

To the problem of word-formation in cognitive linguistics

В статье освещаются ключевые проблемы словообразования, одной из наиболее актуальных всегда являлась проблема продуктивности модели или способа словообразования. Вплоть до сегодняшнего дня наиболее популярным способом анализа лексики и процессов словообразования являлся традиционный подход. Нам представляется возможным определить общую и наиболее продуктивную перспективу решения ряда проблем словообразования и номинативных процессов с позиций когнитивной лингвистики.

Ключевые слова: словообразование, когнитивный аспект, модель, концепт, морфологическая структура, традиционный подход, семантическая репрезентация

The article presents the keyword-formation issues, one of the most essential has always been the problem of model productivity or word-building method. The most popular ways of lexis analysis and word formation processes is a traditional approach. It seems possible to define a common and most productive perspective for solutions of several word-formation processes problems and nominative positions from a perspective of cognitive linguistics.

Keywords: word-formation, cognitive aspect, model, concept, morphological structure, semantic representation, traditional approach

Language development is determined by the progress of its formative system, the emergence of new word-building models, change of the existed ones, increase or decrease of their productivity and many other word-formation process factors. Any modern living language is in constant change and dynamics. Lexicon as the mobile layer of language, the most sensitive to changes in the social, cultural and other spheres of speaking population's life because the word is "the mirror of life".

Up till now the most popular way of vocabulary analysis and word formation processes is a traditional approach. The lexicon was combined in a thematic, functional area, or other characteristics, to identify and analyze a variety of word-formation models (usually the most productive in a particular segment) and corresponding word structure types. This is due to the fact that new lexical units production occurs on certain word-formation models, historically in a particular language. In this case, one of the key problems of word formation is always a problem of model productivity or method of derivation.

There are different opinions comparative to the number of word-formation ways. For example, in modern English 5 to 11 ways are distinguished. These differences are explained by the fact that different ways change their activity and for a long time may exist more or less productive or even die. Anyway, it is generally accepted that presently 6 ways of word formation are the most productive for English language:

- 1) affixation (model “stem + affix”), for example, *ecological*;
- 2) the word composition (model “stem + stem”), for example, *earthday*, *to kneecap*;
- 3) conversion (model V > N and N > V), for example, *to rubberneck*;
- 4) reversion (model “stem – a quasi-affix”), for example, *chocoholic*;
- 5) blending (here we speak of a model conditionally as the fragments are compounded as bases), such as, *spooktacular*;
- 6) reduction, for example, acronyms E.V.A. (extra vehicular activity) - work in outer space; R.E.M. (rapid eye movement) - eye movements during REM sleep.

Other methods, such as:

- 1) alternation, for example *feed on food*;
- 2) doubling (*murmur*), as well as unmodeled ways -
- 3) onomatopoeia (*cuckoo*; *splash*) and
- 4) rhymed repeat, with or without alternation, for example *tip-top*; *hocus-pocus*.

Other methods are not productive in the same degree that the above six methods. In addition, presenting ways of word formation typology, we should mention about the so-called lexical-semantic derivation (the terms-synonyms – “semantic innovation” or “rethinking” (usually word-formation mechanism which has a metaphorical or metonymic nature), which is also sometimes included in the classification but it rather refers to a change of the finished word.

As it was previously noted, not all of these methods are used to the same extent, and the weight of each of them varies in the word-formative process. Traditionally, three groups of word formation methods are highlighted depending on the result:

- 1) derivation, which includes affixation, conversion and reversion (the result – a derivative of the word)
- 2) the word composition (result – a compound word) and
- 3) reduction (result – reduction, the acronym).

We can also select a particular type of mixed and intermediate derivation method that combines the properties of compounding and contraction. This so-

called blending or portmanteau or – when this method for forming single lexical units asymmetrically contaminating word basis of two or more words. This method is extremely popular and productive, as satisfies several requirements of modern English-language discourse in any field: lexis formed in a similar way is semantically ergonomic (concise form and capacious content), image-bearing and stylistically original, which in turn determines its emotiveness.

The rapid nature of formative dynamics and non-trivial methods of forming as new words and new meanings in modern language system requires new approaches to solve research problems. At present, the study of word formation processes in different segments of the modern languages lexical fund and English in particular, is carried out, usually at the junction of several areas of linguistic analysis, which include sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, typological, pragmatic and other approaches.

However, the most promising and actively developing modern lexicological research is rapidly developing cognitive direction, which makes the inevitability of a new interpretation of traditional linguistics objects, including derivation. This has led to numerous studies on the cognitive aspect of word formation in the local and in the foreign language schools.

Guided by the need to define a common and most productive term solutions to several problems of word-formation processes and nominative positions of cognitive linguistics, we consider in more detail some of the works.

Quite an extensive research with an emphasis on cognitive analysis of word-formation process was conducted in German. In this study, derivation of the German language was first introduced as a prototypical cognitive system, consisting of a certain limited set of preformative concepts that allowed the author to identify their specific cognitive function – namely, the “function subcategorization of the world”, which is expressed in a complex nature and properties of decoding data concepts included in onomasiological processes.

This cognitive-lexicological research is based on a detailed analysis of many linguistically reflected reality fragments of any ontology allocated on the basis of universal cluster and additional features, presented as complex derivational concepts for the three key parts of speech – nouns, verbs and adjectives. The result of this study was developed by the author with an extensive cognitive prototypical system consisting of such categories as “Event”, “Face”, “Process”, “State”, coupled with the basic parts of speech and then – with their formative paradigm (with means of word formation, characteristic for nouns, verbs, adjectives).

Thus, the derivation is inextricably linked with the concept of the word, which from the perspective of cognitive science is seen as a concept, as it is lin-

guistic unit and the main carrier of the conceptual value. This is true not only for the derivation of word models, as mentioned above, but also for compounding (syntactic derivation) and portmanteau (contamination, blending), or such on the controversial method of word formation as a semantic reinterpretation. The latter method is considered by some researchers as a mere modification or existing values expansion words rather than the emergence of a new word, by metaphorical or metonymic “transfer” of the concept from a single thematic sphere to another one.

These word-formation models generate different in their morphological structure lexical composites and attribute collocation with clear and idiomatic, darkened semantics, and “deliver” a new language, usually with a metaphorical component, highly specialized in the sphere of use of the common conceptual areas. Lexicon of this type because of its structural and semantic complexity is of particular interest among researchers in the field of linguistics and cognitive tools allows to conduct a deeper and more comprehensive analysis of the actual material. In endocentric or subordinating words grammatical and semantic dominant is the second component of compound nouns (*door-knob*, *blackbird*), while in exocentric compound words the grammatical semantic dominant is not clearly expressed, as these composites are formed by metaphorical or metonymic mappings (*in apple-pie (order)* “in a strict manner”; *butterfingers* “awkward person”).

The second exocentric type composites is sometimes defined as idiomatic as well as the general meaning of complex words can not be inferred on the basis of the sum of their meanings.

For example, in the case of composite representation of idiomatic language a problem of determining the value of a compound word motivation is rather acute. The main reason for this problem is the fact that in the process of going through a composite idiomatic so-called “frazeologisation”, which can be defined as “special cognitive process differences between the conceptual essence of lexical meaning and integrative conceptual framework morphemic syntagma, resulting in the loss of their morphemes content (conceptual, functional, semantic) properties, or acquisition of new”.

And in this case, the use of cognitive concepts and structures makes it possible to identify at what stage is the formation of a lexical complex – frazeologisation or idiomaticity. Under idiomaticity we understand a complete fusion of morphemes, resulting in a “blackout” of the internal word form and the word acquiring properties of inseparability. The term of “frazeologisation” is used to refer to the process which is preceded by idiomaticity.

In the words with frazeological morphemic structure in contrast to the already fully formed lexical idioms - all morphemes or at least one of them retain the ability to transmit information (linguistic or extralinguistic) associated with the lexical meaning of the word. Thus, such a morphemic structure can be analyzed as a systemic linguistic phenomenon caused by integrative meaning of the whole and what should be considered as morphemic structure (ordered formal semantic unity of morphemes).

In this sense, motivation as the basic concept of traditional derivation is quite compatible with cognitive attitudes. One of the main problems of cognitive approach is the structure study of knowledge representation and motivation is the result of motivation as a cognitive process. Using the cognitive approach, the motivation is interpreted as the ability of morphemic structure correlated with lexical meaning in various aspects: semantic, word-formative, conceptual.

In modern linguistics there is no unified theory of the internal form of the word. The status of the internal form of the word is not uniquely defined: language category, mental image, meaning, duplex unit, sign, cognitive structure, etc. The prevailing view is, in which the inner form is identified with the process representation of the word or motivated sign. Therefore, the development of the theory of the internal form from the standpoint of cognitive linguistics can be considered as one of the most effective ways to solve the above described problems.

Литература

1. Блумфилд Л. Язык. М., 1968. 608 с.
2. Борисенкова Л. М. Когнитивные аспекты словообразования (на материале немецкого языка). М.: Ин-т языкознания РАН, 2005. 248 с.
3. Голованова Н. И., Грудева Е. А. Обучение французскому языку как второму иностранному по направлению «сервис и туризм» в неязыковом вузе // МОЛОДЕЖЬ – НАУКЕ: образование, экология, традиции – 2016. С. 130-133.
4. Елисеева В. В. Лексикология английского языка. СПб.: Изд-во СПбГУ, 2003. 44 с.
5. Grudeva E. A., Chepurnaya A. I., Chvalun R. V. Language as a reflexion of the national culture // Вестник АПК Ставрополя. 2016. № S2. С. 105-106.
6. Chepurnaya A. I., Chvalun R. V., Grudeva E. A. Cooperative learning of foreign languages: high school experience // Вестник АПК Ставрополя. 2016. № S2. С. 114-115.
7. Nettet T. The Art of Being Negative: Metonymical Morphological Constructions in Contrast // Oslo Studies in Language: Russian in Contrast. Lexicon. 2010. N 2 (2). P. 261-280.