Dasha A. Voronina-Pryhodii

National Pedagogical Dragomanov University,
Kyiv, Ukraine

NOMINATION AS A COGNITIVE PROCESS IN THE SPHERE OF PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY

Abstract

The article outlines the basic concepts of a cognitive approach in the study of language, including such a process as nomination, which is a topical issue for modern linguistics as well. The nomination is seen as a multidimensional phenomenon and a complex thought-and-speech process that objectifies the cognitive features of human activity and the structure properties of his or her consciousness.

There is substantiated the importance of the cognitive-onomasiological approach involvement to the study of the nominative act, as well as there is characterized the development of the science onomasiology as a way to linguocognitivism. The assumption is made that the key term of the onomasiology is the concept of nomination, which needs to be interpreted in the gnoseo-semiotic and linguistic aspects. Nomination is characterized as a process that is constantly accompanied by human's cognition the world, so the use of cognitive tools in the analysis of nominative units extends the boundaries of research and especially in the direction of terminological nomination.

The terminological nomination also includes the processes of conceptualization and verbalization, but of professional knowledge, and it is the result of cognitive activity of specialists. The terminological unit represents the essential qualities of the nominated object that is why it is important to analyze the motivation of the meaning, as well as the notion of the internal form of the term, which is a formal-semantic relation of the nomination.

As a result, it is stated that the ability of a linguistic sign is potentially limitless and depends on the person's cognition of reality. In addition to this, the nomination in the cognitive aspect is a verbalized form of knowledge about the world in general or within the framework of the certain professional activity of a person in particular.

Keywords: *nomination, onomassiology, cognitive approach, language sign, term, motivation.*

1. Introduction.

While studying linguistic communication, firstly scientists consider the relation between a linguistic sign and its meaning, which is formed within the unit of designation. This connection provides for the person's mental-communicative needs, which are to build expressions in the communication process. Ultimately, the meaning of a linguistic sign is the result of a person's cognition of the surrounding reality. Human consciousness, which stores in various forms the result of cognitive activity, requires the fixation of acquired knowledge for their further use and for the purpose of their transfer, namely for communication.

Therefore, the topical is the issue of the language study in the onomasiological (nomination theory) and cognitive (cognition theory) aspects, in which the naming process establishes a connection between the units of language and the phenomena of reality, and the language itself is a means of mastering knowledge and experience.

From the middle of the twentieth century the science onomassiology studies the question of naming fragments of the surrounding reality both by words and by whole utterances: Teliya (2002), Ufimceva (2010), Kubryakova (2004), Arutyunova (1977), Kolshanskij (1990), Serebrennikov (1959), Gack (2009), Mathezius (2003). In modern linguistics, there are different approaches to the development periodization of the onomasiological direction and its path to cognitivism. Kopach (2007) identifies three stages of the study of words in the nominative aspect:

1) **the pre-functional stage** (beginning of the twentieth century) is represented by the names of the scientists of the field "Words and Things" by Meringer, Schuhardt (2003), Meyer-Lübke. In the same period, ideas about the nomination were described in the works of Jespersen (1958), Balli (2001), Shcherba (1958);

2) **the functional stage** (30-80s of the XIX century) is connected with the development of functionalism in the works of Mathesius (2003), Dokulil (1962) and the transfer of ideas of this direction to onomasiology. In the Soviet period, a functional approach to the analysis of name issues was reflected in the works of Kubryakova (2004), Ufimceva (2010), Golev (1974), Teliya (2002), Zhuravleva (1982), etc.;

3) **conceptual-cognitive approach** (since the 1990s), where the formation of the image of reality perceived by man, is transferred to the level of concept (Štekauer (2005), Hejraarts (1995), etc.) (Kopach 2007: 313- 320).

2. Aim and Objectives.

The **aim** of the article is to characterize the onomasiological and cognitive approaches to nomination problems and to reveal the meaning of this concept.

Achieving this goal involves solving the following **objectives:**
– to clarify the meaning of the concept of nomination and outline its main aspects;
– to explore the nomination process in terms of the cognitive approach;
– to reveal the essence of the process of terminological nomination and its meaning.

3. Methodology.

The research of the lexical nomination is being conducted primarily within the lexicological direction, where semiotic and onomasiological aspects of the nomination are studied. In other words, the lexical nomination is viewed in terms of its structure as a linguistic sign and its relation to the identified phenomenon.

Like any linguistic field, onomassiology requires the extension of the boundaries and objects of study. This extralinguistic phenomena directly or indirectly affect the internal linguistic processes of nomination. For this reason, studies on history, ethnology, cultural studies, anthropology, neurophysiology, sociology, ethnography and literary studies are

involved in the interests of onomasiology. The idea of nomination in cognitive and onomasiological aspects was formed due to the methods of analysis and generalization. Further, it allowed to explore such a variant as terminological nomination.

Language is studied as one of the main sources of human cognition, and a complete analysis of the nomination act is possible only because of the study of cognitive operations and the cognitive structuring of thinking. That is the basis for ensuring the ordering and preservation of human experience, ethnicity, nation, as well as the use of this experience in practice.

4. Results.
4.1. The process of nomination, its types and methods.

Nowadays scientists turn to a slightly different perspective on linguistic research after a thorough study of language tools within the framework of system-structural direction and typological paradigm. Modern linguistics requires a multidimensional description of linguistic phenomena, including in the field of study such a linguistic phenomenon as nomination. It is known that the key task of the language is "providing all spheres of human life with new names" (Ufimceva 2010: 5). It is in the process of nomination, taking into account the dynamic development of cognitive and communicative activity of society, there are determined the corresponding names of concepts of new realities and objects of material and spiritual culture. Nomination is carried out at different levels of thinking and goes through the following steps: concept formation, name creation, fixation of nomination in the language system, implementation of language nominations in specific speech acts (Pylypiv, Lypetskyi, 2018: 178).

According to Encyclopedic Linguistic Dictionary, nomination [from Lat. Nominatio – nomination] – is the formation of linguistic units characterized by a nominative function, that is, they serve to name and isolate fragments of reality and to form relevant concepts about them in the form of words, phrases, phraseologisms and sentences. This term also denotes the result of the nomination process – a significant linguistic unit. Some scholars use the term "nomination" to denote the branch of linguistics, that studies the structure of naming acts: in this sense, nomination is the same as onomiology, and is opposed to semasiology (Teliya, 2002: 336–337).

In a narrow sense, onomasiology is understood as the doctrine of the process of naming the surrounding reality with the words (the process of nomination). In other words, that is the doctrine of lexical objectification of concepts. In a broad sense, onomassiology is the field of study of all the nominative activity that takes place in the language and reflects the process of objects cognition and connections in the world around them (Marchenko, 2014: 40).

Therefore, the study of the lexical nomination is not limited to the lexical direction only, but the key in the study is its semiotic and onomasiological aspects, where the lexical nomination is viewed in terms of its structure as a linguistic sign and its relation to the identified phenomenon.

The notion in language is fixed in the form of meaning, which is marked by the internal form. So, scholars distinguish the following major stages of language nomination:

1) highlighting some features of the new concept;
2) the occurrence of the previous tag word (this stage is not always);
3) definition of linguistic meaning in common features;
4) refinement of the internal form based on meaning;
5) improvement of the concept in the process of its functioning, which is reflected on the meaning;

6) changes in the sphere of meaning that cause certain changes in the internal form; thus, it corresponds more closely to its linguistic content (meaning) (Diakov, Kyiak, Kudelko, 2000: 91–92).

The meaning of a word is determined by the perfect content of the displayed real object or property, that is, the significator. In the nomination, unequivocal correlation of the verbal sign with the meaning is of the great importance, since the language mark captures and supports in speech the very subject that becomes the object of the utterance. Firstly, it is important for the nomination to preserve, by a certain sign, the essential features of real objects and phenomena. Because of their reflection in the semantics of the word, these objects are a differentiating factor for the designation of each particular phenomenon, property, process. The designation of an object by a verbal sign is an indication of that essential and distinguishing feature that separates one object from another (Shmelev, 1973: 34).

In modern linguistics, there are two main types of nominations: the primary (or initial meaning of the word) and the secondary. Acts of direct (primary nomination) with the help of words are remarkable in that they simultaneously relate to the world objectification by a person, with all stages of his social experience and work activity, with the isolation and generalization of the necessary and essential in the subject of cognition (Ufimceva, 2010: 5).

The associative nature of human thinking is the basis of the secondary nomination. Secondary nomination acts establish associations by similarity or contiguity between certain properties of elements of a non-contractual series, reflected in an already existing meaning, and properties of a new name, with a redefined meaning. Associative features that are actualized in the secondary nomination process may correspond to the components of a redefined meaning. They also may respond those semantic features that, without being part of the distinctive features of the meaning, correlate with the background knowledge of native speakers about a given reality or the internal form of meaning (Teliya, 2002: 337).

According to Teliya, a secondary nomination is formed on the basis of the meaning of the word whose name is used in the new naming function. However, in the field of secondary nomination, there are two fundamentally different ways of showing the reality and attributing the meaningful (conceptual and linguistic) content of the names to the marked objects.

Secondary nomination methods vary depending on the language means, used in the creation of new names, and the nature of the name-to-reality relationship. By the nature of pointing the name to reality, two types of secondary nomination are distinguished – autonomous and non-autonomous (indirect) (Teliya, 2002: 336).

The first way of the secondary nomination is the indirect display of non-spoken objects, mediated by the "previous" meaning of the word. Denotation features play the role of the internal form, moving to the new semantic meaning. The formed meaning correlates with the sub-units autonomously.

The second way is that the meaning formation of the new name occurs under the direct influence of the semantic content of another name. The name determines the nature of the reality reflection in a new meaning, defining one or another perspective of its consideration, and thus mediates this reflection. Moreover, this way is an indirect reflection of reality, mediated by the sequence of some elements of the previous word meaning. Therefore, the formed conceptual and linguistic content of such names correlates with the extralinguistic unit not autonomously, but indirectly (Ufimceva, Aznaurova, Kubryakova, Telia, 1997: 74–75).

According to Skvirya, nomination is a polysemic term that means: 1) the naming process; 2) the result of this process, the name itself; 3) a branch of linguistics that studies the structure of naming acts. Nomination should also mean the nominative function of a

word. Depending on the types of base words, the nomination is divided into primary and secondary. Primary nomination is an initial name characterized by a "simple" attitude that reflects the elements of reality. Secondary nomination is the use of already available nominative means in the language in the new naming function (Skvirya, 2013: 97).

The processes of "artificial" and "natural" nomination are linked to the conscious, purposeful influence of a person on the language and linguistic activity, but the essence of these concepts should be further explained in order to better understand them.

Golomidova claims that "artificial nomination becomes a conscious departure from the rules, and natural – by imitation of the usual, often used in semantic or word-forming models". However, the understanding of artificial nomination as a conscious violation of some derivative stereotypes does not clearly indicate its relation to the natural nomination, since "the shift of norms and the change in productivity in certain word-forming models is known to be quite a natural phenomenon for the process of natural linguistic dynamics" (Golomidova, 1998: 32).

When distinguishing between natural and artificial nomination, research positions sometimes differ. Depending on the content of indicators for their differentiation of the general approach, various points of view are formed.

In her work Kopocheva submits the most detailed explanation, in which the basic criterion of differentiation is the specific combination of the nominative activity of objective and subjective factors. In order to distinguish between natural and artificial nomination, it is proposed to take into account "different nature of nominative activity, the presence or the absence of a clearly defined purpose of the nomination by the subjects who name it, and a different ratio of objective and subjective factors in the nomination" (Kopocheva, 1985: 40).

Another point of view is that the processes of natural and artificial nomination are closely linked to the approbation processes of language formation. Confronting the natural and artificial nomination, Ulyanova (1984) comes to the following conclusion: "Natural nomination involves the absence of a conscious plan of action in the object nomination. It also provides the choice spontaneity of the motivational trait and the intuitiveness of the word-forming model selection. The unknown authorship, a small degree of novelty, uncontrollability, lack of awareness of the results and its evaluation, approbation irregularity refers to the natural nomination as well. Artificial nomination is characterized by a clear target set, sustainability in the implementation of action, directed selection of a motivational sign and ways of its expression, popularity of authorship, controllability, awareness of the lexical unit novelty and evaluation of the final results, controllability of the approbation" (p. 50).

In turn, distinguishing artificial and natural nominations, Skvirya distinguishes four of their kinds (Skvirya, 2013: 98):

– nominations that meet standards and are formed naturally (normal or natural nominations, primary nominations);

– mutations, that is, nominations that are characterized by standardity, but appear in the language imperceptibly for its speakers (secondary nominations). These nominations are based on metaphor and metonymy. They are based on associations and reflect a close connection between objects and phenomena of the surrounding reality.

– deliberately created nominations, purposeful naming, directional introduction of titles into the public lexicon are artificial nominations.

– "pathological" nomination, which is a deviation from the norm and arises as a result of the influence of extralinguistic factors.

The first two kinds are natural, the latter are artificial nomination. But at the same time, the artificiality of the nomination is always based on the natural process of naming.

Scholars turn to another perspective of linguistic research, having studied the use of language tools in the system-structural direction and the typological paradigm. Contemporary linguistics seeks a multidimensional description of linguistic phenomena, including such a linguistic phenomenon as nomination in the field of study.

However, an important aspect of the nomination study in the context of the onomasiological approach is not only the search for forms of objectification of meaning, but also the study of the principles and methods of constructing these linguistic forms as signs. Therefore, it can be established that nomination in the onomasiological aspect is understood as the process of turning the facts of reality into the property of the structural system of language, that is, in linguistic meaning. These linguistic meanings reflect the social experience of native speakers. Moreover, the nomination is also the result of a naming process, that is, a sign to signify a fragment of the surrounding reality that they perceive.

4.2. Nomination in Cognitive Aspect.

Reflecting on the semiotic aspects of language within the framework of cognitive-onomasiological approach, it should be emphasized that the characteristic or representative function of the nomination, as a rule, is the peculiarity to generally express the results of human cognitive activity. It also consolidates and stores the results of its socio-historical experience, as well as a cognitive base, which are made up of the experience of cognition, directly related to thinking.

Ferdinand de Saussure also noted that in the nomination the name is mechanically attached to the marked object in the form of a "label" or a "signboard", while "naming in the language" is always meaningful and mediated by thinking. In other words, along with the social characteristic of the nomination, its cognitive character stands out. The proof of this is the reasoning about the ability of the mind to conceive and associate the two sides of a language sign with one another – the concept and the acoustic image (Ferdinand de Saussure, 1999: 69).

Such a connection is a so-called psychic imprint in a person's memory. It is expressed in his or her perception of an event or reality that is connected with certain associations, based on past experience. It follows that the process of certain objects and phenomena designation of objective reality is carried out by means of linguistic units. It is also connected with the formation of concepts, in which the natural properties of things and phenomena are presented in transformed on the basis of communicative needs, associative experience and cognitive perception form (Malinka, Nagel, 2011: 48–49).

That is, the nomination is a process of coding through a name in a linguistic sign of the notion-significator, which reflects the specific signs of the denotation (properties, relations) of objects and processes of the material and spiritual sphere, whereby linguistic units acquire meaningful elements of verbal communication. Let's dwell on the formation and scientific potential of the cognitive approach in nomination research.

Nomination (or naming) is characterized as a process that is constantly accompanied by the human cognition of the world. The more accurate and complete is the cognition, the more detailed the nomination will be (Superanskaya, Podol'skaya, Vasileva, 2012: 88). The degree of the concept awareness depends on how much the relevant sign form becomes meaning of the word. The center of linguistic research is the individual, the group of individuals, the people as the main creator of linguistic culture and linguistic traditions: "In cognitive linguistics there are considered those and only those cognitive structures and processes that are inherent in man as a "source of thought". At the forefront there is a systematic description and explanation of the mechanisms of human language acquisition and principles for structuring these mechanisms" (Jaspers, 2013: 85).

Scholars focus mainly on the subject of the nomination. The process of naming is a pragmatic activity of a person who combines knowledge and symbolically represents it. Thanks to cognitive tools, the boundaries of the study of nominative units are expanded. "There is an opportunity to penetrate into the psycholingual and mental depths of the creation mechanism of the nominative language subsystem, structuring and systematization of processes that directly or indirectly affect this process" (Selivanova, 2000: 27).

Thus, Golovanova emphasizes that the nomination is not only the processes of giving the meaning of the world, but also the processes of cognition, constructing the world, evaluating it and interpreting it. It is also argued that the ability to create variant ways of describing the same is an inherent feature of language that goes beyond mere synonymy. Moreover, the act of nomination is interpreted not as a special linguistic act, but also as a cognitive act, that consolidates the conscious in the form of a linguistic sign (Golovanova, 2011: 15–16).

The language system is understood as a projection of what is known by a man, as a reflex of his thinking about the world and about language, as a set of means that serve to describe the world (Kubryakova, 2004: 22). The act of nomination is interpreted not simply as a special linguistic act, but also as a cognitive act, which consolidates the meaningful in the form of a linguistic sign. The word reflects the elements of experience and reality evaluation by a person and is the storehouse of knowledge (Golovanova, 2011: 16).

We agree with this view, which points to the direct connection between "conscious object" and "word denoted by this object", that is, every word in the mind of the man necessarily represents a certain image, situation or event. This means that a new word can be seen as a result of the objectification of mental structures. The representatives of the onomasiological direction (Ufimceva, Kubryakova, Teliya drew attention to the fact that the nomination could not be reduced to the designation of any realities of the world. It is always mediated by the thought and is a means of objectifying thinking (Ufimceva, Anaurarov, Kubryakova, Teliya, 1997: 7–19).

However, linguistic expression can only be a source material in cognitive linguistics for the study of cognitive processes occurring during the nomination, since it is believed that mental processes are not only based on representations, but also correspond to certain "cognitive computations".

Ahmanova affirms the theory that naming or nomination cannot be regarded as a simple link between the "subject" and the word. It requires a conceptual, or abstract, relation to the subject (Ahmanova, 1957: 99).

The development of a cognitive approach to the study of linguistic phenomena has contributed to the awareness of the latter as a source of information about the conceptual or cognitive structures of our consciousness. "Language detects, objects, how the world is seen and understood by the human mind, how it is refracted and categorized by consciousness" (Kubryakova, 2004: 57).

The notion of conceptualization and categorization is one of the key terms of the cognitive approach. Conceptualization is a model of related concepts, a way of organizing the cognitive process whose ultimate goal is to create an abstract unit – a concept that represents the learned knowledge in the most structured and detailed way. Categorization is summarizing an object into a certain category, a "rubric" of experience; it is the main way of organizing the perceived world, systematizing the observed phenomena. Interpretation of the nominative base by explaining the specifics of the conceptualization and categorization processes brings to the theory of nomination such aspects of analysis that have not been contravened before: explaining the nomination through its mental representation, appealing

to the idioethnic component of a new word, determining the relationship between knowledge and the specificity of its reflection. etc. (Marchenko, 2014: 42).

In the perception of reality, people comprehend different systems of knowledge, as evidenced by the large number of types and methods of categorization. Understanding is not limited to the reproduction of things (concepts) as they are, but reproduces them in the categories of the corresponding system of ideas.

First of all, the nominative act is related to the search for the verbal envelope for any result of cognition from the standpoint of cognitive linguistics. In developing this idea, Kubryakova emphasizes that any human activity (practical, sensual development of reality) is mediated by language, and linguistic nominations are a reflection of the result of such activity. "The word formation should be considered as a system of meeting the needs for the allocation and fixation of special structures (mental representations of human experience and knowledge), that is, "packaging" into linguistic forms that meet certain formal and substantive requirements" (Kubryakova, 2004: 393–394).

In the cognitive approach, the focus is on the mechanisms of learning the information about the world, evaluating it, storing it in certain types of memory, and implementing it in knowledge. This approach to the analysis of linguistic phenomena and facts is used in a variety of linguistic fields and areas.

Thus, the nominative act is the result of consolidation of life experience and it can be reflected in the specifics of not only the individual linguistic personality, but also the whole linguistic community. This approach opens up new opportunities to explore issues related to explaining the linguistic "benefits" of a linguistic personality, which is particularly relevant, for example, in a bilingual environment.

4.3. Terminological Nomination in Special Fields of Knowledge.

The derivative method of nomination is the terminological nomination. Golovanova notes, that cognitive complexity of scientific (and broader – professional) knowledge is adequately expressed in texts through the use of less cumbersome means. This idea is relevant for the study of its specificity (Golovanova, 2011: 17).

That is, the key task of such term-building is to reflect the acquired knowledge with the help of a linguistic sign, not overloading with excess vocabulary, but fully comprising all possible meanings and understandings of the concept.

Hence there is the desire to "folding of meaning" at different levels: to reduce word combinations, to acronyms, univerbation, etc. The main principle in the professional environment: non multa, sed multum – considerable content at the minimum of the means used (but this minimum should not be the minimum minimorum, otherwise there is a misunderstanding) (Golovanova, 2011: 17).

Thus, in the special spheres of knowledge there is a constant replenishment and updating of the lexical composition, which is far ahead of the development of general vocabulary, where there is no such urgent need for the forced development of the lexical resource. The scientific and technological revolution creates the prerequisites for the single system occurrence of the most important spheres of human activity: theoretical laws knowledge of the nature and society (science), the complex of technical means and experience of the transformation of nature (technology), the process of creating material goods (production) and ways of rational interconnection actions in the process of production (management) (Golovin, Kobrin, 1987: 16).

In addition, the information society era dictates its requirements for professional activity, the marking of which is transmitted in the form of language signs.

Scholars note that the terms appear in scientific and technical communication, but not necessarily in the researcher's office or laboratory. Sometimes they arise in a casual conversation, where they use professional discourse, and only later are recorded as scientific or technical terms (Superanskaya, Podol'skaya, Vasileva, 2012: 81). According to the spheres of people professional activity Golovin distinguishes the following groups of terms: 1) terms of science; 2) terms of engineering and production; 3) terms of management; 4) terms of culture and sport (Golovin, Kobrin, 1987: 14–15).

Nomination in these spheres occurs individually within each group, where the key is the interaction with human thinking, cognition and activity. As a result, the boundaries of cognition are systematized and refined so that the concept can be reflected in the appropriate form of a linguistic sign, namely the term.

Particularly the semantics of the term determine its functions in various spheres of social activity, where connection with the concept or correlation with the named subject is in the foreground.

Thus, the authors indicate that production, technical, and other terms (except scientific ones) are semantically close to the common words; moreover, the boundary between the production-technical term and the common word can only be drawn by contextual analysis (Golovin, Kobrin, 1987: 15).

The terminology nomination is always secondary to the general nomination and is associated with a range of issues that distinguish it into an independent area of knowledge. Researchers list such areas as terminology, specialization of terminological meanings, systematicity, rarity, organization in the system and in the corresponding terminological field, etc. (Superanskaya, Podol'skaya, Vasileva, 2012: 82).

The nomination process is closely related to comparison of objects in order to identify their common and distinguishing features. In terminology, the nominative unit must reflect the classification features of the concept, its relation and relation to other lexical items of the same semantic field (Slozhenikina, 2016: 31).

Analyzing the basics of the construction of scientific and technical terminology, the scientist Lotte states that modern terms are built entirely on the basis of existing words. He uses the term "termination", that is, giving terminological meaning to common words by the formation of compound words and phrases, derivatives and apocopic words. However, in his point of view, all of these methods are not sufficient to satisfy the need for science and technology in the names for many tens of thousands of concepts, since the ability to form derivative words is limited by existing word-forming elements and the inability of words to connect with any of these elements. Complex words and phrases can only be used in two, three, or, at least, four-element compounds, but in these cases, the cumbersomeness of the terms often renders them unsuitable in practical terminology (Lotte, 1961: 37).

Formed meanings of terms, as the general categories, reveal the interdependence of linguistic and mental aspects of nomination, contribute to the ways identification of linguistic representation (coding) of mental entities. It causes a close connection of onomasiological and cognitive approaches in the terminology.

According to Volodina, the terminological nomination is "not only a process of designation and communication, it is simultaneously a process of cognition, and the correspondence of the information expressed in the linguistic form, and the related identity of the reflections, largely depend on the structure of the names. of reality in human consciousness" (Volodina, 1995: 81).

According to the semantics of the term, there are sometimes conceptual changes in its nomination. The name given to the new concept reflects the characteristics that the nominee considers the main, classificational. After all, the term must express the conceptual content in

an adequate external form – not in general (with respect to any "truth in the last instance"), but one that corresponds to the competence of the researcher at the specific competence of the researcher at a particular stage in the development of a new theory. The term formed by the scientist reflects the course of his heuristic thought, aimed at a certain area of subject knowledge (Slozhenikina, 2016: 31).

Therefore, semantic transformations of special lexical units and their renamings are obligatory, depending on the way of becoming a scientific concept – from approximate study to its precise definition.

The cognitive approach makes it possible to analyze the occurrence and evolution of special knowledge in a broad civilizational context, to reveal the causes and mechanisms of dynamic processes in the field of terminological (and more professional) nomination, taking into account the changing cognitive-communicative needs of people. All this deepens the scientific understanding of historical processes in term systems, reveals the dynamics of the complex relation of special structures of knowledge (and consciousness) with structures of linguistic. In addition, as the terminologists emphasize, this approach helps to form a more complete and many-sided conception of the term, as it takes into account the prototype categorization implemented in the naive linguistic picture of the world, and the actualization of the term as a sign of "intellectually mature" and clearly defined special concept (Golovanova, 2011: 40).

Previously terminology did not go beyond the analysis of the term and concepts of the system, which he displays. Now the cognitive area has opened terminology for the broad interdisciplinary research to study and terminological term in a broad cultural context.

Defining the terminology of the science language as a nominatively codified system, it should be understood that the term is a verbalized result of scientific and professional thinking, scientific and professional conceptualization, an operational means of activity in the scientific and professional sphere and the main tool of professional communication. Nomination in the field of terminology is understood not only as a process of notation of concepts, but also as a process of cognition. The mechanism, structure, motivation of the name depends on the adequacy of information expressed in the linguistic form of the term, and, ultimately, the construction of the image (model) of the world in human consciousness.

Golovanova believes that "any professional unit is the result of the cognitive activity of a specialist, which consists in conceptualization and verbalization of professional knowledge. The features of conceptualization depend on the level of formed knowledge, on the system of professional units, which will include a new name, on the professional and linguistic competence of specialists" (Golovanova, 2011: 152).

A language provides a better understanding of the processes of mental, cognitive nature, the processes of conceptualization and categorization of the world. All information that comes to a person through different channels is processed in language, through language. "Only language can objectify the processes of awareness, assessment, and comprehension by a person of a particular situation. Objecting the formed concepts and conceptual structures, language gives them a certain degree of completeness" (Ibid.: 11–12).

Since the term is a material expression of the defined concept, ideally the terminological unit should represent the basic, essential properties of the nominated object. On this basis, scientists point to such a concept as "motivation of the term meaning" and distinguish two basic types of special units – motivated and unmotivated. At the motivation level, an associative relationship is made between the semantic elements of the nominative unit and the corresponding lexical meaning. If such a connection is not reconstructed because of the mediocrity of the mental operations of the communicant, then the word is devoid of motivation for him (Diakov, Kyiak, Kudelko, 2000: 77).

That is, motivation means that the nomination process establishes a formal-semantic link, which is the internal form of the new name. In this form there is reflected the associativity of human thinking, the imagery of the perception of the world, centuries-old experience of human cognitive activity. It is relevant to the full assimilation of it in society as a nominative unit and the formation completion of lexical meaning. In this aspect, motivation is the initial act of incorporating the created name into the language system and establishing semantic relations with the motivating word.

According to Grinev-Grinevich, motivation is "a semantic transparency that allows us to form an idea of a notion, named by the term" (Grinev-Grinevich, 2008: 34). Unmotivated are the terms that have no indication of the essential features of a concept. In other words, they are units, which literal meaning is not recognized (Slozhenikina, 2016: 34).

Motivated terms include partially motivated terms whose meaning can only be partially explained by the meaning of the words from which they are formed, or in which only some of the elements of their structure are explained. In fully motivated terms, their values fully correspond to the meaning of the elements of their structure (Grinev-Grinevich, 2008: 63–64).

Before you create a new term or arrange the terminology, the meaning of the relevant term is usually already known, and its essential features are fixed. "Ideally, between the meaning of the concept, its features and the structure of the term should be a direct link, that is, the choice of the term motivation is determined by the features of the expressed concept" (Musaev, 1965: 4–5). Depending on the literal meaning of the term to its true meaning, all terms for convenience of analysis can be divided into three main groups: "properly oriented terms", "neutral terms" and "wrongly oriented terms" (Lotte, 1941: 12). In this distribution, the key feature is the motivation of their meaning.

Separation in the name of the motivational trait is due to the cognitive aspect and is communicative and relevant at the time of creation of the lexical unit. So, we can say that there are no accidental motivational features in the language. Eventually, the newly created name will be fixed for its further use with the formed internal form, and then the lexical meaning, or it will be rejected.

The process of motivation begins with the understanding of the so-called object and involves the formation of a motivating judgment about it, which corresponds to the choice of linguistic means. These means allow creating on the basis of this judgment a name that retains separate components of the original judgment. Motivation is understood as justification for the choice of certain linguistic means and the fixation of individual features of the object in the nominative act. The study of the motivation of a derivative word is primarily related to the problem of reflection of reality and its linguistic structuring.

Emphasising the importance of the phenomenon of motivation and its practicality in the process of terminological nomination, Blinova points out that the functional load of the internal form of the word-term should be used to the maximum and the factor of its motivation should be carefully considered. The successful internal form can serve as a tool for creating the term knowledge of the development of scientific concepts (Blinova, 1981: 36).

Cognitively and communicatively conditioned variants of language units are not identical in their semantics, structure, or compatibility with other language units. They create a surplus of nominative means that allows interpreting the same objects and phenomena in the directions that are appropriate for the individuals. That is, the same nomination object in a language can receive many names on different features. The variability of nominative units may be related to the solution of various communicative tasks and to the understanding of the so-called object when in the process of cognitive activity, a person uncovers its new

aspects. At the same time, there is a constant selection of lexical means in the language, the most significant of which are fixed in the dictionary. Therefore, there is a constant surplus of nominative tools. It allows the language to self-improve and change its system, adapting to the new needs of society.

Thus, it can be argued that the motivation of the nomination does not always reflect the internal logical structure of the concept and is not a clear enough guideline for interpreting the meaning of the term, since the relationship between the term and its meaning may be lost. However, motivation remains an important feature of the term, the most complete expression of which is the systematic nature of the term.

Returning to the concepts of "nomination" and "terminological nomination", the latter Konstantinova calls the naming process in the field of special concepts and emphasizes the important role of the nomination subject. We share her view that term formation is a "system of modeling secondary units of nomination, a characteristic feature of which is the non-random nature of nominative activity, which is conditioned by the systematic nature of the term and the need to implement its definitive function" (Konstantinova, 2004: 114).

The special role of the subject of nomination in the term-forming processes extends the research in the field of terminology and connects it with the logic, psychology, epistemology, which is the basis for spreading the cognitive approach in terminology. Human linguistic activity is further distinguished, stored and designated in the form of a special name, and the process of cognition is fixed as an informative unit of language at the word level.

The information contained in the unit of lexical nomination of specialized knowledge can be represented by a cognitive formula, which by means of the selected meanings indicates a certain set of basic concepts and their connection with each other. This indicates that a person has complex cognitive processing of various linguistic and extralinguistic information. According to Manerko, "the terminological nominative unit has a complex structure, which are certain structures of knowledge related to each other and embedded in a deep structure of the name" (Manerko, 2002: 99), which confirms the idea of multicomponentity of a special linguistic sign. It captures only some of the key features of the reality element, and this fact allows the human consciousness to make generalizations by adding a sign to the various elements of reality that revealed in the process of cognition a similar set of features. Thus, the nominative capacity of a linguistic sign is potentially limitless and depends only on the possibility of cognition the reality by a person.

5. Conclusions.

The cognitive approach to nomination research aims, first and foremost, to determine how the lexical nomination reflects the experience of knowing the world and through which mental structures it can be represented. Linguistic cognition of the world implies that the elements of reality are given different names, so nomination in a cognitive aspect appears as a linguistic form of knowledge about the world. Moreover, the processes of conceptualization and categorization represent the process of nominative activity. With regard to terminological nomination, it is a secondary process of naming that clearly reflects the process of obtaining, processing, storing and transferring special knowledge in the form of a terminological sign at the word level within the limits of a certain professional activity of a person.

The prospects for further study include the cognitive problem of term formation.

R e f e r e n c e s

Ahmanova, O. S. (1957). *Ocherki po obshchej i russkoj leksikologii* [Essays on General and Russian Lexicology]. Moscow : Uchpedgiz.

Arutyunova, N. D. (1977). *Nominaciya, referenciya, znachenie. Yazykovaya nominaciya: Obshchie voprosy* [Nomination, reference, meaning. Language nomination: General questions]. Moscow : Nauka.

Balli, Sh. (2001). *Francuzskaya stilistika* [French stylistics]. 2nd ed. Moscow : Editorial URSS.

Blinova, O. I. (1981). Termin i ego motivirovannost' [The term and its motivation]. In L. I. Skvorcov, & T. S. Kogotkova (Eds.), *Terminologiya i kul'tura rechi*. P. 28–37.

Diakov, A. S., Kyiak, T. R., & Kudelko, Z. B. (2000). *Osnovy terminotvorennia: Semantychni ta sotsiolingvistychni aspekty* [Fundamentals of Terminology: Semantic and Sociolinguistic Aspects]. Kyiv : Vyd. dim "KM Academia".

Dokulil, M. (1962). *Tvoření slov v češtině. Teorie odvozování slov.* Praha : Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd.

Gak, V. G. (2009). *Yazykovye preobrazovaniya: nekotorye aspekty lingvisticheskoj nauki v konce HKH veka. Ot situacii k vyskazyvaniyu* [Language transformations: some aspects of linguistic science at the end of the twentieth century. From situation to utterance]. Moscow : LIBROKOM.

Golev, N. D. (1974). Estestvennaya nominaciya ob"ektov prirody sobstvennymi i naricatel'nymi imenami [Natural nomination of objects of nature by proper and common names]. *Voprosy onomastiki,* 8–9, P. 88–97.

Golomidova, M. V. (1998). *Iskusstvennaya nominaciya v russkoj onomastike* [Artificial nomination in Russian onomastics]. Ekaterinburg : Ural. gos. ped. un-t.

Golovanova, E. I. (2011). *Vvedenie v kognitivnoe terminovedenie* [Introduction to Cognitive Terminology]. Moscow : Nauka.

Golovin, B. N., Kobrin, R. Yu. (1987). *Lingvisticheskie osnovy ucheniya o terminah* [Linguistic basis of the doctrine of terms]. Moscow : Vysshaya shkola.

Grinev-Grinevich, S. V. (2008). *Terminovedenie* [Terminology]. Moscow : Akademiya.

Hejraarts, D. (1995) Principy pragmaticheskoj onomasiologii [Principles of Pragmatic Onomasiology]. *Vestnik MGU. Seriya 9. Filologiya*, 5. P. 127–135.

Jaspers, K. (2013). *Razum i ekzistenciya* [Reason and Existence]. Moscow : Kanon+.

Jespersen, O. (1958). *The Philosophy of Grammar*. Moscow : Izd-vo inostrannoj literatury.

Kolshanskij, G. V. (1990). *Oektivnaya kartina mira v poznanii i yazyke* [An objective picture of the world in cognition and language]. Moscow : Nauka.

Konstantinova, O. V. (2004). Osoblyvosti nominatsii v anhlomovnii terminolohii opodatkuvannia [Features of nomination in English-speaking tax terminology]. *Slovianskyi visnyk. Seriia: Filolohichni nauky*, 5. P. 114–127.

Kopach, O. I. (2007). Teoriya nominacii: istoriya i sovremennost [Theory of nomination: history and modernity]. *Sociokultúrna realita a príroda: Zborník recenzovaných vedeckých prác s medzinárodnou účasťou.* P. 313–320.

Kopocheva, V. V. (1985). *Sootnoshenie estestvennoj i iskusstvennoj nominacii (na materiale nazvanij rastenij)* [The ratio of natural and artificial nominations (on the material of plant names)]: PhD Thesis. Tomsk.

Kubryakova, Ye. S. (2004). *Yazyk i znanie: Na puti polucheniya znanij o yazyke: Chasti rechi s kognitivnoj tochki zreniya. Rol yazyka v poznanii mira* [Language and knowledge: On the way to gain knowledge of the language: Parts of speech from a cognitive point of view. The role of language in the cognition of the world]. Moscow : Yazyki slavyanskoj kul'tury.

Lotte, D. S. (1941). *Nekotorye principial'nye voprosy otbora i postroeniya nauchno-tekhnicheskih terminov* [Some fundamental issues of the selection and construction of scientific and technical terms]. Moscow; Leningrad : Izd-vo AN SSSR.

Lotte, D. S. (1961). *Osnovy postroeniya nauchno-tekhnicheskoj terminologii: Voprosy teorii i metodiki* [Fundamentals of building scientific and technical terminology: Issues of theory and methodology]. Moscow : Izd-vo AN SSSR.

Malinka, A. V., & Nagel, O. V. (2011). Leksicheskaya nominaciya: onomasiologicheskij i kognitivnyj podhody [Lexical nomination: onomasiological and cognitive approaches]. *Yazyk i kultura,* 4(16), P. 44–56.

Manerko, L. A. (2002). Kognitivno-diskursivnyj aspekt issledovaniya nominativnyh edinic v sovremennom anglijskom yazyke [The cognitive-discursive aspect of the study of nominative units in modern English]. *Kognitivnaya paradigma: frejmovaya semantika i nominaciya,* 1, P. 97–111.

Marchenko, E. I. (2014). Kognitivnye aspekty teorii nominacii [Cognitive Aspects of Nomination Theory]. *Nauchnye issledovaniya v Kyrgyzskoj Respublike,* 1. P. 40–44.

Matezius, V. (2003). *Izbrannye trudy po yazykoznaniyu* [Selected Works on Linguistics]. Moscow : Editorial URSS.

Musaev, K. M. (1965). *Alfavity yazykov narodov SSSR* [Alphabets of languages of the peoples of the USSR]. Moscow : Nauka.

Pylypiv, O. H., Lypetskyi, A. D. (2018). Semantychna motyvatsiia leksyky na poznachennia dorohotsinnykh ta napivdorohotsinnykh yuvelirnykh kameniv u tvori Pliniia Starshoho "Historia naturalis" [Semantic motivation of vocabulary for the designation of precious and semiprecious jewels in the work of Pliniia Starshoho "Historia naturalis"]. *Molodyi vchenyi,* 3(1). P. 178–182.

Saussure, F. de (1999). *Kurs obshchej lingvistiki* [General Linguistics Course]. Ekaterinburg : Izd-vo Ural un-ta.

Selivanova, Ye. A. (2000). *Kognitivnaya onomasiologiya* [Cognitive onomasiology]. Kyiv : Izd-vo ukrainskogo fitosociologicheskogo centra.

Serebrennikov, B. A. (1959). O metodah izucheniya toponimicheskih nazvanij [About methods for studying toponymic names]. *Voprosy yazykoznaniya,* 6. P. 52–61.

Shcherba, L. V. (1958). *Opyt obshchej teorii leksikografii: Izbrannye raboty po yazykoznaniyu i fonetike* [The experience of the general theory of lexicography: Selected works on linguistics and phonetics]. Vol. 1. Leningrad: Izd. Leningr. un-ta.

Shmelev, D. N. (1973). *Problemy semanticheskogo analiza leksiki: na materiale russkogo yazyka* [Problems of semantic analysis of vocabulary: on the material of the Russian language]. Moscow : Nauka.

Shuhardt, G. (2003). *Izbrannye stat'i po yazykoznaniyu* [Selected Articles on Linguistics]. (A. S. Bobovich, Trans). 2nd ed. Moscow : Editorial URSS.

Skvirya, V. K. (2013). Ponyatie, vidy i sposoby nominacii politicheskoj leksiki v anglijskom yazyke [The concept, types and methods of nomination of political vocabulary in English]. *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya: Filologiya. Iskusstvovedenie,* 4(295), 75, P. 97–101.

Slozhenikina, Yu. V. (2016). *Osnovy terminologii: Lingvisticheskie aspekty teorii termina* [Basics of Terminology: Linguistic Aspects of Term Theory]. Moscow : LIBROKOM.

Štekauer, P., Lieber, R. (2005). Onomasiological Approach to Word-formation. *Handbook of Word-formation*. P. 207–229

Superanskaya, A. V., Podolskaya, N. V., Vasileva, N. V. (2012). *Obshchaya terminologiya: Voprosy teorii* [General terminology: theory issues]. 6th ed. Moscow : LIBROKOM.

Teliya, V. N. (2002). Nominaciya [Nomination]. In V. N. Yarceva (Eds.), *Lingvisticheskij enciklopedicheskij slovar'.* 2nd ed. P. 336–337.

Ufimceva, A. A. (2010). *Leksicheskaya nominaciya (pervichnaya nejtral'naya)* [Lexical nomination (primary neutral)]. 2nd ed. Moscow: LIBROKOM.

Ufimceva, A. A., Aznaurova, E. S., Kubryakova, E. S., Teliya, V. N. (1997). Lingvisticheskaya sushchnost i aspekty nominacii [Linguistic essence and aspects of nomination]. In B. A. Serebrennikov, & A. A. Ufimceva (Eds.), *Yazykovaya nominaciya.* P. 7–98.

Ulyanova, N. P. (1984). *Sootnoshenie stihijnyh faktorov i soznatel'nogo regulirovaniya v mekhanizmah yazykovoj nominacii* [Correlation of elemental factors and conscious regulation in the mechanisms of language nomination]: PhD Thesis. Moscow.

Volodina, M. N. (1995). Strukturno-kognitivnyj aspekt terminologicheskoj nominacii [Structural and cognitive aspect of terminological nomination]. *Terminovedenie,* 2–3. P. 81–82.

Zhuravleva, A. F. (1982). Tekhnicheskie vozmozhnosti v russkom yazyke v oblasti predmetnoj nominacii [Technical capabilities in Russian in the field of subject nomination]. D. N. Shmelev (Eds.), A. F. Zhuravleva, O. P. Ermakova et al. *Sposoby nominacii v sovremennom russkom yazyke [Nomination methods in modern Russian].* P. 45–109.

Бібліографічний опис:

Анотація

У статті окреслено основні поняття когнітивного підходу в дослідженні мови, зокрема такого процесу, як номінація, що є актуальним питанням і для сучасної лінгвістики. Номінацію розглядають

як багатоаспектний феномен та складний розумово-мовленнєвий процес, що об'єктивує пізнавальні особливості діяльності людини та властивості структур її свідомості.

Обґрунтовано важливість залучення когнітивно-ономасіологічного підходу до вивчення номінативного акту, а також охарактеризовано розвиток науки ономасіології як шлях до лінгвокогнітивізму. Зроблено припущення про те, що ключовим терміном ономасіології є поняття номінації, яке потребує його витлумачення у гносео-семіотичному та власне лінгвістичному аспектах. Охарактеризовано номінацію як процес, що постійно супроводжується пізнанням людини навколишнього світу, тому використання когнітивних інструментів при аналізі номінативних одиниць розширює межі дослідження і передовсім у у напрямі термінологічної номінації.

Термінологічна номінація також включає процеси концептуалізації та вербалізації, але професійних знань і є результатом когнітивної діяльності спеціалістів. Термінологічна одиниця репрезентує суттєві властивості номінованого об'єкта, тому важливим є аналіз мотивованості значення, а надалі і поняття внутрішньої форми терміна, що є формально-семантичним зв'язком найменування.

Як підсумок, зазначено, що здатність мовного знака є потенційно безмежною і залежить від пізнання людиною дійсності, а номінація в когнітивному аспекті постає як вербалізована форма знання про світ загалом або в межах певної професійної діяльності людини зокрема.

Ключові слова: *номінація, ономасіологія, когнітивний підхід, мовний знак, термін, вмотивованість.*