NEOLOGISMS

Xamidova Parizod Abdumanat kizi
Nurabad district, Samarkand region
School English teacher 21

Annotation: *This article reflects information about neologism and its foundations.*
Key words: *new words,* fly machine*,* fire vehicle*, and* lightning (electricity), good, bad*;* hot, cold*;* high, low*;* right, wrong*;* dark, light*.*

Every living language can readily be adapted to meet changes occurring in the life and culture of its speakers, and the main weight of such changes falls on vocabulary. Grammatical and phonological structures are relatively stable and change noticeably over centuries rather than decades (*see below* Linguistic change), but vocabularies can change very quickly both in word stock and in word meanings. Among the drivers of this sort of change, technology is among the most significant.

Every language can alter its vocabulary very easily, which means that every user can without effort adopt new words, accept or invent new meanings for existing words, and, of course, cease to use some words or cease to use them in certain meanings. Dictionaries identify some words and some meanings as "obsolete" or "obsolescent" to indicate this process. No two speakers share precisely the same vocabulary of words readily used and readily understood, though they may speak the same dialect. They will, however, naturally have the great majority of words in their vocabularies in common.

Languages have various resources for effecting changes in vocabulary. Meanings of existing words may change. With the virtual disappearance of falconry as a sport in England, *lure* has lost its original meaning of a bunch of feathers on a string by which hawks were recalled to their handler and is used now mainly in its metaphorical sense of enticement. Words such as *computer* and *jet* acquired new ranges of meaning in the mid-20th century.

All languages have the means of creating new words to bear new meanings. These can be new creations; *chortle*, which entered into general use in the 20th century, was a jocular creation of the English writer and mathematician Lewis Carroll (creator of *Alice in Wonderland*), and *gas* was formed in the 17th century by the Belgian chemist and physician Jan Baptista van Helmont as a technical term in chemistry, loosely modeled on the Greek *chaos* ("formless void"). Mostly, though, languages follow definite patterns in their innovations. Words can be made up without limit from existing words or from parts of words; the sources of *railroad* and *aircraft* are obvious. The controversy over the relations between church and state in the 19th and early 20th centuries gave rise to a chain of new words as the debate proceeded: *disestablishmentarian*, *antidisestablishmentarian*, *antidisestablishmentarianism*. Usually, the bits and pieces of words used in this way are those found in other such combinations, but this is not always so. The term *permafrost* (terrain that is perennially frozen) contains a bit of *permanent* probably not hitherto found in any other word.

A particular source of technical neologisms in European languages has been the words and word elements of Latin and Greek. This is part of the cultural history of western Europe, in so many ways the continuation of Greco-Roman civilization. *Microbiology*

and *dolichocephalic* are words well formed according to the rules of Greek as they would be taken over into English, but no records survive of *mikrobiologia* and *dolichokephalikos* ever having been used in Ancient Greek. The same is true of Latinate creations such as *reinvestment* and *longiverbosity*. The long tradition of looking to Latin and, since the Renaissance, to Greek also as the languages of European civilization keeps alive the continuing formation of learned and scientific vocabulary in English and other European languages from these sources (late 20th-century coinages using the Greek prefix *cyber-* provide an example). The dependence on the classical languages in Europe is matched by a similar use of Sanskrit words for certain parts of learned vocabulary in some modern Indian languages (Sanskrit being the classical language of India). Such phenomena are examples of loanwords, one of the readiest sources for vocabulary extension.

Loanwords are words taken into a language from another language (the term borrowing is used for the process). Most obviously, this occurs when new things come into individuals' experiences as the result of contacts with users of other languages. This is part of the history of every language, except for one used by an impossibly isolated community. *Tea* from Chinese, *coffee* from Arabic, and *tomato*, *potato*, and *tobacco* from American Indian languages are familiar examples of loanwords designating new products that have been added to the vocabulary of English. In more abstract areas, several modern languages of India and Pakistan contain many words that relate to government, industry, and current technology taken in from English. This is the result of British rule in these countries up to independence and the worldwide use of English as a language of international science since then.

In general, loanwords are rapidly and completely assimilated to the prevailing grammatical and phonological patterns of the borrowing language. The German word *Kindergarten*, literally "children's garden," was borrowed into English in the middle of the 19th century to designate an informal school for young children. It is now regularly pronounced as an English word, and the plural is *kindergartens* (not *Kindergärten*, as in German). Occasionally, however, some loanwords retain marks of their foreign origin; examples include Latin plurals such as *cacti* and *narcissi* (as contrasted with native patterns such as *cactuses* and *narcissuses*).

Languages differ in their acceptance of loanwords. An alternative way of extending vocabulary to cope with new products is to create a descriptive compound from within one's own language. English *aircraft* and *aeroplane* are, respectively, examples of a native compound and a Greek loan creation for the same thing. English *potato* is a loan; French *pomme de terre* (literally, "apple of the earth") is a descriptive compound. Chinese is particularly resistant to loans; *aircraft*, *railway*, and *telephone* are translated by newly formed compounds meaning literally *fly machine*, *fire vehicle*, and *lightning (electricity) language*. Some countries try to resist loans, believing that they reduce a language's identity or "purity," and introduce laws aimed at stopping the influx and form committees to provide native translations. Language change, however, is never restrained by such efforts; even in countries that have followed a legal road (such as France), loanwords continue to flow into everyday speech. It can be argued that loans add to a language's richness and flexibility: English itself has received loans from more than 350 languages.

Language and conceptualization

The ability to communicate and the ability to conceptualize are very closely linked, and the typical child learns both these skills together at the same time. This is not to say that thinking is no more than subvocal speech, as some behaviourists have proposed; most people can think pictorially and in simple diagrams, some to a greater degree than others,

and one has the experience of responding rationally to external stimuli without intervening verbalization. But, as 18th-century thinkers saw, human rationality developed and still goes hand in hand with the use of language, and a good deal of the flexibility of languages has been exploited in humans' progressive understanding and conceptualizing of the world they live in and of their relations with others. Different cultures and different periods have seen this process differently developed. The anthropological linguist Edward Sapir put it well: "The 'real world' is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group."

Much of this lies in the irrecoverable prehistory of languages. The idea that there are still some primitive, almost "fossil," languages, embodying a very low level of conceptualization, is a vain one. All that can be said is that languages are different and that, in part, the world is seen differently through the eyes of speakers or users of different languages. But, in some cases, part of the lexical adaptation of a language to developing thought patterns can be followed through.

Ancient Greece saw a wholly unique growth and flowering of civilization in the 1st millennium BCE, which has put virtually the entire civilized world in its debt ever since. In Greek, along with the emergence of certain abstract concepts and ways of thinking, one can follow some of the changes of word meanings and the coining of new words that accompanied this. As an example, the word *dikē* originally meant "way" or "manner," and thereafter it acquired the meaning of the "right way of doing something," "the right way of behaving," and finally "abstract right." Its derivative *dikaiosynē*, traditionally translated "justice," became the subject of philosophical debate and analysis by the Greek philosophers and covered almost the whole range of moral obligation involved in the relations of one person with others in society. Similar debate and refinement of key terms in the various branches of thought covered by Greek philosophy can be followed through; indeed, the term *philosophy* is directly taken from Greek *philosophia*, a compound formed not later than the 5th century BCE from *philo-* (compare *philein*, "to love") and *sophia* ("wisdom") to refer to abstract speculation and debate of a fundamental nature about the world and humans' place in it.

An examination of the lexical structure of languages throws some light on the relations between various aspects of human conceptualization. Spatial relations and their expression seem to lie very deep in the content of vocabulary. Words referring to time are drawn metaphorically from spatial words with great frequency: *a long/short time*, *the near future*, *far ahead/separated in time*. Although time is a continuum, people readily divide it up into bits and record it rather as they do materials extended in space: *five years*, *three months*, *six seconds*. This last use of vocabulary may be a particular trait of European languages and some others. An American Indian language is reported not to do this nearly so readily; it uses cardinal numbers only for discrete, countable objects. A separate class of words aligns the vocabulary of sequential time with that of intensity, so repetition of the same activity again and again (to a European) is rather the intensification of a single activity. Certain differences in cultural attitudes and world outlook are said to accompany this kind of linguistic difference.

Spatial terms are also freely used in the expression of other, more abstract relationships: *higher temperature*, *higher quality*, *lower expectations*, *summit of a career*, *far removed from any sensible course of action*, *a distant relationship*, *close friends*, *over and above what had been said*. It has been theorized that the linguistic forms most closely associated semantically with the expression of relations—case inflections in languages exhibiting this category—are originally and basically spatial in meaning. This "localist" theory, as it has been called, has been debated since the beginning of the 19th

century and probably cannot be accepted as it stands, but the fact that it can be proposed and argued shows the dominant position that spatial relations hold in the conceptualization and verbalization of relations in other realms of thought.

It has been maintained that the human brain has a preference for binary oppositions, or polarities. If this is so, it will help explain the numerous pairs of related antonyms that are found: *good, bad*; *hot, cold*; *high, low*; *right, wrong*; *dark, light*; and so on. For finer discriminations, these terms can be put into more narrowly specified fields containing more than two terms taken together, but their most general use is in binary contrasts. Here, however, one term seems to represent the fundamental semantic category in question. In asking about size, one asks *How big is it?*; about weight, *How heavy is it?*; and about evaluation, *How good is it?* It is possible to ask how small, how light, or how bad something is, but such questions presuppose that the thing in mind has already been graded on the small side, on the light side, or on the bad side.

Style

The capacity for conceptualization possessed and developed by languages is by no means the only purpose language serves. A person's speech, supplemented by facial expression and gesture when speaker and hearer are mutually in sight, indicates and is intended to indicate a great deal more than factual information, inquiries, and requests. Similarly, sign languages incorporate facial expressions and body language to add meaning and nuance. The fact that some of these other functions are performed by parts of a language usually mastered later by foreign learners gives rise to misinterpretation and often makes foreign speakers appear rude or insensitive when they are, in actuality, simply deploying fewer resources in the language.

Within the range of the structural and lexical possibilities of a language, speakers (or senders) are able to convey their emotional attitudes and feelings toward the person or persons they are addressing (receivers) and toward the subject matter of what they are saying (sending). They are also able to conceal such feelings as one form of linguistic deception, though this is usually a harder task. These same resources are also exploited to arouse appropriate feelings and responses in others, again independently of any factual content. This is the chosen field of the propagandist, the preacher, the orator, the barrister (lawyer), and the advertiser. Spoken languages make use of intonation and voice qualities in these different ways; a person can produce and recognize the intonation and type of voice employed in coaxing, in pleading, in browbeating, in threatening, in pleasure, and in anger, as well as those appropriate for matter-of-fact statements and the exposition of details about which the speaker has little or no emotional involvement.

To describe exactly which phonetic features are brought into play is quite another matter, involving advanced competence in phonetic discrimination and analysis. Grammar and vocabulary are equally involved, though differently in each language. English speakers know the difference between *Come and give me a hand!* and *Could you possibly come and help me?*; *He's got the gift of gab* and *He is undoubtedly a fluent and persuasive speaker* are each appropriate for different occasions. By greetings and leave-takings a great deal of intended interpretation of the social relations between individuals can be expressed. Much of this is the "good manners" taught to children and expected of adults; these aspects of language behaviour vary from culture to culture and group to group, but in none are they wholly absent. It is, of course, equally possible to be deliberately bad mannered or deliberately to flout a linguistic convention or expectation, but this can be done only by knowing what is expected in the situation. The refinements of rudeness, like the refinements of politeness, insofar as the use of language is involved, require a very good knowledge of

a language. Equal levels of sophistication are behind the process known as code-switching, wherein individuals move between different linguistic codes depending on the social contexts in which they find themselves.

Written language is no less adapted to conveying more than just factual information, asking factual questions, and giving instructions. Intonation and tone of voice are not easily reproducible in orthographic systems, but part of the skill of novelists or reporters is to convey these features of speech in their descriptions. Additionally, as the examples above show, grammatical and lexical choices are available to the writer, and anyone who has written anything to someone else knows the challenges of making words achieve precisely the purpose for which they are intended.

These variations within a language or within any dialect of a language, may be referred to as styles. Each time people communicate, they do so in one or another style, deliberately chosen with the sort of considerations in mind that have just been mentioned, even though in speech the choice may often be routine. Sometimes style, especially in literature, is contrasted with plain everyday language. In using such plain unmarked types of language, however, one is no less choosing a particular style, even though it is the most commonly used one and the most neutral in that it conveys and arouses the least emotional involvement or personal feelings.

Stylistic differences are available to all mature native speakers or users and in literate communities to all writers, as well as to foreigners who know a second language very well. But there is undoubtedly a considerable range of skills in exploiting all the resources of a language, and communities have always recognized and usually respected certain individuals as preeminently skilled in particular styles, as orators, storytellers, preachers, poets, scribes, belletrists, and so forth. This is the material of literature and, in societies without writing, oral literature.

In all languages, certain forms of expression have been considered worthy of preservation, study, and cultivation. In writing, the nature of written surfaces makes this fairly easy, though not all written material is deliberately preserved; much of it is deliberately destroyed, and, although the chance survival of inscriptions on stone or clay is of the greatest value to the archaeologist and historian, a good deal of such material was never intended to survive. Literature, on the other hand, is essentially regarded as of permanent worth. Printing and, in earlier days, the copying of manuscripts are the means of preserving written literature. In communities without writing, certain persons memorize narratives, poems, songs, prayers, ritual texts, and the like, and these are passed on, with new creations in such styles, to succeeding generations. Such skills, preservative as well as creative, are likely to be lost along with much of the surrounding culture under the impact of literacy. Here, modern recording technology has come to the rescue, and many workers in the field of unwritten languages are preserving specimens of oral literatures with transcriptions and translations while speakers having the requisite knowledge and skills are still available. A great amount of such material, however, must have been irretrievably lost from cultures without writing before the 20th century.

All languages have a literature, but different types of literature flourish in different languages and in different cultures. A warrior caste or a general respect for martial prowess fosters heroic verse or prose tales; urban yearnings for the supposed joys of country life encourage the development of pastoral poetry, itself an outgrowth of the songs of shepherds and rural workers; and the same sense of the jadedness of city life is the best ground for the cultivation of satirical verse and prose, a form of literature probably confined largely to urban civilizations. Every language has the resources to meet these and other cultural requirements in its literature as the occasions arise, but some literary forms are more deeply

involved in the structure of the language itself; this is made clear by the relative difficulty of translating certain types of literature and literary styles from one language to another. Poetry, in particular, is closely bound to the structure of the language in which it is composed, and poetry is notoriously difficult to translate from one language into another.

The special vocabularies and linguistic forms used in several games have already been mentioned. Here one may point to the widespread existence of verbal games themselves, based on the accidental features of a particular language. English-speaking children are accustomed to riddles, puns, and spelling games: "I spy with my little eye something beginning with *p*" (notice the regular formula with which this opens). These and similar word games have been found all over the world. Homer records the punning use by Odysseus of *No-man* (Greek *Outis*) as his name when he was about to attack Cyclops, who then roared out "No-man is killing me!" and so failed to attract any help. In some languages that make use of lexically distinctive tones, tone puns (words alike but for having different tones) are a form of word play.

As an intellectual challenge, the crossword puzzle in all its varieties, originally an American development early in the 20th century, has maintained popularity over much of the literate world that employs the Latin (Roman) alphabet. Crossword-puzzle solvers rely heavily on the relative probabilities of letter sequences in written words to suggest an answer to a partly filled line, and, depending on the particular style of the originator, crossword clues make use of many sorts of formal features in the language, among them spelling puns, spoken puns, and accidental letter sequences in words and phrases. To be able to solve a crossword puzzle in a second language shows a high degree of skill and knowledge therein.

Language and social differentiation and assimilation

The part played by variations within a language in differentiating social and occupational groups in a society has already been referred to above. In language transmission this tends to be self-perpetuating unless deliberately interfered with. Children are in general brought up within the social group to which their parents and immediate family circle belong, and they learn the dialect and communication styles of that group along with the rest of the subculture and behavioral traits and attitudes that are characteristic of it. This is a largely unconscious and involuntary process of acculturation, but the importance of the linguistic manifestations of social status and of social hierarchies is not lost on aspirants for personal advancement in stratified societies. The deliberate cultivation of an appropriate dialect, in its lexical, grammatical, and phonological features, has been the self-imposed task of many persons wishing "to better themselves" and the butt of unkind ridicule on the part of persons already feeling themselves secure in their social status or unwilling to attempt any change in it. Much of the comedy in George Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion* (first performed in 1913, with subsequent film adaptations) turns on Eliza Doolittle's need to unlearn her native Cockney if she is to rise in the social scale. Culturally and subculturally determined taboos play a part in all this, and persons desirous of moving up or down in the social scale have to learn what words to use and what words to avoid if they are to be accepted and to "belong" in their new position.

The same considerations apply to changing one's language as to changing one's dialect. Language changing is harder for the individual and is generally a rarer occurrence, but it is likely to be widespread in any mass immigration movement. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, the eagerness with which immigrants and the children of immigrants from continental Europe living in the United States learned and insisted on speaking English is an illustration of their realization that English was the linguistic badge of full membership

in their new homeland at the time when the country was proud to consider itself the melting pot in which people of diverse linguistic and cultural origins would become citizens of a unified community. A reverse movement, typically by third-generation immigrants, manifests a concern to be in contact again with the ancestral language.

The same sort of self-perpetuation, in the absence of deliberate rejection, operates in the special languages of sports and games and of trades and professions (these are in the main concerned with special vocabularies). Game learners, apprentices, and professional students learn the locutions together with the rest of the game or the job. The specific words and phrases occur in the teaching process and are observed in use, and novices are only too eager to display an easy competence with such phraseology as a mark of their full membership of the group.

Languages and variations within languages play both a unifying and a diversifying role in human society as a whole. Language is a part of culture, but culture is a complex totality containing many different features, and the boundaries between cultural features are not clear-cut, nor do they all coincide. Physical barriers such as oceans, high mountains, and wide rivers constitute impediments to human intercourse and to culture contacts, though modern technology in the fields of travel and communications makes such geographical factors of less and less account. More potent for much of the 20th century were political restrictions on the movement of people and of ideas, such as divided western Europe from formerly communist eastern Europe; the frontiers between these two political blocs represented much more of a cultural dividing line than any other European frontiers.

The distribution of the various components of cultures differs, and the distribution of languages may differ from that of nonlinguistic cultural features. This results from the varying ease and rapidity with which changes may be acquired or enforced and from the historical circumstances responsible for these changes. From the end of World War II until 1990, for example, the division between East and West Germany represented a major political and cultural split in an area of relative linguistic unity. It is significant that differences of vocabulary and usage were noticeable on each side of that division, overlying earlier differences attributed to regional dialects.

Nationalistic influences on language

Deliberate interference with the natural course of linguistic changes and the distribution of languages is not confined to the facilitating of international intercourse and cooperation. Language as a cohesive force for nation-states and for linguistic groups within nation-states has for long been manipulated for political ends. Multilingual states can exist and prosper; Switzerland is a good example. But linguistic rivalry and strife can be disruptive. Language riots have occurred in Belgium between French and Flemish speakers and in parts of India between rival vernacular communities. A language can become or be made a focus of loyalty for a minority community that thinks itself suppressed, persecuted, or subjected to discrimination. The French language in Canada in the mid-20th century is an example. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, Irish Gaelic, or Irish, came to symbolize Irish patriotism and Irish independence from Great Britain, and Irish became Ireland's first official language at that country's independence. Government documents are published in Irish and English (the country's second official language), and Irish is taught in state schools, though it remains under the significant international pressures exerted by English that are described above.

A language may be a target for attack or suppression if the authorities associate it with what they consider a disaffected or rebellious group or a culturally inferior one. There have been periods when American Indian children were forbidden to speak a language other than English at school and when pupils were not allowed to speak Welsh in British

state schools in Wales. Both these prohibitions have been abandoned. After the Spanish Civil War of the 1930s, Basque speakers were discouraged from using their language in public as a consequence of the strong support given by the Basques to the republican forces. Interestingly, on the other side of the Franco-Spanish frontier, French Basques were positively encouraged to keep their language in use, if only as an object of touristic interest and consequent economic benefit to the area.

Language typology

Language families, as conceived in the historical study of languages, should not be confused with the quite separate classifications of languages by reference to their sharing certain predominant features of grammatical structure. Such classifications give rise to what are called typological classes.

In fulfilling the requirements of open-ended creativity imposed on language by human beings, grammatical structure has things in common in all known languages, particularly at the deeper levels of grammar. All known languages have words or wordlike elements combined in accordance with rules into sentences; all known languages distinguish in some way nounlike and verblike sentence components; and all known languages have the means of embedding or subordinating one sentence within another as an included clause (e.g., *the sun set* and *we returned home*: *When the sun set, we returned home*; *Joan was playing tennis* and *Joan twisted her ankle*: *Joan, who was playing tennis, twisted her ankle*, or *while she was playing tennis, Joan twisted her ankle*). Descriptive analyses of all the languages of the world have not yet been prepared, and, of course, there is information about only a minute number of those that are no longer used—namely, those few that were written. But there is enough known to make the assertion of such universal features as have been given with fair confidence. These are often referred to as language universals; their nature and extent is the subject of ongoing discussion and research.

Within these very general guidelines, however, languages exhibit various types of structure. This can most readily be seen by comparing the relations between the forms of words and their syntactic functions in different languages. Such a comparison is the basis of three broad types of language that have been distinguished since the beginning of the 19th century. They are, in fact, more like characteristics than types, in that most languages contain traces of all three, in different proportions.

Classical Chinese made little or no use of word-form variation, such as is found, for example, in Latin, for grammatical purposes. Sentence structure was expressed by word order, word grouping, and the use of specific grammatical words, or particles. Such languages have been called isolating or analytic. Modern Chinese languages are much less analytic than is often believed; probably, Vietnamese is the most fully representative of this type today. Some languages string together, or agglutinate, successive bits, each with a specific grammatical function, into the body of single words. Turkish is a typical agglutinative language: compare Turkish *evleri*, "houses" (accusative case), in which *ev* is the root meaning "house," *-ler* marks plurality, and *-i* is the sign for accusative, with Latin *domūs*, in which *-ūs* combines the representation of accusative and plural without the possibility of assigning either category separately to one part of the word ending. Latin is in this respect an inflectional, or fusional, language. In a more extreme example, Latin *ī* "go!" cumulatively represents in one fused form the verb meaning "go," active voice, imperative mood, second person, and singular number, each a grammatically distinct category.

English, like many other languages, includes features of all three types. In its use of word order alone to distinguish grammatical differences (*the dog chased the cat*; *the cat*

chased the dog), it resembles Classical Chinese rather than Latin. In a word form such as *manliness*, in which each bit can be assigned a grammatical function (*man* the basic noun, *-li-* the adjective formative, and *-ness* the abstract noun formative), it makes use of agglutination, whereas plurals such as *men* and *geese* and past tenses such as *came* and *ran* fuse distinct grammatical categories into a word form in which only arbitrarily can one allot some sound segments, or letters, to one and some to the other.

Assigning languages to different types in this way involves a delicate procedure of balancing one part of the grammar against another and deciding which type of structure predominates and how well the other types are represented. Languages predominantly of each of the types are found in communities at all levels of civilization and with all types of culture.

In the course of transmission, grammatical structures change, just as do pronunciation and meanings, and in time the cumulative effect may be the transference of a language from one overall type to another, although it remains descended from the earlier language and therefore is just as much part of the same historical family. Latin is very different typologically from French in its grammatical structure, but French is nevertheless the form that Latin took in France in the course of time. In the matter of the grammatical relevance of word order, the absence of case inflections in nouns, and the use of verbal auxiliaries instead of single word tense forms, French is more like English, a distant cousin within the Indo-European family, than it is like Latin, its immediate progenitor (compare French *j'ai donné*, English *I have given*, Latin *dedī*). The two sorts of language classification, historical and typological, serve different purposes and are differently based. Language families group languages together on the basis of descent—i.e., unbroken transmission from an earlier common parent language. The evidence is, in the main, systematic correspondences among the shapes of words of similar meanings (e.g., Greek *patēr*, Latin *pater*, French *père*, German *Vater*, English *father*). Languages are put into typological classes, with the reservation already mentioned, on the basis of certain overall similarities of structure irrespective of historical relations. Though these two classifications may coincide with some languages, as is the case to a great extent in the Bantu family, they do so only contingently; being based on different data and oriented differently, they do not logically or necessarily imply each other.

References:

1. Ginzburg R.S. A course in Modern English Lexicology / R.S. Ginzburg, S.S. Khidekel. – M.: Higher School, 1979. – 298 p. – P. 197.
2. Zhou, L. (2016). Neologism in News English, Sino-US English Teaching, 13(4), 292-295. https://doi.org/10.17265/1539-8072/2016.04.007
3. Silvia, P. (2001)'Handbook of Terminology.' Terminology and standardization Directorate. Translation Bureau. Public Works and Government Services Canada.