

## LINGUOCULTURAL ORIGINS OF OCCASIONAL UNITS

Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія: Філологія.

Випуск 2 (44)

УДК 811'373.611+81'38

DOI:10.24144/2663-6840/2020.2(44).354-359

Цонинець М. Linguocultural Origins of Occasional Units; кількість бібліографічних джерел – 26; мова англійська.

**Abstract.** In this article the influence of linguistic culturology on the formation of occasional newly-coined words has been analyzed. The topicality of the research lies in the linguistic and cultural peculiarities of the appearance of individual author's neologisms which help to outline the features of these innovations in the consciousness of the native English speakers. The purpose of the article is to determine the role of the linguocultural influence on the emergence of nonce-words. The objectives of the research are: the definition of the occasional unit and linguistic culturology, the analysis of occasionalisms as the author's creations and the influence of the national language model of the world. The author has tried to prove that the relationship between language and culture is presented as a key one in Modern Linguistics. Linguistic culturology investigates correlation and interference of culture and language. Language is a means of penetrating in a person's mentality and culture. Culture and nation are reflected in the national language model of the world that helps to study the interaction processes of language, thinking and reality in order to understand the leading role of language in the creation and reflection of the inner world of a human being. The main attention of the research is focused on occasional unit as a formation of a particular author who is a language personality and a constituent of a particular nation. The linguistic culturology is treated as a field of knowledge, which is directly related to the study of occasionalisms. The author of such newly-coined words is a social phenomenon filled with an individual aspect, that is formed through the internal attitude towards the language and the establishment of personal linguistic meanings. It was substantiated that each occasional unit contains definite information indicating the author of the formed innovation that reflects the cultural and historical features of a particular nation. Therefore, the study of the occasional units in terms of national and cultural specificity in our time is relevant and important. It contributes to a better understanding of the culture and thinking of the nation. It should be noted that the influence of the national language image of the world on the formation of occasional vocabulary is significant.

**Keywords:** occasionalism, nonce-word, linguistic culturology, the world model, the national world model, the language world model.

**The problem statement.** Due to the appearance of new words, modern linguistics uses various approaches to the study of new nominative units of lexical level. Language is a way of existence and transmission of culture, the implementation of which occurs in words. Thus, linguocultural approach is relevant in studying newly-coined words. Furthermore, it is important to admit that every occasionalism has its own author who is a part of the national culture which includes national traditions, language, history and literature. Linguistic culturology is anthropocentric and concentrates on a person, his background knowledge, national-specific, behavioural norms, making him a representative of the culture as well.

**The analysis of the studies** of occasionalisms is based on the works of such scholars: M.M. Poluzhyn, N.F. Venzhynovych, O.Yu. Kachmar, V.I. Karasyk, V.V. Krasnykh, V.A. Maslova, E.L. Mosunov, N.L. Shamne, V.M. Teliya, M. Heidegger.

**The aim of the article** is the analysis of the linguocultural influence on the formation of occasional units.

To achieve the aim a **complex research methodology** of the material was used including descriptonal, contextual, analytical methods and componential analysis – to identify the component organization of innovations.

**The statement of basic material.** Nonce-words are lexical units created by the speaker on the spur of the moment, for a given occasion only, and may be considered as «potentially» existing in the English vocabulary. Their appearance is caused by the specific features of the author's individual view of the world and its verbal

representation. These peculiarities are evident when the author's representations of the secondary realities created in the text are compared with those of the real world. If there is no analogue of the individual-author's concept in the cultural system, there are grounds to claim that there are new author's neologisms often associated with cultural background [Полюжин 2011, с. 117].

Current studies in linguistics are described by the fact, that «the past is considered not as a prerequisite, but as its immediate component» [Гулыга 2002, с. 6]. Nowadays, linguistic studies are concentrated on national and cultural aspect of language as a component of culture that reflects and preserves cultural and historical information of traditional character and many facts of modernity.

Language reflects the real world surrounding a person, the real conditions of life, national character, value system and worldview. The totality of this knowledge constitutes the world of the language being studied [Сердюк 2019, с. 50].

Occasional units represents the author's understanding of the world, existing of different communities. The way of forming thought with the help of language for each person is individual, and it acts as the main reason of forming nonce-words since a person created a new word tooking for individualization and originality in thought expression.

E.g.: «*After dinner I'm still thinking about Clare's drawing, so I walk out to her studio to look at it. Clare is making a huge sculpture out of tiny wisps of purple paper; it looks like a cross between a Muppet and a bird's nest*» [Niffenegger A. 2003, p. 251]. – «Клер створює

величезну скульптуру з дрібнесеньких клантиків фіолетового паперу, щось середнє між лялькою і пташиним гніздом» [Ніффенгер О. 2016, с. 257].

*Puppets* – are an ensemble cast of puppet characters created by Jim and Jane Henson in 1955. It was formed by using words *marionette* and *puppet* (маріонетка і лялька).

In the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, linguistic culturology emerged on the line of contact of linguistics and cultural studies. It investigates correlation and interference of culture and language, its functioning and represents this process as a coherent structure of linguistic and cultural content [Азимов, Шукин 2009, с. 127].

Any innovation is a result of human activity and has not only additional expressive and emotional meaning, but also cultural. Each culture has its own specific features, which are determined in the linguistic literature as ‘language of culture’, i. e. system of signs and their relations, with which the coordination of value-semantic forms and organization of existing or emerging representations, images, concepts and other semantic constructions were established [Шамне 2000, с. 33].

For instance: *artbabe* – this occasionalism is created to designate a woman who works in the field of art, creates something with her own hands. The word consists of the noun *art* (мистецтво) and *the babe* (немовля). The word *babe* is of American origin. The author combines two language units to form a new word based on his national language model. Linguocultural field of knowledge aims identifying the features of conceptualization and categorization of the environment in the mind of an ethnic group by analyzing linguistic data that provide access to processes and phenomena in the mental world of a person. Linguistic culturology is directly related to the study of the national picture of the world, linguistic consciousness, features of the mental and lingual system [Красных 2002, с. 12].

One of the fundamental issues of linguistic research and the emergence of innovations is the problem associated with the search for national peculiarities of speech units of particular ethnic groups. The fundamental requirement for the formation of occasional units is the author. However, the individual aspect of a language personality is not capable to influence the formation of language traditions and knowledge of the world, since the core of this knowledge is formed by social information about the world [Красных 2002, с. 44].

Scholars agree that language personality can be studied by analyzing his or her vocabulary. It allows to find out a person’s belonging to a certain society, education, character, gender, etc. [Маслова 2001, с. 110].

The sphere of an author’s identification is the meaning of occasional units, which represent the information not only about denotation and signification, but also about a person’s emotional perception of the relevant realities, his or her relation with national and cultural traditions, and the associations they may cause. The substantive side is connected with the cognitive activity of a person, and the world is seen through the culture lens, historical and social experience of a certain people, its linguistic and cultural community [Лебедева 2002, с. 25].

People use language to explain the world and to form one or another of its models. Language is a means of penetrating in a person’s mentality and culture. Mentality is «a system of images underlying a person’s conception of the world, his place in this world that determines the actions and behavior of people» [Полюжин 2011, с. 115]. It manifests itself in everything that a person thinks, how he or she evaluates life and correlates it with being [Венжинович 2006, с. 9]. Mentality, moreover, is clearly evident as a factor that influences people’s choices in transitional periods of their development and as a phenomenon of revealing the mechanism of self-determination of the historical subject in the position of choice. In this case, scholars mean that culture, language, and forms of communication exist beyond mentality, but at the same time participate in its formation.

The notions ‘mentality’ and ‘model of the world’ are distinguished by the level of awareness [Венжинович 2006, с. 10]. The model of the world is a generalized visual image of the world that acts as an outer shell of the subject. Each individual model of the world has a very complex structure and performs a variety of functions, but a common feature for all models of the world is their iconic character. Language stands for the sign, and the diversity of its forms as well as peculiarities. [Мосунов 2007, с. 14].

The model of the world is the reality of human consciousness. A person tries to create a simple and clear model of the world to replace the existing one. Worldview positions occupy an important place in shaping the language model of the world [Качмар 2014, с. 175]. The language model of the world represents the cultural one. However, the language model is poorer than the cultural one [Венжинович 2006, с. 11].

Language reflects people’s character, their national features. It is obvious to the native speaker influencing his thinking and worldview. The language model of the world is original and contains not only scientific but also domestic, mythological and everyday knowledge.

It helps to study the interaction processes of language, thinking and reality in order to understand the leading role of language in the creation and reflection of the inner world of a person. This notion is one of the leading in linguistics and other humanities. It constitutes a set of value-based beliefs of a human being about the world, which reveal the features of his or her worldview. The model of the world includes a value-oriented knowledge of the world that a person has as a result of all his spiritual activity [Карасик 2004, с. 224]. V. Humboldt wrote about the language model of the world and believed that «different languages are organs of nation’s original thinking and perception» [Гумбольдт 1985, с. 253]. In his opinion, each nation accepts the diversity of the world and nominates individual fragments of the world in its own way, though the peculiarity of the created model of the world is determined by individual, group, national, verbal and non-verbal experience. M. Heidegger used a similar philosophical approach. He wrote that the model of the world does not depict the world, but constitutes the world that is perceived as a model. According to

him, there are complex relationships between the picture of the world, reflection of the real world, the language model of the world and fixation of this reflection [Хайдеггер 1993, с. 7].

Considering the broad understanding of the notion 'the language model of the world', its definition should be reduced to the narrower concept of 'national language model of the world' expressed by means of a particular language worldview and perception of a certain ethnic group [Голубовська 2004, с. 23]. It is necessary to distinguish individual author's innovations, as the units that are typical for the writer's creativity in general and symbolize his national language image of the world.

There are as many language models of the world as there are languages, each of which reflects the unique result of centuries-old work on the consciousness of a human being. The originality of each language model of the world becomes apparent only against the background of others, so the comparison and analysis of their universal components attract the attention of many scholars. The national language image of the world is the specific view of the real world and all that is brought into it by the human consciousness registered in vocabulary [Чернишенко 2007, с. 161].

The researchers note that the national and cultural component is formed in the process of socialization of the personality. It is a component of cultural competence and defines the national specificity of the communicators. This component is also able to determine the national specificity of the mental and lingual structure of representatives of a particular community, which helps to outline peculiarities of national character, consciousness and experience of communicators [Красных 2002, с. 42].

It is well known that the national and cultural image of the world is prior to the language. However, the ethnic and cultural model of the world is realized and verbalized and preserved by language, which does not fix everything that covers the ethnic vision of the world, but is able to describe it [Венжинович 2006, с. 10].

Nowadays most researchers are concentrated not on philosophical but scientific understanding of the language model of the world. This issue is widely considered by linguistics. From the point of view of A. Vezhytska, the national and cultural specificity of mentality and character of the ethnos lies not only in the lexical and semantic language level, but also in the morphological and syntactic ones [Вежбицкая 1996, с. 43].

This view is also shared by V. M. Teliya, who believes that the language model of the world is created not only by means of specific vocabulary and reification of procedural meanings, but also by «using syntactic constructions that initially reflect the relationship between the elements of reality perceived objectively» [Телия 1996, с. 82]. Thus, language models the specific features of the national worldview and mentality at all levels.

In general, the language model of the world is anthropocentric, concentrated on a person who explores the world autonomously and creates linguistic means of fixing and transferring knowledge about it to others [Кардашук 1997, с. 120].

The same meaning can be conveyed through different language units, which differ in stylistic and meaningful connotations. Connotation is defined as an additional semantic or stylistic nuances that are superimposed on the basic meaning of the word and serve to express emotional and expressive colour, providing the expressions with a tone of solemnity and familiarity [Розенталь, Теленкова 1985].

Cultural connotations in language, according to the various scholars, should be sought by using various modern methods of linguistic research in cognitive linguistics, frame semantics, logical analysis of language and semiotics. N. H. Bragina, who studies units of the phraseological level, considers that cultural component of language is in culturally marked words, such as metaphor or phraseological units. D. O. Dobrovolsky thinks that idiomatic expressions, find manifestations of culture in the semantics of language units which consist of untranslatable idioms [Добровольский 1996, с. 71].

Each occasional unit contains definite information indicating the author of the innovation formed that reflects cultural and historical features of a particular nation. National specificity is defined by «deep penetration into the very essence of the national identity of the people, revealing how the unity of the mental disposition of the nation is transmitted by language, and how it gets complicated in literature by the identity of the author's individual style and character» [Кашкин 1977, с. 391].

Considering multi-faceted issue, such a phenomenon as 'language personality' should be taken into account. It complements the language model of the world within the artistic work that reflected itself in the form of individual and creative representation. So, language system, author's biography and purpose influence the nature of such a model of the world [Гумений 2018, с. 190].

General problem of the reproduction of the national and language picture of the world includes several important points to stand out. First of all, it is the presence of such components as semantic (national vocabulary – equivalent and non-equivalent); connotative (emotionally coloured elements, cultural and historical realities); pragmatic (transferring the pragmatic meanings of the words) [Русанівська 1988, с. 62].

**Conclusions.** The linguocultural approach is determined by the formation and development of linguistic culturology and is aimed at studying language and culture. The study of occasional units in terms of national and cultural specificity in our time is relevant and important, because it contributes to a better understanding of the culture and thinking of the nation who speaks a particular language, which, in turn, affects the success of intercultural communication. Thus, the influence of the national language image of the world on the formation of occasional vocabulary is significant. After all, the language model of the speaker reflects his or her mentality, ideas, as well as the national specificity of the entire nation. Experiencing the world, a human being forms its nonce-words, which are both linguistically stipulated.

**ЛІТЕРАТУРА**

1. Азимов Э.Г., Шукин А.Н. Новый словарь методических терминов и понятий: теория и практика обучения языкам. Москва: ИКАР, 2009. 448 с.
2. Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание. / перевод с англ., ответственный редактор М. А. Кронгауз, вступительная статья Е. В. Падучевой. Москва: Русские словари, 1996. 412 с.
3. Венжинович Н.Ф. Концептуальна й мовна картина світу як похідні етнічних менталітетів *Лінгвістичні студії*: зб. наук. праць. Донецьк, 2006. Вип. 14. С. 8–13.
4. Голубовська І.О. Етноспецифічні константи мовної свідомості: автореф. дис. д-ра філол. наук. Київ. 2004. 38 с.
5. Гулыга А.В. Русская идея как постсовременная проблема *Русская идея*: Сборник произведений русских мыслителей. Москва: Айрис-пресс, 2002. С. 5–24.
6. Гумбольдт В. Язык и философия культуры / пер. с нем. М. И. Левиной, О. А. Гулыга, А. В. Михайлова, С. А. Старостина, М. А. Журинской. Москва: Прогресс, 1985. 451 с.
7. Гумений В.В. Відтворення мовної картини світу при перекладі художнього тексту. *Молодий вчений*. 2018. № 2 (1). С. 189–192.
8. Добровольский Д.О. Образная составляющая в семантике идиом. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1996. № 1. С. 71–93.
9. Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс: монография. Москва: Гнозис. 2004. 390 с.
10. Кардашук О.В. Картина світу і модель семантичних відношень у лексиці. *Гуманітарна освіта: фактор світової інтеграції*: матеріали міжнар. наук.-практ. конф. (м. Чернівці, 23–25 жовт. 1997 р.). Чернівці, 1997. Ч. 2. С. 205–210.
11. Качмар О.Ю. Проблема співвіднесення концептуальної та мовної картин світу *Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук*: збірник наукових праць. Ужгород, 2014. Вип. 9. С. 173–178.
12. Кашкин И.А. Для читателя современника: Статьи и исслед. Москва: Сов. писатель, 1977. 558 с.
13. Красных В.В. Этнопсихолингвистика и лингвокультурология: Курс лекций. Москва: ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2002. 284 с.
14. Лебедева Т.Б. Динаміка розвитку військової лексичної підсистеми в сучасній німецькій мові: автореф. дис. канд. філологічних наук: 10.02.04 / Київський національний лінгвістичний університет. Київ, 2002. 20 с.
15. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология: учеб. пособие для студ. высш. учеб. заведений. Москва: Издательский центр «Академия», 2001. 208 с.
16. Мосунов Е.Л. Язык и картина мира: автореф. дис. канд. филос. наук. Магнитогорск. 2007. 25 с.
17. Полюжин М.М. Культура – текст – індивідуально-авторський концепт. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія»*. Серія «Філологія». 2011. Вип. 19. С. 114–119.
18. Русанівська М.В. Національний колорит у перекладному творі. *Рад. літературознавство*. 1988. № 7. С. 61–62.
19. Сердюк О.В. Національно-культурна специфіка англійських концептів кішка та собака *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна*. Серія «Філологія». Харків, 2015. Вип. 73, С. 140–42.
20. Розенталь Д.Э., Теленкова М.А. Словарь-справочник лингвистических терминов. 3-е. изд., испр. и доп. Москва: Просвещение, 1985. 399 с.
21. Телия В.Н. Роль образных средств языка в культурно-национальной окраске миропонимания. *Этнопсихолингвистические аспекты преподавания иностранных языков*. Москва: Институт языкознания РАН, 1996. С. 82–89.
22. Хайдеггер М. Путь к языку. Время и бытие. Москва, 1993. С. 7–8.
23. Чернишенко І.А. Фактори формування національних мовних картин світу *Вісник Житомирського держ. ун-ту ім. І. Франка*. 2007. Вип. 2. С. 158–162.
24. Шамне Н.Л. Семантика немецких глаголов движения и их русских эквивалентов в лингвокультурологическом освещении: монография. Волгоград: Изд-во ВолГУ, 2000. 392 с.
25. Ніффенеггер О. Дружина мандрівника в часі: роман; пер. з англ. Н. Хаєцької. Харків: Книжковий Клуб «Клуб Сімейного Дозвілля», 2016. 592 с.
26. Niffenegger A. *The Time Traveler's Wife: a Novel*. Orlando: Harvest Book, 2003. 546 p.

**REFERENCES**

1. Azimov E.G., Shchukin A.N. (2009) *Novyi slovar metodicheskikh terminov i poniatii: teoriya i praktika obucheniya yazykam* [New Dictionary of Methodological Terms and Concepts: Theory and Practice of Language Instruction]. Moskva: Publishing house IKAR. 448 s. [in Russian].
2. Vezhbitskaya A. (1996) *Yazyk. Kultura. Poznaniye* [Language. Culture. Cognition] / translated from English, executive editor M. A. Krongauz, introductory article by Ye. V. Paducheva. Moskva: Russkiye slovari. 412 s. [in Russian].

3. Venzhynovych N. F. (2006) Kontseptualna i movna kartyna svitu yak pokhidni etnichnykh mentalitetiv [Conceptual and Linguistic Pictures of the World as Derivatives of Ethnic Mentality]. *Linhvistychni studii*: collection of scientific works. Donetsk. Vol. 14. S. 8–13 [in Ukrainian].
4. Holubovska I.O. (2004) Etnospetsyfichni constanty movnoi svidomosti [Ethno Specific Constants of Language Consciousness]. Author's abstract of Doctor's dissertation. Kyiv. 38 s. [in Ukrainian].
5. Gulyga A.V. (2002) Russkaya ideya kak postsovremennaya problema [Russian Idea as Post-Contemporary Problem]. *Russkaya ideya*: a collection of works by Russian Thinkers. Moskva: Airis-press. S. 5–24 [in Russian].
6. Humboldt W. (1985) Yazyk i filosofiya kultury [Language and Philosophy of Culture] / translated from German by M. I. Levina, O. A. Gulyga, A. V. Mykhailova, S. A. Starostina, M. A. Zhurinskaiya. Moskva: Progress. 451 s. [in Russian].
7. Humeniy V.V. (2018) Vidtvorennia movnoii kartyny svitu pry perekladi khudozhnogo tekstu [Reproduction of the Linguistic Picture of the World in the Translation of an Artistic Text]. *Molodyi vchenyi*. No. 2(1). S. 189–192 [in Ukrainian].
8. Dobrovolskiy D.O. (1996) Obraznaya sostavlyayushchaya v semantike idiom [The Figurative Component in the Semantics of Idioms]. *Voprosy yazykoznaniiya*. No. 1. C. 71–93 [in Russian].
9. Karasyk V.I. (2004) Yazykovoi krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs [Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse]: monograph. Moskva: Gnozis. 390 s. [in Russian].
10. Kardashchuk O. V. (1997) Kartyna svitu i model semantichnykh vidnoshen u leksytsi [The World Model and Model of Semantic Relations in Vocabulary]. *Humanitarna osvita: faktor svitovoi intehtatsii*: materials of the International scientific-practical conference. (Chernivtsi, 23–25 October 1997). Chernivtsi. Part. 2. S. 205–210 [in Ukrainian].
11. Kachmar O.Yu. (2014) Problema spivvidnesennia kontseptualnoi ta movnoi kartyn svitu [The Problem of Correlation of Conceptual and Linguistic World Model]. *Aktualni pytannia humanitarnykh nauk*: collection of scientific works. Uzhhorod. Vol. 9. S. 173–178 [in Ukrainian].
12. Kashkin I. A. (1977) Dlia chitatelya sovremennika: Statyi i issledovniya [For the Contemporary Reader. Articles and Research]. Moskva: Sovetskiy pisatel. 558 s. [in Russian].
13. Krasnykh V.V. (2002) Etnopsykholingvistyka i lingvokulturologiya [Ethnopsycholinguistics and Linguoculturology]: Course of lectures. Moskva: Publishing house: «Gnozis». 284 s. [in Russian].
14. Liebedieva T.B. (2002) Dynamika rozvytku viyskovoї leksychnoi pidsystemy v suchasniy nimetskiy movi [Dynamics of the Development of Military Lexical Subsystem in Modern German]: avtoref. dys. candidate of philology: 10.02.04 / Kyiv National Linguistic University. Kyiv. 20 s. [in Ukrainian].
15. Maslova V.A. (2001) Linhvokulturologiya [Linguoculturology]: a manual for students in higher education. Moskva: Publishing Center «Akademiya». 208 s. [in Russian].
16. Mosunov Ye.L. (2007) Yazyk i kartina mira [Language and the World Model]: Author's abstract of PhD thesis in philosophy. Magnitorsk. 25 s. [in Russian].
17. Poluzhyn M.M. (2011) Kultura – tekst – indyvidualno-avtorskiy kontsept [Culture – Text – Individual Author's Concept]. Scientific Notes of National University «Ostrozka akademiya». *Series «Philology»*. Vol. 19. S. 114–119 [in Ukrainian].
18. Rusanivska M.V. (1988) Natsionalniy koloryt u perekladenomu tvori [National Identity in a Translated Work]. *Radianske literaturoznavstvo*. No. 7. S. 61–62 [in Ukrainian].
19. Serdiuk O.V. (2015) Natsionalno-kulturna spetsyfika anhliyskiykh kontseptiv kishka ta sobaka [National and Cultural Specificity of English Concepts Cat and Dog]. *The Journal of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series «Philology»*. Kharkiv. Vol. 73, S. 140–142 [in Ukrainian].
20. Rozental D.E., Telenkova M.A. (1985) Slovar-spravochnik lingvisticheskikh terminov [Dictionary of linguistic terms]. 3rd. edition, revised and expanded. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye. 399 s. [in Russian].
21. Teliya V.N. (1996) Rol obraznykh sredstv yazyka v kulturno-natsionalnoi okraske miroponimaniya [The role of language figurative means in the cultural and national identity of world-conception]. *Etnopsikholingvisticheskiye aspekty prepodavniya inostrannykh yazykov*. Moscow: The Institute of Linguistics RAS. S. 82–89 [in Russian].
22. Heidegger M. (1993) Put k yazyku. Vremya i bytiye. [Path to Language. Time and Being] Moscow. S. 7–8 [in Russian].
23. Chernyshenko I.A. (2007) Faktory formuvannia natsionalnykh movnykh kartyn svitu [Factors of the Formation of the National Language World Model]. *Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal*. Vol. 2. S. 158–162 [in Ukrainian].
24. Shamne N.L. (2000) Semantika nemetskiykh glagolov dvizheniya i ikh russkikh ekvivalentov v lingvokulturologicheskoy osveshcheniyi [Semantics of Motion Verbs in German Language and Their Russian Equivalents in terms of Cultural Linguistics]: monograph. Volgograd: Publishing house VolSU. 392 s. [in Russian].
25. Niffenegger A. (2003) *The Time Traveler's Wife: A Novel*. Orlando: Harvest Book. 546 p. [in English].
26. Niffenegger A. (2016) *Druzhyna mandrivnyka v chasi* [The Time Traveler's Wife]; translated from English by N. Khayetska. Kharkiv: Book club «Klub Simeinoho dozvillia», 592 s. [in Ukrainian].

## ЛІНГВОКУЛЬТУРНИЙ АСПЕКТ ОКАЗІОНАЛЬНИХ ОДИНИЦЬ

**Анотація.** У статті здійснено аналіз впливу лінгвокультурології на формування okazіональних новоутворень в англійській мові. Актуальність дослідження полягає в необхідності виявлення й поглибленого аналізу лінгвокультурологічних особливостей індивідуально-авторських неологізмів, які віддзеркалюють особливості формування й змісту цих одиниць. Метою статті є визначення ролі лінгвокультурологічного впливу на функціонування okazіональної лексики. Завдання дослідження охоплюють визначення термінів *okazіональна одиниця* та *лінгвокультурологія*, аналіз okazіоналізмів як авторських новотворів та вплив англійської мовної картини світу на виникнення okazіональних слів. Взаємозв'язок між мовою та культурою вважається істотним у сучасній лінгвістиці. Лінгвокультурологія досліджує співвідношення та взаємовплив культури й мови. Мова виступає засобом проникнення в менталітет і культуру людини. Культура та нація відображені в національній мовній картині світу, яка сприяє вивченню процесів взаємодії мови, мислення та дійсності з метою розуміння провідної ролі мови у створенні та відображенні внутрішнього світу людини. Основну увагу в роботі акцентовано на okazіональній одиниці як на витворі окремого автора, який є мовною особистістю та складником певної нації. Встановлено, що лінгвокультурологія безпосередньо пов'язана з вивченням okazіоналізмів. Обґрунтовано думку про те, що кожний okazіоналізм містить певну інформацію, що вказує на автора сформованого новоутворення, яке відображає культурні та історичні особливості конкретного народу. У наш час вивчення індивідуально-авторських новоутворень із точки зору національної та культурної специфіки є актуальним та важливим. Воно сприяє кращому розумінню культури та розвитку мисленневих здібностей представників кожної нації. За свідченням багатьох дослідників, вплив лінгвокультурологічних чинників на формування okazіональної лексики є значним.

**Ключові слова:** okazіоналізм, новоутворення, лінгвокультурологія, картина світу, національна картина світу, мовна картина світу.

© Цонинець М., 2020 р.

**Марія Цонинець** – аспірант, асистент кафедри прикладної лінгвістики, Ужгородський національний університет, Ужгород, Україна; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0310-3147>

**Maria Tsonynets** – postgraduate student, assistant of the Applied Linguistics Department, Uzhhorod National University, Uzhhorod, Ukraine; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0310-3147>