

The Concept “Ethnocide” Within the Category of Deviation in the English Language

A.S. Ptashkin

Tomsk Polytechnic University, Pr. Lenina, 30, Tomsk, Russian Federation

Abstract: The author describes the language means of expressing the concept “Ethnocide” as the element of the legal-regulatory component of the deviation category in the English language, considers the category of deviation, expressed by the words of general semantics with root *devia-* and concludes that the concretization of the meanings of mentioned above words occurs by means of the analysis of their contextual correlations with language units, representing the concept “Ethnocide”, included in the sphere of deviation.

Key words: Category • Concept • Deviation • Legal-regulatory component • Crime • Ethnocide • Lexeme

INTRODUCTION

“The importance of categorization and concept formation to cognitive development and to cognition in adults, should not be underestimated. Forming categories reduces demands on our inherently limited memory storage and perceptual process and without it we would have to remember independently the same or similar information about each individual member of a category” [1].

Categories occur at different levels of inclusiveness, with more specific ones nested within more inclusive ones: *deviation – crime – ethnocide – linguicide*. “The cognitive process by means of which linguistic categories are established is known as categorization. Categories have members. <...> Categories are also part of conceptual groupings: they form parts of taxonomies, partonomies, frames and domains. Conceptual frames are larger coherent packages of knowledge that are prompted with every word. Our knowledge of the “car” frame, for example, allows us to understand the use of car in *Can you start the car?* in the sense of its active zone “engine of the car”. Conceptual domains are the general fields to which categories of frames belong in a given situation, such as that of “combustion”, which relates engines and heating systems” [2]. “In our usage, semantic domains are common areas of human discussion, such as Economics, Politics, Law, Science, etc., which demonstrate lexical coherence. Semantic

domains are semantic fields, characterized by sets of *domain words*, which often occur in texts about the corresponding domain. Semantic domains can be automatically identified by exploiting a lexical coherence property manifested by texts in any natural language ...” <...> “As well as semantic fields, semantic domains correspond to both lexical fields and conceptual fields” [3].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

For example, the mental unit Ethnocide is the frame in the boundaries of the category of Deviation and it forms the third level within this concept. The category of Deviation like other concepts can be presented as the system with three main levels: superordinate, basic and subordinate ones. The semantic analysis of the vocabulary associated with the superordinate level of Deviation Category let us define the number of lexemes which present this mental unit in its broad meanings. In English language these are the lexemes and phrases with the root *devia-* from deviate – “turn aside. XVII. f. pp. stem of late L. *deviāre*, f. *de* DE- 2 + *via* way. So *devia*?TION. XVII; - F. – *medL*” [4]: deviance, deviancy, deviant, deviation, deviator, deviatory, etc. [5]. The key level is in the middle of the hierarchy system: *deviation – crime – ethnocide*. The third level of Deviation category includes the concrete representatives of the above-mentioned concept: *ethnocide – linguicide*.

The distinctive peculiarity of Deviation is its survival in many spheres of human activity. The problem about the components of Deviation is debatable. The analysis of special literature enabled to define basic elements of structure in Deviation Category.

The common elements of Deviation present the phenomenon under study as the combination of three main components: 1) techno-biological, 2) legal-regulatory, 3) moral-ethic. The focus of this paper is Ethnocide as a part of legal-regulatory element within Deviation Category.

The legal-regulatory element of Deviation Category defines “*ethnocide as forced destruction of a cultural system*” [6]. “The violent eradication of an ethnic group’s collective cultural identity as a distinctive people” <...> “This may take place when a powerful nation aggressively expands its territorial control by annexing neighbouring peoples and their territories, incorporating the conquered groups as subjects” [7]. “Perhaps one reason that ‘ethnic cleansing’ was not a ‘-cide’ term is that the most obvious word, *ethnocide*, already had other meanings. As we saw, Lemkin had mentioned this word in joining *genos* to *-icide*: he noted that ‘another term could be used for the same idea, namely, *ethnocide*. This usage has not caught on, although Stuart D. Stein, in an encyclopaedia entry, noted that ‘the term *ethnocide* is generally taken to, refer to the destruction of members of a group, in whole or in part, identified in terms of their ethnicity’” [8]. “The term “ethnocide” was first used in reference to the destruction of a culture rather than the killing of its bearers. We use the phrase “cultural genocide” for this same phenomenon, but it stretches the definition of genocide to include cultural destruction as equal to the mass murder of group members, unless it ultimately leads to the extinction of the group” [9]. “Ethnocide is an intentional and systematic destruction of an ethnic group” [10], “the deliberate destruction of an ethnic culture” [11].

The above-mentioned meanings of the term *ethnocide* give the opportunity to see the mechanisms of structuring the data about this phenomenon [12].

The basis for pointing out the elements of the legal-regulatory component of Deviation Category was the special literature, dictionaries [13; 14; 15; 16]. The structure of legal-regulatory component of Deviation Category is presented in the Table 1.

This three-segment structure of Deviation Category proves the similarity of legal-regulatory and moral-ethic components in the evaluation of social deviations, for instance, the distinguishing of the concept Crime in the

Table 1: The concept Ethnocide as a part of the category of Deviation.

Deviation
↓
Crime
↓
Crime against Humanity: Genocide
↓
Ethnocide

basic level. But in the sphere of legal-regulatory component the correspondence of this or that action to the law is foremost.

Ethnocide is widely spread in special and imaginative literature and journalistic lexis. In the basic level this concept is presented by the following lexemes: “massacre, killing, murder, slaughter, holocaust, ethnic cleansing (euphemistic), carnage, extermination, mass murder, annihilation, pogrom, butchery, mass slaughter, decimation, mass execution, race extermination, assassination, bloodbath, bloodshed, etc.” [17; 18]; “fratricide, fungicide, germicide, herbicide, homicide, insecticide, matricide, parricide, patricide, pesticide, regicide, suicide, vermicide; crime, delinquency, dereliction, enormity, error, evil, felony, immorality, impropriety, indiscretion, iniquity, injustice, lapse, malfeasance, misdeed, misdemeanor, nonfeasance, offense, omission, outrage, peccadillo, sin, slip, tort, transgression, trip, wrong; annihilation, bane”, etc. [19]. With the help of the contextual analysis some additional lexemes with the suffix *-cide* were found: “ethnocide (forced destruction of a cultural system), libricide, religiocide, ecocide (degradation of an ecosystem), readicide, classicide, democide; politicide, gendercide” [20].

The derivatives of the word “ethnocide”: ethnocidal (adj.), ethnocidally (adv.) [21; 22]. These lexemes are not widely spread in the dictionaries, they can be found under a certain context. All these derivatives will be used in further research in distinguishing the mechanisms of the usage and comparative study within Russian and English languages.

CONCLUSION

The neologisms with the suffix *-icide* are the units of language in the semantic field of Deviation category. The concept *Ethnocide* within the concept of *Genocide* represents the third level of legal-regulatory component of this category. “The contextual semantics of the key

lexemes with the root *devia-* expresses the content of the highest level of legal-regulatory component of Deviation category” [23].

The concept *Crime* contributes the second level of the above-mentioned category.

The means of legal-regulatory component of Deviation category are the corresponding lexemes: deviation, crime, genocide, ethnocide, suicide, libricide, homicide, etc.

The peculiarities of the structure can be traced analyzing the variants of meanings of the lexemes, phrases representing the concrete levels of the category. These meanings enable to specify the semantics of language units that are under analysis.

REFERENCES

1. Rakison, D.H., 2003. Early Category and Concept Development: Making Sense of the Blooming, Buzzing Confusion. Oxford University Press, pp: 464.
2. Radden, G. and R. Dirven, 2009. Cognitive English Grammar. John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp: 374.
3. Gliozzo, A., 2009. Semantic Domains in Computational Linguistics. Springer, pp: 131.
4. Onions, C.T., 1976. The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology. The Clarendon Press, pp: 1025.
5. Davidson, G.W., 2007. Concise English Dictionary. Wordsworth Editions Ltd., pp: 1104.
6. Bodley, J. H., 2012. Anthropology and Contemporary Human Problems. Rowman Altamira, pp: 411.
7. Haviland, W.A., 2009. The Essence of Anthropology. Cengage Learning, pp: 379.
8. Shaw, M., 2007. What is Genocide? Polity Press, pp: 222.
9. Marchak, P., 2003. Reigns of Terror. McGill-Queen's Press, pp: 288.
10. Dictionary.com, 2013. Ethnocide. Date Views 17.09.2013. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/ethnocide>.
11. Merriam-Webster, 2013. Ethnocide. Date Views 09.08.2013. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ethnocide>.
12. Ptashkin, A.S., 2013. Concept “Genocide” as the Form of the Legal-Regulatory Component in the Deviation Category in the English Language. World Applied Sciences Journal, 23(5): 621-627.
13. Walliman, I., 1987. Genocide and the Modern Age: Etiology and Case Studies of Mass Death. Greenwood Press, pp: 322.
14. Wilt H., 2012. The Genocide Convention: The Legacy of 60 years. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, pp: 290.
15. Nersessian, D.L., 2010. Genocide and Political Groups. Oxford University Press, pp: 329.
16. Bloxham, D., 2010. The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies. Oxford University Press, pp: 696.
17. Collins Dictionary, 2013. The English Thesaurus. Date Views 16.10.2013. <http://www.collinsdictionary.com>.
18. Thesaurus, 2013. The English Thesaurus. Date Views 22.10.2013. <http://thesaurus.com>.
19. Cs. Utxas, 2013. The synonyms of the word genocide. Date Views 24.11.2013. <http://www.cs.utexas.edu/users/jared/aiksaurus>.
20. Alvarez, A., 2010. Genocidal Crimes. Taylor and Francis, pp: 202.
21. Wordnik, 2013. Ethnocidal. Date Views 23.11.2013. <http://www.wordnik.com/words/ethnocidal>.
22. Rosenbaum, A.S., 2010. Is the Holocaust Unique? ReadHowYouWant, pp: 882.
23. Ptashkin, A.S., 2011. Peculiarities of the Structure and Expression of the Legal-regulatory Component in the Deviation Category (in the English Language). Tomsk State Pedagogical University Bulletin, 9(111): 49-52.