

STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC FEATURES OF COMPLEX WORDS OF POLITICAL LEXICON IN THE GERMAN LANGUAGE

T.K. Ivanova ¹
L.A. Biktasheva ²

¹Kazan Federal University
E-mail: tanyscha_07@list.ru
²Kazan Federal University
E-mail: leilaag@yandex.ru

ABSTRACT

This paper considers structural and semantic features of compound words of the political vocabulary of the German language. Of interest is the activity of compounding as a way of forming German political vocabulary. These phenomena are especially diverse in journalistic articles. It is social and political journalism that has more expressiveness of the conveyed information compared to the official business style. There are different ways of classifying complex words. In this article we analyze complex words from the viewpoint of structure and semantics. Complex words of certain languages have already been exposed to scholarly studies, but too little attention is given to studying political vocabulary since political text as an object of public communication is very rich in complex words. Many complex words are lexicalized in German political vocabulary, which confirms the need for their full and detailed analysis from a structural-semantic viewpoint. This fact determines the topicality of the article. The purpose of this article is to study the structural and semantic features of political vocabulary represented by compounds. The main research methods are the method of continuous sampling, the descriptive, comparative methods and the method of semantic analysis, as well as the method of analysis for the directly constituent components, which made it possible to draw generalized conclusions according to the results of the research.

Key words: linguistics, analysis, word, discourse, semantics.

1.INTRODUCTION

Political vocabulary reflects social and political changes in people's lives. Political vocabulary is intimately connected with sociolinguistics, which is a "branch of linguistics that is concerned with the dependency of linguistic phenomena and linguistic units on social factors: on the one hand, communication conditions (time, place, participants, goals, etc.), on the other hand, customs, traditions, features of social and cultural life of the speaking collective" (Ter-Minasova, 2000).

The main object of political linguistics is political discourse. V. I. Karasik defines discourse as "the text in a situation of real communication". He identifies 4 features of

discourse: constitutive features of discourse which comprises participants, conditions, organization, methods and material of communication; features of institutionalism – the purpose and conditions of communication, features of the type of institutional discourse that characterize the type of public institution, and neutral features that represent the building material of the discourse (Karasik, 2000).

T.A. van Dejk gives the following definition of discourse: “discourse is a complex communicative phenomenon that includes, in addition to text, extralinguistic factors (knowledge of the world, opinions, attitudes, goals of the addressee) necessary to understand the text. Discourse is a speech stream, a language in its constant movement, absorbing all the diversity of the historical era, individual and social features of both the communicant and the communicative situation in which communication takes place. Discourse reflects the mentality and culture, both national, universal, and individual, personal” (Van Dejk, 1989).

According to E.I. Sheigal, political discourse is a corpus of texts that encompasses extralinguistic factors and participants in political discourse, forming a specific topic of political communication. At the same time, by this notion E.I. Sheigal understands the equivalence of the terms “political discourse” and “political communication” and implicates the subject and addressee in it (Sheigal, 2004). E.I. Sheigal notes that political discourse involves the politicians on political topics, discourse about the politics of people who are not professionals in this field (discourse of journalists, public figures and other citizens) into the discourse.

According to Gavrilova, the fundamental difference between the political language and the ordinary one is that “... the usual units of the language get an extraordinary interpretation”, i.e. a distinctive feature of political discourse is its metaphor (Danilenko, 1988). Many metaphors are used in the speech of politicians, in the media, taking the form of phraseological units. In this perspective, phraseological units are often used to manipulate public consciousness (Arutyunyan, 2015).

Many linguists consider the main function of political discourse to be the function of persuasion. B.P. Parshin writes that “... every text has an impact on the consciousness of the addressee from a semiotic point of view. But for a political text, speech influence is the main goal of communication, the achievement of which is guided by the choice of linguistic means” (Rosen, 1991).

E.V. Rosen emphasizes the semantic variety of the composition of political vocabulary which consists in the fact that frequently used words in a political context can contain additional meaning and acquire political meaning (Muravleva, 1980). Political vocabulary should be meant for being understood not only by a narrow group of specialists but by broad cross-section of the population. This implies that the main criterion of political vocabulary is simplicity, capacity.

2.METHODS

As an experimental study basis, we used complex words of political vocabulary, selected by the method of continuous sampling by the original (texts from the articles of the modern German periodical *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*). Ten articles of the periodical of the German-language newspaper *FAZ* have been analyzed and thirty examples of complex words of political vocabulary represented in this article have been selected. The main research methods are the continuous sampling method, the descriptive method, the comparative method and the method of semantic analysis, as

well as the method of analysis for the immediate constituent components, which allowed us to draw general conclusions on the results of the study. Another trend, revelatory, is dictated by the desire to rip away the mask of pretense and supposed objectivity from phraseology, to reveal the true meaning of pseudo-objective or unpleasant names (Serzhantov, 1986; D'Inka et al., 2018).

This paper attempts to make lexical analysis of German political vocabulary from the structural-semantic point of view to identify their semantic and structural features. It is worthy of note that the problem of distinguishing a complex word as a word-forming phenomenon has a long history and has not yet been resolved. Word formation is the main and most important component of every existing language. The vocabulary is in a state of continuous development under the influence of time, it reflects the changes that take place in the activities of the human population and in all possible areas of our lives.

The process of word formation is a part of the structure of language. The study of the structure of language is inextricably linked with the study of the laws and methods of word formation, its means (Fleischer & Barz, 1995; Steffens et al., 2014; Babenko, 2015). This knowledge is important for practical training of any existing language.

There are many authors studying this phenomenon, and, accordingly, there are many viewpoints about what word formation is. In German, the main and most productive word formation method is compounding. The result of compounding is a composite or a complex word – a combination of two or more words, or stems into a single nominative whole. P. Eisenberg identifies, among the many types of formation of complex words, substantive composites, which he considers to be prototypical. The most common prototype pattern is SBST + SBST (noun+noun) – *Demokratieverständnis*, then the model ADJ + SBST (adjective + noun) – *Falschgeld* and VB + SBST (verb + noun) – *Mischehe*, less common are the models PR + SBST (preposition + noun) – *Ausflucht* (Eisenberg, 2000).

Four types of composites are distinguished according to the semantic relations of components within complex word: determinative, in which the meaning of the kernel component (Grundwort) is specified through the meaning of the determining (Bestimmungswort) – *Golduhr*; copulative composites – the components of a compound word are semantically equal – *Königin-mutter*; composites based on the meteorological transfer from part to whole – *Hitz-kopf* (hothead, hot-tempered) and composites with intensifying components – the role of the first component is to emphasize the meaning of the second one – *Bomben-erfolg* (Donalies, 2005). The analysis of the complex words of political vocabulary based on the material of the periodical publication of the German-language newspaper *Frankfurter Allgemeine* is given.

3.RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As shown in statistical analysis of the exposed complex words in the texts of modern German press, more than 24% of neologisms of the modern German language is formed in the sub-languages of the political and scientific spheres (computer technology is about 9%, and politics is from 9 to 11% according to the dictionaries of new words). We consider these words in more detail proceeding from their structural and semantic characteristics.

In 2018, according to official figures, 185,853 foreigners applied to the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF) – it is 16.5 percent less than in 2017. Despite

this, the issue of refugee migration remains relevant and discussed in Europe, in connection with this there is a large number of complex words with the components *Asyl, Flüchtling, Migration: Asylplan, Asylstreit, Asylrecht, Asylpolitik, Asylaufnahme, Asylbewerber, Asylverfahren, Asylkommpromis, Flüchtlingssituation, Flüchtlingsskrise, Flüchtlingssrat, Flüchtlingssstreit, Flüchtlingsspolitik, Flüchtlingssheim, Migrationsherausforderung*.

From the point of view of structure, the words under consideration are formed by combining the stems of SBST + SBST (noun + noun), where both components regarding semantics have not changed their valency. Complex words refer to the determinative type of composites by semantic relations.

The most interesting combination to be clarified is the complex word *Asyltourismus*, which, according to the article of the German-language newspaper *Frankfurter Allgemeine*, is synonymous with the complex word *Binnenwanderung*, that is, the refugees who have already applied for asylum in one country and registered there, move to another country, namely Germany, and apply for asylum again.

«... *Deutschland ist Magnet für die Migranten. ... Auch dann müssen Schranken errichtet werden, um zu verhindern, was Markus Söder verächtlich "Asyltourismus" nennt, was aber nicht anders ist als Binnenwanderung.* » (Ter-Minasova, 2000).

The complex words from political sphere are based on the components, such as *Regierung, Koalition, Politik, Partei: Regierungssprecher, Regierungsgespräch, Koalitionsstreit, Koalitionsverhandlung, Einwanderungspolitik, Kommunalpolitik, Europapartei, Linkspartei, CDU-partei, Parteivorstandsbeschluss, Schwesterpartei*. Moreover, the understanding of the last complex word which does not require a separate explanation as it can be explained through the translation of its components is *Schwesterpartei*: Schwester – a sister, Partei – a party, that is, parties with the same or similar political goals, which implies the equality of components in semantic terms.

I would also like to note the fact that commonly used complex words, penetrating political vocabulary, have an emotional impact on the reader, while intensifying a text or a message (Ivanova & Biktasheva, 2017; Kalegina et al., 2015). So, for example, the complex word *Traumtänzer* – a dreamer, is formed by the most common pattern SBST+SBST (noun + noun), where the first component of the complex word is the noun *Traum* - dream, and the noun *Tänzer* - dancer. From a semantic point of view, in this example one can trace a metonymic mapping in the direction of part – whole. «...*Nationale Egoisten und europäische Traumtänzer helfen in der Asylpolitik nicht weit.*» (Ter-Minasova, 2000).

The complex word *Teufelskreis* – vicious circle, insidious cycle, structurally formed by combining two noun stems *Teufel*- devil, deuce and *Kreis* – circle. Semantically, they are determinative composites. «...*Das eine lässt sich nicht in Europa, das andere nicht in Deutschland durchsetzen. Beide sind aber aufeinander angewiesen. Wie lässt sich dieser Teufelskreis durchbrechen?* » (Ter-Minasova, 2000).

Often complex words are used in the headings or subheadings of articles in order to clearly indicate the essence and arouse the reader's interest in reading it. Such an example is the compound word *todgeweiht* - doomed to death, consisting of the noun *Tod* – death and the adjective *geweiht* - doomed, which was subsequently substantiated by the author of the article. The compound word is formed by joining the two stems SBST + ADJ (noun + adjective), being from the semantic point of view copulative composites. «*Begegnung mit Todgeweihten. Der eine wurde zum Schein ermordet? Der*

andere sieht sich in Lebensgefahr: Begegnung mit den kremlkritischen russischen Journalisten...» (Ter-Minasova, 2000).

4.SUMMARY

Thus, among the complex words of the political sphere analyzed during the study, the most common are the formations by the traditional patterns, being characteristic of the German word-formation system – these are the patterns of complex words formed by a combination of the stems of two nouns or consisting of the stems of the adjective in combination with the noun. From the semantic point of view, determinative complex nouns are most often encountered, then as regards to frequency they follow formations with copulative relations of the components, and the composites with a metonymic mapping are very rare. It is journalism that has more expressiveness of the conveyed information and exerts an emotional effect on the reader. One of the linguistic features of journalism is linguistic economy, which ultimately leads to compression of the information and the emergence of complex words in the political sphere.

5.CONCLUSIONS

Summing up, we can state the following: the formation of complex words of political vocabulary in the German language occurs according to the common word-formation patterns, being characteristic of complex words of a given language. The revealing of structural and semantic features of political vocabulary is of great research interest in terms of predicting trends in the development of complex words of political vocabulary that deserve special attention. The emergence of the emotional component in some lexicalized complex words, as well as the mechanisms of its occurrence, require another scientific study.

6.ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

1. Ter-Minasova, S. G. (2000). Language and Intercultural Communication. M.: Slovo, 624 p.
2. Karasik, V. I. (2000). Ethnocultural Types of Institutional Discourse. Ethnocultural Specific Character of Speech Activity: a Collection of Reviews. - M.
3. Van Dejk, T. (1989). Poznanie. Kommunikacija [Tekst]. pod red. M. : Progress, S. 3.
4. Sheigal, E. I. (2004). Semiotics of the Political Discourse. M.: The Gnosis ITDGG, 326 p.
5. Danilenko, V. P. (1988). Onomasiological Direction in the History of Grammar. *Questions of Linguistics*, 3, 108–131.
6. Arutyunyan, V. S. (2015). Socio-Political Phraseology through the Prism of Intercultural Communication. *Language. Literature. Culture*, 201 (1), 30-43.

7. Rosen, E. V. (1991). *New Words and Fixed Phrases in German*. M.: Prosveshcheniye.
8. Muravleva, N. V. (1980). *Innovations in the Lexical and Semantic System of the Political Vocabulary of Germany. Structural and Semantic Studies in German Vocabulary*. Kalinin.
9. Serzhantov, S. V. (1986). *The Problem of the Internationalization of Vocabulary (Socialist Interlinguism Studies)*. Collection of Scholarly Articles of MSPIFL named after M. Torez. M.
10. Fleischer, W., & Barz, I. (1995). *Wortbildung der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. 2. Auf. – Tübingen.: Niemeyer, 382 S.
11. Eisenberg, P. (2000). *Grundriss der deutsche Grammatik: 2Bnd Stuttgart; Weimar, Metzler Bnd1: Das Wort*, 236
12. Donalies, E. (2005), *Die Wortbildung im Deutschen. Ein Überblick*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
13. Ivanova, T. K., & Biktasheva, L. A. (2017). *Ways of formation of punning compound words in German and their translations into Russian*. *Revista Publicando*, 4(13 (2)), 437-446.
14. Steffens, D., Al-Wadi, D., & Institut für Deutsche Sprache (Mannheim). (2014). *Neuer Wortschatz: Neologismen im Deutschen 2001-2010*. IDS.
15. D'Inka, W., Kaube, J., Kohler, B., & Steltzner, H. (2018). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. 138, 32.
16. Babenko, O. V. (2015). *Language as a basic feature of ethnos uniting within the conditions of modern challenges*. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 6(3), 168-170.
17. Kalegina T.E, Takhtarova S.S, Zaglyadkina T.Y. (2015). *Denglish and Franglais in the framework of the modern European linguistic landscape//Journal of Language and Literature*. - 2015. - Vol.6, Is.3. - P.195-198.