

УДК 811.512.161:81'366.55  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/1728-242X.2023.29.07>

Ganna SPOTAR-AYAR, PhD (Philol.) Assoc. Prof.  
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2861-6339  
e-mail: [spotar@knu.com](mailto:spotar@knu.com)  
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine

Mariana TSVYD, Master of Arts (Philol.)  
ORCID ID: 0009-0002-4307-0618  
e-mail: [tsvyd.mariana@gmail.com](mailto:tsvyd.mariana@gmail.com)  
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine

## TERM CONCEPTS FOR DISABILITY: SPECIFICS OF NOMINATION, FUNCTIONING AND TRANSLATION (BASED ON MATERIALS OF TURKISH)

**Background.** *In linguistics only few works are dedicated to the study of the vocabulary to denote people with disabilities in the Turkish language (Y. Şişman, M. Öztürk, Z. Baykan, A. Demir, A. Efe), just as there are few specialized works in this filed in Ukrainian linguistics, who describe in their studies the problem of terminological irregularity and the lack of terms approved at the state level to denote disability. The relevance of this study is due to the need to popularize the principles of barrier-free society and inclusiveness, the large request for the translation of texts of rehabilitation and treatment, as well as the revitalization of relations between Ukraine and Turkey in these spheres.*

**Methods.** *During the course of the study over two hundred term concepts used to denote disability and rehabilitation terms functioning from the end of the 19th to the beginning of the 21th century were analyzed with the complex methodology including methods of cognitive linguistics and sociolinguistic approach, the method of contextual analysis and the method of dictionary definitions analysis.*

**Results.** *The terminology on disabilities in modern Turkish has disorganization that can be explained by such factors as: simultaneous usage of Turkish and foreign lexemes (Arabic Persian, English, French, Latin), euphemization of terms, orientation to international standards and agreements and, as a result, use of English lexemes etc. The vocabulary of international agreements and national legislation was found to differ in some cases. Quick formation of negative connotation is the main influencing factor on the terminology formation process and results in creation of a new replacing term without negative meaning.*

**Conclusions.** *Summarizing the main difficult issues in translation we suggest to use the complex of methods and approaches, translation tactics and strategies to help for choosing an equivalent according to the type of discourse, such as using WHO classification for translation of medical documentation, taking into account the requirements of the legislation in force and amendments to it for official documents, being careful using periphrastic explanations, making the person as the main concept but not their characteristic. Adaptation for correctness is essential when translating social texts, advertising, fiction, excessive euphemization of concepts should be avoided when working with any type of text and terms for disability.*

**Keywords:** *impairment, inclusiveness, term, terminological concepts, terms for disability, person with disability, the Turkish language.*

### Background

The study of the terminology and its various aspects and characteristics by scholars of language has been the leading scientific interest of many scientists for decades. There are many works dedicated to studies of terminological irregularity, the phenomenon of synonymy, the search for equivalents, or inventory and unification of terminological devices of various fields.

The relevance of this study is due to the need to popularize the principles of barrier-free society and inclusiveness, the large request for the translation of texts of rehabilitation and treatment, as well as the revitalization of Ukraine and Turkey in these spheres.

The *aim* of our article is comprehensive study of term concepts for disability in modern Turkish, connotation they express in different discourses, the specifics of their functioning, and to specify translation methods that allow finding suitable equivalents for such terms.

**Literature review.** Active scientific studies of the term began only in the 20s and 30s of the 20th century and as a result a branch known as terminology was formed in linguistics, the official founder of which is considered to be the German scientist O. Wüster. The catalyst for this shift was the rapid emergence of new terms as a result of the rapid development of science (Diakov et al., 2000, p. 5). At the same time, a need to study terminological systems occurred, so most of the works on terminology in the middle of the 20th century focused on arrangement of terminological systems and formation and compilation of dictionaries of various fields. During the 90s of the 20th

century, a branch known as linguistic conceptology, which includes cognitive terminology, was formed. The characteristic feature of cognitive terminology is the combination of the established traditional term theories together with the acquired features of interdisciplinary, openness, asystemicity, polyparadigmality, anthropocentrism, and synergism (Petrova, 2020, p. 97). This branch of linguistic research generally considers language as the most important cognitive ability of a person, which is closely related to the characteristic of his/her thinking and activity. Therefore, studying the term formation process from this perspective gives us an understanding that it is the person who forms the meaning of language units and chooses means for interpreting different situations. This is explained by the fact that language is the result and tool of cognition, i.e. scientific and ordinary cognition, which is practically implemented in the processes of categorization and conceptualization of the world (Doskach, 2018, p. 32). Sociocognitive terminology was developed by the Belgian researcher R. Temmerman (Temmerman, 2000). The communicative theory of terminology was developed by M. T. Cabre Castelvi (Cabre, 1999), a representative of the Spanish school. According to this theory, language units for special purposes are multidimensional and include cognitive, linguistic and socio-communicative components. The researcher suggests considering the terms as "sets of conditions" and as an example gives the concept of a polyhedron with three dimensions: cognitive, linguistic and communicative (Petrova, 2020, p. 97). The scientific interest of modern researchers who study the process of

term formation is focused on the definition of the purpose of "term concepts" being localizers of professional meanings that correspond to common and generally accepted situations in the professional community to which the speaker belongs. The term "term concept" defines typical cognitive structures that correspond to common and generally accepted situations in the professional community to which the speaker belongs; stereotypical models of knowledge (consciousness) specific to certain social groups. It can also be interpreted as a rationally understood terminological concept of scientific, professional, expert knowledge, which has a layered structure, a complex content, and a wider-narrower volume, reflected in a set of categorical features, which at the same time is an element (unit) of a certain system in the analyzed fragment of reality (Stasyuk, 2012/2013).

Few works are dedicated to the study of the vocabulary to denote people with disabilities in the Turkish language (Şişman, 2012), (Öztürk, 2011) (Baykan, 2000) (Demir, & Efe, 2020), just as there are few specialized works in this filed in Ukrainian linguistics. Different aspects of use of the terminological apparatus for disability as law terms are analyzed in detail by Y. Şişman in his work "A General Assessment upon the Concepts Used in the Field of Disability" ("*Özürlülük Alanında Kullanılan Kavramlar Üzerine Genel bir Değerlendirme*") (Şişman, 2012). In this article we use the classification of Turkish linguist M. Kahraman, who studies the term and the process of term formation in diachronic. We adhere to the idea that, unlike word formation, the creation of a term is carried out consciously and in a controlled manner, therefore, in the proposed study we rely on the results of Karaman's research (Karaman, 2009) who defines the following methods for the formation of terms: 1) the use of existing resources; 2) replacement of existing resources; 3) use of new resources. Also Scientists in their studies describe the problem of terminological irregularity and the lack of terms approved at the state level to denote disability, emphasize the relevance of these problems and the need for the fastest possible response to their solution.

#### Methods

In our research we used the complex methodology including methods of cognitive linguistics and sociolinguistic approach to the study of terms to achieve the goal of the research and its main tasks. We thus used the method of contextual analysis because lexemes, lexeme combinations, sentences semantics are influenced by situational and ethnocultural factors which influence the linguistic contexts, so the linguistic units are used as part of the speech context. The method of dictionary definitions analysis was also used for clarifying the definition of the term and semantic analysis for extracting semantic information, i.e. meanings contained in a separate text, sentence or lexeme. We analyzed more than 250 terms and concepts used for definition of disabilities, persons with disabilities and rehabilitation and social adaptation.

#### Results

The development of terminology studies during the last century resulted in new approaches used for researches of terms, namely cognitive and sociocognitive terminology and communicative theory of terminology. The common idea supported by scientists is the necessity of studying "term" in the cognition because language, firstly, is the product of human thinking. One of the concepts being the leading subject of researches is the "term concept", that reveals multiaspect and complexity of such lexical units. Thus, it would be a mistake to consider "term" synonymous with "word" because it provides certain features that

distinguish it. A term is a clear, non-monoreference concept, including linguistic and conceptual limitations. In contradistinction to word creation, term formation is a conscious and controlled process. There are various ways of terminologization and terminology creation.

The specific features of the terminology apparatus formation in Turkish are explained by the tendencies observed in different periods of the Ottoman and Turkish history. The functioning of several terms at the same time is due to different semantic components of term concepts on designation of disability, as well as acquisition of new connotations in the process of their use over a long period. The specificity of term concepts for disability distinguishes them among others. The main feature that regulates the functioning of such terms is multi-component of their conceptual complex. The meaning of the term for disability directly depends on type of discourse, context and purpose it is used for. Negative connotation in lexemes functioning as terms for disability in official documentation appears very quickly and as the result they become socially unacceptable for identification persons with disabilities. Thus, social factor along with other processes of terminology formation plays a key role in the formation of the terminological apparatus for disabilities.

Therefore, the translation of terms for disability has its characteristics. Selecting the right equivalence in the target language can often be difficult, depending on the type of translated text. The main factors that complicate the translation of such vocabulary are the occurrence of terminological irregularity in the translation language and insufficient number of specialized dictionaries. The selection of a tolerant equivalence is directly complicated by the fact that even among people with disabilities, opinions on this issue differ. Adaptation for correctness is essential when translating social texts, advertising, fiction, excessive euphemization of concepts should be avoided when working with any type of text and terms for disability.

#### Discussion and conclusions

The term formation process in the Turkish language has been studied by M. Kahraman, who defines the following 5 stages of the terminological apparatuses formation in the Ottoman and Turkish languages (Kahraman, 2017, pp. 141–142):

1. The Classical period (1100–1839): terminology during the times of the Seljuk and Ottoman Empires. The use of terms derived from Arabian and Persian languages was the main characteristic of the period. Such borrowings contributed to mutual understanding between specialists who spoke different languages because it contributed to the formation of a common vocabulary among them (Diakovet al., 2000, p. 110).

2. The Tanzimat period (1839–1876): the period of the appearance of new terms by borrowing them from the Arabic language. However, although the terminology of the medical field was mostly of Arabic and Persian origin, there was also an increase in number of terms borrowed from the French language. The leading intellectuals of that time such as N. Kemal, Dr. A. Kırımlı Aziz Bey, the head of the Medical Printing House A. Hacı, also made great efforts to translate medical terms into Turkish and encourage publications in the medical field in Turkish (Gürlek, 2016, p. 216). In this period, we can find Laws and Acts in which the terms on disability were functioning: The Law on social assistance to military personnel (*Asakir-i Berriye-i Mülükâne Tekaüt Kararnamesi*), which defined payments to military personnel who had received a disability as a result of war (Nurdoğan, 2021, p. 32), Law on Employee health and safety (*Maadin Nizamnamesi* 1869). But the

most important Law that established the use of the terms on disability was the Civil Code of the Ottoman Empire (*Mecelle-i Ahkâm-ı Adliyye* 1868–1876).

3. The period of the first Constitution (1878–1908): the period when terms were borrowed from the Arabic language and at the same time Turkish ones were created. The emergence of legislative acts and the creation of social assistance funds contributed to this. In this period social security and assistance centers called 'Orta Sandığı' were acting to provide assistance for people who lost their work because of age, sickness, disability and death. So, terms for disability were widely used in many local and state documents and acts.

4. The period of the second Constitution (1908–1923): the transitional period characterized by the rejection of Arabic borrowings and the formation of terms with Turkish stems, or adding Turkish affixes to the stems of foreign lexemes.

5. The period of national term formation (1923–2000): during this period, terms were usually formed from Turkish stems and affixes. It can also be divided into three periods: the period of idealism (1923–1945), the period of extremism (1945–1980), and the period of freedom (1980–2000).

The terminological concepts used to denote disability have special characteristic features. The distinctive feature that also regulates the functioning of such terms is the multi-component nature of their conceptual complex. As was argued before, "concepts" are terms for disability consisting of the following semantic components (Spotar-Ayar, & Tsvyd, 2022, pp. 70–72): semantics with which the term functions in medical documents, semantics with which the term functions in national legislation, semantics with which the term is used in the translation of international agreements, semantics with which the term is used in the social sphere, semantics with which the term is used in the domestic sphere.

A significant problem of the use of terms for disability in the social sphere is the so-called process of determinologization, which means the loss of the term's primary, in the case of terms for disability – medical meaning. They are also becoming more commonly used, and they also acquire new stylistic possibilities and emotional coloring (Dev'iatko, 2021, p. 36). In the domestic sphere, terms for disability are often used with a negative connotation. Prejudiced, negative attitudes toward people with disabilities existed even in primitive communities. Such perception of people with disabilities has been fixed and rooted in the subconscious of society for a long time (İçli, 2019, p. 8). After the terms fall into daily use, into the system of general literary vocabulary, they lose their functional and semantic limitation.

Offensive or swear words are words that are used with the intention to insult, hurt or humiliate someone. Initially, most offensive words did not have a negative connotation and acquired it only over time. Words from the so-called taboo topics, i.e., those about which it is not customary to talk, usually become swear words. One of these topics is the topic of health, illness and disability. Even nowadays, people have always been afraid of contamination by an unknown disease, and the taboo around contamination is one of the main powerhouses of the creation of disease euphemisms (Jamet, 2017, p. 9). Disease has always been feared, as said.

The use of swear words in everyday communication is explained by the functions they perform. Words to denote health disorders are often used as an emotionally colored swearing: (2) *Önüne baksana lan! Kör müsün nesin?* – Watch where you are going, man. Are you blind?

In addition, in domestic sphere in Turkey, the following terms for disability are frequently used with a negative connotation. As a rule, they are used to offend a person, to underline a mistake or a disability to do something: *deli* (crazy), *kör* (blind), *sağır* (deaf), *ruh hastası* (mentally ill), *dilsiz* (mute): (3) *Deli misin nesin? Delisin sen, deli. Eğer deli olmasaydın, bunları yapmazdın.* – Are you crazy? For sure, you are crazy. If you were not crazy, you wouldn't do it.

When connotative units of this type are used, the speaker is not always interested in an objective reflection of reality. Their use helps to achieve the appropriate influence on the expression of positive or negative subjective evaluation (Navalna, 2014, p. 132). Terms for disability are usually used in a negative connotation during very emotional communication and express indignation, mockery, and the communicative purpose of their use is humiliation, emphasizing a person's mistake, dissatisfaction with negative behavior: (4) *Zihinsel engelli misin? Beyin özürlü müsün? Aptal mısın? Salak mısın? Engelli misin? Nesin sen olum nesin?* – Are you mentally disabled? Are you brain disabled? Are you stupid? Are you disabled? Who are you, son?

Let us consider the case when the term used to denote a state of health acquired a negative connotation. In the Turkish language, there is a term "*ruh hastası*", which means "mental disorders" (lit. "mentally ill"). Over time, it began to be used as an insult, so the French term "*psikopat*" was borrowed to replace it. However, this term quickly acquired a negative connotation and began to be used in expressions such as: (5) *Ya manyak mısın psikopat mısın nesin?* – Are you a maniac or a psychopath?

Lexemes referring to a state of health or disability acquire a negative connotation and are used as an insult due to a significant impact on people's perception of such social factors as social attitudes and social norms. Different people can see the same aspect in different ways as positive, negative, or neutral (Manchiaiah, 2015, p. 135). However, the human psyche is arranged in such a way that the objects and realities we encounter are immediately correlated with previous experience and learned patterns. The social consequence of this phenomenon is the formation of prejudice and stereotypes (Yaremenko, 2015, p. 75).

The problem that complicates the selection process of the appropriate nominative is terminological irregularity. The irregularity of the terminological apparatus and the presence of several lexemes to denote the same phenomena, including disability, are present not only in the Turkish language. As an example, we can consider the English language, in which *disabled*, *handicapped*, *impaired*, *defective*, *invalid*, *incapacitated*, etc. function in a synonymous sense. The Merriam-Webster Thesaurus proposes "disabled" and "impaired" as synonyms, and the Collins English Thesaurus proposes "incapacitated" and "handicapped" as synonyms for "disabled", but with a note next to the latter, that the lexeme is outdated and rude.

The arguments of Turkish researchers on the translation of the terms *impairment*, *disability* and *handicap* used by the WHO also differ. Karataş and Oran in their study *The Disabled: Those Who Remain at the Periphery of Politics ("Engelliler: Siyasetin Periferinde Kalanlar")* offer the following translation: *yetersizlik*, *özürlülük* and *engellilik* accordingly (Karataş, & Oran, 2007, p. 8). Demir and Efe share the same opinion in their research on the use of social media by persons with disabilities ("*Engelli Bireylerin Sosyal Medya Kullanmaları Üzerine Bir Araştırma*"). However, Y. Şişman in his article "A General Assessment upon the Concepts Used in the Field of Disability"

("Özürlülük Alanında Kullanılan Kavramlar Üzerine Genel bir Değerlendirme") translates these terms as follows: *bozukluk*, *yetersizlik* / *özürlülük* / *sakatlık* and *engellilik* accordingly (Şişman, 2012, p. 77). These examples once again show how acute the problem of correct translation of terms for disability is.

Except the differences related to the functions of the body, the lexeme for the designation of disability may also differ by legal status and meaning it is used with. For example, Turkish legislation establishes two types of disability pensions, the conditions of receiving persons differ: *malulen emeklilik* (a person with a disability identified by the Institution of Health Council, when a person has lost his/her earnings because of a disability to perform duties at least 60% of the workforce) and *engelli emekliliği* (a person with a disability in need of protection, care, support, rehabilitation due to loss of physical, mental, emotional and social abilities with at least of 40 % of workforce).

Disordering in terminological apparatus on disabilities in Turkish language can be seen in many examples. In Article 264 of Civil code of Turkey No 743 (1924) children with disability are named as "âilil veya akli zayıf" (disabled or mentally disabled) and in Municipal Law No 1580 (1930) terms "deliler, dalanmış ve kudurmuşlar" (mentally disabled, crazy) and "âilil ve işten acizler" (disabled and those who lost their ability to perform their duties) (Şişman, 2012, p. 70). In Law No 5798 on Exemption from custom and other taxation on some devices for "kör, sağır ve dilsizler" (blind, deaf and mute) and persons with mentioned disabilities are called as "malul" (disabled) (Şişman, 2012, p. 70).

Amendment (1997) of the Law on Organization of Social Services and Protection of Children (Sosyal Hizmetler ve Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu Kanunu) dated 1983 confirmed that the term "sakat" (disabled) is replaced by the term "özürlü" (disabled), instead of the term "kör" (blind) shall be used the term "görme özürlü" (with vision impairment), the term "sağır" (deaf) is replaced by the term "işitme özürlü" (with hearing impairments). The term "özürlüler" has been used in the Law on Disability (Engeller hakkında kanun), which has been in force since 2005, but the Article 1 of Law No 6462 dated 25/4/2013 established use of the term "engelliler" instead it (Kanun No. 6462. Resmî Gazete 3 Mayıs 2013 CUMA Sayı: 28636).

When translating texts from English or Ukrainian to Turkish and vice versa, which contain terms for people with disabilities, the translator may encounter various problems. Although the difficulty of choosing the right lexemes to denote disability and people with disabilities and the need to systematize terminology on this subject are an extremely urgent issue nowadays, dictionaries with relevant terms are just beginning to be compiled. Regarding the Turkish language, it is worth noting the encyclopedic dictionary Glossary of disability terms ("*Özürlülük terimleri sözlüğü*") by Professor A. Seyyar, compiled by him on his personal initiative and in which more than 200 terms with scientific definitions and explanations are given in alphabetical order. To search for correct and tolerant equivalents of terms for disability and people with disabilities during translation, the project platform "Barrier-free handbook" is useful for the translator, within the framework of which the first online dictionary of correct terms in Ukraine meeting the norms of barrier-free language, was launched. "*Olumsuz çağrışımlar içeren engellilikle ilgili terimlerin listesi*" (List of terms related to disabilities that include negative connotation) is a fairly extensive list of terms for disability with negative connotations in Turkish, that is

freely available on the Internet, also can be useful for the translator. The English-language version of this list "List of disability-related terms with negative connotations" is available on the Wikipedia website. These lists contain many terms that should be avoided. Some of them have a definition and a brief history of their use.

The choice of the correct version of the translation of terms for disability is also complicated by the fact that even among people with disabilities, there is no single view on what approach to formation of terms for their condition they prefer. Of course, the reason for this is the factor of subjectivity; hence it is predictable. Among people with disabilities, some prefer the so-called "*people-first language*" or "*person-first language*", i.e., vocabulary that first denotes a person. For example, "Guidance. Inclusive language" says that instead of the term "blind" the term "person with visual impairment" should be used, and "deaf" should be replaced with "person with hearing impairment", etc. Supporters of this approach justify their position as follows: "*I am a person first, blind second*", "*I am more than my disability*", "*I would prefer people judge me for me, not my illness*", "*We are not defined by what others suppose to be deficits*".

Supporters of the "*identity-first language*" believe that it is necessary to state their identity first. A woman with cerebral palsy explained this standpoint in her interview to National Center on Disability and Journalism: "I have cerebral palsy, and I prefer identity-first language. I consider my disability to be an inextricable part of my identity as a human being. It isn't negative to say I'm disabled; it's a statement of fact. [My disability] is a huge part of my identity and how I experience the world." In other words, she tries to explain that she accepts herself and her body as it is. She thinks that there is no need to avoid her identity, her physical condition because disability is a part of her.

Let us consider another interesting comment on this issue from a person with autism given in 2015 to Rachel Kassenbrock on her question about person-first and identity-first language: "I have autism, & I prefer person-first language. To me, identity-first shows that a person considers their disability as the only part of them that's worth putting forward, while person-first acknowledges that their disability is a part of them while also acknowledging that they're a person with feelings, likes, dislikes, opinions, & rights. I'll say, "I'm autistic," often, but that's more because it's quicker to say than "I have autism."

What exactly is considered offensive and can hurt the feelings of another person often depends on the geographical location and cultural characteristics of the region, but sometimes opinions can differ even among representatives of the same community. Many terms that some people consider offensive are not offensive to others. Therefore, when translating such type of vocabulary, it is necessary to consider the target audience of the translated text.

Another factor to consider is that borrowed international terms may be influenced by national culture and therefore, with time can change their semantics. In some cases, the common meaning may be lost altogether. In general, semantic inconsistencies that occur during the translation of terms can be classified into the following categories: in one language a word has a more general meaning (less special) than in another; a genitive meaning in one language is aspectual in another; a monosemy in one language is a polysemy in another; cross-linguistic stylistic non-equivalence of lexemes and lexeme combinations; not an archaism in one language – archaism in another; lexically

free in one language and not free in another; a term in one language and not a term in another; a lexeme in one language is a lexeme combination in another (Diakov et al., 2000, p. 113). As a result, the way they function in different languages may have a difference in meaning.

The date of adoption of the document is an important aspect that must be considered during translation of legal acts, due to the use of certain terms that may be regulated by acts that came into force later. An example from Turkish legislation can be the current Law on Persons with Disabilities (*Engelliler hakkında kanun*) dated 2005, in which until 2013 people with disabilities were defined as "*özürlüler*", until a separate legislative act replaced the term with "*engelliler*". Another example is the law of 8/6/1949 No. 5434 on the Retirement Fund of the Republic of Turkey, in which "*sakatlığının*" was replaced by "*engelliliğinin*".

Guided by the ideas of tolerance, empathy, and liberality, which have embraced the world community on a global scale, people regularly resort to using euphemisms when it comes to disability as a physical condition of a person, or about people with disabilities. Terms for disability are euphemized everywhere: in the press, in social conversations, in domestic sphere, etc. However, the use of euphemistic language in this context is not always appropriate, even if it is used only with the best intentions.

There is an opinion that euphemisms play the role of "protection" both for those who use them and for those who perceive them or to whom they are addressed. They can also be just ineffective euphemisms for disability are popular – so popular that style guides prescribe against using euphemisms for persons who have disabilities (Gernsbacher et al., 2016, p. 2). Although the main purpose of using euphemisms is to avoid offense, some euphemisms, on the contrary, cause it.

The reason for the negative outcome of using such vocabulary is that euphemizing a word that is offensive to one person may be even more offensive to another. In particular, such expressions as: "differently abled", "people with special needs" (Why you shouldn't use 'differently abled' anymore.) In the Turkish language, in order not to offend people with disabilities, it is appropriate to use the terms "*özürlü*", "*engelli*", "*handicap*" instead of "*sakat*", "*görme engelli*" instead of "*kör*", and "*işitme engelli*" instead of "*sağır*" (Şiriner, 2018, p. 96). It is important to note that euphemisms are unstable formations and are characterized by rapid "aging". Since when the word comes into regular use, it again closely associates with the definition it denotes and loses its euphemistic properties (Tkhir, 2002). Let us take for an example the term "*özürlü*" being an euphemism for "*sakat*", after it became even more humiliating, therefore a new euphemism emerged instead that later became the term "*engelli*" (Şiriner, 2018, p. 96).

Despite the recommendations on which terms to indicate disability are better to use can be found on the Internet, opinions on this issue are divided. Let us take for an example the publications of users of the Ekşi Sözlük, a portal where users give explanations of different lexemes and lexeme combinations and specific features of functioning. Some people think that it is better to avoid the disability identifier altogether and address the person by their name. Some suggest using the term "*engelli*" because, in their opinion, it does not have a negative meaning. There is also an opinion that this term is already outdated, and a better one should be found.

Useful recommendations on how to better communicate with people with disabilities can be found in a document co-authored by the National Youth Leadership

Network (NYLN), a national non-profit organization dedicating to promote leadership and education among youth with disabilities, and by the Kids As Self Advocates (KASA), a national project created by youth with disability for the youth: when talking about places accessible to people with disabilities, it is better to use the term "accessible" rather than "disabled"; the terms "handicapped", "victim", "crippled", "retarded", "stricken", "unfortunate", "special needs" should be replaced by the term "disability"; people with disabilities should not be perceived as "brave", "special" or "superhuman", just because they have a disability does not mean that they are different from people who do not have it; they are the same as everyone else, so there is nothing unusual that they have some talents, skills and abilities; when talking about people without disabilities, it is okay to say "people without disabilities", but it would be inappropriate to call them "normal" or "healthy"; using such terms can make people with disabilities feel "abnormal", as if there is something wrong with them; if there is a possibility, asking directly to a person with a disability what term they prefer is the best option; when in doubt about how to address a person with a disability, call him/her by his/her name.

Practical guidance on how to properly address people with disabilities is given by Reach Incorporation, an American local private non-profit organization that provides services to people with disabilities. First, there is no need to refer to a person's disability or condition unless there is a crucial need to do so. Furthermore, it is not necessary to exaggerate their accomplishments. It is necessary to avoid subjective terms, such as: afflicted with, victim of, etc. There is no need to label people and put them in categories, as in the disabled, the deaf, the retarded, etc. It is better to emphasize the individual, not the disability. Instead of subjective descriptors such as "unfortunate", "pitiful" or "sad", emphasize abilities, for example, instead of "partially blind" say "partially sighted". Do not compare disability with an illness, except when the person is under medical care.

All these comments can be useful for a translator who works with a text containing terms for disability because they are based on many years of experience working with people with disabilities, so various nuances that should be considered when working with such vocabulary are considered. Therefore, contrary to the fact that the purpose of using euphemistic units in speech is not to offend the recipient, the opposite reaction is often encountered in practice. Moreover, a characteristic of euphemisms is that they quickly acquire a negative connotation, as well as the term they are used to replacing. It is necessary to follow general recommendations based on the experience of working with people with disabilities and, if possible, consider the opinion of the person with the disability, in order to properly address a person with a disability.

#### Discussion and conclusions

"Disability" and "person with disabilities" are the concepts defined and regulated by separate legislative acts issued by competent authorities, in accordance with the norms of the national legislation of the country, as well as by the resolutions of international organizations. Firstly, disability is considered conditions of a mental or physical of health of a person. It can be physiological, mental, or intellectual. However, nowadays, there is a tendency to perceive disability in a wider aspect, namely as a cultural and social phenomenon.

Among specific features of term concepts for the designation of disability, it is necessary to note that they

differ in the multicomponent of semantic apparatus. Meaning of a term for disability depends on the type of discourse, context it is used within and an aim of use. Terms on disability may be used in the meaning of a medical diagnosis, as a statement of legal status of a person, as an identification of a person, or used as offensive words. The terms on disability show quick change in apparatus, that can be explained by quick changes in a semantic of a new term (mostly when a negative connotation appears) and as a result, we can see a big influence of a social factor on term forming. In our opinion either in process of term formation and functioning or translation, principles of inclusivity shall be the prevailing during all types of communication process.

The translation of the terms on disability and terms used for persons with disabilities has its specifics and difficulties. Firstly, it can be explained that apparatus has been formed in different historical periods of Turkish language, leading to the disordering of the terminology apparatus and to the appearance of the phenomenon of synonym, as well as the absence of dictionaries and different opinions on it. There are two basic approaches to identify persons with disabilities: to use "person-first language" or "identity-first language". However, it is always a subjective opinion and it is difficult to predict which one is preferable for a recipient of a speech. At first glance, it may seem that if there are doubts about translation, euphemisms can help, but eliminating intentions, the use of euphemisms can, on the contrary, constitute persons with disabilities.

When translating texts that contain references to international documents, the same terminology as used in the document's official translation is recommended. As for translation of normative-legal acts, the date of adoption of the document should be considered, as the use of certain terms may be stipulated by the regulations, which came into force later. The least difficulties arise in the process of translation of medical texts. Translation and selection of the correct equivalent is much easier if some cases of use of terminology is regulated by legislation.

**Authors' contribution:** Ganna Spotar-Ayar – study conception and design, methodology, theoretical framework, revision and editing; Mariana Tsvyd – literature review, empirical data collection and validation, writing.

**Acknowledgements.** The authors express their gratitude to the CBO 'Kyiv city union of ATO veterans' for providing a review of this scientific study. The organization unites all veterans to represent and protect their interests in the territorial community of the city of Kyiv, and is aimed at providing social, medical, legal and material assistance to those who defend the sovereignty and independence of Ukraine. We are grateful for evaluating our work as relevant, and its results as those that have significant practical value and can be used in the process of translations and negotiations within the framework of agreements between the Ukrainian and Turkish parties regarding the treatment and rehabilitation of veterans.

#### References

- ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act). (2017). *Guidelines for Writing and Referring to People with Disabilities*. <https://www.reachcils.org/guidelines-writing-and-referring-people-disabilities/>
- Baykan, Z. (2000). Özürlülük, engellilik, sakatlık nedenleri ve korunma. *Süreklilik Tıp Eğitimi Dergisi*. Cilt, 9, (9). <https://www.ttb.org.tr/STED/sted0900/4.html> [in Turkish].
- Cabrè, M. T. (1999) *Terminology: Theory, Methods, and Applications*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Collins Dictionary. (2016). *Disabled*. <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english-thesaurus/disabled>
- Demir A., & Efe A. (2020). *Engelli bireylerin sosyal medya kullanmaları üzerine bir araştırma. 1. Basım*. Hiperlink Yayınları [in Turkish].

Dev'yatko, Yu. S. (2021). *Typology of Dental Terminology in English and Ukrainian languages and its lexicographical representation*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation] Odesa I. Mechnykov National University [in Ukrainian]. [Дев'ятко Ю. С. *Типологія стоматологічної термінології в українській і англійській мовах та її лексикографічне відтворення*, Одеський національний університет імені І. І. Мечникова].

Diakov, A. S., Kyiak, T. R., & Kudelko, Z. B. (2000). *Basics of term formation: semantic and sociolinguistic aspects*. KM Academia [in Ukrainian]. [Дяков, А. С., Кияк, Т. Р., & Куделько, З. Б. (2000). *Основи термінотворення: семантичні та соціолінгвістичні аспекти*. KM Academia]

Doskach, K. V. (2018). Traditional, cognitive, and functional approaches to determine the term as a specialized language unit. *Zakarpats'ki filolohichni studiji*, 4(1), 30–34. [http://zfs-journal.uzhnu.ua/archive/4/part\\_1/8.pdf](http://zfs-journal.uzhnu.ua/archive/4/part_1/8.pdf) [in Ukrainian]. [Доскач, К. В. (2018). Традиційний, когнітивний і функціональний підходи до вивчення терміна як спеціалізованої мовної одиниці. *Закарпатські філологічні студії*, 4(1), 30–34].

Gernsbacher, M. A., Raimond, A. R., Balinghasay, M. T., & Jilana, S. Boston. (2016). "Special needs" is an ineffective euphemism. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications* 1, Article number 29. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-016-0025-4>

Gürlek, M. (2016). Yabancı Tıp Terimlerine Osmanlı Tıp Metinlerinden Türkçe Karşılık Örnekleri. *Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 16(4), 215–236 [in Turkish].

İçli, T. (2019). Ayrımcılığınin Tarihsel Kökleri, & Engellilere Yönelik Ayrımcılık. *Yörünge Dergisi*, 3, 3–9 [in Turkish].

Jamet, D. (2018). The Neological Functions of Disease Euphemisms in English and French: Verbal Hygiene or Speech Pathology. *Lexis [online]: Journal in English Lexicology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.2397>

Kahraman, M. (2017). Türk Dilinin Terimsel Gelişim Sürecine Tarihi Bakış. *Medeniyet ve Toplum Dergisi*, 1(1), 137–160. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/metder/issue/31233/455490> [in Turkish].

Kanun ve Kanun Hükmünde Karamamerde Yer Alan Engelli Bireylere Yönelik İbarelerin Değiştirilmesi Amacıyla Bazı Kanun Ve Kanun Hükmünde Karamamerde Değişiklik Yapılmasına Dair Kanun. No. 6462. Resmî Gazete 3 Mayıs 2013 CUMA Sayı: 28636. <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2013/05/20130503-1.htm> [in Turkish].

Karaman, B.İ. (2009). Terim oluşturma yöntemleri. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı. Belleten*, 57(2), 45–59. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/belleten/issue/32739/363420> [in Turkish].

Karataş, K., & Oran, B. (2007). Engelliler: siyasetin periferinde kalanlar. *Ufuk Ötesi Bilim Dergisi*. Cilt 7(2), 4–19. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/761925> [in Turkish].

Manchaiah V., Stein G., Danermark B., & Germundsson P. (2015). Positive, Neutral, and Negative Connotations Associated with Social Representation of 'Hearing Loss' and 'Hearing Aids'. *J Audiol Otol*, 19(3), 132–137. <https://doi.org/10.7874/jao.2015.19.3.132>

Mecelle Genel Hükümler (İlk 100 Madde) ve Tam Metin [https://sehitkadersivriortakoku.meb.k12.tr/meb\\_iys\\_dosyalar/34/22/736214/dosyalar/2019\\_09/18160535\\_25125215\\_MECELLE\\_ilk\\_100\\_MADDE\\_VE\\_TAM\\_METIN.pdf?CHK=1d38834235653a4dfc1a6ceb00aebff](https://sehitkadersivriortakoku.meb.k12.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/34/22/736214/dosyalar/2019_09/18160535_25125215_MECELLE_ilk_100_MADDE_VE_TAM_METIN.pdf?CHK=1d38834235653a4dfc1a6ceb00aebff) [in Turkish].

Merriam-Webster Thesaurus, *Disabled*. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/thesaurus/disabled>

Navalna M. I. (2014). Lexical connotations as an expressive means of speech. *Psycholinhivstika*, 16, 127–135. [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/psling\\_2014\\_16\\_12](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/psling_2014_16_12) [in Ukrainian]. [Навальна, М. І. (2014). Лексичні конотації як експресивний засіб мовлення. *Психолінгвістика*, 16, 127–135].

Nurdoğan, A. K. (2021). Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Son Dönemlerinde Modern Sosyal Güvenlik Sistemine Geçiş Çalışmaları Kapsamında Şehit Yakınları ve Malul Askerlere Yönelik Yapılan Düzenlemeler ve Milli Mücadeleye Etkisi. *SDÜ Tıp Fakültesi Dergisi*. Özel Sayı (1), 29–37. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/1296802> [in Turkish].

Önver, M. Ş. (2018). *Sakatlık ve Kentsel Mekân*. IJOPEC Publication. [http://www.ijopecc.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/2018\\_45.pdf](http://www.ijopecc.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/2018_45.pdf) [in Turkish].

Öztürk, M. (2011) *Türkiye'de engelli gerçeği*. Ajans Vista Matbaacılık [in Turkish].

Petrova, T. (2020). Development of the theory of a term in Ukrainian and foreign terminological schools. *Slavica Wratislaviensia*, 172, 91–101. <https://doi.org/10.19195/0137-1150.172.8> [in Ukrainian]. [Петрова, Т. (2020). Розвиток теорії терміна в українській та зарубіжних термінологічних школах. *Slavica Wratislaviensia*, 172, 91–101].

Seyyar, A. Özürlülük Terimleri Sözlüğü. [http://www.sosyalsiyaset.net/documents/ozurluluk\\_terimleri\\_sozlugu.htm](http://www.sosyalsiyaset.net/documents/ozurluluk_terimleri_sozlugu.htm) [in Turkish].

Stasyuk, T. V. (2012/2013). Basic metaconcepts of sociocognitive terminology: terminolect. *Věda a vznik. Materialy IX Mezinárodní vědecko - 8 21 praktická konference. Praha: Education and Science s.r.o.*, 26, 47–49. [in Ukrainian]. [Стасюк, Т. В. (2012/2013). Основні метапоняття соціокогнітивного термінознавства: термінолект. *Věda a vznik – 2012/2013. Materialy IX Mezinárodní vědecko - 8 21 praktická konference. Praha. Education and Science s.r.o.*, 26, 47–49].

Stasyuk, T. V. (2013). Update of socio- and cognitive metaters in terminology. *Naukovi pratsi Chornomors'koho derzhavnoho universytetu im. Petra Mohyla kompleksu / Kyvevo-Mohyljans'ka akademiya. Ser.: Filolohiya. Movoznavstvo*. 223 (211), 87–91. <https://lib.chmnu.edu.ua/pdf/naukpraci/movoznavstvo/2013/223-211-19.pdf> [in Ukrainian]. [Стасюк, Т. В. (2013). Актуалізація соціо- та когнітивних метатермінів у термінознавстві. *Наукові праці Чорноморського державного університету ім. Петра Могили комплексу – Києво-Могилянська академія. Сер.: Філологія*.

Мовознавство, 223(211), 87–91].

Stasyuk, T. V. (2019). Prolegomena of Sociocognitive Terminology and Sociocognitive Interpretation of the Term. *Terminologichnyi visnyk: zb. nauk. Prats. Instytut ukrainskoi movy NAN Ukrainy*, (5), 55–64. <http://dspace.dsau.dp.ua/jspui/handle/123456789/1572> [in Ukrainian]. [Стасюк, Т. В. (2019). Прологмени соціокогнітивного термінознавства та соціокогнітивна інтерпретація терміна. *Термінологічний вісник. Збірник наукових праць*. Інститут української мови НАН України, (5), 55–64].

Şişman, Y. D. (2012). Özürlülük Alanında Kullanılan Kavramlar Üzerine Genel Bir Değerlendirme. *Sosyal Politika Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 7 (28), 69–85. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/spcd/issue/21090/227122> [in Turkish].

Temmerman, R. (2000). *Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: The sociocognitive approach*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Tsvyd, M., & Spotar-Ayar, G. (2022). Conceptual components of terminological concepts for disability denotation in modern Turkish. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology*, X (77), 264, 69–74. <https://seanewdim.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Conceptual-components-of-terminological-concepts-for-disability-denotation-in-modern-Turkish-M.-P.-Tsvyd-G.-Y.-Spotar-Ayar.pdf> [in Ukrainian]. [Спотар-Аяр, Г. Ю., & Цвид, М. П. (2022). Поняттєві компоненти терміноконцептів на позначення інвалідності в сучасній турецькій мові. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology*, X (77), 264, 69–74].

Tkhir, V. B. (2002). The evolution of euphemistic substitutes: a consequence of the law of sequence. *Kultura narodov Prychernomor'ya*, 32, 148–152.

<http://dspace.nbuv.gov.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/75184/53-Thir.pdf?sequence=1> [in Ukrainian]. [Тхир, В. Б. (2002). Еволюція евфемістичних субститутів: наслідок дії закону послідовності. *Культура народів Причорномор'я*, 32, 148–152].

Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Anayasası. <https://www.icisleri.gov.tr/kurumlar/icisleri.gov.tr/lcSite/illeridaresi/Mevzuat/Kanunlar/Anayasa.pdf> [in Turkish].

Yaremenko, S. O. (2015). Cognitive biases as an internal factor in the effectiveness of disinformation in mass media. *Informatsiya i pravo*, (1), 74–77. [nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Infprg\\_2015\\_1\\_11](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Infprg_2015_1_11) [in Ukrainian]. [Яременко, С. О. (2015). Когнітивні упередження як внутрішній фактор ефективності дезінформації у засобах масової інформації. *Інформація і право*, (1), 74–77].

Yuzhakova, O. (2012). Study of Ukrainian term systems and term nominations in the cognitive aspect. *Visnyk Nats. un-tu "Lvivs'ka politekhnika". Seriya "Problemy ukrayins'koyi terminolohiyi"*, 733, 60–66. <https://science.lpnu.ua/uk/terminologiyavsi-vypusky/visnyk-no-733-2012/doslidzhennya-ukrayinskyh-terminosystem-i-terminnyh> [in Ukrainian]. [Южакова О. (2012). Дослідження українських терміносистем і термінних номінацій у когнітивному аспекті. *Вісник національного університету "Львівська політехніка". Серія "Проблеми української термінології"*, 733, 60–66].

Отримано редакцією журналу / Received: 01.10.23

Прорецензовано / Revised: 02.11.23

Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 27.11.23

Ганна СПОТАР-АЯР, канд. філол. наук, доц.

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2861-6339

e-mail: spotar@knu.ua

Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна

Мар'яна ЦВИД, магістр

ORCID ID: 0009-0002-4307-0618

e-mail: tsvyd.mariana@gmail.com

Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна

## ТЕРМІНОКОНЦЕПТИ НА ПОЗНАЧЕННЯ ІНВАЛІДНОСТІ: СПЕЦИФІКА НОМІНАЦІЇ, ФУНКЦІОНУВАННЯ ТА ПЕРЕКЛАДУ (НА МАТЕРІАЛІ ТУРЕЦЬКОЇ МОВИ)

**Вступ.** Вивченню термінів на позначення осіб з інвалідністю в турецькій мові присвячено всього декілька наукових праць (Я. Шішман, М. Озтюрк, З. Байкан, А. Демір, А. Ефе), так само й в українській лінгвістиці обмаль спеціалізованих праць, які торкаються проблем термінологічної непорядкованості та відсутності термінів на позначення інвалідності, затверджених на державному рівні. Актуальність цього дослідження обумовлена необхідністю популяризації принципів безбар'єрності та інклюзивності у суспільстві, значним запитом на переклад текстів у галузі реабілітації й лікування, а також активізації співробітництва України та Туреччини в цих сферах.

**Методи.** Під час дослідження було проаналізовано більше 200 терміноконцептів, що використовуються на позначення інвалідності, і термінів реабілітації, які функціонують з кінця ХІХ до початку ХХІ ст. У дослідженні використано комплексну методологію, що включає методи когнітивної лінгвістики та соціолінгвістики, метод контекстуального аналізу та метод аналізу словникових дефініцій.

**Результати.** Термінологія на позначення інвалідності у сучасній турецькій мові є непорядкованою, що можна пояснити такими факторами, як: одночасне використання турецьких та іноземних лексем (запозичених з арабської, перської, англійської, французької, латинської мов), евфемізація термінів, орієнтація на міжнародні стандарти та угоди і, як наслідок, використання англійських лексем тощо. Виявлено, що лексика міжнародних угод і національного законодавства в деяких випадках відрізняється. Швидке формування негативної конотації є основним фактором, що впливає на процес формування термінології та призводить до створення нового терміна без негативного значення на заміну попередньому.

**Висновки.** Узагальнюючи основні проблемні питання перекладу, пропонуємо застосовувати комплекс методів і підходів, тактич і стратегій перекладу з метою обрання еквівалента відповідно до типу дискурсу, зокрема: використовувати класифікації ВООЗ для перекладу медичної документації, термінологію чинного законодавства з урахуванням змін до нього для офіційних документів; обережно вживати описові конструкції та евфемізми, водночас фокусуючи увагу на людину, а не на її характеристику ("person-first language"). Прагматична адаптація має важливе значення під час перекладу текстів соціальної сфери, реклами, художньої літератури, тому варто уникати надмірної евфемізації понять у процесі роботи з будь-яким типом тексту та термінами на позначення інвалідності.

**Ключові слова:** інвалідність, інклюзивність, особа з інвалідністю, термін, терміноконцепт, турецька мова.

Автори заявляють про відсутність конфлікту інтересів. Спонсори не брали участі в розробленні дослідження; у збиранні, аналізі чи інтерпретації даних; у написанні рукопису; у рішенні про публікацію результатів.

The authors declare no conflicts of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; in the decision to publish the results.