



ORIGINAL PAPER

Word vs. Term - Language for Specific Purposes

Ileana Mihaela Chirițescu¹⁾, Floriana Anca Păunescu²⁾

Abstract:

Specialised language must be the reflection of a scientifically advanced civilisation. If general language grows naturally alongside new nuances of collective communication developed by unspecialised members in society, special language is dependent on the concrete advancements of people in science and technology, and how those transformations shall be subsequently described and categorised using new-fangled terminology. Standard communication is more inclined to capture emotion while professional language has the absolute prerogative of reflecting knowledge and then disseminate it so that those elements of knowledge shall benefit increased numbers of individuals. Terminology is not an encryption per say, yet it is inaccessible to normal members of the public who are unspecialised because they lack the basic referential knowledge to understand those terms and concepts. When terms are put together to construct advanced language texts, the degree of specialisation and conceptual enhancement is increased exponentially. This status quo can indeed limit access on a quantitative scale, but the criteria of quality are more than likely empowered. Specialised Language is perceived from a scientific standpoint as a subcategory of the standard, general language that has as its main objectives the communication and dissemination of specialised information from a referential standpoint as opposed to the standard language where methodologies are more diverse and the referential factor is not as relevant. Analysing specialised communication identifies a referential functionality which triggers a propensity towards denotation, the concrete and lexical precision.

Keywords: *communication; variations; evolution; terminology.*

¹⁾ Lecturer, Ph.D., University of Craiova, Department of Applied Modern Languages, Romania, Phone: 004 0251411552, Email: chiritescumihaela@yahoo.com.

²⁾ Associate Professor, Ph.D., University of Craiova, Department of Applied Modern Languages, Romania, Phone: 004 0251411552, Email: anca.paunescu@yahoo.com.

Introduction

The native speakers may benefit from a particular inherent advantage when it comes to business language, they are not automatically blessed with mastery in this respect. A good knowledge of business language does not entail a good knowledge of business terminology, bearing in mind professional training is needed in order to understand business language both practically and linguistically. Simple language training shall not be sufficient if the specific terminology remains abstract in the absence of the actual business and work practice in the real world.

The classic paradigm is based upon the predication that the transformation of society produces linguistic transformations, but in the case of Business terminology, the language itself has become a tool for regulating professional and social activity, thus the language has come to control and administer certain aspects of the economy. This is highly evident in the corporate world where a specialised corporate, business, linguistic apparatus has come to bestow uniformity upon all branches of a corporation across continents, cultures and different languages. For many, Business language is viewed as a non-coagulated system. Because of this status quo and the differences between standard users and specialised users, the standard language and the specialised language shall have to cross boundaries and mix themselves, as it is almost impossible to create absolute boundaries between the two.

A core characteristic of language is its connectivity to its speakers, as the speakers grow and evolve or even possibly devolve, so does the language. Complex and specialised language is the concrete manifestation of a powerful and diverse society. The living, transformational nature of language should be approached systemically based on merging social evolution with geographic and cultural proliferations. One can even wonder if language is the product of society or maybe, to some extent, language itself can influence the way a society functions or behaves. Linking language to nationality can sometimes even outsource the economic status of the speaker. A wealthy individual may speak a different form of language compared to an extremely pauper citizen though they share the same nationality and exist within the same immediate geography. These additional variations have also come to link language with power; therefore, it is not only important to play the part but also to act the part, climbing the social ladder often brings forth expectations of linguistic evolution and adaptation.

The Need to Define Specialised Languages

Specialised Language is perceived from a scientific standpoint as a subcategory of the standard, general language that has as its main objectives the communication and dissemination of specialised information from a referential standpoint as opposed to the standard language where methodologies are more diverse and the referential factor is not as relevant. Analysing specialised communication identifies a referential functionality which triggers a propensity towards denotation, the concrete and lexical precision.

"Thanks to the above the head video projectors that exist nowadays in the seminar rooms, teachers can use diverse assets to support their clarifications, introduce new vocabulary or solve exercises. Teachers now have the possibility of learning programs that allows them to construct lesson plans that have effect on the surface and deep learning through pictures, videos, sounds, graphics and visual organizers" (Bărbuceanu, 2020: 41a).

Word vs. Term - Language for Specific Purposes

Advanced communication is defined by terminology and, in fact, it is a general opinion that terminological structures are indeed the building blocks for language for specific purposes. If we define standard language as the total ensemble of lexical, semantic and grammatical tools affiliated to the members of a linguistic group or community with the purpose of proliferating basic communication, then specialised language is attached to a more restricted, professional assembly of advanced users, expounding an entire system of signs and triggers which facilitate the dissemination of knowledge pertinent to scientific domains of relevance through the use of specialised terminology. The terminological density, which is more often than not associated to terminological communication, represents yet another distinct characteristic that differentiates it from standard linguistic hegemonies.

Faber and Lopez Rodriguez (2012) provide a comprehensive definition of specialised language that includes a focus not only on advanced content but also takes into consideration cultural contexts, society variations, textual assemblies and conceptual domains, as well as the concrete individuals who must process the entire system of specialised language. The researchers state that:

"Specialized language is more than a technical or particular instance of general language. In today's society with its emphasis on science and technology, the way specialized knowledge concepts are named, structured, described, and translated has put terminology or the designation of specialized knowledge concepts in the limelight. The information in scientific and technical texts is encoded in terms or specialized knowledge units, which are access points to more complex knowledge structures. Underlying the information in the text are entire conceptual domains, which are both explicitly and implicitly present, and which represent the specialized knowledge encoded. In order to create a specialized text, translators and technical writers must have an excellent grasp of the language in the conceptual domain, the content that must be transmitted, and the knowledge level of the addressees or text receivers" (Faber & Rodriguez, 2012: 9).

Specialised language must be the reflection of a scientifically advanced civilisation. If general language grows naturally alongside new nuances of collective communication developed by unspecialised members in society, special language is dependent on the concrete advancements of people in science and technology, and how those transformations shall be subsequently described and categorised using new-fangled terminology. Standard communication is more inclined to capture emotion while professional language has the absolute prerogative of reflecting knowledge and then disseminate it so that those elements of knowledge shall benefit increased numbers of individuals. Terminology is not an encryption per say, yet it is inaccessible to normal members of the public who are unspecialised because they lack the basic referential knowledge to understand those terms and concepts. When terms are put together to construct advanced language texts, the degree of specialisation and conceptual enhancement is increased exponentially. This status quo can indeed limit access on a quantitative scale, but the criteria of quality are more than likely empowered.

Encryption is a noteworthy component of specialised language in terms of accessibility, availability and understanding of content. From the perspective of scientifically codified material, Pitch and Draskau state the following:

"LSP is a formalized and codified variety of language, used for special purposes and in a legitimate context—that is to say, with the function of communicating information of a specialized nature at any level—at the highest level of complexity, between initiated experts, and, at lower levels of complexity, with the aim of informing or initiating other interested parties in the most economic, precise and unambiguous terms possible". (Picht& Draskau,1985: 3).

Another important aspect of Picht and Draskau's definition is confirmed by what the two authors name as contextual legitimacy. The context of addressability must be composed of peers, experts who are "initiated" scientifically, linguistically or preferably both. Complex levels of communication are not destined for delectants, not out of some sort of elitism, but simply from the pragmatic standpoint that the information would simply be wasted on non-specialised users.

Specialised language goes beyond the complexity of terminological context or rigid scientific content. Humans are an equally important component in the equation of specialised communication, and the significant challenge is to harmonise both the human and the scientific component in order to generate the "unambiguous exchange of information" among "professionals" uniting content and the beneficiary of that content with a view of supporting scientific development and the subsequent progress of society that comes with it:

"The main purpose of special languages, i.e. allowing objective, precise, and unambiguous exchange of information particularly between subject field experts and professionals, makes dialectal variation very minor. The issue is not one of affirming one's own geographical origin, but rather one of communicating unambiguously. In this sense, presenting a highly specialized scientific text in a written article or a conference paper does not require the same discourse as a spontaneous oral communication on the same subject. Finally, the intentions or purposes of the communication, both in general and special language, also condition the syntactic, morphological, and textual devices used" (Cabré, 1999: 77-78).

According to Sager et al. (1980), the need to understand specialised language is a contextual undertaking and, therefore, it must be analysed through the association with general language. The authors do not simply look at specific language as a distinct, separate entity, but rather as a part of an intricate, interconnected system of extended communication that is conjoined with other vectors of communication. They even expound that what they call "natural language" can incorporate both specialised and general communication. The authors believe it is highly evident that:

"The nature of language is such that general language and special languages can be accommodated within one natural language: the fundamental characteristics of language are manifested both in English and in the language of chemical engineering, both in French and in the language of physics. The difference between general and special languages is a difference of degree rather than kind: the degree to which the fundamental characteristics of language are maximized or minimized in special languages. Special languages are used more self-consciously than general language and the situations in which they are used intensify the user's concern with the language. It is therefore on the level of use that we look for more specific differentiating criteria" (Sager, Dungworth&McDonald, 1980: 17).

Word vs. Term - Language for Specific Purposes

Isolation, contextualised separation between general and specialised language represent, according to the authors, elements that are conditioned by degrees which are deemed essential in the minimisation or maximisation of advanced terminology. These elements of activation are user-conditioned based on the affinity with which communicators approach the intensity of language and the levels of specialisation they wish to commandeer.

"Another category of learners a teacher might encounter in the classroom and to whom visuals are of uttermost importance is represented by the mnemonic visuals. Mnemonic pictures contain organised retention mechanisms that enhance the students' ability to remember any text or information provided it is presented visually" (Bărbuceanu, 2020: 40a).

Cabré (1999) investigates potential elements of co-dependency between general language and special language by identifying two core elements which differentiate the two types of linguistic categories, namely, terminology and the manner in which that terminology is assembled, combined and disseminated. It is the author's clear opinion that specialized and advanced communication exist as separate entities governed by specific rules and standards of generation. Although the distinction is clear, she does mention that specialised communication, though a vastly superior form of standard communication, can use certain elements of basic language in order to make itself more accessible to a wider range of users and specialists. This increase in the quantity of the individuals it can reach is more or less equivalent to an adjacent increase in subsequent efficiency and standardised quality. Therefore, we can state that terminology is an independent communicational entity that can, at times, harness the power of standard language in order to obtain additional degrees of empowerment, reach and nuances. Maria Cabré conveys the following:

"Specialized communication differs from general communication in two ways: in the type of oral or written texts it produces, and in the use of a specific terminology. The use of standardized terminology helps to make communication between specialists more efficient. The criteria they use to evaluate specialized texts are not the same as those used to evaluate general texts. In general texts, expression, variety and originality prevail over other features; in specialized texts, concision, precision and suitability are the relevant criteria. A scientific text must be concise because concision reduces the possibility of distortions in the information. It must also be precise because of the nature of scientific and technical topics and the functional relations among specialists. Finally, it must be appropriate or suitable to the communicative situation in which it is produced so that, depending on the circumstances of each situation, every text is adapted to the characteristics of the interlocutors and their level of knowledge about the topic, introducing more or less redundancy according to need" (Cabré, 1999: 47).

Cabré further explains that the difference between general and special communication is additionally increased by characteristics that are not even structural. These new-defining elements are actually fuelled by the "criteria" used for the evaluation of both acts of communication. therefore, if two types of communication are different not only structurally, but also from an evaluative point of view, then the borders between the two are more actively and clearly conveyed. But the differences between the two do not end here. Standard and special communication can be distinguished based on the context in which the act of communication is delivered.

While standard language is significantly informal and independent of context, specialised acts of communication are compelled to take into account contextual variations. A scientific speech can be delivered under positive or dire circumstances, in front of a small or large group, and it can also be tributary to cultural and personal beliefs. Thus, an advanced act of communication must, more or less, tread lightly and consider a substantial number of variables that can influence or even affect the core ideas conveyed. Furthermore, informal communication between friends or colleagues is held to very few standards or preconditions. A specialised act of communication is, on the other hand, on the opposite side of the spectrum when considering the human factor of addressability both in terms of speaker and as receiver.

"Today's teachers must learn to communicate in the language and style of their students, re-thinking old-style teaching in education in the digital age, where educators often find themselves as immigrants trying to cope with the digital natives that are no longer engaged with chalk and blackboard and one educational flow from the teacher to the student. Teachers must recognize that their students are digital natives who master essential skills for accessing digital, cloud libraries and informational resources available from their own devices" (Bărbuceanu, 2020: 136b).

The generator of the message should, in this case, exhibit a strong sense of cultural awareness, as well as the wisdom to adapt a level of communication so that the target audience is able to understand it. The opposite can apply as well: if an advanced communicator does not possess the necessary level of specialisation, compared to the people he/she is addressing, if that person is intellectually and professionally inferior to the target audience, then, in order to avoid embarrassment and the generation of unnecessary information, that speaker/writer should choose not to stand before the respective audience as it accomplishes no positive results and only wastes the time of his and her interlocutors.

The area that clearly differentiates specialised and unspecialised language belongs to vocabulary. Terminology, advanced vocabulary underscore significant structural disparities between the two categories of language under analysis. Researcher Maria Teresa Cabré (1999) explores variations of the lexicon and outlines three distinct variations related to the linguistic dimension of terminology:

"The greatest divergences are found in the vocabulary. The words in the general language texts are much easier to understand for most speakers of the language than those in the special texts.

- a. General language lexical items, e.g. *brain, medicine, slice, pressure, rock, temperature*
- b. Specific lexical items that can be attributed to a borderline area between general language and special language: *imaging, invasive, scanner, chemical composition, metamorphic, recrystallization*
- c. Lexical items specific to special texts: *adenosine triphosphate, lactic acid, spectroscopy, basaltic, diagenesis, protolith*" (Cabré, 1999: 73)

The first area of interest relevant to the lexical infrastructure of advanced communication refers to general language items that are morphed into contextualised specialisation. Outside context, those terms may be benign and generally accessible, but with proficient integration, they are afforded new semantic extensions. The second tier of vocabulary items is placed within a "borderline area", mediating both general and special patterns of language, outlining transitional patterns that are more harmonious as

Word vs. Term - Language for Specific Purposes

they belong to both worlds of communication. the elements of vocabulary that are exclusively specific to terminology are the most advanced and precise form of professional communication. their meaning is independent of context or additional semantic variation. By no means, this is rigidity, but more than that, it is the mark of stability and uncorrupted coagulated meaning.

The author further develops her lexicographic assertions and analyses terminology from the perspective of complex corroborations and textual integration. Analysing specialised vocabulary as a tool for constructing specialised texts generates an endorsement for increased variation and specialisation:

"Certain structures and categories appear more frequently in special texts than in general language texts:

- a. Morphological structures based on Greek or Latin formatives: *diagenesis, igneous, pathological*
- b. Abbreviations and symbols: *MRI, C*
- c. Nominalizations based on verbs: *accumulation, identification, recrystallization*
- d. Straightforward sentence structure with little complex subordination" (Cabré, 1999: 73).

The immersion in the traditional origins of specialised terminology constitutes a scientific prerequisite not only in linguistics but in all areas of scientific expertise. Allowing Greek or Latin terms to transcend millennia and achieve synchronicity with modern, specialised communicational needs is an aspect that cannot be overlooked. Specialised vocabulary can be disseminated solely through contextual integration. Any professional act of communication cannot be just a random enumeration of independent words. Those words must be skilfully brought together to form syntagmatic relations, sentences and complex phrases that capture the exact intent, the desired effect of the act of communication as it is designed and implemented by the advanced communicator.

Delimitating general language from special language can be a challenging undertaking if we consider the intersectional nature of the two elements. Though imbued with the significant insertion of co-dependence, scientific analysis can discern between interdependent manifestations of language. Cabré outlines a comprehensive framework that can bestow clarification among the two zones of expertise. Regarding special language texts, she claims the following:

- "They often represent an implicit dialogue between the writer and the recipient of the message.
- They do not implicitly present personal positions; when they do occur, they are indicated by such phrases as e.g. *according to the author, in our opinion, we believe that, etc.*).
- They attempt to persuade the reader indirectly, although it might not be done explicitly, by providing arguments, citing data, providing examples, explaining, etc.
- They introduce metalinguistic elements such as explanations, definitions, parenthetical material, synonyms, etc. The number of these functional resources used in each text depends on the degree of specialization of the communication, and on the prior knowledge of the readers of the specialized communication. The less expert the reader, the more redundant the text will be and the more metalinguistic elements it will contain.

- Specialized messages do not ignore the elegance of language, the appropriateness of the forms used, or the advantages of the right format and layout" (Cabré, 1999: 75-76).

The implicit nature of textual representations allows for specific, specialised allocations of linguistic resources that are specific to professional act of communication. Even the manner in which the audience is persuaded is highly depersonalised, meant to convey objective truths that are not bound to personal opinions or individual perspective. Each fact communicated is powered by a system of arguments, professionally assembled and disseminated so that it adds the maximum effect of conviction and credibility. Furthermore, even metalinguistic elements are a highly cherished resource in specialised language, harnessing what Cabré defines as "functional resources". The level of specialisation in texts is directly dependent on the terminological prowess of its constitutive elements, yet that proliferation of elements, the elevated ability of the *arscombinatoria* is the sole prerogative of the professional communicator and reflects not only on that person's linguistic knowledge but also on his or her ability to outline discourse within an intercultural context.

Linguistic experts have concluded that developments in the area of science, economics and communication always trigger an influx of innovative terminology whose purpose is to cognitively quantify the new quantities of data, package them by categories and then disseminate them towards users with the purpose of facilitating not only the development of the human resource but also the implementation of those new scientific discoveries as steadfast standards of reference. In researching the connection between scientific advancements and terminology, special language, Picht and Draskau (1985) reveal a series of unique characteristics, specifically adapted to correlate advanced knowledge to enhanced communication:

- a. "Special languages have a single purpose, in the sense that they are used in a specific social setting and for communication.
- b. They have a limited number of users.
- c. They are acquired voluntarily.
- d. They are autonomous with respect to the general language, in the sense that variation among special languages does not bring about variation in the general language" (Picht and Draskau, 1985: 9).

The first main characteristic of expert discourse is the solidity of purpose. If in the case of standard communication, there are no real or urgent, deliberate objectives in communication, sometime communication is just a random act of social bonding, specialised communication is always fuelled by objectives. There is no element of randomness to terminology. Professionals use it to serve lucrative or scientific purposes. They employ its resources in order to manage material and human resources. Discussing money or the weather from a general perspective is nothing more than chit-chat meant to pass the time, to elicit random act of dialogue and interaction. Sometimes, these elements are nothing more than conversation fillers. Address the same topics from a specialised perspective and you could be saving crops, lives, material goods, in the case of weather, while discussing capital in a professional context utilising specialised terminology can mean the difference between keeping outsourcing or even eliminating tens of thousands of jobs because of financial constraints. The next element that strongly defines specialisation in communication is reflected in the quantity and quality of the people who perform the respective act of communication. While general language promotes quality over quantity, catering to the discursive whims of the masses,

Word vs. Term - Language for Specific Purposes

specialised acts of communication are greatly reductive in terms of quantity, but compensate this numeric decrease by substantially increasing the quality of informational content, as well as the quality of the people who are able to engage in those respective discussions. Specialised discourse is the prerogative of initiated users.

Native intelligence in cooperation with work ethics and a propensity to achieve continuous perfection elevates normal users to the status of advanced users. Those who reach the necessary level of understanding in order to process specialised language are not just successful in communication, they automatically become proficient in specific, specialised areas of expertise, and this makes them the gatekeepers of the functionality and management of society. If information is power, it can only be attained by the mastering of specialised content.

Specialisation does not only secure the present; it controls the future of development across the board. Specialisation in the areas of terminology and science is a voluntary act of determination.

"These native, who seems to favor a synchronistic or consecutive interaction, can text messages with his eyes closed, is an intuitive learner with zero tolerance or patience, with an extensive preference to discover via actions, trialing and communication rather than by reflection". (Bărbuceanu, 2020: 136b).

A user will go to great lengths towards achieving the personal linguistic and professional competence that will allow him or her to decrypt and master a terminology that is, otherwise, detached from standard language. If we add contextual and cultural immersion into the mix, then the rigorousness of specialisation is fully underscored and clarified as an endeavour to master objective elements of absolute scientific truths and integrate those solid referents into an often subjective and ambiguous social and professional context.

In approaching the issue of terminological specialisation, Sager (1990) proposes an elevated level of contextualisation that is not only concerned with the multidisciplinary aspect, but also with the evolution of terminology through different timeframes, thus, identifying factors of relevance that correlate science with synchronicity and traditional legitimacy.

"Terminology has many ancestors, is related to many disciplines and is of practical concern to all students of special subjects and languages. It is, therefore, appropriate at this stage of its emancipation as an independent practice and field of study to delimit it and to relate it to the disciplines in which it finds application. Although essentially linguistic and semantic in its roots, terminology found a more recent motivation in the broad field of communication studies, which may be described as a modern extension of the mediaeval trivium of logic, grammar and rhetoric. With this orientation terminology can claim to be truly interdisciplinary. It is vital to the functioning of all sciences, it is concerned with designations in all other subject fields, and it is closely related to a number of specific disciplines. [...] The common element among these disciplines is that they are each concerned, at least in part, with the formal organisation of the complex relationships between concepts and terms. Since terminology is concerned with concepts, their definitions and names, it is only appropriate to begin a discussion with a formal definition of the subject" (Sager, 1990: 2).

Specialised texts represent the refined and integrated form of terminology. Mastering huge packages of terminology attests only to a good memory or a capacity for repetition. The superior integration of those terms, by building texts, complex structures, is the landmark of collaborative intelligence that seeks not only to understand and further disseminate scientific reality, but to go beyond that and transform that information into concrete, professional changes in domains ranging from economics, transportation, national defence, public safety or the health sector. These specialised texts must embody series of traits, which Cabré has identified in this following categorisation:

The characteristics of scientific and technical texts (doctoral dissertations, technical reports, formal lectures, specialized articles in learned journals, etc.) reflect this tendency towards impersonalization and objectivity by using elements like:

- a. "first person plural as a means of expressing modesty
 - b. the present tense
 - c. absence of exclamations
 - d. short sentences
 - e. avoidance of unnecessary redundancy
 - f. frequent use of impersonal formulae
 - g. noun phrases
 - h. other systems of representation, e.g. drawings, tables, in the body of the text"
- (Cabré, 1999: 75).

The use of the first-person plural should not be misconstrued as an act of capricious subjectivity. It is an expression of modesty towards working collaboratively with the aim of achieving progressive togetherness. The present tense conditions the listeners to actively listen and be involved in the activity of learning in the present with a view of improving the future. The elimination of exclamation is, somehow, the equivalent of excluding emotional undertones. Science should be objective, not emotional. Specialised listeners should be impressed by the validity of the arguments they encounter and not by discursive histrionics that can hijack the true purpose of a specialised communication. The impersonal approach, the depersonalisation raises awareness that scientific advancements is not meant for individual use, but for the progress of the collective, for society as a whole. In addition, the use of charts, diagrams, tables and drawings can maximise the precision of specialised communication by pinpointing the exact information that the specialised communicator wishes to transmit to the targeted advanced receivers of that specific information.

Specialised language should carry and spread the validity of positive and scientific arguments beyond cultural borders and beyond actual geographic borders. Communicational prowess is the key to unlocking the miracles of science by making them accessible across the world, letting individuals better themselves, supporting not only the development of science but the development of our most precious resource, the human resource, and those newly developed specialists shall in turn create new specialists, thus, creating the ideal conditions for exponential growth on an intellectual, communicational and material level.

Word vs. Term. Knowledge Building and Transfer

Words and terms elicit relevance based on a pattern of interconnectivity. They both designate symbols and those symbols are, in fact, assembled through an association of sounds and letters which ultimately designate a concept.

Word vs. Term - Language for Specific Purposes

If we are to look at what a word signifies, we shall turn our attention towards abstract representations that are often difficult to express, but are paradoxically imprinted throughout the collective human psyche. The most common definition asserts that a word is, in fact, the smallest linguistic unit that elicits meaning throughout an extended majority of people. That meaning should be constant and even variations of interpretation should be collectively shared by, at least, other subgroups. If a linguistic unit is to gain a status of becoming a word, then both the speaker and the listener must share a common understanding regarding the meaning of that utterance, as well as an agreement as to how that unit shall be utilised, both in context and culturally. Furthermore, if we are to accept and embrace the religious specification of meaning, the word is actually the core building block of creation as it preceded all other elements, generating them into being. This line of reasoning would entail that in order for an element to become relevant, it has to, at least, be defined and categorised into existence. If something is undiscovered, unsaid or simply not understood collectively, it is significantly irrelevant to the collective necessities of humanity. Naming something, allocating a word for it affords that element strength and materialisation. Even words which define abstract emotions are often misconstrued as ramblings or potential imbalances if there is not a stable frame of references associated with a collective integration in society. The very act of writing implies the deliberate choice of words which is achieved through a sort of anticipatory empathy by stimulating ourselves towards wishing to understand what the words we place on paper will mean to the reader who will, in fact, receive and decode them by contextualising those units of meaning based on both personal and collective experience and affinities.

Regarding the distinction between word and term, Maria Teresa Cabré (1993) detects the following elements of separation:

- "the term always indicates a concept / categorical notion, while the word does not (there are also prepositions, conjunctions that are syncategorematic notions);
- the term, restricted to a specialized field, designates a single concept (characterized by mono-sign), while a word can be polysemantic;
- the synonymy relationship is excluded, theoretically, between terms, while between words synonymous relationships can be established;
- the term can be made up of several words, updating itself as a syntactic group;
- terms do not frequently use the same word forms as word-specific ones. They are more composed of elements of Greco-Latin or syntagmatic constructions than words in the standard language;
- the term can also be constructed from symbols, letters, numbers, mathematical, physical, chemical formulas, while the written word is a graphemic sequence that reproduces a phonemic structure (morphological, syntactic);
- treated as signs in relation to reality, in the case of the word its arbitrary character is more obvious, while, in the case of the term, it tends towards a relative motivation, by reference to other units of the terminological system, based on the notion expressed in a notional field and proven by finding the linguistic designations from that notional field in the structure of the new term.
- the word is represented by any linguistic unit component of a natural language; the term is only that linguistic unit that belongs to a specialized language" (Cabré, 1993: 87-89).

We can safely state that terms are, in effect, words, or, at least, created through words, but not all words can be deemed as being terms. Simply put, a term implies a higher degree of specialisation, of elitism, it is not wildly accessible to the masses, but it is characterised by unquestionable precision throughout the normative perception of specialised users, both speakers and listeners. Terms are the proverbial bread and butter in the field of science and specialised areas of communication. A term is formal and expresses solid functionalities while the word exists within the realm of neutrality and is available to unspecialised assemblies of individuals supporting day-to-day lives and activities, enabling communication as a whole.

Words are at the bottom of the pyramid of meaning. Although they do not commandeer superior specialisation, they are essential to the proper inner workings of a language. Their commonality endorses human interactions and forges bonds of friendship and affection. The top of the pyramid is formed, almost exclusively, from terms. They are the expression of professional progress and specialisation, allowing for superior definitions and mechanisms of integration. Moreover, they are not restrictive by definition, it is not forbidden to know or understand those terms, yet one cannot simply access or understand superior, integrated definitions without exploring the initial steps of communication, namely the words. Mastering or thoroughly exploring words will open the door to understanding and properly utilising some or even the full power of terminology which is, by definition, specialised.

When approaching the differentiation between words and terms, we must explore the conventional nature of terminology. It is generally understood that the arbitrary nature of words is powered by an insufficient connection between the signifier and signified. Terms exhibit a different pattern or shift in paradigm as the connectivity between notion and its subsequent designation is not at all random, but a solidified version of communication that is built upon general agreement among specialised users. This trait of the terms is all the more obvious in the context of communicational units of terminology that have undertaken a strong consensus of stability. Terms are the building blocks of notions, and the same cannot be attested regarding words, as words are more attached to grammar structures, acting as building blocks rather than superior elements of linguistic integration.

In her investigation of the connection between language and term, Elena Croitoru (2004) identifies terms as a superior linguistic manifestation which enhance not only meaning and precision, but also act as catalysts for the generation of specialised linguistic structures and formulations which are able to accommodate the new standard of the language:

- "Nominative + infinitive with present and past reference, pointing to both simultaneity and anteriority relationship – *it was considered to be, it proved to have been*;
- Accusative + infinitive with simultaneity relationship (e.g.: *the bank considers card payments to be the most efficient*);
- preposition + gerund and verbal nouns;
- verbal adjectives;
- gerund as a subject (usually rendered in Romanian by *prin faptul că* or used after instead of and translated *și nu*);
- passive constructions, which have the highest frequency in specialised texts;
- the use of the subjunctive mood specific to formal English, hence specialised texts" (Croitoru, 2004: 21).

Word vs. Term - Language for Specific Purposes

From the perspective of linguistics, it is made evident that terminology exists within a higher realm of understanding compared to word proliferation. Terms can be based on one word, a combination between two words or perhaps even a multiplicity of words, and their purpose is to enhance the connection between linguistics and terminology. The most important difference between term and word is, ultimately, attached to the frame of established reference. A word can ascend to the status of term if the notion it serves is circumvented to an area of science or specialised language and can adequately function within that mechanism. This definition of the term sees the analysis of components of both meaning and purpose adhere to singular and precise extensions. The analysis of the units of meaning must be completed by the specification of the field of reference and the highlighting of the relations between the expressed concept and the whole system. If any word can be assimilated, under certain conditions, to a term, not every term, as we have seen, can be identified with a word. Given that many times, at the level of common usage, the term and the word are used as synonyms, without any differentiation of meaning, perhaps it would be clearer if we were talking in terminology about terminological unity - simple or complex.

To describe the functioning of the linguistic sign, semiology uses a scheme well known as the semiotic triangle, of Aristotelian tradition: form - meaning - referent. Terminology took over this means of representation, but using another formulation: the form of the term - notion (concept, intention) - object (extension).

According to Ferdinand de Saussure:

"The linguistic sign unites, not a thing and a name, but a concept and a sound-image.' The latter is not the material sound, a purely physical thing, but the psychological imprint of the sound, the impression that it makes on our senses. The sound-image is sensory, and if I happen to call it "material", it is only in that sense, and by way of opposing it to the other term of the association, the concept, which is generally more abstract". (De Saussure, 1966:66)

The relationship between the meaning of a term and its ability to designate reality is its denominative value. The ability of words / terms to have a referent is a function of language as important as designating a concept. In the field of specialised communication, it becomes a primary element. There are words devoid of denominative value, therefore devoid of referent, grammatical tools whose value is purely syntactic. In principle, the term has a certain denominative value. However, even words / terms whose denominative value is indisputable, may have uses in which the referent is fictitious or only absent: 'robot', for example, evokes a reality that we know, more or less, as functioning in certain branches of industry, for example - "industrial robots". But the phrase android robot is born from the fantasy of writers. On the other hand, in a phrase like: "There are no robots in this lab", the negative form indicates the absence of any referent.

On a case-by-case basis, therefore, a term, even having a denominative value, may or may not evoke a real object, depending on its use. We must also remember the difference between the virtual reference and the current reference. The first case is the ability of words to have references. It can be identified at the level of language, of the system. The current reference is at the level of discourse and consists in the effective evocation of one or more references. In the case of monosomy, the differences between the two are almost imperceptible, but in the case of polysemantic lexical units, the updated reference in discourse selects a single element of reality.

Any linguistic sign, except proper names, refers in the structure of the language to a class of objects characterized by common features. In terms of reference, therefore, the signs are category-related. However, the referent can be individualized through a series of determinations. In this context, however, the occurrence of any term names a specific object.

For the scientific language the exact rendering of the reality in logical and linguistic plan is of a special importance. This is the only language that tries to respect the objective limits of reality. Science uses language both to represent, in an exact way, the real, the concrete, and especially, to analyse the designated elements, stating something about them. The classifications operated by science do not always coincide with those of the current language, governed rather by the subjectivity of the speakers. The ideal of scientific language is quite difficult to achieve because, having its basis in the common language, it cannot neutralize its valences, it cannot always reduce the connotative meanings, polysemy, homonymy. That is why the precise identification of objects acquires a special importance in the specialized sphere.

In interpreting the connection between word and term, De Saussure (1966) places great emphasis on the psychological nature of linguistic and communicative imagery:

"The psychological character of our sound-images becomes apparent when we observe our own speech. Without moving our lips or tongue, we can talk to ourselves or recite mentally a selection of verse. Because we regard the words of our language as sound-images, we must avoid speaking of the "phonemes" that make up the words. This term, which suggests vocal activity, is applicable to the spoken word only, to the realization of the inner image in discourse. We can avoid that misunderstanding by speaking of the sounds and syllables of a word provided we remember that the names refer to the sound-image" (De Saussure, 1966: 66).

According to the model of logic, in terminology we speak of concept or notion and not of meaning. The concept is a unit of thought, a mental representation, a product of the abstraction and generalization of a given reality, consisting of a set of characters assigned to an object or a class of objects, expressed by a term or a symbol. Another designation of this plan, specific to terminology is that of intention. We note that the meaning of the word is a set of lexical and grammatical elements, both competing in its definition. In the process of explaining and defining the terms, the primary meaning is usually used. The meaning retains only those elements which are necessary to differentiate it. Intentional expression means the totality of properties that an object must have in order to be able to apply a certain name to it, even if, even in this case, they are retained in certain situations, in definition, for example, only specific parts.

The general characteristics of the superclass are added to those specific to the classes. For example, the general characteristics of the superclass "currency" are added to the characteristics of the class "dollars" or "pounds". They can exist both virtually and cash, and they are used for the procurement of goods and services. Then, the following elements are subclasses and orders, the latter including other features that also differentiate concretely. The number of distinctive characteristics increases even more when it comes to identifying a particular trait. At this level, the perceptual content of the word is changeable and may present distinctive, potential virtual features that are not necessarily related to the constant features of the object.

Word vs. Term - Language for Specific Purposes

By defining and understanding the lexicon, we can distinguish certain lexical traits whose analysis extends to semantic areas of comprehension. There is a direct connection between the study components and the lexical definition of words, and this pattern of connectivity is relevant due to the fact that lexicography as well as semantics are founded upon similar predications. Therefore, defined elements are firstly classified and only later clarified within subsequent classes of words. If a semantic analysis is performed with respect to classes whose lexical elements are grouped by commonality that is referentially established, then they will be attributed to an investigation of proximity, seeing as common elements can exist in groups, but can also be uttered through the use of a signal word. Particular differences that are categorized from a lexical standpoint are often constant and exhibit an increased level of referential stability.

Conclusions

In terminology, according to patterns of logic, we speak of the extension of a term, which includes all the objects (references) that can be designated by it. The definition of a term by extension corresponds to a definition by reference. Didactic works often offer in a schematic form the extension of a studied notion. A characteristic of the terminology, in general, and of the current terminology, in particular, is the ontological approach and, therefore, the special importance that is given to the referent, to the extension. The starting point is the existing pattern, which is analysed, according to its characteristics, and not the word in itself.

Analysing terms from this perspective is tributary to the unique understanding of differences between notions, which ultimately belong to the same category, this including even synonyms or words that exhibit proximity of meaning. Via this methodology, the connectivity of terms becomes a reality. A translation analysis sees patterns implemented between two distinct signifiers belonging to separate languages which are correspondent to the same signified element.

References:

- Bărbuceanu, C. D. (2020a). Visual teaching – Using digitalized material to engage ESP students. *Revista de Științe Politice. Revue des Sciences Politiques*, Craiova: Universitaria Publishing House, no. 67.
- Bărbuceanu, C. D. (2020b). Teaching the Digital Natives. *Revista de Științe Politice. Revue des Sciences Politiques*, Craiova: Universitaria Publishing House, no. 65.
- Cabré, M. T. (1993). *La terminologia. Teoria, metodologia, aplicaciones*. Barcelona: Editorial Antartida/Empuries.
- Cabré, M. T. (1999). *Terminology. Theory, Methods and Applications*. Edited by Juan Sager, translated by Janet DeCesaris. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cabré, M. T. (1999). *Terminology. Theory, Methods and Applications*. In: Helmi Sonneveld, Sue Ellen Wright (eds.), *Terminology and Lexicography Research and practice*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Croitoru, E. (ed.). (2004). *English through Translation. Interpretation and Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. Galați: Editura Fundației Universitare Dunărea de Jos.
- De Saussure, F. (1966). *Course in General Linguistics*, Translated by Wade Baskin. Edited by Perry Meisel and Haun Saussy (Meisel P. & Saussy H., Eds.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

- Faber, P., Lopez-Rodriguez, C. I. (2012). *Terminology and specialized language*. In Pamela Faber (Ed.), *A Cognitive Linguistics View of Terminology and Specialized Language*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Picht, H., Draskau., J. (1985). *Terminology: An Introduction*. Guildford, UK: University of Surrey.
- Sager, J. C., Dungworth, D., Macdonald P. F. (1980). *English Special languages. Principles and Practice in Science and Technology*, Wiesbaden:Brandstetter.
- Sager, J. (1990). *A Practical Course in Terminology Processing*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Article Info

Received: March 24 2021

Accepted: April 02 2021
