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Abstract

The present paper aims to investigate the concept of the analogue rule, as a method employed in translatology, while focusing on the term-formation processes employed in the texts of European Union in both, English and Slovak. The paper analyses thirty-two randomly selected terms taken from randomly selected EU text from the field of pharmacovigilance in both language versions, and it attempts to investigate the effectiveness of the application of the analogue rule. The results presented herein suggest that in the majority of the selected terms the application of the analogue rule is effective; however, the paper does not fully acknowledge the terminological discrepancy regarding the definition of term-formation processes, which may have an influence on the results.
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Introduction

The present paper aims to investigate the terminological equivalence in the European Union (EU) texts drafted in English and Slovak, while focusing on the term-formation processes applied while forming such terms and on the analogue rule, as one of the translatorial tools which should be followed. This paper will consider the texts to be translations despite the EU’s equivalence language policy, for all the documents are drafted in one of the working languages of EU (English, German, French) and then translated into all the other languages.

The European Union, being a specific establishment, creates space for new legal concepts to be named. The term-coining process within the EU context is carried out by lawyer-linguists, specialists in the fields of law and linguistics. Term-formation within this context is onomasiological and experts coining such terms have to follow not only the language-specific term-formation rules but they also have to acknowledge the EU regulations for term-formation.

Such rules are well described not only in the Slovak and English language (note Masár 2000, Furdík 2008, Sager 1990; processes employed in English and Slovak are compared in Bílá, Kačmarová et al. 2015) but also in the regulation on term-formation ISO 704:2000, providing for
and describing the processes to be employed when describing a new concept, which has been
issued by the institutions of European Union. Furdík (2008) elaborated several frameworks for
word-formation motivation, thus dividing word-formation processes into subgroups. His final
framework acknowledges for the elementary types of motivation (základné typy motivácie), the
additional types of motivation (nadstavbové typy motivácie) and the contact types of motivation
(kontaktová motivácia). This categorization was then carefully evaluated by Ološtiak (2009) who
acknowledged its complexity but also pointed out some limitations of such categorization.
However, despite being a useful tool for analysis (along with Masár’s work (2000)), these types
of motivation and the processes listed by Masár has been based on the Slovak language.
Therefore, I would like to stress the importance of the comparative-contrastive research focusing
on the parallel between English and Slovak word-formation process, which was conducted by
Bilá, Kačmárová, et al. (2015), which points out the differences and similarities between the
concepts of the word-formation processes in both languages. Though this paper is drafted in
English and so it should acknowledge the concepts as defined by English lexicology, I will also
draw on the aforementioned findings when commenting on the word-formation processes.

This paper might be contributing to the area of comparative lexicology within the EU
context as the amount of research covering for this issue seems to be limited. The issue of the
term equivalence in EU texts drafted in English and Bulgarian was researched by Yankova
(2015), who has proposed recommendations concerning the choice of an appropriate translational
equivalent, and the steps to be taken when there is no such equivalent. These findings are of
great importance as well, yet for the purposes of this paper her recommendations for coining
neologisms as mentioned later herein are crucial. Moreover, this particular research seems to be
the only one known to the author of this paper dealing with word-formation analysis within the
EU context, even though it tackles the issue only marginally.

This paper is structured in two parts. The first one is theoretical, dealing with the crucial methods
of term-formation, explaining them, and giving examples for better understanding of each term-
formation procedure. This part also covers the features which have to be demonstrated by every
new term which is standardised. The second part consists of the research (in a form of a case
study) carried out on the selected texts from the EU corpus, namely English and Slovak versions
of Regulation No. 1235/2010 of the European parliament and of the Council. The focus of the
research is on which term-formation procedures were applied on the selected terms, and on
stressing the occurrence of particular term-formation procedures in both, English and Slovak
version, and the agreement of such processes as proposed by analogue rule. The primal focus of
the research part is not only on the identification of the term-formation methods used in the
selected English terms, but also on the comparison of the methods used in English and Slovak
terms of the above mentioned texts, as far as Valeontis and Mantzari (2006) point out that the
term-formation mechanism in a target language should be preserved in a source language (which
lays the foundation for the research question of this paper). Even though the EU texts are not
translations due to the EU’s language policy, and none of them should be regarded either a source

1 Both available online at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html
text or translation, practice suggests that there is always a text serving as a draft for all the other language versions and such a text is usually drafted in one of the working languages.

1 Theoretical background

1.1 Terminology and terms

The very first thing to be defined for the purposes of the present analysis is the notion “terminology” because, as Valeontis and Mantzari (2006) suggest, it is important to understand that terminology has interdisciplinary character and so it borrows various tools for term formation from different disciplines in order to meet its own requirements. Sager (1990) describes three main dimensions related to terminology:

- the cognitive dimension – examining the concept relations and ascribing them certain definitions and terms,
- the linguistic dimension – examining existing and potential linguistic forms which can name new concepts,
- the communicative dimension – examining how terms transfer knowledge in various communicative situations.

The above-mentioned features of terminology, describing terminology as an interlinguistic discipline dealing with terms, their grammatical features, and how they work in the actual situation, can also be referred to by a cover term “the theory of terminology” as coined and defined by Masár (2000).

Another important notion to be defined for the purposes of this paper is a term itself. In his Ako pomenúvame v Slovenčine, Masár (2000) explains that a term is an element of the word stock of a particular language defining a concept and as such it is listed in the system of terms in a particular field, and has particular meaning in such a field, while European international standard dealing with terminology, ISO 704 (2000, p. 24), defines a term as “a designation consisting of one or more words representing a general concept in a special language”, and Furdík (2008) claims that a term is a specific type of sign.

In order to become fixed and accepted, a term has to get through several activities which are according to L!SE, the project of Elena Chioccehetti called Report Analysis of existing Terminology Workflows and funded by the European Commission, as follows (2012, p. 8):

1. “expression of need (related to specific domain(s)/term(s)/text(s); internal or external need; binding request/informal request; voiced by public or private entity);
2. documentation (collection of reference material; selection of reference material);
3. term selection (term extraction; term selection);
4. elaboration of terminology entries (concept system(s); term description in L1; equivalence in L2/L3/L4/...; term description in L2/L3/L4/...; expert consultation and validation; notes on equivalence; import/export data);
5. revision and quality check (linguistic revision; content revision; equivalence revision; formal revision);
6. **standardization** (term selection; study and discussion of material \(\rightarrow\) decision; official resolution);
7. **dissemination** (paper/online publications; application of decisions; dissemination in media)”; For the purposes of this paper, the primal focus will be on the activities employed in step number 3, the **term selection and formation** and step number 4 **elaboration of terminology entries**. For any following description of methods, it is necessary to bear in mind that terms can be simple or complex.

1.2 **The motivation behind EU terms**

According to Furdík (2008), the existence of every linguistic unit depends on three basic principles which are 1. anthropomorphisation (every lexical unit is human dependent), 2. parametrization (as defined in phraseology), and 3. motivation, while the last one is the focus of this subchapter. The lexical motivation behind word-formation processes is what explains the concept being expressed through a particular lexical unit only, it explains its existence, its function within the system, and when analyzed in a context, it suppresses the arbitrary nature of signs (Furdík 2008, Masár 2000, Lakoff 1987, Ološtiak 2009). Furdík (2008) further clarifies the claim of the lexical unit not being arbitrary but rather motivated. Concluding that each lexical unit is motivated in a certain way, it is claimed that all EU terms are motivated in a certain way as well. Furdík (2008, p. 33) proposed the working framework consisting of the following types of motivation: 1. Basic types of motivation, 1.1. Elementary (paradigmatic), 1.2. Specified, 1.2.1. Phonological, 1.2.2. Semantic, 1.2.3. Morphological, 1.2.4. Derivational, 1.2.5. Syntactic, 1.2.6. Phraseological, 1.2.7. Onymic, 2. Pragmatic types of motivation, 2.1. Expressive, 2.2. Stratificational, 2.3. Terminological, 2.4. Sociolectal, 2.5. Territorial, 2.6. Temporal, 2.7. Individual, 3. Contact types of motivation, 3.1. Acceptational, 3.2. Abbreviational. Ološtiak (2009), elaborating on his framework, defends the theory of motivational cooperation which is important for all the EU related terms analyzed later herein. Therefore, it is necessary to stress that all the terms analyzed herein are motivated differently on the level of basic types; however, on the level of pragmatic motivation they are terminologically and sociolectally motivate. As Furdík (2008) suggests, the motivation of the term dwells in its characteristics, particularly in accuracy, explicitness, clarity of meaning (the existence of an onomasiological structure, its place within the system, and derivativeness).

The following chapters, therefore, provide for the brief debate over all the term-formation processes employed in both, English and Slovak.

1.3 **Term formation methods**

Undoubtedly, the driving force behind term-formation is the need to name new concepts. Regarding EU, probably the biggest urge to employ new terms is in the new member states of the European Union. As a new member state joins the EU, such country must employ the European law and all the directives which have to be transferred into the language of such a state. As far as
the most commonly used working language of EU is English, this paper deals with term formation procedures used mainly in the English language. Though these are not applicable in all the languages, a relation between them and those used in Slovak can be drawn.

According to the official EU terminological standards ISO 704 (2000, p. 31), which is a part of ISO/TC 37, term-formation patterns depend on the lexical, morphosyntactic, and phonological structures of individual languages.

There are 4 main term-formation methods employed in both, English and Slovak language:

- Creating new forms
- Neologism
- Using existing forms
- Translingual borrowings (ISO 704 2000, Masár 2000)

For all the term-formation methods tackled later herein, it is necessary to mention that this paper does not aim to offer an exhaustive description of such methods, but rather to briefly introduce the most commonly used methods. These serve as theoretical background for the analysis conducted later in this paper.

1.3.1 Creating new forms

The ISO norm number 704 of November 2000 (ISO 704 2000) recommends the methods to be used in term-formation in English in the EU institutions. It also defines ‘new form’ as “a new lexical entity that never existed before” and lists the following methods such as new forms, derivation, compounding, and abbreviations to be used when forming such an entity.

**New forms** create a brand-new word defining a concept, which is labelled by Masár (2000) as ‘neodvodený termín’, while the **derivation** “process involves forming a new term by adding one or more morphological elements, or affixes, to a root or a word” (ISO 704 2000, p. 31) and in Slovak language it is defined by Masár (2000) as ‘odvodený termín’, e.g. an amendment, amending. The derivation is, according to Furdík (2008), the matter of affixation and declensional paradigms employed in particular language.

On the other hand, **compounding** operates on the already established forms of lexical units, while “combining existing words or word elements to create a new form which contains two or more roots but designates a single concept” (ISO 704 2000, p. 32). The Slovak equivalent for this method in Ako pomenívame v slovenčine by Masár (2000) is ‘zloženiny’ or ‘kompozitá’, and according to ISO 704 (2000) these can be 1) compounding complex forms, which can be 1.1) joined by hyphenation (e.g. general-interest, or materiálno-technický), 1.2) joined by fusing (e.g. outflow or telekomunikácia; however, Masár (2000) points out that the most common way to join words in Slovak is by morpheme “o” unless one element of a compound is a foreign word), or 1.3) not joined (e.g. member state or členský štát); or 2) compounding blends which are based on compounding of clippings (e.g. information+entertainment – infotainment) (Masár 2000).

Though the above-mentioned methods are recommended by the EU norm, I find it necessary to tackle the issue of the terminological equivalence regarding the compounds and multiword expressions as understood in English and Slovak language, for the comparative-
contrastive analysis on such expressions conducted by Bilá, Kačmárová et al. (2015) is of particular importance for the analysis presented later herein. Tackling the issue of the conceptual equivalence between English and Slovak terms regarding compounds and multiword expressions, they conclude the difference in the concept being designated by terms ‘compound’ and ‘multiword expression’, especially in the Slovak language as in English such a difference is of a formal nature only.

**Abbreviated forms** are also recommended in the quoted EU norm while the process of “shortening the word or words designating a concept [is applied in order to][…] create new abbreviated forms” (ISO 704 2000, p. 32). The EU ISO standard suggests that further sub-methods should be employed in this method, namely those operating on the level of words 1) short forms which aim to the “use [of ] fewer words to designate the same concept” (ISO 704 2000, p. 32) (e. g. European Council – Council, or Rada Európy –rada); and 2) clipped terms which “are formed by truncating the front, middle or back portion of a simple term” (ISO 704 2000, p. 32) (e. g. influenza – flu, or informácia – info); and those operating on the level of shortcuts and initial letters, such as 3) abbreviations which “[are] created by omitting words and/or parts of a word making up a term” (ISO 704 2000, p. 32) (e. g. page – p., or strana – str) 4) initialisms which is a method creating abbreviations “by using the first letters of each/some elements of a complex term” (ISO 704 2000, p. 33) (e. g. United Nations – U. N., or Organizácia spojených národov – OSN) and 5) acronyms – defined as “abbreviations created by combining initial letters or syllables from each/some elements of the full form” (ISO 704 2000, p. 33) ( e. g. light of amplifier with stimulated emission – laser (also used in Slovak)).

### 1.3.2 Neologisms

According to another regulation of EU dealing with terminology ISO/TC37 1087-1:2000 (cf. Terminology work – Vocabulary – Pt. 1: Theory and application, Valeontis, Mantzari 2006, p. 8), a neologism is a “new term coined for a given concept”. Neologisms either name the new concept, which results into the enrichment of a vocabulary of a language (a new term is related to the denoted) or they operate on the level of stylistics (a new term is related to the lexical system) (Furdík 2008). Generally, it is very difficult to define neologisms for their being labeled neologisms is only temporary, and so these are mainly temporarily motivated. Regarding the term-formation as employed in EU texts, creating a neologism is one of the recommended methods to be employed in the absence of adequate equivalents (Yankova 2015). “Neologisms cannot be chosen in an arbitrary way. They should be somewhat transparent to the target audience and should not violate the natural word-formation of the target language. They should also allow for derivatives” (Yankova 2015, p. 17).

### 1.3.3 Creating New forms from Existing forms

New terms can be also formed from already existing forms by several methods. 1) **Conversion** is a method by which “new terms can be created by changing the syntactic category” (ISO 704 2000, p. 34) (e. g. output (noun) - to output (verb)). This method is quite common especially in English, however, in Slovak these changes are usually paradigmatic and so
the two words are different in their forms. Another method is 2) terminologization; “the process by which a general word or expression is transformed into a term designating a concept in special languages” (ISO 704 2000, p. 34), also described by Masár (2000) as ‘terminologizácia’ (e. g. sound (generic word) – sound (specialized term in physics), or zvuk – zvuk). The method of 3) semantic transfer within a special language is semantically motivated and it is defined as “an existing term within a special language [being] used to designate another concept by logical extension” (ISO 704 2000, p. 34) and there are two types of semantic transfer 3.1) simile, about which Sager (1990, p. 71) claims that “[they] are generally used in the preliminary phase of the creation of term and help to the stabilization of concepts” and “simile is usually expressed by means of suffixes such as –like, -style, -type”, etc. (Valeontis, Manzari 2006); and the second one is 3.2) synecdoche, described by Masár (2000) as consisting of two different processes: toto pro parte and pars pro toto. The former one refers to the method of term-formation in which the whole names a part and the latter refers to a part naming the whole. 4) Transdisciplinary borrowing is also known as internal borrowing; “a term from one subject field is borrowed and attributed to a new concept in another subject field within the same language” (ISO 704 2000, p. 34), which is defined by Masár (2000) as determinologizácia (e. g. virus (medical term) –virus (IT term), or in Slovak, Masár (2000) gives an example of katalyzátor as defined in chemistry and as defined in social sciences).

1.3.4 Translingual borrowings

Translingual borrowings are motivated by contact and acceptance of a particular term in the target language. Both motivations are well described by Furdík (2008) and on the level of translingual borrowings Ološtiak (2009) adds so-called interlingual motivation, which is related to lexemes taken from other languages. It also involves word-formation processes of a borrowed lexeme on any of the levels of a target language as the target language is the active one when borrowing a term rather than a source language (Furdík 2008). This is reflected in processes labeled in Slovak as ‘transfonemizácia’, ‘transortografizácia’, ‘transmorfemizácia’, ‘transmorfoligizácia’, ‘transderivácia’, ‘transsémantizácia’, ‘transkolokácia’, and ‘transfrazeologizácia’. The European norm for term-formation, ISO 704 (2000) describes this method as introducing terms from one language into another language by borrowing, by means of a 1) direct loan, a process during which an “existing term is frequently adopted from one language to another if there is no current term for the concept in the second [other] language, while spelling or pronunciation may differ” (ISO 704 2000, p. 35); Masár (2000) describes this method as ‘internacionalizácia’ and also claims that, even though it is commonly used by translators, “a new term should be formed if the theory of terminology of the target language allows it” (Masár 2000, p. 45), or a 2) loan translation, “the process whereby the morphological elements of a foreign term are translated to form a new term” (ISO, 704 2000, p. 35) (e. g. worldview – svetonázor).
1.3.5 Term properties

Whatever method is used in order to produce a new term, Masár (2000) claims that there are several properties that each term should have. The term, according to Masár (2000) has to be:

1. fixed (in a particular field it has to have exactly the same meaning anytime the term is used)
2. formed in accordance with the term-formation rules and grammar rules of a particular language
3. functional (the term has to satisfy long-term communication needs in a particular field).

Moreover, Furdík (2008) claims that the particularity of a term dwells in its specifics such as accuracy, explicitness, semantic clarity (word-formation motivation), fitting within a system, derivability (the term should have a form from which derivates can be formed).

1.4 Analogue rule

Analogue rule is a translation tool proposed by Valeontis (2006) at the 2nd Terminology Summit during which he also demonstrated the importance of such a tool. He proposed the term to be an object consisting of a concept which is build up by elements on various linguistic levels. The whole object can be understood as a knowledge. Such a knowledge is usually named in one language and due to the necessity of being spread, the “namers” of other languages (after Valeontis) have to find an appropriate way of naming such knowledge in their languages. Valeontis (2006) claims the analogue rule to be a tool which allows a translator to acknowledge for all the aspects of a new form coined in one language, including the term-formation processes. Considering the term formation processes he proposed that these are followed in a source language if such a language allows for the following of term-formation mechanism.

“The Analogue Rule does not impose, but simply gives priority to the examination of a term-formation mechanism in the target language analogous to that of the source language, thereby ensuring:

• utilization of the work which has been accomplished in the source language, where the new knowledge (new concept) was created, and which it is unwise to ignore;
• restriction of arbitrariness in selecting term-formation mechanisms possibly irrelevant to, or incompatible with, the term-formation mechanisms for the rest of the concepts of the same concept system, where the concept being named belongs;
• minimization of the problems that may arise from future modifications or revisions, which will reasonably be effected in the source language (given that knowledge from future development of the subject field under consideration will most probably remain imported knowledge for the target language)” (Valeontis 2006, p. 10).
2. Method, Research question and results

2.1 Research question and method

As debated earlier herein, some authorities claim the importance of some translatological procedures. Therefore, the main purpose of this research is to investigate the application of the translatological method known as the analogue rule (as defined earlier herein and referred to as AR) and comment on the appropriateness of such application. The research questions, *To what extend is such a rule applied? and To what extend is such an application efficient?*, are based mainly on the claim of Veleontis and Mantzari (2006) who argue that when forming a term in a target language, a translator should employ the same method that is used for the term-formation in a source language. This paper employs the comparative method of the term-formation processes applied in the selected terms of the two languages, English and Slovak, while the outcome of such a comparison is the investigation of the appropriateness of the analogue rule.

2.3 The sample

The sample for the analysis presented later herein was drawn from Regulation No. 1235/2010 of the European parliament and of the Council available online at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html in both languages, English and Slovak. The sample itself consists of the following terms: an EEA relevance, advanced therapy medical products, legislative acts, union-wide, commission, Eudravigilance database, wheel, European like, transparency, med, WHO, etc. and their respective equivalents in The Slovak language. Based on the comparison of the term formation methods employed in both observed languages, it is possible to reflect upon the research questions of this paper. For the number of the words in the sample is relatively small, this research is considered to be a case study.

2.3 Comparison of the selected terms and the identification of the term-formation process (results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>English term</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Slovak term</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>AR application</th>
<th>AR effectivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>An EEA relevance</td>
<td>- not joined compound</td>
<td>význam pre EHP</td>
<td>- not joined compound with the preposition</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- noun + noun</td>
<td></td>
<td>- noun + pp + noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- EEA - initialisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>- EHP – initialisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- multiword expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>advanced therapy medicinal products</td>
<td>- not joined compound,</td>
<td>Lieky na inovatívnu liečbu</td>
<td>-noun + pp; pp compound</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- adj. + adj. +adj. + noun</td>
<td></td>
<td>- adj. + noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- medicinal product - compound</td>
<td></td>
<td>-lieky⇒ simple term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>legislative acts</td>
<td>- not joined compound, - adj. + noun</td>
<td>Legislatívne akty</td>
<td>-translingual borrowing, a calque - multiword expression</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>union-wide</td>
<td>- compound joined by the hyphen</td>
<td>celoúnirový</td>
<td>- compound joined by fusion (&quot;o&quot; morpheme)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>- Abbreviations, short form</td>
<td>Komisia</td>
<td>- Abbreviation, short form</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>wheel (meaning a vehicle)</td>
<td>- semantic transfer - synecdoche (pars pro toto)</td>
<td>vozidlo</td>
<td>- simple term</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>European like</td>
<td>- semantic transfer - simile</td>
<td>európsky</td>
<td>- simple term, related to EU, adj.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>transparency</td>
<td>- derivation (-ency) - - adj → noun</td>
<td>transparentnost'</td>
<td>- derivation - adj → noun</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>med</td>
<td>- abbreviation - clipping</td>
<td>lieky</td>
<td>- simple term</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>- abbr. initialism</td>
<td>SZO</td>
<td>- abbr. initialism</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>human use</td>
<td>- not joined compound</td>
<td>humanné použitie</td>
<td>- not joined compound</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>member state</td>
<td>- not joined compound - noun + noun</td>
<td>členský štát</td>
<td>- not joined compound - adj. + noun - multiword expression</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Union legislation</td>
<td>- not joined compound - noun + noun</td>
<td>právne predpisy Unie</td>
<td>- not joined compound - adj. + noun + noun- multiword expression</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>pharmaceutical residues</td>
<td>- not joined compound - adj. + noun</td>
<td>farmaceutické rezidua</td>
<td>- not joined compound - adj. + noun - multiword</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>environmental problems - not joined compound - adj. + noun</td>
<td>environmentálny problém - not joined compound - adj. + noun - multiword expression</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>European Medicine Agency - not joined compound - adj. + noun + noun</td>
<td>Európska agentúra pre lieky - not joined compound with preposition - adj. + noun + pp. + noun - multiword expression</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>national parliament - not joined compound - adj. + noun</td>
<td>národný parlament - not joined compound - adj. + noun - multiword expression</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>centralized procedures - not joined compound - adj. + noun</td>
<td>centralizovaný postup - not joined compound - adj. + noun - multiword expression</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>pharmacovigilance - compound blend (from pharmacology + vigilance)</td>
<td>dohľad nad liekmi - not joined compound - noun + pp + noun - multiword expression</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>post-authorization - compounding with the hyphen</td>
<td>po vydaní - multiword expression with the preposition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>transmission - derivation (suffixation verb → noun)</td>
<td>postúpenie - derivation (suffixation noun → noun)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>TFEU - abbr. initialism</td>
<td>ZFEU - abbr. initialism</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>risk - terminologization</td>
<td>riziko - terminologization</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>safeguarding public health - not joined compound - verb + noun + noun</td>
<td>ochrana verejného zdravia - not joined compound - noun + adj. + noun - multiword expression</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>clinical trials - not joined compound - adj. + noun</td>
<td>klinická skúška - not joined compound - adj. + noun</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>a black symbol - not joined compound - adj. + noun</td>
<td>čierny symbol - not joined compound - adj. + noun</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: The analysis and comparison of the selected terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>- terminologization</th>
<th>- terminologization</th>
<th>- terminologization</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. periodic safety update reports</td>
<td>- not joined compound - adj. + adj. + noun + noun</td>
<td>periodicky aktualizované správy o bezpečnosti</td>
<td>- not joined compound with the preposition - adv. + adj. + noun + pp. + noun - multiword expression</td>
<td>✓  ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. risk management plan</td>
<td>- not joined compound - noun + noun + noun</td>
<td>plán riadenia rizík</td>
<td>- not joined compound - noun + noun + noun</td>
<td>✓  ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. risk-benefit assessment</td>
<td>- compound by hyphenation - noun + noun</td>
<td>hodnotenie rizík a prínosov</td>
<td>- not joined compound - noun + noun + noun</td>
<td>X  ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 1: AR application and effectiveness

3 Discussion

The selected EU directives deal with the topic of pharmacovigilance. Though this is an area with rich terminology, the focus is on the term-formation methods employed in the randomly selected terms, some of which are also used in other EU texts. This subchapter discusses each term individually.

The very first term to be discussed is legislative acts from regulation No 1235/2010. It is obvious that the method employed here is the compounding of an adjective and a noun. There would be nothing interesting about it in English version; however, the Slovak version seems to be what Masár (2000) refers to as ‘undesirable loans’ as the Slovak equivalent is legislatívne akty.
At the first sight the term-formation method seems to be identical with the English equivalent, so in accordance with the analogue rule, it seems to be more a calque, a word-for-word translation regarding the word acts in this case.

Another term, medicinal products, for example, does not follow the analogue rule. The term is once again a compound of an adjective and a noun, but its Slovak equivalent is rather a non-derived term, lieky. Nevertheless, Masár (2000) claims that this process is highly desirable when forming the term in a target language if such a language offers term-formation methods resulting in more natural expression. Term lieky is followed with the term human use. The term human use is another compound of two nouns, and such a process is followed in the Slovak equivalent, yet the word humanné, in the term humanné použite may imply different meaning, even though in the Slovak language it is already recognized as a medical term.

All the examples mentioned so far suggest that one of the main methods used in term formation in EU texts may be compounding. Terms such as member state (sec. 3), Union legislation (sec. 3), pharmaceutical residues (sec. 3), environmental problem (sec. 3), European Medicines Agency (sec. 1), national parliament (in citations) or centralized procedures (sec. 1) are the results of non-joined compounding. Slovak equivalents are also formed by non-joined compounding, apart from the term farmaceutické rezidua which seems to be a calque again and Európska agentúra pre lieky which is a compound with the preposition as far as grammar rules of Slovak language do not provide space for linking such nouns without any prepositions (agentúra pre lieky).

Another thing in this regulation worth our attention is the way the term pharmacovigilance is treated. In English version, the term-formation method is compounding and a sub-method is compounding blends, as far as the first part of the term is clipped from the term pharmacy and the second part vigilance has its own meaning in English. This term was obviously designed to serve the EU purposes only, so a direct loan to Slovak version would be an obvious method to be used. Its Slovak version is dohľad nad liekmi, which is more reasonable if we consider the minimization of ambiguity.

There are also examples of compounds linked by a hyphen, e. g. Union-wide (sec. 1), which is rather a joined-by-fusing term in the Slovak version – celoúniťový in the analysed texts. The second term linked by a hyphen is post-authorisation (sec. 11), which is a noun. However, in order to make the whole concept of post-authorization clear, in the Slovak version a preposition and a verb combination is used rather than a noun, so its Slovak equivalent is po vydaní.

The derivation is represented in this text by terms such as transmission (in citations) or transparency (sec. 7), while the former term is derived by the suffix –ssion from a verb to transmit, the latter one is derived from an adverb transparent by adding a suffix –ency.

When it comes to the elaboration of all of the above-mentioned terms, it is obvious that compounds might be the most common outcome of term-formation process employed when proposing new EU terms, which is also backed by Masár (2000), who claims that almost 77% of all new terms are compounds.

\[^2\text{of the selected EU texts mentioned earlier herein}\]
Another quite commonly used method, not only in the EU text but also in other legal texts, are abbreviations, especially short forms. These are usually introduced by the phrase "hereinafter referred to as" or in the case of the given text, these are introduced in brackets immediately after the full form, e.g. in the section (1) - Union-wide marketing authorisation procedure for certain categories of medicinal products (full form) and the short form is provided immediately after in the brackets – the centralized procedure. Or in the section (5) of the same page, the short form Eudravigilance database serves as a short form of Union pharmacovigilance database and data-processing network. Or in the section (3), European Medicines Agency is shortened into Agency.

Within the theoretical framework of abbreviations, initialization can be found in the analysed texts as well, e.g. in the section (25) Treaty on the functioning of the European Union is initialized into TFEU along with EC initials stands for European Committee and they are being repeated all over the text.

Considering new definitions, term risk especially forming a compound with words identified or potential represents a field-specific meaning. VOLUME 9A of The Rules Governing Medicinal Products in the European Union suggests that this general word is defined as a purely medical term, which is achieved by terminologization.

Also as a newly introduced topic regarding the EU context, pharmacovigilance, covers a wide range of neologisms, such as safeguarding public health (sec. 23), clinical trials (sec. 18), a black symbol (sec. 17), periodic safety update reports (sec. 14), risk management plan (sec. 17), or risk-benefit assessment (sec. 10), all formed as compounds.

Based on the empirical reasoning of all the above analyzed methodologies, it can be claimed that probably due to an attempt to create a term that fulfils all the properties a term should have, and to avoid ambiguity, one of the most common method of term formation in English drafts is compounding. For the purposes of the present analysis, it is necessary to bear in mind that Eurolect is a variety in its own right as far as it has to consider all the languages involved, and that not all of the methods mentioned in the theoretical part can be effectively employed in order to form a new term.

However, as Graph 1 suggests, whereas in twenty-one cases out of the total number thirty-two of the analysed terms AR was applied, in eleven cases it wasn’t. As the further analysis of the term formation and the overall outcome of the combination of such term formation and AR application suggests, out of twenty-one cases in which AR was applied, such application was effective in all cases and did not result in ambiguous or unnaturally sounding terms. Even though there might arise a speculation in few of them, such as human use the Slovak equivalent of which is humánne použitie, the Slovak equivalent is commonly used medical term or legislative acts.

The analysis presented in Table 1, however, did not fully consider the discrepancy between the compounds and multiword expressions, as debated by Bilá and Kačmárová (2015) in the theoretical part of this paper. If closer analysed, this discrepancy, may be of great importance for the presented analysis and may result in different results. The analyses as presented in Table 1 regarded these terms as compounds in both versions, English and Slovak, and, therefore, it evaluated them in terms of ‘AR application’, even though it acknowledged the Slovak
equivalents having the nature of multiword expressions only partially. The main reason for regarding such a discrepancy and such AR application acceptable is the terminological imbalance between the English and Slovak terms regarding the field of lexicology.

**Conclusion and suggestions for further research**

Overall, this paper’s aim was to provide the theoretical outline of term-formation methods in both, English and Slovak languages and to analyze the selected terms drawn from Regulation No. 1235/2010 of the European parliament and of the Council available online at [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html) in its English and Slovak version. The main focus was on the analysis of randomly selected terms while attempting to identifying employed term-formation methods in both, English and Slovak terms (treating them as equivalents from the translatological perspective), on comparing such methods and evaluating them within the theoretical framework of the analogue rule. As the results presented in this paper suggest, in twenty-one cases out of thirty-two, the analogue rule was applied and such application resulted in unambiguous terms in all twenty-one cases. Even though the topic of term-formation and mainly analysing of such methods is an inexhaustible area for research, as in the context of Eurolect every single word can be considered a term in its own right, it is necessary to stress that the presented paper is a case study and attempts to point out only to a very specific aspect from the translatological and lexicological theory. Therefore, the results interpreted herein cannot be applied neither to all EU documents nor to all EU terms. In order to make these results more general, it is recommended to observe the phenomena in question on greater sample based on greater number of EU documents from various fields. Moreover, for any other similar research it is also recommended to acknowledge the terminological discrepancy in the field of lexicology between the observed languages, for as the results suggest, it may have a great impact on the overall interpretation of results.
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