

The Theoretical Background of the Terminological Field *CONSTITUTION*

The article deals with the theoretical foundations of the terms, terminologies, terminological systems and terminological fields. The terminological field *CONSTITUTION* has been analyzed. The tendencies concerning the ways of defining such notions as «a terminology» «a terminological system» and «a terminological field» have been highlighted. The phenomena of «a system» and «a field» in the terminological studies have been compared and confronted. The ways of classifying the terms have been determined. The definition of the terminological field *CONSTITUTION* has been settled. The examples of the terms' use have been demonstrated. The notion of the polysemy in the context of the terminological field has been investigated. The patterns of the main terminological word-combinations have been outlined. The nominal, adjectival and verbal terms representing the terminological field *CONSTITUTION* have been analyzed and illustrated; their percentage has been fixed. Nouns have been proved to be a predominant part of speech for the formation of terms; their domination over verbs and adjectives has been established.

Key words: a term, a terminological field, a terminological system, a terminological word-combination.

Statement of the Problem and its Significance. The present day linguistics is one of the leading branches, taking into account its presence in any sphere of the social life. The legal system itself and the improvement of the Constitutional law, promote the further cognition and interpretation of the Constitutional documents, doctrines and acts. The terms are an obligatory element to constitute any legal document. The terms tend to take over the dominant role in legal language while their correct interpretation guarantees the accuracy of the legal procedures. The terminological field *CONSTITUTION* has been proved to be not thoroughly investigated and this fact causes the present study of the terminological field *CONSTITUTION*.

The Analysis of the Recent Researches in the Sphere. The modern terminological studies focus mainly upon the significance and position of the terms in the lexicon (B. M. Holovin, O. V. Superanska), the morphological peculiarities and functioning (V. P. Danylenko, O. O. Reformatyky), standardization and unification of terms in the different special terminologies (T. R. Kyiak, L. O. Symonenko) and the cognitive aspects of the terminologies (M. M. Volodina, O. S. Kubriakova).

The Goal and the Specific Tasks of the Article. The article aims at establishing the boundaries of the terminological field *CONSTITUTION*, and establishing semantic and structural peculiarities of the terms representing the terminological field. The goal is realized via the following tasks: 1) to determine the notions of «a terminology», «a terminological system» and «a terminological field»; 2) to contrast the notions of «a system» and «a field» in the terminological studies; 3) to implement the definition of the terminological field *CONSTITUTION*; 4) to correlate the term and the terminology as its context; 5) to analyze the legal terms (namely nominal, adjectival and verbal terms) correlating with the terminological field *CONSTITUTION*.

A paper is a study of the Constitution of the United States of America and the digest of laws in the United Kingdom serving as the legislative base and therefore equating with the Constitution.

Statement regarding the basic material of the research and the justification of the results obtained. The linguistics does not share a common idea how to define such notions as «a terminology» «a terminological system» and «a terminological field». Though there exist a thought that a terminology, comprising a set of terms, is a separate system within the bounds of any lexicon.

A terminology is defined as a totality of terms correlating to a certain scientific or manufacturing sphere. A terminology is also treated as a study about the formation, content and functions of the terms. The general terminological theories highlight the terms' formation and use in order to trace how the human knowledge: has been accumulated and transferred. The study improves the existing terminologies, finds out the best patterns to form the terms, singles out the characteristics peculiar to all the terminologies.

In contrast to a terminology, a terminological system never arises immediately with the formation of a certain science. A terminological system reflects the certain stages or theories of this science. The use-proven scientific theory is not obligatory for the basis of the terminological system. A concept or general notions can be enough. O. M. Tur considers that the following peculiarities sufficiently characterize any terminological system: 1) a terminological system is a certain totality of terms geared to fulfill a communicative or a thematic task; 2) all the elements of a terminological system are interconnected or interrelated; 3) no one term can exist beyond the

bounds of a terminological system; 4) the boundaries between the terminological systems can be more or less distinct; 5) terminological systems can cross forming the intersection points comprising the groups of terms peculiar to several systems; 6) a terminological system can be used by one or more scientific spheres. The simultaneous belonging to two or more terminological systems indicates the interdisciplinary status of a terminological system.

The term «field» in linguistics was introduced in the 20ies of the XX century by H. Ibsen and J. Trier. They were the founders of two polar trends concerning the semantic field. They were syntagmatic and paradigmatic approaches correspondingly, whereas the notion of the terminological field was introduced by O. O. Reformatsky, who treated the terminology as the terminological field because a word cannot be a term if it lacks its terminology [6]. The theory of field influenced greatly the linguistics of the XX century in general, and structuralism in particular and innovated the linguistic criteria and principles of its structure.

In modern linguistics the notions «system» and «field» are sometimes used interchangeably on the basis of structural peculiarity as a dominant one. In this case the structure equals the field. Thus, the structure is defined as the content and inner organization of a totality which is integral, whereas the system is treated as a set of interrelated and interdependent elements which form a complexity of subelements [3, p. 19]. Taking this idea into account, J. Hlavatska proves that a system is a result of the functional principles in shaping elements, and a field is an outcome of invariant principle to organize the elements and their existence.

The conceptual structure of terms comprises the conceptual and lexical meanings. They serve as the categories to structure the conceptual content of terms in different ways. The logical approach establishes the hierarchy of scientific concepts and classifies the terms thematically, whereas the linguistic approach identifies the component structure of the terminological lexical meaning [9, p. 58]. Hence, the logical approach focuses on the thematic groups of terms and the linguistic one emphasizes the terms and their terminological fields. The thematic groups and terminological fields possess a common feature, representing the integrity of lexical units, which detect the inner interconnections. However, thematic groups set connections referring to the objects and phenomena; therefore the main kind of relations in the thematic group is hierarchical. A terminological field instead appears as the paradigmatic unity of interrelated words able to verbalize the same concept. Within the field words are engaged in various paradigmatic relations on the basis of their semantics [26, p. 24].

The field approach to the semantic structure of a word can significantly extend the display of its semantics. The advantage is that applying the differential semantic signs the field approach gives a chance to contrast the similarities and differences of terms at the microsemantic level [10, p. 492].

The field theory introduced by J. Trier has gained its wide use in linguistics. J. Trier believed that a single word gets its definiteness on the basis of its lexical environment, and the fields are linguistic connections between separate words and inside the lexicon. The fields constantly interact with the other fields of the same paradigm, therefore, a field cannot be isolated. In the process of their interaction the fields join together to constitute into the fields of higher rank, which in their turn form lexicon of the language in general. J. Trier's theory is based on such a contrast and comparison: the language promotes the division of the human knowledge into a certain number of parts just the same as mosaic divides the space with the help of mosaic crystals [26, p. 24].

A term as the central unit any terminological field is an independent element of nomination [4, p. 35]. A term is an element of any specific natural or artificial language (a word, a word combination, an abbreviation, a symbol, a combination of words and letters/numbers-symbols), which has some special terminological value that can be expressed verbally or formally, and accurately reflects the characteristics of the corresponding notion [11, p. 27]. A term is a word that definitely correlates with the respective unit of a corresponding logical-conceptual system in terms of content.

Any professional language as «the unity of all the linguistic means that are applied in the professional communication to ensure the understanding among the members of this field» [8, p. 104] is a certain terminological field, which possesses the hierarchy of subfields and interconnections. Therefore, the analysis of any professional lexicon starts with the identification of terminological subfields that constitute its notional base.

Applying the definition of a terminological field as a set of linguistic (mainly lexical) units combined by a common meaning in order to reflect the conceptual, substantive or functional similarity of the phenomena [12, p. 41], we define the terminological field *CONSTITUTION* as a semantic field engaging in the terminology formed on the basis of the constitution that provides the structure of the lexical-semantic groups in the synchronic development of society and language.

O. O. Reformatsky admitted that a term always belongs to some terminology in the bounds of which it is monosemantic. A terminological field replaces the term's context. Within a terminological field, any term acquires its certainty and monosemy, whereas beyond it loses the specificities of a term. A term may exist out of

context, if it is known to what type of a terminology it belongs. Terms obtain their monosemy due to the membership in the terminology but not due to the context. Therefore, terms never depend on the context. To prove the idea it is sufficient to illustrate the difference between the term *bribery*, singled out within the terminological field *CONSTITUTION* (*bribery is the offering, giving, receiving, or soliciting of something of value for the purpose of influencing the action of an official in the discharge of his or her public or legal duties* [25]) and *bribery* as a non-term (*the expectation of a particular voluntary action in return is what makes the difference between a bribe and a private demonstration of goodwill* [19]).

There are opposite views considering the notion and the nature of the polysemy in terminology, due to the fact that polysemy is a presence of several interrelated meanings at one word, usually occurring as a result of changes and development of the original meanings in the context [9]. K. Ya. Averbukh claims that polysemy in the field of terminology is actually absent, because the terms tend to certainty in any particular terminological system. The other scientists do not deny the existence of polysemantic terms, but the majority of them believes that «polysemy and semantic homonymy are adverse phenomena within a separate scientific terminology» [7, p. 36], and therefore these terminologies must be unified.

Contrasting the meanings of the term «amendment» it is possible to correlate it with the legal vocabulary. However, in addition to legal data this term is often used in the terminological field of the financial sector. Therefore, in *legacy amendment as a change in the pleadings – statements of the allegations of the parties in a lawsuit – may be achieved if the parties agree to the amendment or if the court in which the proceeding is pending grants a motion for the amendment made by one party* [19]. At the same time there should be illustrated another definition (in the sphere of economy): *amendment is a change to an agreement; an attachment added after contract execution in order to modify or expand upon the original contract* [24]. The inner peculiarities of terms enable their separation from other language units and facilitate the classification of all the plurality of terms. Thus the nomination is to be specified [16, p. 235].

Next to the leading terminologists A. Ya. Kovalenko, O. V. Superanska, N. V. Podolska, N. V. Vasilieva all the terms according to their structure have been divided into:

1) simple, consisting of one word, for example *capitation* [20] – *a fee, charge or a tax that is levied on a per person basis* [25]; *ratification* [20] – *the confirmation of a previous act done either by the party himself or by another* [25];

2) complex, consisting of two words written together or with a hyphen, for example: *post-colonial* [20] – relating to, or being the time following the establishment of independence in a colony [25];

3) word-combinations, consisting of several components, for example: *compulsory military service* [20] – *drafting into the military service of the state* [25].

We admit the wide range of terminological word-combinations alongside with terms within the terminological field *CONSTITUTION*. Therefore, the terminological word-combinations have been classified into three types following the studies by O. V. Superanska.

The first type includes the terminological word-combinations, the components of which are independent words that can be used separately and that retain their meaning [17, c. 19], for example: *subordinate legislation* [23] – *law made by statutory authorities and government departments under powers given to them by (primary) legislation to carry out the requirements of the primary legislation* [25].

The second type includes such terminological word-combinations, one component of which is a term of technical origin, and the second one belongs to the common lexis, for example: *habeas corpus* [22] – *the name given to a variety of writs, (of which these were anciently the emphatic words,) having for their object to bring a party before a court or judge* [25]. The components of this type can be represented by two nouns or a noun + an adjective [3, p. 115]. This way to create scientific and technical terms has been proved to be more productive than the first one, where the two components are independent terms.

The third type includes terminological word-combinations, both components of which are of the common lexis and only their combination is treated as a term [17, p. 20], for example: *county palatine* – *a term bestowed upon certain counties in England, the lords of which in former times enjoyed especial privileges* [25].

Terminological word-combinations expressing single coherent concepts, differ in their degree of semantic valency, they are steadier compared to the free word combinations in their lexical and semantic organization. They can be classified as lexical collocations, the characteristic feature of which is that one of the components cannot be substituted with any word of the corresponding category, but only with the elements that constitute a certain semantic group [15, p. 223].

The classification of terms according to the morphological structure is traditional in linguistics. However, it is believed that it is quite relative, since it does not cover the terms created by affixation, telescoping, the

abbreviations, etc. It should be noted that there exist the words, which can be attributed to several groups. And, despite the large number of possible classifications of language terms there are still multi-meaning units that have never been classified properly. Therefore, there is the problem of full and multiaspect classification in modern terminology.

Each terminological unit, according to the part of speech classification, may be determined as a noun term, an adjective term, an adverb term or a verb term. Considering the sociological approach to the study of terms on the basis of the authorship linguists distinguish collective and individual terms. It is quite obvious that the functional words cannot maintain the role of a single (one-component) term, considering their lexical dependence [5, p. 20]. Currently, not all notional parts of speech can be represented as a one-component term or a terminological element within the complex term.

Thus, the process of term formation depends on the belonging of a lexical unit to a particular part of speech. According to the implementation in the composition of terminological units, the parts of speech that participate in the formation of terms are divided into free, semi-dependent and dependent. The free parts of speech are verbs and nouns, because they, unlike other parts of speech, can form one-component terms and act as terminological elements in the composition of a complex term. Thus, the mentioned above parts of speech are often the most productive from the terminological consideration.

The importance of noun terms is asserted in both Constitutions. Nouns represent 79 % single-component terminological units in the Constitution of Great Britain, for example: *authority* [23] – *a body having jurisdiction in certain matters of a public nature* [25]; *derogation* [21] – *the partial repeal or abolishing of a law, as by a subsequent act which limits its scope or impairs its utility and force* [25].

The number of nouns in single component terms in the US Constitution is the dominant group and equals 87 %: *citizen* [20] – *a member of a free city or rural society, possessing all the rights and privileges which can be enjoyed by any person under its constitution and government, and subject to the corresponding duties* [25]; *trial* [20] – *the examination before a competent tribunal, according to the law of the land, of the facts or law put in issue in a cause, for the purpose of determining such issue* [25].

The nouns also encourage the formation of the terminological word combinations, for example, *maritime jurisdiction, state legislature, goal delivery*. Sometimes it is not obvious to determine to what part of speech the term belongs due to the phenomenon of conversion in English. In the sphere of terminological nomination the process of the transformation of parts of speech is often traced. Hence, in the terminological field CONSTITUTION we admit the terms, formed from already existing units of the current specialized vocabulary in combination with the units of the common lexis, expressed by nouns that have resulted from the conversion, for example: *lords temporal* [18] – *the titled nobleman who peers other than bishops in their capacity as members of the House of Lords* [25]; *chief justice* [18] – *the presiding judge of a court having several members* [25].

The verbal units mainly obtain their terminological meaning due to the phenomena of valency and conversion. In the framework of a particular terminological system a particular verb or a verbal noun formed on its basis is applied for the specific activity or state (*appeal* [20] – (n) *the complaint to a superior court of an injustice done or error committed by an inferior one, whose judgment or decision the court above is called upon to correct or reverse; appeal* – (v) *the process of the complaint to a superior court of an injustice done* [25]).

Thus, the verbal units implement their terminological meaning on the speech level, the language advantage is to the substantivized units formed on their basis. All things considered, the nouns predominate over verbs and adjectives in terminological corps of the British Constitution and US Constitution.

Conclusions and Prospects for Further Research. To summarize, we note that the phenomenon of terminology today is not properly studied, despite the significant amount of linguistic studies devoted to this multi-aspect phenomenon. Based on the theoretical basis of such scholars as O. O. Reformatsky, T. Panko, I. Kochan H. Matsyuk, we defined the terminological field CONSTITUTION as the field with dominating semantic component within the terminology, formed on the conceptual basis of the Constitution, which provides the semantic structure of lexical groups in a certain synchrony of society and language. Among the free parts of speech nouns and verbs are acknowledged, because they, unlike other parts of speech, can form one-component terms, and act as a part of complex terminological units. Thus, the above-mentioned parts of speech are often primary in the terminological system. There is another view of such scientists as L. Hoffman, S. R. Kazarin, V. P. Danilenko, F. O. Tsytkina and even O. S. Akhmanova. The researchers suggest enough examples to prove the opposite view arguing that the term can belong at least to four parts of speech: noun (priority), adjective, adverb and verb.

As legal terminology develops general theoretical aspects of the term, terminology, terminological system of law, and defines key concepts and categorial apparatus of its industry, the future prospects of research are to be

developed in expanding the parameters of classification in the scope of usage (the terminology of legal doctrine, legal practice, terminology of enforcement and interpretational acts) and structural types of terms with the involvement of the additional sources for analysis and profound study of terminological polysemy and ambiguity.

References

1. Ахманова О. С. Словарь лингвистических терминов / О. С. Ахманова. – М. : КомКнига, 2005. – 576 с.
2. Вердиева З. Н. Семантические поля в современном английском языке / З. Н. Вердиева. – М. : Высш. шк., 1986. – 118 с.
3. Виноградов В. С. Введение в переводоведение (общие и лексические вопросы) / В. С. Виноградов. – М. : [б. и.], 2001. – 224 с.
4. Даниленко В. П. Лексико-семантические и грамматические особенности слов-терминов / В. П. Даниленко // Исследования по русской терминологии. – М. : [б. и.], 1971. – С. 5–67.
5. Іерінг, Рудольф фон. Юридична техніка / Рудольф фон Іерінг. – М. : Стаут, 2008. – 231 с.
6. Квитко И. С. Термин в научном документе / И. С. Квитко. – Львов : Выща шк., 1976. – 150 с.
7. Кияк Т. Р. Прагматичні аспекти стандартизації української термінології / Т. Р. Кияк // Мовознавство. – 1993. – № 1. – С. 35–38.
8. Кияк Т. Р. Функції та переклад термінів у фахових текстах / Т. Р. Кияк // Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка. – Вип. 32. – Житомир : ЖДУ, 2007. – С. 104–108.
9. Куньч З. Й. Українська риторична термінологія: історія і сучасність / З. Й. Куньч. – Львів : Вид-во Нац. ун-ту «Львівська політехніка», 2006. – 216 с.
10. Мацюк Г. П. Термін у соціолінгвістичних традиціях / Г. П. Мацюк // Ucrainica II. – Olomouc, 2006. – С. 477–482.
11. Непийвода Н. Ф. Мова української науково-технічної літератури (функціонально-стилістичний аспект) / Н. Ф. Непийвода. – К. : ТОВ «Міжнародна фінансова агенція», 1997. – 303 с.
12. Панько Т. І. Українське термінознавство / Т. Панько, І. Кочан, Г. Мацюк. – Львів, 1994. – 216 с.
13. Пекарская Л. А. Реализация требований к «идеальному» термину в реально функционирующих терминологиях / Л. А. Пекарская // Термин и слово. – М. : Наука, 1999. – С. 22–28.
14. Реформатский А. А. Что такое термин и терминология / А. А. Реформатский // Вопросы терминологии. – М. : Изд-во АН СССР, 1961. – С. 46–54.
15. Розенталь Д. Э. Словарь-справочник лингвистических терминов / Д. Э. Розенталь, М. А. Теленкова. – М. : [б. и.], 1985. – 280 с.
16. Скороходько Е. Ф. Терміни, що виражають нові знання у структурі англomовних наукових текстів / Е. Ф. Скороходько // Вісник Харків. нац ун-ту ім. В. Н. Каразіна. – 2000. – № 471. – С. 235–240
17. Суперанская А. В. Состав и структура термина / А. В. Суперанская // Взаимодействие языков на разных уровнях и научно-технический перевод. – Орел, 1987. – С. 19–21.
18. Act of Settlement 1700 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Will3/12-13/2/introduction>
19. American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : <https://www.ahdictionary.com/>
20. Constitution of the United States. The Bill of Rights & All Amendments [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : <http://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/overview>
21. English Bill of Rights 1689 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/WillandMarSess2/1/2/introduction>
22. Habeas Corpus Act 1679 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Cha2/31/2/contents>
23. Statute of Westminster 1931 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo5/22-23/4/contents>
24. The Complete Real Estate Encyclopedia by Denise L. Evans, JD & O. William Evans [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : <http://financial-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com>
25. The Law Dictionary. Featuring Black's Law Dictionary Free Online Legal Dictionary 2nd Ed. [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : <http://thelawdictionary.org/>
26. Trier J. The Linguistic Filed. An Investigation / J. Trier // Lexicology: Critical Concepts in Linguistics // ed. by P. Hanks. – Abingdon : Routledge, 2008. – Vol. 2. – P. 22–44.

Шелудченко Світлана, Сівчук Леся. Теоретичні засади дослідження термінологічного поля КОНСТИТУЦІЯ. У статті досліджено теоретичні засади вивчення термінів, термінологій, термінологічних систем і термінологічних полів. Установлено термінологічне поле *КОНСТИТУЦІЯ*. Виокремлено й контрастовано тенденції та напрями досліджень щодо понять «термінологія», «термінологічна система» й «термінологічне поле». Вивчено лінгвістичні поняття система та поле в аспекті термінологічних досліджень. Окреслено чільні класифікації термінів. Детерміновано термінологічне поле *КОНСТИТУЦІЯ*. Продемонстровано приклади вживання термінів-конституентів аналізованого термінологічного поля. Досліджено поняття полісемії в контексті термінологічного

поля. Виокремлено моделі основних термінологічних словосполучень термінологічного поля *КОНСТИТУЦІЯ*. Проаналізовано та проілюстровано терміни-іменники, терміни-прикметники та терміни-дієслова, що складають термінологічне поле *КОНСТИТУЦІЯ*; встановлено відсоткове співвідношення термінологічних одиниць за частининомовною ознакою. Визначено продуктивну частину мови при творенні термінів термінологічного поля *КОНСТИТУЦІЯ*.

Ключові слова: термін, термінологічне поле, термінологічна система, термінологічне словосполучення.

Шелудченко Светлана, Сивчук Леся. Теоретические основы исследования терминологического поля *КОНСТИТУЦИЯ*. В статье исследуются теоретические основы изучения терминов, терминологий, терминологических систем и терминологических полей. Установлено терминологическое поле *КОНСТИТУЦИЯ*. Отмечены тенденции, касающиеся способов определения таких понятий, как «терминология», «терминологическая система» и «терминологическое поле». В работе выделены принципы сравнения и сопоставления при анализе явлений «системы» и «поля» в рамках терминологических исследований. Определены основные способы классификации терминов. Дается определение терминологического поля *КОНСТИТУЦИЯ*. Продемонстрированы примеры употребления терминов. Исследовано понятие полисемии в контексте терминологического поля. Выделены модели основных терминологических словосочетаний. Проанализированы и проиллюстрированы термины-существительные, термины-прилагательные и термины-глаголы, составляющие терминологическое поле *КОНСТИТУЦИЯ*; определено процентное соотношение терминологических единиц по частеречному признаку. Доказана продуктивность имён существительных при образовании терминов терминологического поля *КОНСТИТУЦИЯ*.

Ключевые слова: термин, терминологическое поле, терминологическая система, терминологическое словосочетание.

The article acted to the editorial board
07.04.2016

УДК 811.161.2:81'373.2

Богдан Шуневич

Особливості побудови абревіатур і скорочень англійських термінів автомобільного транспорту

У статті проаналізовано особливості побудови англійських абревіатур і скорочень, які трапляються в укладеному автором «Англійсько-українському словникові термінів з автомобільного транспорту» обсягом близько 9 тис. лексичних одиниць.

Проведено часткове порівняння абревіатур і скорочень термінів автомобільного транспорту, пожежно-технічної тематики й робототехніки.

У процесі дослідження виявлено, що в термінології автомобільного транспорту переважають ініціальні абревіатури (299) від однієї до п'яти літер, наявні омоніми, акроніми, а також є велика кількість скорочень (154), порівняно з пожежно-технічною й робототехнічною термінологіями.

Для трьох згаданих термінологій характерне використання традиційних ініціальних і нетрадиційних та комбінованих абревіатур.

Результати проведеного дослідження використано в методичній розробці для курсантів і студентів напрямів підготовки «Філологія», «Транспортні технології» стосовно перекладу абревіатур та скорочень.

Ключові слова: абревіатура, скорочення, акронім, автомобільний транспорт, термін, термінологічне сполучення.

Постановка наукової проблеми та її значення. Українські науковці в численних працях розкрили різні аспекти дослідження термінології автомобільного транспорту (АТ) та суміжних галузей [2; 3].

Як відомо, будь-яка терміносистема включає однослівні терміни, у тому числі абревіатури й скорочення, та дво- й багато-компонентні терміни. Наприклад, співвідношення цих спеціальних термінів в англійській терміносистемі з робототехніки становить, відповідно, 358 однослівних термінів і 77 абревіатур та скорочень [5, с. 87] і 1715 дво- й багатокомпонентних термінів [5, с. 113].