HYPERO-HYPONYMIC RELATIONS OF THE TERM LANGUAGE POLICY IN THE UKRAINIAN AND JAPANESE LANGUAGES

Yuliya Dzyabko

The object and subject sphere of sociolinguistics are changing, which has the influence on the development of its terminological system. Nonetheless, available in the Ukrainian and Japanese linguistics terminological linguistic dictionaries and individual sociolinguistic works partially embrace the conceptual apparatus of sociolinguistics which create difficulties for all-rounded description of this terminological system [1–6].

In linguistics there is certain experience in studying individual terminological systems in comparison with Ukrainian branch vocabulary, for example, linguistic, cybernetic, financial and legal terminological systems have already been described [7–10]. Nonetheless, the issue of compiling Ukrainian-Japanese and Japanese-Ukrainian branch dictionaries has not yet been the object of analysis. Currently, a limited amount of research works in Ukraine are dedicated to the description of phonetics, phraseology, vocabulary and grammar of the Japanese language or contrasting of its features with the Ukrainian correspondences. Therefore, theoretical and applied foundations of comparative lexicology are topical for analysis on the basis of the Ukrainian and Japanese languages. The aim of this article is to examine one of the aspects of analyzing comparative semantics of sociolinguistic terminological system in the Ukrainian and Japanese languages, namely hypero-hyponymic relations, on the basis of the term *language policy*. The task is to disclose its explicit and implicit manifestations.

Semantic and structural studies of this type of relations in comparative aspects presuppose the systematization of all units which disclose the content of the notions of equivalent terms *мовна політика* and 言語政策 /gengo seisaku/ in two languages. This approach will serve the elaboration of theoretical foundation for compiling ‘Japanese-Ukrainian Dictionary of Sociolinguistic Terms’.

Primarily, we will shortly characterize initial statements of our approach to the problem. Terms acquire their meanings only within terminological system where each unit has logical and notional relations with other units. Taking into account that the definition of the term is semantic equivalent of its meaning and its components are exponents of semes, by means of componential analysis we will delineate seme compositions of the term *language policy* in each language. Componential analysis helps to single out minimal sense elements. The method of definitions is considered to be the most reliable: identifying word in defining phrase and other components of definition contain distinctive features of meaning and make it possible to single out integral semantic component and differential elements [11: 32; 12: 32; 13: 75]. The way of singling out integral and differential semes is substantiated by the systemic organization of lexical meaning: terminology of sociolinguistics, similar to any other field of science, is not merely a general sum of its terms, but a certain system of notions. Thus, the meaning of the term is a set of hierarchically linked semantic components that make the structure of meaning.

The list of definitions obtained by way of total sampling from five Ukrainian and Japanese sources, has been stratified on the basis of frequency characteristics of identifiers which are included to interpretation: components which occurred in two or more definitions are given the status of semantic component of this term. The meaning of the Ukrainian term *мовна політика* and corresponding Japanese term 言語政策 /gengo seisaku/ include the obligatory component ‘заходи’, in Japanese – ‘方策’ /housaku/ or ‘方針’ /houshin/ (see [14: 28–35]).

Taking into account a two-part structure of the terms *мовна політика* and 言語政策 /gengo seisaku/: name ‘політика’ – 政策 /seisaku/ (it is s semantic component of the main term that points to the most general characteristics of the notion) and specifiers ‘мовна’ – 言語 /gengo/ (referent that illustrates the characteristic of differential character), it is reasonable to add specifier ‘мовний’, which stands for the content of the notion ‘мовна політика’ to the integral component ‘заходи’.

Sociolinguistic terminological system is formed by way of setting various types of relations and interconnections between the notions. The main variety of these relations includes hypero-hyponymic relations which play the role of organizer of the terminological system and are considered the universal model of representing scientific knowledge. Comparing this type of semantic relations will help to identify

and to differentiate universal idioethnic components of terminological system in two languages.

Hyponymic relations illustrate logical subordination of notions based on non-lateral implication, namely one-sided introduction of semantic content of the narrow notion to a wider one [15: 292]. Simultaneously, hyponymy is not any type of implications, but only those which lead to generic hierarchy of notions on the basis of common characteristic [16: 155].

We will express an opinion as to the boundaries of hyponymy, which, apart from generic and specific relations, sometimes include meronymic (partative) relations [17: 132]. Meronymy is one of the types of taxonomic relations in lexical system of language, which demonstrates semantic relations of inclusion between the part and the whole [18: 231−233]. We find it inexpedient to equal these types of relations. Unlike generic and specific relations, which are logical by nature and based on internal relations between individual characteristics or properties of the notion, partative relations are ontological and transfer the relations of adjacency in space or time. Ontological relations do not unite notions, but single objects as representatives of these notions [19: 103].

Lexical and semantic subordinations envelope the privative opposition of generic notion to specific ones, which, correspondingly, open the notional sense of the generic one, and oppose each other via differential semes. Therefore, specific notion necessarily has the same characters as a generic one, but not vice versa. Traditionally generic notions are called hyperonyms, while words denoting specific notions are known as hyponyms [15: 292; 16: 88; 13: 83]. The terms expressing specific notions contain a set of features that characterized meaning of the term – the name of generic notion plus some additional meaningful features that narrow the scope of their meanings [20: 191–192].

Semantic hyponyms in hyponymic row have equal relation of subordination and are identified as cohyponyms. They do not have relations of implication. Since hyponyms oppose each other in the content of specific feature, equipollent oppositions are formed between them.

Generic designation of *language policy* as hyperonym contains features common for all hyponyms. It forms the hierarchy of lexemes, in the basis of which underlies the principle of its correlation with the closest or more distant generic denotation. In each terminological combination syntagmatic properties are realized through the meaning of specifier [20: 198]. At the same time the number of features needed for differentiation of notion, is inversely proportional to the level of hierarchy: at each following level the semantic structure of the terms becomes more complex due to at least one additional semantic component. We will unite generic and specific notion not into one big generic and specific formation, but to several hyponymic rows on the basis of differential classification features, each of which is the basis for dividing generic notion into specific ones and serves a uniting factor in the group.

Interaction of the term *мовна політика* as hyperonym to the names *зовнішня мовна політка* and *внутрішня мовна політика* is secured by the seme ‘мовні заходи’. The peculiarity of such relation in the micro field leads to the fact that the term may stand both generic and specific notion depending on the level of abstraction: either higher or lower. Therefore, hyponym *зовнішня мовна політика* is hyperonym to the term *мовна політика інтернаціоналізації* (single out on the basis of differential seme ‘регулювання мовних заходів на міжнародній арені’).

The unit 言語政策 /gengo seisaku/ forms synonymic identical hyponymic rows according to the features ‘国内に対する’ /kokunai ni taisuru/ - ‘means for external needs of the state’ – ‘外国に対する’ /gaikoku ni taisuru/ - ‘means for internal needs of the state’ with the terms 対外言語政策 /taigai gengo seisaku/ – *зовнішня мовна політика* and 対内言語政策 /tainai gengo seisaku/ – *внутрішня мовна політика* [1: 149].

Nonetheless, in comparison with the Ukrainian language we observe discrepancies in formation of subordinate notions. Primarily, the term 対外言語政策 /taigai gengo seisaku/ *external language policy* forms generic and specific relations with the term 日本語政策 /nihongo seisaku/ (the content of the term is conveyed by the Ukrainian correspondence *мовна політика щодо японської мови як іноземної*). On the basis of common generic component ‘言語政策’ /gengo seisaku/ ‘linguistic measures’ on the basis of semantic similarity of differential features ‘外国に対する’/gaikoku ni taisuru/ and ‘国外むけ’ /kokugai muke/ ‘designated for external needs of the state’, which belong to the structure of units 対外言語政策 /taigai gengo seisaku/ *external language policy* and 日本語政策 /nihongo seisaku/, as well as on the basis of

opposition of differential – ‘言語’ /gengo/ ‘language’ and ‘日本語’ /nihongo/ ‘Japanese language’, privative opposition of inclusion is formed, where the latter is a hyponym. The term 対内言語政策 /tainai gengo seisaku/ comes into generic and specific relations with units that stand for directions of language policy within the country: 国語政策 /kokugo seisaku/ *language policy towards national language*, 少数語政策 /shousuugo seisaku/ *language policy towards language minorities*, 移民語政策 /imingo seisaku/ *language policy towards immigrants* (differential seme ‘言語地位’ /gengo chii/ ‘status of language in the state’).

Generic and specific relations may be expressed explicitly or implicitly.

Explicit manifestation of hypero-hyponymy

Relations between the terms appear due to actualization of syntagmatic meanings of hyperonym with the help of lexical specifiers [20: 191].

The development of hyponymy in a formally semantic way stipulates the formation of terminological derivative group (TDG) which points to the systematic nature of interconnection of the content plane and expression plane. New derivatives are based on one term and its elements consistently subordinate to each other and operate in hymonymic relations. This systematization of material provides a possibility for organizing the terminological system and for defining the place of each single term within its structure.

Formally semantic oppositions dominate in hypero-hyponymic paradigm of the Ukrainian term *мовна політика* and its Japanese equivalent 言語政策 /gengo seisaku/, uniting the largest groups of specific names around the generic name. Realization of syntagmatic meanings occurs as a result of linear contacts between linguistic units: generic term→ specific term. New specifiers introduce new data on generic notion to the significatum of formed complex nomination [20: 198]. In this case hyponyms demonstrate affinity with hypernonym not only on the level of semantics, but also structure, which is testified by common terminological elements with hyperonyms: *мовна політика → перспективна мовна політика* and *ретроспективна мовна політика* (differential semes ‘збереження мовної ситуації – зміна мовної ситуації’).

With the help of the seme ‘статус мови’ the term *мовна політика* stands out as hyperonym to the row of cohyponyms: *мовна політика стратегічної багатомовності*, *мовна політика офіційної одномовності*, *мовна політика офіційної двомовності*, *регіональна мовна політика*, *мовна політика диференційованого юридичного статусу*, *комплексна мовна політика* (TDG 4). In Japanese sociolinguistic terminological system there are no units with similar semantics, therefore the names of the latter two hyponymic groups of the term *мовна політика* are considered as those which do not have equivalents in the Japanese language. Equivalent-free lexemes, which are typical for the Ukrainian sociolinguistic system, serve as evident illustrations of lexemic asymmetry.

Another example of lexical non-correspondence is such type of equivalent-free term of the Ukrainian language as *гендерна мовна політика*, which, on the basis of differentiated specific seme ‘гендер’, comes into generic and specific relations with the unit *мовна політика* (TDG 5). Nonetheless, in this case the absence of semantic equivalent is stipulated not by the absence of the notion in the system of the Japanese language, but by the fact, that word combination 性（ジェンダー）と言語政策 /sei (jendaa) to gengo seisaku/ ‘gender and language policy’ was not transferred from nominal syntagma into the term.

It is worth considering the term *рідномовна політика* introduced into Ukrainian sociolinguistics by I. Ohiyenko for describing the conscious influence on the development of the Ukrainian language [6: 136]. This term comes into generic and specific relations with the term *мовна політика* on the basis of differential semantic component ‘мовні заходи щодо розвитку української мови’ (TDG 6).

Facing equivalent-free correspondences of the foreign language it is extremely important to correctly choose the way of translating by means of the native language, since translating means to express correctly by the mean of one language those elements that have been previously expressed by the means of the other language [21: 10]. In case the equivalent is not available in the Ukrainian language, we use the method of semantic and structural loan translation based on conveyance of combinatorial word composition when composing parts (morphemes) or phrases (lexemes) are translated by corresponding elements of the target language. Simultaneously, we preserve the semantics and syntactic structure of the Japanese terms coordinating it with the source text.

In the Japanese language there is a term 言語教育政策 /gengo kyouiku seisaku/, which is translated as 'policy of language education' in our version. Combined with hypero-hyponymic connections with the unit 言語政策 /gengo seisaku/, it stands for *performing language policy in education and language teaching* (differential seme '言語教育に関する政策' /gengo kyouiku ni kansuru seisaku/ 'measures for language teaching' [22: 7] (TDG 3).

Lexeme 言語教育 /gengo keikaku/, which is an integral semantic component of the term 言語教育政策 /gengo kyouiku seisaku/, is a hyperonym to specific names 母語教育政策 /bogo kyouiku seisaku/, 外国語教育政策 /gaikokugo kyouiku seisaku/ and 第二言語教育政策 /daini gengo kyouiku seisaku/ [22: 7]. These terminological combinations, denoting the measures for studying the native language, the foreign language and second language correspondingly, form hyponymic paradigm on the basis of common (implicitly expressed) specific seme '言語地位' /gengo chii/ 'status of language' and differential – '母語' /bogo/ 'native language', '外国語' /gaikokugo/ 'foreign language', '第二言語' /daini gengo/ 'second language'.

Implicit development of syntagmatic meaning of the term 言語政策 /gengo seisaku/ is testified by multi-component unit 言語拡散政策 /gengo kakusan seisaku/ (in our version – 'policy of language spreading') (TDG 4). The term 言語拡散政策 /gengo kakusan seisaku/, denoting the conscious measures of the government and official institutions as to the changes in the processes of mastering and using of language [22: 358], form hypero-hyponymic paradigm with the term 言語政策 /gengo seisaku/ on the basis of differential seme '言語拡散'/gengo kakusan/ 'language spreading'.

In the Ukrainian language the members of previous two terminological derivative groups have not yet come through the process of terminological formation, therefore their translated correspondences are expressed in the form of free combinations.

On the basis of differential feature 'модель впровадження мовних заходів' in the Ukrainian language the term *мовна політика* comes into generic and specific relations with the terms *асиміляційна мовна політика, диференційна мовна політика, мультикультурна мовна політика* (*плюралізм*) [6: 39]. In the Japanese language we find incomplete paradigm of this hypero-hyponymic group. There are no independent correspondences for denoting the notion *диференційна мовна політика*. Instead, the Japanese dictionaries of sociolinguistics with the help of the feature '言語政策の実施の基礎' /gengo seisaku no jisshi no kisou/ 'model of realization of linguistic measures' formed the specific classification 言語政策 /gengo seisaku/ through the range the terms: 言語同化政策 /gengo douka seisaku/, 多言語政策 /tagengo seisaku/, 風土語政策 /fuudo gengo seisaku/, 国際言語政策 /kokusai gengo seisaku/, which are equivalent to the Ukrainian notions *асиміляційна мовна політика*, *мовна політика багатомовності*, *регіональна мовна політика*, *мовна політика інтернаціоналізації* correspondingly [23: 87]. The structure of this hyponymic row combines the features of the Ukrainian terminological derivative group TDG 2 and TDG 4, which testifies to the larger embranchment of the types of language policy in the Ukrainian sociolinguistic system.

Implicit manifestation of hypero-hyponymy

Implicit manifestation of hypero-hyponymic relations occur as a result of actualization of paradigmatic meanings and have only lexical and semantic manifestations. We take into account the feature 'historically biased manifestation of linguistic measures' in the term *language policy*. In the Ukrainian language we observe hyponymic paradigm *англізація*, *арабізація*, *іспанізація*, *полонізація*, *романізація*, *русифікація*, *угорщення (мадяризація)*, *українізація*, *чехізація*. In the Japanese sociolinguistic theory there are notions of 英語化 /eigoka/ 'anglization', 中国化 /chugokuka/ 'chinesation', ローマ字化 /roumajika/ (ローマナイズ /roomanaizu/) romanization, ロシア化 /roshiaka/ russification, 日本化 /nihonka/ japanization. Surely, taking into account the openness of sociolinguistic terminological system, hyponymic paradigm may be supplemented by new elements formed by analogy to the available ones.

Summary. Comparative analysis of notional structure of the Ukrainian term *мовна політика* and its Japanese correspondence 言語政策 /gengo seisaku/ premises the arrangement of terminological correspondences in dictionary article.

Unlike the Ukrainian terminological system, the system of Japanese terms holds fewer units that present the notion of *language policy*. Generic and specific hierarchy of the term *language policy* in both languages testifies to great number of subordinated groups of hyponyms singled out on the basis of differential features that specify their meanings. These elements of sociolinguistic terminological systems in compared languages are characterized by semantic symmetry, partial non-correspondence and asymmetry (inter-language lacunas), demonstrating differences in linguistic mentality and peculiarity of extra-linguistic processes that envelope linguistic and political basics of both societies.

Semantic asymmetry lies in combination of all semantic components in scientific notion and stands as a result of scholarly means and types of terminological nomination. With partial semantic non-correspondence the number of differential semes does not coincide in compared correspondences, which results in differences in creating subordinate element, hyponyms, in terminological hierarchy. Inter-language lacunas presuppose the absence in the target language of the notion designated in the source language by certain lexical unit and is related with the peculiarities of language distribution of the objective world of each language.

Comparison of terminological micro-field 'language policy' in the Ukrainian and Japanese languages allows to find correspondences for arranging a vocabulary entry in the 'Japanese-Ukrainian Dictionary of Sociolinguistic terms'.

1. *木村護路クリストフ*.言語政策研究の言語観を問う―言語計画/言語態度の二分法 から言語管理の理論へ― //言語政策.日本言語政策学会, 2005. – P. 1–13.
2. *Верста І.* Мікрополе терміна мовна політика / Ірина Верста // Вісн. Львів. ун-ту. Сер. філологічна. – Львів, 2006. – Вип. 38, ч. 1. – С. 89–94.
3. *Бідер Г.* Про мовознавчу термінологію Івана Франка / Г. Бідер // Ucrainistica. – Кривий Ріг, 2007. – С. 80–89.
4. *Мацюк Г.* Термін у соціолінгвістичних традиціях / Г. Мацюк // Ucrainica II. – Olomouc, 2006. – С. 477–482.
5. *Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями* та *проблеми* : підручник / О. О. Селіванова. – Полтава : Довкілля-К, 2008. – 712 с.
6. *Мацюк Г.* Прикладна соціолінгвістика. Питання мовної політики: навч. посіб. / Г. Мацюк. – Львів : Видавничий центр Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка, 2009. – 212 с.
7. *Рогач Л. В.* Семантична основа лінгвістичних термінів в українській та англійській мовах : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.15 / Л. В. Рогач. – К. : Київ. Нац. ун-т ім. Т. Шевченка, 2000. – 20 с.
8. *Брагіна Е. Р.* Структурно-компонентний аналіз термінів кібернетики в англійській мові у зіставленні з українською та російською : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.15 / Е. Р. Брагіна. – Донецьк : Дон. нац. ун-т, 2001. – 18 с.
9. *Кришталь С. М.* Структурно-семантичний аналіз метафоричних термінів підмови фінансів в англійській і українській мовах : автореф. дис. … канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04 / С. М. Кришталь. – Донецьк : Дон. нац. ун-т, 2003. – 20 с.
10. *Ляшук А. М.* Семантична структура юридичних термінів української та англійської мов : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.17 // *А. М. Ляшук*. – К. : КНЛУ, 2007. – 20 с.
11. *Nida E. A.* Componential Analysis of Meaning / E. A. Nida. – The Hague–Paris : Mouton, 1975. – 272 p.
12. *Шелов Д.* Определение терминов и понятийная структура терминологии / Д. Шелов. – СПб. : Изд-во Петерб. гос. ун-та, 1998. – 234 с.
13. *Geeraerts D.* Theories of Lexical Semantics / *D. Geeraerts*. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2010. – 362 p.
14. *Дзябко Ю.* Мікрополе «мовна політика»: спроба формування методики зіставного аналізу на матеріалі української та японської мов / Ю. Дзябко // Мовні і концептуальні картини світу. – К. : Вид. дім Дмитра Бураго, 2011. – С. 28–35.
15. *Lyons J.* Semantics / J. Lyons. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1977. – Vol. *1, 2*. – 897 p.
16. *Cruse D. A.* Lexical Semantics / D. A. Cruse. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1986. – 326 p.
17. *Плотников Б. А.* О форме и содержании в языке / Б. А. Плотников. – Минск : Вышейшая шк., 1989. – 252 с.

18. *Murphy M. Lynne*. Semantic relations and the lexicon: Antonymy, Synonymy, and other paradigms / M. Lynne Murphy. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 292 p.
19. *Cabré M. Teresa.* Terminology: theory, methods and applications / M. Teresa Cabré. – Philadelphia PA: John Benjamins, 1999. – 248 p.
20. *Панько Т. І., Кочан І. М., Мацюк Г. П.* Українське термінознавство : підручник / Т. І. Панько, І. М. Кочан, Г. П. Мацюк. – Львів : Світ, 1994. – 216 с.
21. *Гак В. Г., Григорьев Б. Б.* Теория и практика перевода : французский язык / В. Г. Гак, Б. Б. Григорьев. – СПб. : Интердиалект , 2000. – 456 с.
22. 応用言語学事典 / 小池生夫（編). – 東京: 研究社, 2003. – 972 p.
23. *益田出.* 社会言語学 / 出益田. 大学教育出版, 1997. – 91 p.