

При анализе дефиниций прилагательного *freudig* и существительного *Freude* становится очевидным, что компонент *-freudig* не демонстрирует семантической связи с данными родственными ему основами: ни у прилагательного *freudig*, ни у существительного *Freude* нет семы 'охотно (и часто) делать, совершать что-л.'. Ср.:

freudig «a. von Freude erfüllt, bestimmt; froh; b. Freude bereitend; erfreulich» a. 'наполненный радостью, радостный'; b. 'доставляющий радость, отрадный';

Freude «1. hochgestimmter Gemütszustand; das Froh- und Beglücktsein; 2. (gehoben) etwas, was jemanden erfreut» 1. 'хорошее расположение духа; состояние радости и счастья'; 2. '(выс.) что-л., что радует кого-л.' [2].

Однако указанная сема содержится в семантике компонента *-freudig*, о чем свидетельствует ряд примеров: *diskutierfreudig* 'охотно (и часто) вступающий в дискуссии, любящий дискутировать', *sportfreudig* 'охотно (и часто) занимающийся спортом, любящий спорт' и др. [2; 3]. Таким образом, формирование значения компонента *-freudig* произошло по аналогии с синонимичным компонентом *-lustig*. Доказательствами этого являются, во-первых, толкования единиц с одним из компонентов посредством единиц с другим компонентом, например, *reisefreudig* «*reiselustig*»; во-вторых, существование ряда синонимичных единиц с данными компонентами, например: *arbeitsfreudig* – *arbeitslustig*, *kampffreudig* – *kampflustig*, *kauffreudig* – *kaufflustig*, *lebensfreudig* – *lebenslustig* и т.д. [2; 3].

Таким образом, значения переходных компонентов могут формироваться по аналогии со значениями компонентов, с которыми они связаны парадигматическими отношениями.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / под. ред. В. Н. Ярцевой. – 2-е изд., доп. – М. : Большая рос. энцикл., 2002. – 707 с.
2. Duden – Online [Электронный ресурс]. – 2014. – Режим доступа : <http://www.duden.de>. – Дата доступа : 11.09.2017.
3. Das Digitale Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache (DWDS) [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа : <http://dwds.de>. – Дата доступа : 25.09.2017.

J. Pacovská (Liberec, Czech Republic)

THE PICTURE OF A CZECH SCHOOL THROUGH THE PRISM OF CHILDREN OF OLDER SCHOOL AGE

One of the key terms in cognitive linguistics, especially in its cultural and ethnolinguistic direction, is the *linguistic picture of the world*. This is a complex term which, as J. Underhill states, may be characterised through five sub-concepts. He calls them *world-perceiving*, *world-conceiving*, *cultural mindset*, *personal world*, and *perspective*. These terms represent the following: stages of the ongoing

process of understanding the world, sharing the feelings in comprehending the world, influence of culture on the understanding of the world, personal attitude towards the world, and changes in understanding the world which takes place in the course of our development. It is apparent from the terms that the author regards the extent of shareability of viewpoint as the main distinctive feature. Firstly, it is shared nationally as well as within a particular culture, and secondly, it is also generated by an individual as a member of a particular nation [1].

It is the shareability of the linguistic picture of the world that is the focus point of our paper as well. In this paper we are going to look into conceptualisation of Czech school through the eyes of children. Therefore, we shall concentrate on a single segment of the linguistic picture of the world, and we shall observe how this picture is generated by Czech children, in particular children of older school age that attend the senior level of elementary school in the Czech Republic.

For cognitive linguistics in whose theoretical framework we work, linguistic references to reality are essential. Language is not only the medium of thoughts, expression and communication – it is also the picture of the world, a model of the world, and therefore it is a testimony of what the natural world actually is [2] The path towards uncovering the linguistic picture of the world leads through revealing connotative elements in the meaning of words, because connotations point not only to the objective and verifiable attributes of phenomena, but they also capture the way native speakers think about them, what ideas are generated in their mind, what are their life experiences, their way of experiencing, and their values. If we focus on the connotative elements of meaning, we find out ...“what is linked to the given expression in the conceptual system of native speakers, what is evoked in them while using that expression, and therefore what modifies the attitude of native speakers towards denotation...” [3, p. 28].

As Underhill mentions (cf above), the linguistic picture of the world changes in the course of our development, i.e it is dependent on the age of the speakers. We based our research on a questionnaire survey distributed among sixty pupils of the 6th and 8th grade of elementary school. We asked the following question: *What words do you think of when you imagine school?* Consequently, we created semantic categories of data based on the shared semantic attributes of submitted answers that corresponded to the connotative elements of the meaning of “school.” By means of a research probe we were striving to discover what kind of image of school forms in the minds of elementary school pupils these days. Through our research we found out about the experiences that pupils gain at school, in what way school influences their value system, their attitudes, emotional experiences, and whether they perceive school as an inspirational life environment.

The following overview records the most frequent connotations which, according to our research, make up the image of a Czech school in children of older school age. The following overview presents the most frequent connotations, i.e. particular linguistic expressions (examples in brackets) which we grouped into semantic categories (in bold). The categories are lined up in a descending order according to the number of concrete answers given in each category:

- 1) school – **education** (educating / education, skills, knowledge, experience, teaching, teaching how to learn);
- 2) school – **relationships** (friends, getting to know new people, respect, tolerance, role models);
- 3) school – **negative emotions** (loathing, boredom, troubles, shame, fear, waste of time, nerves);
- 4) school – **positive emotions** (love, new acquaintances, calm, carelessness, fun);
- 5) school – **staff** (teachers, pupils, janitor, principal, cooks, schoolmates, supervision);
- 6) school – **building** (building, space, classrooms, corridors, cafeteria, gym);
- 7) school – **life** (school of life, preparation for life, rules, order, personality development, future).

The research we just presented, as well as some of our previous researches [4] and the monitoring of authentic school teaching and numerous interviews conducted among pupils both former and current, shows that the creation of a positive image of school is significantly encouraged by communication that is based on respect towards the pupil's personality; this in turn generates a friendly atmosphere at school that stimulates education. The questionnaire survey has shown that it is necessary to support the awareness of how useful Czech language teaching is from the viewpoint of life perspectives, and that it is vital to reinforce positive interpersonal relationships through teaching – the result being an experience of positive emotions.

It is disquieting that pupils associate school with negative emotions more frequently than with positive emotions. This information should prompt teachers to pursue such attitude towards pupils and such teaching methods that it would be possible to eliminate negative emotions which may even lead to the development of serious psychosomatic issues in pupils.

The research confirmed that emotions and relationships experienced in the school environment mean a lot to schoolchildren. Unfortunately, as we have just mentioned, negative emotions prevail over positive emotions. This finding is also in accordance with pedagogic researches that have confirmed the essential role of school as an environment in which interpersonal relationships are formed in a significant way. The responsibility for their formation is mainly on the teacher.

The results we arrived at are also in accordance to our previous research [4] in which we analysed what character traits of teachers are most treasured by university students. The prevalent answer was the teacher's ability to contribute to the formation of friendly relationships which influences the entire atmosphere in the classroom. At the same time we enquired what character traits define a teacher who is regarded by students as a personality. Even here the participants pointed out – besides the teacher's erudition as a specialist – his or her helpfulness and respect towards the students, empathy, and other attributes on the basis of which relationships within the class are formed.

Cognitive view on language which we have illustrated in our text through the approach to lexical meaning, can be used as a diagnostic tool which exposes the conceptualisation processes of a certain segment of population – in the case of our present research, children – and therefore it enables us to look into the pupils' linguistic picture of the world. By the same token, our findings can be used as an indicator of teaching success as it provides the teacher with a significant reflection on their pedagogic activities.

The paper was supported by the SGS 21166 project Language Stereotypes in the School Environment from the Viewpoint of Cognitive Linguistics.

REFERENCES

1. *Underhill, J. W.* Creating Worldviews: metaphor, ideology & language / J. M. Underhill. – Edinburgh : Edinburgh UP, 2011. – 302 p.
2. *Vaňková, I.* Nádoba plná řeči / I. Vaňková. – Praha: Karolinum, 2007. – 312 s.
3. *Vaňková, I.* Co na srdci, to na jazyku. Kapitoly z kognitivní lingvistiky / I. Vaňková. – Praha: Karolinum, 2005. – 343 s.
4. *Pacovská, J.* K hlubinám šudákovy duše. Didaktika mateřského jazyka v transdisciplinárním kontextu / J. Pacovská. – Praha: Karolinum, 2012. – 244 s.

Ю. И. Петракова (Минск, Беларусь)

ОНОМАСИОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ СУБСТАНТИВНЫХ ЕДИНИЦ В ПРОЦЕССАХ ВТОРИЧНОЙ НОМИНАЦИИ

Лексические единицы языка, участвуя в процессах вторичной номинации, выступают в качестве производящих баз для порождения наименований, свидетельствующих о выполнении тех или иных номинативных запросов, или ономасиологических заданий. Строго говоря, каждая возникающая лексическая единица манифестирует отдельное задание номинации, однако в лингвистике общепризнанным является тезис о том, что зависимость между производными и исходными единицами, а следовательно, между ономасиологическими заданиями и производящими базами, особенно четко прослеживается на уровне их лексико-семантических характеристик.

Как известно, неотъемлемым свойством производных единиц является указание на связь обозначаемых сущностей с другими объектами, признаками, действиями, наименования которых представляют собой соответствующие производящие базы. В связи с этим возникает вопрос о том, каким диапазоном именуемых категорий характеризуются те или иные классы производящих баз и, самое главное, возможно ли частичное совпадение этих ономасиологических диапазонов у единиц разной лексико-семантической отнесенности.