

UDC 801.73

KARACHUN Yuliia – Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor of Department of Theory, Practice and Translation of English, National Technical University of Ukraine “Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”, Victory Avenue, 37, Kyiv, 03056, Ukraine (juliakarachun@ukr.net)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5171-8704>

BORKOVSKA Inna – Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of AMGS3, National Technical University of Ukraine “Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”, Victory Avenue, 37, Kyiv, 03056, Ukraine (Borkovskaya@meta.ua)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5035-7866>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2522-4565.2022.51.17>

To cite this article: Karachun, Yu., Borkovska, I. (2022). Semantyko-pragmatychni vidnoshennia mizh skladnymy terminamy-imennykamy z elektrychnoi inzhenerii [Semantic and pragmatic relations between compound terms-noun in electrical engineering]. *Problemy humanitarnykh nauk: zbirnyk naukovykh prats Drohobyt'skoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Ivana Franka. Seriya «Filolohiia» – Problems of Humanities. “Philology” Series: a collection of scientific articles of the Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 51, 135–141, <https://doi.org/10.24919/2522-4565.2022.51.17> [in English].*

SEMANTIC AND PRAGMATIC RELATIONS BETWEEN COMPOUND TERMS-NOUN IN ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

Summary. Today, in the era of technological boom and rapid development of state-of-the-art technological inventions, the lexical level of scientific and technical literature, in particular on electrical engineering, is actively replenished with new units. These are mainly terms used to designate objects, devices, names of parts of these objects and devices, processes, phenomena, units of measurement, names of professions, etc. in the analyzed field. An obligatory component of the lexical level of electrical engineering texts are compound terminological units, in particular of the noun type, which we will analyze in the paper from the point of view of semantics and pragmatics and in the context of their connection or definite distinction. Its goal was to find out what is primary in the process of creating a new compound noun term: semantics or pragmatics and how they interact in the structure of the lexical meaning of a terminological unit. The analysis of the theoretical material convinced us that all scientists can be grouped into three camps regarding their view of this problem. Representatives of the first of them believe that semantics is the main, dominant one, and pragmatics is just its extension called post-semantics. Instead, representatives of the second group deny the existence of any connection between these concepts, justifying their independence from each other. The third group of scientists insists on the complete interdependence of semantics and pragmatics. Based on the analysis of noun-type terminological units extracted from English-language scientific and technical texts on electrical engineering, primarily their semantics and pragmatics, we adhere to the views of the last group of scientists in our research, are its supporters and consider the semantics and pragmatics of terms as a single, indivisible monolith. This can be explained by the fact that the understanding of any lexical unit, in particular a compound noun term, occurs due to the simultaneous perception, analysis and understanding of the heard reality, that is, due to the simultaneous use by the recipient of both semantic and pragmatic knowledge.

Key words: compound term, semantics, pragmatics, noun, electrical engineering, scientific and technical text.

КАРАЧУН Юлія – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри теорії, практики та перекладу англійської мови, Національний технічний університет України «Київський Політехнічний інститут імені Ігоря Сікорського», Київ, проспект Перемоги, 37, Київ, 03056, Україна (juliakarachun@ukr.net)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5171-8704>

БОРКОВСЬКА Інна – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри англійської мови гуманітарного спрямування № 3, Національний технічний університет України «Київський Політехнічний інститут імені Ігоря Сікорського», Київ, проспект Перемоги, 37, Київ, 03056, Україна (Borkovska@meta.ua)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5035-7866>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2522-4565.2022.51.17>

Бібліографічний опис статті: Карачун, Ю., Борковська, І. (2022). Семантико-прагматичні відношення між складними термінами-іменниками з електричної інженерії. *Проблеми гуманітарних наук: збірник наукових праць Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка. Серія «Філологія», 51, 135–141, doi: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2522-4565.2022.51.17>*

СЕМАНТИКО-ПРАГМАТИЧНІ ВІДНОШЕННЯ МІЖ СКЛАДНИМИ ТЕРМІНАМИ-ІМЕННИКАМИ З ЕЛЕКТРИЧНОЇ ІНЖЕНЕРІЇ

Анотація. Сьогодні, в епоху технологічного буму та стрімкого розвитку надсучасних технологічних винаходів, лексичний рівень науково-технічної літератури, зокрема з електричної інженерії, активно поповнюється новими одиницями. Це в основному терміни, вживані на позначення предметів, приладів та пристроїв, назв частин цих предметів та пристроїв, процесів, явищ, одиниць вимірювання, назв професій тощо в аналізованій галузі. Обов'язковим компонентом лексичного складу текстів з електричної інженерії є складні термінологічні одиниці, зокрема іменникового типу, які аналізуватимемо в представленій праці з погляду семантики й прагматики та в контексті їхньої пов'язаності чи чіткого розмежування. Її метою було з'ясувати, що є первинним в процесі творення нового складного терміна-іменника: семантика чи прагматика і як вони взаємодіють у структурі лексичного значення термінологічної одиниці. Аналіз теоретичного матеріалу впевнив нас у думці, що всіх учених стосовно погляду на цю проблему можна об'єднати в три групи. Представники першої з них уважають, що семантика є основною, панівною, а прагматика – всього лише її продовженням під назвою постсемантика. Натомість представники другої заперечують наявність будь-якого зв'язку між цими поняттями, обґрунтовують їхню незалежність одне від одного. Третя ж група науковців наполягає на повній взаємозалежності семантики та прагматики. Опираючись на проведений аналіз вилучених з англійських науково-технічних текстів із електричної інженерії термінологічних одиниць іменникового типу, насамперед їхньої семантики й прагматики, дотримуємося в своєму дослідженні поглядів останньої групи науковців, є її прихильниками й уважаємо семантику та прагматику термінів єдиним, неподільним монолітом. Це можна пояснити тим, що розуміння будь-якої лексичної одиниці, зокрема складного терміна-іменника, відбувається завдяки одночасного сприймання, аналізування та розуміння реалії, тобто за рахунок одночасному використанню реципієнтом як семантичного, так і прагматичного знань.

Ключові слова: складний термін, семантика, прагматика, іменник, електрична інженерія, науково-технічний текст.

Relevance of the topic. The study and research of linguistic units, in our case compound terms-noun in electrical engineering, can not be carried out only within the framework of lexical and word-forming semantics, since understanding the meaning of these linguistic units is possible only taking into account a certain communicative situation. That is why the research of modern scientists is based on the desire to establish the relation between semantics and pragmatics in the structure of lexical units. In this work, we will try to consider three points of view of three groups of supporters of these theories and substantiate the conclusions.

Analysis of recent research and publications. For decades, there have been continuous discussions among domestic and foreign scientists about the primacy of two linguistic phenomena in the structure of the lexical meaning of a lexical unit: semantics and pragmatics. G. P. Gryce, S. K. Levinson, F. Rykanati, O. S. Aznaurova, R. L. Bezugla, Y. Huang, F. S. Batsevich, G. O. V. Yemets, N. G. Ishchenko, V. V. Kozlovskiy, N. G. Khodakovska devoted a number of their works to clarifying this question. In our study, we propose to consider all three points of view of the above-men-

tioned scientists and determine for yourself what is primary.

The purpose of the research is to identify what appears the first – semantics or pragmatics, in the lexical structure of the terminological unit in electrical engineering taking into account different pragmatic factors and peculiarities of the situation and how they can correlate in this meaning.

Main tasks of the research are:

- to define what are semantics and pragmatics;
- to consider different point of views on the interrelation between semantics and pragmatics in the lexical meaning of the terminological unit;
- to show, based on the example, how semantics and pragmatics function in the lexical meaning of analyzed terms;
- to sum up what is the most essential in the lexical meaning: semantics or pragmatics.

Presentation of the main research material. The meaning of a compound terminological unit comes from a combination of semantics, which is responsible for the lexical meaning of a word, and pragmatics, which is responsible for the use of this word in speech, taking into account certain pragmatic parameters and the communicative situation. The question of the primacy and distinction between pragmatics and semantics in the structure of the lexical meaning of a word is still debatable for three decades. There are different opinions of scientists regarding this issue.

The first group of scientists H. P. Grice, S. K. Levinson, F. Rykanati, headed by R. Gibbs, believed that semantics appeared first, and pragmatics is its continuation under the name of post-semantics. They argued that pragmatics depends on semantics, because there is always a close connection between what is meant and what is written “whatever can be meant can be written”. R. Gibbs argued that in order to understand what the speaker is saying literally, we need semantic information, and in order to understand what the speaker is talking about, we need pragmatic information, which is less clear than semantic knowledge. So, semantics is the first “step” in the interpretation of a statement, and pragmatics is the second, more essential one.

Semantics has a tendency to take what is written literally, that is why within the limits of

semantics it is impossible to get a complete picture of the communication process, the attitude of the speaker to what is said, the impact of the statement on the recipient of information and ensuring a reverse reaction to what is heard or read, that is, the process of understanding both literal and non-literal literal acts. Non-literal acts include interrogative, exclamatory, encouraging syntactic constructions, which are real, integral components of communication, and within the limits of logical semantics, the explanation of such phenomena did not find justification, therefore, within its framework, there was a need to distinguish pragmatics – a science that would fill these gaps through an in-depth analysis of what the speaker said and its impact on the recipient of information. Such a theory in linguistics is known as an explicit theory, that is, a theory that allows studying not only literal statements in the form of syntactic constructions, but also to track a possible conditional connection that will arise between the addresser and the addressee in the course of a certain communicative situation.

The second group of scientists O. S. Aznarova, R. L. Bezugla, Ya. Huang insisted on the independence of semantics and pragmatics. They noted that semantics is related to the literal meaning of linguistic units or its fragments in a neutral context, and pragmatics is related to the interpretation of lexical units in a wider context, which includes an understanding of the entire discourse, the beliefs or expectations of the addresser and the addressee, their social relations, duties, knowledge, etc. So, the pragmatic interpretation of the statement is focused on the subject of the statement and the entire discourse, and the semantic interpretation is focused on the statement itself, this is what can explain the autonomy of pragmatics in relation to semantics.

Proponents of this theory believed that semantics is focused on linguistic units, and pragmatics is focused on the speaker who uses these units; semantics refers to the word, and pragmatics refers to the speaker who formulates thoughts using certain words; the semantic properties of the statement can be analyzed outside the context (within the null context), and the analysis of its pragmatic properties requires the involvement of a wide discourse context; pragmatic representation depends on the cognitive, emotional, mental, expressive, and psychological states of the recip-

ients, in contrast to pragmatic representation; semantic phenomena are subject to rules, and therefore can be included in grammar; pragmatic phenomena are subject to restrictive principles of a rhetorical nature; semantic explanations usually have a formal character, pragmatic ones – functional; the semantic components of linguistic phenomena report, that is, they have an affirmative character, and the pragmatic components express (such as emotions, feelings, expressions of will, etc.) or have the character of a common fund of knowledge, background knowledge, that is, they have an exclusively communicative, interpersonal character. Pragmatic components cannot be denied, as they relate to the inner world of a person.

The third group of scientists F. S. Batsevich, O. V. Yemets, N. G. Ishchenko, V. V. Kozlovskiy and N. G. Khodakovskaya, believe that pragmatics and semantics are mutually conditioned and interconnected, thus their cannot be divided. They spoke about the functional correlation of these phenomena, because the understanding of a lexical unit occurs due to its simultaneous perception, understanding and analysis, that is, the use of both semantic and pragmatic knowledge. Accordingly, N. G. Ishchenko and F. S. Batsevich insist on the simultaneous correlation of semantics and pragmatics, since the modeling of the meaning of a lexical unit is closely related to the process of its nomination, that is, the stage of word formation is characterized by the choice of a lexical unit, which is a letter sign (sound formula) of the depicted reality based on the content, meaning, meaning that this lexical unit will convey. The addressee, having received the message, immediately interprets it, receives information about the intentions, strategies and motives of the addressee and reacts to this message.

In the study, we get the opinion that semantics and pragmatics are indivisible and condition each other, because the meaning of a word cannot be clearly formulated and fixed without referring to pragmatic factors, that is, the conditions of the speech act, which are oriented to its participants, place and time, that is, semantics studies the meaning of a linguistic unit, while pragmatics realizes this meaning in certain communicative situations.

Since our work is focused on establishing the relationship between semantics and pragmat-

ics, we suggest considering compound terminological units in electrical engineering as a kind of unity of nomination and influence on the interlocutor and ensuring communication. Based on this, the study of compound noun terms requires addressing the aspect of nomination, the development of nominative units and the aspect of communication, pragmatic functioning. Naming an object or situation is not only a process of nomination (designation), but also a process of cognition and communication.

The relationship between semantics and pragmatics in the structure of lexical meaning is that in the communicative process contextual adaptation of lexical meaning and real pragmatic differentiation of lexical units are carried out. Semantics answers the question: “what meaning is encoded in the lexical meaning of a terminological unit?”, and pragmatics – “what do you want to say/convey to the addressee (what information) using this particular terminological unit?”

To explain and confirm our opinion about the unity and relationship of semantics and pragmatics in the structure of the lexical meaning of a compound terminological unit, let's consider the compound noun term *circuit-breaker* – an automatic switch. The lexical meaning of a compound noun term is formed from a subject-logical component (denotation), which is determined by the need (necessity) for a newly formed word that will correlate the very name of the depicted reality with its content (semantic content). Nomination of a compound noun term occurs according to certain established word-formation patterns in the language based on analogy and association.

That is, first the author turns to the means of the lexical system of the language to express a new nomination and to lay down new meanings or meanings in it, choosing and combining the lexical units *circuit* and *breaker*, which corresponds to the following word-formation model $N + V (-er) = CN$. The combination of these terms allowed the author to include a somewhat broader meaning to explain a certain device, namely a contact switching device capable of turning on, conducting and turning off the current when the electric circuit is in a normal state, as well as turning on, conducting for a certain set time and turning off the current when certain abnormal state of the electric circuit.

The pragmatic meaning of the compound noun term *circuit-breaker* is based on the author's intention to convey coded semantic information in the term for communication in the field of electrical engineering, taking into account such pragmatic factors (parameters) as the purpose, conditions of communication, personal data of information recipients, etc.

Based on this, the author can use the terminological unit *circuit-breaker* in a certain communicative situation, for example, to publicize the results of research at a symposium, a conference between fellow scientists; for communication in the production and technical sphere with colleagues-specialists; for explaining theoretical material (certain processes) to students of technical specialties, etc. Accordingly, this terminological unit will be used taking into account such pragmatic parameters of the addressee as age, social and professional status. Therefore, the use of the compound noun term *circuit-breaker* is limited by industries, the author's intention, the communicative situation and the addressee.

Considering an example of a text from scientific and technical literature, namely a textbook on electrical engineering: A *circuit-breaker* is a mechanical switching device, capable of making, carrying, and breaking currents under normal circuit conditions and also making, carrying for a specified time, and breaking currents under specified abnormal circuit conditions such as those of short circuit. In normal operating conditions, a *circuit-breaker* is in the closed position and some current flows through the closed contacts. The *circuit-breaker* opens its contacts when a tripping signal is received. We can talk about the possibility of the compound noun term *circuit-breaker* to have a pragmatic meaning. Since this terminological unit is often used by the author in the text presented above in order to explain to the reader/listener what it will be about, what invention, and what functional characteristics are inherent in the depicted invention, to convey information and to ensure communication. The author's use of such a compound noun term is aimed at the target audience, say specialists or students of a technical specialty.

As we can see, semantics and pragmatics interact in the structure of the lexical meaning of a compound noun term, because pragmatic information encoded in the semantics of a termi-

nological unit turns on associative mechanisms that contribute to the recognition of the speaker's intention, pragmatics indicates the rules for using a new lexical unit in the context, as well as conditions of its use.

Based on this, the statement that "pragmasemantics" is a special type of semantics that is "focused exclusively on the participants of communication, and therefore semantics studies the meanings expressed in each language traditionally, that is, with the help of unmotivated language signs; pragmatics is non-traditional addition to language signs in communication. Semantic components of the language code are figuratively imagined, and pragmatic components are experienced, recognized on the basis of common experience and use of one idio-ethnic language by the participants of communication. That is why we share the opinion that the boundaries between semantics and pragmatics can disappear, since semantics without pragmatics lacks certainty, pragmatics without semantics is pointless. The starting point for both semantics and pragmatics is the concept of meaning, but each of them interprets this phenomenon in its own way.

For semantics, meaning is a clearly organized attribute of the language system, where each of the elements of language as a bilateral sign enters into structural relations and acquires significance. In objective semantics, meaning is defined as objective reality based on truth, while in pragmatics we see the displacement of meaning from objective reality to the consciousness of the speaker. Pragmatics indicates the rules and conditions of adequate use, the use of a new lexical unit and, depending on its stylistic affiliation, reveals both typical and atypical speech situations for it.

We consider the correlation of semantics and pragmatics in the structure of the lexical meaning of a compound term-noun as the functioning of language units (compound terms-noun) in language and speech, which is aimed at: the semantics of a compound term and its adequate use in a specific communicative situation; the influence of such a lexical unit as a means of communication in oral and written speech; taking into account the pragmatic situation and pragmatic parameters of the language unit in the communication process. Compound terminological units are the result of the activity of the speaker,

a formal operation that establishes various types of relationships between phenomena and objects of objective reality, all this fixes the content of a compound term-noun, which is a means of transmitting knowledge in the field of scientific technologies.

The distinction between semantics and pragmatics is reduced not to the distinction between different entities, but to the distinction between different (objectivist and subjectivist) interpretations of the same entities.

Conclusions and prospects for further research on this topic. Therefore, we follow a semantic-pragmatic, that is, a compromise approach, according to which pragmatics and semantics are interconnected and interact, complementing each other. Pragmatic information

encoded in the semantics of compound noun terms activates associative mechanisms that contribute to the recognition of the speaker's thoughts (intentions). The perspective of further research is to analyze semantics and pragmatics not only on the basis of the structure of the lexical meaning of compound terms noun, but this material can be involved in the study of other parts of the language that function in other fields of science and technology. On the basis of semantics, we can classify terminological units in scientific and technical literature due to their meaning. On the basis of pragmatics, we can consider the pragmatic value of the analyzed units taking into account pragmatic factors and try to analyze terminological units according to the pragmatic meaning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Азнаурова Э. С.** Прагматика текстов различных функциональных стилей. Общественно-политический и научный текст как предмет обучения иностранным языкам. Москва : Наука, 1987. С. 3–29.
- Бацевич Ф. С.** Термінологія комунікативної лінгвістики: аспекти дискурсивного підходу. *Проблеми української термінології. Вісник нац. ун-ту «Львівська політехніка»*. 2002. № 453. С. 30–34.
- Безугла Л. Р.** Лінгвістична прагматика та дискурсивний аналіз. *Studia philologica*. 2012. Вип. 1. С. 95–100.
- Вышкин Е. Г.** К проблеме разграничения семантики и прагматики. *Коммуникативно-прагматические функции языковых единиц*. 1990. № 3. С. 3–7.
- Ємець О. В.** Типи та прагматичний ефект висунення у сучасних художніх і газетних текстах. *Філологічний дискурс: зб. наукових праць*. 2018. Вип. 7. С. 213–220.
- Ищенко Н. Г.** Прагматичне значення похідних іменників. *Вісник ЛНУ ім. Т. Шевченка*. 2012. № 14 (249). С. 78–84.
- Козловський В. В.** Семантичний і прагматичний аспекти речення (на матеріалі сучасної німецької мови). *Збірник наукових праць. Проблеми загального, германського та слов'янського мовознавства*. 2008. С. 323–326.
- Ходаковська Н. Г.** Співвідношення семантики та прагматики в структурі лексичного значення стилістично маркованих похідних іменників. *Науковий вісник кафедри Юнеско КНЛУ*. 2010. Вип. 21. С. 140–147.
- Gibbs R. W.** A New Look at Literal Meaning in Understanding. What is Said and Implicated. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2002. Vol. 34. P. 457–486.
- Grice H. P.** Logic and Conversation. *Studies in the Way of Words*. 1991. Vol. 25. P. 22–40.
- Huang Y.** *Pragmatics*. Oxford, 2007. 367 p.
- Levinson S. C.** *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, 1995. 420 p.
- Récanati F.** *Direct Reference: From Language to Thought*. Oxford, 1993. 420 p.

REFERENCES

- Aznaurova, E. S.** (1987). Pragmatika tekstov razlichnyh funktsionalnyh stiley [Pragmatics of the Texts of Different Functional Styles]. *Sbornik statej – Collected articles*. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- Batsevych, F. S.** (2002). Terminolohiia komunikatyvnoi lnhvistyky: aspekty dyskursyvnoho pidkhodu [The terminology of Communicative Linguistics]. *Problemy ukrainiskoi terminolohii. Visnyk nats. universytetu "Lvivska politekhnika" – Problems of Ukrainian terminology. Bulletin of the Lviv Polytechnic National University*, 453, 30–34 [in Ukrainian].
- Bezuhla, L. R.** (2012). Lnhvistychna prahmatyka ta dyskursyvnyi analiz [Linguistic Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis]. *Studia philologica – Philological studies* (Issue 1), (pp. 95–100) [in Ukrainian].
- Gibbs, R. W.** (2002). *A New Look at Literal Meaning in Understanding. What is Said and Implicated. Journal of Pragmatics*. (Issue 34), (pp. 457–486) [in English].

- Grice, H. P.** (1991). *Logic and Conversation. Studies in the Way of Words* (Issue 25), (pp. 22–40) [in English].
- Huang, Y.** (2007). *Pragmatics. Oxford* [in English].
- Ishchenko, N. H.** (2012). Prahmatychnie znachennia pokhidnykh imennykiv [Derivative Meaning of Compound Terminological Units]. *Visnyk LNU im. T. Shevchenka – Bulletin of LNU named after T. Shevchenko*, 14 (249), 87–84 [in Ukrainian].
- Kozlovskiy, V. V.** (2008). Semantychnyi i prahmatychnyi aspekty rechennia (na materiali suchasnoi nimetskoï movy) [Semantic and Pragmatic Aspects of the Sentence (on the material of the modern German language)]. *Problemy zahalnoho, hermanskoho ta slovianskoho movoznavstva: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats – Problems of general, Germanic and Slavic linguistics: Collection of scientific works* (pp. 323–326) [in Ukrainian].
- Khodakovska, N. H.** (2018). Spivvidnoshennia semantyky ta prahmatyky v strukturі leksychnoho znachennia stylistychno markovanykh pokhidnykh imennykiv [The Semantics and Pragmatics Relation in the Lexical Structure of Stylistically Marked Derivative Nouns]. *Naukovyi visnyk kafedry Yunesko KNLU – Scientific Bulletin of the UNESCO Department of KNLU* (Issue 21), (pp. 140–147) [in Ukrainian].
- Levinson, S. C.** (1995). *Pragmatics. Cambridge* [in English].
- Récanati, F.** (1993). *Direct Reference: From Language to Thoughti. Oxford* [in English].
- Vyishkin, E. G.** (1990). K probleme razgranicheniya semantiki i pragmatiki. Kommunikativno-pragmaticheskie funktsii yazykovyih edinits [To the problem of distinguishing semantics and pragmatics]. *Kommunikativno-pragmaticheskie funktsii yazykovyih edinic – Communicative and Pragmatic Functions of the Lexical Units*, 3, 3–7 [in Russian].
- Yemets, O. V.** (2018). Typy ta prahmatychnyi efekt vysunennia u suchasnykh khudozhnikh i hazetnykh tekstakh [Types and Pragmatic Effects of the Modern English Literature and Newspaper]. *Filolohichniy diskurs: zbirka naukovykh prats – Collection of scientific works* (Issue 7), (pp. 213-220) [in Ukrainian].