
© NATALIA A. AKSARINA, OLGA V. TROPHIMOVA

natalja-aksarina@rambler.ru

УДК 811.161.1'37—057.874

***HYPOSEMANTIZATION OF LANGUAGE UNITS
IN WRITTEN SPEECH OF SENIOR PUPILS
(BASED ON THE TEXT OF COMPOSITIONS
OF UNIFIED STATE EXAMINATION IN RUSSIAN)***

SUMMARY. The article is devoted to the study of influence of the active semantic process of hyposemantization on written speech of senior pupils.

KEY WORDS. Hyposemantization, semantic process.

During the recent years much attention of linguists has been paid to the active processes occurring at all levels of language and observed in various communicative environments. The influence of these processes on the development of modern Russian language lexical subsystem, which is especially resistant to changes under the impact of both extralinguistic, and intralinguistic factors, is especially noticeable [1; 33-34]. In this respect, the analysis of children's and youth's lexicon, principles of its formation and features of its realization in oral and written speech in various areas of communication is of great interest. Being both a cause and consequence of many changes in the linguistic consciousness of native speakers, active semantic processes reflect the specifics of language mastering by modern "homo loquens". The results of supervision over the dynamics of these processes play an important role in lingvo-cultural diagnostics of language communities as well as individuals.

Typicality, frequency of some lexical, lexico-grammatical and lexico-stylistic errors in written speech of senior pupils allows to trace similarity in the principles and reasons of their occurrence. It provides the ground to say that the basis of such errors is not a subjective lexical illiteracy of the respondents, but an effect of objective linguistic processes .

The forced mastering of huge lexical fund in the conditions of modern multicomunications causes pupils to use words and locutions, ideas about the semantics of which are faulty. So, in the compositions of the Unified State Examination in the Russian language one can clearly trace the influence of hyposemantization, in other words, partial deactualization of certain components of a word meaning in the consciousness of native speakers, on the authors' speech development. This process is formally expressed through all sorts of verbal redundancy — a consequence of the author's desire to make up "missing", not perceived by his or her linguistic consciousness, components of word semantics: *The author tells and explains us, that there are people with a large supply of knowledge.* In this case, the writer's consciousness does not capture the component

“to perform a speech act” in the semantics of the verb *to explain* — and, as the result, the ostensible semantic incompleteness of the structure is compensated by the use of excessive verb *to tell*.

A highly dynamic communication of modern teenagers provides the impossibility to focus on the distinctions between units connected by components of some hierarchy of different levels. This results in the loss of semantic uniqueness of more or less similar but not interchangeable or partly interchangeable words and locutions. In accordance with the nature of the semantic leveling (unification) of these units it is possible to single out several models (varieties) of hyposemantization observed in the written speech of senior pupils. To ensure the objectivity of the conclusions, we examine these models on the basis of text fragments taken from essays, written on the basis of the same initial text.

1. Quite often there happens lexico-grammatical hyposemantization **according to the dominant of synonymic set of words (synonymic)** [2; 146], where separate differential signs of a peripheral member of the set are deactualized. At the same time, the most common differential component which organizes a synonymic set and is especially explicated in the dominant is of the greatest importance. So, in the example *В данном тексте описывается о судьбе лошади* (The text **portrays about** a horse’s fate.) the peripheral member of the synonymic set — the verb *to portray* — acquires the grammatical valency of the verb-dominant *to report* (*to report about* has a normative valency). This error takes place due to the semantic weakening of the differential explicit component “to be expressed in description” in the verb *to portray*, which does not allow valency with the preposition **about** (grammatical forms of the Accusative case used with the preposition about). Since the verb *to portray* does not possess such a component, the occurrence of the defective valency **portrays about a fate** indicates that the pupil perceives only the common semantics of the set in the word *portrays* — to report, to tell, to convey, ect.

2. Hyposemantization **according to archiseme (thematic, neutralizing the concepts within a certain thematic group)**. For example: *Лошадь тихо гуляла и никому не осложняла жизнь* (The horse was strolling quietly **not complicating anybody’s life**) (in the initial text — *не мешала* — **disturbing**), the phraseological unit *to complicate somebody’s life* with the peripheral member of the thematic group “obstacle” having lost some differential characteristics (“making up difficulties, troubles preventing from a comfortable life”) has been drawn nearer to the perinuclear unit *to disturb*.

Contexts that are almost as frequent as the previous contain units based on hyposemantization **according to a nuclear component of a lexico-semantic field (field Hyposemantization)**. This kind of hyposemantization is most typical for a verb as a part of speech with the greatest mutual interdependence of differential and integral semantic components. So, in the context: *Я считаю, что закон поступил очень жестоко* (*It seems to me that the law dealt with him very cruelly*) the comparison of the defective valency *that the law dealt with him cruelly* with the standart valency *that the law was cruel to him* makes it possible to see that the verbs *to treat* and *to be* from the same lexico-semantic field “to be, to show oneself” are unified according to the field forming feature — the central integral component, at the same time the differential components are deactualized.

Hyposemantization according to the differential explicit features (the so called usage of communicatively redundant words) is rather frequent in the written speech of senior pupils: *...это милое создание никак не защищено от воздействия зла... и пр. (this cute creature is not protected from the effects of evil)*. In this case the respondent's consciousness does not perceive the implicit differential component "influencing, affecting" in the semantics of the word *evil*. The subjectively observed semantic scarcity of the construction is atoned by the usage of the redundant word *effect*.

The faults caused by hyposemantization of the grammatical features (**grammatical**) are also multiple. For example in the context *Автор высказывает свое недовольство по отношению людей к животным (The author expresses his discontent with human regarding animals)* there is a failure to distinguish the grammatical semantics of the derived preposition *regarding* and the generating noun phrase *regard for*, instead of which the preposition is used (the correct variant: *discontent with human regard for animals*). It happens due to the fact that the grammatical characteristics of the different parts of speech are unified in the respondent's consciousness because of the special actualization of the most common semantic component "attitude to something or somebody". The deactualization of the distinctions in the semantics of the grammatical forms of the noun and the preposition is mainly motivated by the regular broadcasting of the similar constructions in the mass media. Such constructions may be literary acceptable as well as literary defective. The grammatical hyposemantization may take place as a consequence of lexical hyposemantization — when a word gets redundant components of meaning. For example, the reason for it may be semantic contraction of the construction *discontent regarding human attitude to animals*, where the causal component contained in the preposition *concerning* is attributed to the word *regard* by mistake. It also may happen due to the contraction of the construction *discontent with human attitude regarding animals*, according to which the semantics of the noun *attitude* taken from the same theme group as the noun *regard* is contaminated with the semantics of the preposition.

Hyposemantization according to common semantic components of the denotatum (according to the root of related words or the derivational base) is active and well studied by linguists. When this hyposemantization takes place lexico-semantic components of word formation are deactualized in the consciousness of the speaker and the author maintains the only conception of explicit set of the derivational base. For example, in the context *Нагибин рассказывает нам свою жизненную историю о том, что они узнали... (Nagibin tells us his life story about what they have learned)* the adjective *life* has undergone hyposemantization according to the derivational base of the noun *life* (normative variant: *tells a story from his life*). Thus the motivational feature of the adjective *life* "relating to life", "typical for life" is not felt by the respondent.

Sometimes there occurs hyposemantization according to the expressive feature among the students with prominent defects in speech development. Due to this hyposemantization subject-logical part of word meaning is almost completely deactualized: *Я согласен с мнением автора, потому что эта лошадь была непростая, прекрасная, погубленная (I agree with the author, because this*

horse was not simple, magnificent, wasted). The similar error is observed in a fragment of another text: *Beautiful was the horse, but wasted*. Complementarity and opposition of the units that only have a common expressiveness and evaluation capacity indicates that the respondents do not perceive the semantic differentiation of the units.

From time to time, there is **metonymic hyposemantization**: *Их любовь мы можем увидеть в их глазах и поведении*. (*We can trace their love in their eyes and behavior*). In this case, the metonymic usage of the word *eyes* instead of the word *glances* is defective because of the presence component “the way of personality expression” in the semantics of the homogeneous member *behavior*.

It is interesting that such phenomena are also observed in modern business communication, and in written mass media. It makes it possible to take into consideration not only the universality of the ongoing process, but also the fact that the lexicon of adult native speakers and teenagers is equally formed under its influence. It seems to be of the greatest importance due to the necessity to develop effective methods of the formation of communicatively diversified lexicon among children and young people.

REFERENCES

1. Contemporary Russian Language: Active Processes of XX—XXI centuries / The Institute of the Russian Language named after V.V. Vinogradov. Russian Academy of Sciences. Moscow, 2008. 712 p.
2. Zeitlin, N.S. Speech Mistakes and the Ways to Avoid them. M.: LIBROKOM, 2009. 192 p.