SEMANTIC DISTINCTIONS IN SPECIALIZED VOCABULARY
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF NOTIONAL TERMINOLOGICAL OPPOSITIONS
IN THE TERMINOLOGICAL SYSTEM OF SOCIAL WORK)

Olga A. Bursina

Vologda State University (Vologda, Russia)
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3873-2269

A b s t r a c t . The article deals with the specificity of semantic distinctions in the terminological system of social work. The urgency of the study is determined by interdisciplinary relations between various fields of knowledge, by the role of a certain terminological system in the process of scientific research, and by the need to regulate and classify the terminological corpus of social work in order to study the semantic word building aspect of the given terminological system. The study is performed on the basis of component analysis of 77 notional terminological oppositions (NOTs). The continuous sampling method was used to select terms from special literature on the basis of notional criterion. The sample makes up a representative and reliable set. The substantiation of antonymic relations between the terminological units under study rests on the analysis of the semantic content of the terms constituting the NTO. Being a subsystem of the literary English language, the terminological system of social work undergoes the same semantic processes, and we can observe NTOs with complementary, contrary and conversive types of antonymy in them. Moreover, word building antonymy dominates over the lexical one. The results of the study can be of certain interest to specialists in general linguistics and in special terminological studies. They can be used in the theory and practice of social work and in creation of modern dictionaries on social work.

K e y w o r d s : special terminology; special terms; terminological oppositions; terminological studies; complementary antonyms; contrary antonyms; conversive antonyms; word building models; word building; social work; lexicography.

ОСОБЕННОСТИ СЕМАНТИЧЕСКОГО РАЗЛИЧИЯ
В КОРПУСЕ СПЕЦИАЛЬНОЙ ЛЕКСИКИ (НА ПРИМЕРЕ ПОНЯТИЙНЫХ
ТЕРМИНОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ОППОЗИЦИЙ В ТЕРМИНОСИСТЕМЕ СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ РАБОТЫ)

Бурсина О. А.

Вологодский государственный университет (Вологда, Россия)
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3873-2269

А н н о т а ц и я . Данное исследование посвящено изучению особенностей семантического различия в корпусе терминов социальной работы. Актуальность исследования определяется междисциплинарными научными связями, ролью отдельно взятой терминосистемы в процессе научного познания, необходимостью лингвистической систематизации корпуса терминов социальной работы с целью изучения семантического и словообразовательного аспектов терминосистемы. Исследование выполнено на материале компонентного анализа 77 понятийных терминологических оппозиций (ПТО). Термины были отобраны методом сплошной выборки из текстов специальной литературы на основе понятийного критерия. Исследуемая выборка представляется репрезентативной и достоверной. Доказательство антонимичных отношений между терминологическими единицами строится на анализе семантического значения терминов, входящих в ПТО. Являясь подсистемой общего литературного английского языка, терминосистема социальной работы переживает те же семантические процессы, и мы находим ПТО, в которых представлены комплементарный, контрарный и конверсивный типы антонимии. Словообразовательная антонимия преобладает над лексической. Результаты исследования представляют интерес как для общего языкознания, так и для терминоведения в частности, а также могут быть использованы в процессе систематизации научных знаний в теории социальной работы и при составлении специальных словарей и словников.

Introduction. The genuine interest in studying theoretical and applied problems of Terminologies stems from the mutual influence of scientific knowledge and discoveries on all spheres of human activity. It has always been necessary to name new special notions and things, to classify them, to analyze their functions in a certain field of knowledge and in the language in general. Various extralinguistic factors lead to the necessity of a deeper analysis and a systematic approach to forms and functions of terms of social work. The factors are: social economic changes and reforms in the society in the 20th–21st centuries; the unique interdisciplinary character of the term system of social work due to the fact that it combines several spheres of human activity, i.e. psychology, medicine, education, etc.,

Linguists all over the world have had various opinions on whether antonymic relationships occur in terminologies and if they do whether antonymic relationships have a specific character. Taking into account the statement that any term system is part of the literary language which helps specialists to communicate in scientific professional spheres we have to acknowledge the fundamental truth that terms being the words of the literary language are involved in various regular semantic relationships with other words. Nowadays the majority of linguists studying languages and specialized languages admit that semantic relationships of opposition are a frequent phenomenon in various term systems. Therefore, it is important to analyze the specificities of forms and functions of semantic relationships of opposition within terminologies.

Modern terminology studies prove the existence of relationships of opposition in all types of terminologies. V. P. Danilenko claims that the phenomenon of antonymy, far from being absolutely excluded from a system of terms, helps to name and define things and phenomena in various fields of knowledge [Danilenko 1977: 79]. Indeed, scientific notions describe the reality as a system that is why they are based on logical opposition. Moreover, to obtain specialist knowledge and to reach the high professional level a specialist in any sphere needs to learn and use a certain specialized language including the understanding of semantic relationships of opposition. A. K. Suleimanova says that antonymy in terminologies is one of the most important factors in improving a system of terms, classifying and systematizing the notions. Therefore, it helps a specialist to analyze the essence of any concept, phenomenon and process [Suleimanova 2005: 124]. E. G. Khomyakova claims that antonyms are used to specify the essential differences in objects and phenomena of the reality; these differences are reflected in the language as opposite characteristics of one and the same essence [Khomyakova 2002: 176].

A number of classifications of antonyms are offered in various linguistic studies on antonymy. Each classification is based on the peculiarities of antonyms relevant for this or that study: 1) precision of antonymic relationships between two meanings (precise / approximate antonyms); 2) possibility of combination of meanings of antonyms (complete / incomplete antonyms); 3) number of antonymic meanings of two words; 4) morphological structure of antonyms (antonyms of the same / different roots); 5) types of linguistic units which form antonymic relationships (grammar / lexical antonymy, antonymic words / idioms); 6) part of speech of antonyms; 7) functioning in the system of language and contexts (usual / contextual antonyms); etc. While studying specialized languages linguists face some more problems such as studying any specificities of a term system, defining the special character of antonymy in terminologies, analyzing the peculiarities of functioning antonymic terms in a specialist text / context, etc.

Antonymic relationships are quite regular in terminologies. There are various views on the definition and aspects of this phenomenon

among linguists but they all usually come to the same conclusion. S. Jones proposes to use the term 'antonymy' in its broader sense, referring to any pair of words which could be intuitively recognized as 'opposites' [Jones 2002: 1]. A. Mettinger introduces a more specific term 'semantic opposition' which is also suitable [Mettinger 1994: 3]. Speaking about antonymic relationships in terminologies I. S. Kulikova and D. V. Salmina propose the term 'notional oppositions of terms' (NOTs) [Kulikova, Salmina 2002: 28] and S. E. Nikitina introduces the term 'contradictory opposition' [Nikitina 1987: 48]. According to them, units of NOTs or contradictory oppositions help to identify the boundaries of specialized languages and to analyze their logical potential for semantic relationships.

It must be noted that the problem of antonymy is not just the problem of finding and analyzing bipolar oppositions. Such an approach to studying antonymy is quite a primitive way of perceiving the world around us. M. Ya. Tsvilling and V. M. Leichik prove this statement to be relevant and important while studying terminologies of the social humanitarian sphere (e.g. the terminology of social work) because they have their own specific features and are quite a contrast to terminologies of the sphere of natural sciences and mathematics [Leichik, 2006; Tsvilling, 1989]. The meanings of terms of social humanitarian sphere do not just clarify nature of phenomena and objects of reality, they also imply professional experience. Thus, an opposition is not always bipolar; it may consist of a number of terms organized in more complex rows of words.

In this research a case of antonymy in the term system of social work is broadly regarded as a notional opposition of terms (NOT). Such an approach to terminological antonymy emphasizes its specific aspects: semantic diversity of terms-antonyms which can be described as multidirectional; terms-antonyms as qualitative opposites, or as comparative / contradictory opposites. Thanks to this approach terms-antonyms can be regarded not just as words with opposite meanings but as terms which are opposed to each other and at the same time correlate with each other. This research studies various types of NOTs and their components, formal morphological structure of terms included in NOTs in order to analyze antonymic relationships within the specialized language,

to clarify specificities of the terminology of social work in particular and terminologies of social humanitarian sphere in general.

Discussion and Results. Undoubtedly, the basis for antonymy in the terminology of social work is the basic principles of the literary language. However, due to specificities in term formation, meanings and functioning of the terms under consideration it seems to be more convenient, logical and effective to systematize and analyze terms not as antonymic pairs of words, but as NOTs which consist of 2 or more components with multidirectional meanings or comparative / contradictory meanings.

First, components of a NOT can form a bipolar opposition. In this case they denote specialized notions with diametrically opposite meanings. Thus, NOTs can be represented by contradictories:

(1) able-bodied (adj.) :: disabled (adj.)

NOT (1) represents the contradictory antonyms which are mutually opposed and deny one another; their meanings say about presence / absence of the characteristic. It is seen, first of all, on the morphological level: the second component of the NOT has the negative prefix *dis-* which is used to form the adjective with the opposite meaning (*dis-* means *the opposite of*); and also from the meanings of both adjectives: **able-bodied** – *having all the physical abilities that most people have* **:: disabled** – *impaired or limited by a physical, mental, cognitive, or developmental condition.*

(2) gender-blind (adj.) :: gendered (adj.)

NOT (2) represents two opposed adjectives denoting different characteristics of people. It is seen on the morphological level: the first component of the NOT is a compound adjective formed with the help of *-blind* that means *that does not make a difference between people on the basis of the quality mentioned, or favour one group over another*, the second component of the NOT is formed with the stem of the noun and the ending *-ed* which means that the object / subject has the characteristic expressed in the stem: **gender-blind** – *not discriminating on the basis of gender, or not making a distinction between the sexes* **:: gendered** – *reflecting the experience, prejudices, or orientations of one sex more than the other; having or making gender-based distinctions.*

(3) external locus of control (n.) :: internal locus of control (n.)

NOT (3) represents two opposed nouns denoting personality traits. These compound nouns have the components which are different in their meanings: *external – connected with or located on the outside of something/somebody* and *internal – connected with the inside of your body*. In this NOT the compound terms are contradictories due to the meanings of their contradictory components: **external locus of control** *– a person's perception, the belief that the environment has more control over life circumstances than the individual does. People view the world as the primary contributor to their life situations and believe forces outside of themselves are responsible for their misfortunes or success* **:: internal locus of control** *– a belief regarding responsibility for actions. Individuals with an internal locus of control generally hold themselves responsible for actions and consequences.*

Second, components of a NOT can form a contrary / gradual / incompatible opposition.

(4) long-term foster care (n) :: short-term foster care (n)

NOT (4) represents a case of contrary opposition which is based on the differences in the meanings of the components included in the compound nouns: *long-term – that will last or have an effect over a long period of time* and *short-term: lasting a short time; designed only for a short period of time in the future.* Thus, **long-term foster care** *– the intentional and planned placement of a child in foster care for an extended period of time* **:: short-term foster care** *– a kind of foster care that is intended to provide short-term care to children whose parents may be experiencing special or emergency needs of their own.* It should be noted that in the literary language the words *long / short, low / high*, etc. have the diametrically opposite meanings. However, being the components of the compound words in NOTs they help to form terms with relatively opposite meanings but not the absolute terms-antonyms.

(5) stress-free job (n.) :: low stress job (n .) :: optimum stress job (n.) :: high stress job (n.)

NOT (5) represents a case of gradual opposition. This type of opposition shows gradual change in characteristics, properties or quality of a person, object or phenomenon. In NOT (5) gradual opposition is based on the meaning of the following components: *-free – without the thing mentioned; low – below the usual or average amount; optimum – the best possible; producing the best possible results* and *high – greater or better than normal in quantity or quality, size or degree.* Thus, **stress-free job** *– occupation that causes no stress* **:: low stress job** *– occupation that involves a high level of freedom and control regarding how the work will be accomplished, no frequent pressing deadlines, no routine overtime, no hostile or hazardous work conditions* **:: optimum stress job** *– occupation with the amount of job-related stress an individual can experience* **:: high stress job** *– occupation when work demands exceed the worker's ability and she/he cannot cope or control them.*

Third, the category of opposition can be represented in NOTs by means of the relationships of incompatibility.

(6) husband (n.) :: wife (n.)

NOT (6) represents two nouns of different roots. According to their meanings they are terms-incompatibles: **husband** *– the man that somebody is married to; a married man* **:: wife** *– the woman that somebody is married to; a married woman.*

(7) social worker (n.) :: client (n.)

Terms-incompatibles are often formed according to different models of word formation. NOT (7) represents two nouns of different roots, one of them is a compound noun written with spaces. The relationships of incompatibility is seen in the meanings of the terms: **social worker** *– a person whose job is social work* **:: client** *– a person who uses the services or advice of a professional person or organization.*

(8) adoptee (n.) :: adopter (n.)

The components of NOT (8) are the terms of the same root. The relationships of incompatibility is proved by the meanings of the suffixes: *-ee – added to a verb to form a noun that refers to the person to whom the action of the verb is being done* and *-er – added to some verbs to form nouns that refer to people or things that do that particular activity.* Thus, **adoptee** *– a person who has been adopted* **:: adopter** *– a person who adopts a child of other parents as his or her own child.*

(9) cared-for (n.) :: caregiver (n.)

NOT (9) represents two compound nouns formed according to different models of word formation but sharing one root *care-* with the corresponding meaning: *the process of caring for somebody / something and providing what they need for their health or protection.* In the first component of the NOT we see the phrasal verb *care for* which is transformed into the noun with the help of the ending *-ed* and the semi-affix *-for* which is written with a hyphen. The meaning of the phrasal verb is preserved: *to look after somebody who is sick, very old, very young*, etc. The second component of the NOT is a compound

noun consisting of two roots -*care* and -*give* which means *to provide somebody with something* and the suffix -*er* which is *added to some verbs to form nouns that refer to people or things that do that particular activity*. Thus, **cared-for** – *a person having needed care* and attention **:: caregiver** – *an individual, such as a physician, nurse, or social worker, who assists in the identification, prevention, or treatment of an illness or disability.*

The components of NOTs (6) – (9) are the incompatibles which show the social relationships between two people.

There are various approaches to studying terms-antonyms. Studying formal morphological structure of terms included in NOTs is of great interest. According to V. P. Danilenko there are two most frequent major types of antonymy: lexical and morphological [Danilenko 1977: 80].

Lexical antonymy implies that NOTs consist of terms of different roots. Morphological structures of such terms-antonyms also differ from each other. The models of NOTs can be as follows:

– simple adjectives and nouns of different roots:

(10) major (adj.) :: minor (adj.)

In NOT (10) there are two simple adjectives: **major** – *of full legal age* **:: minor** – *below the age of legal majority*. See also NOT (6).

– simple words and derivatives (nouns and adjectives) in different combinations:

(11) risky (adj.) :: safe (adj.)

NOT (11) represents terms-adjectives of different roots. The first component of the NOT is a derived word formed with the suffix -*y*, the second component is a simple word: **risky** – *involving the possibility of something bad happening* **:: safe** – *not involving much or any risk; not likely to be wrong or to upset somebody*. See also NOT (8).

– compound words and derivatives (nouns and adjectives) in different combinations:

(12) colour-blind (adj.) :: racist (adj.)

NOT (12) represents two terms-adjectives of different roots. The first term is a compound word written with a hyphen. It consists of two stems: *colour-: the colour of a person's skin, when it shows the race they belong to* and -*blind: does not make a difference between people on the basis of the quality mentioned, or favour one group over another*. The second term is a derived word formed with the suffix -*ist* which has the meaning: *prejudiced on the basis specified*. Thus,

colour-blind – *not discriminating on grounds of skin colour or ethnic origin* **:: racist** – *having the belief that some races of people are better than others; showing this through violent or unfair treatment of people of other races.*

(13) commercial (adj.) :: not-for-profit (adj.)

NOT (13) represents two terms-adjectives of different roots. The first term is formed with the suffix -*al* added to the stem of the noun. The second term is a compound word which consists of one stem of the noun and two semiaffixes, one of which is a negative one. Thus, **commercial** – *making or intended to make a profit* **:: not-for-profit** – *not intended to make a profit, but to make money for a social or political purpose or to provide a service that people need.*

NOTs (1) – (5), (7), (9) are also the examples of lexical antonymy.

Morphological antonymy implies that NOTs consist of terms of the same root. This type of antonymy is based on the regular usage of prefixes and semiaffixes added to the opposites in NOTs. The following models of NOTs are possible:

– presence / absence of prefixes with the negative meaning in one component of a NOT: *anti-, dis-, in-, im-, non-, un-*.

(14) racist (adj.) – *having the belief that some races of people are better than others; showing this through violent or unfair treatment of people of other races* **:: anti-racist (adj.)** – *opposed to the unfair treatment of people who belong to other races;*

(15) empower (v.) – *to give someone official authority or the freedom to do something* **:: disempower (v.)** – *to deprive of power, authority, or influence: make weak, ineffectual, or unimportant;*

(16) discriminatory (adj.) – *treating a person or group differently from and usually worse than other people, because of their skin colour, sex, sexuality, etc.* **:: non-discriminatory (adj.)** – *used to describe a situation in which everyone is treated in the same way;*

(17) abusive (adj.) – *using or involving physical violence or emotional cruelty* **:: non-abusive (adj.)** – *not treating someone badly or cruelly, esp. physically, not using rude and offensive words;*

(18) paid (adj.) – *for which people receive money* **:: unpaid (adj.)** – *done or taken without payment;*

(19) earner (n.) – *a person who earns money for a job that they do* **:: non-earner (n.)** – *one who is not earning money;*

– usage of the prefixes with polar meanings in the components of a NOT: *pre- / post-, anti- /*

pro-, etc.

(20) **antinatal (adj.)** – *relating to the medical care given to pregnant women* :: **postnatal (adj.)** – *connected with the period after the birth of a child;*

(21) **pre-partum (adj.)** – *relating to the period before parturition: before childbirth* :: **post-partum (adj.)** – *connected with the period after the birth of a child;*

(22) **antisocial (adj.)** – *hostile or harmful to organized society, especially being or marked by behavior deviating sharply from the social norm* :: **prosocial (adj.)** – *relating to or denoting behaviour which is positive, helpful, and intended to promote social acceptance and friendship;*

– usage of the semiaffixes with polar meanings in the components of a NOT: *out-* / *in-,* etc.

(23) **outpatient (n.)** – *a person who goes to a hospital for treatment but does not stay there* :: **inpatient (n.)** – *a person who stays in a hospital while receiving treatment.*

The components of NOTs (14) – (23) are either simple or derived words. Each NOT includes the components of the same root. The meaning of each prefix or semiaffix can change, specify and / or supplement the meaning of this or that term.

This research shows that morphological antonymy is characteristic of the terminology of social work. 60,8% of NOTs represent the cases of morphological antonymy. It is reasonable because, adding affixes to the beginning or end of a word is a productive way of word formation in modern English. Suffixes, prefixes and semiaffixes are popular among specialists and non-specialists, their meanings are quite clear, they are available and easy to use not only in the literary language but especially in specialized languages. They are quite functional in forming oppositions of terms. From the logical and cognitive points of view in any professional sphere it is easier to form, recognize, identify and use terms-antonyms which are of the same root. The meanings of such terms are obvious and easy to understand, especially when it comes to international communication and cooperation of specialists. Besides, it is characteristic of the terms of social work to form word families. It is common knowledge that word families can assist with deriving related words via affixes, along with decreasing the time and effort needed to derive and recognize such words.

Литература

Conclusion. Studying the phenomenon of antonymy in specialized languages we conclude that it has certain specificities in the system of terms of social work in comparison with the literary language. Antonymic relationships are represented in the research as notional oppositions of terms (NOTs). In the terminology of social work multidirectional character and difference in meanings of terms are the results of the predominance of morphological antonymy over lexical antonymy. This predominance is predictable and reasonable because it is easier to form the second component of a NOT with the same root as the first component has. It is convenient to use prefixes with polar meanings, prefixes with a negative meaning, semiaffixes with opposite or supplementary meanings, etc. As a result both components of a NOT are recognizable and understandable within the specialist field due to one and the same root and an affix with the clear meaning.

This research proves that notional words of three parts of speech (nouns, adjectives and verbs) can form notional oppositions. Simple terms, derivatives and compound terms in different combinations can form NOTs. It is also of great interest to study terms-collocations or terms-combinations of words. It is the topic for further consideration.

The components of NOTs can define notions with diametrically opposite meanings or notions with various meanings that correlate with each other multidirectionally. The latter help to realize the boundaries of a term system, to consider the logical relationships within a term system and to specify additional notions and meanings which are close to this or that term system and the corresponding sphere of knowledge. Therefore, NOTs are necessary and even obligatory from the point of view of regulation and systematization of the terminology of social work. They improve the quality of terms and make terms clear, easy to form and use. That is why the phenomenon of antonymy is characteristic of terminologies and proves the fact the any terminology is part of the literary language and the same linguistic processes and principles occur in the systems of terms. However, these processes and principles are transformed according to the needs of a specialized language.

Даниленко, В. П. Русская терминология / В. П. Даниленко. – Москва : Наука, 1977. – 246 с.

Куликова, И. С. Введение в металингвистику (системный, лексикографический и коммуникативно-прагматический аспекты лингвистической терминологии) / И. С. Куликова, Д. В. Салмина. – Санкт Петербург : Издательство «Сага», 2002. – 352 с.

Лейчик, В. М. Терминоведение: предмет, методы, структура / В. М. Лейчик. – Москва : ДомКнига, 2006. – 256 с.

Никитина, С. Е. Семантический анализ языка науки. На материале лингвистики / С. Е. Никитина. – Москва : Наука, 1987. – 144 с.

Сулейманова, А. К. Терминосистема нефтяного дела и ее функционирование в профессиональном дискурсе специалиста : монография / А. К. Сулейманова. – Уфа : РИО БашГУ, 2005. – 268 с.

Хомякова, Е. Г. Эгоцентризм речемыслительной деятельности: На материале английского языка : дис. … д-ра филол. наук / Хомякова Е. Г. – Санкт Петербург, 2002. – 250 с.

Цвиллинг, М. Я. Специфика научно-общественного текста (к вопросу о внутриотраслевой дифференциации языка науки) / М. Я. Цвиллинг // Разновидности и жанры научной прозы. Лингвостилистические особенности. – Москва : Наука, 1989. – С. 27–36.

Burke, P. Learning Disabilities in Children / P. Burke, K. Cigno. – Blackwell Science, 2000. – 176 p.

Jones, S. Antonymy. A Corpus-based Perspective / S. Jones. – London and New York : Routledge, 2002. – 193 p.

Mettinger, A. Aspects of Semantic Opposition in English / A. Mettinger. – Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1994. – 205 p.

The Blackwell Companion to Social Work / ed. by M. Davis. – Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2008. – 538 p.

Источники дефиниций

Словарь английского языка Мериам Вебстер. – URL: https://www.merriam-webster.com/thesaurus/colour-blind (дата обращения: 30.09.2020). – Текст : электронный.

Кембриджский словарь английского языка. – URL: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/non-profit (дата обращения: 30.09.2020). – Текст : электронный.

Оксфордский словарь английского языка. – URL: https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/not-for-profit_1?q=not-for-profit (дата обращения: 30.09.2020). – Текст : электронный.

Словарь английского языка Коллинза. – URL: https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/racist (дата обращения: 30.09.2020). – Текст : электронный.

References:

Burke, P., Cigno, K. (2000). *Learning Disabilities in Children*. Blackwell Science. 176 p.

Danilenko, V. P. (1977). *Russkaya terminologiya* [Russian Terminology]. Moscow, Nauka. 246 p.

Davis, M. (Ed.). (2008). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Work*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 538 p.

Jones, S. (2002). *Antonymy. A Corpus-based Perspective*. London and New York, Routledge. 193 p.

Kembridzhskii slovar' angliiskogo yazyka [Cambridge Dictionary]. URL: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/non-profit (mode of access: 30.09.2020).

Khomyakova, E. G. (2002). *Egotsentrism rechemyslitelnoi deyatelnosti: Na materiale angliiskogo yazyka* [Egocentricity of Verbal and Cognitive Behaviour: Based on the Studies of English]. Dis. … d-ra folol. nauk. Saint Petersburg. 250 p.

Kulikova, I. S., Salmina, D. V. (2002). *Vvedenie v metalingvistiku (sistemnyi, leksikograficheskii I kommunikativno-pragmaticheskii aspekty lingvisticheskoi terminologii)* [Introduction to Metalinguistics (System, Lexicography and Communication Pragmatics as Language Terminology Aspects]. Saint Petersburg, Saga. 352 p.

Leichik, V. M. (2006). *Terminologiya: predmet, metody, struktura* [Terminology Studies: Subject Matter, Methodology, Structure]. Moscow, DomKniga. 256 p.

Mettinger, A. (1994). *Aspects of Semantic Opposition in English*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 205 p.

Nikitina, S. E. (1987). *Semanticheskii analiz yazyka nauki. Na materiale lingvistiki* [Semantic Analysis of the Language of Science. Based on Linguistics Language]. Moscow, Nauka. 144 p.

Oksfordskii slovar' angliiskogo yazyka [Oxford Learners' Dictionaries]. URL: https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/not-for-profit_1?q=not-for-profit (mode of access: 30.09.2020).

Slovar' angliiskogo yazyka Kollinza [Collins Online Dictionary]. URL: https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/racist (mode of access: 30.09.2020).

Slovar' angliiskogo yazyka Meriam Vebster [Dictionary by Merriam Webster]. URL: https://www.merriam-webster.com/thesaurus/colour-blind (mode of access: 30.09.2020).

Suleimanova, A. K. (2005). *Terminosistema neftyanogo dela I ee funktsionirovanie v professional'nom diskurse spetsialista* [Term System of Oil Engineering and its Functioning in Professional Discourse]. Ufa, RIO BashGU. 268 p.

Tsvilling, M. Ya. (1989) Spetsifika nauchno-obshchestvennogo teksta (k voprosu o vnutriotraslevoi differentsiatsii yazyka nauki) [Specificity of Scientific-Public Texts (On Intra-branch Differentiation of the Language of Science)]. In *Raznovidnosti I zhanry nauchnoi prozy. Lingvisticheskie osobennosti*. Moscow, Nauka, pp. 27-36.

Данные об авторе
Бурсина Ольга Алексеевна – кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры английского языка, Институт социальных и гуманитарных наук, Вологодский государственный университет (Вологда, Россия).
Адрес: 160000, Россия, Вологда, ул. Ленина, 15.
E-mail: olgasazanova@yandex.ru.

Author's information
Bursina Olga Alekseevna – Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor of Department of English, Institute of Social and Humanitarian Sciences, Vologda State University (Vologda, Russia).