

Заглавие документа: Криворот, В.В. THEORY OF NOMINATION AND WORD-MAKING PROCESSES // Кросс-культурная коммуникация и современные технологии в исследовании и преподавании языков: материалы международной научно-практической конференции, посвященной 90-летию БГУ (Минск, 25-26 октября 2011г.)/ редкол.: О.И. Уланович и др. – Минск: Изд. центр БГУ, 2012. – 279 с. – С. 79-81.

Авторы: Криворот, Виктория Владимировна

Тема: Теория языка

Дата публикации: 2011

Издатель: Изд. центр БГУ

Аннотация: *В настоящем реферате представлены концепции и точки зрения по вопросу теории номинации и классификации процессов словообразования ряда лингвистов, таких как Кубрякова Е.С., Арнольд И.В., Адольф Заунер, Вильям Д. Уитни и др...*

В работе представлено видение и понимание сущности и типологии языковых номинаций, форм и последствий влияния и взаимодействия на процесс номинации лингвистических и экстралингвистических причин. Особое внимание отведено проблеме определения видов словообразования и, в частности, вопросу.

В.В. Криворот

THEORY OF NOMINATION AND WORD-MAKING PROCESSES

Every new phenomenon in human society and in human activity in general, which is of any importance for communication, finds a reflection in vocabulary. A word, through its meaning rendering some notion, is a generalised reflection of reality; it is therefore impossible to understand its development if one is ignorant of the changes in social, political or everyday life, production or science, manners or culture it serves to reflect.

Act of nomination is a speech-cognitive process of choosing a ready name for the thing from the available linguistic units or coining a new name for it. The coining of new words proceeds by way of combining linguistic elements on the basis of a determinant/determinatum relationship called syntagma.

Kubryakova defines the structure of the nomination act in the following way: it includes the speaker's intention and the linguistic means of its realization. In accordance with his/her intention the speaker analyses the situation and marks some details in it. This affects the choice of a nomination unit [1, p.43]. Here the following factors are taken into consideration:

1) the source of nomination: in which form – ready or newly coined – the unit is taken;

2) the form and the length of the nomination unit: a word, a word-combination or a sentence;

3) the inner form of nomination: nomination may be either by a motivated sign or an unmotivated sign. Examples: phonetic motivation – *smash, whip, splash*; morphological motivation – *friend – unfriendly*; semantic motivation – *the arm of a person → the arm of a tree*;

4) the semantic types of nomination: direct/indirect, primary/secondary, literal/figurative. Primary nomination takes place when the referent is nominated directly and the meaning of the linguistic unit can be understood without the help of a context, in isolation. Secondary nomination is the use of existing linguistic units in a new function, with a new meaning.

5) the adequacy of the nomination act and the inner control over its appropriateness and exactness.

In the act of nomination, various pragmatic factors are of great importance: emotional factors; evaluative factors; social factors.

The vocabulary of a language, and, correspondingly, the «lexicon» as the subcomponent of the grammar which formally represents the lexical competence of a native speaker, are structured by two organizational principles: a semantic and a formal-morphological one.

Semantic structures result from the existence of various kinds of sense relations between lexical items, or rather, the meanings of lexical items, on the basis of which one obtains sets of lexemes sharing a common basic meaning. These sets are usually referred to as lexical fields.

Formal-morphological structures derive from the ability of already existing lexical items to combine with other lexical items or with bound morphemes (prefixes, suffixes) forming morphologically complex new lexical items. These processes, i.e. compounding, prefixation, suffixation, etc., characterize the field of word-formation, and they are usually regarded as a means of extending the vocabulary almost without limits in order to adapt it to the ever-changing referential requirements of a speech community. This leads to a formal division of the vocabulary into primary and secondary lexemes. Primary lexemes, e.g. *big, mountain, give, in*, etc., are simple, arbitrary linguistic signs in the sense of Saussure. Secondary lexemes, e.g. *spaceship, steamboat, rewrite, atomize, rider, departure*, etc., are lexical syntagmas. As such they are characterized by a determinant/ determinatum relation; they are relatively motivated with regard to their constituents and parallel formations; and they are based on certain morphological, semantic, and syntactic patterns.

Most authors elaborate a classification of word-making processes on the basis of the onomasiological study of a specific given concept. In his article «Some aspects of modern diachronic onomasiology» Joachim Grzegza offers a general (i.e. language-independent) classification that characterizes word-making processes as combinations of the aspects «stratic filiation», «morphological filiation», and «semantic filiation»[2]:

1. Semantic/semasiological change (including eponymy (the formation of common nouns from proper nouns; or antonomasia, métonymie onomastique) and folk-etymological change;
2. Borrowing from another language or variety (incl. another diachronic variety);
3. Word formation (including calques) (compounding including folk-etymological compounds, derivation incl. back-formation);
4. Semantic pseudo-loan from another language or variety;
5. Partial folk etymology, blending, truncation (incl. ellipsis), acronymy;
6. Morphological/lexical pseudo-loan;
7. Root creation/ word manufacture.

One of the important problems of onomasiology is that a large number of different onomasiological studies are distributed in publications that can only be found or accessed with difficulty. And as for comparative studies which must be the basis for any theoretical conclusions, a central database and a central publication are needed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Кульгавова, Л.В. Лексикология английского языка. Учебно-практические материалы/ Л.В. Кульгавова. – изд.2-е перераб. – М.: АСТ: Восток-Запад, 2008. – 511 с.
2. Grzega J. Some aspects of modern diachronic onomasiology/ J. Grzega// Linguistics [Electronic resource]. - Mode of access: <http://www.ebscohost.com/academic/comparing-full-text-databases>. - Date of access: 01.08.2011.