

2 Three types of terminology in chess

Pius ten Hacken, Maria Koliopoulou

ABSTRACT

In this paper we demonstrate that there are different types of terminology and that the classification of terms does not depend on the domain but on the position of the term in the discussion in the field. In a field such as chess, we find both specialized vocabulary and terms in the narrow sense. The difference is that the former have a prototype-based concept as their meaning, whereas the latter have a terminological definition consisting of necessary and sufficient conditions. Among the latter, we distinguish legal and scientific terms. Legal terms in chess refer to concepts used in the regulations. Scientific terms appear in theories that try to explain why a particular move is good or bad. Specialized vocabulary encompasses all terms for which a terminological definition is not necessary. In Greek chess terms, we find translations and borrowings of various types. There is no obvious correlation between the naming strategy and the terminological type.

Τρεις τύποι ορολογίας στο σκάκι

Pius ten Hacken, Μαρία Κολιοπούλου

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Στην εργασία αυτή παρουσιάζουμε διαφορετικούς τύπους ορολογίας και υποστηρίζουμε ότι η κατηγοριοποίηση των όρων δεν εξαρτάται από το θεματικό πεδίο καθαυτό, αλλά από τις ιδιότητες του όρου στο συγκεκριμένο πεδίο. Συγκεκριμένα, εντοπίζουμε δύο κύριες κατηγορίες όρων: ειδικό λεξιλόγιο και όρους υπό τη στενή έννοια. Η διαφορά των δύο αυτών τύπων έγκειται στα χαρακτηριστικά της έννοιας.

Στο ειδικό λεξιλόγιο οι έννοιες έχουν πρωτοτυπικά χαρακτηριστικά. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι τα εννοιακά όρια του ειδικού λεξιλογίου δεν είναι αυστηρώς προσδιορισμένα. Σε αυτή την περίπτωση, η υιοθέτηση ενός ορολογικού ορισμού είναι δύσκολη, αλλά κυρίως μη αναγκαία, καθώς η τυποποίηση του ειδικού λεξιλογίου αφορά πρωτίστως το όνομα του όρου και όχι την έννοια. Το ειδικό λεξιλόγιο απαντά κυρίως σε τεχνικά πεδία.

Αντιθέτως, οι όροι υπό τη στενή έννοια απαιτούν έναν ορολογικό ορισμό, βασισμένο σε αναγκαίες και επαρκείς συνθήκες. Στην περίπτωση αυτή, η αυστηρή οριοθέτηση της έννοιας, που υπερβαίνει τη φυσική τάση προσδιορισμού πρωτοτυπικών εννοιών, είναι αναγκαία για την εφαρμογή ενός νόμου ή μιας επιστημονικής θεωρίας. Επομένως, οι όροι αυτού του τύπου απαντούν αντίστοιχα σε νομικά ή επιστημονικά πεδία. Εντούτοις, δεν υπάρχει μια σαφής κατηγοριοποίηση των θεματικών πεδίων που να αντιπροσωπεύει τις διαφορετικές ορολογικές κατηγορίες. Στην ιατρική, για παράδειγμα, απαντούν και οι δύο τύποι όρων.

Οι όροι υπό τη στενή έννοια κατηγοριοποιούνται περαιτέρω σε νομικούς και επιστημονικούς. Ο ορισμός ενός νομικού όρου δημιουργεί μια νέα έννοια που είναι αυστηρώς προσδιορισμένη και έχει ως σκοπό να διασφαλίσει την εφαρμογή (νομικών) κανόνων και έμμεσα μια εύρυθμη κοινωνία. Οι επιστημονικοί

όροι αποσκοπούν στην κατηγοριοποίηση, διασφάλιση και μετάδοση της γνώσης. Οι ορισμοί τους βασίζονται σε εμπειρικά κριτήρια και συχνά υπόκεινται σε κριτική. Οι δύο αυτοί τύποι των όρων υπό τη στενή έννοια δεν κατηγοριοποιούνται σύμφωνα με το θεματικό πεδίο στο οποίο απαντούν, αλλά σύμφωνα με τις ιδιότητες των εννοιών τους.

Ένα θεματικό πεδίο που εμφανίζει τους διαφορετικούς αυτούς τύπους όρων είναι η σκακιστική ορολογία, την οποία και χρησιμοποιούμε ως παράδειγμα στην παρούσα μελέτη. Παραθέτοντας σκακιστικούς όρους της Αγγλικής καταδεικνύουμε τόσο την ειδοποιό διαφορά μεταξύ ειδικού λεξιλογίου και όρων υπό τη στενή έννοια, όσο και την περαιτέρω κατηγοριοποίηση των τελευταίων σε νομικούς και επιστημονικούς όρους. Νομικού τύπου όροι απαντούν σε περιπτώσεις εννοιών που αφορούν κανονισμούς. Όροι επιστημονικού τύπου αφορούν διαφορετικές θεωρητικές προσεγγίσεις και προκύπτουν κυρίως όταν είναι αναγκαίο να αξιολογηθεί μια συγκεκριμένη σκακιστική κίνηση. Το σκακιστικό ειδικό λεξιλόγιο περιλαμβάνει εκείνους τους όρους, για τους οποίους δεν απαιτείται ένας ορολογικός ορισμός.

Συγκεκριμένα, η σκακιστική ορολογία καθορίζεται διεθνώς από την Παγκόσμια Ομοσπονδία Σκακιού. Τα εννοιολογικά χαρακτηριστικά των διαφόρων όρων, όπως αποδίδονται από την εν λόγω ομοσπονδία, καθορίζουν την κατηγοριοποίησή τους στους τρεις τύπους. Για παράδειγμα, οι λεπτομερώς προσδιορισμένες πληροφορίες που απαιτούνται για να ορίσει κανείς την έννοια της σκακιέρας ('chessboard') καταδεικνύουν έναν όρο νομικού τύπου. Επιστημονικού τύπου όροι απαντούν στο πλαίσιο της σκακιστικής θεωρίας, όταν, δηλαδή, μια συγκεκριμένη κίνηση αξιολογείται με βάση εμπειρικά κριτήρια. Για παράδειγμα, η αξιολόγηση και οριοθέτηση των διαφόρων τύπων ανοιγμάτων στο σκάκι αποτελούν επιστημονικούς όρους. Το ειδικό λεξιλόγιο περιλαμβάνει όρους, όπως *άνοιγμα* ('opening'), *μέσο παρτίδας* ('middlegame') και *τέλος παρτίδας ή φινάλε* ('endgame'), καθώς η μετάβαση από τη μία φάση στην άλλη ορίζεται υποκειμενικά. Επομένως, οι τρεις αυτοί όροι αποτελούν πρωτοτυπικές και όχι αυστηρώς προσδιορισμένες έννοιες.

Η παρούσα μελέτη εξειδικεύεται περαιτέρω στη σκακιστική ορολογία της Ελληνικής. Αρχικά μελετάμε τον τρόπο σχηματισμού των σκακιστικών όρων και διαπιστώνουμε ότι οι ελληνικοί όροι είναι αποτέλεσμα δευτερογενούς οροδοσίας. Εντοπίζοντας τους πρωτογενείς όρους σε διάφορες γλώσσες, κυρίως στη Γαλλική, αλλά και τις διάφορες μορφές σχηματισμού των ελληνικών όρων προτείνουμε τέσσερις βασικούς τύπους σκακιστικών όρων: α) πλήρως μεταφρασμένοι όροι, β) δάνειες λέξεις, γ) εν μέρει μεταφρασμένοι όροι, δ) πλήρως μεταφρασμένοι όροι με συνώνυμη δάνεια λέξη.

Σύμφωνα με τον πρώτο τρόπο σχηματισμού, ο σκακιστικός όρος της Ελληνικής αποτελεί το μετάφρασμα ενός όρου από μια άλλη γλώσσα. Για παράδειγμα, ο όρος *βασιλιάς* αποτελεί ελεύθερη μετάφραση των αντίστοιχων όρων που αποδίδουν το σχετικό πόνι στις ευρωπαϊκές γλώσσες. Συχνά είναι δύσκολο να προσδιοριστεί η γλώσσα-πηγή. Οι δάνειοι σκακιστικοί όροι της Ελληνικής προέρχονται από διάφορες γλώσσες, κυρίως από εκείνες που καθόρισαν την ιστορία του σκακιού, μέχρι την καθιέρωση και τυποποίηση της ορολογίας αυτού του πεδίου. Η Γαλλική αποτελεί συχνά γλώσσα προέλευσης για τα μεταφραστικά δάνεια της Ελληνικής, όπως μαρτυρά το παράδειγμα *ροκέ* ('castling') από τον γαλλικό όρο *roque*.

Το τρίτο και τέταρτο είδος σχηματισμού όρων συνδυάζουν, με διαφορετικούς τρόπους, τους δύο πρώτους. Το παράδειγμα *τεχνητό ροκέ* ('artificial castling') αποτελεί ένα μετάφρασμα συνδυαστικού τρόπου, αποτελούμενο, στο πρώτο μέρος, από έναν μεταφρασμένο όρο, και στο δεύτερο μέρος, από έναν δάνειο. Η δυνατότητα ύπαρξης συνώνυμων όρων μαρτυρείται από τον όρο *διορθώνω* και τον συνώνυμό του *ζαντούμπ*, προερχόμενο από τον γαλλικό όρο *j'adoube*. Οι συνώνυμοι όροι δεν ακολουθούν τον ίδιο τρόπο σχηματισμού, καθώς ο πρώτος όρος αποτελεί μια μετάφραση και ο δεύτερος μια δάνεια λέξη.

Οι έννοιες των σκακιστικών όρων της Ελληνικής καθορίζονται από την Ελληνική Σκακιστική Ομοσπονδία με βάση τις προδιαγραφές της Παγκόσμιας Ομοσπονδίας Σκακιού. Μελετώντας παραδείγματα σκακιστών όρων της Ελληνικής διαπιστώσαμε ότι καταδεικνύουν τόσο τις δύο βασικές κατηγορίες όρων (ειδικό λεξιλόγιο και όροι υπό τη στενή έννοια), όσο και τις υποκατηγορίες όρων νομικού και επιστημονικού τύπου, όπως ακριβώς απαντούν και στην Αγγλική. Ωστόσο, με βάση τα παραδείγματα ελληνικών όρων που παραθέτουμε, δεν προκύπτει συσχετισμός του τρόπου οροδοσίας με τους διαφορετικούς εννοιακούς τύπους όρων.

0 Introduction

In classical approaches to terminology, based on [1], standardization of terms is the central concern. The aim of standardization is to facilitate communication in specialized domains. More recently, this emphasis on standardization has been criticized, e.g. by [2]. The central point of criticism is that the classical approach neglects the linguistic nature of terms. In [3] and [4], it is attempted to develop a synthesis that takes into account the linguistic properties of terms while laying a sound theoretical foundation for standardization as required for successful communication. Here, we will first outline the requirements and problems of standardization (section 1) and present a classification of terms (section 2). A crucial point is that the resulting classes do not depend on properties of the domain, but on properties of the communication. This is illustrated by an analysis of the terminology of chess (section 3). Section 4 turns to Greek and addresses the question how the relation between English chess terms and their Greek counterparts correlates with the classes identified in section 3. Finally, section 5 summarizes the conclusions.

1 Standardization as a need and as a problem

There are many fields in which standardization of terminology is a requirement for successful communication. An obvious example is the domain of chemistry. As shown by [5] and [6], the transition from alchemy to chemistry was marked by the adoption of the *nomenclature* developed by Antoine de Lavoisier (1743-1794) and others in 1787. Whereas in alchemy, research was secret and communication mostly restricted to the initiated, in

chemistry the aim was to work on a shared scientific knowledge in an open scientific community. Each alchemist had his own names of substances and passed them on to his apprentices. In a proper scientific community, however, it should be possible to repeat experiments on the basis of their description. In order to know the composition of substances, a much more detailed description is necessary, using terms that are understood in the same way by the entire community.

In the Western European tradition, Eugen Wüster (1898-1977) was the founder of an approach in which standardization of terminology was studied as a field of its own, not restricted to individual domains. Because of his background as the owner of an electrical engineering company, his main interest was in technical terminology. In his PhD thesis, [7], he argued for an international effort of standardization of technical language. Obviously, such an effort could not be extended to the entire language. In [1], a clear distinction is made between the terminological approach and the linguistic approach to language. The question is, however, to what extent it is possible to separate the two.

In the 1970s, it was discovered that natural concepts as stored in people's mind are based on prototypes, cf. [8], [9]. In the sociocognitive approach to terminology, as elaborated in [2], it is argued that the insights gathered in prototype semantics undermine the possibility of defining concepts in the way advocated by [1]. In a domain such as life sciences, terms are said to behave in a way that exploits the vagueness of the underlying concept. However, if definitions of the classical type are no longer used, this has a negative impact on the precision and success of communication.

2 Three types of terminology

An attempt to reconcile the communicative needs observed by [1] with the problematic aspects of terminological expressions observed by [2] should start with an acknowledgement that in formulating a terminological definition, we do something profoundly unnatural. A definition in necessary and sufficient conditions imposes precise boundaries on a concept that in its natural form is based on prototypes. In [3] and [4], it is argued that this means that we should not attempt to define concepts in necessary and sufficient conditions unless there is a specific communicative need for such a definition. Such a need does not exist for all terms. Therefore, [3] distinguishes *TERMS IN THE NARROW SENSE* and *SPECIALIZED VOCABULARY*.

In specialized vocabulary, there is no need for a terminological definition. This is often the case in technical domains or crafts. In [3], the domain of piano manufacturing is used as an

example. Here the meaning of terms designating parts of the piano and instruments for handling them is prototype-based. It is still useful to standardize such terms, as [10] illustrates, but for specialized vocabulary of this type, the standard only affects the name, not the delimitation of the concept.

In terms in the narrow sense, the need to delimit the concept overrides the natural tendency of concepts to be based on prototypes. In [3], two examples of domains where such terms occur are discussed. One is mathematical linguistics. Here we cannot prove any theorem if we have not formally defined the concepts it involves. Another domain is traffic law. Here we cannot enforce a law unless we have delimited the concepts it invokes. We have to know what counts as a moped before we can impose a fine for driving faster than the specific speed limit that mopeds are subject to.

There are two types of motivation for overriding the natural tendency to leave a concept as a prototype and instead formulate a terminological definition for it. In [11], legal terminology is discussed. In cases such as traffic law or laws governing the designations on wine labels, the aim of precise definitions is to influence behaviour and protect people who behave in the desired way. In [12], scientific terminology is discussed, e.g. *planet*. Here the aim of a precise definition is to classify naturally occurring events or objects as a basis for a scientific theory.

Many of the problems with terminological definitions identified by [2] disappear when we make a distinction between terms in the narrow sense and specialized vocabulary. For specialized vocabulary it is difficult but also unnecessary to come up with a terminological definition. Also in sciences, it is not the case that all terms are terms in the narrow sense. In medicine, most of the terms designating instruments do not require a terminological definition and should be considered specialized vocabulary. There is also a distinction between the two types of motivation for terminological definitions. The definition of a legal term creates a concept, whereas in science, finding the best definition of a term is often a matter of empirically informed debate. That we actually have two different types of term, not two types of domain, can be illustrated by considering terminology in chess.

3 The terminology of chess

The game of chess is governed by the *Fédération internationale des échecs* (FIDE). The FIDE has adopted a set of rules for the game, the latest version of which, [13], was adopted at the 25th FIDE Congress in Tallinn (2012) and came into force in 2014. Although the regulations are not laws in the same way as [14], the way the terms are used is technically

the same. As is typical of a legal text, [13] focuses on the regulation of an aspect of the outside world and uses terms in doing so. At the end of the document a glossary of terms is given with references to the articles with relevant information. As an example, (1) gives the relevant passages for *chessboard*.

- (1) a. The game of chess is played between two opponents who move their pieces on a square board called a 'chessboard'. [...] (Art. 1.1)
- b. The chessboard is composed of an 8 x 8 grid of 64 squares alternately light (the 'white' squares) and dark (the 'black' squares). [...] (Art. 2.1)

[13] does not contain a proper terminological definition of *chessboard*, which would start by stating what a chessboard is and give necessary and sufficient conditions delimiting the concept, but the information needed to formulate such a definition is contained in the two statements in (1).

Not all terms in chess are of the legal type. An example of a different type of term is found in the division of a typical game into opening, middlegame, and endgame. The division between these phases reflects a different type of preparation. The opening starts from the defined initial position. An experienced chess player has a repertoire of openings from which to choose the first few moves. Usually, the opening is played quite fast. The middlegame starts when the typical set openings come to an end. Now it is no longer the opening knowledge, but the strategic and tactical insight of the players that determines the moves. The transition to the endgame comes when there are only few pieces left on the board. In most cases, it is known whether the position is winning for one of the players or a draw and experienced players rarely play out an endgame in an actual match.

While *opening*, *middlegame*, and *endgame* are clearly terms, their meaning is rather of the prototypical kind. There are clear cases in which we can decide whether we are looking at an opening or a middlegame, but there are also cases where players may disagree with each other. The rules of chess are the same in all three phases of the game, so that it does not really matter if one player considers the position part of the opening, but his opponent takes it to be already in the middlegame. The moves are the same, even though two players may differ in their attribution of a particular position. *Opening* and *middlegame* are specialized vocabulary.

There is a third type of term in chess, besides legal terms used in formulating the rules of play and prototype-based specialized vocabulary used by players in their communication. This type of term is used in what is called *chess theory*. Chess theory is concerned with the

question of how good a particular move is. It treats this question as an empirical one, so that a hypothesis about the answer can be verified by the facts. A famous example of an early work in this genre is the *Handbuch des Schachspiels* [15], published in 1843 by Tassilo von Heydebrand und der Lasa (1818-1899) after an idea by Rudolph von Bilguer (1815-1840). One of the aims of this work is to classify openings and evaluate how good an opening is for white and for black. A modern successor is *Modern Chess Openings* [16], now in its 15th edition (2008).

In the study of chess openings of this type, the chances of winning for white and black in a particular named opening, e.g. the French opening, are evaluated. The terminological question this raises is how to delimit *French opening*. The choice of a name for such an opening is not essential, as illustrated by the *Encyclopedia of Chess Openings* (ECO) [17], which uses alphanumeric codes. What is crucial is which sequences of moves are combined into the relevant concept. This is in part an empirical question, in the sense that the nature of the ensuing game is determined by the opening. We want the name to refer to a set of possible moves that lead to similar games, so that we can make sensible predictions about the outcome. Terms for individual openings are therefore examples of scientific terms, as they behave in a way similar to terms in empirical sciences.

Therefore, in the domain of chess we have three types of term. Legal terms, e.g. *chessboard*, are used to formulate the rules of the game. Specialized vocabulary, e.g. *opening*, is used to talk about the game in ways that require understanding, but no precise delimitation. Names of individual openings can be used in the same way as terms in empirical science to denote and delimit concepts for which empirical hypotheses are tested.

4 Greek chess terms

Against the background of these general considerations of chess terminology, we will now discuss chess terms in Greek. In section 4.1, we will consider how names for the concepts have been chosen in Greek. In section 4.2, we turn to the correlation between the types of terminology identified in section 3 and the naming strategies discussed in section 4.1.

4.1 Naming strategies

Chess as we know it now has a long history in which it gradually developed. In the course of this development, concepts were named in the language that was central or influential in chess or its predecessors. These names often served as the basis for further naming processes. In the late medieval period, the rules of chess were settled in a way that still underlies current rules. At that time, the central focus was in Italy and Spain. Earlier sources

were in Persia and in the Arab world. In the 18th century, France was the undisputed centre of chess, in particular thanks to François-André Danican Philidor (1726-1795). In the 19th century, also England and Germany became important. Although Russia and the Soviet Union dominated chess for much of the 20th century, by that time most terminology had been established.

The Greek role in the history of chess has been quite limited. This is reflected in the naming of terms, which generally takes the names in other languages as its starting point. The naming strategies in Greek can be classified as in (2).

- (2) a. Fully translated terms
- b. Loanwords
- c. Partially translated terms
- d. Fully translated terms with a synonymous loanword

Let us consider each of the cases in (2) in turn. A good example of (2a) is βασιλιάς ('king'). Whereas this piece is generally named in corresponding ways in all languages, other pieces have names that do not correspond so closely. Thus, Greek has αξιωματικός ('military officer') for English *bishop*. French has *fou* ('fool') and German *Läufer* ('runner') for this piece. In all cases, they refer to court officials. In the French court, the court jester was the only person who could freely criticize the king, which made him one of the principal advisors. In German courts, the *Läufer* was the messenger of the king. In Greek, αξιωματικός is a free translation of such terms.

Loanwords as in (2b) come from various languages that played a role in the history of chess. For example, the term σαχ ('check') comes from Persian word *Šâh* (Shah) indicating a title given to emperors or kings in Persia. In general, loanwords have been phonetically adapted to the Greek language, as indicated here by the change in initial consonant. In ματ ('mate'), we have a loanword from Arabic that did not have to be adapted phonologically. The most common source language for borrowings in Greek is French. It is not always easy to identify the language from which a term is borrowed, but for ροκέ ('castling'), the French origin is rather clear. The French term is *roque*, whereas English *castling* is not a candidate and German *Rochade* is, with its two variant pronunciations of the *-ch-*, a clear borrowing itself. Loanwords from English are less common. An example of a clear case is χάντικαπ ('handicap'). Here French expresses the converse, *avantage* ('advantage') and German *Vorgabe* (lit. 'gift in advance') is a fully translated term.

Whereas (2a) and (2b) can be seen as opposite strategies, the remaining two classes combine them. In the case of (2c), we have a complex term, i.e. a derivation, compound or multi-word term, of which a part is translated and a part borrowed without translation. An example is *αντιγκαμπί* ('countergambit'). The term *gambit* is originally French, but Italian has *gambetto* and Spanish *gambito*. It refers to a move which sacrifices a piece (usually a pawn) in the opening in return for a positional advantage. The other side can accept or reject the sacrifice. A countergambit is a kind of rejection that sacrifices a piece (again, typically a pawn) in return. In the Greek term, *gambit* is borrowed as *καμπί*, but *counter-* is translated as *αντι-*.

An example with a multi-word term is *τεχνητό ροκέ* ('artificial castling'). It refers to a series of moves that together have the same effect as castling. It occurs, for example, when the right to castle has been lost by a movement of the king. Here the borrowing *ροκέ* ('castling') is modified by the translation of *artificial*.

An interesting example is *κίνηση φορσέ* (lit. 'forced move'). Nowadays, both in English and in French the common term for this concept is *zugzwang*, a clear borrowing from German. It describes a situation where a player is forced to play a move, but any move will deteriorate the position. The Greek expression is borrowed from the French *coup forcé*, where *coup* ('move') has been translated, but *forcé* ('forced') only transliterated.

Whereas in (2c), the two techniques in (2a) and (2b) are applied to different components of the term, in the case of (2d), we find two competing terms produced by (2a) and (2b). An example is the use of *ανπασάν* and *εν διελεύσει*. The former is a borrowing from French *en passant* (lit. 'in passing'). The latter is a calque, translating the two French words literally. It refers to a special way of capturing a pawn. A similar pair exists for *j'adoube* (lit. 'I adjust'). Normally, if a player touches a piece, this piece has to be played. When they say *j'adoube* before touching the piece, this obligation is dropped. In Greek we find both the direct loanword *ζαντούμπ* and the calque *διορθώνω*.

In sum, the concepts in chess have all been named in languages other than Greek. The most common Greek naming strategies are translation of the word that motivated the name and borrowing of the word with its form. In special cases, results of both strategies can exist side by side or different strategies can be applied to different parts of the term.

4.2 Types of term and naming strategies

As chess is an international game, there is no reason to expect that the considerations in section 3, which identified three types of terminology in chess do not apply to Greek.

Although the FIDE Secretariat is in Athens, this does not affect the position of the *Greek Chess Federation* (Ελληνική Σκακιστική Ομοσπονδία, ΕΣΟ), founded in 1948. As all national federations, ΕΣΟ organizes chess tournaments and national championships. They also provide a Greek version of the rules of chess, which is a translation of the official English version adopted by FIDE.

It is an interesting question to what extent the fact that the official rules are a translation from English affects the naming strategy adopted for terms of the legal type. Where traditional terms were established in Greek before the foundation of FIDE in 1924, there is no reason to expect a strong influence. This is the case for the names of pieces. An example such as *αξιωματικός* shows this most clearly. The English *bishop* was not borrowed or translated because there was already a fully adequate term in place. Also the term *ροκέ* for *castling* shows a limited influence of English. The term was borrowed from French at a time when French rather than English was the dominant language. The fact that *ροκέ* was borrowed whereas *αξιωματικός* uses a Greek form can be explained by the fact that the former is a much more technical term than the latter. However, the use of both *ανπασάν* and *εν διελεύσει* shows that this is no more than a general tendency. The underlying concept is highly specialized and precisely delimited, but both the French expression and its translation are in use.

When we turn to specialized vocabulary, for which no boundaries have to be established, we can expect that the means of transmission are different. Instead of the formal regulation by an international organization, the emergence of these terms is due to communication about the game that may be very informal. In international communication, English is currently used most frequently, but earlier French and German were more important. Terms like *άνοιγμα* ('opening'), *μέσο παρτίδας* ('middlegame') and *τέλος παρτίδας* or *φινάλε* ('endgame') were probably introduced in Greek by players who had heard the concept being talked about in another language. As these examples suggest, translation is a prominent naming strategy here.

The category that is most difficult to determine is the terms of the scientific type. We can easily determine whether a particular term needs to be defined as a term in the narrow sense when this is motivated by its role in the rules of check. It is much more difficult to determine whether any claims made about what is a good move or a good strategy require such a precise terminological definition. The terms in question developed out of specialized vocabulary and the question is whether their boundaries are important.

As an example, consider *σαχ με αποκάλυψη* (lit. check with uncovering, ‘discovered check’). It refers to a check that results from moving a piece away from the line between a check-giving piece and the enemy king. The most likely origin of the Greek term is French *échec à la découverte* (lit. ‘check with the uncovering’). German has *Abzugsschach* (lit. ‘withdrawal check’), which uses a different image. The Greek expression should be classified as a translation (calque). Whether this is an item of specialized vocabulary or a term in the narrow sense of the type used in empirical science depends on the theories it appears in.

We can say in general that terms of this type emerge first as specialized vocabulary and only afterwards become terms of the scientific type. This process takes place when the theory of chess develops and more powerful, explanatory accounts of what constitutes a good move are proposed. When we want to establish how important *σαχ με αποκάλυψη* is in determining the winner of a game, we may want to make more precise claims about the conditions that need to be fulfilled for a position to count as *σαχ με αποκάλυψη*.

As mentioned above, an area of particular attention in theorizing is the opening. Opening theory wants to establish which openings are good. The precise conditions to be included in a particular opening have to be established. In [17], the naming problem is solved by using alphanumeric codes. Instead of using English opening or *αγγλικό άνοιγμα* (‘English opening’), which leaves open a range of questions as to which positions and sequences of moves are included, [17] assigns A10 to A39 to all openings that start with c2-c4, the characteristic first move of the English opening.

5 Conclusion

We showed in this paper that there are three types of terminology. We distinguish specialized vocabulary from terms in the narrow sense and within the latter we distinguish legal and scientific terminology. In a field like chess, we find all three types. The study of Greek chess terminology showed that specialized vocabulary is at the basis of most if not all terms. For legal terminology, a conscious decision to impose a regulation determines the transition from specialized vocabulary to terms in the narrow sense. Scientific terminology is much more elusive. In Greek, chess terminology is borrowed or translated. It is also possible to combine the processes for a single expression and in some cases the two strategies are in competition. There is no obvious correlation between the choice of naming strategy and the type of term. A more detailed historical study would be needed to determine any regularities in this respect. However, the fact that most if not all terms originate in specialized vocabulary suggests that no general rules can be formulated for the correlation between terminological type and naming strategy.

References

- [1] Wüster Eugen, *Einführung in die allgemeine Terminologielehre und terminologische Lexikographie*, Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag, 1991.
- [2] Temmerman Rita, *Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: The Sociocognitive Approach*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2000.
- [3] ten Hacken Pius, 'Prototypes and Discreteness in Terminology', Bernal Elisenda & DeCesaris Janet (eds.), *Proceedings of the XIII Euralex International Congress*, 2008, IULA-UPF, Barcelona, pp. 979-987.
- [4] Ten Hacken Pius, 'Terms and Specialized Vocabulary: Taming the Prototypes', Kockaert Hendrik J. & Steurs Frieda (eds.), *Handbook of Terminology*, 2015, Volume 1, Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 3-13.
- [5] Bensaude-Vincent Bernadette & Stengers Isabelle, *Histoire de la chimie*, Paris: La Découverte, 1995.
- [6] Crosland Maurice, *The Language of Science: From the Vernacular to the Technical*, Cambridge: Lutterworth. 2006.
- [7] Wüster Eugen, *Internationale Sprachnormung in der Technik, besonders in der Elektrotechnik. Die nationale Sprachnormung und ihre Verallgemeinerung*, Berlin: VDJ-Verlag, 1931.
- [8] Labov William, 'The Boundaries of Words and Their Meanings', Bailey C.-J. N. & Shuy R.W. (eds.), *New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English*, 1973, Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, pp. 340-373.
- [9] Rosch Eleanor, (1978), 'Principles of Categorization', Rosch Barbara & Lloyd Eleanor (eds.), *Cognition and categorization*, 1978, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 27-48.
- [10] Arntz Reiner, Picht Heribert & Schmitz Klaus-Dirk, *Einführung in die Terminologearbeit*, 7. Auflage, Hildesheim: Olms. 2014.
- [11] Ten Hacken Pius, 'Creating Legal Terms: A Linguistic Perspective', *International Journal for the Semiotics of the Law* 2010, 23, pp. 407-425.
- [12] Ten Hacken Pius, 'The Tension between Definition and Reality in Terminology', Dykstra Anne & Schoonheim Tanneke (eds.), *Proceedings of the XIV Euralex International Congress*, 2010, Ljouwert: Fryske Akademy / Afuk, pp. 915-927 .
- [13] World Chess Federation, *Laws of chess: for competitions starting on or after 1 July 2014*. FIDE, 2012. (<http://www.fide.com/component/handbook/?id=171&view=article>).
- [14] Ανδρουλάκης Νικόλας, Δαλακούρας Θεοχάρης, Γιαννίδης Ιωάννης & Αναγνωστόπουλος Ηλίας. *Κώδικας Ποινικής Δικονομίας. Νομολογία κατ'άρθρον*. Αθήνα: Δίκαιο & Οικονομία – Π.Ν. Σάκκουλας, 2015.

- [15] Von Heydebrand und der Lasa Tassilo, *Handbuch des Schachspiels*, Berlin: Verlag von Veit & Comp, 1843.
[16] De Firmian Nick, *Modern Chess Openings*, 15th edition, USA: Random House, 2008.
[17] *Encyclopedia of Chess Openings*, Matanović Aleksandar (ed.), ECO code.

Prof. Dr. **Pius ten Hacken**, Dr. **Maria Koliopoulou**

Institut für Translationswissenschaft,
Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck
Herzog-Siegmond-Ufer 15
6020 Innsbruck, Austria

English-Greek glossary

English term	Greek term
bishop	αξιωματικός
castling	ροκέ
check	σαχ
chessboard	σκακιέρα
endgame	τέλος παρτίδας, φινάλε
french opening	γαλλικό άνοιγμα, γαλλική άμυνα
Greek Chess Federation	Ελληνική Σκακιστική Ομοσπονδία (ΕΣΟ)
handicap	χάντικαπ
in passing	εν διελεύσει (αν πασσάν)
king	βασιλιάς
legal term	νομικός όρος
mate	ματ
middlegame	μέσο παρτίδας
opening	άνοιγμα
scientific term	επιστημονικός όρος
specialized vocabulary	ειδικό λεξιλόγιο
term in the narrow sense	όρος υπό τη στενή έννοια
World Chess Federation (Fédération Internationale Des Échecs, FIDE)	Παγκόσμια Ομοσπονδία Σκακιού