the general language. This is largely due to extralinguistic causes and the nature of humanitarianism as a form of knowledge of reality. While the principles of natural and scientific disciplines are based on the consistency of some physical laws, reveal their physical essence regardless of social importance, the nature of the humanities is connected with the idea of the principle heterogeneity and incomplete world, they are interested in socially and culturally conditioned forms of activity. The study of these specific features on the material of different social and human sciences is devoted to the research of A.A. Makarova, O.N. Shmelyova, I.B. Semyonova, N.P. Timofeyeva (terminology of economics), S.P. Khizniak, T.A. Moskalenko, T.A. Lazdin (terminology of Jurisprudence), I.Y. Berezhnavskaya, S.N. Vinogradov, N.V. Bugorskaya, V.V. Antimirova (terminology of linguistics).

The greatest interest for our work represent the researches of K.M. Ushakova, I.Y. Eliseeva, I.A. Degtyaryova devoted to the study of terminology of style and literature. The authors note that the conceptual apparatus of these disciplines has a number of important characteristics related to the specificity of the literature science itself, the breadth and diversity of the tasks before it: «Awareness of the essence and purpose of literary creativity, introduction with the arsenal of artistic techniques, visual and expressive means of poetry language <... > education of reading taste and public opinion about literary phenomena, development of criteria for their evaluation, methods and methods of analysis, commenting on literary texts <... > improvement of writing skills, synchronous and asynchronous description of the literary process, etc.» [3; 272]. The difficulties in categorizing literary concepts arising from the breadth and multidimensional nature of the subject matter of study are also pointed out by foreign researchers: «after all <... > we are only beginning to learn how to analyze a work of art in its integrity; we are still very clumsy in our methods and their basis in theory is still constantly shifting» [4; 33].

That is, the fundamental specificity of literature science is due to the subject of scientific study, which is understood to be the historical and literary process in a broad sense. In this connection, literature, performing the functions of accumulation of scientific facts, their systematization and reflection, at the same time remains to a certain extent a science of subjective and variable. It can often be said that literature itself is a form of artistic creation aimed not so much at reflecting objective reality as at transforming it. In addition to objective information, facts perceived intelligently and subject to strict scientific description, an emotional-intuitive component of literary knowledge is important here, due to the direct, emotional-sensual perception of the text. As an essentially integrated discipline, literature includes both a special field of knowledge as one of the humanities, and a field of culture and artistic creation, and a sphere of domestic communication.

Thus, literature as a social science takes an intermediate position between the aesthetic direction of human knowledge, which includes the sphere of artistic and visual arts, and the humanitarian fields of knowledge. In each of these spheres, literature draws on specific techniques of scientific description. The importance of such categories as artistic value in it predeterminates the gravity towards emotionally colored subjective-evaluation structures, while the nature of the humanities requires informative saturation of texts, systemicity and rigour in the application of the conceptual apparatus. The image of the scientific subject of literature is postulated on the basis of the definition of general laws of development of fiction (theory of literature), methods of analysis of works of writers (literary criticism), history of development of literary process as a whole (historical literature).

The mobility, variability and importance of the subject of literature, both in synchronic consideration and in historical perspective, naturally entails dynamic processes of rethinking and transformation of terminology. The intensification of literary meta-language is formed in close connection with psychology, ethics, philosophy, aesthetics. The dynamics of phenomena of social development, aesthetic representations and ideological principles of society are accordingly reflected in the development of terminology systems of literature. The philosopher and literary scholar A. Losev on this basis put forward and justified the principle of historical variability of the content of theoretical categories of literature, which is accordingly reflected in the semantic mobility of the units of the conceptual apparatus. At the same time, the meaning of the term is complicated by additional emotional-tint connotations, can be transformed under the influence of dynamic context use of the term, vary significantly depending on the individual views of the researcher and dominant cultural-historical concepts affecting the usual content of a term.

As a result, literary terminology exists as a fundamentally open system that is difficult to clearly systematize and parameterize. This feature was formulated within the framework of the historical and theoretical direction, which argued that in humanitarian knowledge science is determined not by the rigidity of the system of definitions, but by the completeness of the study. The regularity of conceptual and linguistic structures in literature is specific. They record not objective facts and patterns of the physical world, but unique phenomena of artistic verbal creativity, subject to constant interpretation, reflection, assessment and reassessment. Terminological units tend to serve as representants of aesthetic categories, making it possible to have a pronounced evaluation component in terminology.

Socio-cultural, historical-literary conditionality, importance of subjective-personal beginning of both author and interpreter of literary work fundamentally affects degree and quality of manifestation of the most important properties of the term as a special unit, such as consistency of semantics, unambiguity, priceless, stylistic neutrality [5; 55]. The meta-language of literature is heterogeneous and multi-layered, reflecting the terminosystems of various methodological and artistic directions that dominate during one period or another of the historical and literary process. All this makes it difficult to classify and typologize the phenomena studied by literature. It can be argued that virtually clear, consistent criteria for defining and systematizing terms of literature have not yet been worked out.

Another important feature of literary terminology is its close connection with natural language, which in a certain sense is also the object of the description of this science, an integral component of the historical and literary process. Thus, in the terminological systems of English-language literature there is a significant amount (65.5 % to 86.6 % of the vocabulary) of so-called consubstantial terms, that is, such terminology units, which have orthophonic equivalents in the general language, fully coincide with them graphically and in sound form. Such terms exhibit a much higher degree of multitasking and variability. For example, the dictionary definition of one of the key terms of the literature «form» emphasizes the existence of different meanings and understandings of it in English-language literature: «Form, a critical term with a confusing variety of means. It can refer to a *GENRE (e.g. 'the short story form'), or to an established pattern of poetic devices (as in the various *FIXED FORMS of European poetry), or, more abstractly, to the structure or unifying principle of design in a given work» [6; 100].

These properties of the scientific and categorical apparatus of literature, its considerable conditionality with national, cultural social characteristics, dependence on the general language determine the uniqueness and specificity of terminological buildings formed within the framework of different linguistic and national philological traditions. The cultural essence, social history and mentality of language significantly affects the characteristic of the term. Therefore, the peculiarities of literary terminology are particularly pronounced when comparing terminosystems of different languages. Comparative analysis of lexico-semantic and lexicographic characteristics of scientific apparatus of literature, formed and functioning in different languages, principles of their correlation and correlation, becomes a pressing task of linguistic research, having both theoretical and applied significance.

Comparative study of terminology in the Russian-speaking and English-speaking literary traditions involves solving a number of tasks: analysis of terminology buildings recorded in English-speaking and Russian-speaking terminology dictionaries, identification of principles of selection of terms and formation of categorical apparatus, regular models of terminology education; Identification of the scope, boundaries and structure of terms, dynamics of their semantic transformation, types and trends of variability; Definition of principles of language design and logical-semantic organization of definitions of key terminology units. The source of the study can be both literary, industry stylistic dictionaries and encyclopedias, push dictionaries, and literary texts themselves for the analysis of the native use of terms.

The study of the body of terms reveals significant differences in methodological approaches to literary analysis, segmentation of phenomena of historical and literary process within the framework of a specific cultural and linguistic scientific tradition. They make it possible to draw conclusions about the semantic value of terminological units, their usability, systemicity, termino-educational ability, combination.

One method of comparing units of different terminosystems is to analyze the principles of their fixation, that is, different methods of definition. The study of different approaches to the procedure of definition, modeling of terminological definitions, the presence of which is considered one of the conditions for the definition of a language unit as a term, allows to identify specificity and universal features of different terminosystems in Russian-language and English-language literature. The definition, as a category intended to describe the essential and distinctive characteristics of the objects or to reveal the meaning of the concept, must meet a number of universal requirements arising from the logic of scientific knowledge. Among these

are the need to define the term through the nearest genus and species difference; the principle of proportionality; logical consistency, clarity and acutance. The view characteristic must be a characteristic or a group of characteristics that are specific to the term and are not present in other concepts that belong to the same genus; a definition should not be defined through a concept that itself required definition; definition should not be only negative [6; 30].

As a tool of analysis, it is advisable to use the classification of definitions proposed by D.P. Gorsky, which involves their division into contextual, aspective and genetic (inductive). In contextual definitions, the meaning of a term is defined by some context or set of contexts on the basis of which it can be formulated. Such definitions are based on the identification of the «scope of definitions» of the term rather than its meaning» [7; 51]. The essence of classification and genetic definition consists in definition of a concept through its assignment to a certain class and specification of defined objects among this class of concepts — by some properties or methods of their formation, description, construction. According to researchers, the aspective type of definition formation is the most productive in the practice of term definition due to its logical-semantic universality, structural stability and compositional clarity.

In general, the principle in the definition is to follow the logic of a characteristic internal structure, in which the defining structure is more difficult to define from the point of view of the syntax structure. This complexity results from the fact that «the verbal definition of a term is an explanation of its meaning, anchoring in language the results of an analysis of a defined concept» [8; 30]. Thus, the most essential is the deletion of two opposing types of formal description of terms: descriptive (contextual definitions) and ancestral (classification definitions).

Another method of comparing terminosystems in different languages is a semantic analysis of terms based on a quantitative-descriptive statistical method, which allows to identify the volume and semasiological structure of terminological values, to detect their multi-meaning and semantic mobility. According to I.I. Mihina, multivariuousness is a characteristic feature of terms of English-language literature: «The same terms of literary genres become either indeterminate-significant, equivalent, or multivalued. At the same time, dictionaries reflect some components of the value, there are no others, there is a difference in their qualitative and quantitative composition. « Thus, the concept of allegory can be interpreted as a literary form: «a story or visual image with a second distinct meaning partially hidden behind its literal or visible meaning»; as a way of realizing an indirect meaning: «a description of one thing under the guise of another suggestively similar...»; as a form of narrative «a form of representation that functions as a trope, lying somewhere between personification and metaphor....» [9; 120]. The multi-meaning of literary terms is related both to the functioning of the term as a unit of language and to the dynamics of the development of the science of literature. In different terminosystems it can manifest in different ways: in the form of semantic variability, heurisy, ambisemy, polysemy.

Thus, the terminology systems of literature have a number of essential features, both due to the general nature of humanitarian knowledge in general, and to the specificity of literature as a science, its subject matter, and the dynamics of development. The active development of scientific communication actualizes the study of conceptual-terminological «tools,» which have developed in different languages, as a universal means of forming thought and scientific knowledge, consolidating the results of cognitive activity. The justification of the specificity of lexicons of terminology systems, semasiological structure of values and logical-formal connections of terms, ways of their definition and lexicography will allow to characterize essential features of the research apparatus of literature, peculiarities of language and professional thinking in different language traditions, the process of accumulation and understanding of knowledge in the science of literature.

References

- 1 Лотте Д.С. Основы построения научно-технической терминологии: Вопросы теории и методики / Д.С. Лотте. — М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1961. — 158 с.
- 2 Шмельёва О.Ю. Терминологические процессы в синхронии и диахронии (на материале английского языка) / О.Ю. Шмельёва. — СПб.: Изд-во СПбГУ ЭФ, 2010. — 120 с.
- 3 Федотов О.И. Литературоведение / О.И. Федотов, В.А. Луков // Энциклопедия гуманитарных наук. — 2010. — № 4. — С. 27–278.
- 4 Wellek R. A History of Modern Criticism / R. Wellek. — London, 1986.
- 5 Гринёв-Гриневи́ч С.В. Терминоведение / С.В. Гринёв-Гриневи́ч. — М.: Изд. центр «Академия», 2008. — 304 с.

6 Baldick Ch. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms / Ch. Baldick. — New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2001. — 280 p.

7 Жуков О.Р. Системные аспекты дефинирования в терминологии выразительных средств языка: дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.01 – «Русский язык» / О.Р. Жуков. — Саратов, 2017.

8 Горский Д.П. Определение (логико-методологические проблемы) / Д.П. Горский. — М.: Мысль, 1974.

9 Михина И.И. Семантическая вариативность термина и средства ее лексикографического отражения (на примере терминологии литературных жанров в английском и русском языках): дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.19 / И.И. Михина. — М., 1988. — 340 с.

Л.М. Харитонова, К. Калеткенова

Салыстырмалы зерттеу объектісі ретінде әдебиеттің терминологиялық жүйелері

Бүгінгі таңда терминологияның әртүрлі мәдени-тілдік және ғылыми дәстүрлерінде, соның ішінде терминдерді бір тілден екінші тілге аудару процесін онтайландыру мәселелерін шешу үшін қалыптасқан терминжүйелердің мәртебесі, қызмет етуі және ғылыми сипаттамасы сияқты аспектілерін зерделеу өзекті болып отыр. Мақалада гуманитарлық білім мен әдебиеттанудың ғылым ретіндегі ерекшелігіне негізделген әдебиеттанудағы терминологияны зерттеудің кейбір мәселелері зерттелді. Қазіргі ғылыми коммуникация танымдық іс-әрекеттің нәтижелерін бекітетін әмбебап құрал ретінде әртүрлі тілдерде қалыптасқан ұғымдық-терминологиялық "тәжірибені" салыстырмалы зерттеуді талап етеді. Терминологиялық жүйелер құрамының ерекшеліктерін, мағыналардың семасиологиялық құрылымын және терминдердің логикалық-формальды байланыстарын, оларды дефинирлеу тәсілдерін негіздеу әртүрлі мәдени-тілдік дәстүрлерде тілдік және кәсіби ойлаудың ерекшеліктерін сипаттауға мүмкіндік беретін әдебиеттанудың зерттеу аппаратын зерттеудің маңызды аспектілері ретінде қарастырылды.

Кілт сөздер: әдебиеттану, терминология, терминжүйесі, салыстырмалы талдау.

Л.М. Харитонова, К. Калеткенова

Терминологические системы литературы как объект сравнительного изучения

Сегодня все более актуальным становится изучение различных аспектов терминоведения, таких как статус, функционирование и научное описание терминосистем, сформированных в разных культурно-языковых и научных традициях, в том числе для решения вопросов оптимизации процесса перевода терминов с одного языка на другой. В статье рассмотрены некоторые проблемы изучения терминологии в литературоведении, обусловленные спецификой гуманитарного знания и литературоведения как науки. Современная научная коммуникация требует сопоставительного изучения понятийно-терминологического «инструментария», сложившегося в разных языках, как универсального средства, закрепляющего результаты познавательной деятельности. Обоснование специфики состава терминологических систем, семасиологической структуры значений и логико-формальных связей терминов, способов их дефинирования проанализировано как существенный аспект изучения исследовательского аппарата литературоведения, позволяющий охарактеризовать особенности языкового и профессионального мышления в различных культурно-языковых традициях.

Ключевые слова: литературоведение, терминология, терминосистема, сопоставительный анализ.

References

- 1 Lotte, D.S. (1961). *Osnovy postroeniia nauchno-tehnicheskoi terminologii: Voprosy teorii i metodiki* [Foundations of Scientific and Technical Terminology: Questions of Theory and Methodology]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR [in Russian].
- 2 Shmelyova, O.Yu. (2010). *Terminologicheskie protsesy v sinkhronii i diakhronii (na materiale anhliiskogo yazyka)* [Terminology Processes in Synchronia and Diachronia (on English language material)]. Sanit-Petersburg: Izdatelstvo SPbHU EF [in Russian].
- 3 Fedotov, O.I., & Lukov V.A. (2010). Literaturovedenie [Literature]. *Entsiklopediia humanitarnykh nauk — Encyclopedia of Humanities*, 4, 271–278 [in Russian].
- 4 Wellek, R. (1986). *A History of Modern Criticism*. London.
- 5 Greenev-Greenevich, S.V. (2008). *Terminovedenie* [Terminal Studies]. Moscow: Izdatelskii tsenter «Akademiiia» [in Russian].

6 Baldick, Ch. (2001). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

7 Zhukov, O.R. (2017). Sistemnye aspekty definirovaniia v terminologii vyrazitelnykh sredstv yazyka [Systemic aspects of definition in terminology of expressive means of language]. *Candidate's thesis*. Saratov [in Russian].

8 Gorsky, D.P. (1974). *Opredelenie (lohiko-metodologicheskie problemy)* [*Definition (logical and methodological problems)*]. Moscow: Mysl [in Russian].

9 Mihina, I.I. (1988). Semanticheskaia variativnost termina i sredstva ee leksikograficheskogo otrazheniia (na primere terminologii literaturnykh zhanrov v anhliiskom i rusском yazykakh) [Semantic variability of the term and means of its lexicographic reflection (on the example of terminology of literary genres in English and Russian languages)]. *Candidate's thesis*. Moscow [in Russian].