

V. SKUJIŅA

## APPELLATIVIZATION AND SEPARATION AS METHODS OF WORD-FORMATION

With new coinages the system of word-formation is constantly broadening and improving. Alongside with the productive methods of word-formation (affixation, composition) some other methods are gradually developing (change of meaning, conversion, etc.), among them such methods as appellativization and separation, which up to now have not been given their independent place in the system of word-formation.

The present article deals chiefly with appellativization and separation in the formation of the Latvian scientific terminology.

Appellativization is a method of word building which is based on the change of meaning. The appellative is considered by Soviet linguists as a common noun contrasted to a proper noun<sup>1</sup>, and the term *appellativization* (this term is used, for instance, by A. Superanskaya<sup>2</sup>) denotes the process in which a new common noun is created on the basis of a proper noun. Several Soviet linguists use the term *deonymization*<sup>3</sup> to denote this process. In my opinion, advantage should be given to the term used by A. Superanskaya, because it includes the result of the process of word-formation („appellative“).

Till now the appellativization in Soviet linguistics has been discussed mainly in the onomastic research works, but it plays an important role in the process of term-formation as well, e. g. this method is used for forming numerous terms in various fields.

D. Lotte, one of the founders of Soviet terminology, mentions the so-called surname terms („фамильные термины“<sup>4</sup>, e. g. *джоулева теплота, насос Лэнгмюра*), which he includes in the category of neutral terms and stresses that these surname terms do not possess unnecessary associations (this is the positive side of such terms), but do not reveal significant features of the conception and its relations with other

<sup>1</sup> Подольская Н. В. Словарь русской ономастической терминологии. М., 1978. С. 37.

<sup>2</sup> Суперанская А. В. Общая теория имени собственного. М., 1973. С. 118. (336 с.)

<sup>3</sup> Podolskaya N. Op. cit.

<sup>4</sup> Лотте Д. С. Основы построения научно-технической терминологии. М., 1961. С. 27. (158 с.)

conceptions (this is the negative side of such terms). D. Lotte warns against an extensive formation of surname terms and simultaneously admits, that considering the peculiarities of surname term formation, they have their positive role in the term systems of several fields<sup>5</sup>.

More than once the proper noun origin of such terms as *ampērs*, *džouls*, *farads*, *vats*, *volts*, has been stressed in terminological literature. Recently several separate research works have been dedicated to the use of proper nouns in word-formation which contain a detailed analysis of several structural and semantic groups of such coinages, although the corresponding process of word-formation has been presented in a descriptive way, characterising it as a transposition of proper names, their use in various productive derivations or in composite models (eponyms)<sup>6</sup>, etc.

Appellativization as a method of word-formation is used in various languages. In Latvian terminology appellativizations are chiefly international words which have been borrowed as common nouns from other languages, i. e., the process of appellativization has taken place before the borrowing. Nevertheless the models of appellativization in Latvian are productive. They serve as examples for appellativization on the basis of either foreign or Latvian proper names.

In Latvian terminology one can encounter both complete and incomplete forms of appellativization. Complete appellativization takes place when the word loses its proper name qualities completely and becomes a common noun, written with a small initial letter, e. g. *Rentgens* → *rentgens*, *rentgena stari*; *Jānītis* → *jānīši*, *dižjānīši*; *Rainis* → *rainisms*, *rainistika*, *rainists*.

We can distinguish three types of complete appellativization: direct, affixal and composite.

Direct appellativization is the most usual type of appellativization, because proper names transform into common nouns directly, without affixation or any other change, e. g. *Ampērs* — *ampērs*, *Donāts* — *donāts*, *Elzevīrs* — *elzevīrs*, *Bordo* — *bordo*, *Panama* — *panama*. Some cases of ending, i. e., gender changes can also be included in the group of direct appellativization, e. g. *Kalifornija* → *kalifornijs*, *Kardāno* → *kardāns*, *Volta* → *volts*. (Cases when the ending is changing lies on the border between direct and affixal appellativization, because such endings have qualities of suffix endings.)

This type can be viewed as exhaustive if the appellativization is considered in its narrowest sense.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. P. 28

<sup>6</sup> Шлихта М. И. К вопросу о роли имен собственных в создании медицинских терминов // Актуальные проблемы лексикологии. Новосибирск, 1971. С. 55—57. (188 с.); Мурясов Р. З. Антропонимы в словообразовательной системе языка // ВЯ. 1982. № 3. С. 62—72.

The direct appellativization is very close to conversion, though they differ in one major respect: conversion is characterised by the change of part of speech; appellativization takes place within the boundaries of one part of speech.

The direct appellativization as a means of term-formation is usually connected with the surnames of prominent scientists, inventors, etc., less frequently – with place names, which in the process of appellativization transform into units of measure (*ampērs, džouls, oms, volts*) or other designations (*boikots, čarlstons, čemberlens, donāts, elzevīrs, mančestr*).

The transformation of proper nouns into common nouns in the process of affixal appellativization requires the addition of some affix, thus the word-formation is carried out with the help of two processes: appellativization and affixation, e. g. *Bairons* → *baironisms*, *Bakuņins* → *bakuņinisms*, *Gagarins* → *gagarinīts*, *Listers* → *listerioze*, *Rainis* → *rainistika*, *Altajs* → *altaīts*, *Amerika* → *amerīcijs* (up to now these word-formations have been dealt with as affixation).

In affixal appellativization the stem of a proper noun is usually retained unaltered, though in separate cases some elements of the stem can be missing or altered, e. g. the surname of American scientist L. Baekeland (in Latvian *Bekelends*) is used to form a designation for artificial fibre (Latvian *bakelīts*), where the final *-īts* is added to an altered stem.

The historical theory named after Bakunin in Russian is called *бакунизм* where an element of the stem is missing. In Latvian historical terminology this theory is denoted by the term *bakuņinisms* which can be considered as a regular derivative of the proper noun *Bakuņins* and displaying an independent word-formation in Latvian.

In composite appellativization proper nouns are transforming into common nouns simultaneously with compound formation. In this case the first element of the compound is usually a stem of the proper noun, e. g. *Glaubers* → *glaubersāls*, *Kaplāns* → *kaplānturbīna*, *Senjets (Segneto)* → *segnetsāls*, *Tomass* → *tomasprocess*, *Vatmanis* → *vatmaņpapīrs*. Such composite appellativization is frequently preceded by a word combination with the proper noun as an attributive component: *Glaubersāls*, *Kaplāna turbīna*, etc.

There are several types of combining appellativization, e. g. direct composite appellativization (*Dons Kihots* → *donkihots*), affixal composite appellativization (*Andrejs Upīts* → *andrejupītisms*, *Anrī Termjē* → *anrītermjerīts*). Affixal composite appellativization is characteristic of deonymic adjective formation, e. g. *andrejupītisks*, *imantziedonisks*, *ojārvācietisks*.

Incomplete appellativization can be viewed as a kind of word-formation only conditionally. Incomplete appellativization concerns proper names used in the dependant component of a combination of words. These proper names have two functions: one is that of a proper name, connected with a definite person or place, the

other function is characteristic of a common noun, denoting a specific concept or feature. The second function is even dominating in terms. As these terms still retain their proper name function, they are written with a capital letter: *Faradejs* → *Faradeja skaitlis*, *Stjūdents* → *Stjūdentā kritērijs*, *Vuds* → *Vuda sakausējums*, *Daugava* → *Daugavas svīta*, *Leidene* → *Leidenes trauks*, *Turnbula* → *Turnbulas zilums*. The use of the capital letter shows that the appellativization (in its proper sense) has not taken place, though the semantic side of the proper names has changed to a definite extent.

When the connexion between a proper name and its object (person or place) is weakening, the function of a common noun is gaining the upper hand and the complete appellativization can take place and the small initial letter replaces the capital letter, e. g. *alpu vijolīte*, *bikforda aukla* (from *Alpu vijolīte*, *Bikforda aukla*). In some cases word combinations with proper names as the dependent component are replaced by one-word terms, which are direct, affixal or composite appellativizations of the corresponding proper names, e. g. *Bogheda* → *Boghedas ogles* → *bogheds*, *Besemers* → *Besemera process* → *besemerēšana*, *Vatmanis* → *Vatmaņa papīrs* → *vatmaņpapīrs*.

All types of appellativization have a common feature (peculiar to this method of word-formation): in the process of word-formation the change of meaning takes place which is connected with the transformation of a proper noun into a common noun and which is manifested by the change of the initial letter (with the exception of incomplete appellativization). Contrary to other types of the change of meaning, appellativization may cause changes in the ending (i. e. gender), addition of affixes (affixal appellativization) or addition of other words (composite appellativization).

Appellativization is also common in speech, e. g. *Jānis Misiņš* → *misiņi* or *misiņš* (J. Misiņš' library), *Pauls Stradiņš* → *stradiņi* (P. Stradiņš' hospital).

Very close to appellativization are such cases when a common noun has been formed on the basis of a proper-noun-like designation in inverted commas ("Ikarus" → *ikars*, "Volga" → *volga*, "Žiguli" → *žigulis*) or on the basis of acronyms (*BAM* → *bams*, *KamAZ* → *kamazs*, also *bamietis*, *vefietis*, as well as *dederons* from *DDR*, etc.).

Separation is another method of word-formation analysed in the present article. The term *separation* has been borrowed from syntax. Separation in the domain of word-formation is a process contrary to composition and prefixation. The component of a compound or prefixed word (the basic component which has a root and an ending) which previously was not used independently acquires the function of an independent word. The independent function is usually acquired by such components which are present in several derivations (compounds), e. g. *diahronija*, *sinhronija* → *hronija*; *elektrolīze*, *hidrolīze*, *termolīze* → *līze*; *absorbcija*, *adsorbcija* → *sorbcija*. The independent status has been acquired recently by such international

elements as *koma*, *ptoze*, *soma*, *stāze*, which are usually postfixal elements in compounds, e. g. *glaukoma*, *hromosoma*, *metastāze*. Such postfixal elements in terminology acquire the function of a dominant conception term.

International postfixal elements are acquiring the function of an independent term in different languages and this influences the same process in Latvian. Besides, this process takes place on the basis of national word-formation.

In some Latvian syntactic-morphological compounds with final *-is*, *-e* (e. g. *ligzd-gulis*, *saulmīlis*, *ātrrakstis*, *lietvedis*, *grāmatzinis*; *sarakste*, *paszine*) or prefixal formations (e. g. *ierakste*) the basic components which are not usually used separately do acquire the function of an independent term, e. g. *gaisdzese*, *škidrumdzese* → *dzese*; *straujplūde*, *noplūde* → *plūde*; *ārvēde*, *caurvēde*, *pašvēde* → *vēde*. These separations (*dzese*, *plūde*, *vēde*) formally coincide with affixal (suffixal) derivations (ch. *dzese*, *plūde*, *vēde* — as *cirte*, *krite*, *rauste*) and one cannot draw a strict border between them. Nevertheless, some derivations with *-is* and *-e* which previously were only components in compound or prefixal formations and thus being secondary in relation to the corresponding compound or prefixal formation, prove that they have acquired the independent status due to separation (disunification).

In a small number of cases this process can be observed in the formations of nominal origin, e. g. *aproce*, *ieroce* → *roce* ('sleeve cut'); *apkakle*, *pakakle* → *kakle* ('low neck').

Separation has not become a productive method of word-formation in Standard Latvian and Latvian scientific terminology, cases of separation are not systemic (not all components can transform into an independent word). Many of these separations can be regarded as undesirable from the standpoint of Standard Latvian, e. g. components of such words as *pavērse*, *sniegtīris*, *mantzinis*. Still the need for such separations in terminology occasionally can arise and thus they are transformed into independent words.

In speech one can find such separations as *māns* (from *grafomāns*, *teatromāns*), *mīlis* (from *ēnmīlis*, *saulmīlis*), etc.

The above discussed methods of word-formation — appellativization and separation — have not arisen in an empty place. They are closely related to traditional methods of word-formation: appellativization — to the change of meaning, affixation and composition, separation — to composition and affixation. Yet appellativization and separation have their own peculiar features which enable them to be analysed separately and to occupy a definite place in the system of word-formation not only in Latvian, but in other languages as well.

It is probable that due to increasing need of nomination these methods will become more active in future as they are useful for the enrichment of vocabulary.

## APELATIVĀCIJA UN SEPARĀCIJA KĀ VĀRDDARINĀŠANAS PAŅĒMIENI

### *Rezumē*

Latviešu valodas vārddarināšanas sistēmā sava patstāvīga vieta būtu ierādāma tādiem jauniem vārddarināšanas paņēmieniem kā apelatīvācija un separācija.

Apelatīvācija ir ar vārda nozīmes maiņu cieši saistīts vārddarināšanas paņēmiens, kurā jauns sugasvārds (apelatīvs) tiek darināts uz īpašvārda bāzes. Izšķir pilno un nepilno apelatīvāciju. Pilnajai apelatīvācijai ir trīs paveidi: tiešā, afiksālā un kompozitīvā. Tiešajā apelatīvācijā īpašvārds kļūst par sugasvārdu bez jebkādiem papildu vārddarināšanas līdzekļiem (*ampērs, džouls, volts*), afiksālajā – reizē ar īpašvārda pāreju sugasvārda kategorijā notiek arī afiksācija (*gagarinīts, listerioze*), kompozitīvajā – veidojas saliktenis (*glaubersāls, vatmanpapīrs*). Nepilnajā apelatīvācijā latviešu valodā saglabājas lielā sākumburta rakstība (*Alpu vijolītes, Bikforda aukla*).

Separācija ir saliktoņdarināšanai pretējs vārddarināšanas process, kurā patstāvīga vārda funkciju iegūst saliktoņa vai prefiksāla atvasinājuma pamatkomponents (*gaisdzese, šķidrumsdzese → dzese; absorbcija, adsorbciija → sorbcija*).

Apelatīvācijai un separācijai īpaša vieta ir terminu darināšanā, turklāt ne tikai latviešu, bet arī citās valodās.