

V. L. IVASHCHENKO, L. V. TUROVSKA,
I. A. KAZYMYROVA, N. O. YATSENKO¹
(Kyiv, Ukraine)

GENERAL SLAVIC TERMINOLOGY: MAIN TRENDS OF STUDY

The paper attempts to analyze main paradigm, aspectual, cross-paradigm, cross-aspectual and cross-disciplinary trends of study of the general Slavic terminology development in the late XX – early XXI centuries. Fundamental papers of Russian, Ukrainian, Belorussian, Polish, Czech, Bulgarian, Slovakian and Slovenian scholars are systematized according to the existing trends in the field of terminology.

Key words: general terminology, Slavic terminology, paradigm, aspectual, cross-paradigm, cross-aspectual, cross-disciplinary, trends of study.

Any analytical review of scientific papers, first and foremost, requires generalization of the previous best practices learnt over the specified period of development of the particular area of knowledge. Record keeping of theoretical papers dedicated to the Slavic terminology has shown that there is no systematic description of the main trends of study in linguistics that would help the scholars to orient in this sphere of knowledge.

It is true that some information on scientific research in a particular branch of terminology of the Slavic linguistics can be partially found in the scientific papers of Ukrainian, Russian and Belarusian researchers who have explored theoretical problems in terminology the such as: generaltheoretic (Y. M. Marchuk, V. V. Varyn, S. L. Mishlanova, V. H. Kulpina, V. A. Tatarynov, M. H. Antoniuk, H. A. Hvozdyvych) [1; 3; 14; 21; 22; 32], including paradigm (V. A. Tatarynov, I. M. Kochan) [11; 26; 27; 30; 31], development of specific theories – terminological text theory (V. M. Leichyk) [18], integrity theory (M. Popova, V. A. Tatarynov) [23; 28]; specific-purpose (L. V. Turovska) [36]; criticism of conventional terminology (V. A. Tatarynov) [29]; sociolinguistic (L. B. Tkachova) [34], especially, structural and system, onomasiological, semasiological and cognitive (A. S. Diakov, T. R. Kyiak, Z. B. Kudelko) [6]; info- and sociolinguistic (V. A. Stupin) [25]; comparative (V. M. Leichyk) [17], particularly, engineer and linguistic as well as the theory of translation (F. A. Tsytkina) [38–40]; comparative-contrastive (P. O. Selihai) [24]; typological (L. V. Turovska) [37]; structural and semantic as well as functional (Y. V. Zhytin) [7]; functional and stylistic (V. A. Tatarynov, N. O. Yatsenko) [33; 44]; functional and stylistic as well as the theory of translation (N. O. Yatsenko) [43; 45]; functional and discursive (D. V. Shcherba) [41]; historical (O. V. Borkhvalt, V. G. Kulpina, V. A. Tatarynov, L. V. Turovska) [2; 16; 35]; civilizational (V. G. Kulpina) [13]; cognitive, notably, lingua-conceptualized (V. L. Ivashchenko) [8, p. 3–6, 119–121; 9, p. 382–388], cognitive and communicative (L. O. Manerko, O. Y. Holovanova) [4; 19; 20], cognitive and discursive (I. A. Kazymyrova) [10]; theoretical and applied

¹ Прізвища, імена, по-батькові перекладено відповідно до Постанови Кабінету Міністрів України № 55 “Про впорядкування транслітерації українського алфавіту латиницею” від 27 січня 2010 р.

(S. V. Hrynov-Hrynevych) [5, p. 12–13], including theoretical and methodological (V. A. Tatarynov) [33], theoretical and terminological (V. K. Shcherbin, V. H. Kulpina, V. A. Tatarynov) [42; 15] etc.

Certainly, it is difficult to cover and comment on all the theoretical papers on the Slavic terminology within one publication, so we shall limit ourselves only to analytical review of fundamental papers on the general Slavic terminology of the late 20th ('90th) – early 21st centuries, when the general terminology is considered to be a science developed in strong interrelation with typological terminology based on the general theory, as well as upon the results of particular study of the development of certain features in all terminology branches and clearly evident difference between them [5, p. 54–56].

The main objective of the proposed study is to analyse the theses and monographs on Ukrainian, Russian, Belarusian, Polish, Czech, Bulgarian, Slovak, Slovenian, Croatian, Serbian and Macedonian general terminology of the specified period, and also classify them according to the main paradigms of study and trends in which the terminologists work nowadays.

We consider it necessary to emphasize that proposed exploration is not exhaustive, since work on record keeping and categorization of general theoretical papers on the Slavic terminology still continues.

Keeping in mind poly-paradigm of present-day linguistics [12] and, consequently, terminology as one of its structural elements and fully self-contained scientific discipline, we can discuss parallel coexistence of three paradigms under study in the selected terminological areas: 1) [system and] structural / term-centric / conventional or, as determined by some scholars, structuralism, classificatory and structural, taxonomic, formal, inventory at its post-paradigm stage – [system and] structural / term-centric / conventional terminology, 2) functional at its own paradigm stage – functional terminology, 3) cognitive / cognitive and discursive or, as determined by some scholars, ambi-semantic, cognitive and functional, cognitive and communicative, anthropocentric, neofunctional, interpretative, at its pre-paradigm stage – cognitive terminolog. We will briefly analyse fundamental theoretical studies on the general Slavic terminology of the selected period according to the certain paradigms of study, or their trends.

I. General Slavic terminology of system and structural paradigm (Table 1). Key paradigm-generating concepts and constructions of this scientific study area are the following:

1) theoretical: “term / nomen = linguistic sign / linguistic [invariant] unit”, “terminological norm = language norm” // “standard”, “term / nomen / special lexical item = structural system element”, “term element”, “connections / relationships between terms / special lexical units = connections / relationships between system elements”, “opposition of terms / special lexical units = oppositions of system elements”, “hierarchy of terms / special lexical units = hierarchy of system elements”, “formal / content structure of term”, “static / dynamic structure of term system”, “term system / nomenclature = sign system = exists in and for itself”, “term system / nomenclature = linguistic subsystem”, “hierarchy of term systems = supersystem / system / subsystem”, “term system level”, “limit” = “ter-

minological meaning in terms of units / categories / classes”, “term system – substratum” – “term system – “organism” – term system – “environment”, “formal (structural) typology of terms / term systems”, “[terminology] [lexical] semantic / conceptual / field”, “scientific metaphor / metonymy” and etc.;

2) methodological: “semiological / semiotic analysis principle”, “logicism principle” by means of “formalization (structural, formal description / analysis) of term / term system”, “empirical description of individual facts // system description”, “system and structural analysis”, “mathematical exploration methods”, “synchronous description method”, “component analysis method”, “simulation method”, “thesaurus method in semantics”, “semantic field method”, “description method by lexical and semantic groups”, “comparative analysis (method)”, “comparable analysis (method)”, “semantic analysis”, “definitive analysis” and etc.:

In the present day system and structural general Slavic terminology these constructions are based on the general theory of term which is represented to a certain extent by:

- theory of [terminological] nomination [in the special sphere], considering theory of semantic / lexical derivation, theory of [scientific / terminological] metaphor (basically, linguistic, in particular, onomasiological aspect – *onomasiological terminology*), for instance, in the papers of Bulgarian scholars – M. Popova, S. Kolkovska, K. Kabakchiiev, A. Khrystova, B. Popov (“The aspects of Bulgarian terminology”, 1999), T. Boiadzhyiev (“Bulgarian lexicology”, 2002), M. Popova (“The typology of terminological nomination”, 1990 – typological aspect), B. O. Aleksiev (“Contrastive aspect of terminological metaphor”, 2005); Russian scholars – M. M. Volodina (“The theory of terminological nomination”, 1997), L. M. Aleksieiva (“The term and metaphor: semantic substantiation of metaphorization”, 1998), V. I. Bihanova (“Yakut terminology (establishment stages)”, 1996 – historiographical aspect); Slovak scholar B. Krupa (“The metaphor at the intersection of scientific disciplines”, 1990); Ukrainian scholar R. V. Ivanitskyi (“The lexicographic aspects of terms normalization (based on German, English, Ukrainian and Russian terminological units)”, 1995 – typological as also normative and lexicographic aspects);

- theory of definition or semantic theory of term in the context of theory of lexical / linguistic meaning, theory of semantic field / lexical and semantic groups (logical and linguistic, semasiological aspects – *semasiological terminology*), for instance, in the papers of Russian scholars – S. D. Shelov (“The experience of development of terminological theory: knowledge and definition of terms”, 1995, 1995a, “Term. Termhood. Terminological definitions”, 2003 – typological aspect), M. V. Marchuk (“The dynamics of lexical meanings of polysemantic words (vocabulary of general terminological level)”, 1996 – diachronic aspect);

- cross-theoretical or cross-aspectual studies within the same paradigm (e.g. *onoma-semasiological aspect – onoma-semasiological terminology + historical aspect – historical terminology*), in particular, in the papers of Russian scholars – H. A. Dianova (“The term and notion: problems of evolution (to the basics of historical terminology)”, 1996, 2000 – linguological and semiotic / onoma-semasiological and historical aspects), T. S. Kohotkova (“National origins of Russian terminology”, 1991 – onoma-semasiological and historical aspects); Slovenian scholar – Y. Khonzak-Yakhych (“Slovenian terminology in the

19th century (based on the Czech influence)”, 1999 – structural and semantic and also historical aspects);

- theory and methodology of [applied] terminology (theoretical and methodological / theoretical and applied terminology), particularly, conventional theory of terminography (theoretical terminography) in the context of theory of lexicography (theoretical lexicography), lexicographical and terminography descriptions / terminology analysis (theoretical and lexicographic / theoretical and terminography aspects), terminological activities in the field of valuation of individual terminology and standardization, conduct of terminology expertise and editing (basically, theoretical and applied aspects), as well as methods of assessment, design and creation of traditional dictionaries (methodological terminology), for instance, in the papers of Bulgarian scholar B. O. Aleksiiev (“Terminography oriented to the knowledge”, 2011 – theoretical and terminographical aspects); Slovak scholar Z. Yurchatskova (“Terminology: Basic principles, methods and their application”, 2002 – theoretical and methodological aspects); Polish scholars Y. Liukshyn and B. Zmazher (“Theoretical foundations of terminology”, 2001, 2006 – theoretical and methodological aspects); Russian scholar O. V. Borkhvald (“Historical terminology of Russian language”, 2000 – theoretical and methodological foundations in the historiographical aspect).

Table 1. General Slavic Terminology of System and Structural Paradigm

<u>Russian terminology</u>	<u>Bulgarian terminology</u>	<u>Slovak terminology</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • onomasiological terminology: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • onomasiological terminology: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • onomasiological terminology:
M. M. Volodina (1997);	M. Popova, S. Kolkovska,	V. Krupa (1990)
L. M. Aleksiieva (1998);	A. Khrystova, B. Popov	• theoretical and
V. I. Byhanova (1996)	K. Kabakchyiev (1999);	methodological terminology :
• semasiological terminology:	T. Boiadzhyiev (2002);	Z. Yurchatskova (2002)
S. D. Shelov (1995, 1995a,	M. Popova (1990);	
2003);	B. O. Aleksiiev (2005)	<u>Ukrainian terminology</u>
M. V. Marchuk (1996)	• theoretical terminology :	• onomasiological
• onomasiological +	B. O. Aleksiiev (2011)	terminology:
historical terminology :	<u>Polish terminology</u>	R. V. Ivanytskyi (1995)
H. A. Dianova (1996, 2000);	• theoretical and	<u>Slovenian terminology</u>
T. S. Kohotkova (1991)	methodological terminology :	• onomasiological +
• theoretical and	Y. Liukshyn,	historical terminology:
methodological terminology :	B. Zmazher (2001, 2006)	Y. Khonzak-Yakhych (1999)
O. V. Borkhvald (2000)		

II. General Slavic terminology of functional paradigm (Table 2). It is based on the following key paradigm-generating concepts and constructions and constructions:

1) theoretical: “structural (formal) – functional”, “terminological meaning” – “form (formal structure) of term”, “terminologization / determinologiza-

tion”, “function of professional language / language for special purposes (LSP)”, “term functioning in the text / discourse”, “application of terms” – “variation of term / terminological variation”, “professional / special / scientific text / discourse” – “literary text” – “information system”, “professional language / language for special purpose (LSP) – “sublanguage” – “metalanguage” = functional system [of expression means]”, “functioning of professional language / sublanguage / metalanguage / language for special purposes (LSP)”, “professional language / language for special purpose (LSP) = professional communication means”, “professional community / professional society”, “professional / special communication”, “functional simulation of specialist language activity”, “professional competence”, “culture of professional / scientific language / speech”, “interdisciplinarity”, “[terminological] functional and semantic field”, “terminological meaning in terms of / nearly functional and semantic field”, “scientific style = functional style as language variety”, “functional typology / stratification of professional languages / sublanguages / languages for special purpose (LSP)”, “terminological motivation”, “degree of termhood = degree of motivation as motivation [between form and function] of term”, “slang”, “scientific / professional discourse” etc.;

2) methodological: “functional analysis” – “formal analysis”, “quantitative method / count method / statistical method”, “principle of linguistic economy”, “principle of methodological monism”, “iconicity principle”, “principle of discourse / text motivation”, “diachronic / historical principle” // “diachronic description”, “syntax analysis”, “distributive analysis”, “teleological principle (purposeful LSP functioning)”, “continuous sampling method”, “contextual analysis”, “discourse analysis”, “sociolinguistic analysis methods”, “syntagmatic analysis” etc.

In the present-day general theoretical functional Slavic terminology these constructions are represented to a certain extent by:

- concept of functional varieties / styles of language in the study of scientific / scientific and technical style (stylistic terminology), for instance, in the paper of Russian scholar O. M. Ponomarova (“Scientific style as an object of assimilation by native speakers”, 2004 – the concept of scientific style in the position of preverbal readiness);

- linguistics // stylistics of scientific / professional / academic scientific text, in particular, linguistics // stylistics of languages for special purposes (LSP), in the context of the theory of linguistics // text stylistics and concept of term stylistic function in special, scientific, popular science, science fiction and literary texts, as well as information systems (textual term analysis – term-centric and terminological text analysis – text-centric aspects terminological text theory), for instance, in the papers of Russian scholars – N. Y. Saltanova (“The specific discourse in literary text: in comparison with discourse in scientific text”, 2008 – typological, text-centric and comparative aspects), L. M. Yelizarova (“Terminological and literary innovations in the functional aspect (based on the compositions of modern science fiction)”, 1992 – term-centric and comparative aspects), O. V. Karpova (“The functioning of everyday expressions in the scientific text”, 2005 – genre and stylistic aspects), D. O. Razoronova (“The term in the modern

fiction: based on the English language”, 2006 – term-centric stylistic aspect), R. S. Stoianova (“Asystem phenomena in the verbal scientific text”, 2004 – typological, system and asystem structural and astructural / antistructural and text-centric aspects), M. V. Cherkunova (“The pragmalinguistic features of scientific and educational literature abstracts: based on English publications”, 2007 – typological, communicative, text-centric, pragmalinguistic aspects); Polish scholar O. Vashchuk-Zin (“Semantic transformations of general terms in the scientific text”, 2007 – term-centric and semasiological aspects);

- cross-theoretical / cross-aspectual studies, for instance, in the papers of Russian scholars – Y. V. Slozhenikina (“Terminology in the lexical system: functional variation”, 2006, “Terminological variation: semantics, form, function”, 2010 – synthesis of the theory [term as] of linguistic sign [special application field] / semiotic theory of term and theory of terminological variability – pragmasemiotic and typological aspects of dichotomy “linguistic variation – functional variability” in the context of criticism of traditional, codified by special guidebooks and DSTU point of view on the term), A. L. Kogotyzheva (“Communicative organization of scientific text”, 2002 – synthesis of communication theory and linguistics / text stylistics – communicative and stylistic, text-centric and typological aspects);

- theory and methodology of [applied] terminology (theoretical and methodological / theoretical and applied terminology), particularly, in theoretical and [lingua-] didactic and translation aspects, namely, translation terminography and abstract theorems of professional / special / scientific translation in the context of terminographical theory (theoretical terminography) and the theory of translation (translation terminology), for instance, in the papers of Polish scholars – V. Pytel (“Preparation of special texts in the language teaching system”, 2005 – text-centric and lingua-didactic aspects), H. Vyshnievska (“Terminological iteration as a tool for organization of professional language learning process”, 2010 – term-centric and lingua-didactic aspects), H. Novotko (“Pragmatic aspects of professional translation (based on Russian, Polish and German languages)”, 2000 – pragmatic and translation aspects), M. Lukasyk (“English-Polish and Polish-English special purpose dictionaries (1990–2006). Terminographic analysis”, 2007 – translation and typological as well as theoretical and terminological aspects; “Special texts and terminography development”, 2010 – theoretical and methodological terminography foundations); Russian scholars – Y. H. Pyrikov (“Fundamentals of system translation concept (terminological aspect)”, 1992 – translation aspect), I. S. Kudashev (“Design of special translation dictionaries”, 2007 – theoretical and lexicographic (terminographic), typological, translation and anthropocentric aspects); Belarusian scholars – K. P. Liubetska (“German-Belarusian lexicography of the 20th century and formation of Belarusian terminology”, 2004 – theoretical and lexicographical (terminographical), historiographical and translation aspects) and I. M. Salkova (“The structure of sublanguage lexicon and selection of learner’s dictionary”, 1990 – theoretical and lexicographical (terminographical) and didactic aspects); Czech scholar D. Zhvachek (“Chapters on the theory of translation (professional translation)”, 1995 – translation aspect).

Table 2. General Terminology of Functional Paradigm

<p><u>Russian terminology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stylistic terminology : O. M. Ponomariova (2004); N. Y. Saltanova (2008); L. M. Yelizarova (1992); Y. V. Karpova (2005); D. O. Razorionov (2006); R. S. Stoianova (2004); M. V. Cherkunova (2007)) • semiotic term theory + terminological variation theory: Y. V. Slozhenikina (2006, 2010) • communicative and stylistic terminology : A. L. Kohotyzheva (2002) • translation terminology : Y. H. Pyrikov (1992) • theoretical terminography: I. S. Kudashhev (2007) 	<p><u>Belarusian terminology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • theoretical lexicography / terminography: K. P. Liubetska (2004); I. M. Salkova(1990) <p><u>Polish terminology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • terminology theory of text: O. Vashchuk-Zin (2007) • theoretic and applied terminology : V. Pytel (2005); H. Vyshnevska (2010); M. Lukasyk (2007, 2010) • translation terminology : H. Novotko (2000) <p><u>Czech terminology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • translation terminology : D. Zhvachek (1995)
--	---

III. General Slavic terminology of cognitive paradigm (Table 3). Nowadays interdisciplinary synthesis of philosophy, epistemology, in particular, philosophy of consciousness, cognitive psychology (cognitive psychology), cognitive anthropology, mathematical logic (mathematics, logics, semiotics), intellectual and computer technologies, cognitive / computer graphics contrary to cognitive linguistics (especially, cognitive semantics, cognitive grammar, cognitive stylistics), neurolinguistics, psycholinguistics, linguistic technologies represent them as a new paradigm of study based on the following key paradigm-generating concepts and constructions:

1) theoretical: “cognition” – “scientific / special / professional knowledge // knowledge of the world”, “representation structures of special / scientific / professional knowledge”, “invariant of scientific knowledge”, “cognitive nature of term”, “orientation function of term”, “information nature of term”, “term area” – “mental area”, “term notion”, “scientific / special image-notion”, “scientific / professional concept = meaning”, “scientific / professional concept = meaning”, “mental (formal) / semantic structure of scientific concept”, “content of scientific / professional / special notion – content of scientific / professional / special concept”, “concept – term notion”, “scientific / professional concept sphere” / “conceptual sphere of science”, “category as format of scientific / professional / special knowledge”, “categorization of scientific / special / professional knowledge as manifestation of world categorization”, “conceptualization of scientific / special / professional knowledge as manifestation of world conceptualization”, “conceptual / linguistic [national] scientific / professional world view”, “professional linguistic peculiarity”, “cognitive capability / cognitive style of specialist”, “expert / scientist / specialist as S of scientific / professional / special knowledge”, “cognitive error – terminological error”, “prototype definition of term / determination of term boundaries / linguistic boundaries of term / term limitations”, “discrediting / non-discrediting of scientific / special / professional meaning”, “conceptual scientific metaphor”, “terminological database” etc.;

2) methodological: “method of [cognitive] simulation”, “methodology of structuration (simulation) of situation”, “methods of mathematical simulation / mathematical logic”, “mental and linguistic description-simulation”, “procedure of analysis of some concepts with the help of others”, “conceptualization method” = “conceptual analysis / concept-analysis”, “conceptual simulation of linguistic world view”, “procedure of concept reconstruction”, “frame analysis”, “formal analysis”, “statistical analysis”, “information and logical analysis”, “method of free / object-oriented association experiment”, “search for knowledge structures that stand for linguistic form as continuation of definitive analysis”, etc.

These constructions, to a certain extent, represent individual study programs in the modern general and theoretical cognitive Slavic terminology, provided that today there is no unified theory of cognitive linguistics (and thus in its context and cognitive terminology). Integrating achievements of classical semantic theories, cognitive theory, system theory, information theory, theory of case grammar, prototype theory, theory of artificial intelligence, machine-translation theory, automation theory, as well as logical and philosophical, lingua-logical and lingua-psychological concepts etc., the general Slavic terminology in the late 20th – early 21st century is primarily represented by two trends:

- lingua-cognitive itself that primarily focuses on cognitive and nominative, cognitive and semantic, as well as cognitive and communicative aspects (lingua-cognitive terminology), for instance, in the papers of Russian scholars – E. A. Sorokina (“Cognitive aspects of lexical design (to the foundations of cognitive terminology)”, 2007, 2007a – cognitive and semasiological, historiographical and sociolinguistic aspects), Y. I. Shestak (“Professionally marked phraseological units in cognitive and communicative aspects”, 2008 – cognitive and communicative aspects);

- linguistic and technological that provides automatic processing of terms by using specialized computer software (computer-based terminology contrary to the theory and methodology of applied terminology as a synthesis of linguistics and computer technologies, in particular in their [lingua-] didactic (oriented at the employment of computer technologies in teaching of languages for special purposes), translation (mainly centered on the translation of scientific and technical terminology), as well as information and normative (mostly oriented at the standards of scientific and technical terminology application) aspects in the context of development of theoretical framework for creation of algorithms / systems of automatic analysis, search and translation of terms in various texts / language corpora, as well as creation of electronic dictionaries of terms and term banks / databases, translation or information and normative using of computer technologies (computer-based terminology), for instance, in the papers of Russian scholars – S. V. Hrynov (“Fundamentals of lexicographical description of term systems”, 1990 – synthesis of general theory and methodology of applied terminology, particularly conventional theory of terminology in its system and structural, as well as typological aspects and theory of terminological activities in the information and technological aspects, including automation and design of termbases), V. I. Mikhailova (“The structure of multi-component terms and creation of electronic dictionaries (theoretical basics for development of translation algorithms)”, 1992), N. Y. Zaitseva (“Semiotics of Romance

terminological systems in their relation to English and Russian ones”, 2003 – technological aspects of information and semiotic theory of term using thesaurus-network and matrix-frame methods contrary to theoretical guidelines of norm-centric, as well as communicative and translation, comparable and typological terminology); Polish scholars – Y. Valinskyi (“Search for terms in the compared language corporae”, 2001), fragmentarily H. Felber, H. Budin (“Theory and practice of terminology”, 1994 – synthesis of terminological theory of nomination and systems theory with creation of termbanks); Slovenian scholar Sh. Vintar (“Terminology and computer terminography”, 2008 – theoretical and methodological foundations of computer terminology contrary to general theory of term in its structural and functional as well as ontological aspect in particular, application of terminological theory of nomination in practical and conventional terminography and standardization as well as automation of terminographical activities – construction and processing of special corporae and automatic selection of terms).

Table. 3. General Terminology of Cognitive Paradigm

<u>Russian terminology</u>	<u>Polish terminology</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • linguo-cognitive terminology : E. A. Sorokina (2007, 2007a); Y. I. Shestak (2008) • computer terminology : N. Y. Zaitseva (2003) • computer terminography: S. V. Hrynov (1990); V. I. Mikhailova (1992) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • computer terminology : S. V. Hrynov (1990); V. I. Mikhailova (1992) <p><u>Slovenian terminology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • computer terminography: Sh. Vintar (2008)

In addition, we should highlight the trends of cross-paradigm study in the general Slavic terminology in the late 20th ('90th) – early 21st centuries, among them we distinguish:

1. Structural and functional trends (Table 4) is represented, for instance, in the papers of Russian scholars – H. P. Melnikov (“Terminology fundamentals”, 1991 – onoma-semasiological and typological aspects of ordering terminologies, nomenclatures and terminological borrowings in the context of methodological synthesis of systems theory and general theory of term in particular, terminological theory of nomination and theory of definition), O. V. Superanska, N. V. Podolska, N. V. Vasylieva (“General terminology. Problems of theory”, 2012 – opposition of common properties of term and special vocabulary, special vocabulary and common vocabulary in the context of the analysis of their linguistic basis, development of term typology and LSP typology contrary to terminological nomination), A. M. Zarva (“The definition as typological variety of scientific text”, 2003 – logical and semantic, communicative and typological aspects of the theory of definition), O. O. Nikulina (“Terminological units as a result of interaction and mutual influence of terminology and phraseology in modern English”, 2005 – onomasemasiological and lexicographical aspects of phraseological theory in the context of terminological theory of nomination), M. V. Zymova (“Polysemy in terminology”, 2010 – semiotic and typological aspects of the theory of lexical / terminological meaning), M. V. Kosova (“Terminologization as a process of reconsideration of Russian common lexis”, 2004 – typological aspect of semantic theory of derivation and semantic

modulation as demonstration of linguistic specialization of term), and M. M. Horbushyna (“Terms with repeated elements in modern English”, 2001 – comparative and typological as well as onomasemasiological aspect of terminological theory of nomination), L. M. Aleksieieva (“Term and metaphor: semantic substantivation of metaphor”, 1998, “Origin and functions of metaphoric terms in the text”, 1999 – theory of [scientific] metaphor in the context of terminological theory of nomination), V. Y. Sobolieva (“Functionally marked special lexicon in the dictionary and text”, 2000 – functional and stylistic, as well as normative aspect), K. Y. Averbukh (“General theory of term”, 2004, “General theory of term: comprehensive and varied approach”, 2005, “General theory of term”, 2006 – synthesis of theories of LSP, linguistic sign of special application area, terminological variation, nomination in special area, applied terminology in logical and grammatical, logical, semiotic, semasiological, system, as well as and terminographical and standardization aspects; criticism of general / conventional theory of term); Russian and Polish scholars – V. Leichyk, L. Besekyrka (“Terminology: subject, methods, structure”, 1998 – onomasemasiological, typological and comparative, system aspects of general theory of term, theoretical and methodological foundations for study of languages for special purposes and applied terminology); Polish scholar S. Haida (“Introduction to the theory of term”, 1990, “Modern scientific Polish – language or jargon?”, 1990a – onomasemasiological, functional, historiographical and typological, social and applied as well as lingua-scientific aspects of general theory of term); Bulgarian scholar Y. Petkova (“Terminologization in modern Bulgarian literary language”, 2009 – onomasemasiological aspect of terminological theory of nomination); Belarusian scholars – A. I. Bahdzevych (“Word-building structure of deverbative term units – adjectives in modern Belarusian literary language”, 1999 – norm-centric aspect of terminological nomination and variation theories), L. A. Antoniuk (“Belarusian terminology: establishment, development, structure”, 1992 – onomasemasiological and historical aspects).

One of the trends of the terminology study is theoretical and methodological / theoretical and applied, in particular, translation aspect, revealed, for instance, in the paper of Russian scholar L. M. Aleksieieva (“Distinguishing features of scientific translation”, 2002 – onomasemasiological aspect of the theory of [scientific] translation).

Table. 4. General Terminology of Structural and Functional Trends

<u>Russian terminology</u>	• translation terminology :
H. P. Melnikov (1991);	L. M. Aleksieieva (2002)
O. V. Superanska, N. V. Podolska,	
N. V. Vasyliieva (2012);	<u>Polish terminology</u>
O. O. Nikulina (2005);	L. Besekyrka (1998);
A. M. Zarva (2003);	S. Haida (1990, 1990a)
M. V. Zymova (2010);	
M. V. Kosova (2004);	<u>Bulgarian terminology</u>
M. M. Horbushyna (2001);	Y. Petkova (1992)
L. M. Aleksieieva (1998, 1999);	
V. Y. Sobolieva (2000);	<u>Belarusian terminology</u>
K. Y. Averbukh (2004, 2005, 2006);	L. A. Antoniuk (1992);
V. Leichyk (1998)	A. I. Bahdzevych (2009)

2. Functional and cognitive / cognitive and functional trends (Table 5). It is primarily represented in the papers of Russian scholars L. Y. Buianova (“Terminological derivation. Metalinguistic aspectuality”, 1996, “Terminological derivation in the language of science: cognition, semiotics, functionality”, 2011 – cognitive and semiotic, metalinguistic, logical and conceptual as well as lingua-conceptual pragmatic aspects of terminological derivation contrary to functional derivation theory) and O. S. Kuzmyna (“Syntagmatics of scientific text (based on the Russian scientific literature)”, 2005 – lingua-cognitive and culturological, logical and psychological aspects).

Aspectual demonstrations of the aforesaid trends are the following:

- cognitive and communicative terminology has been developed in the papers of Russian scholars, in particular, O. I. Holovanova (“Category of professional leader in the dynamic language area”, 2004 – cognitive and communicative, as well as historical aspects), N. S. Milianchuk (“Lingua-pragmatic category of non-categoricity of statements in the scientific style of modern Russian”, 2005 – cognitive and ethical pragma-communicative and discursive aspects of the concept of functional variations / styles of language), K. B. Svoikin (“Dialogics of text in the English scientific communication”, 2006 – computer-oriented, semantic and cognitive, communicative, methodological, localization aspects with emphasis on concept and typological analysis). Theoretical and applied demonstration of this aspect is represented in the papers of Russian scholar R. Z. Zahidullin (“Theoretical and methodological basics of translation thesaurus (based on English for special purposes)”, 1993, 1994 – cognitive and communicative concept of translation in the context of theoretical and methodological foundations for LSP thesaurus creation);

- cognitive and discursive terminology (sometimes it is treated as paradigm demonstration of cognitive terminology) created on the basis of intensive study of various types of professional / scientific / special discourses, as well as term cognition, its functioning in different types of discourses, stated, for instance, in the papers of Russian scholars – N. L. Morhun (“Scientific network discourse as text type”, 2002 – communicative and text-centric aspect, combination of traditional analysis of linguistic units with discourse-analysis as linguistic sign development in discourse), A. O. Boldyrieva (“Category of authority in the scientific discourse”, 2006 – communicative, lingua-stylistic, psycholinguistic and comparative aspects), V. V. Kuznietsova (“Implementation of corporate principles in the English group professional discourse”, 2005 – structural and semantic, communicative, comparative and cognitive aspects); Ukrainian scholars – O. M. Ilchenko (“Etiquettization of English-American scientific discourse”, 2002 – typological, normative and textual, as well as interpersonal and communicative aspects of discourse etiquettization concept), E. F. Skorokhodko (“Term in the scientific text (for creation of term-centric theory of scientific discourse)”, 2006 – term-centric theory of scientific discourse as development of theoretical and methodological foundations for general theory of term in the term and text-centric, typological and communicative aspects), I. A. Kolesnikova (“Lingua-cognitive and communicative-pragmatic parameters of professional discourse”, 2009 – lingua-cognitive, functional, communicative

and pragmatic, as well as “professional and normative” aspects), O. I. Bahrii (“Scholarly dispute: discourse and pragma-oratorical characteristics (based on the English articles of the middle 20th – early 21st centuries)”, 2010 – communicative, pragma-oratorical, interpersonal, genre and typological, as well as linguistic aspects).

Table 5. General Terminology of Functional and Cognitive Trends

<u>Russian terminology</u>	<u>Ukrainian terminology</u>
L. Y. Buianova (1996, 2001);	• cognitive and discourse terminology :
O. S. Kuzmyna (2005)	O. M. Ilchenko (2002);
• cognitive and communicative terminology :	E. F. Skorokhodko (2006);
O. I. Holovanova (2004);	I. A. Kolesnikova (2009);
N. S. Milianchuk (2005);	O. I. Bahrii (2010)
K. B. Svoikin (2006);	
R. Z. Zahidullin (1993, 1994)	
• cognitive and discourse terminology :	
N. L. Morhun (2002);	
A. O. Boldyrieva (2006);	
V. V. Kuznietsova (2005)	

In the general Slavic terminology of the late 20th – early 21st centuries we can distinguish cross-disciplinary trends of scientific studies which are actively created at the border of terminology and other scientific disciplines (Table 6). Except for cognitive terminology as a paradigm, cross-disciplinary studies also include:

- integrative that are created on the basis of integration theory of term and integration concept (model) of language for special purposes combining achievements of epistemology, linguistics, sociology, psychology, logic, semiotics, information technologies which include the papers presented by Bulgarian scholar M. Popova (“Theory of terminology”, 2012 – onomasemasiological, structural and functional, cognitive / epistemological, linguistic itself, sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, logical and philosophical, information and semiotic as well as methodological aspects of the theory of nomination) and Polish researcher S. Hrucha (“Linguistics of languages for special purposes”, 2013 – integration concept / model of language for special purpose in the historiographical, functional and cognitive aspects on the basis of anthropocentric theory of text linguistics considering study of professional idiolects and polylects as well as professional competence);

- sociolinguistic as an interdisciplinary synthesis of sociology and terminology contrary to sociolinguistics which suggests the formation of trend for general socioterminology, for instance, in the papers of Ukrainian scholars – A. S. Diakov, T. R. Kyiak, Z. B. Kudelka (“Fundamentals of term formation: Semantic and sociolinguistic aspects”, 2000 – general theory of term in onomasemasiological, structural, motivational, etymological, translation, methodological aspects and glosso-linguistic aspects contrary to sociolinguistic establishment trends of national term systems, theory of linguistic interferences and terminological planning);

- **civilizational** (reveals the knowledge and experience of civilizations reflected in language, represented in several aspects: civilizational, comparative and historical, historical and genetic, anthropocentric and internal structural) as an interdisciplinary synthesis of general theory of civilization and general theory of term contrary to civilizational linguistics that interacts with sociolinguistics, history, cultural linguistics, computer technologies which is defined as a “new method” [13] in the modern terminology. In particular, these are the papers of Russian scholars – O. V. Superanska, N. V. Podolska, N. V. Vasylieva (“General terminology. Terminological activities”, 2008 – theoretical and methodological foundations for general theory of terminology and applied aspects of terminologist activities including normalization and standardization, linguistic and technological, terminographical, coordinational and didactic contrary to the history of scientific ideas and scientific language development in the ancient civilizations and different nations); Czech scholar S. Zhazhi (“Latin and Greek vocabulary, grammar and terminology of Slavic languages”, 2010 – contrastive and comparative aspects of crucial role of the ancient languages, especially Greek and Latin, in the development of European culture, their influence on the vocabulary, terminology and grammar of Slavic languages as well as importance of Latin knowledge, especially for modern professional occupations of people in various fields);

- **linguadidactic** as an interdisciplinary synthesis of pedagogics and terminology contrary to linguadidactics, in particular the papers of Russian scholars – O. O. Makarova (“Significance of system orientation in the study for formation of its scientific understanding (based on learning of English vocabulary), 1992 – linguadidactic aspect), O. I. Arkhypova (“Formation of foreign language vocabulary of specialist in the integrative learning of foreign language and general professional disciplines”, 2007 – theoretical and methodological foundations of linguadidactics in anthropocentric and thesaurus aspects);

- **marginal** (beyond the scope of linguistics itself with preferential philosophical aspect) as an interdisciplinary synthesis of philosophy, sporadically linguistics, sociology, culturology, hermeneutics, methodological culture of science, cognitive science, in particular the papers of Ukrainian scholars – V. S. Lukianets, O. M. Kravchenko, L. V. Ozadovska (“Modern scientific discourse: New methodological culture”, 2000 – sociocultural and philosophical aspects of scientific discourse, updating of its methodological culture through the “linguistic turn in the philosophy” in the context of current crisis of rationality concept and new problematics of postmodern deconstruction of the metaphysics of rationalism, narrativization and hermeneutics, cognitive practices of modern science), S. M. Yahodzinskyi (“Scientific discourse in the information society: methodological and sociocultural aspects”, 2008 – philosophical and methodological, historical and scientific, sociocultural aspects of scientific discourse as a synthesis of scientific and theoretical, scientific and industrial, scientific and educational activities, as a part of social system of information society and basis for information civilization development), O. V. Trishchuk (“Scientific and information discourse as a social and communicative phenomenon”, 2009 – scientific and information discourse as a social and communicative phenomenon and socio-psycholinguistic practice).

Table 6. General Terminology of Cross-Disciplinary Trends

<u>Russian terminology</u>	<u>Ukrainian terminology</u>	<u>Bulgarian terminology</u>
• civilizational trend: O. V. Superanska, N. V. Podolska, N. V. Vasylieva (2008)	• social terminology : A. S. Diakov, T. R. Kyiak, Z. B. Kudelko (2000)	• integrative trend: M. Popova (2012)
• linguodidactic trend: O. O. Makarova (1992); O. I. Arkhypova (2007)	• marginal trend (beyond the scope of linguistics itself): V. S. Lukianets, O. M. Kravchenko, L. V. Ozadovska (2000); S. M. Yahodzynskyi (2008); O. V. Trishchuk (2009)	<u>Czech terminology</u> • civilizational trend: S. Zhazha (2010)
		<u>Polish terminology</u> • integrative trend: S. Hrucha (2013)

Thus, general Slavic terminology science of the late 20th – early 21st centuries represents nearly 100 fundamental papers, 52 of them disclose problematics of three major paradigm trends: system and structural / conventional, functional and cognitive.

General theoretical studies of system and structural paradigm (22 papers) reveal predominance of onomasiological aspect of scientific searches, in particular represented in the context of terminological theory of nomination (Russian, Bulgarian, Slovak and Ukrainian terminology). To a smaller extent, theoretical and methodological foundations (Russian and Slovenian terminology), as well as problematics of onomasemasiological and historical directions (Russian, Polish and Slovak terminology) are developed. Semasiological aspect and classical theoretical terminography are generally presented only in one area of linguistic culture (in Russian and Bulgarian terminology respectively).

In the functional paradigm under study (21 papers) terminological theory of text is actively developed nowadays (Russian and Polish terminology) and focuses more on theoretical and applied aspects (Polish, Russian, Byelorussian and Czech terminology), in particular the problems of translation (Russian, Polish and Czech terminology) and theoretical terminography issues (Russian and Belarusian terminology). Only individual studies in the areal of Russian culture reveal stylistic, communicative and stylistic as well as semiotic and varied aspects of term learning.

General theoretical studies of cognitive paradigm (9 papers) are primarily focused on solution of linguistic problems in cognitive and nominative, cognitive and semantic as well as cognitive and communicative aspects (Russian terminology), and also linguistic and technological trends (in Russian, Polish and Slovenian areals of linguistic cultures).

Cross-paradigm studies are arranged according to two trends: structural and functional as well as functional and cognitive / cognitive and functional. Structural and functional trends which is mostly represented by the papers of Russian scholars (15 papers of 21) and, to a lesser extent, of Poland, Bulgarian and Belarusian scholars (5 papers), combine achievements of systematic and structural / conventional and functional terminology. Functional and cognitive / cognitive and functional trends are mostly represented by the papers of Russian scholars (11 papers of 15) and, to a smaller degree,

by Ukrainian scholars (4 papers) touching various aspects including functional and cognitive (Russian terminology), cognitive and communicative (Russian terminology) as well as cognitive and discursive (Russian and Ukrainian terminology).

Cross-disciplinary trends (14 papers) of general theoretical studies in the Slavic terminology of the specified period appear in the historiographical (Russian terminology), sociolinguistic (Ukrainian terminology) civilizational (Russian and Czech terminology), integrative (Bulgarian and Polish terminology) linguadidactic (Russian terminology) and marginal (Ukrainian terminology) aspects, the latter of them actually go beyond terminology and linguistics as such.

The prospects of further analytical review of the Slavic terminology of the late 20th – early 21st centuries will be devoted to systematization of scientific searches in the field of industrial terminology.

(Переклад з укр. А. ФЕДОРОВА)

1. *Антонюк М. Г., Гвоздович Г. А.* Терминологические исследования в Беларуси // Славянское терминоведение. – 2009. – № 1. – С. 16–18.
2. *Борхвальдт О. В.* Историческое терминоведение русского языка: Монография. – Красноярск: РИОКГПУ, 2000. – 200 с.
3. *Варин В. В.* Актуальные аспекты современного терминоведения // Проблемы социолингвистики и многоязычия / Отв. ред. В. А. Татаринов, А.-К. С. Баламамедов. Серия Библиотека журнала «Русский Филологический Вестник». – М.: Москов. Лицей, 1997. – Т. 1. – С. 170–176.
4. *Голованова Е. И.* Введение в когнитивное терминоведение: Учеб. пос. – М.: Изд-во «Флинта»; Изд-во «Наука», 2011. – 222 с.
5. *Гринева-Гриневиц С. В.* Терминоведение: Учеб. пос. для студ. высш. учеб. завед. – М.: Академия, 2008. – 181 с.
6. *Дьяков А. С., Кияк Т. Р., Куделько З. Б.* Основы термінотворення: Семантичний та соціолінгвістичний аспекти. – К.: Видав. дім “КМ Academia”, 2000. – 218 с.
7. *Житін Я. В.* Погляд на термін крізь призму структурно-семантичного та функціонального підходів // Вісник Нац. ун-ту “Львівська політехніка”. Серія “Проблеми української термінології”. – 2009. – № 648. – С. 9–15.
8. *Іващенко В.* Концептуальна репрезентація фрагментів знання в науково-мистецькій картині світу (на матеріалі української мистецтвознавчої термінології): Монографія. – К.: Видав. Дім Дмитра Бураго, 2006. – 326 с.
9. *Іващенко В.* Лінгвоконцептологія і термінознавство (аналітичний огляд) // Мовні і концептуальні картини світу: Зб. наук. пр.: У 2 ч. – К.: Київський нац. ун-т імені Тараса Шевченка, 2009. – Вип. 26. – Ч. 1. – С. 382–388.
10. *Казмирова І. А.* Концепція терміноцентризму в сучасному українському когнітивно-дискурсивному термінознавстві (аналітичний огляд) // Ucrainica V. Současná ukrajinistika. Problémy jazyka, literatury a kultury: Sb. příspě. z mezinár. conf. “VI olomoucké symposium ukrajinistů střední a východní Evropy”. Olomouc 23–25.8.2012. – Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2012. – С. 88–91.
11. *Кочан І.* Українські терміни в парадигмі сучасних наукових учень // Українська термінологія і сучасність: Зб. наук. пр. – К.: КНЕУ, 2009. – Вип. 8. – С. 30–34.
12. *Кубрякова Е. С.* Парадигмы научного знания в лингвистике и ее современный статус // Известия Академии наук СССР. Серия литературы и языка. – 1994. – № 2. – Т. 53. – С. 3–15.
13. *Кульпина В. Г.* Цивилизационный подход к терминологии // *Татаринов В. А.* Общее терминоведение: Энциклопедический словарь. – М.: Москов. Лицей, 2006. – С. 342–346.
14. *Кульпина В. Г., Татаринов В. А.* „Teoretyczne podstawy terminologii”. «Теоретические основы терминоведения» // *Татаринов В. А.* Общее терминоведение: Энциклопедический словарь. – М.: Москов. Лицей, 2006. – С. 309–313.

15. *Кульпина В. Г., Татаринев В. А.* Болгарское терминоведение: теоретические исследования и практическая терминография // Учитель, ученик, учебник: Материалы VI Междунар. научн.-практ. конф.: Сб. ст. / Отв. ред. Л. А. Городецкая. – М.: КДУ, 2011. – Т. 1. – С. 418–433.
16. *Кульпина В. Г., Татаринев В. А.* Историческое терминоведение // *Татаринев В. А.* Общее терминоведение: Энциклопедический словарь. – М.: Москов. Лицей, 2006. – С. 67–68.
17. *Лейчик В. М.* Основные положения сопоставительного терминоведения // Отраслевая терминология и ее структурно-типологическое описание: Межвуз. сб. науч. тр. – Воронеж: ВГУ, 1988. – С. 3–10.
18. *Лейчик В. М.* Элементы терминоведческой теории текста // Стереотипность и творчество в тексте: Межвуз. сб. науч. тр. – Пермь: Перм. гос. ун-т, 2002. – Т. 5. – С. 27–47.
19. *Манерко Л. А.* Истоки и основания когнитивно-коммуникативного терминоведения // Лесикология. Терминоведение. Стилистика: Сб. науч. тр., посвященный В. М. Лейчику. – М.; Рязань: Пресса, 2003. – С. 120–126.
20. *Манерко Л. А.* Терминосистема в традиционной и когнитивно-коммуникативной лингвистике // Научно-техническая терминология: науч.-технич. реферат. сб.: Материалы 10-ой междунар. науч. конф. – М.: ВНИИКИ, – Вып. 1. – С. 48–52.
21. *Марчук Ю. Н.* Актуальные аспекты теории терминоведения // Функциональные исследования / Ред.: А. И. Изотов, В. А. Татаринев. Серия: Библиотека журнала «Русский Филологический Вестник». – М. – 1996. – Т. 2. – С. 111–117.
22. *Мишланова С. Л.* Терминоведение XXI века: История, направления, перспективы // Филологические науки. – 2003. – № 2. – С. 94–101.
23. *Попова М.* Теория на терминологията. – София: Знак'94, 2012. – 683 с.
24. *Селігей П. О.* Пуризм у термінології: український досвід на європейському тлі // Мовознавство. – 2008. – № 1. – С. 49–67.
25. *Ступин В. А.* Инфолосоциоллингвистика. Методология, методика и техника исследования динамики терминологических процессов и предметных областей: Учеб.-метод. пос. для аспирантов. – СПб: Изд-во СПб ГУЭФ, 2000. – 185 с.
26. *Татаринев В. А.* Научная парадигма Российского терминологического общества РоссТерм и ее перспективы // Терминологический вестник. – 2000. – № 1. – С. 5–23.
27. *Татаринев В. А.* О формировании новой научной парадигмы в российском терминоведении // Василию Ивановичу Абаеву 100 лет: Сб. ст. по иранистике, общему языкознанию, евразийским культурам / Отв. ред. М. И. Исаев. – М.: Языки русской культуры, 2001. – С. 155–160.
28. *Татаринев В. А.* Предисловие. Интегративная теория общего и болгарского терминоведения // *Попова М.* Теория на терминологията. – Велико Търново: Знак'94, 2012. – С. 17–20.
29. *Татаринев В. А.* Рецепция терминологических взглядов Ойгена Вюстера в отечественном терминоведении // Вопросы филологии. – 2004. – № 1. – С. 106–109.
30. *Татаринев В. А.* Российская школа терминоведения: от традиций стандартизации к амбисемантической парадигме // Славянское терминоведение. – 2009. – № 1. – С. 9–12.
31. *Татаринев В. А.* Терминоведение в России: на подступах к новой парадигме // *Słupskie prace humanistyczne.* – 1999. – Т. 18. – С. 209–217.
32. *Татаринев В. А.* Формирование направлений и методов в отечественном терминоведении // *Татаринев В. А.* История отечественного терминоведения. – М., 1995. – Кн. 1. – Т. 2: Направления и методы терминологических исследований: Очерк и хрестоматия. – С. 9–72.
33. *Татаринев В. А.* Формирование функционально-стилистического направления в русском терминоведении // *Stylistyka.* – 1995. – Т. 4. – С. 332–337.
34. *Ткачева Л. Б.* Актуальные проблемы терминологии в социоллингвистическом освещении: Автореф. дисс. ... докт. филол. наук: 10.02.19 / ЛГУ. – Л., 1987. – 32 с.
35. *Туровська Л. В.* Историчне термінознавство в Україні кінця ХХ – початку ХХІ ст. // Українська мова. – 2012. – № 2. – С. 67–80.

36. Туровська Л. В. Отраслевое терминоведение в Украине в первой половине XXI века: краткий обзор // Вопросы терминоведения. – 2012. – Вып. 1. – С. 32–35.
37. Туровська Л. В. Типологічне термінознавство кінця XX – початку XXI ст. в Україні // Вісник Нац. ун-ту “Львівська політехніка”. Серія “Проблеми української термінології”. – 2012. – № 733. – С. 49–52.
38. Циткина Ф. А. Теоретические и инженерно-лингвистические основы сопоставительного терминоведения: Дисс. ... докт. филол. наук: 10.02.20 / Военный ин-т. – Ужгород, 1987. – 433 с.
39. Циткина Ф. А. Теоретические и инженерно-лингвистические основы сопоставительного терминоведения: Автореф. дисс. ... докт. филол. наук: 10.02.20 / Военный ин-т. – М., 1988. – 38 с.
40. Циткина Ф. А. Терминология и перевод (к основам сопоставительного терминоведения). – М.: Высшая школа, 1988. – 157 с.
41. Шерба Д. До питання про кореляцію понять “терміносистема”, “фахова мова” та “фаховий дискурс” у сучасному термінознавстві // Українська термінологія і сучасність: Зб. наук. пр. – К.: КНЕУ, 2007. – Вип. 7. – С. 93–96.
42. Шербин В. К. Основные направления белорусской терминографии // Славянское терминоведение. – 2009. – № 1. – С. 25–28.
43. Яценко Н. О. Перекладне термінознавство в Україні кінця XX – початку XXI століття // Українська мова. – 2012. – № 3. – С. 94–110.
44. Яценко Н. О. Функціонально-стилістичне термінознавство в Україні на початку XXI століття // Наукові праці Кам’янець-Подільського нац. ун-ту імені Івана Огієнка. Філологічні науки. – Кам’янець-Подільський: Аксіома, 2011. – Вип. 28. – С. 522–524.
45. Яценко Н. О. Функціонально-стильовий напрям в українському термінознавстві кінця XIX – першої половини XXI століття // Наукові записки Ніжинського держ. ун-ту імені Миколи Гоголя. – 2011. – С. 40–45.

В. Л. Іващенко, Л. В. Туровська,
І. А. Казимилова, Н. О. Яценко

ЗАГАЛЬНЕ СЛОВ’ЯНСЬКЕ ТЕРМІНОЗНАВСТВО: ОСНОВНІ НАПРЯМИ ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ

Зроблено спробу проаналізувати основні парадигмальні, аспектуальні, крос-парадигмальні, крос-аспектуальні та крос-дисциплінарні дослідницькі напрями розвитку загального слов’янського термінознавства кінця XX – початку XXI століття. Відповідно до напрямів систематизовано фундаментальні праці російських, українських, білоруських, польських, чеських, болгарських, словацьких, словенських дослідників у царині термінознавства.

К л ю ч о в і с л о в а : загальне термінознавство, слов’янське термінознавство, парадигмальний, аспектуальний, крос-парадигмальний, крос-аспектуальний, крос-дисциплінарний, дослідницький напрям.