

## CONCLUSION

In the professional usage of a foreign language, a command of linguistics metalanguage is necessary. Our approach is that it can be achieved through the explanation and explication of systemic configuration and causality of linguistic phenomena with regard to intralingual and interlingual relations. Intersemiotic interlinking of linguistics terms, to our knowledge, is absent in scholarly literature. In terms of intrasemiotic treatment, it is more common in specific languages; yet, it offers an insight into the linguistics terminology of a given language during the period in which the sources concerned were published. With regard to encyclopedic publications, merely the contents of the terms are presented. In bilingual or polylingual publications, only the translations of the terms without their conceptualizations are presented, i.e. the provided translation solutions are not justified. This evidences the non-existence of a source presenting interlingual interlinkage of form and content of linguistics terms, which also points to the lack of research shedding light on the similarities and discrepancies between the two linguo-cultures and their linguistics traditions.

Becoming a professional user of a foreign language should mean mastering the system of the language (including the linguistics metalanguage) and fluency; yet not only fluency in terms of communicating a message, but also conceptual fluency. A question arises what can be considered purposeful in grasping the nature of linguistics terminology. For the time being, our scope is the essential linguistics metalanguage in English and Slovak languages. Thus, the aim of the research was to design the conceptualizing process that is necessarily present if the true meaning of (linguistics) terminology is to be identified. The question was what approach should be undertaken in dealing with the linguistics terminology: mere translating can lead to inadequate fossilization; mere explaining can bring about inadequate mental picture of the term and concept. It follows that a purposeful approach seems to be such that guarantees that conceptualization has taken place. We believe this is a hybrid approach combining bilingual and encyclopedic information. In order to test the feasibility and appropriateness of this approach, the structure of the conceptualizing process was stated as such that encapsulates frame establishment, pre-understanding, salience, and code

configuration. The proposed process was attested to through looking into relevant fields and notions and offered data that pointed out interesting discrepancies.

Within the paradigm of Frame Semantics, this can be explained by the different frames that determine the usage of first and second language expressions. In other words, foreign language users may fail to know what framing device is intended for the appropriateness of a context in which a foreign language expression is used. The conceptual differences arise from the fact that “frames are created rather than reflected by language” (Fillmore 1985, p. 227). In order to foster conceptual fluency, we can think of frames as first-order and second-order. In the present research, the first-order frame is ‘linguistics’, within which we consider a term a textual unit, one that does not exist in isolation; rather it becomes delineated through its attachment to a particular second-order frame, i.e. a ‘particular linguistics branch’.

The linguistics terminology mirrors the distinctiveness of a language, which is why interlingual and/or intercultural incompatibility of the terms may often be the case. The knowledge of metalinguistic vocabulary of any field results from conscious learning. Conscious learning involves mastering a language in a systematic way, i.e. cognizant juxtaposition of two language systems with all relevant distinctive features. In acquiring linguistics metalanguage, we usually take for granted that foreign language expressions and structures are carriers of their native concepts. More often than not, however, this is not the case, and, as a matter of fact, an asymmetry occurs between language form and conceptual content. This is one of the implications that the research has pointed out. Furthermore, the material shows that terminology has its own life in the linguistics tradition of that particular cultural community. This is so even in the cases of terms sharing origin with terms from a different cultural community (as exemplified by the Latinate terms in our research). Present-day usage of the metalanguage evidences that not necessarily every concept has a counterpart with the same conceptualization in a different language. As lingua-cultures develop in their specific environment and at their own pace, we dare say these are applicable not only to English and Slovak, but also to other language pairs.