

конструкцией “*c’est*”, наречиями-усилителями “*justement*”, “*précisément*”, употребляющимися с коннектором “*parce que*”, а дополнительность, меньшая значимость аргумента выражается наречиями “*d’ailleurs*”, “*du reste*”, “*au demeurant*”.

Следует отметить, что научные труды Ж.-К. Анкомбра и О. Дюкро и исследования ученых Женевской лингвистической школы, с одной стороны, позволили расширить возможности лингвистического анализа аргументации, с другой стороны, стимулировали интерес лингвистов не только к изучению аргументативных маркеров, но и к анализу функционирования более широкого класса языковых средств – дискурсивных маркеров.

### *Литература*

1. Демьянков В. З. Эффективность аргументации как речевого воздействия // Проблемы эффективности речевой коммуникации. М.: ИНИОН, 1989. С. 13-40.
2. Anscombre J.-C. Théorie de l’argumentation, topoi et structuration discursive // Revue québécoise de linguistique. Montréal, 1989. Vol. 18. N 1.
3. Anscombre J.-C., Ducrot O. L’argumentation dans la langue. Bruxelles: Mardaga, 1983.
4. L’argumentation: principes et méthodes. Paris: E.S.F., 1996.
5. Ducrot O. Opérateurs argumentatifs et visée argumentative // Cahiers de linguistique française. Genève, 1983. № 5.
6. Moeschler J. Argumentation et conversation: éléments pour une analyse pragmatique. Paris: Hachette, 1985.
7. Shelling M. Remarques sur le rôle de quelques connecteurs // Cahiers de linguistique française. Genève, 1983. № 5.
8. Spengler N., de. Première approche des marqueurs d’interactivité // Cahiers de linguistique française. Genève, 1980. № 1.
9. Stratégies interactives et interprétatives dans le discours. Genève, 1991.
10. Zénone A. Marqueurs de consécution // Cahiers de linguistique française. Genève, 1981. № 2.

УДК 811

*A. N. Garipova (Kazan, Russia)  
Volga State Academy of Physical Culture, Sport and Tourism*

### **English borrowings as a linguistic and cultural component in language development**

Появившиеся в последнее время зарубежные исследования позволяют составить представление о текущем состоянии дел в сфере заимствования. При всем разнообразии то-

чек зрения на отдельные явления в сфере овладения лексикой иностранного языка прослеживаются общие тенденции в решении возникающих проблем.

**Ключевые слова:** заимствованная лексика, трансформационная грамматика, морфология, словообразование, лингвокультурный аспект, лингвокультурная ситуация

Recently appeared foreign studies allow one to have an idea of the current state of affairs in the field of borrowing. With all the diversity of points of view on certain phenomena in the field of mastering foreign language vocabulary, some general tendencies in solving emerging problems can be traced.

**Keywords:** borrowed vocabulary, transformational grammar, morphology, word formation, linguocultural aspect, linguocultural situation

To characterize the modern processes of studying borrowings by foreign linguistics, it is necessary to have an understanding of the linguocultural situation in which they arise. In other words, to determine the locus of the areas of linguistic knowledge under consideration in the general language system, it is necessary to understand their relationship with other components of this system, in particular with grammar and vocabulary – the basic components of any language. In this regard, it is necessary to have at least a minimum of knowledge about how the concepts of grammar and vocabulary are interpreted in foreign studies, how they process and adapt borrowings. It is also important here that both the tasks and objects of study in the field of linguocultural interaction and mutual influence of languages receive a different assessment depending on the occurrence of borrowings in the same word-formation nest or, conversely, they belong to different nests, are a kind of inter-nest. It is also important to understand here that in foreign linguistics, on the one hand, the mutual gravitation of grammar to the vocabulary of the language is noted, and on the other, the influence of this gravitation on the organization of the composition of the borrowed vocabulary.

Until recently, one of the basic components of foreign transformational grammar was the provision that in order to transform the syntactic structure into an utterance (in the form of a dialogue or monologue), a number of transformations should have been performed on the basic word-symbols until the implementation of a specific syntactic scheme required stating instead of them of specific lexical units. It meant that linguistic expressions with a general syntactic scheme are considered derivationally related and these connections in the corresponding word-formation nests appear as a result of transformation, which is directly responsible for the adaptation process of borrowings, including in word-formation nests. This approach, therefore, questioned, in any case made it unnecessary, the independent separation of borrowings into separate models of morphological adaptation, because if, for example, a homogeneous construction spreads simultaneously in equal parts both to the passive part of the lexical composition, and to which is a verbal name, then all of them in this case will appear as equivalent variants of transformative connections, and in this situation the difference between

borrowings within the same level of the word-formation nest or borrowings of different levels will be minimal. Thus, the transformational view of borrowing contradicted the traditional grammatical approach, proposing a holistic description of the adaptation of borrowing instead of the level, differentiated representation of the facts of the language [1, p. 1-2]. Later it was revealed that a significant number of transformations of the borrowed vocabulary, on the one hand, change its meaning, and on the other, it is far from always possible. The problem of the methodological elaboration of such a transformation arose, and this, in turn, called into question one of the foundations of transformational grammar. It was necessary to find a solution that would reduce the impact of the transformational approach. Ultimately, morphology and word formation, vocabulary came to the fore, because it is precisely this that gives the greatest opportunity to analyze morphological and word formation changes. Nevertheless, in this case, the borrowing dictionary as a whole was perceived as a "hodgepodge", a simple sum of borrowed lexical units, albeit linguoculturologically valuable, but nevertheless accidentally caught in another language, with their own semantic characteristics inherent only in them. And yet, to present a separate dictionary entry for each borrowed unit would generate inevitable duplication due to morphological connectivity, morphological, semantic and linguocultural interpenetration of word forms.

One of the ways to resolve this issue was the recognition of the grammar of the basis that allows borrowings to function in a new linguocultural environment in the most natural way. Here it should only be borne in mind that if, in relation to borrowings, it acts as an accumulator, with all their meanings, then one of the most urgent tasks in describing a language is the problem of what information about the borrowed lexical unit used will ensure its most adequate use in one or more a different linguocultural situation of communication. True, here different grammars offered their answers. So, case grammar put at the forefront the data on the semantic meanings of those nominal borrowings that could be combined with any one specific verb. In functional grammar, the first place is given to the question of matching specific predicates with specific names. In the last third of the last century, the so-called "grammars of borrowed vocabulary" have come to the fore, in which there are no hard boundaries between grammatical rules and lexical borrowings. Moreover, the whole grammar, according to some researchers, comes down to a complete description of borrowing lexical units, each of which has corresponding delimiting markers [2, p. 25]. Here, each borrowed word is limited and endowed with such features that allow it to be not only correctly formed in terms of structure, but also (which is very important) organically fit into the syntactic structure, the functioning of the sentence. Such grammar is presented as a kind of list of borrowed lexical increments, which, in turn, can be classified, for example, by parts of speech. Thus, in foreign linguistic studies, reflected in various kinds of grammars, the problem arose not only of a terminological description of the characteristics of borrowed lexical units, but also of relations between them, including at the level of synonymy, antonymy, polysemy, connotation, cultural backgrounds, etc.

At the same time, grammatical rules here are usually reduced to lexical generalizations reflecting the relationship between borrowed lexical units and between their specific (including linguoculturological) characteristics. Consequently, word formation is present here at the grammatical and lexical levels. Of course, this point of view is one of the possible. So, morphology, according to the rules of which a borrowed word is included in the process of functioning of a foreign language for it, has its own laws, actions, the real manifestation of which encounters a natural resistance of foreign vocabulary for it. In this linguocultural situation "morphological rules are by no means less regular than syntactic or phonetic rules, because they are more influenced by the borrowed part of the lexicon" [3, p. 12-13].

The work in which one of the first to raise the question of regularity in relation to the phenomena of word formation and morphology, in contrast to the phenomena of syntax, was the study of F. Planco [4, p.16]. In it, the author carefully analyzes those factors that affect the operation of a particular rule at the morphological level, i.e. derivation rules at the level of borrowed words, ranging from derivatives to word forms. He also pointed to the conventionality of the boundaries between rule and exception. So, if the action of the rule depends on a number of general linguoculturological factors (in particular, the number of syllables in the borrowed word, the phonological features of the morphemes of the connotative, emotional part of the general semantic meaning included in it) and their functioning can be represented in the form of specific conditions, then in this case it will disappear the need to talk about deviations from the rules. This point of view is more than interesting. In our opinion, it is also relevant for the modern Russian language, in which, as is known, that neither the rule is the exception, although, of course, here we are talking primarily not about borrowed vocabulary. At the same time, if you adhere to objectivity, a certain specific list of certain rules is largely determined by the characteristics of the specific native language of the borrowed word. Hence an important detail follows - it is hardly possible today to derive some general rules that would apply to all borrowings. Based on the foregoing, together with the concept of context-dependent transformations, one can also use the concept of context-dependent rules for adaptation and transformation of the borrowings themselves and, therefore, use in a certain scope of application of the rules. True, in this case, the regularity in the syntax cannot be opposed to the irregularity of word formation, and it will be rather difficult to distinguish between grammar and vocabulary by this criterion. On the other hand, by the type and degree of regularity, one can try to determine word formation and inflection. Ultimately, the introduction of specific prohibitions on the operation of a particular rule helps to identify the specifics of the passage of processes within the word-formation nest of borrowed vocabulary.

The interaction of these two generally opposite concepts in the analysis of the problems of the formation of derivatives from borrowed lexical units was one of the most important elements of rethinking the lexical components of the language. Ulti-

mately, the development of this direction, perhaps, will follow the path of constant clarification of the structure of a foreign language word of lexical borrowing, which today is no longer reduced to a simple list of borrowings presented in the language. At the same time, a different understanding of morphology and word formation in relation to borrowings inevitably leads to a discussion, for example, about which units a foreign language lexical borrowed unit is formed from and whether it contains, in particular, simple, derived or complex words. Questions about whether affix morphemes are included in the basis of the borrowed vocabulary are also discussed. Currently, there are also discussions in foreign linguistics that prefixes and suffixes should also be represented in dictionaries, as other independent foreign-language lexemes are represented in them. The answers to these and other similar questions are important, because the definition of various morphological processes depends on the analysis of which elements they carry out - morphemes or whole borrowed words, real statements or syntactic constructions of varying complexity used in the corresponding linguocultural situation.

### *References*

1. Hoekstra T., Holst H., Morraat M. Lexical grammar. Dordrecht, 1981. P. 55.
2. Hundson H. Introduction // Stratosta St. The case for lexicase: An outline of lexicase grammatical theory. L.; NY., 1998. P. 225.
3. Malicka – Kleparska A. The conditional morphology: A study of double motivation in Polish and English. Lublin, 1985. P. 112.
4. Plank F. Morphologische Regularitäten: Aspect der Wortstrukturtheorie. Tübingen, 1981.
5. Scalise S. Generative morphology. Dordrecht, 1986. P. 89.

УДК 811

*A. N. Garipova (Kazan, Russia)  
Volga State Academy of Physical Culture, Sport and Tourism*

### **Structural and semantic features of modern computer terminology (on the material of the English language)**

Компьютерный сленг – это лингвистическое явление, которое стало объектом для изучения многих исследователей, в связи со своим обширным употреблением не только специалистами программного обеспечения, но и многочисленными пользователями компьютеров. Специфический язык киберкоммуникации характеризуется рядом особенностей, выделяемых согласно различным критериям. Тем не менее такая форма общения посредством сети Интернет постоянно пополняется новыми лексическими единицами и являются до конца неясными для большинства пользователей глобальной сети.