MINISTRY OF EDUCATION OF AZERBAIJAN REPUBLIC
AZERBAIJAN UNIVERSITY OF LANGUAGES

AZIZA HAJIYEVA

# ENGLISH LEXICOLOGY

*(Textbook)*

Approved by the department of "European Languages and Literature" of "Scientific Methodological Council" of the Ministry of Education of Azerbaijan Republic, February 19. 2011 (record of evidence № 2)



"Elm və təhsil"
BAKU – 2011

*By the order of the Ministry of Education of Azerbaijan Republic (the stamp was given order № 358, on 02.03.2011)*

***Editors:*** **N.M.Yusifov**
*doctor of philosophy, professor*
**E.B.Najafly**
*doctor of philosophy, associate professor*

***Reviewers:*** **B.Huseynov**
*doctor of philology, professor*

**K.M.Gozalova**
*doctor of philosophy, associate professor*
**A.M.Jafarov**
*doctor of philosophy, associate professor*

**Aziza Hajiyeva. English Lexicology *(Textbook)*.**
**Bakı, "Elm və təhsil", 2011. – 248 səh**



4602000000
*N*098 – 2011 ***qrifli nəşr***

## Contents

## PREFACE

This textbook is the first attempt. It is intended for students of the senior courses of University of Languages, teachers of English and all those who are interested in the English language and its vocabulary. The students will find the fundamentals of the word theory and the main problems associated with English vocabularies, their characteristics and subdivisions. Each chapter contains theoretical and language materials in English language.

The textbook meets the requirements of the programme in the subject. The students' attention is drawn to the methods of lexical research. The central interest in a synchronical analysis of the present-day English vocabularies has given shape in the whole book.

English Lexicology as an independent subject forming part of the curricula of the Foreign Language faculties. It implies that the most of foreign linguists consider words as the fundamental units of language.

İt is attempted as far as possible to present some parts of the material in terms of the theory of lexicology in English, which is very important. Much attention is given to the history of linguistic science as it deals with vocabulary.

The debt of the authors of this textbook is to make the students clear whether all the references are given or not. Therefore it is tried to give more additional applications in a language, when it seemed specially important for a student to know about the existence of a book. In this way more space was available for describing the ever changing English vocabularies.

The textbook is intended to be as clear and memorable as possible. The author tried to present the material in an easy and comprehensible style. The book is based on the course of lectures in English Lexicology delivered by the author for some years at the University of Languages. The subject matter corresponds to the programme on English Lexicology issued by the Ministry of Education of Azerbaijan Republic.

In preparing this textbook the author has tried to take into consideration the latest achivements in linguistic science.

We shall greately indebted for all criticism and correction that will help to improve the book. Our warmest thanks are due to our philologists who reviewed the edition for their valuable advice and suggestions and the interest they have shown in this textbook and to all those who helped us.

The author owes a great debt to a number of her colleagues from the department of English Lexicology, who offered their advice. The author is highly indebted to the prorector, professor N.M.Yusifov and E.B.Najafly who read the earlier version in its entirety and made many extremely valuable suggestions aimed at improving the treatment of the subject and the arrangement of the material.

*Author*

# INTRODUCTION

## OBJECTS AND AIMS OF LEXICOLOGY

Lexicology is the part of linguistics dealing with the vocabulary of a language and the properties of words as the main units of language. It studies words, their nature and meaning, words' elements, relations between words, word-groups and the whole lexicon.

The term first appeared in the 1820s, though there were lexicologists in essence before the word was coined. The term "lexicology" is composed of two Greek morphemes, "*lexis*" – which means "word, phrase" and "*logos*"– which denotes "learning a department of knowledge". Thus, the literal meaning of the term "lexicology" is the science of the word". Lexicology is the part of linguistics, which deals with the vocabulary and characteristic features of words and word-groups. It learns vocabulary in the process of history of a language. All lexical and phraseological units are included in the vocabulary of the language.

The term "vocabulary" is used to denote the system of words and word-groups that the language possesses.

The term "word" denotes the main lexical unit of a language resulting from the association of a group of sounds with a meaning. This unit is used in general functions characteristic of it. It is the smallest unit of a language, which can strand alone as a complete utterance.

The term "word-group" denotes a group of words which exists in the language as a ready-made unit, has the unity of meaning, the unity of syntactical function, e.g. the word-group

"as loose as a goose" means "clumsy" and is used in a sentence as a predicative (He is as loose as a goose).

An allied science to lexicology is lexicography, which also studies words in relation with dictionaries – it is actually concerned with the inclusion of words in dictionaries and from that perspective with the whole lexicon. Therefore lexicography is the theory and practice of composing dictionaries. Sometimes lexicography is considered to be a part or a branch of lexicology, but the two disciplines should not be mistaken: lexicographers are the people who write dictionaries and they are at the same time lexicologists too, but not all lexicologists are lexicographers. It is said that lexicography is the practical lexicology, it is practically oriented though it has its own theory, while the pure lexicology is mainly theoretical.

So, lexicology is a branch of linguistics - the science of language. The literal meaning of the term "lexicology" is "the science of the word". Lexicology as a branch of linguistics has its own aims and methods of scientific research. Its basic task – being a study and systematic description of vocabulary in respect to its origin, development and its current use. Lexicology is concerned with words, variable word-groups, phraseological units and morphems, which make up words.

**The aims of lexicology** are:

1) to identify the essence of words;

2) to determine the properties of the words as elements of the system;

3) to determine the different relationship existing between the words within the system (similarity of meaning, polarity of meaning, stuctural characteristics they share, etc.);

4) to reveal morhological patterns according to which the words are built;

5) to study the role of the words as components of word-groups and phraseological units;

6) to study the relationships between interdependently functioning words and word-groups or phraseological units.

Thus, in the word "boy" the group of sounds [boi] is associated with the meaning "a male child up to the age of 17" and with a definite grammatical employment: that is a noun, has a plural form – "boys", a personal noun, has the genetive case "boy's".

Another example, the word "movement" belongs to a large group of English words formed in accordance with the pattern V+ment (verb-stem+a noun forming suffix –ment). Here belong such words as "engagement, arrangement, development, management", etc. If we consider the meaning of all these words we shall observe a certain similarity, all of them denote abstract notions. Knowing these words a student can guess the meaning of other words. He is likely to come across when reading texts. Language is an objective social phenomenon connected with the thinking and social life of human society. It is the product of the entire number of epochs in the course of which it is enriched and developed. The continuous development of society demands that the language should replenish its vocabulary with new words. The names of objects that have already disappeared, usually pass out of use. And on the other hand, the names of new objects constantly enter the language, that is all the changes in human society cause changes in vocabulary. If we compare Old English with Modern English we can see a certain extent that the vocabulary has changed in the sense, that it has been replenished with a considerable number of new words and expressions, which have come into being in connection with the rise of production, the progress of technology, science, etc.

A number of words and expressions have changed their meaning or have acquired a new meaning. E.g. "meat" in OE was used as "xörək", but in ME it is used as "ət". "To trade" in OE was used as "dənizı (kəsib // üzüb) keçmək", but in ME

it is used as "ticarət etmək". A number of words were dropped out of the vocabulary. E.g. In Old English the words "onlete" and "onsene" were used instead of the word "face". The word "face" is of French origin. After the French word "face" entered the English language the words "onlete" and "onsene" dropped out of the vocabulary.

Distinction is made between **general lexicology and special lexicology**. General lexicology is a part of general linguistics. It is concerned with the study of vocabulary irrespective of the specific features of any particular language.

Special lexicology is the lexicology of a particular language (Azerbaijani, Russian, German, French, etc.). It is the lexicology of a particular language, i.e. the study and description of its vocabulary and vocabulary units, primarily words as the main units of language. Special lexicology is based on the principals of general lexicology and laid down by general lexicology of vocabulary.

According to the theoretical basis of the vocabularies of different languages there are three types of them: **historical, descriptive and contrastive lexicology.** Lexicology can study the development of the vocabulary, the origin of words and word-groups, their semantic relations and the development of their sound form and meaning. In this case it is called **historical lexicology**. Historical lexicology deals with the historic change of words in the course of language development.

The evolution of any vocabulary, as well as of its single elements forms the object of historical lexicology or etymology. This branch of linguistics discusses the origin of various words, their change and development. In the past, given historical treatment was always combined with a comparative method.

Another branch of lexicology is called **descriptive** and studies the vocabulary at a definite stage of its development. Descriptive lexicology deals with the vocabulary of a given language at a period of time. It studies the functions of words and their specific structure as a characteristic inherent existing as a natural and permanent part in the system. The descriptive lexicology of the English language deals with the English words in the morphological and semantic structures.

If the vocabularies of different languages are compared, this branch of study is called **contrastive lexicology.** Not only relative languages, but languages belonging to different morphological systems are also compared and found out similarities and differences of the words. This type of lexicology studies languages from the point of view of their identity and differentiation.

Historical and Descriptive lexicology are connected with each other closely, because it is impossible not to know the lexical system of a language, the evolution and history of vocabulary, because historical lexicology involves the development of words not only of one period, but some periods.

Lexicology is the younger branch of linguistics compared with grammar. In lexicology we shall study word formation (word building), semasiology, etymological characteristics of words, phraseological units and lexicography and so on.

**The object** of our study will be the vocabulary of Modern English, but sometimes it will be necessary to go into the history of the English language and the English people, because without it some phenomenon concerning the language cannot be understood.

Modern English lexicology investigates the problems of word-structure and word-formation in Modern English, the semantic structure of English words, the main principles of the

classification of vocabulary units into various groupings, the laws governing the replenishment of the vocabulary. It also studies the relations existing between various lexical layers of the English vocabulary, the specific laws and regulations that govern its development at present time, the source and growth of the English vocabulary and the changes taken place in its history.

## LEXICOLOGY, ITS LINKS WITH OTHER BRANCHES OF LINGUISTICS

Lexicology is closely connected with other branches of linguistics: the history of the language, phonetics, stylistics, grammar and such new branches of science as sociolinguistics, paralinguistics, pragmalinguistics and others.

**Phonetics** for example, investigates the phonetic structure and is concerned with the study of the out or sound –form of the word*: pit - pot; tip - tap – top;* If we remember that a word is an association of a given meaning, so that *top* is one word, *tip* is another. Phonemes have no meaning of their own, but they serve to distinguish between meanings. Their function is building up morphemes and it is on the level of morphemes that the form-meaning unity is introduced into language. Therefore we may say that phonemes participate in signification: *[pit] - [tip]; hop (jump) – hoop (loud cry) – heap (number of things) – hip (part of the body), etc..*

Stress also plays an important role in the discrimination between the words. The word *"`import"* is recognized as a noun and distinguished from the verb *"im`port"* due to the position of stress.

**Stylistics.** There is also a close relationship between lexicology and stylistics, which is concerned with a study of a nature, functions and styles of languages. It studies many problems treated in lexicology. These are the problems of meaning, synonymy, functional differentiation of vocabulary according to the sphere of communication. For a reader without some awareness of the connotations and history of words, their meanings are hidden in their root and their stylistic properties, a substantial part of the meaning of a literary text,

whether prosaic or poetic may be lost. *House – building – cottage – dig – residence – mansion; parent - father-daddy - sire,* etc.

**Grammar.** It is inseparably bound up with lexicology. It is the study of grammatical structure of language. It is concerned with the various means of expressing grammatical relations between words as well as with patterns after which words are combined into word-groups and sentences: *head - to head; hand - to hand; face - to face, etc.*

A close connection between lexicology and grammar is conditioned between the objects of their study. Even isolated words in a dictionary bear a definite relation to the grammatical system of the language, because they belong to some parts of speech. As the words are arranged in certain patterns, they possess some grammatical meanings. For.ex.:

*the head of the committee* and *to head a committee*

The two kinds of meaning are often interdependent. That is to say certain grammatical functions and meanings are possible only for the words. Their lexical meaning makes them similar for those functions. On the other hand, some lexical meanings in some words occur only in definite grammatical patterns in languages.

## THE SYNCHRONIC AND DIACHRONIC APPROACHES

In opposition to the totally historical view of language of the previous hundred years, Ferdinand de Saussure emphasized the importance of seeing from two distinct and largely exclusive points of view, which he called "synchronic" and "diachronic".

Special lexicology employs synchronic and diachronic approaches. These terms are of Greek origin: *"syn"* means "*together*", "*with*"; "*dia*"-means "*through" and "chronos*" – "*time"*. The distinction between these two approaches is due to the Swiss philologist Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913).

**The synchronic approach** is a methodological distinction, which concerned with the vocabulary of a given language as it exists at a given time, at a present time. It is Special Descriptive Lexicology that deals with the vocabulary at a certain time.

**The diachronic approach** is a Special Lexicology, which deals with the changes and the development of the vocabulary in the course of time. It is Special Historical Lexicology that deals with the evolution, development of the vocabulary units of a language as time goes by.

Thus, descriptive linguistics is known as "synchronic linguistics" and studies a language at one particular period of time. But historical linguistics is known as diachronic or temporal linguistics and deals with development of language through time.

A good example illustrating the distinction between the two approaches and their interconnection: *to beg - beggar.*

Synchronically, the words *to beg and beggar* are related as simple and derived words. When we approach the problem diachronically, we learn that the noun "*beggar"* was borrowed

from old French and only presumed to have been derived from a shorter word with the help of the suffix – *er*.

It should be stressed, however, that these two approaches should not be contrasted, as it was done by F.de Saussure's opinion of this matter. They consider that the synchronic and diachronic approaches are interconnected (to be connected or linked) and interdependent (depending on each other), because the synchronic state of a language system is a result of a long process of historical development. He said: "Synchronic linguistics will concern the logical and psychological relations that bind together co-existing terms and form a system in the collective mind of speakers. Diachronic linguistics, on the contrary, will study relations that bind together successive terms, not percieved by the collective mind, but substituted for each other without forming a system".

Thus, synchronic linguistics deal with systems whereas diachronic with units. The relationship between the both aspects of language study was diagrammatically represented by Saussure in the following way:


Here AB is the synchronic axis of simultaneities. CD is the diachronic axis of succession. The difference between descriptive or synchronic and historical or diachronic linguistics can be illustrated by this diagram of Saussur, who was the the first person to point the necessity of distinguishing between the two approaches.

**"A diachronic"** approach is one that focuses on the history of a text.

**"A synchronic"** aprpoach is not concerned with the history of the transmission of a text, but rather focuses on the text as a whole

literary unit. For example, the word *"post"* comes into English through French and Italian from Latin *"posta-posita"*. In the beginning of the 16th century it meant "one of a number of men stationed with horses along roads as intervals, their duty being to ride forward with the King's *"packet"* or other letters, from stage to stage. The word, however has become international and denotes the present – day system of carrying and delivering letters and parcels. Its synonym "*mail*" mostly used in America, i.e. *a bag of letters.* It becomes from Old French *"male"*(modern malle) "bag", a word of Germanic origin.

## WORD THEORY. THE DEFINITION OF WORDS

A theory is a system of ideas intended to explain something, especially one based on general ideas independent of the thing to be explained. Theory is an analytical tools for understanding, explaining and making predictions about a given subject matter. There are theories in many different fields of study, including the arts and sciences. One of them is the word study.

A word is a fundamental unit of the language. When defining the word one must distinguish it from other linguistic units such as a phoneme, a morpheme or a word group. All these linguistic units are significant and therefore must be investigated both as a form and a meaning. A word is the smallest free form in a language, in contrast to a morpheme, which is the smallest unit of meaning. A word may consist of only one morpheme (e.g. wolf), but a single morpheme can not exist as a free form (e.g. the English plural morpheme –s).

There are four fundamental levels in a language which make up four systems:

Phonemes: *[p,r,s,m,l,o,e]* ;

Morphemes: *-er, -th, un-, dis-*, etc.

Words: *go, lecture, follow, read, light*, etc.

Sentences: *We learn lexicology. They can write and speak English*, etc.

The four systems are interrelated and constitute the complex structure of the language. Each system is studied separately. Phonemes are studied in Phonetics, form buildings and morphemes are learned in Grammar, words and their equivalents, phrases are studied in Lexicology.

Word is the principal and basic unit of the language system. Uniting meaning and form, it is composed of one or more morphemes, each consisting of one or more spoken sounds. Morphemes are also meaningful units but they cannot be used independently, they are always parts of words, whereas words can be used as a complete utterance *(Write!)*. When a derivational affix is added, a new word is formed (cf. *writer)*, thus ***write and writer*** are different words adding different grammatical functions, words may take functional affixes: *write-writer-wrote.* They are different forms of the same word. Different forms of the same word can also be built analytically with the help of auxiliaries.

Edward Sapir takes into consideration the syntactic and semantic aspects. He points out very important characteristic of the word, its indivisibility. The indivisibility will be clear from a comparison of the article *a* and the prefix *a-* : *a lion* and *alive*. A lion is a word group because we can separate its elements and insert other words between them: *a living lion, a dead lion* etc. *Alive* is a word. It is indivisible. Nothing can be inserted between its elements. The morpheme *"a-"* is not free, it is not a word. Another examples: *apart – a part (Joking apart! – It is a part of this thing); aside – a side (Joking aside! – step a side); ahead – a head (Go ahead! – a head of a tree) etc.*

The word *head* is the equivalent of the Azerbaijani word *baş*. These words are identical in three cases: 1) "head" is the part of body; 2) "head" is the leader ; 3) "head" of smth. (mountain, tree and so on.). But it has other meanings, such as: *head teacher, head doctor* and so on.

All the words of a language constitute its vocabulary. A word is a unit of the language having a definite phonetical and grammatical form and also a definite meaning, sometimes several meanings (such words are called polysemantic). Every

word has two aspects: a) outer aspect – sound-form; b) inner aspect – meaning.

The sound form of the word is not identical with its meaning. But they are closely connected with each other. The connections between the sound-form and the meaning of the word are conventional. It can be proved by comparing almost identical sound-forms, that possesses different meanings in different languages. The sound-form *eye* in English means "a part of a person's body, with the help of which we can see". But the sound form *ay* in Azerbaijani means the only satellite of the earth (that's the moon).

The meaning is a certain reflection in our mind of objects, phenomena or relations. The sound-form functions as the outer aspect of the word (A.I.Smirnitsky).

The presence of the meaning in a word differs it from other sounds. Words express people's notions about reality surrounding them.

Words may express *real* and *unreal notions*. Real notions are *table, city, book, the sun, the earth,* etc. Unreal notions are *devil, whitch, dream, etc.*

Words and notions are not the same. Word is a unit of the language, but notion is a unit of thought. Notion generalizes reflection of reality in thought. Word generalizes signs of things. Words name things and phenomena of reality. Word as a name is fixed in the process of the intercourse of people.

One and the same word in different cases of use expresses *general* and *single* notions. For ex.: when we say, "radio" or "telephone" is a useful "invention", we mean not a concrete *radio* or *telephone*, but in general any *radio* or *telephone* . But when we say "The radio is out of order", we mean a definite *radio*. In this case it expresses a single notion.

Though every word is a unit of sound and meaning we cannot say that if we change one of the elements, the other will change accordingly.

In a number of instances words have several meanings. The context generally gives the word its actual meaning. The context will generally show in what meaning the word is used. When used literally words have their natural meaning; when used figuratively they have nonliteral or symbolic meaning.

The meaning of the word is wider and has additional characteristics: e.g. the word *country* may mean *ölkə, kənd, şəhər kənarı, sahə, etc.* (e.g. medicine is quite unknown country to me).

# MORPHOLOGICAL STRUCTURE OF A WORD. WORD AND ITS MEANING

Morphology is interested in the internal structure of words. We can break down words into smaller units by analysing their structure and identify systematic processes that allow speakers to add new words to the lexicon and indicate grammatical information, such as tense and number. An example illustrates the point:

*girls = girl + -s*

It seems that "girls" can be broken down into two parts, the first of which refers to something in the world (a young female human beeing) and the second indicating a grammatical category – in this case number, and specifying plural.

In linguistic terminology the minimal parts of words that we have analysed above are called **morphemes.** A great many words have a composite nature and are made up of morphemes.

The term morpheme is derived from Gr. morphe 'form'+eme. Linguists to denote the smallest unit or the minimum distinctive feature have adopted the Greek suffix – eme. (Cf. phoneme, sememe). The morpheme is the smallest indivisable two-facet meaningful unit. A morpheme like a word has form and meaning. Morphems occur in speech only as constituent parts of words, not independently, although a word may consist of only single morpheme. The morpheme may be defined as the minimum meaningful language unit.

Morphemes are also connected with a given meaning with a given sound-form. But unlike the word, morphemes are not independent. They cannot serve as a building material for the language. Morphemes cannot be divided into smaller elements. They are units of the language. Like words they have sound-form and meaning, but they are the smallest indivisible

language units. Morphemes appear in speech not independently, but in words.

The main morpheme of a word is its root having the main lexical meaning. E.g. *end, ending, endless, unending, endlessly*, etc.

As it is seen from the examples the main root of all these derivative words is *end*.

## Types of Morphemes: root morphemes and affixational morphemes

According to the role the morphemes play in constructing words, they are subdivided into root morphemes and affixational morphemes. **Root morphemes** carry the lexical meaning common to a set of semantically related words constituting one word-cluster: *rest, restless, restful, restive, rest-cure, rest-day, rest-house, resting-place, etc.* The root morpheme "rest" as the common element of all these words conveys the idea of freedom from activity, repose. Such morphemes are called root-morphemes. Roots are main morphemic idea in a given language at a given stage of its development. A root remains after removing all suffixes. Root is the common element of words within a wording-family. Thus *heart* is the common root of the following series of words: *heart, hearten, dishearten, heartily, heartless, hearty, heartiness, sweet-heart, heart-broken, kind-hearted, whole-heartedly*, etc.

In some of these, as, for example, in *hearten* there is only one root; in others the root, thus forming a compound, like *sweet-heart*. After root-morphemes comes word-building morphemes that are called affixational morphemes or simply affixes.

**Affixational morphemes** are divided into **inflectional** affixes (indicating the grammatical form of the word, e.g.

number, tense, etc.) and **derivational** affixes. Inflectional affixes have only grammatical meaning and are used for the formation of word-forms. Derivational affixes are used for building various types of words. For instance, if we take this pair of words "write" and "writer", the derivative morpheme – *er* has a grammatical significance, as it serves to distinguish a noun from a verb, and it has a lexical meaning of the noun "writer" is different from the verb "write". So, inflections are dealt with in grammar whereas derivational morphemes are discussed in lexicology.

Root must be differed from **stem,** because it is the basic unit of the derivational analysis. Stem is the part of a word to which affix is attached. It is larger than a root. Stem may include root with word-building affixes. It is the part of the word which remains unchanged throughout its paradigm (a set of all the different forms of a word). The stem has not only the lexical meaning, but also grammatical meaning. They differ from words by the absence of inflections in their structure of words. The basic unit of the derivational analysis is the stem. The stem is defined as that part of the word which remains unchanged throughout its paradigm. It is the stem of the word that takes the inflection which shape the word grammatically as one or another part of speech (help, helped, helps).

The stem as the unchangeable part of the word throughout its paradigm differs in principle from the root-morpheme – common part within a word cluster and the lexical center of the word. It should be remembered, that it is the stem which a part from the lexical meaning carries a definite part of speech meaning and takes on not only inflections but various derivational affixes.

Distinction is also made of **free and bound morphemes**. **Free morphemes** coincide with word-forms of independently functioning words. It is obvious that free morphemes can be

found only among root morphemes. They can stand by themselves as single words, e.g. *open, door, table,* etc. Free morphemes fall into two subgroups:

a) lexical morphemes, e.g. *boy, man, house, tiger*, etc.
b) functional morphemes, e.g. *and, because, when,* etc.

Thus the morpheme "rest" in the word *rest* is a free morpheme.

**Bound morphemes** are those which do not coincide with separate word-forms. They cannot stand alone, but are attached to another form, e.g. *re-, -ist, -ed, -s,* etc. Consequently, all derivational morphemes are bound: *-ful, -less, -ive,* etc.

Bound morphemes are divided into two categories:

a) derivational (used to make words of a different grammatical category from the stem, e.g. *fool-foolish, pay-payment),* (suffixes –ish, -ment, etc, and prefixes such as re-, ex-, etc.);
b) inflectional (these are not used to produce new words, but indicate aspects of the grammatical function of a word, e.g. *–s, -ed, -ing, -er,* etc).

According to the morphological structure words are divided into: 1) simple words, 2) derivative words, 3) compound words.

Simple words consist of one word: *sky, room, flat, house,* etc. They are all semantically non-motivated. Simple words are generally monomorphic and phonetically identical with the root morphemes.

Derivative words consist of a root and one or more affixes: *teacher, reader, information*, etc. They are built on stems of various structure through which they are motivated, i.e. derived stems are understood on the basic of the derivative relations between their ICs and the correlated stems. For example, the derived stem *boy*-ish is understood through the

comparison with the simple stem *boy*, it is built on, and on the basis of derivative relations between it and the suffix *-ish.*

Compound words consist of two or more roots. They are made up two or more ICs, both of which are themselves stem (*black-eyed, black-board, film-star, waste-paper basket, pen-holder, diving-suit,* etc.).

In English bound stems are especially characteristic of loan words. The point may be illustrated by the following French borrowings: *charity, courage, coward, nation,* etc. If we take the suffixes of these words away, the remaining elements "char","cour","cow", "nat" do not coincide with any semantical related independent words.

The division of the words into simple and compound words is a historical change, for example:

*Woman <wif+man - qadin insan*

*Elbow< eln+boza - qolun büküyü (dirsək), etc.*

Linguists call them hidden stems. Affixes are further subdivided into prefixes, suffixes and infixes accoding to their position.

Suffixes are attached to the end of words and they change the meaning and the part of speech: *to work - worker, "-er"* changes the part of speech. But some of them don't change the part of speech, such as: *child-childhood; free-freedom,* etc. They are changed from concrete into abstract ones.

Prefixes are attached to the beginning of the words and the majority of them don't change the part of speech: *happy-unhappy, "un-"* doesn't change the part of speech.

An infix is an affix placed within a word, like the word *"passage > passenger", "porridge > porringer"*. This type is not productive.

Suffixes are also divided into derivational and functional. Derivational suffixes change the meaning of the part of speech:

" – *dom, -less, -ness*, etc". Functional suffixes convey new grammatical forms. E.g. *work-ed, write-s*, etc.

There are some suffixes called semi-suffixes. Once they were words, but now they are used as suffixes. For ex.: *gentleman, postman, waterproof, clockwise, saleswoman* and so on. About semi-suffixes will be spoken thoroughly.

In order to make the segmentation of words into smaller parts a little clearer, we must differentiate between *the base, the stem* and *the root* of a word in morphological terms. The stem is the base with all inflectional suffixes removed. It is larger than a root as we mentioned above. Stem may include root with word-building affixes. Root is the common element of words within a word-family. It remains after removing all suffixes:

base: *reactions*
stem: *reaction (-s)*
root: *(re-) act (-ion) (-s)*

## Allomorphs

Morphemes may have different phonemic shapes. Such as: *please, pleasure, pleasant, pleasing*. The morphems [pli:s], [ˈplezə], [ˈplezənt] do not differ in meaning or function. They show only a slight difference in sound form depending the final phoneme of the preceeding unit. They are considered as variants of one and the same morpheme and are called **allomorphs.**

The combining from *allo* – from Greek *allo* (other) is used in linguistic terminology to denote elements of a group whose members constitute a structural unit of the language (allophones, allomorphs).

Allomorphs occur not only among root morphemes, but also among suffixes and prefixes. Thus, for example , -ion / -tion /-sion / -ation are the positional variants of the same suffix. To show this they are taken together and seperated by the sign "/". They do not differ in meaning or function but show a slight difference in sound form.

An allomorph is defined as a prepositional variant of a morpheme occuring in a specific environment and so characterized by complimentary distribution. Complimentary distribution is said to take place in two linguistic variants cannot appear in the same environment. Thus, stems ending in consonants take as a rule *–ation* (liberation); stems ending in *"pt"*, however, take *–tion* (corruption) and the final *"t"* becomes fused with the suffix.

Allomorphs will also occur among prefixes. Their form then depends on the initials of the stem with which they will assimilate. A prefix such as *im-* ocurs before bilabials (impossible), its allomorph is *ir-* before *"r"* (irregular), *il-* before *"l"* (illegal). It is *in-* before all other consonants and vowels (indirect, inability, etc.).

# STRUCTURE OF WORDS AND WORD BUILDING

Morphological word-structure defined with the help of the ICs method reflects the sequence and arrangement of morphemes with the word. Derivational analysis aims at revealing the patterns on the basis of which new word appear in a language.

The typical relations of morphemes within the words are known as derivational or word-formation relations. Derivational analysis of the word makes use of the ICs method.

The results of morphemic and derivational analysis may coincide: *re-write, re-read, re-build, a-ward, re-ward,* etc.

If we consider these words at the morphemic level we may observe the similarity of their morphological structure. Each word consists of two ultimate constituents, corresponding to morphemes. They are called external structure. By external structure of the word we mean its morphological structure. For example, in the word "postimpressionists" the following morphemes can be distinguished: the prefixes " post-, im-"; the root "press"; the noun forming suffix "-ion, -ist"; and the grammatical suffix of plurality "-s". All these morphemes constitute the external structure of the word "postimpessionists". But the internal structure of the word, or its meaning is nowadays commonly referred to as the word's semantic structure. This is certainly the word's main aspect.

Derivational analysis of the same words aims at defining the pattern of morpheme arrangement which serves a basis for the formation of new words *(re-ward, re-write* are built to the same pattern *re+verb stem*). The words *"re-ward", "a-ward"* having a similar morphological structure do not follow the mentioned pattern. The component part "ward" in both words

is not verb stem. So the derivational pattern of these words will be different from those mentioned above.

Word-buildings or word-formations are the process of creating new words out of the morphemes and stems. There are various types and ways of building words. The English language used to mention morphological (or word-derivation), syntactic and lexico-semantic (or word-composition) types of word-building.

Word-derivation means the making of a new word out of an old one by the addition of prefixes or suffixes by changing a vowel or a consonant in old words or without any formal word-building elements.

Word-composition means the joining together two or more words. That means a syntactical type of word-building.

Word-building is closely connected with grammar and vocabulary. On one hand, words are coined in accordance with the existing grammatical rules and on the other hand, when created they enrich the vocabulary.

In Modern English we can find many ways of the formation of new words, some of which existed in early periods.

All the ways that are used in the formation of new words are called productive, and those that are no longer used at present are called nonproductive.

Productive ways are affixation, compounding (composition), conversion and shortening (clippings).

Nonproductive ways are sound interchanges, stress interchanges, sound imitations (onomotopoeia ) and back formation.

## WORD-DERIVATION: AFFIXATION

Derivational affixes as the structural level of the word analysis are treated as units of the word-structure. **Affixation** is one of the most productive ways of word-buildings throughout the history of English. It is generally defined as the formation of words by adding derivational affixes to different types of basis. Affixation is the development of the vocabulary. The main function of affixation in Modern English is to form one part of speech from another; the secondary function is to change the lexical meaning of the same part of speech. There are two types of affixes: derivational and functional affixes. Lexicology is primarily concerned with derivational affixes, the other group being the domain of grammarians. The derivational affixes in fact, as well as the whole problem of word-formation, form a boundary area between lexicology and grammar and are therefore studied in both.

While examining the derivational affixes in Modern English from the point of view of their origin distinction should be made between native and foreign affixes. They have different sources of origin. Some of them are native (-hood, -ly, -less, -some, etc.), some are Greek (anti-, ex-, un- etc.), some are Latin (sub-, dis-, com-, inter-, etc), some are French (-ment, -ance, -age, etc.). Many affixes were once separate words, such as: -dom (in the meaning of "sentence, judgement"), -hood (in the meaning of "state, condition"), -ship (in the meaning of "shape"), etc.

The most ancient affixes were derived from Old English. They are of Germanic origin. But when in the XII century a large number of French words were borrowed, a great many of these words brought with them their derivatives formed on

French and Latin patterns. When such pairs of words as *to derive-derivation* had found the way into the English language, it was natural that the suffix *-tion* should be recognized as a means of forming nouns out of verbs.

Foreign affixes that had no equivalents in English were naturalized and used with English words. Sometimes it so happened that the foreign affix was simple and more convenient than the native one. As the Latin "*re-*" has replaced the Old English "again" ( again buy > rebuy).

In some instances the attempts to naturalize foreign affixes failed, because there was no real need to be supplied.

As a rule, affixation is subdivided into suffixation, prefixation and infixation. We should distinguish productive suffixes, suffixes of narrow usage, nonpoductive and dead suffixes.

## Suffixation

Modern English possesses a large stock of suffixes (fixed after) which present material for word-formation. It is the formation of words with the help of suffixes. The main function of suffixes in Modern English is to form one part of speech from another, the secondary function is to change the lexical meaning of the same part of speech. For ex.: "educate" is a verb, "educatee" is a noun). They usually modify the lexical meaning of the base and transfer words to different parts of speech.

There are suffixes, however, which don't shift words from one part of speech into another. They usually transfer a word into a different semantic group. E.g. a concrete noun becomes an abstract one, as:

*Child – childhood, friend – friendship, brother-brotherhood, companion –companionship,* etc.

Chains of suffixes are called as compound suffixes:

*-ably= -able + ly (profitably, unreasonably);*

*-ically = -ic + -al + -ly (musically, critically;)*

*- ation = -ate+ ion (formation, information)*

Thus these suffixes are specific suffixes of a composite nature. They consist of two suffixes. But there are some words similar to them, such as: *fascination, translation.* At first sight they look like a parallel to *fascination and translation.* These words are built by the suffix *-ion* on the basis *fascinate, translate.* But there is no base *adoptate, it is adopt.*

There is also a group suffix *-manship,* consisting of *-man and -ship,* such as, for example, a*uthormanship.* But *statesmanship* or *chairmanship* are built by adding the suffix *-ship* to the compound base *statesman, chairman.*

Distinction is usually made between *dead and living suffixes.* Dead suffixes are described as those which are no longer left in Modern English as the component parts of words: *-d = dead, seed; -le = bundle; -l =sail; -el = havel; -ock – hillock; -t = flight; -ie = birdie, etc.*

Living suffixes may be easily singled out from a word: *kind-ness, child –hood, sleep-less,* etc.

Productive suffixes and suffixes of narrow usage are used at the given stage of the development of the language and can be used when occasion demands.

Suffixes employed in English are much more numerous than prefixes.

For ex.: *un-just-ify, dis-arrange-ment, etc.*

Words like them *(unjustify...)* are often qualified as prefixal-suffixal derivatives. In Modern English suffixation is mostly characteristic of noun and adjective formation, while prefixation (fixed before) is mostly typical of verb formation.

## Classification of suffixes

There are different classifications of suffixes in linguistic literature:

1. The first principle of the classification is the part of speech formed:
   a) noun - forming suffixes
   b) adjective - forming suffixes
   c) verb - forming suffixes
   d) adverb - forming sufixes
   e) numeral - forming suffixes

**Noun-Forming Sufixes**:

We may classify the noun - forming suffixes under the following headings:

1. denoting agent, doer, belonging. E.g.
   -er = *writer*, -or = *sculptor*; -ist = *socialist*, etc.
   - ee = *employee*, -eer =*engineer*, –ian = *Russian*, etc.
   - ese = *Chinese*, -ant/-ent = *assistant, student*, etc.
   - ster = *gangster, roadster, oldster, youngster*, etc.
2. Making the feminine gender:
   - ess = *actress, hostess, waitress*, etc.
3. Denoting diminutiveness :
   - ling = *darling;* - ie = *birdie, girlie*; - let = *booklet;* - *en* = *chicken*, etc.
4. Suffixes having an intensive force:
   - ard = *drunkard*, etc.
5. Suffixes forming abstract nouns (denoting act, state, quality):
   -ance/-ence = *assistance, experience*, etc.
   - dom = *freedom, kingdom*; -ness = *darkness*; -hood = *childhood*, m*otherhood*, etc.

-ancy/-ency = *tendency, vacancy*; - ion/-sion/-tion/-ation = *union, opinion, tension, explanation, creation*; -ism = *communism, capitalism*, etc.

-ment = *development;* -ship = *friendship*, etc.

-ty = *honesty*; -th = *warmth, growth*, etc.

6. Suffixes denoting collectivity. Collective suffixes denoting collection or place:

- age = *village, courage;* -ery/-ry = *peasantry, poetry, slavery, machinary, etc.*

**Adjective-forming suffixes:**

Adjective-forming suffixes are divided into the following groups:

1. Suffixes possessing a quality of any kind:

-al = *formal*; -ly = *friendly*; -ed = *wooded*, etc.

- y = *cloudy, sunny*; -ic = *public, cleric, sceptic, cynic, celtic, domestic*, etc.

-ant/-ent = *important, different, dependent*, etc.

-some = *tiresome, handsome, troublesome*, etc.

2. Suffixes possessing a quality in a high degree:

- ful= *beautiful, hopeful, powerful, dreadful*, etc.

- ous = *courageous, glorious, joyous, obvious, serious*, etc.

3. Suffixes possessing a quality of a slight degree:

- ish = *reddish, childish, greyish, whitish, foolish*, etc.

4. Suffixes denoting negative quality:

- less = *useless, homeless, hopeless, powerless, senseless, worthless*, etc.

5. Suffixes denoting a quality of actions and possibilities:

- ive = *active, passive, affirmative, conclusive, talkative*, etc.

- able/ -ible = *unbearable, possible, eatable, fashionable, saleable*, etc.

**Verb-forming suffixes**

-ate = *facilitate, hesitate,* etc.

- er = *glimmer;* -en = *shorten, quicken;* -fy/ -ify = *satisfy, classify,* etc.

- ize/-ise = *naturalize, organize, apologize, generalise,* etc.

- ish = *establish,* etc.

**Adverb-forming suffixes**

-ly = *coldly;* -ward /-wards = *eastwards, seaward*; etc.

- wise = *likewise, otherwise, clockwise, crosswise,* etc.

There are no Romanic or Greek suffixes forming adverbs.

**Numeral-forming suffixes**

- fold = *twofold, tenfold,* etc.

- *teen = fourteen;* - *th = seventh, tenth,* etc.

- ty = *sixty, fifty,* etc.

According to the lexico-grammatical character of the base suffixes may be classified into various groups:

a) sufixes added to verbal stems - deverbal suffixes, such as: *-er, -ing, -ment, -able,* etc. *reader, suffering, amazement, government, payment, suitable, comfortable,*etc.

b) suffixes added to noun stems - denominal suffixes, such as: *-less, -ish, -some, -ful,* etc. *handless, foolish, troublesome, mouthful,* etc .

The adjective forming suffix *–y* has several meanings:

a) composed of full of: *bony, stony,* etc.

b) characterized by: *rainy, cloudy,* etc.

c) resembling what the base denotes: *inky, bushy,* etc.

Adverb - forming suffix *–ly* can be added either to the adjectival base or to noun bases: *quickly, friendly,* etc.

The verb suffix *–en* attached to noun and adjectival base: *to strengthen, to wooden, to soften,* etc.

But, though the word numb exists in English, number is not "one who numbs", it is derived from Old French *nombre* borrowed into English and completely assimilated.

The word *smoker* has binary meaning, it is "one who smokes a tobacco", and "in a railway car in which passengers may smoke".

Words that are made up of elements derived from two or more different languages are called *hybrids*. English contains thousands of hybrid words, the majority of which show various combinations of morphemes coming from Latin, French and Greek and those of native origin.

Latin – *abilis* was not borrowed through French. Moreover, it is not an isolated case, but rather an established pattern that could be represented as English stem + *-able. Cf. answerable, eatable, likeable,* etc.

Its variant with native *negative* prefix "*un-*" is also worthy to note: *un-* + English stem + *-able.* E.g.

*Unanswerable, unbearable, unbelievable,* etc.

More frequent pattern is *un-* + Romanic stem + *-able*, which is also a hybrid: *unallowable, uncontrollable, unmoveable,* etc.

The same phenomenon occurs in prefixation and inflection. The noun "bicycle" has a Latin prefix "bi-", a Greek root "cycle < kyklos < a wheel", however, takes an English inflection (changing) in the plural "bicycles". There are also many hybrid compounds, such as: a black guard (Eng+Fr) or a schoolboy (Gr+Eng).

Observation of the English vocabulary, which is probably richer in hybrids than that of any other European language, shows a great variety of patterns.

In some cases it is the borrowed affixes that are used with native stems, or vice versa.

**Semi-affixes**: There are a few roots in English which have developed great combining ability in the position of the second

element of a word and a very general meaning similar to that of an affix. They receive this name because semantically, functionally, structurally and statistically they behave more like affixes than like roots. Their meaning is general. They determine the lexico-grammatical class the word belongs to. They are unstressed in derivative words, such as: Cf. *sea-man*, where *–man* is a semi-affix.

*–land (Ireland, Scotland, motherland, fatherland, wonderland), -like (ladylike, unladylike, businesslike, starlike, flowerlike), -worthy (seaworthy, trustworthy, praiseworthy), -berry (strawberry, mulberry); -man/-woman (airman, yesman, saleswoman); - proof (waterproof), - wise (otherwise), - hood (childhood), -dom (freedom, kingdom), -ship (friendship), -ward (seaward, toward), -boy (cowboy), -ant (servant), etc.*

## Prefixation

Derivational morphemes affixed before the stem are called **prefixes** (fixed before). It is the formation of words by means of adding a prefix to the stem. Prefixes only modifies the lexical meaning of the stem: both the simple word and its prefixal derivative mostly belong to the same part of speech.

In English it is characteristic for forming verbs. For example, the prefix *un-* when added to verb stems, adds to the meaning of the verbs an additional component denoting a reverse action: *do – undo, bolt – unbolt, lock – unlock, etc.*

Some times ago there were linguists who treated prefixation as part of word – composition. At present the majority of scholars treat prefixation as an integral part of word-derivation regarding prefixes as derivational affixes. There are 51 prefixes in the Modern English word-building. The greatest number are verbs -42%, adjectives comprise 33,5%, nouns

make up 22%. As a rule prefixes do not change the part of speech of the word to which they are added. They can be classified according to the nature of words in which they are used: prefixes used in notional words and prefixes used in functional words. There are two types of prefixes:

1) Prefixes used in notional words are proper prefixes which are bound morphems, e.g. un- (unhappy). dis- (displeased), mis- (misunderstand), etc.

2) Prefixes used in functional words are semi-bound morphemes, because they are met in the language as prepositions and prepositions like adverbs: *out-, over-, up-, under-,* etc.

The second type of prefixes are qualified as semibound morphemes. They occur in speech both as independent words and as derivational affixes:

*to look up* (independent) – *upstairs* (semibound morpheme), *over the table* (independent) – *overshoe* (semibound),

As it was told above, the main function of prefixes in English is to change the lexical meaning of the same part of speech. But the recent research showed that about twenty-five prefixes in ME form one part of speech from another (*button – bebutton, family-interfamily*). They can transfer words to a different part of speech. Such prefixes have functional difference between suffixes and prefixes.They modify the lexical meaning of the stem. Therefore both the simple word and its prefixed derivative mostly belong to the same part of speech. But there are two prefixes in English which change the part of speech of words to which they are added.

en- = *large — enlarge, rich — enrich*

be- = *little — belittle*

One and the same prefix may be added to different parts of speech. For ex.: *un-happy; un-tie,* etc.

**Prefixes of Germanic origin:**

***a*** – It is a non-productive prefix denoting:

1) *on, in* (OE) = *ashore, asleep,* etc.

2) *of , from* (OE) = *to arise,* etc.

***be*** – It is a non-productive prefix changing the part of speech: *befriend, befool,* etc.

***un*** –. It is a productive prefix which gives a negative meaning and shows a reverse action = *unknown, unusual, undo,* etc.

***for*** - . It is a non-productive prefix with a negative meaning: *forget, forsake, forbid,* etc.

***out*** –. It is a productive prefix (out of) = *outcome, outlet,* etc. It makes intransitive verbs transitive: *outrun (run ahead of), outlive,* etc.

***with*** – It is a non-productive prefix which means "against, opposite, back": *withdraw, withhold, withstand,* etc.

***on*** – . It is a non-productive prefix: *onlooker, onslaught, onset,* etc.

***over*** – It is a producive prefix: *overtake, overlook,* etc.

***in*** – . It is a non-productive prefix: *income, insight,* etc.

***under.*** – It is a productive prefix: *undergo, undertake,* etc.

***to*** – . It is a non-ptoductive prefix: *together, toward,* etc.

**Prefixes of Romanic Origin:**

***bi-.*** It is a productive prefix which means "twice", "two": *biweekly, bimonthly, bicycle,* etc.

***de*** – . It is a non-productive prefix which means separation (off, away): *depart,* etc.

***dis*** –. It is a productive prefix which expresses separation or has a negative reverse meaning. For ex.: *dismiss, dislike, displease,* etc.

***en-/em-.*** They are non-productive prefixes which mean *in, into* and form verbs changing the part of speech: *enlarge, enrich, employ,* etc.

***in-/il-/ir-/im-/ig-.*** They are productive or less productive prefixes meaning:

1) ***not-, non-, un-:*** *incorrect, illegal, irregular, impossible, ignoble,* etc.

2) ***in-, on-, intro-:*** *inhabit, invade, introduce, introspection,* etc.

***co -*** it is a productive prefix which means "with", "together": *co-author, co- existance,* etc.

***counter-/contro-/contra-.*** They are productive prefixes meaning "against, contrary, in opposition": *counter-revolutionary, counter-attack, contra-distinction, contra-distinguish,* etc.

***ex-.*** It is a productive prefix which means:

1) formerly: *ex-director, ex-president, ex-champion,* etc.

2) out of: *export,* etc.

***extra –.*** It is also a productive prefix which forms adjectives denoting "beyond", "outside of": *extraordinary, extra-special(edition), extra nuclear,* etc.

***inter-.*** It is a productive prefix which means "together, among, between": *international, intermediate, interrelation,* etc.

***non-.*** It is a productive prefix which means "not, un, in": *non-party, non- stop, nonsense,* etc.

***post -.*** It is a productive prefix which means "after, later": *post-war, post - position, post-date,* etc.

***pre-.*** It is also a productive prefix which denotes priority: *pre-war, pre revolutionary,* etc.

***re-.*** It is a productive prefix which means "again": *reread, rewrite,* etc.

**Note:** A very frequent prefix with a great combining power is *re-,* denoting a repeated action. It may be prefixed to a verb or verbal noun: *remarry, reread, rewrite,*

*remarriage*. There are many words in English in which this prefix has become fused with the stem of the word and lost its original meaning. Such words have their own independent meanings. That's why there are such pairs of words in English as: *remark, recover*, etc.

***sub-.:*** It is a productive prefix which means "under, below, beneath": *subway, submarine*, etc.

***trans-.*** It is a productive prefix which means "over, through, across, beyond": *transcontinental, transatlantic, transport*, etc.

***ultra-.*** It is a productive prefix which means "beyond": *ultramodern, ultra-fashionable, ultra-violet*, etc.

***vice-.*** It is also a productive prefix in the meaning of "instead of, in place of": *vice-president, vice-governor, vice-minister*, etc.

**Prefixes of Greek Origin:**

***a -.*** It is a non-productive prefix which means "not, non": *atheist, atheism*, etc.

***amphi-.*** It is a non-productive prefix which means "about, on both sides, of both kinds": *amphitheatre*, etc.

***anti - /ant.*** It is a productive prefix which means "against": *antiparty, antifascist, antarctic, antitype, antithesis, antiaircraft*, etc.

***dis-/di-.*** They are non-productive prefixes which mean "twice, double": *dissyllable, diphthong*, etc.

***poly-.*** It is a non-productive prefix which means "many or much": *polysyllable, polyglot, polysemantic*, etc.

## Polysemy, homonymy and synonymy of derivational affixes

Many commonly used derivational affixes are polysemantic in Modern English and are found in different parts of speech.

An example of polysemantic affix is the adjective suffix *–y* which has several meanings:

1) resembling what the stem denotes: *bushy, inky*;
2) characterized by: *rainy, cloudy, windy*;
3) full of; *stony, salty, bony.*

Many homonymous derivational affixes are found among those forming different parts of speech: the adverb suffix *-ly* added to adjective stems *(quickly, slowly)* is homonymous to the adjective suffix *–ly* added to noun stems *(lovely, friendly).* The suffix *–en, -ish,* the prefix *un-* also exit in their homonymous forms and are added to different stems *(wooden, soften; foolish, childish; unhappy, unusual, undo, etc.).*

Synonymous affixes appeared in the English language due to extensive borrowing from other language. The suffix *–er* of native origin denoting the doer of the action is synonymous to the suffix *–ist* of Greek origin having similar semantic properties.

Having much in common these suffixes differ from each other in some respects: unlike the suffix *-er,* the suffix *–ist* combines mostly with noun stems and denotes the agent.

## CONVERSION. DIACHRONIC APPROACH TO CONVERSION. ITS ORIGIN

Conversion is a mean of forming new words without adding any derivative element, so that the basic form of the original and the basic form of the derived words are homonymous having the same morphological structure, but belonging to different parts of speech.

In the course of the historical development grammatical forms in English were lost and another way of forming new words came into being. Due to the loss of inflexion words in Modern English have in most cases no special forms to indicate to what part of speech they belong. When inflexions are lost, there is nothing to distinguish the form of the verb from a noun.

The terminology used for this process has not been completely established yet. The most usual terms are "conversion", because a word is converted (shifted) to a different part of speech; and "zero-derivation", because the process is like deriving (transferring) a word into another morphological category with a zero-affix creating a semantic dependence of one word upon another. Other less frequently used terms are "functional shift", "functional change" or "zero-marked derivative".

The essence of the phenomenon may be illustrated by the following example: *His voice silenced everyone else.* The word *silence* exists in the English language as a noun and a verb may be formed from the same stem without adding any suffix or prefix or without changing the stem in any other way, so that both basic forms are homonymous. Their distribution on the other hand is quite different. In our example *silence* not only takes the functional verbal suffix *-ed* but

also occupies the position of a verbal predicate "having voice" as a subject and *everyone else* as its object. Its lexico-grammatical meaning is also a verb. The difference between "silence" as a noun and as a verb is morphological, syntactical and semantic; the original and the resulting words are grammatically different; a new paradigm is acquired and the syntactic functions and ties are those of a verb. The term "conversion" is in a way misleading, as actually nothing is converted; the original word continues its existance alongside the new one. As to "zero derivation", it does not permit us to distinguish this type from sound interchange *food (n) – feed (v),* where no derivative morpheme is added either. The term "root formation" is not always suitable as the process can involve not only root words, but also words containing affixes and compounds. The terms "functional change" or "transposition" implies that the process in question concerns usage, not word-formation. This immediately brings us into an extremely controversial field. Accepting the term "functional change" one must admit that one of the same words can belong to several parts of speech simultaneously. Some scholars assert that conversion will become even more active in the future because it is a very easy way to create new words in English. There is no way to know the number of conversions appearing every day in the spoken language, although we know this number must be high.

As a type of word formation, conversion exists in many languages. The main reason for the wide-spread development of conversion in present-day English is no doubt the absence of mophological elements serving as classifying signals, or in other words, of formal signs marking the part of speech to which the word belongs. It is a wide-spread word formation in English. The causes that made conversion so widely spread are to be approached diachronically. Nouns and verbs have

become identical in form firstly as a result of the loss of endings.

Conversion is a type of word-building – not a pattern of structural relationship. Synchronically both types *sleep (n) – sleep (v)* and *pencil (n) – pencil (v)* must be treated together as cases of patterned homonymy. But it is essential to differentiate the cases of conversion and treat them separately when the study is diachronic.

Established examples of noun > verb conversion are: *to badger, to bottle, to mail, to mashroom, to skin, etc.*

Almost any noun or adjective can at once become a verb if imployed as such, and almost any verb may be used to express the idea of its action and result. E.g. *eye-to eye, water-to water, empty–to empty, clean – to clean, etc.*

The disappearance of frontier between parts of speech may also be illustrated by the adjectival use of adverbs.

*very* (adv) = *the very man* (adj); *seldom* (adv) = a *seldom pleasure* (adj); *above* (adv) = *the above remark* (adj), etc.

The adverbs are converted into nouns:

*in, out,* etc. For ex.:

He knows all *the ins and outs* of the town.

Adverbs are converted into verbs:

*down* (adv) = to *down* (verb)

Even some interjections are converted into verbs:

*boo* (int.) – bəyannamə, mənfi qiymət, pisləmə *to boo* - narazılıq ifadə etmək.

The converted word acquires all the grammatical characteristics of the part of speech into which it has been converted.

This way of forming new words is productive. It should be mentioned that especially nouns are often converted into verbs. Such verbs are called "denominative" verbs.

Conversion began to develop strongly in the 15th century when the English language acquired an analytical character. Now in English almost any part of speech can be converted into some other part of speech.

Conversion can be described as a morphological way of forming words. It has been the subject of many linguistic discussions since 1891 when H.Sweet first used the term in his "New English Grammar". Various opinions have been expressed on the nature and character of conversion in the English language and different conceptions of conversion have been put forward. The treatment of conversion as a morphological way of forming words was suggested by A.İ.Smirnitsky in his works on the English language. This idea is also accepted by R.S. Ginzburg and others.

Other linguists do not agree with this conception of conversion as a morphological way of forming words. As one of the two words within a conversion pair is semantically derived from the other, it is of great theoretical and practical importance to determine the semantic relations between the words related through conversion. We can show the following typical semantic relations.

1. Verbs converted from nouns (denominal verbs). This is the largest group of words related through conversion. The semantic relations between the nouns and verbs vary greatly. If the noun refers to some object of reality (both animate and inanimate), the converted verb may denote:

a) action characterizing the object:

*ape* (n) = *to ape* (v) (imitate in a foolish way); *butcher* (n) = to *butcher* (v) (to kill animals for food, cut up a killed animal); *dream* (n) = to *dream* (v) For ex.:

He awoke every morning from rosy scenes of *dream* to an atmosphere that was vibrant with the jar and jungle of tormented life (J.London).

İn this sentence the word "dream" is in the meaning of "yuxu", but it can be used as a verb as well, "to dream".

*milk* (n) –*to milk* (v) e.g.

You may bring me a little broth now, and some *milk* with a little port in it (O.Henry).

b) instrumental use of the objects:

*whip* (n) – *to whip* (v) – (to strike with a whip)

c) addition of the object:

*fish* (n) – *to fish* (v) – (to catch or try to catch fish);

The most common *fishes* in the Terek are carp, barbel and sewruga (Murray).

d) deprivation of the object:

*dust* (n) – *to dust* (v) – (to move dust from smth); *skin* (n) – to *skin* (v) – (to strip off the skin from).

2. Nouns converted from verbs (deverbal substantives):

The converted noun may denote:

a) instance of the action:

*to jump* (v) – *jump* (n) – (sudden spring from the ground); to *move* (v) – *move* (n) – (a change of position)

b) agent of the action:

to *help* (v) – *help* (n) – (an aid);

c) place of an action:

*to drive* (v) – *drive* (n)- (a path or road along which one drives); to *walk* (v) – *walk* (n) – (walking)

d) object or result of the action:

*to peel* (v) – *peel* (n) – (the outer skin of fruit or potatoes taken off);

3. An adjective preceded by the definite article is often used in the plural to denote a whole group of persons:

*young (adj) — the young (n), old (adj) — the old (n), poor(adj) — the poor (n), rich (adj) — the rich (n).*

As a rule the meaning of a converted word is somehow connected with the meaning of the original one. But at the

same time it has some new elements in it (that's converted words get additional meanings). For ex.:

- *pocket* (n) - as a converted word *to pocket* has two meanings: 1) to put smth into pocket; 2) to steal smth from the pocket;
- *dog* (n) - as a converted word *to dog* means to follow.

A word is considered to be fully converted when it gets all the features of the part of speech into which it is converted. But in such word combinations as *stone wall. automobile plant* the nouns *stone and automobile* perform the function of an adjective. But we cannot say that here *stone and automobile* are converted into adjectives, because here *stone and automobile* cannot have a degree of comparison. But such nouns as *chief and choice* have been fully converted into adjectives because they have a degree of comparison. For ex: *choicest apple, chiefest reason.*

## Partial Conversion

Conversion from noun to adjective and from adjective to noun is rather controversial (mübahisəli) one. It is called "partial conversion" by Quirk (1997: 1559) and Cannon (1985:413) and "syntactic process" by Bauer (1983:230). This peculiar process occurs when "a word of one class appears in a function which is characteristic of another word class" (Quirk, 1997:1559). Most of these cases should not be treated as conversion but as nouns functioning as adjectives and vice versa.

## Marginal Cases of Conversion

There are some few cases of conversion in which there are slight non-affixal changes. These can be considered marginal (qıraq-bucağa yazılmış, kənarda yazılmış) cases of conversion

(Bauer 1983: 228-229). Although the shift takes place, they are called "marginal", because of the alterations produced in the word. Words belonging to this category are a close and long-established set. This marginal group can be divided regarding two different aspects: the pronunciation and the word-stress (Quirk,1997: 1566).

With respect to pronunciation there are some nouns ending in voiceless fricative consonants [s], [f] and [ θ] which are converted into verbs with the voicing of the final consonant into [z], [v] and [ ð]. For example, the noun 'use' [s] shifts to the verb 'to use' [z] without any change, but the voicing of the final consonant. The noun 'advice' [s] which began to be written with 'c' in the 16th century (Oxford English Dictionary, 1979, vol.1: 139), whereas its corresponding verb 'advise [z] did not change its original spelling. Similarly, the noun 'belief' changed from 'beleive' in the 16th century, grief-greive, proof-prove (Oxford English Dictionary, 1979, vol.1: 782).

The other marginal type has to do with the stress pattern. There are some bisyllabic verbs which shift to nouns or adjectives with a change in word stress from the verb distribution to the noun and adjective pattern ['-]. Such as, the verb 'conduct [kən'dʌkt] to the noun conduct ['kondəkt], from the verb pro'test [prə'test], to the noun ['proutest].

# COMPOUND WORDS.

## Compound Words or Word-Composition

In linguistics, a compound is a lexeme that consists of more than one stem. Compounding or composition is the word formation that creates compound lexemes. In other words, compound, compounding or word compounding occur when a person attaches two or more words together to make them one word. The meanings of the words interrelate in such a way that a new meaning comes out which is very different from the meanings of the words in isolation.

It is the productive way of word building. It is known as word composition which occur in the language as free forms. They are inseparable vocabulary units. Like all inseparable vocabulary units compound words take shape in a definite system of grammatical forms, syntactic and semantic features.

A compound word forms a single idea, but the merging of two parts is not always complete and it is not always possible to differ compound words from syntactical groups. E.g.

*A strong-box* = a compound word in the meaning of *seyf*;

*A strong box* = syntactical group in the meaning of *möhkəm qutu*

**Structure of compound words.**

The structural unity of a compound word depends upon:

1. the unity of stress;
2. solid or hyphinated spelling;
3. semantic unity;
4. unity of morphological and syntactical functioning.

These are characteristic features of compound words in all languages. As a rule English compounds have one uniting stress (usually on the first component), e.g. *hard-cover, best-seller.* We can also have a double stress in an English compound, with the main stress on the first component and with a secondary stress on the second component, e.g. *blood-vessel.* The third pattern of stresses is two level stresses, e.g. *snow-white, sky-blue.*

The semantic unity of a compound word is often very strong. In such cases we have idiomatic compounds where the meaning of the whole is not a sum of meanings of its components, e.g. to ghostwrite, skinhead, brain-drain, etc. In non-idomatic compounds semantic unity is not strong, e.g. airbus, astrodynamics, etc.

English compounds have the unity of morphological and syntactical functioning. They are used in a sentence as one part of it and only one component changes grammatically, e.g. These *girls are chatter-boxes.* "Chatter-boxes" are predicative in the sentence and only the second component changes grammatically.

Structurally compound words are characterized by the spesific order and arrangement in which bases follow one another.

Phonetically the immidiate constituents (ICs) acquire a new stress pattern: "hot and house" – each possesses its own stress, but when the stems of these words are brought together we have a new word-formation – a compound word. So, the pronunciation has more significance than the spelling, for the position of stress generally changes when two stems are linked up in a compound. But the stress is placed on the first part when the merging is complete. If two elements of the compound are only partially combined, the stress falls equally

on the both parts of the compound. E.g. *schoolboy, schoolfellow,* etc.

Only the context helps to distinguish compounds from free syntactical groups. For ex.:

*The crow is a black bird* = a syntactical group;

*A 'blackbird is in the cage* = a compound word.

There are two common semantic classification of compounds : an **endocentric** and **exocentric compounds. An endocentric compound** consists of a *head,* i.e. the categorial part that contains the basic meaning of the whole compound, and modifiers, which restricts this meaning. For example, the English compound *doghouse* , where *house* is the head and *dog* is the modifier. It is understood as a house intended for a dog. Endocentric compounds tend to be the same part of speech (word class) as their head, as in the case of *doghouse.* Other examples: darkroom, smalltalk, etc. are endocentric compounds.

But **exocentric compounds** do not have a head, and their meaning often cannot guessed from its constituent parts. For example, the English compound *white-collar* is neither a kind of collar, nor a white thing. In an exocentric compound, the word is determined lexically, disregarding the class of the constituents, such as *skinhead, paleface (person).*

However, in another common type of compound, the exocentric (or known as a bahuvrihi compound in the Sanskrit tradition), the semantic head is not explicitly expressed. *A redhead,* for example, is not a kind of head, but a person with red hair. Similarly, a *blockhead* is also not a head, but a person with a head that is as hard and unrespective as a block (i.e. stupid).

**Compound Words and Free Phrases**

There are two important peculiarities distinguishing compounds in English from free phrases.

– ICs of English compounds are free forms, i.e. they can be used as independent words with a distinct meaning of their own. As the English compounds consist of free forms, it is difficult to distinguish them from phrases;

–separating compounds from phrases and also from derivatives is no easy task. E.g. *starlit (ulduzlu)= star+light (lit)* cannot be a phrase because its second element is the stem of a participle *(lit),* and a participle cannot be syntactically modified by a noun;

–stress patterns may distinguish a compound word from a noun phrase consisting of the same component. For example, *a black board*, adjective plus noun, is any board that is black, and has equal stress on both elements. The compound *blackboard,* on the other hand, though it may have started out historically as *black board*, now is stressed only on the first element, *black.*

**Classification of Compound Words**

Compound words may be classified according to the type of compositions and the linking element; according to the structural pattern, according to the part of speech.

1. The classification according to the type of composition permits us to establish the following groups:

a) without connecting elements: *heartache, newspaper, first class;*

b) compounds with a vowel or a consonant as a linking element: *speedometer, Euro-Asian, Anglo-Azerbaijan, gasometer, handicap, handicraft, etc.*

c) compounds with linking elements represented by preposition or conjunction stems: a *son-in-law, a stay-at- home, rough-and-ready;*

d) in some cases the first part of a compound word has the possessive inflexion: *townsman, sportsman, draftsman, saleswoman, etc.*

2.The classification of compounds according to the structure of ICs distinguishes:

a) compounds where the constituents are simple elements: *toothache, headache, filmstar, highway, grey-green, weekend, timetable,* etc.

b) compounds where at least one of the constituents is a derived stem:

*blue-eyed, long-legged, handicapped, chain-smoker,* etc.

In English language the second component is derived.

c) compounds where at least one of the constituents is a clipped stem: *X-mas, V-day, H-bag,* etc.

d) compounds where at least one of the constituents is a compound stem: *wastepaper basket,* etc.

3. According to the part of speech to which the compound belongs we distinguish compound nouns, compound adjectives, compound verbs:

The semantic relations between the parts of a compound word are different. As a rule the second part of a compound word expressing the general meaning is limited by the first: *steam-engine.*

In English language very often the second part of a compound word expressing a general meaning is made more exact by the first: *cut-throat. light-grey, light-blue,* etc.

There are cases when the parts of a compound word are independent: *father-in-law, mother-in-law,* etc.

Very often the second part of a compound word expresses a general meaning and the first part stresses the quality: *grey-haired, long-legged, blue-eyed,* etc.

Very often compounds are used attributively: *a wait-and-see policy, a happy-go-lucky man,* etc.

**Differences of Compound Words and Phraseology**

1. It is impossible to insert any word between compound words.: *blackboard, wastepaper;* but in phraseological units it is possible: to *break one's heart = to break his kind heart* (ph.un.), but *"heart-break"* (CW);
2. As compound words belong to the concrete meaning, they have no other variant; but phraseological units sometimes have their variants. For ex. *to keep level head = to keep cool/cold head(təmkinini saxlamaq*); *touch the wood = touch the soft/hard wood* (göz dəyməsin), etc. are phraseological units; but *touch - me - not (*küsdüm gülü*), blue-bell* (inci çiçəyi), *fountain pen* (qələm), *blackbird* (qara quş) etc. are compound words and have no other variants;
3. Compound words are pronounced under one stress, but the components of phraseological units each have their own stresses.
4. A compound word consists of stems of words, in most cases not its every component but the whole compound word has only one stress.

Besides, compound words have solid and hyphenated spelling and we cannot insert another word between their components. But a phraseological unit consists of separate words and its every component has its own stress and they are written separately and in many cases we can insert another word between the components of phraseological units.

## Grammatical Types of Compound Words

There are various grammatical types of compounds: they are compound nouns, compound adjectives, compound verbs, compound adverbs and compound pronouns.

**Compound nouns**

There are the following types of compound nouns:

1. The stem of a noun preceded by the stem of another noun: *steam-ship, fountain-pen, classroom, sunbeam,* etc.
2. The stem of a noun preceded by the stem of an adjective: *sweet-heart, software, etc.*
   In all these cases the second part of a compound word expressing a general meaning is limited by the first.
3. The stem of a noun preceded by the stem of a verb: *tell-tale, dare-devil, cut-throat, breakfast, pickpocket* (a thief), *etc.*
   Here the first part of a compound word expressing a general meaning is made more exact by the second.
4. The stems of two nouns with a preposition in the middle: *mother-in-law, father- in- law, stay-at-home,* etc.
5. The stems of two verbs with a conjunction in the middle: *come-and-go.*
   The parts of a compound word are independent here.

**Compound adjectives**

The most common ways forming compound adjectives are the following:

1) the stem of an adjective preceeded by the stem of a noun: *skyblue, coalblack, heartfree,* etc.
2) the stem of a noun followed by the stem of a participle: *sunburnt, homekeeping, card-carrying, breath-taking,* etc.

In all these cases the second part expressing the general meaning is made more exact by the first.

3) the stem of an adjective and the stem of a noun with the suffix *-ed*: *goodnatured, openhearted, long-legged,* etc.
The first part shows the quality. All these compounds with the suffix *-ed* are called compound derived words.

**Compound verbs**

There are few compound verbs in English. They are formed chiefly:

1) by the stem of a verb preceeded by the stem of an adjective: *to fulfill, to broadcast, to waylay,* etc.
2) the verb expresses a general meaning :
by the stem of a verb preceeded by the stem of a noun. E.g. *to backbite, to browbeat,* etc.

**Compound Adverbs in English**

Compound adverbs in English are formed by:

1) the stem of a pronoun and the stem of an adverb. E.g. *somewhere, anyhow, anywhere, somehow, etc.*
2) the stem of an adverb and the stem of the adverb *ever*. E.g. *whenever, however, whoever, etc.*

Here the second part expresses a general meaning.

**Compound pronouns**

They are formed by:

1) the stem of a pronoun plus the stem of a pronoun. E.g. *myself, himself, herself,* etc.
2) the stem of a pronoun plus the stem of a noun. E.g. *something, somebody, someone,* etc.
3) the stem of a pronoun and the stem of the adverb *ever*. E.g. *whoever, whatever, however,* etc.

Generally the meaning of compound words can be understood from the component parts. But very often the component of the word has a meaning which differs from the meanings of its components taken separately and the meaning cannot be derived from the meanings of its components. E.g. *blackboard, bluebottle, bluebell*, etc.

Very often compound words have figurative meanings. E.g. *to browbeat*.

**Composite Verbs**

One of the ways of forming new words is the addition of a word-building element to a verb. This element is placed after the verb which is written separately and has a stress of its own and is called postposition. All the verbs formed by means of this element are called composite verbs. This way is productive. We should distinguish between compound verbs and composite verbs.

In a compound verb there are two stems. But in a composite verb there is one stem and a word-building element. E.g. *to waylay* (compound verb); *to give up* (composite verb).

Postpositions are descendants of the old English adverbs and prefixes and in Modern English they are neither adverbs nor prepositions. The adverb is a word which expresses some additional circumstances attending an action or a quality.

The preposition is a form-word which is used to show its relation to some other words in the sentence. E.g.

I. *to sit still* - an adverb (how?)
   *to sit down* - does not answer any question, has no independent meaning;

II. She put her hat on the table; She put on her hat.

More often the following postpositions are used: *away, down, in, off, over, out, up.* They are homonyms of prepositions and adverbs.

The postposition is a word-building element and forms a single idea with a verb. Postpositions are polysemantic and can be divided into the following types:

1. Adverbial Postpositions

They modify the verbs showing direction: *to go: to go in, to go away, to go out, to go down, to go up, to go by, to go round.* In this case the meaning of a composite verb can be understood from the component parts.

11. Intensifying Postposition

They show stylistic shade. E.g. *eat = eat up; cut = cut off,* etc.

111. Lexical Postpositions or Idiomatic Expressions.

In this case the meaning of a composite verb cannot be derived from the meaning of its components. For ex.: *to give in; to bring up, to put down,* etc.

The corresponding nouns of some composite verbs have the opposite order of components and the meaning of such nouns is sometimes different too. E.g.

*to come in - income, to rush in - inrush, etc.*

Very often one and the same postposition with different verbs forms synonyms: *to write down - to put down; to go out – to come out; to step out – to pass out; to turn on – to switch on,* etc.

We should distinguish between composite verbs and verbs with prepositions by means of which they govern their object: *to get up, to wait for, to insist on,* etc.

The postposition is a word building element of a verb but sometimes it is used with other parts of speech:

1) with nouns: *a looker on, a passer by, the goings on,* the *way out, etc.*

The plural of these nouns is formed by the inflexion(s) which is added to the first element: *passers-by, lookers on,* but *grown ups.*

2) with adjectives: *hard up: high up, etc.*

*3)* with adverbs: *far off, near by, etc.*

**Criteria of Compounds**

There are three criterias of compounds:

1) **the closed or solid forms,** in which the words are melded together, such as: *firefly* (işıldaquş – zool.), *secondhand, childlike, redhead, keyboard, makeup, notebook,* etc; In the "solid" or "closed" forms short words appear together as one. These compounds consist of short (monosyllabic) units that often have been established in the language for a long time. For example, *housewife, wallpaper,* etc;

2) **the hyphenated form,** in which two or more words are connected by a hyphen. Compounds that contain affixes , such as *house-build(er) and single-mind(ed)(ness),* as well adjective-adjective and verb-verb compounds, such as *blue-green and freeze-dried* are often hyphenated. Compounds that contain articles (rent-a-cop), prepositions (mother-of-pearl), and the conjunction "and" (salt –and-pepper) are also often hyphenated.

**3) the open or spaced form** consisting of newer combinations of usually longer words, such as: *post office, middle class, full moon, lawn tennis,* etc.

In addition to this native English compounding, which consists of words derived from Latin, as *horticulture* and those of Greek origin, such as *photography*, the components of which are in bound form (connected by connecting vowels, which are most often *-i* and *-o* in Latin and Greek and cannot stand alone. Modifying compounds are often hyphenated to avoid confusion. For example, *an old - furniture salesman* clearly deals in *old furniture*, but an old furniture salesman would be an old man.

Comparative and superlative forms of adjectives are hyphenated when compounded with other modifiers: *the highest-priced car, the shorter-term loan.* But this is not always the case: *the most talented youngster.* Adverbs, words

ending in *-ly* are not hyphenated when compounded with other modifiers: *a highly rated bank, publicly held securities.*

When modifying a person with his or her age, the compounded phrase is hyphenated: *my six-year-old son.* However, when the age comes after the person, we don't use a hyphen. *My son is six years old,* but *he is six-year-old.*

There is no rule for determining if a compound word should be hyphenated, written separately or spelt together. When in doubt about it, one must consult a dictionary. In some words the usage is fixed, in others it varies.

**Plurals and Possessives of Compounds**

Most dictionaries will give variant spellings of compound plurals. If the compounds are with closed form, only one spelling is acceptable for some compounds, like *passersby.*

For hyphenated forms, the pluralizing *-s* is usually attached to the element that is actually beeing pluralized: *daughters-in-law, half-moons, mayors-elect.* The most significant word – generally the noun – takes the plural form. The significant word may be at the beginning, middle, or end of the term.

The possessive of a hyphenated compound is created by attaching an apostrophe *–s* to the end of the compound itself: *my daughter-in-law's car,*

## Derivational compounds. Reduplication. Ablaut combination. Rhyme combination. Pseudo combination

Derivational compounds or compound derivatives like "long-legged" do not fit the definition of compounds as words consisting of more than two free stems, because their second element is not a free stem. **Derivational compounds** are included into the compounds for two reasons: because the number of the root morphemes is more than one, and

because they are nearest to compounds in patterns. Derivational compounds are words, usually nouns and adjectives consisting of compound stem and a suffix. Their structural integrity is insured by the fact that suffixes refer to the combination as a whole, not to one of its elements: *house-keeping, blue-eyed, evil-hearted, kind-hearted, teenager,* etc.

Derivational compounds is very frequent. Its ICs are a noun phrase and turns them into the elements of a compound adjective. Similar examples are extremely numerous. Compounds of this type are formed very freely: *bare-legged, kind-hearted, absent-minded,* etc. In these examples the first element is an adjective stem: here are examples with a noun and a numeral stem as the first element: *four storied*, etc.

Another frequent type of derivational compounds are nouns with the suffix or added to a compound stem: *early-riser, hard-smoker, front-sitter*, etc.

In the coining of the derivational compounds two types of word-formation are at work. The suffix *-er* is one of the productive suffixes in forming derivational compounds: *man-eater, tooth-picker, shoe-maker* etc.

The group consists of reduplicative compounds that falls into three main subgroups: **reduplicative compounds proper, ablaut combinations and rhyme combinations.**

The repeating of parts of words to make new forms is called **reduplication.** Reduplicative compounds proper are not restricted to the repetition of onomatopoeic stems with intensifying effect, as it is sometimes suggested. Actually it is a very mixed group containing usual free forms, onomatopoeic stems and pseudo morphemes. Onomatopoeic repetition exists, but it is not very extensive : *hush-hush (secret ), murmur, pooh-pooh,* etc. In *blah-blah* "nonsence", 'idle talk" the constituents are pseudo morphemes which do not occur elsewhere.

There are various categories of this: ablaut (vowel substitution), exact and rhyming. The reduplicative compounds resemble in sound form, the rhyme combinations like *razzle-dazzle,* ablaut combinations like *sing-song.*

**Rhyme combinations** are also twin forms consisting of two elements, which are joined to rhyme: *fuddy-duddy, hanky-panky, hobson-jobson, hubble-bubble, boogie-woogie, harum-scarum.*

The choice of the basic sound cluster in some way or other is often not motivated. About 40% of those rhyme combinations are not motivated: *namby-pamby.* The pattern is emotionally charged and chiefly colloquial, jocular, often sentimental in a babyish way.

**Ablaut combinations** are twin forms consisting of one basic morpheme, sometimes a pseudo-morpheme, which is repeated in the other constituent with a different vowel: *chit-chat, knick-knack, ding-dong, tick-tock,* etc. Almost all of these use the vowel "i" in the first part of the reduplication and either "a" or "o" in the second part: *chit-chat, dilly-dally, fiddle-faddle, knick-knack, ping-pong, shilly-shally, tick-tock, wishy-washy,* etc.

**Exact combinations**: Several of the rhyme combinations are baby-talk, showing how they are used to help youngsters learn the language: *blah-blah, bye-bye, chi-chi, choo-choo, goody-goody, no-no,* etc.

## SHORTENING

In the process of communication words and word-groups can be shortened. The causes of shortening can be linguistic and extra-linguistic. By extra-linguistic causes changes in the life of people are meant. Shortenings are words produced by means of clipping full word or by shortening word-combinations, but having the meaning of the full word or combinations. As a type of word-building, shortening of spoken words is also called clipping or curtailment. It is regarded in the English language as far back as the 15th century. Newly shortened words appear continuously. They are neologisms: *demo-demonstration, telly-television, ltd-limited, biz-business, bus-omnibus,* etc.

The reasons why words are shortened are different. Sometimes it is done for the sake of economy. For ex.: the shortened word *ad* requires less place or time than the word *advertisement.* Many borrowings are shortened in Modern English, and they have got new meanings. Such as the French word *despote* which means *əyləncə, əyləndirmə, əyləndirilmə* is shortened in English as *sport* and has the meaning of *idman.*

In most cases a shortened word exists in the vocabulary together with the longer word from which it is derived and usually has the same lexical meaning. The question naturally arises whether the shortened forms and the original forms should be considered as separate words. They consider that a shortened word must be treated as a word variant of the original word from which it is derived. But other linguists consider them as two distinct words.

Shortening is a very important way of word formation. It increases the number of monosyllables. By means of shortening

stylistic synonyms and pet names are created. Sometimes the mere initials of a phrase come to be treated as a word. For ex.: *BC* = before Christ, *AD* = Anno Domini; This way of word formation is productive.

Lexical shortening or shortened variants of words and phrases are used as independent lexical units with a certain phonetic shape and semantic structure of their own. We may meet them both in oral and written speech, but others only in oral colloquial speech. E.g. *bus - omnibus, phone - telephone, mike - microphone,* etc.

Clipping consists in the cutting off of one or several syllables or a word. In many cases the stressed syllable is preserved, e.g. *sis* from *sister*, *Jap* from *Japanese,* etc.

Diminutives of proper names are often formed in this way, e.g. *AL* from *Alfred*, *Ed* from *Edward*, *Sam* from *Samuel*,etc.

## Types of Shortening

Traditionally shortenings are classified into several types depending on which part of the word is clipped.

Words formed by shortening can be divided into initial (apheresis), final (apocope) and middle (syncope).

1) Words that have been shortened at the beginning is called initial clipping (apheresis). It is a Greek word, means *apo* – off, *roptein* – to cut. For ex.: *phone* (telephone), *plane* (aeroplane), *story* (history), *car* (motor-car), *cycle* (bicycle), *bus* (omnibus), *versity* (university), etc.

2) Words that have been shortened at the end is called final clipping (apocope). It is also a Greek word, means *apo*-off, *hairem* – to take. For ex.: *taxi* (taximeter), *col* (college), *piano* (pianoforte), *lab* (laboratory), *exam* (examination), *ad* (advertisement), *zoo* (zoological garden), etc.

3) If the omission of a letter or unstressed syllable occurs in the middle of the word, it is called middle clipping (syncope). For ex.: *fancy* (fantacy), *maths* (mathematics), *ma'am* (madam), *specs* (spectacles), *pants* (pantaloons), *ne'er* (never), *ma'at* (market), etc. This way mostly results in stylistical synonyms, i.e. the words which have exactly the same meaning as the original ones, but are jargonic.

Words that have been clipped both at the beginning and at the end are called mixed clipping, e.g. *flu* (influenza), *tec* (detective), *frig* (refrigerator), etc.

It is typical of word-clipping in ME that in most cases it is the nouns that are shortened. There are very few clipped adjectives, all of them belonging to jargonize, e.g. *add* (ardent – ehtirasli, qaynar), *dilly* (delightful –valehedici), and some others. As for clipped verbs it is usually a case of conversion from clipped nouns, e.g. *to taxi* from taxi, *to phone* from phone, *to perm* from perm (a permanent wave), etc.

When performing in the sentence, abbreviations take on grammatical inflections, e.g. M.P.s, M.P.'s, etc.

Shortened words may be used with the definite and the indefinite articles, e.g. the B.B.C., a bike, the radar (radio detection and ranging), etc.

**Graphical Abbreviations**

In Modern English many new abbreviations, acronyms, blends are formed, because the tempo of life is increasing and it becomes necessary to give more and more information in the shortest possible time. An abbreviation (from Latin *brevis*, meaning *short)* is a shortened form of a word or phrase.

Usually, but not always, it consists of a letter or group of letters taken from the word or phrase. For ex. the word

*abbreviation* can itself be represented by the *abbreviation, abbr., abbrv., or abbrev.*

Graphical abbreviations are the result of shortening of words and word—groups only in written speech while orally the corresponding full forms are used. They are used for the economy of space and effort in writing. Distinction should be made between graphical and lexical shortening. Graphical signs and symbols stand for the full word combination of words only in written speech. In oral speech graphical abbreviations have the pronunciation of full words: p – page, Golf – Gentleman only, ladies are forbidden, MR –minister, Miss – missis.

The characteristic feature of graphical abbreviation is that they are restricted in use to written speech, occuring only in various kinds of texts, articles, books, advertisements, letters, etc. In reading many of them are sudstituted by the words and phrases that they represent. E.g. *Dr -doctor, Mr – mister, oct-october*, etc.

Distinction should be made between shortening of words in written speech and in oral speech. Graphical abbrivations are used in various spheres of human activity. During World War I and later the custom became very popular not only in English speaking countries, but in other parts of the world as well, to call countries, governmental, social, military, industrial and trade organizations and officials not by their full titles, but by initial abbrivations derived from writing: the USA, UN, NATO, UNESCO, CIC –Commonwealth of Independent Countries;

The oldest group of graphical abbreviations in English is of Latin origin. In these aabbreviations in the spelling Latin words are shortened, while orally the corresponding English equivalents are pronounced in the full form.

For ex.: *a.m.*[ei 'em] (Lat. ante meridiem – in the morning), *p.m.*[pi: 'em] (Lat. post meridiem - in the afternoon), *cf*

(Lat.conferre-compare), *e.g.* (Lat. exampli gratia) - for example, *i.e.* (Lat. id est) - that is, *No* (Lat. numero) – number, *p.a.* (Lat. per annum) – a year, *d* (Lat. dinarius) – penny, *lb* (Lat. libra) –pound.

Some graphical abbreviations of Latin origin have different English equivalents in different contexts, e.g. *p.m.* can be pronounced "in the afternoon"(post meridiem) and "after death" (post mortem).

Some graphical abbrivations gradually penetrate into the sphere of oral intercourse. E.g.

*M.P.* - Member of Parlament, *S.O.S.* – Save our Souls, a wireless co-signal of extreme distress, also figuratively, any despairing cry for help, etc.

There are cases of the so-called semishortenings when the second word is preserved, the first is abbreviated: *H-bomb ([ˈeitʃ ˈbɔm] (hydrogen bomb), V-day [viˈdei] (victory day), E-voting (electron voting — elektron səsvermə);* or when one word is shortened and the other is omitted: *pop – popular music,* etc.

There are also graphical abbreviations of native origin, where in the spelling we have abbreviations of words and word-groups of the corresponding English equivalents in the full form. We have several semantic groups of them:

a) days of the week, e.g. *Mon –Monday, Tue –Tuesday,* etc.
b) names of months, e.g. *Apr – April, Aug –Augest,* etc.
c) names of states in USA, e.g. *Ala – Alabama, Alas – Alaska,* etc.
d) names of counties in UK, e.g. *Yorks – Yorkshire, Berks – Berkshire,* etc.
e) names of address, e.g. *Mr., Mrs., Ms., Dr.,* etc.
f) military ranks. e.g. *capt. – captain, col., - colonel, sgt. – sergeant,* etc.

g) scientific degrees, e.g. *B.A. – Bachelor of Arts, D.Ph. – Doctor of Philology,* etc.
h) units of time, length, weight, e.g. *ft.- foot/feet, sec.- second, in. – inch, mg. - milligram,* etc.

Reading of some graphical abbreviations depends on the context, e.g. *m.* can be read as "male, married, metre, mile, million, minite", etc.

To form the plural of an abbreviation, a number, or a capital letter used as a noun, simply add *s* to the end. For ex. a group of *MPs*, mind your *Ps and Gs*., but to indicate the plural of the abbreviation of a unit of measure, the same form is used as in the singular. For ex. *1 ft or 16 ft.; 1 min or 45 min,* etc.

As a rule, lexical abbreviations do not include functional words (prepositions, articles, etc), although there are some exceptions, e.g. R. and D. ['a:rən'di:] – research and development program, etc.

Lexical abbreviations first make their appearance in written speech, mostly in newspaper style and in the style of scientific prose and gradually find their way into the sphere of oral intercourse.

**Acronyms**

There are two ways to read and pronounce such abbreviations:

As a succession of the alphabetical readings of the constituent letters, it was spoken above, such as BBC ['bi:'bi:'si;] – British Broadcasting Corporation; TV ['ti:'vi:] – television, MP [ˈem ˈpi] = Members of Parliament; SOS [ˈes ˈou ˈes] = Save our Souls.

If the abbreviated written form can be read as though it were an ordinary English word it will be read like one. Many examples are furnished by political and technical vocabulary, e.g. UNO ['ju:nou]. - United Nations Organization; NATO

['neitou] – North Atlantic Treaty Organization, UNESCO ['juneskou] – United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, etc. Such kind of abbreviations are called acronyms. They are formed from the initial letters of a name.

The difference between acronyms and abbreviations is this: acronyms are proper words created from the initial letters or two of the words in a phrase and they are pronounced like other words (NATO, from North Atlantic Treaty Organization) or by combining initial letters of a series of words (radar, from radio detection and ranging). By contrast, abbreviations do not form proper words and so they are pronounced as strings of letters. For ex. 'U 'S 'A, 'M 'P, but there are some abbreviations, such as: *rd* - road, *str* – street, etc. are used in addresses on envelopes, etc.

Acronyms are lexical derivations of a phrase. They are regular vocabulary units spoken as words. Acronyms may be formed from the initial syllables of each word of the phrase, e.g. *interpol = inter /national pol/ice,* etc.

Acronyms may be formed by a combination of the abbrevation of the first or the first two members of the phrase with the last member undergoing no change at all, e.g. *V-day = Victory Day, H-bomb = hydrogen bomb,* etc. It's sometimes even used in oficial documents, financial documents and other documents. For ex.

| | |
|---|---|
| BFN | Bye for now |
| DYK | Do you know |
| HHJK | Ha,ha, just kidding |
| HLM | He loves me |
| IDK | I don't know |
| IHY | I hate you |
| KIT | Keep in touch |

In some cases the translation of initial letters is next to impossible without using special dictionaries:

| | |
|---|---|
| **T** ankful | **O** ne |
| **E** nergetic | **B** ogus |
| **A** ble | **A** sshole |
| **C** heerful | **M** onipulating |
| **H** ardworking | **A** merica |
| **E** nthusiastic | |
| **R** emarkable | |

**Blendings**

Among these formations there is specific group that has attracted special attention of several authors and was given several different names: *blends, blendings and portmanteau* words. The last term is due to *Lewis Carrol,* the author of "Alice in Wonderland" and "Through the Looking Glass". One of the most linguistically conscious writers, he made a special technique of using blends coined by himself, such as: *chortle* (v)< *chuckle* + *snort, mimsy* (adj) <*miserable* + *flimsy, galumph* (v) <*galoop* + *triumph.* Humpty-Dumpty explaining these words to Alice says: "You see it's like a portmanteau - there are two meanings packed up into one word".

So the term "blending" is used to denote the method of merging parts of words (not morphemes) into one need word. Blends are words formed from a word-group or two synonyms. In blends two ways of word-building are combined: abbreviation and composition. Blending signage the method of merging parts of words into one new word; the result is a blend, also known as a portmanteau.

This prosess of formation is also called *telescoping*, because the words seem to slide into one another like sections of telescope. Let us compare the one of the more recent examples "bit", the fundamental unit of information, which is short for *binary digit*. Blending is in fact compounding by means of clipped words. Many blends are short-lived.

There are two types of blendings that can be distinguished. One is additive, the second is restrictive.

The additive type is combined by the conjunction *and* :

cablegram = *cable and telegram*, twirl = *twist and whirl*, zebrule = *zebra and mule*, swellegant = *swell and elegant*, pomato = *potato and tomato*, glaze = *glare and gaze*, galumph = *gallop and triumph*, fruice = *fruit and juice*, animule = *animal and mule*, smog = *smoke and fog;* brunch = *breakfast and lunch;* Frenglish = *French and English;* flush = *flash and blush*, dollarature = *dollar and literature*, flurry = *flash and hurry*, etc.

The restrictive type is transformable into an attributive phrase, where the first element serves as modifier of the second:

*digicam = digital camera*, medicare >*medical care*, Niffles >*Niagara Falls*, *slanguage* >*slang language*, positron >*positive electron*, telecast >*television broadcast*, cinemadict >*cinema adict*, dramedy > *drama comedy*, detectifiction > *detective fiction*, magalog > *magazine catalogue*, slanguist > *slang linguist*, etc.

In English in order not to pronounce polysyllabic words, they were simplified in old language:

*Goodbye = God be with you*, etc.

Blendings, although are not very numerous altogether, but seem to be on the rise, especially in terminology and also in trade advertisements. A specifically English word pattern absent in languages, must be described in connection with

initial abbreviations in which the first element is a letter and the second a complete word. For example, *A-bomb, A-terror, H-accident risk, H-test,* etc. where *A* stands for atomic or atomic bomb, and *H* for hydrogen bomb. The pronunciation is alphabetic.

No stylistic or semantic generalization on this type seems possible, the example beeing of different types. Alongside the examples of words in *H-* connected with nuclear weapons, but in *lady's H-bag,* it is for *handbag.*

All kinds of shortenings are very productive in present-day English.They are specially numerous in colloquial speech, both familiar colloquial and professional slang.

## Minor Types of Word Formation

**Sound interchange.**

It is the gradation of sounds occupying one and the same place in the sound form of one and the same morpheme.

Sound interchange may be defined as an opposition in which words or word forms are differentiated due to an alternation in the phonemic composition of the root. The change may affect the root vowel, as: *food n: : feed v;* or root consonant as in *speak v : : speech n;* or both, as for instance in *life n : : live v.* By means of vowel interchange we distinguish different parts of speech or transitive and intransitive verbs. E.g.

a) *full (adj) - to fill (v), song(n) - to sing (v), food (n) - to feed (v).* etc.

b) *to sit - to set, to lie - to lay, to fall – to fell,* etc.

Consonant interchange means by which one part of speech is formed from another by shifting the final consonant. In some cases the difference in pronunciation is accompanied by difference in spelling, in other cases it is not. Generally verbs

have a voiced consonant at the end and in nouns, it is changed into a voiceless consonant. E.g. *house - to house, use - to use,* etc.

Consonant interchange may be combined with vowel interchange. E.g. *bath - to bathe, breath - to breathe, life - to live.*

It may also be combined with affixation: *strong a: : strength n, long a: : length n, deep a: : depth n,* or with affixation and shift of stress as: *'democrat : : democracy, delicate a: : delicacy n, pirate n : : piracy n, vacant a : : vacancy n,* etc.

The process is not active in the language at present and the oppositions like those listed above survive in the vocabulary only as remnants of previous stages. The sound interchange is not productive now.

Synchronically sound interchange should not be considered as a method of word building at all, but rather as a basis for contrasting words belonging to the same word-family and different parts of speech or different lexico-grammatical groups. The causes of sound interchange are twofold and one should learn to differentiate them from the historical point of view. Some of them are due to ablaut or vowel gradation characteristic of Indio-European languages and consisting in a change from one to another vowel accompanying a change of stress. The phenomenon is best known as a series of relations between vowels by which the stems of strong verbs are differentiated in grammar (drink-drank-drunk).

**Stress-interchange**

Many English verbs of Latin, French origin are distinguished from the corresponding nouns by the position of stress. E.g. *to pre'sent v = 'present n, to ob'ject v = 'object n, to ex'port v = 'export n, to im'port v = 'import n, 'absent a =:*

*to ab'sent v, 'frequent a = to fre'quent v, 'perfect a = to per'fect v, 'abstract a = to ab'stract v*, etc.

It should be mentioned that words are no longer formed by means of sound interchange and stress - interchange.

Both sound and stress-interchange may be regarded as ways of forming words only diachronically, because in ME not a single word can be coined by changing the root-vowel of a word or by shifting the place of the stress. Sound-interchange as well as stress-interchange is absolutely non-productive ways of word-formation. *E.g. to sing-song, to live-life, to breathe-breath*, etc.

Sound-interchange naturally falls into two groups: vowel-interchange and consonant-interchange. By means of vowel-interchange we distinguish different parts of speech, e.g. *fill-to full, food-to feed, blood-to bleed, etc.*

In some cases vowel-interchange is combined with affixation. E.g. *long-length, strong-strength, broad –breadth, nature-natural, nation-national*, etc.

Intransitive verb and corresponding transitive ones with a causative meaning also display vowel-interchange. E.g. *to rise-to raise, to sit-to set, to lie-to lay, to fall-to fell, etc.*

The type of consonant-interchange typical of ME is the interchange of a voiceless fricative consonant in a noun and the corresponding voiced consonant in the corresponding verb. E.g. *use-to use, mouth-to mouth, house-to house, advice-to advise, etc.*

Consonant–interchange may be combined with vowel-interchange, e.g. *bath-to bathe, breath-to breathe, life-to live, etc.*

It is worth noting that stress alone, unaccompanied by any other differentiating factor does not seem to provide a very effective means of distinguishing words, And this is, the reason why opposition of this kind are neither regular nor productive.

**Sound Imitation or Onomatopoeia words.**

The great majority of motivated words in presnt-day language are motivated by reference to other words in the language, to the morphemes that go to compose them and to their arrangement. Therefore, even if one hears the noun *wage-earner* for the first time, one understands it, knowing the meaning of the words *wage* and *earn* and the structural pattern noun stem + verbal stem + -er as in *bread-winner, skyscraper, hard-smoker, tooth-picker, etc.* But sound imitating or onomopoeic words are on the contrary motivated with reference to extra-linguistic reality, they are echoes of natural sounds (*lullaby, twang, whiz).* It is the formation of new words on the basis of imitating the sounds of nature, birds, animals or other lifeless things. They are the naming of an action or a thing. For instance, words naming sounds and movement of water: *babble, blob, bubble, flush, gurgle, gush, splash,* etc. Then there are sounds produced by animals, birds and insects. E.g. *buzz, cackle, croak, crow, hiss, honk, howl, moo, mew, neigh, purr, roar* and others. Some birds are named after the sound they make, these are *the crow, the cuckoo, the whippoorwill* and a few others. There are others imitating the noise of metallic things: *clink, tinkle*, or forceful motion: *clash, crash, whack, whip, whisk, etc.*

The term onomatopoeia is from Greek *onoma* (name, word) and *poiein* (to make) – (the making of words 'in imitation of sounds'). It would be wrong to think that onomatopoeic words reflect the real sounds directly, irrespective of the language, because the same sounds are represented differently in different languages. Onomatopoeic words adopt the phonetic features of English and fall into the combinations peculiar to it. It becomes obvious when one compares onomatopoeic words *crow* and *twitter* and the words *flow* and *glitter* with which they are rhymed in the following poem:

*The cock is crowing,*
*The stream is flowing.*
*The small birds twitter,*

*The lake does glitter,*
*The green fields sleep in the sun.*

This method does not give many words, but is known in many languages. E.g. *to buzz, to bleat, to whistle, to roar, to moo, to mew, to whisper, babble, gush, splash,* etc. Such kind of words reflect the real sounds directly, irrespective of the laws of the language. Many verbs denote sounds produced by human beings in the process of communication or in expressing their feelings: *chatter, babble, grunt, grumble, murmur, titter, giggle, mutter,* etc.

Some linguists consider them sound symbolism. As the same combinations of sounds are used in many similar words, they become more closely associated with the meaning. For ex.: *flap, flip, flop, flash, flush, glimmer, gabble, glitter, glare, slush, sleet, slime.*

Here, *fl-* is associated with quick movement, *gl-* with light and fire, *sl-* with mud, etc.

Onomatopoeic words are very expressive and sometimes it is difficult to tell a noun from an interjection. E.g. bang!, hush!, pooh! etc.

Once being coined, onomatopoeic words lend themselves easily to further word-building and to semantic development. They readily develop figurative meanings. *Croak*, for instance, means "to make a deep harsh sound". In its direct meaning the verb is used about frogs or ravens. Metaphorically it may be used about a hoarse human voice.

**Back- Formation**

Back-formation (also called reversion) is a term norrowed from diachronic linguistics. It denotes the derivation of new words by subtracting a real or supposed affix from existing words through misinterpretation of their structure. The phenomenon was already introduced in when discussing compounding verbs. The process is based on the similarity of names, e.g. French *"contredanse"*, orig. "*English country dance*" or the words

*beggar, butler, cobbler, typewriter* look very much like agent nouns with the suffix –er/-or, such as *actor* or *painter*. Their last syllable is therefore taken for a suffix and subtracted from the word leaving what is understood as a verbal stem.

The very frequency of the pattern verb stem+-er (or its equivalents) is a matter of common knowledge. Nothing more natural therefore than the prominent part this pattern plays in back-formation. Alongside the examples already cited above are *burgle v < burgler n; cobble v < cobbler n; sculpt v < sculptor n.* This phenomenon is conveniently explained on the basis of proportional lexical oppositions.

$$\frac{\textit{teacher}}{\textit{teach}} = \frac{\textit{painter}}{\textit{paint}} = \frac{\textit{butler}}{x}$$

then *x=butle*, and *to butle* must mean "to act as butler".

The process of back-formation has only diachronic relevance. For synchronic approach *butler : : butle* is equvalent *to painter : : paint*, so that the present-day speaker may not feel any difference between these relationships. The fact that *butle* is derived from *butler* through misinterpretation is synchronically of no importance.

The most productive type of back-formation in present-day English is derivation of verbs from compounds that have either *–er* or *-ing* as their last element. This type will be clear from the following examples: *thought-read v < thought-reader n < thought-reading n; air-condition v < air-conditioner n < air-conditioning n.* Other examples of back-formations from compoundings are the verbs *baby-sit, house-break, house-clean, house-keep, tape-record* and many others.

The semantic relationship between the prototype and the derivative is regular. *Baby-sit*, for example, means 'to act or become employed as a baby-sitter', that is to take care of children for short periods of time while the parents are away from home.

# ETYMOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH WORDS

A foreign language is not just a subject learnt in a classroom, It is something used for communication by real people in real situation. Language belongs to each of us, everyone uses words. What there in a language that makes people so curious? The answer is that there is almost nothing in our life that is not touched by the language.

We all speak and we all listen, so we are all interested in the origin of the words, in how they appear and die. An international vocabulary in any language changes due to the development of economy, science, etc.

Everything depends on time. So etymology helps us to find out the origin, formation and primary meaning of words. Etymology is sometimes thought of as the study of the "true meaning" of the word, but this is not what it is. It is the concern of etymology to study the history of a word. Thus it examines when and how a word entered the language, how its original form changed over the years and how its meaning evolved.

Etymology is a branch of linguistics concerned with the facts relating to the origin, formation and primary meaning of words. Etymology is the study of the history of words and how their form and meaning have changed over time. Generally it is learned in the Historical Lexicology. Historical Lexicology learns not only the etymology of those which exists nowadays, but also words that are not already used. So, etymology has two investigation fields: 1) false etymology or folk etymology and 2) scientific etymology.

## Folk Etymology

Folk etymology is a linguistic phenomenon whereby borrowed or archaic phrases are reinterpreted according to analogy with other common words or phrases in the language. In folk etymology, speakers of a language assume the etymology of a word or phrase by comparing it to similar-sounding words or phrases that already exist in the language. In **folk etymology** the historical development of words are not taken into consideration.

The term "folk etymology" comes from German "Volksetymologie". It goes back to the remotest past of the history of the language. The reason is not far to seek. When confronted with a strange or foreign word, people sometimes try to make it over so that it will be easier to pronounce.

In English the changes of that type come in numbers not only in dialects, but in the literary language as well. About 1660 the influence of herbalists, botanists and horticultural writers made the term "asparagus" familiar. By folk etymology the word was corrupted to *sparrow-grass*. The word was widely used in earlier times. During the 18-th century *asparagus* returned to literary use, and *sparrow-grass* has become a vulgarism. It is seldom heard to-day, except in a joke. Another example, if someone thought that *Manhattan* got its name from *Man With Hat On* then they would be doing folk etymology, or the word *rhyme* came from Old English *rim* (measure) and would naturally be *rime* in Modern English. But scholars attempted to drive it from the Greek *rhythmos* and the spelling *rhyme* is the result of their efforts.

The words *debt and doubt* which had been adopted through French (in Chaucer's language *dette — doute*) were corrected and changed in spelling by the insertion of *b* in order to show their relation to Latin *debitum and dubitare* respectively.

Folk etymology is usually used in borrowed words. Sometimes in an attempt to find motivation for a borrowed word the speakers change its form. This is a mistaken motivation and is called folk etymology. This case is not frequent. E.g. the international radio-telephone signal *may-day* corresponding to the telegraphic SOS used by aeroplanes and ships in distress. It has nothing to do with the *May Day*. It is a phonetic rendering of French *m'aidez* – help me.

In some cases the structure and the pronunciation are difficult to the people. So, the people contrast such borrowed words with difficult pronunciation to the understandable words, which are already known to them and find out the easiest way to utter them.

It is worth mentioning that changes of that type come in numbers not only from the popular masses but from scientific investigation as well.

Besides, that is the formation of a new word due to the wrong analysis of already existing root the ending of which coincide with some well-known suffixes. These endings are taken away and new words appear. For ex. *to burgle* has been created from *burglar*, *to beg* from the *beggar*, *to edit* from the word *editor*, *to coble* from the word *cobler*, etc.

The following examples are proved as folk etymology:

*Bridegroom* provides a good example. What has a *groom* got to do with getting married? The true explanation is more prosaic. The Middle English form was *bridgome*, which goes back to Old English *brydguma*, from "bride" + guma "man". However, *gome* died out during the Middle English period. By the 16th century its meaning was no longer apparent, and it came to be popularly replaced by a similar-sounding word, *grome*, "serving lad". This later developed the sense of "servant having care of horses", which is the dominant sense

today. But *bridegroom* never meant anything more than "bride's man".

Spanish *cucaracha* became by folk etymology *cockroach*.

*Butt-naked* from the term *buck-naked; lanthorn* (as old lanterns were glazed with strips of cow's horn) from *lantern*; *shame-faced* from *shamefast* "caught in shame"; the name Antony/Anthony is often spelled with an [h] because of the Elizabethan belief that it is derived from Greek *ανθος (flower)*. In fact it is a Roman family name and so on.

**Scientific Etymology**

The historical development and phonetic changes are essential for **scientific etymology.**

The word "etymology" derives from the Greek – etumologiä. from **"etumos"**, which means **"true or real".** The ending "-ology" suggests the **"study/science"** of something. It is the study of the origins of words. The Greek poet Pindar employed creative etymologies to flatter his patrons.

According to the etymological principle the English vocabulary is usually divided into the following groups: 1) native words and 2) borrowed (or loan) words.

Numerically the borrowed stock of words is considerably larger than the native words.

1.The native word – stock which makes up about 30 % of the vocabulary;

2.The borrowed or loan words, which make up more than 70 % of the English vocabulary.

The term *borrowing* (loan words) is used in linguistics to denote the process of adopting words from other languages. It is one of the ways of enlarging of the vocabulary. There is no language without loan words.

The analysis of the English vocabulary from the point of view of the etymology shows that it is mixed. There are many foreign elements in Modern English vocabulary. The reason for it lies in the history of the English people who had come across with many other peoples and their languages.

**Native words**

The native words form the main body of the English language. In linguistic literature the term native is used to denote words of Anglo-Saxon origin brought to the British Isles from the continent in the 5th century by the Germanic tribes – the Angles, the Saxons and the Jutes.

Words of native origin consist of very ancient elements – Indo-European, Germanic and West Germanic cognates. Anglo-Saxon word-stock is about 25-30 %. Almost all words of Anglo-Saxon origin belong to very important semantic groups. There include:

- most of the auxiliary and modal verbs *(shall,will, must, can, may)*;
- pronouns– personal (except "they" which is a Scandinavian borrowing) and demonstrative;
- prepositions (*in, out, on, under*);
- numerals from one to hundred *(one, two, three);*
- conjunctions (*and, but, as*).
- National words of Anglo-Saxon origin include such groups as words denoting parts of human body (*head, hand, arm,finger, bone, heart);*
- members of the family and the closest relatives *(father, mother, son, daughter, wife*);
- natural phenomena and planets *(snow, rain, wind, sun, star, frost);*
- animals *(horse, cow, swine, sheep, bear, fox, calf)*;

- plants *(tree, oak, fir, grass, birch, corn);*
- time of day *(day, night);*
- heavenly bodies (*sun, moon, star);*
- numerous adjectives, qualities and properties (*green, blue, white, small, thick, high, good, old, young, cold, hot, long*);
- seasons of the year (*winter, spring, summer);*
- human dwelling and furniture *(house, room, bench);*
- common actions *(do, make, go, give, drink, answer, say, tell, speak, hear, see*).

Most of the English native words have undergone great changes in their semantic structure and as a result nowadays they are polysemantic. E.g. the word *finger* does not only denote a part of a hand as in OE, but also:

1) the part of a glove covering one of the fingers;
2) a fingerlike part in various machines;
3) a hand of a clock;
4) an index;
5) a unit of a measurement.

Highly polysemantic are words: *man, head, hand, go*, etc.

Anglo-Saxon words are root words. Such affixes of native origin as *–ness, -ish, -ed, un-, mis-* make part of the patterns widely used to build numerous new words throughout the whole history of English. Most words of native origin make up large clusters of derived and compound words in the present day language, e.g. the word "wood" is the basis for the formation of the following words: *wooden, woody, wooded, woodcraft, woodcutter, woodwork, woodpecker* and many others. The formation of new words are greatly facilitated by the fact that most Anglo-Saxon words are root-word.

Loan words are divided into two groups:

1. **Denizens** are words of foreign origin which have been accommodated to the English language by the substitutions of English sounds for the unusual foreign ones. They are usually

associated by the words, and sometimes oust them and become, indistinguishable from the native element. E.g. *leg for leggs* (Iceland); *sign for signe* (French); *surndler[swindlə] for schwindler* (Germ.), etc.

2. **Aliens** are words which borrowed from foreign languages without change of the foreign spelling and which are immediately recognised as foreign words. They have kept their spellings and pronunciation. E.g. *fiancee, garage, mirage, champagne, leisure, pleasure,* etc.

We can find the following types of loan words in the English language.

**Borrowing or Loan Words in English**

Borrowing words from other languages are characteristic of English throughout its history. More than two thirds of the English vocabulary are borrowings. Borrowed words are different from native ones by their phonetic structure, by their morphological structure and also by their grammatical forms. English history is very rich in different types of contacts with other countries, that's why it is very rich in borrowings. The Roman invasion, the adoption of Christianity, Scandinavian and Norman conquests of the British Isles, the development of British colonialism and trade and cultural relations served to increase immensely the English vocabulary. The majority of these borrowings are fully assimilated in English in their pronunciation, grammar, spelling and can be hardly distinguished from native words. The main languages from which words were borrowed into English are described, such as: Latin, Scandinavian, French, Greek, Italian, Spanish. Russian and others.

## Celtic Words

By the 5th - 6th century several of the Germanic tribes (the Angles, the Saxons and Jutes) migrated across the sea to the British Isles. There they were confronted by the Celts, the original inhabitants of the Isles. The Celts desperately defended their lands against the invaders. Through numerous contacts with the defated Celts, the conquerors borrowed a number of Celtic words (*bald, down, hard, cradle, valley*). Especially many words among the Celtic borrowings were place names, names of rivers, hills, etc. The names of rivers *Avon, Devon, Thames, Cornwell Exe, Ux* originate from Celtic words meaning "river" and "water".

Later on some Celtic words came through French. For ex. *car, career, cloak, etc.*

In the XIII century some Celtic words came from Scotland and Ireland.

E.g. *clan* (klan) , *tory* («Tory» partiyası ) *plaid*, etc.

The word 'tory" originally meant "robber", but now it is the name of a political party. The Celtic element in the English vocabulary is quite insignificant.

## Latin Words (the history of Latin borrowings)

### The Latin influences on Old English.

Latin was not the language of a conquered people. It was the language of a higher civilization, a civilization from which the Anglo-Saxons had much to learn. It began long before the Anglo-Saxons came to England and continued throughout the Old English period. For several hundred years, while the Germanic tribes who later became the English were still occupying their continental homes, they had various relations

with the Romans through which they acquired a considerable number of Latin words. Later when they came to England they saw the evidences of the long Roman rule in the iseland and learned from the Celts a few additional Latin words, which had been acquired by them.

**Latin influence of the Zero Period (first layer)**

Latin words began to penetrate into the English vocabulary at an early stage of the English history. They were brought by Anglo-Saxons from the continent and some of them existed in the language of local population of the British Isles because Romans had been there in the I century and left some traces of their civilization (it was mentioned before).

So, these Latin words refer to the objects of trade. E.g. *butter, dish, wine, pepper, pear, peach, plum, kitchen, kettle, cook, cheese*, etc.

Most of the territory now known to us as Europe was occupied by the Roman Empire. Among the inhabitants of the Europe are Germanic tribes. Their stage of development was rather primitive, especially if compared with the high civilization of Rome. They are primitive cattle-breeders and know almost nothing about land cultivation. Their tribal languages contain only Indo-European and Germanic elements.

Due to Roman invasion Germanic tribes had to come into contact with Romans. Romans built roads, bridges, military camps. Trade is carried on and the Germanic people gain knowledge of new and useful things. The first among them are new things to eat. It has been mentioned that Germanic cattle-breeding was on a primitive scale. Its only products were meat and milk. It is from the Romans that they learned how to make butter and cheese. As there are naturally no words for these foodstuffs in their tribal languages, they had to use the Latin words to name them. It is also the Romans that the Germanic

tribes owe the knowledge of some new fruits and vegetables of which they had no idea before and the Latin names of these fruits and vegetables entered their vocabularies: *cherry, pear, plum, pea, beet, pepper, cup, kitchen, mill, port, wine* and so on.

Romans built some fortresses and camps there. So, such kind of Latin words entered the English vocabulary. E,g. *strata (street), wall, campus (camp), castra (castle-Latin origin), colony (Latin - colonia)* etc.

Some Latin elements remain in some geographical names, ending in *chester = Manchester, Winchester. Lancaster* (from Latin castrum = a fortified camp), *Doncaster*, etc. A few other words are thought for one reason or another to belong to this period: *port* (harbor, gate, town) from Latin "portus"; *munt* (mountain) from Latin "montem"; *torr* (tower, rock) from Lanin "turns", etc. All of these words are found also as elements in place-names. However, the Latin influence of the First Period remains much the slightest of all the influences which Old English owed to contact with Roman civilization.

**Latin influence of the Second Period**

The greatest influence of Latin upon Old English was occasioned by the introduction of Christianity into Britain in 597. This date marks the beginning of a systematic attempt on the part of Rome to convert the inhabitants and makes England a Christian country. This layer was significant for the christianization of England. These words express religious notions. They came to Britian in the $6^{th}$ and $7^{th}$ centuries when the English people were converted to Christianity. According to the well-known story reported by Bede as a tradition current in his day, the mission of St.Augustine was inspired by an experience of a man who later became Pope

Grigory the Great. He sent his missionaries to Britain to convert them into christianity (English people were heathens at that time). Latin was the official language of the Christian church and consequently the spread of Christianity was accompanied by a new period of Latin borrowings.The introduction of Christianity meant the buildings of churches and the establishment of monasteries.

As Latin was the language of christianity many religious terms entered the English vocabulary. They are: *monk, priest, angel, anthem, candle, canon, clerk, hymn, minister, dean, abbot, pope, apostle, bishop, circle, martyr, mass, master(magister), noon, offer, organ, palm, paper, rule, shrift,* etc.

Some of these words were reintroduced later. But the church also exercised a profound influence on the domestic life of the people. This is seen in the adoption of many words, such as the names of articles of clothing and household use: *cap, sock, silk, purple, chest, sack;* words denoting foods, such as: *beet, caul (cabbage), millet (OE mil), pear, radish, lobster;* names of trees, plants, and herbs, such as: *aloes, balsam, fennel, hysop, lily, mallow* and the general word "plant".

Among the Latin words there are many Greek words *(minister, dean, anthem, devil, church,* etc.).

It was natural that educational terms were also Latin borrowings, for the first schools in England were church schools, and the first teachers were priests and monks. So the word *"school"* is a Latin borrowing (Lat. schola, of Greek origin), and so are such words as "scholar" and "magister".

Some words of general meaning were also borrowed at that time. E.g. *plant, chalk, spade, lion, tiger,* etc.

## The third layer of Latin Borrowings

This layer of Latin borrowings includes words which came into English due to two historical events: the Norman Conquest and the epoch of Renaissance (XV – XVI centuries).

The Renaissance was the epoch of geographical discoveries of the development of literature and art. That's why these borrowed words are connected with science, literature and art. The Renaissance was a period of extensive cultural contacts between the major European states. Therefore, it was only natural that new words also entered the English vocabulary from other European languages. The most significant were French borrowings. This time they came from the Parisian dialect of French and are known as Parisian borrowings. Examples: *routine, police, machine, ballet, scene, technique, bourgeois,* etc.

They were borrowed from books, not through personal intercourse, as it was the case with the words of the first and second layers.

The words of the third layer are often called *scientific* or *bookish*, or *learned* words. These words were not used as frequently as the words of the Old English period, therefore some of them were partly assimilated grammatically. Many of them have retained their Latin aspects. For ex.:

*minimum, maximum, genius, datium, antenna, memorandum,* etc.

Latin words have the following features:

1) All the verbs of the English language ending in *-ate* and *-ute* are of Latin origin.

E.g. *to exaggerate, to narrate, to persecute, to execute, to translate,* etc.

2) All the adjectives ending in *-ior* are of Latin origin.

E.g. *superior, senior, junior*,etc.

3) Some of the English nouns have two adjectives:

a) Latin;
b) Anglo-Saxon

| Anglo-Saxon | | Latin |
|---|---|---|
| Noun | adjectives | adjectives |
| *Sun* | *sunny* | *solar* |
| *Moon* | *moony* | *lunar* |
| *Father* | *fatherly* | *paternal* |
| *Mother* | *motherly* | *maternal* |
| *Brother* | *brotherly* | *fraternal* |

There are some nouns which have only Latin adjectives:

| English nouns | English adjectives | Latin adjectives |
|---|---|---|
| *Eye* | ---------- | *ocular* |
| *Mind* | ---------- | *mental* |
| *Tooth* | --------- | *dental* |

1) Some of Latin shortened words are used in the written language. For ex.: *e.g.* (exampli gratia) – for example; etc. (et cetera) – and the rest; *i.e.* (id est) – that is; *a.m.* (ante meridiem) – before noon; *p.m.* (post meridiem) – after noon; id (idem) – the same; *P.S.* (post script) - after what had been written; A.D. (anno domini) – in the year of the Lord; B.A. (Baccalaureus Artium) – Bachelor of Arts; B.L. (Baccalaureus Legum) – Bachelor of Law and others.

Together with the words of the third layer some Latin affixes (prefixes and suffixes) were borrowed. E.g.

1) *inter- – international*
2) *super- (over) –superhuman*
3) *- ist — socialist, capitalist*
4) *-ism — socialism, capitalism*

The main morphological features of Latin words are:

1) many Latin words are polysyllabic. For ex.:

*examination, commencement*

2) very often they have prefixes ending in consonants:

*adventure, abnormal, correspondence*

3) double consonants are very often met in these words:

*communicate, collaborate, narrate*

Some Latin Sayings and Quotations:

**Veni, vidi, vici** – "I came, I saw, I conquered". The message was sent by Julius Caesar to the Roman Senate after his battle in 47 BC (Before Christ) against King Pharnaces 11.

Quod erat demonstrandum (QED) – "which was to be demonstrated". This abbrevation is often written after a mathematical proof.

**Greek Words**

Many Greek words entered the English language through Latin and French (Renaissance period). Some Greek words entered during the 2nd layer of Latin words (we have already menioned them).

Some of them entered through French: *fancy, idea, cataloque, chronical, atmosphere, autograph, catastrophe, climax, comedy, critic,* etc.

Many of them came into English during the renaissance. They mostly refer to science, art and literature. E.g. *geology, lexicology, geography, etymology, homonym,* etc.

Almost all of the lexicological terms and many theatre terms are of Greek origin. E.g. *epiloge, comedy, tragedy, drama*, etc.

The morphological features of Greek words are:

*ch[k] – school, character, chemistry, chaos,* etc. ;

*ph [f] - morphology, phonetics, phoneme, morpheme,* etc.;

*y (in the root) – style, system, type, rhythm, symbol, synonymy,* etc.

In the languages of the world there is a tradition of forming scientific and technical terms on the basis of Greek and Latin roots. Such words are called artifical formation. E.g. *telephone, telegraph, television.*

It would be wrong to call these words Latin or Greek, because they appeared in other countries where the invention or discovery called by the name took place. From the point of view of their usage they are international.

**Scandinavian Words**

English belongs to the Germanic group of languages and there are borrowings from Scandinavian, German and Holland languages. Scandinavians occupied the territory which now belongs to Sweden, Norway and Denmark. Scandinavians often made invasion into some countries of Europe and into England beginning with the VIII century. In 878 the English King Alfred the Great was obliged to recognize the Danish rule over the territory covering two thirds of Modern England. Scandinavians ($8^{th}$ – $11^{th}$ cenfuries) lived there for a long time and the intercourse of two countries affected their languages.

Both of them belong to Germanic group and they had many common words. As the result of this conquest there are about 700 borrowings from Scandinavian in English. Scandinavians and Englishmen had the same way of life, their cultural level was the same, they had much in common in their literature, therefore there were many words in these languages which were almost identical, e.g. *syster (sweoster) – sister, fiser (fisc) – fish, felaqi (felawe)- fellow, anger, cake, call, kill, husband, raise, root,* etc.

However, there were also many words in the two languages which were different and some of them were borrowed into

English as nouns: *bull, cake, egg, kid, knife, skirt, window, wing, lump, rag;* adjectives: *flat, ill, happy, low, odd, ugly, wrong, low, sly;* verbs: *call, die, guess, get, give, scream, take, kill,* and many others.

Even some pronouns and connective words were borrowed which happens very seldom, such as: *same, both, till, though,* and the pronouns of the 3rd person plural were also borrowed from Scandinavians: *they, them, their.*

Some of English words changed their meanings under the influence of the similar Scandinavian ones. E.g. *bread* in old English meant *a piece of bread.* But the Scandinavian word *bread* meant *çörək.* So, the English language got this meaning. The opposite process took place with the word *loaf,* which in Anglo-Saxon meant *çörək,* but now it means *a piece of bread* . In Old English the word *dream* meant *joy,* under the influence of the similar Scandinavian word it got its present meaning *wish.*

In Old English the verb *to starve* meant *to die.* But after the Scandinavian verb *to die* had been borrowed and because in form it was nearer to the English words *dead* and *death,* the verb *to starve* narrowed its meaning and now it means *to die of hunger.*

Many of Scandinavian words begin with the following letter combinations:

*sk = skin, sky, skirt, ski, skill,* etc.

*sc = scream, screen, scrape, scrub, score, scowl, scorch,* etc.

Sometimes it is difficult to say whether a word is a Scandinavian or English because they have common words.

## French Words

There are many French words in the English vocabulary. It is due to the fact that England and France are neighbouring countries and the stage of their historical development. Therefore, English contains many words from Norman French, brought to England during the 11th century Norman Conquest. In 1066 the Normans conquered Britain. French became the language of the Norman aristocracy and added more vocabulary to English. A very great quantity of French words entered the English vocabulary after the Norman conquest. An area of land has been taken by war. Normans brought into England the French culture. Soon after the Norman conquest a revolt arose in England which was stamped down (banished) and Norman barrons became the master of the country. French became the state language. The English was spoken by common people. Norman French was the language of honour and justice, because the ruling class was French. Indeed, Mattew of Westminister said: "Whoever was unable to speak French was considered a vile (alçaq, rəzil) and contemptible (nifrətəlayiq) person by the common people".

The struggle between two languages lasted about 4 centuries. It ended with the victory of the English language. Many French words entered the English vocabulary during that period.

French words can be grouped according to some definite spheres of the English life to that time:

1.Words referring to the sphere of government, state, feudal, titles. E.g.

*govern, government, administer, crown, state, empire, royal, majesty, tax, treasurer, noble, prince, princess, peasant, servant, slave, people, nation, parliament, count, countess, duke, council,* etc.

2. Military terms: *army, navy, battle, victory, enemy, peace, arms, spy, combat, defence, guard, mail, defeat, castle, tower, war, soldier, battle, banner, brigade, battalion, cavalry, infantry,* etc.
3. Juridical process (law terms): *to sentence, judge, justice, to condemn, to acquit, to accuse, to advocate, jury, verdict,* etc.
4. Finance: *treasure, wage, poverty,* etc.
5. Morality: *gentle, patience, courage, mercy, pity,* etc.
6. Words connected with religion: *service, sermon, to pray, virtue, saint,* etc.
7. Words reflecting the mode of life of the French: *nobility, pleasure, leisure, delight,* etc.
8. Words connected with art, learning, medicine: *colour, picture, ornament, image, nobility, painting, sculpture, music, beauty, cathedral, palace, mansion, fashion, , luxury, chamber, ceiling, column, poet, prose, romance, paper, pen, volume, chapter, study, geometry, grammar, gender, physician, pain, pulse, poison,* etc.
9. Words relating to clothing and jewelry: *topaz, emerald, ruby, pearl, gown, garment, coat, petticoat, robe, embroidery, button, satin, fur, sable, jewel, ornament, broach, garnet, diamond, lace,* etc.
10. Words relating to food and cooking: *lunch, dinner, appetite, roast, stew,* etc.
11. The names of some dishes and food:
    *feast, appetite, tart, sole, sturgen, sardine, beef, veal, mutton, bacon, toast, cream, sugar, salad, raisin, jely, spice,* etc.
    But the animals out of whose meat was prepared were called by the Anglo-Saxon names.

| Anglo-Saxon | French |
|---|---|
| *ox* | *beaf* |
| *swine, pig* | *pork, bacon* |
| *deer* | *venison* |
| *sheep* | *mutton* |

Common words and expressions include nouns: *age, air, city, cheer, honor, joy;* adjectives: *courages, cruel, poor, nice, pure;* verbs: *advance, advise, carry, cry, desire;* phrases: *draw near, make believe, hand to hand, by heart, etc.*

French words did not meet their synonyms in English, because the notions which they expressed were new to the English people. Especially words connected with the mode of life of French barons: *parliament, dainty,* etc.

If the French words were borrowed expressed the notions familiar to the English people, there appeared pairs of synonyms which began to struggle with each other.

Sometimes the English word ousted its French synonym. E.g.

English: *girl* French: *damsel*

Sometimes the French word ousted the English one. E.g.

| French: | English: |
|---|---|
| *army* | *here* |
| *cry* | *reodian* |
| *enemy* | *foe (now it is mostly used in poetry)* |

Under the influence of some French words several English words either changed or narrowed their meanings. E.g.

French: *autumn* English: *harvest*

French words continued entering the English language after the 16th century as well. The words which entered in the 16th century kept their French character. They are called aliens. These words have the following features. E.g.:

1)(ch - is pronounced as [ʃ] = *machine, chauffeur, champagne*, etc.

g – is pronounced as [ʒ] = *mirage, regime, garage*, etc.

i – is pronounced as [i:] = *chic, machine*, etc.
qu – is pronounced as [k] = *bouquet*, etc.
ou – is pronounced as [u:] = *rouge*, etc.

2) The stress falls on the last syllable as:

*Barri'cade, fa'tigue, ca'price, canno'nade, poli'ce, car'toon* etc.

Among these French words there are some which have fully kept their French character. They are called perfect aliens. E.g.

*Vis-a-vis [vi:za:vi:] = in front of — visavi; bon mot = a witty saying*, etc.

French borrowings which came into English after 1650 retain their spelling, e.g. consonants [p, t, s] are not pronounced at the end of the word (buffet, bouquet).

English contains many words of French origin, such as *art, collage, competition, force, machine, police, publicity, role, routine, table* and many anglicized French words. These are pronounced according to English rules of orthography, rather than French (which uses nasal vowels not found in Englsh).

## Italian Words

Cultural and trade relations between Italy and England brought many Italian words into English.The earliest Italian borrowings came into English in the 14th century (Renaissance and later), it was the word "bank" (from the italian "banko" – "bench"). Italian money-lenders and money-changers sat in the streets on benches. When they suffered losses they turned over their benches. It was called "banco rotta" from which the English word "bankrupt" originated.

In the 17th century some geological terms were borrowed: *volcano, granite, bronze, lava*. At the same time some political terms were borrowed: *manifesto, bulletin*.

But mostly Italian is famous by its influence in music and in all Indo-European languages, there are many musical and architectural terms (words) were borrowed fom Italian into the English vocabulary. E.g. *balcony, bust, opera, operette, soprano, baritone, sonata, piano, tenor, concerto, trio, violin, colonel, basso, falsetto, solo, duet, quartet, libretto,* etc.

Some of the Italian words do not refer to any definite sphere, but express various notions. E.g. *umbrella, macaroni, fiasco, incognito, gazette, arsenal, balcony, casino, pantaloons, pasta, pissa, spaghetti,* etc.

**Spanish Words**

After the discovery of America by Columbus in 1492 Spain became one of the richest European countries and rival of England.

There were some armed conflicts between two countries and there were also periods of peaceful, diplomatic relations between them. These various forms of contacts gave some Spanish words to the English vocabulary.

Spanish borrowings came into English (Renaissance and later) mainly through its American variant. There are the following semantic groups of them:

a) trade terms: *cargo, embargo;*

b) names of dances and musical instruments: *tango, guitar;*

c) names of vegetables and fruit: *tomato, potato, tobacco, cocoa, banana, ananas, apricot,* etc.

Pure spanish words are: *armada, guerilla, cargo, cannibal, coyote, desperado, mosquito, tornado,* etc.

**Portuguese Words**

They are not at all numerous: *veranda, tank, cobra*, etc.

**Arabic Words**

Many Arabic words entered the English vocabulary during the crusade. The majority of Arabic words came into English through some other European languages, mostly through French.

Among Arabic words borrowed directly may be mentioned the followings:

*emir, harem, khalifa, simoom, giraffe, minaret, mosque, salaam, sultan, vizier, bazaar, caravan,* etc.

. The following words came into English through French:

*caravan, algebra, magazine (it is used as journal in French), cipher, admiral, coffee, syrop,* etc.

**Indian Words**

*Squaw* – an Indian woman (in America), *wigwam*- an Indian hut, *moccasin* – Indian shoes, *fire-water*(n) (colloq. spirits such as whisky, gin and rum) , *pipe of peace* – means "to have friendly attitude towards the others", etc.

**Persian Words**

*Divan, chess, chech-mate, shawl, lilac,* etc.

**Dutch Words**

The Dutch were the teachers of the English people in nautical matters. That's why the words which entered the

English vocabulary are mostly nautical terms. E.g. *deck, reef, yacht, skipper,* etc.

**Russian Words**

Russian words in the English vocabulary are divided into two groups:

1) The words which entered before the October Socialist Revolution;

2) The words which entered after the revolution.

The words which entered after the revolution are called Sovietisms. The words of the first group are of ethnographical character, because the English people who came to Russia beginning with the XVI century (English merchants, ambassadors and travellers) were greatly interested in Russian people, Russian customs and so on.

So they brought back with them to England such words as: *steppe, troika, samovar, icon, izba, balalayca, tayga, zakuska,* etc.

In the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th centuries terms of social life entered the English vocabulary. E.g. *decabrist, nihilist, duma, intelligentsia,* etc.

Sovietisms played great progressive role in Russia, as they were connected with the establishment of new socialist system. They expressed new important progressive ideas. They were: *Soviet, leninism, communist, udarnic, shock-brigade, izvoschic, ucaze, self-criticism, artel, kolkhoz, sovkhoz, bolshevik,* etc.

Among sovietism we find many translation-loans:

*collective-farm, five - year plan, state farm, soviet power, self-criticism, hero of socialist labour, hero of the Soviet Union, Countries of Peoples Democracy, courts of justice, people's actor, labour-day,* etc.

Among Russian words there are also some semantic loans:

*pioneer, brigade, ideology, socialist, competition, shockworker* which have acquired a new meaning under the influence of the corresponding Russian names.

## Why are Words Borrowed and Criteria of Borrowings

Sometimes it is done to fill a gap in vocabulary. When the Saxons borrowed Latin words for "butter, plum, beet", they did because their own vocabularies lacked words for these new objects. For the same reason the words "potato, tomato" were borrowed into English from Spanish when these vegetables were first brought to England by the Spaniards.

The historical circumstances stimulate the borrowings process. Each time two nations come into close contact. The nature of the contact may be different. It may be wars, invasions or conquests . There are also periods of peace when the process of borrowing is due to trade and international cultural relations.

What criteria of borrowings are there in borrowings:

a) the initial position of the sounds [v[, [dʒ], [z[ or the letters j, z are sure sign that the word has been borrowed. E.g. *volcano* (It.), *vase* (Fr.), *jungle* (Hindi), *gesture* (L.), *giant* (OFr.), *zero* (Fr.), etc.

b) the morphological structure of the word and its grammatical forms may also prove to the word being adopted from another language. So the suffixes in the words *neurosis* (Gr.), *violoncello* (It.) betray the foreign origin of the words. Some early borrowings have become so thoroughly assimilated that they are unrecognizable without a historical analysis:

*chalk, mile* (L.), *ill, ugly* (Scand.), *enemy, car* (Fr.), etc.

**Assimilation of Borrowings**

When words migrate from one language into another they assimilate themselves to their new environment and get adapted to the norms of that language. They undergo certain changes which gradually erase their foreign features, and finally they are assimilated. Sometimes the process of assimilation develops to the point when the foreign origin of a word is quite unrecognizable.

Assimilation of borrowings depends on the following factors:

a) from what group of languages the word was borrowed: if the word belongs to the same group of languages to which the borrowing language belongs, it is assimilated easier;
b) in what way the word is borrowed: orally or in the written form, words borrowed orally, are assimilated quicker;
c) how often the borrowing is used in the language: the greater the frequency of its usage, the quicker it is assimilated;
d) how long the word lives in the language: the longer it lives, the more assimilated it is.

Borrowings enter the language in two ways: through oral speech (by immediate contact between peoples) and through written speech (by indirect contact through books, etc.). Words borrowed orally (*-inch, mil, street*), are usually short and they undergo considerable changes in the act of adoption. Written borrowing (*e.g. Fr.-communique, ballet, chauffeur, regime, table)* preserve their spelling and some pecularities of their sound-form. Their assimilation is long and laborious process.

It is difficult to believe now that such words as "dinner, cat, take, cup" are not English by origin. Others, though well

assimilated, still bear traces of their foreign background. "Distance, development" are identified as borrowings by their French sufixes. "Skin, sky" are by the Scandinavian initial "sk", "police, regime" by the French stress on the last syllable.

Till now we had a good look at the origin and sources of borrowings. Now it is our task to see what changes borrowings have undergone in the English language and how they have adopted themselves to their peculiarities.

There are two kinds of changes that borrowed words undergo. On the one hand there are changes specific of borrowed words only. Such changes serve to adapt words of a foreign origin to the norms of the borrowing language. On the other hand there are changes that are characteristic of both borrowed and native words.

Adaptation of words of a foreign origin to the norms of the borrowing language is called assimilation. The linguists distinguish phonetical, grammatical and lexical assimilation of borrowings.

**Phonetic assimilation** comprising changes in sound-form and stress is the most conspicuous. Sounds that were alien to the English language were fitted into its own sounds. For ex.: the letter *e* in recent French borrowing alien to English speech is rendered with the help of [ei]: communiqué, café, or the words "regime, matenee, ballet" borrowed as early as the 15$^{th}$ century still sound surprisingly French.

**Grammatical assimilation.** When words from other languages were introduced into English they lost their former grammatical categories and acquired new grammatical categories by analogy with other English words. Some borrowings have two plural forms: native and foreign.

E.g. *vacuum (Lat.) – vacua and vacuums,* or Russian word *sputnik* is used in six cases, but in English it is used only in two cases, or the Russian noun "пальто" was borrowed from

French early in the 19th century and has not yet acquired the Russian system of declension. The same can be said about such English renaissance borrowings as "datum" (pl.data), "phenomenon" (pl.phenomena), "criterion" (pl. criteria), whereas earlier Latin borrowings such as "cup, street, wall, plum" were fully adapted to the grammatical system of the language long ago.

**Lexical assimiliation.** When a word is taken over into another language, its semantic structure undergoes great changes. Polysemantic words usually adopted only in one or two of their meanings. So, the word *timbre* that had a number of meanings in French was borrowed into English as a musical term only.

The words *cargo* and *cask* are highly polysemantic in Spanish , but they were adopted only in one of their meanings – *the goods carried in a ship, a barrel for holding liquids.*

Sometimes, a borrowed word acquired new meanings. E.g. the word "to move" in Modern English has the meanings of "to propose", "to change one`s flat". But the word "to move" did not have these meanings in its former semantic structure. Some meanings of borrowed words become more general, others more specialized. E.g. the word *umbrella* was borrowed (from Italian) in the meaning of *a sunshade.*

Sometimes the primary meaning of a borrowed word becomes a secondary meaning. E.g. the word "fellow" was borrowed in the meaning of "comrade, companion", but now this meaning has become a secondary meaning, its secondary meaning now is "a man or a boy".

**Etymological Doublets**

Sometimes a word is borrowed twice from the same language. At the result, we have two different words with different spellings and meanings, but historically they come back to one and the same word. Such words are called etymological doublets.

They may enter the vocabulary by different routes. Some of these pairs consist of a native word and a borrowed word: "shrew" (n) (E.) – "screw" (n) (Sc.). Others are represented by two borrowings from different languages: "canal" (Latin) – channel (Fr.), "captain" (Latin) – "chieftain" (Fr.), catch (Norm.Fr.) – chaise (Fr.),etc..

Though the words borrowed from the same language twice, but in different periods: "travel"(Norm. Fr.) – "travail" (Parisian French), "cavalry" (Norm.Fr.) – "chivalry" (Parisian Fr.), "goal" (Norm.Fr.) – "jail" (Parisian Fr.), skirt (Sc.) – shirt (Eng.), scabby (Sc.) – shabby (Eng.).

A doublet may also consists of a shortened word and the one from which it was derived: "history" - "story", "fantacy" – "fancy", "defence" – "fence", "shadow" – "shade", etc.

Etymological trimplets (i.e.groups of three words of common root) occur rarer, but here are at least two examples: "hospital" (Latin) – "hostel" (Norm Fr.) – "hotel" (Parisian Fr.), "to capture" (Latin) – "to catch" (Norm.Fr.) – "to chase" (Parisian Fr.), moneta (Lat.) – mint (Fr.)- money (Eng), etc..

Sometimes, etymological doublets are the result of borrowing different grammatical forms of the same word. For ex., the comparative degree of Latin "super" was "superior" which was borrowed into English with the meaning "high in some quality or rank". The superlative degree (Latin "supremus") in English "supreme" with the meaning "outstanding", "prominent". So "superior" and "supreme" are etymological doublets.

## International Words

In all the languages of the world we find a greater or smaller quantity of foreign elements which is the result of the intercourse of peoples. Many of the words of foreign origin become assimilated to such a degree that later on they are not felt as foreign and many people think they are their own words. In English words *wall, street, chalk* and many others have become fully assimilated and it is forgotten by non - specialists that they are of foreign origin. Among these foreign elements there are words common to all European languages. They are mostly of Latin and Greek origin. Such words are called international.

Most names of sciences are international, such as: *philosophy, mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, medicine, linguistics, lexicology* and others.

There are also numerous terms of art in this group: *music, theatre, drama, tragedy, comedy, artist, primadonna,* etc.; and the sport terms: *football, volley-ball, baseball, hockey, cricket, rugby, tennis, golf,* etc.

It is quite natural that political terms frequiently occur in the international group of borrowings: *politics, policy, revolution, progress, democracy, communism, anti-militarism and so on.* 20th century scientific and technological advances brought a great number of new international words: *atomic, antibiotic, radio, television, sputnic,* etc.

Fruits and foodstuffs imported from exotic countries often transport their names too and become international: *coffee, cocoa, chocolate, banana, mango, grapefruit*, etc.

Many sovietisms have also become international now. E.g. *bolshevik, Leninist, sputnic,* etc.

The spelling of the majority of international words considers in English, Russian, Azerbaijani and other languages

of the world. But there are some international words having different spelling. E.g. *talant* - in Russian and Azerbaijani *talant* (istedad), in French *talent* ['tolənt].

The Latin suffixes *–ist, -ism* are also international. For ex.: *communist, specialist, telegraphist,* etc.

Semantically the international words mostly coinside special term, as: *psychology, geography, geology, oncologist,* etc.

But in some international words we find the divergence of meaning. The word *pathetic* in English means *touching*, but in Russian in the meaning of *highly emotional*. The English word *sympathetic* means "kind or feeling pity for smb."

Sometimes a word has several meanings in one language. E.g. the word *toast* has two meanings in English: 1) roasted slice of bread; 2) speech pronounced at table to smb's health.

But in Russian and in Azerbaijani it has only one meaning тост – sağlıq.

The similarity of such words as the English "son", the German "Sohn" and the Russian "сын" should not lead one to the quite false conclusion that they are international words. They represent the Indo-European group of the native element in each respective language and are cognates, i.e. words of the same etymological root, not borrowings.

## ARCHAISMS

It must be noted that some words may drop out of the language altogether. These are called archaic words. Archaism is a Greek word. *Archaikos* means "ancient". As a linguistic term archaism means an obsolete word. Some words become archaic, because the objects or phenomena which they signify become obsolete or disappear. They are words which have come out of active usage.

An archaism is a language that was current at one time, but has passed out of regular use. An archaism can be a word, a phrase or the use of spelling, letters or syntax that have passed out of use. Archaisms draw attention to themselves when used in general communication.

The disappearance of words may be caused by purely linguistic factors, when a new name is introduced for the notion that continues to exist. The old word on becoming rare can acquire a new stylistic property obtaining, due to its ancient flavour and be accepted in poetic diction.

E.g. "ere" – before; *save* – except, *lists* – arena, *visor* - dəbilqə, *shield* - qalxan, etc. So archaisms are words which are no longer used in everyday speech, which have been ousted by their synonyms. Archaisms remain in the language, but they are used as stylistic devices to express solemnity. Most of them are lexical archaisms and they are stylistic synonyms. Such as:

*steed* (horse), *slay* (kill), *behold* (see), *woe* (sorrow) etc.

Some words disappeared and some words are substituted by some other words in English. E.g.

| Archaism | | Modern |
|---|---|---|
| *Woe* | - | *bitter, grief* |
| *Mere* | - | *pond, lake* |

*eke* - *also*
*forbears* - *ancestors*
*ere* - *before*

Some of archaic words are used in historical books and novels to name the things which once existed and used in the language for the sake of some special stylistic colouring. A great number of archaic words survive in poetry (especially the romanticists) that simple words of every day use were less capable to show vivid images than the old and rarely used words. So they introduced many archaic words into their poetic vocabulary. These words are called poetic archaisms. E.g.

*Behold - to see, to look*
*Yonder - there*
*Steed - horse*
*Main - ocean*
*Spouse - wife*
*Swain - peasant boy*
*Of yore - of ancient time*
*Thou - you*

There are also grammatical archaic words:

*Hath - has*
*Doth - does*

In English some compound words and set-expressions keep archaic elements in them:

*a stepson* – in this compound word the component *step* (Old English *steop*) means *destitute*.

In the expression "to *read a riddle* is used in one of its old meanings *to guess* or *to interpret*.

The preposition *on* once had the meaning *because of*. From here we have such expressions nowadays as *on purpose* and *on compulsion* .

From the point of view of linguists archaic words can be used by writers for stylistic purposes, but this should be done carefully not over – burden the text with unknown words,

because it would make the text difficult to understand. They must use archaisms if it is necessary to describe the historical facts.

As it was said above archaisms are words that were once common, but are now replaced by synonyms. When these new synonymous words, whether borrowed or coined within the English language, introduce nothing conceptually new, the stylistic value of older words tends to be changed.

Some examples will illustrate this statement:

aught –*anything* whatever, betwixt (prp) – *between*, chide(v) – *scold*, damsel (n) – *a noble girl*, hark (v) – *listen*, lone (a) – lonely, morn (n) – *morning*, etc.

Some of the archaic words are used in historical books and novels to name the things which once existed or for the sake of some special stylistic colouring.

When the causes of the word's disappearance are extra-linguistic, e.g. when the thing named is no longer used, its name becomes *historism*. They are very numerous as names for social relations and institutions and objects of material culture of the past. The names of ancient weapons, transports, types of boats, types of carriages, ancient clothes, musical instruments or agricultural implements can be good examples for historism.

archer – *shooter*; baldric – *belt for a sword*; blunderbuss – *an old type of gun*, etc.

Before the appearance of motor cars many different types of horsedrawn carriages were in use. The names of some of them are: brougham (– *one horsed and twoseated carriage)*, calash, diligence (– *four wheeled cab(cariage)*, gig (– *onehorsed light wagon)*, hansom (– *two wheeled ekipaj, phaeton)*, etc.

The history of costume forms are interesting topic by itself. It is reflected in the history of corresponding terms. The corresponding glossaries may be very long. Only very few

examples can be mentioned here. In W.Shakespeare's plays, for instance, *doublets* are often mentioned. *A doublet* is a close-fitting jacket with or without sleeves worn by men in the $15^{th}$ - $17^{th}$ centuries. Not all historisms refer to such distant periods.

Thus *bloomers* – an outfit designed for women in mid-nineteenth century. It consisted of turkish style trousers gathered at the ankles and worn by women as *"a rational dress"*. It was introduced by Mrs. Bloomer - editor and social reformer, as a contribution to woman rights movement. Somewhat later *bloomers* were worn by girls and women for games and cycling, but then they became shorter and reached only to the knee.

A great many historisms denoting various types of weapons occur in historical novels. E.g.

*a battering ram* "an ancient machine for breaking walls", a *blunderbuss* "an old type of gun with a wide muzzle", *breastplate* "a piece of metal armour worn by knights over the chest to protect it in the battle"; *a crossbow* "a medieval weapon consisting of a bow fixed across a wooden stock".

Many words belonging to this semantic field remain in the vocabulary in some figurative meaning. E.g. *arrow, shield, sword, vizor,* etc.

## NEOLOGISMS

The vocabulary of any language doesn't remain the same, but changes constantly. New notions come into being, requiring new words to name them. On the other hand, some notions and things become outdated and the words that denote them drop out of the language. Sometimes a new name is introduced for a thing or notion that continues to exist and the older name ceases to be used. The number of words in a language is therefore not constant.

A neologism is a word, a term, or a phrase which has been recently created ("coined") – often to apply to new concepts. Neologisms are especially useful in identifying inventions, new phenomena or old ideas which have taken on a new cultural context. A neologism from Greek (*neos* – new, *logos* – speech) is a newly coined word or phrase that may be in the process of entering common use, but has not yet been accepted into mainstream language. Neologisms are often directly attributable to a specific person, publication, period or event. The term *neologism* is first attested in English in 1772, borrowed from French *neologism* (1774).

A neologism can refer to an existing word or phrase which has been assigned a new meaning. Neologisms are ecpecially useful in identifying inventions, new phenomena, or old ideas which have taken on a new cultural context.

New words and expressions or neologisms are created for new things irrespective of their scale of importance. They may be all important and concern some social relationships, such as a new form of state. E.g. *People's Republic,* or something threatening the very existance of humanity, like *nuclear war.* The thing may be quite insignificant and short-lived, like *fasions in dancing, clothing, hairdo or footwear,* etc. In every

case either the old words are appropriately changed in meaning or new words are borrowed.

Neologisms are frequently coined out of elements (morphemes or words) which exist in a given language. In deliberate coinages there is often an analogy with some other word or words in the language.

There are also acronyms among neologisms by which we mean new words formed by combining the initial or first few letters of two or more words: such as UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization), NABISCO (National Biscuit Company), etc.

Thus a neologism is any word or set expression formed according to the productive structural patterns or borrowed from another language and felt by the speakers as something new. So, neologism is a term which refers to any new lexical unit, the novelty of which is still felt.

The intense development of science and industry has called forth the invention and introduction of immense number of new words and changed the meanings of old ones. E.g. *computer, izotop, tape-recorder, super-market, aerobic* and so on.

In every changing field of political life and affairs new words are constantly coined:

*unemployment – unused; the poor – the underprivileged.*

The laws of efficient communication demand maximum signal in minimum time. To meet the requirements the adaptive lexical system is not only adding new units, but readjusts the ways and means or the word-building means.

Thus the resources of the vocabulary are considerably extended by compounding where new words are made on the pattern of other words, such as: *phonegraph, autograph, dictaphone* combines elements found in the words *dictate and telephone*. When radio location was invented it was defined as radio detection and ranging which is long and so a

convinient abbreviation out of the first letter or letters of each word in this phrase was coined, hence *radar*. The process of nomination may pass several stages.

The lexical system may adapt itself to new functions by combining several word-building processes. Thus, *fall-out* the radio active dust decending through the air after an atomic explosion – is coined by composition and conversion simultaneously.

It is also interesting to mention the new meaning of word-formation patterns in composition. *Teach-in* is a student conference or series of seminars on some burning issue of the day, meaning some demonstration of protest. This pattern is very frequent: *lie-in, sleep-in, pray-in, love-in, etc.*

In all the above variants the semantic components "protest" and "place" are invariable present. This is a subgroup of peculiarly English and steadily developing type of nouns formed by a combined process of conversion and composition from verbs with postpositives, such as a *hold-up, "armed robbery"* from *hold-up* "rob", *come-back* – "a person who returns after a long absence".

The development of shortening aimed at economy of time and effort, but keeping the sense complete is manifest not only in acronyms and abbreviations but also in blends. E.g. *bionics<bio + (electr) onics; slimnastics < slim +(gym) nastics*, etc.

Semi-affixes which used to be not numerous and might be treated as exceptions now evolve into a separate set. A free use of semi-affixes has been illustrated. The set of semi-affixes is also increased due to the so-called abstracted forms that is parts of words or phrases used in what seems the meaning they contribute to the unit. E.g. *workaholic* "a person with a compulsive desire to work" was patterned on *alcoholic, foot-*

*ballaholic* and *bookaholic* are selfexplanatory. Compare also: *washeteria* "a self-service laundry".

When some words become a very frequent element in compounds the discrimination of compounds and derivatives, the difference between affix and semi-affix is blurred. Here are some neologisms meaning obsessed with something and containing the elements "mad" and "happy": *power-mad, money-mad, speed-mad, movie-mad; autohappy, trigger-happy,* etc.

It is not quite clear whether in spite of their limitless productivity, we are still justified in considering them as compounds.

In what follows the student will find a few examples of neologisms showing the pattern according to which they are formed. *Automation* – "automatic control of production" is irregularly formed from the stem *automatic* with the help of the very productive suffix *–tion*. The corresponding verb *automate* is a back-formation, i.e. *re-equipt* in the most modern and automated fashion. *Re-* is one of the most productive prefixes, the others are *anti-, de-, un-* the semi-affixes *self-, super-* and *mini-* and many more. E.g. *anti-flash* – "serving to protect the *eyes*", *anti-body* – "substance that the body produces in the blood to fight disease", *anti-pollution* – "to make less attractive", *resit* – "to take a written examination a second time", *rehouse* - "to move a family, a community to a new house", *unfunny* – "not amusing", etc.

Different synonymic neologisms come through adoptations of the same borrowed word. The names of new referents, things and ideas denoted by the words constantly enter the language. The rapid advances which are being made in scientific knowledge, the extention of sciences and arts to many new purposes and objects create a continual demand for the

formation of new words to express new ideas, new agencies and new wants.

And language, directly reflecting these needs, enriches its vocabulary and perfects its system of grammar.

In epochs of social upheaval neologisms came into the language in large numbers. Such neologisms make up semantic groups connected with various spheres of social-political life, culture, science, technology, etc.

Thus, for instance, with the progress of science, technology, political and cultural life, the 19th century has brought large numbers of new words, special politics and technical terms in various branches of science. E.g.

*capitalism, communism, proletariat, automat, telegraph, telephone, aviation,* etc.

In the course of time the new word is accepted into the word stock of the language and being often used to be considered new or else it may not be accepted for some reason or other and vanish from the language.

The fate of neologisms is hardly predictable: some of them are shortlived, others, on the contrary, become durable if they are liked and accepted. Once accepted they may serve as a basis for further word-formation.

Thus, *zip* (the imitative word denoting a certain type of fastener) is hardly felt as new, but its derivatives – the verb *to zip* ( to zip from one place to another), the correspoding personal noun *zipper* and the adjective *zippy* – appear to be neologisms. *To zip* – bağlamaq, düymələmək ; *zipper* – düymə, ilgək; *zippy* –bağlanmış, düymələnmiş and so on.

Neologisms are words which have recently appeared in the language.

## TERMS

Terminology constitutes the greatest part of every language vocabulary. It is also the most intensely developing part. Terminology of a language consists of many systems of terms. We shall call a **term** - any word or word-group used to name a notion characteristic of some special field of knowledge, industry or culture. The scope and content of the notion that a term serves to express are specified by definitions in literature on the subject. The word utterance, for instance, may be regarded as a linguistic term, since Z.Harris, Ch.Fries and other representatives of descriptive linguistics attach to it the following definition: "an utterance is any stretch of talk by one person before and after which there is a silence".

**A term is** in many respects, a very peculiar type of a word. An ideal term should be monosemantic and, when used within its own sphere, does not depend upon the micro-context, provided it is not expressed by a figurative variant of a polysemantic word. Its meaning remains constant until some new discovery or invention changes the referent or the notion.

A term can obtain a figurative or emotionally coloured meaning only when taken out of its sphere and used in literary or colloquial speech. But in that case it ceases to be a term and its denotational meaning may also become very vague. It turns into an ordinary word. The adjective *atomic* used to describe the atomic structure of matter was until 1945 as emotionally neutral as words like *quantum* or *parallelogram*. But since that time it has assumed a new implication, so that the common phrase "this atomic age", which taken literally has no meaning at all, is now used to denote an age of great scientific progress, but also holds connotations of ruthless menace and monstrous destruction.

It goes without saying that there are terms for all the different specialists. Their variety is very great. E.g. amplitude (physics), antibiotic (medicine), arabesque (ballet), feedback (cybernetics), fission (biology), frame (cinema), etc. Many of the terms that in the first period of their existence are known to a few specialists, later became used by wide circles of laymen. Some of these are of comparatively recent origin. Here are a few of them, with the year of their first appearance. For ex.: quantum (1910), vitamin (1912), isotope (1913), penicillin (1929), transistor (1952), beam weapon (1977), etc.

The origin of terms shows several main channels, three of which are specific for terminology. These specific ways are:

1. Formation of terminological phrases with subsequent clipping, ellipsis, blending, abbreviations. For ex.: transister receiver - > transistor – > trannie; television text – > teletext; ecological architecture - > ecotecture; extremely low frequency – > ELF.

2. The use of combining forms from Latin and Greek like *aerodrome, aerodynamics, microfilm, telegraph, thermonuclear, telemechanic,* etc.

3. Borrowing from another terminological system within the same language whenever there is any affinity between the respective fields. Sea terminology, for instance, lent many words to aviation vocabulary, which in its turn made the starting point for the terminology adopted in the conquest of space. If we turn back to the linguistics, we shall come across many terms borrowed from rhetoric: metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche and others.

There are special establishments busy with improving terminology. We must also pay attention to the fact that it is often possible to trace a term to its author. It is, for instance, known that the radio terms *anode* and *cathode* were coined by M.Faraday, the term *vitamin* by Dr.Funk in 1912, the term

*bionics* was born at a symposium in Ohio (USA) in September of 1960, etc.

Terms are not separated from the rest of the vocabulary, and it is rather hard to say where the line should be drawn. With the development and growth of civilization many special notions became known to the layman and form part and parcel of everyday speech. Are we justified to call such words as *vitamin, sedative or tranquilizer* terms? With radio and television sets in every home many radio terms – *antenna, teletype, transistor, short waves* are well known to everybody and often used in everyday conversation. In this process, however, they may lose their specific terminological character and become similar to all ordinary words in the international part of their meaning. The study of terminology can give very valuable data concerning the interdependence of the history of language and the history of society. The development of terminology is the most complete reflection of the history of science, culture and industry.

As said above terminology constitutes the greatest part of every language vocabulary and it refers to all the spheres of the language and science.

## SEMASIOLOGY

The branch of linguistics that is devoted to the study of meaning is known as semasiology. Semasiology deals not with every kind of linguistic meaning only. It does not mean that we need not pay attention to the grammatical meaning. On the contrary, grammatical meaning must be taken into consideration in so far as it bears a specific influence upon lexical meaning.

"Sema" means "sign", logos – learning. It is a Greek term. At present many linguists consider the term "semantics", because the latter having many meanings creates confusion. *Semantikos* – "significant, meaning", *semainein* – "to signify", *sema* – "sign". Semasiology is a discipline within linguistics concerned with the question "what does the word X mean?"

The meaning of the term is somewhat obscure, because according to some authors "semasiology" merged with "semantics" in modern times, while at the same time the term is still in use when defining onomasiology. **Onomasiology** (the meaning of the names) is the opposite approach to semasiology. Onomasiology, as a part of lexicology, departs from a concept (i.e. an idea, an object, a quality, an activity, etc.) and asks for its names. Thus, an onomasiological question, e.g. "what are the names for long, narrow pieces of potato that have been deep-fried?" (answers: *French fries* in the UK, etc.), while a semasiological question is, e.g. "what is the meaning of the term *chips*?" (answers: "long, narrow pieces of potato that have been deep-fried" in the UK, "slim slices of potatoes deep fried or baked until crisp in the US).

In international scientific vocabulary "semantics" is also called "semasiology". In linguistics, semantics is the subfield that is devoted to the study of meaning. The basic area of

study is the meaning of signs, and the study of relations between different linguistic units: homonymy, synonymy, antonymy, polysemy, paronyms, and so.on.

So, the main objects of semantic study are: semantic developments of words, its causes and classification, types of lexical meaning, polysemy and semantic structure of words, semantic grouping in the vocabulary system, i.e. synonyms, antonyms, etc.

In the course of the historical development the meanings of words are changed. In most cases the new meaning either replaces the previous meaning of the old word or is added to its old meaning.

In some cases the meaning of a word is extended or narrowed. The meaning of a word may get new shades. E.g. the word *to write* originally meant *to scratch* and indicated an early mode of writing by means of scratching on stone, metal or wood. The word *spoon* originally meant *a splinter of wood*; *to investigate* meant *to follow smb's traces*, etc.

## Semantic Structure of Words

Every word has two aspects: the outer aspect – sound form, and the inner aspect – meaning. The interrelation between the two aspects shows that they may develop differently. Every word is a unity of sound and meaning, but they do not always form a constant unit. The context generally gives the word its actual meaning. E.g. the word *nice* means of good quality, excellent, but in a sentence *A nice state of affairs*, it may sound ironical and acquire the opposite meaning.

There are two schools in present-day linguistics: the referential approach which formulates the essence of meaning by establishing the interdependence between words

and things or concepts they denote, and the functional approach, which studies the functions of a word in speech.

The essential feature of referential approach is that the distinquishing between the true components closely connected with meaning.

When we examine a word we see that its meaning is not identical with it. Concept is the thought of the object that singles out its essential features. The meaning of words, however, is different in different languages. That is to say, words expessing identical concepts may have different meanings and different semantic structures in different languages.

Functional approach of meaning maintains that the meaning of a linguistic unit may be studied only through its relation to other linguistic units and not through its relation to either concept or referent. In a very simplified form of this view may be illustrated by the following: the meaning of these two words *develop and development* are different, because they function in speech differently.

## Types of meaning

In any language we can find words with only one meaning and words with only two or more meanings. Words with only one meaning are called monosemantic words. Words with many meanings are called polysemantic words. Polysemantic words are more than monosemantic words.

Linguists distinguish **primary meaning and secondary meaning** in a word. The primary meaning appears earlier than the secondary meaning, that's why the primary meaning is called the original meaning of the word. The secondary meaning is derived from the original meaning.

Linguists distinguish **direct or nominative meaning and figurative meaning** in a word. The meaning is nominative when it nominates the object without the help of context.

The meaning is figurative when the object is named and at the same time characterized through its similarity with another object.

In the latest research works linguists distinguish **denotative and connotative meanings** in a word. The denotative meaning expresses a notion or an actually existing thing of reality (a book, a tree, friendship etc.), and makes the communication possible. It follows that the word as a linguistic sign is realized or actualized due to its denotational meaning in the first place.

Apart from denotational component there is another component, which introduces into speech some additional information as to the speaker's attitude to the subject matter as well as some information as to his relation with his listener. So, connotative meaning is an additional meaning to the denotative meaning of the word.

The denotative and connotative meanings of the word taken together are their lexical meanings. Besides the lexical meaning a word has a grammatical meaning as well. All the lexical and grammatical meanings of the word form its semantic structure.

As said above there are two types of the meaning in a language: the grammatical and the lexical meanings.

**The lexical meaning** is the realization of concept or emotion by means of definite language system. Comparing word forms of one and the same word we observe that besides a grammatical meaning, there is another component of the meaning. This component is identical in all the forms of the word. Thus, the word - forms: *write, writes, wrote, writing, written* possess different grammatical meanings of tense, person and so on, but in each of these forms we find one and

the same semantic component denoting the process of an action. This is the lexical meaning of the word. Both the lexical and grammatical meaning make up the word-meaning as neither can exist without each other.

An inflected word is primarily a grammatical form. A suffixal derivative is primarily a lexical form. We can make similar distinction between the types of paradigm in which these morphemes take part. A paradigm like *love – loves – loved* is an inflectional paradigm.

Lexical derivatives make up a derivational or lexical paradigm. Thus, for instance, from the kernel word *love* a number of derivative words can be generated by means of certain well-known rules telling us what morphemes must be added and to what kernel they must be added (V or N): *love* (N), *love* (V), *lovely* (Adj.), *lover* (N), *loveliness* (N), *loving* (A), *loving* (Adj), *loveless* (Adj), *lovable* (Adj), *beloved* (Adj). Similarly: *live* (V), *live* (Adj.), *liveable* (Adj), *lively* (Adj.), *liveliness* (N), *liven* (V).

Every word combines lexical and grammatical meanings. For ex. "father".

**He is a personal noun.**

It has not only denotational but connotational meaning as well.

**Dady is a colloquial term of endearment.**

The denotational meaning is segmented into semantic components:

**Father is a male parent.**

A word may be polysemantic, i.e. it may have several meanings:

father may mean *a male parent, an ancester, a founder or a leader, a priest.*

**Grammatical meaning.** We notice that word-forms such as: *tables, boys, books* etc. though denoting widely different

objects of reality, but they have something in common. This common element is the grammatical meaning of plurality which can be found in all of them. Thus grammatical meaning may be defined as the component of meaning recurrent in identical sets of individual forms of different words, as e.g. the tense meaning in the word forms of verbs (*asked, said*), or the case meaning in the word forms of various nouns *(parent's, boy's, girl's, students')*, etc.

The concept of plurality, case etc. may be expressed by the lexical meaning, e.g. *boys, boy's,* etc.

In modern linguistic science it is commonly held that some elements of grammatical meaning can be identified by the position of the linguistic unit in relation to other linguistic units, i.e. by its distribution. Word-forms "goes, speaks, answers" have one and the same grammatical meaning as they can all be found in identical distribution, e.g. only after the pronouns "he, she, it" and before adverbs like "well, quickly, every day".

The grammatical meaning is more abstract and more generalized than the lexical meaning. It unites words into big groups such as parts of speech or lexio-grammatical classes.

Lexico-grammatical or Parts of speech meaning is usual to classify lexical items into **major word-classes** - nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs and **minor word-classes** – articles, prepositions, conjunctions and others.

## Denotational and Connotational Meanings.

Lexical meaning may be analysed as including denotational and connotational components. As it was mentioned above, one of the functions of the words is to denote things, concepts, and so on. The component of the lexical meaning which makes communication possible is the denotational meaning.

Hornby characterized the word *cat – a small fur-covered animal often kept as a pet in the house.*

Longman characterized greater detail: - *a small animal with soft fur and sharp teeth and claws, often kept as a pet in buildings to catch mice.*

The second component of the lexical meaning is the connotational component, i.e. the emotive charge and the stylistic value of the word.

For ex.: the word *hospital.* What is thought and felt when the word *hospital* is used?

*The architect who built it; a place where people are treated for, nursed through illness or injuries; the invalid staying there after an operation or the man living across the road,* etc. *(A.S.Hornby).*

The emotive charge varies in different word-classes. In some of them, in interjection the emotive element prevails, whereas in conjunctions the emotive charge is as a rule practically non-existent.

Connotation – is the pragmatic communicative value the word receives of *where, when, how, by whom, for what purpose.* There are four main types of connotations: stylistic, emotional, evaluable, expressive.

1. The stylistic connotations are understood in a synonymic group. So *horse, steed, nag(sl)* and *gee-gee* are used in different styles.

2. Emotional connotation is acquired by the word as a result of its frequent use corresponding to emotional situation. E.g. *beseech* means "*to ask eagerly and also anxiously*".
3. Evaluative connotations express approval and disapproval. E.g. *Shut up!* ( When somebody is displeased).
4. Intensifying connotations (expressive, emphatic). E.g. *magnificent, splendid* are used colloqually as terms of exaggeration.

## SEMANTIC TRANSPOSITION OF WORDS

Linguists distinguish direct or nominative meaning and figurative meaning in a word. The meaning is nominative when it nominates the object without the help of the context (in isolation).

The meaning is figurative when the object is named and at the same time characterized through its similarity with another object. Nominative meaning may be concrete and abstract, they may be of wide usage or narrow usage. Figurative meanings may be metaphoric and metonymyc. When used literally they have their natural, usual, direct meaning, when used figuratively they have a nonliteral, suggestive meaning. They are pictorial language, they appeal to the imagination, make for clearness and for beauty.

The most frequent transfers are based on associations of similarities or of contiguity. These types of transfer are wellknown as figures of speech and called metaphor, metonymy, hyperbole, euphemism, litotes, irony, synecdoche and zoosemy.

### Metaphor

*"All the world's a stage,*
*And all the men and women merely players,*
*They have their exits and their entrance".*
**William Shakespeare.**

A metaphor is an analogy between two objects or ideas, conveyed by the use of a word instead of another. The English metaphor derives from the 16th century Old French *metaphore,* from Greek which means "meta - change over" and "pherein -

to bear, to carry". In Modern Greek, the word "metaphor" also means "transport" or "transfer". So, a metaphor is a transfer of name based on the association of similarity and it is actually a hidden comparisons that show how two things that are not alike in most ways are similar in one important way.

1. Metaphors may be simple and complex. Simple metaphors are based on the resemblance between physical properties, appearance of objects, such as: *colour, form, movement, position, etc,* For ex.:

***a bridge*** *= 1) körpü; 2) bənd; 3) xərək; 4) burunun üst hissəsi (eynəkdə);*

***a ball*** *= 1) şar; 2) top; 3) yumaq, kələf;*

***a palm*** *=1) ovuc; 2) palma ağacı və ya onun yarpağı;*

***a skeleton*** *= 1) skelet; 2) arıq (adam);*

***a lamp post*** *=1) sütun, dirək, şalban; 2) uzun arıq adam*

2. Metaphors based on the resemblance of movement. For ex.:

***foxtrot*** *= 1) tülkü yerişi; 2) fokstrot (müasir rəqslərdən birinin adı, bu rəqs üçün yazılmış musiqi);*

***a slow coach*** *= kareta, yavaş tərpənən adam/ ləng gedən adam;*

***to plough the waves*** *= əbəs yerə zəhmət çəkmək and so on.*

3. Metaphors based on the resemblance of colour:

***violet*** *=1)bənövşə; 2) bənövşə rəngi;*

***lilac*** *= 1)yasəmən; 2) yasəmən rəngi and so on.*

4. Metaphors based on the resemblance of position:

***nose*** *= 1) burun; 2) qayığın, gəminin, təyyarənin və s.-nin ön hissəsi;*

***head*** *= 1) baş; 2) qapaq; 3) yuxarı hissə;*

***behind the scenes*** *= 1)məxfi, gizli, xəlvəti, səhnə arxasında*

Many simple metaphors are used so often that they fade away and lose their metaphorical expressiveness. E.g. *the legs of a table*

In such cases the comparison is forgotten and we have a new word. In some cases the use of the new word in word combinations seems absurd if the word retains its old meaning. E.g.

The ship *manned* with girls *(here "to man" is metaphor in the meaning of gəmini heyətlə tamamlamaq);*

He (Bossinney) reminded James, as he said afterwards, *of a hungry cat;*

I have been *green,* too, Miss Eyre. - *grass green;* not a more vernal tint freshens you now than once freshened me (Ch. Brontee).

In the above mentioned sentences *to man, a hungry cat* and *green, grass green* are metaphors, but the word *to man* is a new word.

Or in the sentence The walls are *white-washed* with blue, the verb *to white-wash* is a new expression. The primary meaning is "forgotten".

Complex metaphors are based on various complicated images defying classification. E.g. *the key to a mystery, the light of knowledge,* etc.

When we say *the blood boils* we are using words in sense which we well know not to be their original meanings, but which we feel to be justified by resemblance. In this way we create a metaphor. E.g.

*a rainy day – qara gun; a leaky vessel =1) su buraxan gəmi, batan gəmi; 2) çox danışan adam, sirr saxlaya bilməyən; standing dish* = 1) *həmişəki adi xörək, həmişəki xörək; 2) adi söhbətin mövzusu,* etc.

There are many set expressions, proverbs that contain the names of animals, birds, etc. used metaphorically.

*A snake in the grass - gizli düşmən, to make mountains out of molehills -qarışqadan fil düzəltmək, şişirtmək; to take a bee line - kəsə yolla getmək*

Some proper names have become common on the basis of metaphor. E.g.

*Romeo, Don Juan, Don Quixote, Hooligan,* etc.

It presents a method of description which likeness of one thing to another by referring to it, as if it were some other one. E.g. *a cunning person is referred to as a fox; a woman may be called a peach, a lemon, a cat, a goose, a bitch, a lioness,* etc.

Metaphor is the commonest of all figures of speech. It gives vivacity and expressiveness to speech and is especially necessary when an accustomed term loses its force through familiarity. It is an effective semantic way contributing much to the expressive power of language.

When we say *a shade of doubt, the light of knowledge, bitter enemy, the thread of argument, a golden opportunity, a stony heart, a stormy discussion; it is murderous heat, one's blood boils* we identify imaginatively one subject with another.

Metaphor may be described as a semantic process of associating two referents, one of which resembles the other. The word *hand* acquired in the 16th century the meaning of *a pointer of a clock or a watch* because of the similarity of one of the functions performed by the hand and the function of the clock-pointer.

In these expressions the objects are characterized by human qualities. Parts of body have furnished quite a number of well-established metaphors: *the lip of a cup, the leg of the table, the teeth of a saw, the hand of a watch, the teeth of a comb, the tongue of a shoe, the eyes of a potato,* etc.

Metaphor not only extend the use of words, but enrich the vocabulary. E.g.

My dad was *boiling mad* – ( It implies that my dad was very, very angry);

His idea was diffucult *to swallow* - (it implies that his idea was hard to accept);

The homework was *a breeze* - (it implies that the homework was very easy to do);

Her dog, Jake was *the sunshine* of her life – (Jake was the brightest or best part of her life).

Metaphor can be poetic and linguistic.

Poetic metaphor:

*The world is a bundle of hay*

*Mankind are the asses who pull* (Byron).

Linguistic metaphor: *foot (of a mountain), leg (of a table), eye (of a needle), nose (of a kettle, ship*) etc.

As a result of long usage, the comparison is completely forgotten and the thing named often has no other name (metaphorically proper names; *Don Juan, Haci Qara* and so on).

There is a *semantic motivation in metaphor.* So that it is based on the co-existence of direct and figurative meanings. E.g. *a mouth* is used to denote a part of body, and at the same time it can metaphorically apply to any opening or outlet: *the mouth of a river, the mouth of a cave,* etc.

*A jacket* is a short coat and also a protective cover for a book. In their direct meanings neither *the mouth* nor *the jacket* is motivated.

## Simile

Metaphor and simile are both terms that describes a comparison: the only difference between them is that a simile makes the comparison explicit by using "like" or "as". The Columbia Encyclopedia, 6th edition, explains the difference as: "a simile states that A is like B, a metaphor states that A is B". In this figure of speech two unlike things are compared, the comparison being made explicit typically by the use of the introductory "like" or "as" (American Heritage Dictionary).

The metaphor is an implied hidden comparison, but simile is a direct comparison. E.g. "You are my sunshine" is a metaphor, whereas "Your eyes are like the sun" is a simile.

Simile is a language device consisting in comparing two usually quite different objects. It may be recognized easily by the presence of *like* or *as*, occasionally by the comparative degree with *than* and less frequently in older poetry by *so*. Even though similes and metaphores are both forms of comparison, similes allow the two ideas to remain distinct in spite of their similarities, whereas metaphors compare two things without using "like" or "as". For example, a simile that compares a person with *a bullet* would go as follows: "*Katrina was a record-setting runner and as fast as a speeding bullet".* A metaphor might read something like: " *Katrina was a record-setting runner, a speeding bullet that could zip past you" (Katrina being the speeding bullet".*

When you are said: "You look like your mother" there is no simile, because the comparison is between like objects.

*I wandered lonely as a cloud –Mən bulud kimi tənha avaralanırdım;*

*My love is like a melody* – are simile.

A metaphor may usually be extended into simile, and a simile may be condensed into a metaphor. Metaphor and simile as devices are so integral part of a language that we are often unaware of their use until they are specially pointed out. Metaphor is the broader term. A simile is a metaphor , but not all metaphors are similes.

Examples: *free as mountain winds; as rapid as a wind; as white as snow, to swim like a fish, to laugh like a hyena[hai:nə] (goreşən), as red as a ripe tomato, etc.*

As we have seen what is only implied in the metaphor is distinctly expressed in the simile. Metaphor is to be preferred to the simile when the comparison is quite easy to be

understood, when a likeness is felt so vividly that the writer can directly call one thing by the name of another. For ex. "The snow blanketed the earth" is also a simile and not a metaphor, because the verb "blanketed" is a shortened form of the phrase "covered like a blanket".

Both metaphor and similes illustrate the fact that words change in meaning through the process of comparison.

Similes are widely used in literature, both modern and ancient. **Aristotel** said that good similes give an "effect of brilliance", but he preferred the use of metaphore, as it was shorter, and therefore more attractive in creative usage.

Simile Poem

I am mad as a storm,
I am silly as a monkey,
I am dumb as a donkey,
I am tall as a tree,
I am hungry as a lion,
I am nice as a horse,
I am loud as a thunderstorm,
I am thin as paper,
I am clever as my Mum.

by Aurelie Biehler

## Metonymy

Metonymy is the device in which the name of one thing is changed for that of another, to which it is related by association of ideas, as having close relationship to one another. The strength .of metonymy lies in the pictorial appeal of the concrete and visual and prominent, as opposed to the abstract and general. It is a figure of speech used in rhetoric in which a

thing or concept is not called by its own name, but by the name of something intimately associated with that thing or concept.

The term " metonymy" is also derived from Greek, which means "meta" – change and, "onyma" – name. Metonymy is a transference of meaning which is based on contiguity.

Contiguity of meaning or metonymy may be described as a semantic process of associating into referents one of which makes part of the other or is closely connected with it. The transfer may be conditioned by spatial, temporal, causal, symbolic, instrumental, functional and other connections.

Spatial relations: *present* when the name of the place is used for the people occupying; *the chair* may mean *the chairman.*

A causal relationship : *fear* < *ME fere // feer* < *OE faer "danger"*, unexpected attack; *frown* – is used in paralinguistics.

Functional connection: the things substituting one another in human practice: the early instrument for writing was *a feather*. We write with pens that are made of different materials and have nothing in common with feathers except the function.

Symbolic connection: the crown for *monarchy*. Instrument for the product, *hand* for handwriting.

Common names may be metonymically derived from proper names as in *macadam* - a type of pavement named after its inventer John McAdam (1790) and *diesel* invented by a German mechanical engineer Rudolf Diesel (1860).

Sometimes the semantic connection with place names is concealed by phonetic changes and is revealed by etymological study. The word *jeans* can be traced to the name of the Italian town Genoa, where the fabric of which they are made of, was first manufactured. Jeans is a case of metonymy, in which the

name of the material *jean* is used to denote an object made of it.

Words denoting the material from which an article is made are often used to denote the particular article: *glass, iron, copper, nickel* and others.

Metonymy may be based on different relations. The followings are the most common categories:

1.The name of the container is used instead of the thing contained:

*The kettle boils* (instead of *the water boils); He drank a cup* (instead of *he drank a cup of tea, coffee, water),* etc.

The names of various organs are used in the same way. E.g. *Ear, eye, heart,* etc.

Such as*: He has a weak eye* (instead of *eye-sight*).

2. Sometimes the change of meaning is reserved and the name of the thing contained is used instead of the container. E.g.

*School* = as bulding and as knowledge;

3. The name of the place is used instead of what is going in that place or instead of a person who is in this place. E.g.

*Bush* = 1 ) kol-kos, 2) avara

*Chair* = 1) stul, 2) kafedra (persons)

There are various associations of contiguity.

Association between material and product made of:

*Clay* = 1) gil, 2) qab

*Brass* = 1) mis, latun; 2) nəfəsli alət

*Copper*= coins made of copper

*Silver* = silver coins

*nickel* = nickel coins

4. A part stands for the whole.

*ABC* = the alphabet – 1.əlifba, 2. əlifba kitabı.

*to count noses* = to tell noses - iclasda iştirak edənləri (səsverənləri) saymaq.

*grey beard* = an old man (cf. ağsaqqal)

5. The whole stands for a part.
   The names of various animals are commonly used to mean furs. E.g.
   *fox* = 1) tülkü, 2) xəz, tülkü dərisindən hazırlanmış xəz
   *otter* = 1) su samuru, 2) su samuru dərisi
   *squirrel* = 1) dələ, 2) dələ dərisi (xəzi), etc.
6. Association between instrument and agent:
   *pen* = 1) qələm, 2) yazıçı.
   E.g. The best pens of the day = The best writers of the day.
7. Association between cause and effect. Here one meaning represents the cause and the other – the result. E.g. *cold* = soyuq (cause); soyuqlama, soyuqdəymə (result).
8. The name of the inventer is used instead of what he has invented. E.g.
   *Mackintosh, Volt, Diesel,* etc.

Besides *metaphor* and metonymy, there are other types of semantic changes. They are: synecdoche, hyperbole, litotes, irony, euphemism. There is a difference between these terms as understood in literary criticism and in lexicology. Thus, *"The White House said"* would be a metonymy for the president and his staff, because the *White House* is not part of the president or his staff, but is closely associated with them.

*He is the hope of the family; She was the pride of her school; I have never read Balzac in original; My sister is fond of old china; The coffee-pot is boiling; The pit loudly applauded; He succeeded to the crown.*

The transference of meaning connected with time expresses the process and the result of that event. E.g. *The process of his mourning: Onun yas mərasimi.*

Sometimes metonymy expresses the material itself and the things made of it. I planted an apple (Alma əkdim). It doesn't mean that I planted an apple (the fruit), but the seed of an apple, or the tree of an apple.

The main characteristic feature of metonymy is that, one of the components existing together, is imagined in mind. For ex.: He ate three plates— It means that he ate *three plates of soup,* or He knows *Sabir by heart (his works).*

## Synecdoche

The simplest case of metonomy is called synecdoche, literary meaning is "receiving together". It is also a Greek word, means *syn* – together, *ekdechomai* – I join in receiving.

Synecdoche means giving the part for the whole or vice versa. The name of a part is applied to the whole may be illustrated by such military terms as the *royal horse* for *cavalry* and *foot* for *infantry.*

Here we have:

a) the sign for the thing signified. E.g. *from the cradle to the grave* - from childhood to death; *gray hair* - old age or old men, should be respected.

b) the names of various organs are used in the same way. E.g.: *an ear-* for music, *a ready tongue-* for head, it is often used for brains, *heart* – for emotion, *coke* – for soda, *castle* – for home, *bread* –for food, E.g.

*He that has a tongue in his head may find his way where he pleases - Şirin dil adamı İsfahana da aparar, Şirin dil ilanı yuvasından da çıxarar.*

c) a part of species substituted for a whole:

*He manages to earn his bread* –(necessities of life).

It is generally held that metaphor plays a more important role in the change of meaning than metonymy.

Metonymy and synecdoche have contributed to the stock of words by becoming fossilized.

He commanded a fleet of thirty sail.

There is a mixture of the tiger and the ape in the character of a Frenchman (Volter).

The authorities put an end to the tumult.

He was bound in irons.

I have a few coppers in my purse.

Synecdoche is a figure of speech in which:

- a term denoting a part of something is used to refer to the whole thing;
- a term denoting a thing (a 'whole") is used to refer to part of it;
- a term denoting a specific class of thing (a "species") is used to refer to a larger, more general class (a "genus") is used to refer to a smaller, more specific class (species);
- a term denoting a material is used to refer to an object composed of that material.

Synecdochy is closely related to metonymy (the figure of speech in which a term denoting one thing is used to refer to a related thing); indeed, synecdochy is often considered a subclass of metonymy.

Examples where a part of something is used to refer to the whole:

The hired "*hands*" (workers) are not doing their jobs; His parents bought him a new "*set of wheels*" (car);

Examples where a species (specific kind) is used to refer to its genus (more general kind):

The "*cutthroats*" (assassins) there will as soon as show a man as look at him".

Examples where the whole of something is used to refer to a part of it:

Use your "*head*" (brain) to figure it out.

Examples where a genus is used to refer to a species:

No "*creature*" (person) would believe that story.

Examples where the material, an object is made of is used to refer to the object itself:

Those are some nice *"threads"* (clothes).

**Zoosemy**

The process of people being nicknamed from animals is very common. Names of animals are often used metaphorically to denote qualities. This is zoosemy. E.g.

" A cruel man" may be called *a tiger,* a cunning (crafty) person may be called "a fox or a sly dog"; "a lively child" may be called *a chicken;"* a stupid person" may be called "a goose, an ass"; "a clumsy person" may be called "a bear"; if a person is "stubborn", we may refer to him as *mulish*, etc.

Most expressions of this type are of popular origin.

*Rabbit – hearted* = qorxaq, cəsarətsiz; *rat-face* = cüvəllağı;

*Queer fish* = qəribə adam; *adder* = murdar, iyrənc.

Thus, we find quite a number of instances when names of animals are metaphorically used to denote human qualities. Most expressions of this type are of popular origin.

There are a great many idiomatic phrases and proverbial sayings containing names of animals, birds, insects, etc. used metaphorically, e.g.

*a dog in the monger* – Nə özü yeyir, nə başqasına verir; *snake in the grass* – gizli düşmən; *it is raining cats and dogs* - it is pouring heavily (şıdırğı yağış yağmaq); *to take a bee line* – qısa// kəsə yolla getmək.

Better examples of names of animals are:

*Calf* — a young man, *a gay dog* — a lively person; *donkey* — a foolish man; *monkey* - a mischievous child; *a pig* — 1) a greedy person; 2) an ill-mannered person; *whale (amer.)* — a clever person.

Peculiar is the metaphoric use of desubstantive (denominative) verbs coming from animal names. Such verbs are generally made by means of conversion. Here are some examples for illustration:

*dog* — to dog a person's foot steps; *fish* — to fish out, to try to make smb. tell smth., to fish in troubled waters; *fox* — to fox, to beguile, to trick; *ape* — to ape, to imitate; *wolf* — to wolf, to eat greedily as a wolf does.

If a person devoted to books and study, she (or he) may be called *a bookworm* ( fiquratively: kitab qurdu - insan haq.).

Zoosemy needs no explanation when people are nicknamed (lion, parrot, sheep, snake, duck, goose, mole, viper, hen, cock, etc.).

*He is like a lion* – simile as we know.

*He is a wolf in sheep's clothing* – O,qoyun dərisi geymiş canavardir (metaphor).

## Hyperbole

Hyperbole is the use of exaggeration as rhetorical device or figure of speech. It may be used to evoke strong feelings or to create a strong impression, but is not meant to be taken literally.

The term is derived from Greek, *hyper* – beyond, *ballein* - to throw. Hyperbole is another name for an exaggeration, so, it is an exaggerated statement. By this figure we mean a statement exaggerated fancifully for the purpose of creating emphasis or effect. It is frequently used in fiction and poetry, but not in scientific texts, where precision of expression is necessary. Colloquial speech is rich in hyperbolic expressions. It serves to convey intensity of feeling. One of the most typical features of hyperbole is its emotional saturation. In colloquial speech hyperbole makes use of especially striking

intonation with great rises and falls of voice. On occasion, newspapers and other media use hypebole when speaking of an accident, to increase the impact of the story. Familiar examples of hyperbole are:

*a thousand and one care; I haven't seen you for ages; the waves were mountain - high; I'd give the world to see her; Million of reasons; I beg a thousand pardons ; I've told you fifty times; A thousand thanks,* etc.

The most important difference between a poetic hyperbole and a linguistic one lies in the fact that the former creates an image, whereas in the latter the denotative meaning quickly fades out and the corresponding exaggerating words serve only as general signs of emotion itself. Some of the most frequent emphatic words are*: Absolutely!, Lovely!, Splendid!, Marvellous!, Amazing!* etc.

Hyperbolic expressions are a frequent occurance in our every day colloquial speech. E.g.

*A fresh egg has a world of power* (Bellow).

A very good example is chosen by I.R.Galperin from Byron,

*When people say "I've told you fifty times",*
*They mean to scold and very often do.*

The reader will note that Byron's intonation is distinctly colloquial, the poet is giving us his observations concerning colloquial expresssions. So, the hyperbole here, though used in verse, is not poetic but linguistic. Hypebole is common in tall short tales.E.g.

- Mrs. Candour: Oh, Maria! Child, - what is the whole affair of between you and Charles? His extravagance, I presume - *the town talks of nothing else.*
- Maria: I am very sorry, ma'am, *the town has so little to do.*
- Mrs. Candour: True, true, child, but there is no *stopping people's tongue.*

Hyperbole often loses its force and all its hyperbolic character. Some hyperbolic expressions have become so well established in popular use, that their stylistic nature is no longer noticed.

The process of the fading of emotional colouring resulting from the use of exaggeration constantly goes on in the language.

Frequent hyperbolic use of highly emotional words leads to their weakening and to be subsequent creation of more emphatic terms, which gradually lose their force and are in their turn replaced by more emphatic terms. Hypebole is often used in description. It emphasizes some qualities of a person or thing by exaggerating them. It can also be used to describe a person's emotion. Hyperbole is a comparison like similes and metaphors, but is extravagant and even ridiculous. For ex.

*I am so hungry I could eat a horse; I have a million things to do; I had a ton of homework; If I can't buy that new game, I will die; He is as skinny as a toothpick; He is older than the hills.*

Hyperbole is very common in both everyday speech and in written English. In written English, it tends to be used within informal settings or for literary effect. It is not for example, regarded as good practise to use hypebole within business English, it could be regarded as unprofessional. Therefore hypebole is a literary tool or a very informal tool and it should not be used in formal settings.

We observe it in such words as: *to astonish, to amaze, to surprise.*

*Astonish* originally meant to "thunderstrike" (lat. *extonare: ex* – from, out of; *tenare* – to thunder) and was in its earliest stages used in the physical sense of "stun".

The word was also used metaphorically for the extreme effect of dismay or wonder that paralyses the faculties for a

moment. The word lost its force, till nowadays it is hardly more than an emphatic synonym for *surprise* or *excite, wonder.*

*Amaze* has almost the same history; originally it meant utter physical superfaction.

## Litotes

Hyperbole is an exaggerated statement, but the reverse figure is called litotes, ( from Gr. *Litos* - "plain", "simple", "meagre", "weak", "not enough") or understatement. It is a figure of speech in which understatement is employed for rhetorical effect. It is most often used to describe the expression of an idea by a denial of its opposite.

It might be defined as expressing the affirmative by the negative of its contrary; *not bad* for "good"; *not small* for "great"; *no coward* for "brave", etc. Litotes is a form of understatement always deliberate and with the intention of emphasis. However, the interpretation of litotes icluding cultural context in speech it may also depend on intonation and emphasis: for example the phrase "not bad" can be said in such a way as to mean "excellent".

**Litotes** or **meiosis** may be easily illustrated by reference to both literary and popular speech. Belittling terms are commonly applied by emphasis to what is most highly valued. Anything *highly praised* is *far from bad*, or *not half bad.*

Some understatements do not contain negations. E.g.

*I could do with a cup of tea.*

Understatement expresses a desire to conceal or suppress one's feelings, according to the code of reserve and to seem indifferent and calm. E.g.

*Long time since we met.; It is a bit, isn't it?*

Understatement is rich in connotations. It may convey irony, disparagment and add expressiveness. E.g. *rather unwise*

(about somebody very silly) *or rather pushing* (about somebody quite unscrupulous) - vicdansiz.

Understatement is considered to be a typical British way of putting things and is more characterictic of male colloquial speech. So, *when a woman calls a concert absolutely fabulous*? using a hyperbole, a man would say *it is not too bad*, or that *it was some concert.*

Some examples in litotes:

| Litotes | As a mean of saying |
|---|---|
| Not bad | Good |
| You are not wrong | You are correct |
| Not unlike | Like |
| She is not so unkind | She is kind |
| He was not unfamiliar with the works of Dickens | He was well acquainted with the works of Dickens |
| She is not the brightest girl in the class | She is stupid |
| They are not the happiest couple around | They are unhappy |

Litotes is a mind of understatement, where the speaker or writer uses a negative of a word ironically, to mean the opposite. Litotes is to be found in English literature right back to Anglo-Saxon times. It is a figure of speech, conscious understatement in which emphasis is achieved by negation. It is a stylistic feature of old English poetry. The term meiosis means understatement generally, and litotes is considered a form of meioses.

## Irony

The term irony is also taken from rhetoric, it is the expression of one's meaning by words of opposite sense, especially a simulated adoption of the opposite point of view for the purpose of ridicule or disparagement. One of the meanings of the adjective *nice* is "bad", "unsatisfactory", it is marked off as ironical and illustrated by the example: *You have got us into a nice mess!*

The same may be said about the adjective *pretty: A pretty mess you've made of it; as straight as a round-about; as smooth as sandpaper; as funny as a funeral, etc.*

Irony is a literary or rhetorical device, in which there is a gap between what a speaker or a writer says and what is generally understood. Irony may also arise from a discordance between acts and results, especially if it is striking and seen by an outside audience. Irony is understood as an aesthetic evaluation by an audience which relies on a sharp discordance between the real and the ideal and which is variously apllied to texts, speech, events, acts and even fashion.

The connection between irony and humor is somewhat revaled when the surprise at what should have expected startless us into laughter. However not all irony is humourous.

## Euphemism and taboos

By this figure we speak in gentle and favourable terms of some person, object or event, which is ordinarily seen in a less pleasing light. Euphemism is the substitution of an inoffensive expression, or one with favourable associations, for an expression that may offend of its disagreeble association.

People try to avoid using words and expressions that are unpleasant, inappropriate or embarrassing . They are afraid of hurting another people's feelings using such kinds of words and expressions. The consciously-avoided words and expressions are called "euphemisms". The word *euphemism* comes from the Greek word. *Eu* – good/ well + *pheme* – speech/speaking. Euphemism is the substitution of words or expressions for words and expressions that seem rough, unpleasant or inconvenient to be pronounced. The people use euphemisms to get rid of the negative meaning or connotation the word or topic in question has. These include sex, death, killing, crime, disease and different functions of the human body.

Etymologically, this term is the opposite of the blaspheme (evil-speaking). It may be used to hide unpleasent or disturbing ideas, even when the literal term for them is not necessarily offensive. This type of euphemism is used in public relations and politics. Sometimes the use of euphemism is equated to politeness. There are also superstitious euphemisms, based (consciously or subconsciously) on the idea that words have the power to bring bad fortune, and there are religious euphemisms, based on the idea that some words are holy (saint), or that some words are spiritually taboo. Taboos were orginally concerned with sacred matters that could not be discussed, but nowadays taboos usually concern things that people are ashamed of.

The origin of euphemism is to be sought in the remotest past, at early stage of civilization, when religious taboo dictated the avoidance of certain terms. For ex.: *the names of dead persons.* People refuse to utter the name of a person, who is no longer living, or to give it to a child, so that name actually becomes obsolete among the tribe. It was believed that the

name of a person or a thing had the force of producing disasters.

In English many euphemisms appeared in the 17th century. Instead of *God* they said "Lord", *By God!* = by George!, Instead of *Devil* they said "Dickens", "Old Harry" (because their thought was "Speak of the Devil and he will appear").

Words connected with sacred beings and objects are tabooed. Taboo is a strong social prohibition meant as a safeguard against supernatural forces. This is of historical interest.

The term comes from the Tongan language and appears in many Polinesian cultures. When an activity is taboo, it is forbidden. Some taboo activities or customs are prohibited under law may lead severe penalties. Other taboos may result in embarrasement, shame or redness.

The use of taboo in English dates back to 1777 when an English explorer Captain James Cook visited Tongans. He wrote: "When anything is forbidden to be eaten, or made use of it, they say that is taboo".

The English language contains numerous euphemisms related to *dying, death, burial*, and the people and places which deal with *death*.

The practice of using euphemisms for *death* is likely to have originated with the magical belief that to speak the word "death" was *to invite death, to draw death's attention.* It is the ultimate bad fortune. A common theory holds that *death* is a taboo subject in most English speaking cultures. It may be said that one is not dying, but fading quickly, because the end is near. People who have died are referred to as *having passed away,* or *passed* or *departed.* In early English poetry the heroes did not literally die, but euphemistically lay or fell. The term "cemetery" for "graveyard" is a borrowing from Greek, where it was a euphemism, literally meaning "a sleeping place".

The same feature of language is familiar in Modern English, such as:

*to decease, to join the majority, yield up the ghost, to go to one's reckoning, to expire, to pass away, to breathe one's last, to go west, to be no more, to go to one's last resting place,* etc.

Instead of *to kill – to finish, to be away with, to put away, to remove, to settle,* etc. Sometimes the *deseased* is said *to have gone to a better place*, but this is used primarily among the religious with a concept of Heaven.

Instead of *dead* they say: *late, departed, deceased. My better half* instead of *my wife.* Instead of *fat* or *overweight* they say: *full figured, heavy - set, thick-boned, fluffy;* for *drug addiction* they say *chemical dependency*; *correctional facility* for *prison*; *lost their lives* for *were killed; the big "C"* for *cancer; powder room, rest room* for *toilet room* (US) – (the word "toilet"; was itself originally a euphemism).

The latter is the common areas in certain body parts and functions. People find it difficult to talk about going to the toilet. Among good friends and acquaintances it may be acceptable to directly ask the location of the toilet or mention the bodily function(s) for which one needs to use it, but in other situations people might ask: "Where could I wash my hands?" In a restaurants the women often say that they need *to go and powder their noses* or that they need *to freshen up* when they need to use the toilet.

From the semasiological point of view euphemism is important. It is a frequent occurance in most modern languages, but it will be remembered that it is not the same as religious taboo with which it is connected historically.

Words having an unpleasant connotations are sometimes replaced by letters: Ex: *T.B* . = tuberculosis; *to hell* = to "h" with it.

Unpleasant words are sometimes replaced by foreign names, such as: *with children, pregnant* = enceinte (Fr.).

Euphemisms are referring to something unpleasant by using milder words and phrases. E.g. *pass away* = to die; *pregnant* = to be in the family way; *naked* = to be in the birthday suit, *drunk* = intoxicated, *mad* = insane, *deaf* = hard of hearing, etc. For ex.:

*1. "Your grammar is"*...she had intended saying *awful*, but she amended it to "*not particulary good"* (J.London. Martin Eden);

2. - Where did you get the dough from then?

- *Pinched* it, if you want to know (Sillitos A. Key to the Door).

3. I mean did they put you in a good place?

- What d'yo mean? – said Mr. Watkins suspiciously, "One would think you were trying to make out I'd been *put away*..."(Walls H.G. The Hummerpond Park Burglary). (*to put away* – in colloqual speech means "to put into prison").

Every culture has its own topics that are forbidden and should not be talked about directly. For ex. In Azerbaycani there were some words which were forbidden to pronounce in social place among the eldest and much respected people. E.g. instead of *my wife* they used to say *my children's mother*, etc. Side by side with euphemisms there exists **dysphemisms** (kakophemisms). They are collogual and jargonic words. When applied to people, animal names are usually dysphemisms: *coot, old bat, pig, chicken, bitch*, etc.

Speakers resort to dysphemism to talk about people and things that frustrate and annoy them, that they are disapprove of and wish to disparage, humilate and degrade. Curses, name-calling and any sort of derogatory comment directed towards others in order to insult or to wound them are all examples of dysphemism. Exclamatory swear words that release frustration or anger are dysphemism. Like euphemism, dysphemism

interacts with style and has the potential to produce stylistic discord; if someone at a formal dinner party were publicly announce "I'm off for a piss", rather than saying "Excuse me for a moment", the effect would be dysphemistic. E.g. old fox – *kaftar*, to go to a hell - *cəhənnəm olmaq*, beast - *vəhşi*, bull – *qanmaz*, to gorge //to guzzle ; *gözünə dürtmək // zəhrimarlanmaq*, a ruthless // a ferocious person - *amansız, əzrayıl,* etc.

As said above euphemisms and disphemisms are stylistic connotations in their semantic structure.

**Short Glossary of Words and Their Euphemisms**

| Word | Euphemism |
|---|---|
| accident | incident |
| addict, addiction | substance abuse |
| arrest | apprehend |
| beggar | homeless person, panhandler |
| bombing | air support |
| coffin | casket |
| criminal | illegal |
| crippled | physically challenged |
| dead | departed, deceased, lost, gone |
| death insurance | life insurance |
| death penalty | capital punishment |
| death | end, destination, better world |
| die | pass away, expire, go to heaven |
| drugs | illegal substances |
| drunk | intoxicated, tipsy |
| fail | fall short, go out of business |
| fat | overweight, chubby, stout, plump |
| garbage collector | sanitation person |
| genocide | ethnic cleansing |
| illegal worker | undocumented worker |

| | |
|---|---|
| imprisoned | incarcerated |
| jail | secure facility |
| kill | put down/away/out/to sleep |
| lazy | unmotivated |
| make love | sleep with |
| money | funds |
| mortuary | funeral home/parlor |
| murder | hit, kill, finish off someone |
| old | senior, seasoned |
| old age | golden age, golden years |
| old person | pensioner |
| old persons' home | retirement home, rest home |
| perspire | sweat |
| poor | low-income, underprivileged |
| prison | correctional facility |
| prisoner | inmate, convict |
| pregnant | to be in the family way |
| sexual intercourse | sleep with, make love |
| sexual relationship | intimate relationship |
| spy | source of information |
| stupid | slow |
| toilet | WC, restroom, washroom, Loo |
| ugly | unattractive |
| unemployed | between jobs, taking time off |

## RESULTS OF SEMANTIC CHANGE

Word meaning is liable to change in the course of the historical development of the language. The etymological analysis make it possible to see the development of the meaning of the word and at the result can be generally observed the changes of the denotational meaning of the word.

According to the types of change there are four major tendencies:

1) extention of meaning (generalization);
2) narrowing of meaning (specialization);
3) degradation of meaning (pejoration);
4) elevation of meaning (amelioration).

### Extention of meaning (generalization)

If a word begins to be applied to wider group of objects or phenomena its meaning is extended. Extention of meaning means widening of the word. Most words begin as specific names for things. However, this denotation is quickly lost and the meaning of words is extended and generalized. Extention of meaning is one of the most common features in the history of words. For ex. *Manuscript* is a word that now refers to any author's copy, whether written by hand or typed, but originally it meant only something written by hand. But the word *manufactured* now applies generally to all sorts of mechanical process. Or the word *season* originally meant only "the period of sowing", but now it is used to denote all the four parts of the year. The word *to arrive* originally meant "to come by ship or

by boat". The word *journal* originally meant "diary", but now it means only periodical publication.

The original proper name is usually forgotten. Such as:

*calico* (pambıq parça növü)– from Calicut, India;

*lynch* – (daş-qalaq etmək, to punish wildly) – from Charles Lynch, a planter in Verginia in the 18-th century;

*cravat* - (qalstuk, kerchief for men covering their neck) – from the French word Croation;

*a foreigner* – was originally one who lived out of doors;

*picture* – originally smth. painted;

*scene* – from Greek for tent;

*paper* – from Greek papyrus of an Egiption plant;

*pipe* – originally meant a simple musical instrument. Gradually it was transfered to other things resembling this shape.

Extention of meaning includes not only the change from concrete to abstract, but also from specific to general.

The process of generalization went very far in the history of the word *thing*. Its etymological meaning was "an essembly for deliberation on some judicial or business affair", *hence* – "a matter brought before this assembly" and what was said *or decided upon* then "cause", "object", "decision". Now it has become one of the most general words of the language, it can substitute almost any noun, especially non-personal noun, and has received a pronominal force: Cf. *something, nothing, anything,* as in *Nothing has happened yet.*

While generalizing, the words acquire figurative meanings, but there are some words which can substitute any word of their class. Such kind of words are called generic terms. For ex.: *person* – for personal noun = "man, woman"; *furniture* – for the words "table, chair, wardrobe, buffet"; *animal* – for

"dog, horse, wolf, fox"; *team* – for "a group of person, acting together in work or in a game", etc..

## Narrowing of Meaning (Specialization)

If a word begins to be applied to a narrower (or a less) number of objects or phenomena its meaning is narrowed. It is one of the tendencies - narrowing of meanings or restriction. Sometimes it is called specialization of meaning. In the process of historical development the word loses one or many of its meanings or becomes the international word.

So, a word of wide usage is restricted in the application and comes to be used only in a special sense.

In early times, a human or animal body, living or dead, was called *corpse*. Now this general term has been specialized to mean *a dead body, usually that of human being*. Or the word *meat* originally meant *any kind of food*, but now it means only *flesh of some animals*. The word *wife* meant *woman*, *to starve* originally meant *to die*, but when the Scandinavian word *to die* was borrowed the meaning of *to starve* became narrowed and now it means *to die of hunger*. The word *deer* meant *any kind of animal,* but when the French word *beast* was borrowed, the meaning of the word *deer* was narrowed. The following words illustrate the narrowing of words:

*Meat* – originally meant *food and drink*;

*Bread* - originally meant *a fragment or a small piece;*

*Fruit* - originally meant *a product or something enjoyed*;

*Wife* - originally meant simply *woman (wife-woman),* now restricted to a married woman. The word *housewife* is retained from that time;

*Garage* (Fr. borrowing) once meant *any safe place*. Now it means specifically a building for housing automobiles;

*Worm* – once meant *any kind of reptile or insect;*

*Grocer* – was used in the meaning of *a wholesale dealer*, now *a retail dealer* in the tea, coffee, sugar, spices, fruits and other commodities;

*Hospital* – originally *a place for shelter or entertainment of travelers,* Compare: *hostel, hotel* are from this word.

Words are often specialized in technical vocabulary. Such as: *Dog* – qarmaq; *pig* – qəlib, bülöv daşı; *arm* – qulp, sap, tutacaq; *eye* – qol, ilgək and so on.

Other examples of specialization are *room,* which alongside the new meaning keeps the old one of "space"; *corn* original meaning "grain", "the seed of any cereal plant": logically the word becomes specialized and is understood to denote the leading crop of the district; hence in England *corn* means "wheat" in Scotland "oats", whereas in the USA, as an ellipsis or *Indian corn*, it came to mean "maize".

As a special group belonging to the same type one can mention of proper nouns from common nouns chiefly in toponymics, i.e. place names. E.g.: *the City* – the business part of London; the Highlands – the mountainous part of Scotland; *Oxford* – University town in England (from *ox+ford*, i.e. a place where oxen could ford the river); *the Tower* (of London) – originally a fortress and place, later a state prison, now a museum.

## Elevation of Meaning (Amelioration)

In the course of time some words have completely changed their meanings. It happened because people's attitude to some things or phenomena have changed. The process known as elevation or amelioration is opposite of degradation. Words often rise from humble beginnings to positions of greater importance, such changes are not always easy to account for in detail, but we can say that social changes make them

acquire better meanings. In such cases social and class relations are revealed.

We observed that some words acquire a worse meaning as the result of being restricted in meaning.

Some highly complimentary words were originally applied to things of comparatively slight importance. Many words have been elevated through association with the ruling class. E.g. *knight* once meant *a boy*. Then it meant *servant* and coming through military associations it received new meaning: *a tittle of rank.*

*Fame* – (Lat.) originally meant only "report, common talk, rumour";

*Splendid* (Lat.) – goes back to the simple meaning "bright";

The following words are familiar examples of the process of elevation of meaning:

*Minister* – now means an important public official, but in earlier times meant "servant";

*Comrade* – from Spanish for " roommate ";

*Marshal* – a Germanic word meaning "horse-servant" was adopted into French;

*Chiffon* ['ʃifən] – meant "a rag" in French;

*Smart* – now is used in the meaning of "chic", but in earlier times meant "causing pain";

*Nice* – in earlier times meant "foolish" being derived through French from Latin " nescius" (This is the regular sense in Chauser's writings).

The word was gradually specialized in the sense "foolishly particular about trifles". Then the idea of folly was lost and "particular about small things", *accurate* came into existence. In this sense *nice* was naturally applied to persons *as a nice observer, a nice distinction.* So, the word passed through different stages of radiation and became elevated in meaning. Gradually it became into *accurate* and applied to persons as *a*

*nice observer*. Then it became elevated in meaning, denoting *good quality, excellent.*

*Lord* – Christian word; the lord –God; Lord knows. *The lord's day*-bazar günü; *to lord* – idarə etmək, *lord* – inzibati vəzifə tutan şəxs;

*Queen* – 1) kralica, şahzadə; 2) ilahə, mələikə; 3) gözəllik, bəzək; 4) sevgili, canan;

*Duke* – hersoq (Qərbi Aropada yüksək zadəgan rütbələrindən biri);

*Tory* – Ingiltərədə indiki konservativlər (mühafizəkarlar), (köhnəlik tərəfdarları) partiyasının əsasını təşkil edən siyasi partiyanın adı; 2) konservativlər partiyası.

## Degradation of meaning (Pejoration)

Along with elevation of meaning there exists one more process of meaning, i.e. degradation. Degradation is such a process that a word falls into disrepute for some reasons. Words once respectable may become less respectable. Some words reach such a low point that it is considered improper to use them.

The following words originally have their neutral meaning but in Modern English they are used, with an unfavourable implication. Some words reflect class relations in the country and the attitude of the ruling class to common people. E.g. the word *villain* meant "a man working on a farm or country house". Such person was thought by his social superiors to have low sense of morality and that is why the word changed its meaning into *scoundrel.*

The word *knave* in Old English meant *a boy, a servant boy*. But as from the point of view of the master most of the servant boys were rouges, the word *knave* descended to the meaning *rascal. Rascal* originally meant *yaramaz, dələduz.*

Sometimes, only the derivatives of words have a degradating meaning, but the word itself is natural and keeps its original meaning. E.g.

*Mood - moody* (of bad temper) = məyus, qəmgin; *scheme-schemer* = fitnəkar. The following words are examples of degradation of meanings:

*Churl* (qanacaqsiz) – in OE meant *a man*;

*Boor* (tərbiyəsiz) - in OE meant *a farmer*;

*Vulgar* - in OE meant *common, ordinary*, in Latin - *vulgaris* meant *the common people*;

*Gossip* - in OE meant *a God parent*;

*Silly* - in OE meant *happy*;

*Insane* - in OE meant *not well*, Latin – *insane;*

*Idiot* - in OE meant *a private person*, in Greek *idiotes*.

## POLYSEMY

While analysing the word meaning we observe that words are not units of a single meaning. They are monosemantic and polysemantic.

Monosemantic words are few in number. They are mainly scientific terms. The majority of English words are polysemantic.

Polysemy is a diachronic term. It is a word of Greek origin which consists of two words: *poly* means "many" and *sema* means "meaning". Thus the term polysemy is used to denote the presence of several meanings that usually appear in one and the same word on the basis of its original meaning. It must be said that the main source of polysemy is a change in the semantic structure of the word. So the word *polysemy* means "plurality of meanings", it exists only in the language, not in speech. A word which has more than one meaning is called polysemantic.

It implies that a word may retain its previous meaning and at the same time acquire one or several new ones. For ex.: The word *table* has some meanings (yemək, lövhə, qonaqları əyləndirmək, table manner and so on.), but the primary meaning is a *flat slab of stone or wood*, the other meanings are secondary meanings, and they derived from the primary meaning of the word. This word has at least 9 meanings in Modern English: *a piece of furniture, the persons seated at a table, the food put on the table, meals; a thin flat piece made of stone or wood; an orderly arrangement of facts or figures; part of a machine-tool,* etc. Or the word "*hand*" has the meanings of *1) parts of body, 2) the part of a clock, 3) handlike things,* etc.

Polysemy is characteristic of most words in many languages. But owing to the monosyllabic character of the English language, polysemy is more characteristic of the English vocabulary.

The main source of polysemy is a change in the semantic structure of the word. This change may be metaphoric or metonymic of which we spoke.

There are two main reasons that help words to get several meanings:

1. The fact that words are used in different situations surrounded by other words. Their neighbourhood may influence the meaning of words. For ex.: *glass — güzgü, şüşə, stəkan, barometr; head — baş (bədən üzvü), baş həkim, baş müəllim, baş soğan, hər hansı bir əşyanın (dağın, ağacın, stolun, etc.) başı, cayın başlanğıcı*, etc.
2. Words can be used figuratively. E.g. the word *hand* originally meant *əl*. Later new meanings connected with the original meaning of this word began to appear mainly: *skill, ability, crew, a worker;*

The context shows in which of its several meanings the word is used. Under the "context" we mean the surrounding words or even sentences which are combined with the given polysemantic word. E.g.

There is *a table* in the middle of the room.

There are some *tables* on the walls showing the achievements of the national economy. Another examples:

She *worked* hard - The lift doesn't *work* - I *worked* on him to come to the wedding (here in the meaning of "influence").

I just bought *a book* (object) – He wrote *a book* (text) – We *booked* in at the hotel (check in) – *We booked* our tickets this morning (reserve a seat).

These examples show that polysemy is not only homogeneous phenomenon.

She could hear the *piano* (sound) – She polished the *piano* (piece of furniture). These objects can be viewed from a number of points of view. For example as a music instrument or a piece of furniture. The link between these usages is clearly the object as a whole.

So by the word polysemy, it is understood that several meanings exist in one word on the basis of its original meaning. The phenomenon polysemy is met in different parts of speech. For example:

Noun: ***witness:*** 1.sübut, şahidin ifadəsi; 2. hadisəni ilk görən və onu təsvir edə bilən şəxs; 3. məhkəmədə and içib ifadə venrən şəxs; 4. hər hansı bir sənəddə məsul şəxsin imzasının yanında imza atan şəxs və s.

Verb: *run:* 1. insanın qaçması; 2. maşınların şütüməsi; 3. qanın axması, dövran etməsi; 4. çayın axması, tökülməsi; 5. burunun axması və s.

Adjective: *large:* 1. a large room - böyük otaq; 2. large mouth - iri ağız; 3. large appetite - yaxşı iştaha; 4. large number - çox say və s.

Polysemy is more characteristic of the English vocabulary as compared with the other languages. This is due to the monosyllabic character of English and the predominance of root words.

## HOMONYMY

In linguistics, a homonym is one of a group of words that share the same spelling and the same pronunciation, but have different meanings, usually as a result of the words having different origins. So, words identical in sound form, but different in meanings are traditionally termed homonyms. The word *homonym* is of Greek origin, which consists of two words *homos* (similar) and *onoma* (name). Thus words identical in sound form and spelling, but different in meanings are called homonyms.
For ex.: *yoke (boyunduruq);* məc. *zülm, əsarət); yolk (yumurta sarısı); meat – meet,* etc. The meaning of the given word is determined by the context. Ex.:

*Meet* my sister; I don't like *meat*; A penny is one *cent*; The soap has a nice *scent*; She *sent* me a letter, etc.

Homonymy in English is wide-spread specially among monosyllables:

*I-eye; too-two; right-write; or-ore; steal-steel; tail- tale,* etc.

The term "homonym" can be used to refer to two different kinds of words:

a) *words that share the same spelling* (irrespective of their pronunciation);
b) *words that share the same pronunciation (*irrespective of their spelling).

This means that "homonym" can be used to mean a homograph and homophone. A distinction can be made between perfect homonym, which is called "true" homonym, such as *skate* (glide on ice) and *skate* (the fish).

*Homographs* (literally "same writing") are words identical in spelling, but different both in their sound form and

meaning. It is precise to call them **homographs** and they are sometimes misleadingly called **heteronyms.**They are usually defined as words that share the same spelling, regardless of how they are pronounced. For ex.:

*bow* [bou] – a piece of wood curved by a string and used for shooting arrows; *bow* [baw] - the bending of the head or body;

*lead* [li:d] – to go with or in front of a person to show the way – aparmaq, rəhbərlik etmək; *lead* [led] – soft, heavy, easily melted metal - qurğuşun;

*tear* [tiə] – a drop of water that comes from the eyes (göz yaşı), tear [teə] – to pull apart by force (cırmaq);

*wind* [wind] – air that is moving across the surface of the earth; wind [waind] - tighten the spring of a watch or clock; raise the weights that operate a clock;

*row* [rau] – noisy or violent argument or quarrel; row [rou] – number of a person or things in a line;

*Homophones* (literally "same sound") are usually defined as words that share the same pronunciation, regardless of how they are spelled. They are words identical in sound form, different both in spelling and in meaning.

For ex.: *sea-see; hear-here, son-sun, read-red, knight-night, know-no, wright-right, pair-pear,* etc.

Homonyms appear as a result of the followings:

1) Disintegration of polysemy, that is when one meaning of a polysemantic word tears itself away from the polysemantic word and becomes an independent word, because semantically it cannot be traced back to its primary meaning. E.g. *board* is a *plank of wood.* Then it became *a side of a ship*, then *food* because *food* was served on the table made of wood; later on it acquired the meaning of *council* (sovet, şura).

2) As a result of phonetical and morphological changes sometimes they originated from different roots and having different meanings became to coincide in form.

*ear = qulaq – A.S. = eare; ear = sünbül < A.S. = ear*

3) As a result of conversion. E.g.

*water = to water, love = to love; back (n) = to back (v) = back (adv); work = to work*

4) As a result of shortening. E.g.

*exam = examination, lab = laboratory, frig = refrigerator*

5) Sometimes borrowed words are homonyms to the native ones. E.g.

*ball (En.) = ball (Fr.) (bal – rəqs gecəsi); match (En.) = match (Fr.) (kibrit), etc.*

There are two types of homonyms:

1) full or perfect homonyms. Full lexical homonyms are words, which represent the same category of parts of speech and have the same paradigm. They are such words identical both in spelling and sound form, but different in meaning: *case – something that has happened, case – a box, a container; bark – noise made by a dog, bark – the skin of a tree; march – a game, a contest, March- the third month of the year; match – a game, a contest, match – a short piece of wood for producing fire,* etc.

2) partial homonyms are subdivided into three groups. This classification of homonyms are given by prof. Smirnitsky. They may be classified by the type of meaning into lexical, lexico-grammatical and grammatical homonyms:

a) lexical homonyms: in which the part of speech meaning of the words and their paradigms are identical. They differ only in lexical meanings: *seal - (möhür); seal - (suiti).*

b) lexico-grammatical homonyms differ both in lexical and in grammatical meanings. They either belong to

different parts of speech or present grammatical forms of different words :

*blue (mavi) – blew (past tense of* "blow"*); found (bünövrə) – found (past tense of* "find"*); rose (flower) – rose (past ind. of* to rise*),* etc.

Word-building also contributes significantly to the growth of homonymy, and the most important type undoubtedly **conversion**. Such pairs of words as *comb (n) – to comb (v); pale (adj) – to pale (v)* are numerous in the vocabulary. Homonyms in this type, which are the same in sound and spelling, but refer to different categories of parts of speech are also called lexico-grammatical homonyms.

c) grammatical homonyms are the homonyms of different word-forms of one and the same word: *asked (Past Ind.) – asked (Participle11); brothers (plural) – brother's (Posess. Case).*

One of the debatable problems in semasiology is the demarkation line between homonymy and polysemy, i.e. between different meanings of one word and the meanings of two homonymous words.

It should be stressed that homonyms are distinct words, not different meanings within one word. The description of various types of homonyms in Modern English would be incomplete if we did not give a brief outline of diachronic processes that account for their appearance.

It is usually held that if a connection between the various meanings is apprehended by the speaker, these are to be considered as making up the semantic structure of a polysemantic word; otherwise it is a case of homonymy (if not apprehended), not polysemy.

Polysemy is referential when one object is linked to several usages of a word; polysemy is lexical when several resembling objects are linked to several usages of a word; the

phenomenon is called homonymy when several non resembling objects are linked to several usages of a word.

## Sources of Homonyms

There are a lot of different sources of homonyms in English language. One source of homonyms is **phonetic changes**, which undergo in the coarse of their historical development. As a result of such changes, two or more words, which were formally pronounced differently, may develop identical sound forms and thus become homonyms. For example, *night* and *knight*, were not homonyms in Old English as the initial *k* in the second word was pronounced and not dropped as it is in its modern sound form: *OE. kniht (cf.OE niht*). In OE the verb *to write* had the form *writan*, and the adjective *right* had the forms *reht, riht.*

**Diverging** meaning development of a polysemantic word and **converging** sound development of two or more different words are also the main sources of homonyms.

The process of diverging meaning development can be observed when different meanings of the same word move so far away from each other that they come to be regarded as two separate units. This happened for example, in the case of Modern English *flower* and *flour* which originally were one word *(ME. flour, cf. OF. flour, flot, flos – florem*) meaning "the flower" and *the finest part of wheat.* The difference in spelling underlines the fact that from the synchronic point of view they are two distinct words even though historically they have a common origin.

Convergent sound development is the most potent factor in the creation of homonyms. The great majority of homonyms arises as a result of converging sound development which leads to the coincidence of two or more words which were

phonetically distinct at an earlier date. For ex.: OE *ic* and OE *eaze* have become identical in pronunciation. ME *I [ai] and eye [ai].*

**Borrowing** is another source of homonyms. A borrowed word may duplicate in form either a native word or borowing. So, in the group of homonyms *rite (n) –to write (v) - right (adj)*, the second and the third words are of native origin, whereas *rite* is a Latin borrowing (-Lat. *ritus*).

Words borrowed from other languages may become homonyms through phonetic convergence: OE *ras* and Fr. *race* [reis] are homonyms in Modern English.(cf. *race* [reis] – "running" and *race* [reis] – a distinct ethnical stock.

Homonyms can develop through shortening of different words, e.g."cab" from "cabriolet", "cabbage", "cabin".

## PARONYMS

A **paronym** or **paronyme** in linguistics may refer to two different things:

1. A word that is related to another word and derives from the same root, e.g. a cognate word; 2. Words which are almost homonyms, but have slight differences in spelling or pronunciation and have different meanings.

So, words that are kindred in origin, sound form and meaning and therefore liable to be mixed but in fact different in meaning and usage are called **paronyms**. This is a word of Greek. origin *pare* – beside, *onoma* – name. It enters the lexicological terminology very conveniently alongside such terms as synonyms, homonyms and allonyms.

Paronyms are at the same time called false homonyms. They may be etymologically linked words as well as the words approaching in form by accident: *Bear- beer - bare* (dözmək – pivə - çılpaq), *Cause - course* (səbəb – kurs) və s.

Poetic paronyms is specific mainly for the poetic diction. It is called contextual paronyms.

Paronyms are divided under the following types:

1. Words having one and the same root, but different derivational prefixes, e.g. p*recede* – əvvəl getmək, qabaq olmaq, qabaqca olmaq, and *proceed* – davam *etdirmək, davam etmək; prescription* – (qanundan kənar) elan, göstəriş; *preposition* – sözönü, *proposition* – təklif, təklif etmə//edilmə*; anterior* – qabaq, ön, qabaqkı, (bundan) əvvəlki, keçən; *interior* – daxili, daxili hissə.
2. Words having one and the same root but different derivational suffixes,e.g. *popular* – məşhur, hamıya məlum, geniş yayılmış//tanınmış; xalqın ruhuna,

dünyagörüşünə uyğün, *populous* – əhalisi sıx olan; gur, izdihamlı

3. Words derived from different roots, e.g. *compliment* – əlavə etmə (edilmə), tamamlama, əlavə, *compliment* – kompliment (xoş söz, iltifat).

Different authors suggest various definitions. Some define paronyms as words of the same root, others as words having the same sound form. For ex.: *seize and cease , 'carrier(hambal) and ca'reer(mənsəb, sənət, peşə),* etc.

Allonym is a term offered by Shextman denoting contextual pairs semantically coordinated like *slow and careful, quick and important.*

Allonym is a word that differs in spelling and pronunciation from all other words. No doubt in ordinary usage, we shall have little need for this term, although it would simplify lexical explanation if one could start by making the claim that the most words in English are allonyms.

## SYNONYMS

Synonyms are different words with almost identical or similar meanings. Words that are said synonym are called to be synonymous, and the state of being a synonym is called synonymy. The word comes from ancient Greek, *syn* "with" and *onoma* "name".

Synonyms are words only similar but not identical in meaning. Synonyms are words different in their outer aspects, but identical or similar in their inner aspects. They are two or more words of the same part of speech possesing one or more identical lexical meanings, interchangable in some contexts. They differ in some shades of meaning, connotative meanings, style, etc. For example, the synonyms "big, large" mean "of more than average size" and are often interchangeable in this meaning: a big house (country, family, dog), a large house (country, family,dog). One can say "big success, large success; big problem, large problem", where "big" is more colloquial, and large is more formal.

But there are very few synonyms which coincide both in denotative and connotative meanings and can substitute each other in any text. They are: *word formation - word building; airman = flyer, flying man; wireless = radio.*

Strictly speaking, there are no synonyms that have completely the same meaning and can be interchangeable in all cases. Occasionally, the difference between two (or more) synonyms is slight and they seem to be interchangeable, at least in some meanings, for example: *to begin-to start, big-large, wrong-incorrect.*

A group of synonyms is called *a synonimic set/row* . E.g.: *famous, celebrated, renowned, illustrious, popular, well-known, distinguished* and so on. These adjectives refer to a

widely known person or object and make up a synonymic set. In a synonymic set there is usually a word which is broader in meaning and the most neutral stylistically than the others due to which it can be used (stand for) for all the other members of the group, though sometimes because of that the whole expression may lose its colourfulness and exactness. So, all synonymic groups have a "central" word whose meaning is equal to the denotation common to all the synonymic group and hold a commanding position over other words. It is called *the synonymic dominant* or the leading member of the group. For ex.: In the series *to leave, to depart, to quit, to retire, to clear out* the verb *to leave* is general and can stand for each of the other four terms which expresses the most general idea. Thus *to leave* is the synonymic dominant of the group, or *piece* is the synonymic dominant in the group *slice, lump, morsel*, the adjective *red* is the synonymic dominant in the group *purple, scarlet, crimson*, etc.

In most cases synonymic dominant is of Anglo-Saxon origin, but it is not always so. There are rather many words of French origin which have become very popular in English and that's why they are the synonymic dominants in some groups of words. E.g. *enemy – foe; rich - wealthy*, etc.

The member of a synonymic group may be of Anglo-Saxon, French or Latin origin. E.g.

*to ask (A.S.), to guestion (French), to interrogate (Latin);*
*to end (A.S.), to finish (Fr.), to complete (Latin):*
*to gather (A.S.), to assemble (Fr.), to collect (Latin),* etc.

The synonymic dominant belongs to the basic word-stock while the other members of the group may belong to it or not, that is stylistic synonym never belongs to the basic word-stock.

The dominant synonym expresses the notion common to all synonyms of the group in the most general way, without any contrabuting, any additional information as to the manner,

intensity, duration or any attending feature of the referent. So any dominant synonym is a typical basic vocabulary word. Its meaning, which is broad and generalized, more or less "covers" the meaning of the rest of the synonyms, so that it may be substituted for any of them.

Summing up what has been said, the following characteristic features of the dominant synonym can be underlined:

1. High frequency of usage;
2. Broad combinability, i.e. ability to be used in combinations with various classes of words;
3. Broad general meaning;
4. Lack of connotations.

If a word is polysemantic it naturally has several synonyms which will not be synonymous to each other. E.g.

*to close - to shut - to finish*;
*to cry - to shout -to shed tears - to sob - to yell- to roar;*
*bright - brilliant - radiant - luminous - beaming - lustrous (about light)*;
*bright - gifted - capable - intelligent (about the capability of a person),*
*bright — vivid — lively - fresh (about colour);*
*to tremble - to shiver - to shudder - to shake.*

The use of synonyms is of great importance as they help us to express our thoughts more exactly and vividly and to avoid monotony created by repetition of one and the same word. So, there are **three functions** in speech:

a) the function of substitution (to avoid repetition and monotony);
b) the function of procession;
c) the expressive stylistic function.

Sometimes synonyms are used for the sake of emphasis. For ex.:

*He spoke to me strictly and severely.*
*She is a clever and intelligent girl.*

Some pairs of synonyms have become set expression. E.g. *rough and rude (hurrily), by hook or by crook (by all means), really and truely (in fact), by fits and starts ( sometimes)*, etc.

Some of such pairs of synonyms have become set-expressions on the basis of alliteration, that is the repetition of one and the same sound for the sake of uniform. E.g.

*calm and quiet, safe and sound, thrill and tremble, bag and baggage.*

In such pairs all the shades, semantic or stylistic are lost and they are used to emphasize the meaning and serve stylistic purposes.

In teaching it is often convenient to explain the meaning of a new word with the help of its previously learned synonyms.

Such a method of teaching forms additional associations in the students' mind and the new word is better remembered. In this case the teacher must show that synonyms are not identical in meaning or use and explain the difference between them.

## Types of synonyms

The only existing classification system for synonyms was established by academician V.V.Vinogradov. In his classification system there are three types of synonyms: *ideographic* (which he defined as words conveying the same concept, but different in shades of meaning), *stylistic* (differing in stylistic characteristics) and *absolute* (coinciding in all their shades of meaning and in all their stylistic characteristics).

1) **Ideographic synonyms** refer to the same general concept, but they differ slightly in the denotational meaning adding something to the general notion. They bear the same idea, but

not identical in their referential content, as in: *look, glance, glimpse, eye, stare,* etc.

*look* – conscious and direct endeavour to see;

*glance* - a look which is quick and sudden;

*glimpse* – a look implying only momentary sight;

*stare* – a look with a long duration without taking one's eyes, etc.

*Beautiful, fine, handsome, pretty, nice, wonderful; strange, odd, queer; to ascent, to mount, to climb,* etc.

Other obvious examples of ideographic opposition are: *to beg, to beseech. To beg* denotes a state of want; *to beseech* denotes a state of urgent necessity. One *begs* with importunity, one *beseeches* with earnestness.

The idiographic synonyms differ in time and quickness of the action.

2) **Stylistic synonyms** are distinguished stylistically. They are words of the same meaning but used in different speech styles. Such synonyms express exactly the same meaning, but are used in different styles. E.g.

| **neutral** | **poetical** | **bookish** | **official** | **nursery** | **colloqual** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| house | mansion | building | residence | | digs |
| father | sire | parent | | daddy | dad |
| horse | steed | | | gee-gee | |
| child | infant | | | bebe | kid |
| to die | | | | | to kick the bucket |

Stylistic synonyms often differ not so much in meaning as in the emotional colouring. Such kind of synonyms are often

used in poetry. Numerous stylistic synonyms have been creative by shortening:

*brolly – umbrella, cute – acute, gent – gentleman, mo – moment, tween – between, examination-exam,* etc.

In most cases the shortened form belongs to the colloquial style, and the full form to the neutral style.

Among stylistic synonyms we can point out a special group of words, which are called euphemisms. These are words used to substitute some unpleasant or offensive words, e.g. *late* instead of "dead", *to perspire* instead of "to sweat", etc.

There are also phraseological synonyms, these words are identical in their meanings and styles, but different in their combining with other words in the sentence, e.g.

*to be late for a lecture* but *to miss the train*; *to visit museums*, but *to attend lectures*, etc.

**3) Absolute synonyms** are words identical in meaning without any difference. Such as: *pants - trousers, end – finish.* They can be indiscriminately one for the other in any context without causing the slightest change of meaning. These synonyms are rare. Absolute or perfect synonyms may be found in special terminology:

*scarlet – fever – scarlatina; word-formation – word-building, noun – substantive, functional affix – inflection,* etc.

There are some absolute synonyms in the language, which have exactly the same meaning and belong to the same style, e.g. *to moan – to groan; homeland – motherland,* etc.

The absolute synonyms are rare in the vocabulary and on the diachronic level, the phenomenon of absolute synonymy is anomalous and consequently temporary: the vocabulary system invariably tends to abolish it either by rejecting one of the absolute synonyms or by developing differentiation characteristics in one or both (or all) of them. Absolute synonyms, i.e.

words quite alike in all functions, probably not to occur. Somettimes one of the absolute synonyms is specialized in its usage and we get stylistic synonyms, e.g. "to begin" (native), "to commence" (borrowing). Here the French word (to commence) is specialized.

The difference between synonyms can be phraseological. It means that they can be used with certain words only. For ex.: In the sentence *He got up early and he rose early* the words *got up* and *rose* are synonyms and are interchangeable. But in the sentence *the sun rises early* the word *get up* cannot substitute the word *rise*. We can say *a high tree- a tall tree*, but we cannot say *a high man.* The verbs *to throw, to cast, to fling, to toss* in some cases may stand for each other, but in set expressions *to cast a glance, to cast lots* the verb *to cast* can not be substituted by its synonyms (*to fling, to throw, to toss).*

In set expression *I beg your pardon*, we cannot say *I ask your pardon.*

So the interchangeability of the members of a synonymic set depends on the context, so it is contextual. There are few synonyms that are always interchangeable, contextual. They are called *total* synonyms.

## Sources of synonyms

The following four points are usually considered as sources of synonyms: borrowings, dialectisms, wordbuildings, euphemisms.

1. Borrowings from French, Latin and Greek are the most numerous ones in English. They often express an idea or name a thing for which there exists already a native word. Thus synonyms appear in the vocabulary.

2. Dialectisms are words from local dialects which have entered the English vocabulary as regular words. E.g.
*lass - girl; bonny - pretty; daft - wild; foolish- crazy.*
3. Wordbuilding procession which is at work in the English language, creates synonyms to words already in the use. Five cases are to be considered in use:

a) composite or phrasal verbs (verbs with postpositives):
*to choose – to pick out ; to abandon – to give up; to enter – to go in, precipitation - to fall out* etc.

b) compounding:
*resistance – fight back*; *dreamer - star-gazer; the shivers - pins and needles,* etc.

c) conversion:
*to work – work; love – to love;*

d) set expression:
*to laugh – to give a laugh, to walk – to take a walk; to hesitate – to be in two minds; to exaggerate – to make a mountain out of a molehill; to decide – to make up one's mind,* etc.

e) affixation or loss of affixes:
*anxiety – anxiousness, amongst – among,* etc.

4. euphemisms:
*queer – is a euphemism for mad; intoxicated – for drunk; naked – in one's birthday suit,* etc.

There is one more term so-called "cocophemism or dysphemism" which is the opposite of "euphemism". This term is used to imply negative attitude to the object (it was already spoken above).

## ANTONYMS

***My only love sprung from my only hate!***
***Too early seen unknown, and known too late!***
**(W.Shakespeare, "Romeo and Juliet")**

One of the features enhancing the pathetic expressiveness of these lines is contrast, based on such pairs as *love-hate, early-late, unkown-known*. The opposition is obvious: each component of these pairs means the opposite of the other. The pairs may be termed antonymic pairs.

Antonyms, from the Greek (*anti* – "opposite" and *onoma* - "name") are gradable opposites and have traditionally been defined as words of opposite meaning. **Antonym** – a word that expresses a meaning opposed to the meaning of another word. Hence we can say that words opposite in meaning are generally called antonyms. Familiar examples of antonyms are:
*dark - light, easy - difficult, black - white, tall - low, sit - stand, boy - girl, father - mother, early - late, young - old,* etc.

Though the word *antonym* was only coined by philologists in the 19th century, such relationships are a fundamental part of a language, in contrast to synonyms, which are a result of history and drawing of fine distinctions which are mostly etymological accidents.

Antonyms are often helpful and exceedingly valuable in defining the exact meaning of the given words and their synonyms. Thus, for instance, taking such combinations of words as: *green peas, green meadows* we see that the word *green* is a name of colour. But comparing the antonyms *green* and *ripe* we find out that *green* may also mean *unripe, immature*.

Antonyms are the negative connotations of a particular word. So, it is a word or phrase that is opposite in meaning to a particular word or a phrase in the same language.

Traditionally we can oppose the meaning of any pair of words. But there are the words in the vocabulary that are usually, constantly (always, permanently) opposed to each other: *handsome - ugly, hard - soft, hate - like,* etc.

The characteristic features of antonyms are the followings:

1. Antonyms belong to the same part of speech;
2. Unlike synonyms, antonyms do not differ either in style, emotional colouring or in distribution.
3. Antonyms are interchangeable at least in some contexts.
4. Antonyms form binary opposition, the distinctive feature of which is semantic polarity.
5. Notions expressed by antonyms may be contrary or contradictory.

When we say *hot* we mean *not cold, enemy - not a friend.* The word possesses its full meaning because we oppose it to its antonyms. In the semantic structure of the word *hot* there is a connotation *not cold.*

Antonym is not evenly distributed among the categories of parts of speech. Antonyms are common mainly among qualitative adjectives. E.g. *good - bad, deep - shallow, light - dark,* etc.

Antonyms may be found among other parts of speech, such as:

Nouns: *light - darkness, weakness - strength,* etc.
Verbs: *to give - to take, to sit - to stand, to open - to shut,* etc.
Adverbs: *quickly - slowly, early - late,* etc.
Prepositions: *up - down, in - out, above - below,* etc.

As words are polysemantic one and the same word may have different antonyms:

*A dull student - a bright student, dull colours – bright colours, a dull knife - a sharp knife,* etc.

Polysemantic words can have several antonyms.They may have antonyms in some of their meanings. E.g. *old – new, young; happy - unhappy, miserable.*

Antonyms are traditionally classified into antonyms – words of different roots (absolute antonyms or root antonyms or antonyms proper). E.g. *narrow – wide, thin – thick, love – hate,* etc. and derivational antonyms (words of the same root, but having negative affixes: E.g. *pleasant - unpleasant, regular - irregular, honest - dishonest, useful - useless.*

Derivational antonyms are formed by means of affixes. The affixes in derivational antonyms serve to deny the quality which is stated in the stem. E.g. *happy -unhappy, kind - unkind, pleasant - unpleasant,* etc.

In derivational antonyms prefixes are more than suffixes. Generally the following negative prefixes are used to form derivational antonyms:

*dis-, il-, im-, in-, ir-, un-,* etc. Other negative prefixes occur in this function only occasionally.

E.g, *to please - to displease, legal - illegal, polite - impolite, direct – indirect, regular - irregular, happy - unhappy,* etc.

As to suffixes Modern English gives no examples of words forming their antonyms by adding a negative suffix, such as: *–less (useless)*

The opposition *useful - useless* is more complicated, as the suffix *–less* is not merely added to the contrasting stem, but substituted for the suffix *–ful*. The group is not numerous. In most cases, even when the language possesses words with the suffix *–less,* the antonymic pairs found in actual speech are formed with the prefix *un-*. Thus, the antonymic opposition is not *selfish-selfless*, but selfish-unselfish.

Antonyms are two or rarely more words of the same language belonging to the same part of speech, identical in style and nearly identical in distribution, associated and used together so that their denotative meanings render contrary or contradictory notions.

There are some subgroups of antonyms called complimentary (additional) and conversive.

1) It is a binary opposition. It may have only two members; the denial of one member implies the assertion of the other.

*Female - male, prose - poetry.*

Having noted the difference between complimentary terms and antonyms proper, we must also take into consideration that they have much into common so that in a wider sense both groups are taken as antonyms. Complimentarities like other antonyms are regularly contrasted in speech *(male-female)* and the elements of a complimentary pair have similar distribution. The assertion of a sentence containing and antonymous or complimentary term implies the denial of a corresponding sentence containing the other antonym or complimentary:

The poem is good - The poem is not bad *(good-bad* antonyms proper*)*.

This is prose – This is not poetry *(prose and poetry* complimentaries*)*.

2) Another subgroup of antonyms is called conversives. E.g.

*buy - sell, give - receive, cause - suffer, ancestor - discendant, parent -child,* etc.

Conversives denote one and the same referent as viewed from different points of view. For ex.: *right - wrong, clear - vague, clean - dirty.*

Most of the derivational antonyms in English are formed by the help of the prefixes which are added to the beginning of the antonymous words.

As said above, notions expressed by antonyms may be contrary (absolute antonyms) or contradictory (derivational antonyms). Absolute (root) antonyms express contrary notions, but derivational antonyms express contradictory notions.

Antonyms are devided into gradable and non-gradable antonyms. Gradable antonyms are opposites along a scale in that when someone says *"I am not high"* it does not necessarily mean "I am short". Non-gradable antonyms do not present such flexibility; when we say "I am married" the only antonym available in this sentence would be "I am single". Gradable antonyms represent points on a scale that are roughly equal in distance from the middle of the scale. Non-gradable antonyms represent opposed states that cannot be measured on a scale. *Dead* and *alive* are good example of non-gradable antonyms. They are not points on a scale. They are opposed states. It means that if you are dead, you are not alive. If you are alive, you are not dead. Gradable antonyms are often modified by adverbs to express higher and lower points on the scale: e.g. *extremely hot, very hot, too hot, quite hot*, etc, There are often other adjectives expressing extreme and intermediate points on the scale, but non-gradable antonyms are not usually modified by adverbs. E.g. *almost dead (= about to die), half - dead (=very tired), stone dead (emphatic/hyperbolic).* These expressions do not represent points on a scale.

J.Lyons calls antonyms like *love - hate* antonyms proper. Their main characteristic feature is that they are gradable. If we compare the meanings of the words *kind - cruel* we shall see that they are completely opposed to each other. The opposition is gradable, it may include several elements characterized by different degrees of the same property: *kind – unkind - cruel. Kind - cruel* are absolute antonyms and they express contrary notions that are felt as completely opposed to each other: *kind* means *gentle*, *friendly*, *showing love*, but

*cruel*, on the contrary, means *taking pleasure in giving pain to others, without mercy, hard hearted.*

In the antonymic pairs *kind - cruel* we see polarity of meanings. Adjectives *kind - unkind* are derivational antonyms and they express contradictory notions, because in these adjectives we do not find polarity of meanings. In these adjectives semantic opposition shows simple negation. *Unkind* means *not kind*, which does not necessarily mean *cruel.* Syntactical negation is weaker than the lexical antonym (not happy does not necessarily unhappy). To prove this difference in intensity V.N.Komissarov gives examples where a word with a negative prefix is added to by "at all": *I am sorry to inform you that we are not at all satisfied with your sister. We are very much dissatisfied with her.*

In case of antonyms, the words have the same denotational component of the lexical meaning, but different in style, emotion, distribution and other features. But antonyms have only some common elements in the denotational meaning. Compare: *ashamed - proud; feeling unhappy – feeling joy; troubled - happiness,* etc.

Antonyms do not differ in style, emotional colouring or distribution.

It should be stressed that almost every word can have one or more synonyms. But not every word has its antonyms. Only those words whose meaning can be opposed have antonyms. That's why in any language synonyms are more than antonyms.

Usually every word has one antonym, even some words may have two antonyms. E.g. *happy – unhappy - miserable; large – little - small*

There are also pairs of antonyms which have become set expressions. E.g.

*Far and near, from first to last, up and down, neither here nor there*

Not only words, but set expressions as well can be grouped into antonymic pairs. E.g. *by accident – on purpose;*

Antonyms are often found in proverbial sayings. E.g. *Sweet as honey, bitter as gall (= honey tongue, heart of gall); The more haste, the less speed; What is done cannot be undone.*

The English language is rich in synonyms and antonyms. The diachronic study following their development is of great interest as it permits us to reveal the systematic character of the vocabulary.

An elephant

When people call this beast to mind,
They marvel more and more
At such *a little tail* behind
So *large a trunk* before.

## PHRASEOLOGY

The vocabulary of a language is enriched not only by words, but also by phraseological units. It is a branch of linquistics deals with word-groups which consists of two or more words and word combinations. The same as words, phraseological units express a single notion and are used in a sentence as one part of it. It is common known that words become a means of communication only when they are used in combinations. There are two kinds of word combinations:

1. free word combination, i.e. constructive sentence of the process of speech according to grammar rules of the given language;
2. bound or set expressions. They are also called stop-phrases or ready made expressions.

In free combinations words are combined according to phonetical and grammatical rules of the given language. In free combinations components retain their independent meanings. The meaning of the whole combination is deduced from the meanings of its separate components. A free word combination permits substitution of any of its component or components. In a free word combination syntactical rules can never be broken. E.g. *to cut bread, to cut cheese, to eat cheese,* etc.

In bound word combinations such kind of substitution is impossible. The components here are semantically bound. Nowadays we call them phraseological units or set expressions. They exist in a language in ready made. They are taken as separate words and inserted as separate words. Proverbs, sayings, aphorisms are also included into phraseology. Every language possesses such phraseological units. They are called winged expressions as well, because being created by people or some famous writers they express

some exact and deep thought and are widely used by all the people speaking the given language.

The term phraseology was first used by the Swiss linguist Ch. Bally. In 1905 he wrote two books on style. One of the chapters was called phraseology. Ch.Bally was the first who worked out the theory of phraseology. He treated phraseology not as expressions like certain linguists. He was the first who analysed the phraseological units. But he approached the problem from the stylistical angle. He never thought of it as independent science.

Attempts have been made to approach the problem of phraseology in different ways. But no two authors agree upon the terminology they use. The word phraseology, for instance, has a very different meaning in our country and abroad. In our linguistic literature the term has come to be used for the whole set of expressions where the meaning of one element is dependent on the other irrespective of the structure and properties of the word, with other authors it denotes only such phrases which are distinquished from idioms not possessing expressiveness or emotional colouring.

## Classification of Phraseological Units

This classification is made of by acad. V.V.Vinogradov. He has worked out a classification of Russian phraseological units which is based on the motivation of the units, i.e. on the relationship existing between the meaning of the whole phraseological unit and the meaning of its components. This classification may be called a semantic classification. According to Academician V.V.Vinogradov there are three kinds of them: *phraseological fusions, phraseological unities and phraseological combinations.*

## Phraseological Fusions

In phraseological fusions or cast iron-idioms the meaning can never be derived as a whole from the conjoint meanings of its elements. They are indivisible both semantically and syntactically. In phraseological fusions the degree of motivation is very low, we cannot guess the meaning of the whole from the meaning of its components, they are highly idiomatic and cannot be translated word for word into other languages. For example: *to bark to the moon* does not mean *to bark as a dog to the moon*, but in the meaning of *to speak in advance, to speak in vain*; *to show the white feather (*to show cowardness); *to cut stick (*to leave quickly, to run away quickly); *to kick the bucket (*to die), *to pull one's leg (*to deceive), *at sixes or sevens* (in confusion), *to ride the high horse* (to put on airs), etc.

As seen from the above mentioned combinations the meanings of the given phraseological fusions are not deduced from their components.

No word can be substituted in a phraseological fusion by its synonym because it would destroy the meaning of the given phraseological fusion.

It is impossible to say why a phraseological fusion has this or that meaning. In order to understand its meaning we must go into the history of a given language and find out the etymology of the expression. E.g. *to wear one's heart upon one's sleeve* - the meaning of this phraseological unit is *to be frank beyond measure (öz hisslərini biruzə verməmək)*. This expression comes from the Middle Ages. When knights wore the sign of their ladies embroidered on their sleeves, every one knew what lady the knight admired. *to ride the high horse* means "to put on airs". This set expression also comes from the Middle Ages when the chief knight used to ride the highest horse.

Thus many of phraseological fusions are historically motivated and can be explained if we know their origin. Phraseological fusions are the most idiomatic of all kinds of phraseological units.

## Phraseological Unities

They are also not divisible semantic units. They are semantically inseparable units, but they differ from phraseological fusions. In phraseological unities the meaning can be deduced from the first meaning of their components. They are figurative expressions. E.g.

*to play the first fiddle = to be in a best position, to be a leader in something; old salt = experienced sailor; to put a spear into somebody's wheel = to interrupt smb., etc.*

Phraseological unities of this type are metaphorical expressions. Due to this they can be homonyms of free word combinations.

In some of the phraseological unities one word can be substituted by its synonyms. For ex.: *to nip in the bud - to check in the bud - to crush in the bud = bələkdə ikən məhv etmək/boğmaq, etc.*

Phraseological fusions are sometimes called idioms, but phraseological unities are called metaphorical phrases and they both belong to the synthetic type of phraseological units, because they are indivisible. They appear in a language as a result of people's thinking in images. They usually live a long life. That is why we often find archaic words in them. E.g. Neither *kith nor kin.*

Both words *kith* and *kin* mean relations. But they are not used separately nowadays. They are kept in such expressions, as *I have neither kith nor kin in this country.*

*Hue and cry ( hay-küy) - hue* is an archaic word which means *great noise*. But nowadays this word is used only in this expression.

In some of the phraseological unities one of their components are not used separately and they have no independent meanings and they are used only in combinations.

## Phraseological Combinations

Unlike phraseological fusions and phraseological unities traditional combinations are analytical type of set expressions. Phraseological combinations are called analytical expressions, because in these expressions the components are independent to a certain degree. They are habitual word combinations. It is usually impossible to account logically for the combination of particular words. It can be explained only on the basis of tradition. E.g.

*to discuss a question, public opinion, to pay a visit, peace-loving countries, to take into consideration, to pass an examination, to make a report,* etc.

The components of these expressions retain their independency, full semantic independence, although they are limited in their combinative power. They are limited in their power to be combined with other words. E.g.

The English people say *to set free* or *to set at liberty*, but they don't say *to set at freedom.* Or *to deliver a lecture*, but not *to read a lecture.*

In some of phraseological combinations the dependent word can be replaced by its synonyms. E.g. *to win victory = to gain victory, to make inquiries = to inquire, to make haste = to hurry,* etc.

Words of wide meaning, as *to make, to take, to do, to give, etc.* form many phraseological combinations, such as, *to give*

*help, to make a mistake, to take an examination, to make fun of, to make inquiries, to make friends, to make haste,* etc.

But in phraseological unities the meaning of the whole unit is not the same of the meanings of its components, but is based upon them, i.e. may be understood from the components. Such as: *to take place, to go to school, to show one's teeth.*

All of these kinds of phraseological units exist in a language in ready made form and are reproduced in the process of speech. In order to master new idioms we must memorize them, because they do not follow any standard rules. Whenever you hear or read an idiom that strikes you or interesting in itself, make a note of it.

In phraseological combinations we shall see that the components of the phraseological combinations are independent. Generally one of the components of the combinations is independent and the other one is dependent. E.g. *a cold in the head* (zökəm), *to be unable to look smb. in the face* (üzünə baxmağa utanmaq), *to laugh in smb's face* (üzünə gülmək), *to hold one's tongue* (dilini saxlamaq), etc.

In these examples the first words of the combination are used in their independent meanings and the second words of the combinations are dependent.

In phraseological combinations words are combined according to the syntactical rules of modern language and they do not "swallow" each other semantically.

Nowadays we may find traditional combinations, many of which belong to political sphere and are used mostly in newspapers and magazines. E.g.

*fraternal countries, national unity, cold war, people of good will, the relaxation of international tension, membership fee,* etc.

## Grammatical Classification of Phraseology

Phraseology is classified according to the syntactical functions which they perform in a sentence. This classification takes into consideration not only the type of components of phraseology but also the functioning of the whole set expression in a sentence. As said above, phraseology functions in sentences as separate words. E.g.

*He kicked the bucket* is equivalent to the sentence *He died.* In this case we say that phraseology is equivalent to simple words. In the above mentioned sentence the phraseological unit *to kick the bucket* functions as the verb *to die*. According to their function in a sentence phraseology may be divided into the following types:

1. **Substantival phraseological unit**

*A snake in the grass* ( a terrible enemy. Cf. = gizli düşmən), *the apple of one's eyes* (a very dear person); *lord and master* (husband, Cf = evin ağası); *a stony heart* (daş qəlbli); *husband's tea* (joke: very sweet tea, araq); *a man of straw* (etibarsiz adam), etc.

Substantival phraseological units function in a sentence like nouns, they can be a subject, an object or a predicative of the given sentence, that's why they are called equivalents of nouns.

2. **Verbal phraseological units**

Verbal phraseological units function in a sentence like verbs, they are equivalents of verbs. The following phraseological units belong to this type:

*to show the white feather* (to be afraid)*; to make up one's mind* (to decide); *to strike the iron while it is hot* (to be in time); *to call smb. names (*to swear smb); *to get into deep water (* to be in a difficult position*); to pay nature's debt (*to die), etc.

5. **Adjectival phraseological units**

Such kind of phraseological units function in a sentence like adjectives, they are equivalents of adjectives. E.g.

*As mad as a March hare (*very mad);
*Good for nothing* (very useless);
*High and mighty (*boastful);
*More dead than alive (* very tired);
*Blind as a bat* (completely blind)
*As bold as brass* ( shameless, barefaced*)*, etc.

6. **Adverbial phraseological units.**

Such kind of phraseological units function in a sentence like adverbs, they are equivalents of adverbs. E.g.

*on the alert* (on guard); *by hook or by crook (*by all means)*;* *before one can say Jack Robinson* (momentary); *once in a blue moon* (seldom); *from one's cradle to one's grave* (all one's life); *with all one's heart* (sincerely)*; rain or shine* (by all means), etc.

7. **Interjectional phraseological units**

Interjectional phraseological units function in a sentence like intejections, that's why they are called interjectional phraseological units. E.g. *God bless me! (*Ay Allah!*),* *Hang it all!* (Cəhənnəm olun!), *By God!* (Allah haqqi!*),* *Go to hell! (*Go to devil!*),* etc.

It should be stressed that phraseological units as well as separate words can be polysemantic. E.g. *to feed fishes* has two meanings*; 1) to drawn, 2) to be sea-sick.*

On the other hand phraseological units may have synonyms. E.g. to *breathe one's last = to kick the bucket = to go to one's long rest.*

## Sources of Phraseological Units

Phraseological units are arranged into groups according to their origin and sources, too. The sources from which phraseological units are derived are various. They may be:

1. **Historical facts or situations**. E.g. *to burn one's boats* - means to make a decisive step after which it is impossible to retreat.

This is an expression said by Julius Caesar who ordered to burn all the boats after his soldiers had landed on the bank of the river, so that they could not run away.

2. **National customs, traditions and English reality**. E.g. *to fulfil the slightest wish of smb.*

This phrseological unit appeared in connection with the English custom that the bride had to fulfil every wish for her bridegroom.

The expression *to carry coal to Newcastle* means "to do useless thing". Newcastle is the centre of the coal industry of Great Britain (cf. Zirəni Girmana aparmaq).

*To cut off with a shilling* means *to disinherit* - vərəsəlikdən məhrum etmək.

In ancient times when a person disinherited his son or daughter or another relative after his death the disinherited persons used to say that they had been simply forgotten and it was all a mistake and demanded their share. That was why spiteful testators used to leave the disinherited person only a shilling so that the latter might not be able to say that he had been forgotten.

3. **Literary sources.**

These are expressions of some well - known authors. E.g. *to be or not to be, that is a question* (Shakespeare); *murder will out (*J.Chauser) (cidanı çuvalda gizlətmək olmaz); *How goes the enemy? (what is the time)* (Ch.Dickens), etc.

4. **Professional expressions**

They have become metaphorical because of being used figuratively. E.g. *to sugar the pill* (şirnikləşdirmək); *to put the finishing touch* (it comes from painting) - (işi sona çatdırmaq); *to be on the scent (from hunting)* -(düz izinə düşmək); *to kill two birds with one stone (from hunting)* - (bir güllə ilə iki quş vurmaq); *to trim the sail to the wind (from nautical sphere)* - (uyğunlaşmaq, ayaqlaşmaq); *to take the wind out of smb's sails* - means : to spoil smb's plans *(from nautical).*

5. **Sources may be folk sayings, especially proverbs**. E.g.

*A burnt child dreads the fire* = Ilan vuran ala çatıdan qorxar;

*There is no rose without a thorn* = Qızıl gül tikansız olmaz;

There are other sources of phraseological units. Phraseological units which have been formed on the basis of the names of the historical personalities. E.g. *Nadiri taxtda görmək; İskəndər kimi sədd açmaq,* etc.

Phraseological units which have been formed on the basis of geographical names. E.g. *Çin səddi çəkmək, Kəbədə yağ içmək,*

Phraseological units which have been formed on the basis of religious legend and traditions. E.g. *Nuhu beşikdə görmək, Nuh əyyamından qalmaq, Həzrət İsa kimi qeyb olmaq,* etc.

Professional expressions have become metaphorical, because of their being used figuratively.

## Criteria of Phraseology from the Free Phrases

In linguistic literature phraseological units or idioms are contrasted to free phrases. A free combination is a syntactical unit, which consists of notional and form words, and in which notional words have the function of independent parts of the sentence. A free phrase (or a free word combinations) permits

substituation of any of its elements without semantic change by the other elements. E.g.

*We sit at the table; we eat at the table; we write at the table*, etc.

In a phraseological unit words are not independent. They form set-expressions, in which neither words nor the order of words can be changed.

Free phrases are contrasted by the speaker according to the structural rules of the language. Free combinations are created by the speaker, but phraseological units are used by the speaker in a ready form, without any changes. The whole phraseological unit has a meaning which may be quite different from the meaning of its component, and therefore the whole unit and not separate words has the function of a part of the sentence. If substitution is impossible (or restricted to free synonyms), if the elements of the word-groups are always constant and make a fixed context, the phrase is a set expression, a phraseological unit or an idiom. Idioms are reproduced into speech ready-made like words. They are not constructed by the speaker.

Free word combinations are made up during the speech, they are not units of a language. But phraseological units exist as ready-made units, they are not made up during the speech, they are units of a language.

Praseological units consist of separate words and therefore they are different words, even from compounds. Words have several structural forms, but in phraseological units only one of the components has all the forms of the paradigm of the part of speech it belongs to. E.g. *to to bed, goes to bed, went to bed, gone to bed, going to bed,* etc., the rest of the components do not change their form.

All the phraseological units are set expressions, but not all the set expressions are phraseological units. In phraseological

units all the components or one or two of their components are used figuratively, that is why they possess a transferred meaning. That's why the components of set expressions which retain their literal meaning are not phraseological units.

In other words in phraseological units either one of the components has a phraseologically bound meaning or the meaning of each component is weakened or entirely lost. But set expressions which do not possess these features are not phraseological units.

Phraseological units and words are similar in the following:

a) they both are brought into speech ready - made;
b) they are idiomatic and never constructed in speech and are inseparable units semantically and functionally.

The differences between them are:

a) the divisibility of the phraseological units into separately structure units which is contrasted to the structural integrity of words;
b) a phraseological unit can be resolved into words, whereas words are resolved into morphemes.

## The Characteristic Features of Phraseological Units

Phraseological units have their own specific features. These features have always been treated from the point of view of style and expressiveness. They are euphonic, imaginative, connotative qualities. E.g.

I wish, she returned *safe and sound.*

Here *safe and sound* is more reassuring than the synonymous word *uninjured,* which could have been used. These euphonic and connotative qualities also prevent substitution. Any substitution would destroy the euphonic effect.

Rhythmic qualities are characteristic of almost all set expressions: *by fits and starts* (irregularity); *heart and soul* (with complete devotion to a cause); *more and more , one by one; on and on,* etc.

In this case alliteration also occurs: *then and there* (at once), *head over heels* (have head on the shoulders); *a bee in one's bonnet* (be foolish), etc.

Rhyme is also characteristic of set expressions: *fair and square (*honest); *by hook or by crook* (by any method whether fair or unfair, by all means); *right or wrong,* etc.

These are lexical stability of phraseological units. It means that no element of phraseological units is subjected to any substitution. If any, then it is pronominal. E.g. *black frost*

*Black frost* means *frost without ice and snow.* In a free combination the adjective would mean "colour".

Semantic stability of phraseological units is based on the lexical stability. If a component can't be substituted by any word, then it is the proof of a semantic stability. E.g. no substitution is possible in *Can the leapard change his spots*? It is taken from the Bible. The English writers had the temptation to change the name of the *leapard* for the name of some other animals, but failed, because the phrase is semantically stable.

## Various Approaches to the Study of Problems of Phraseology

There are various approaches to the study of phraseology and the problem of their classification.

In English and American linguistics there are no theoretical works on scientific study of phraseology. There is no special branch studying phraseology. There is no term *phraseological unit.*

English and American linguists just collect phraseological units, explain them, describe some of the peculiarities, their origin and etymology and arrange them into groups according to their origin: as phrases from sea life, from agriculture, from hunting, from sports and so on. In this way they compile different kinds of dictionaries of phraseological units which they often call *idioms* or *phrases*.

Many ex-soviet linguists have shown a great interest in the theoretical study of problems of phraseological units.

The most significant theory for Russian phraseology was worked out by academician V.V.Vinogradov. He worked out a very interesting classification of Russian phraseological units. His articles on Russian phraseology produced a great influence upon many linguists in our country and abroad. In studying phraseological units of national languages many linguists refer to the phraseological theory and the classification of phraseological units worked out by acad. V.V.Vinogradov. His classification on the material of the English language was given above.

But V.V.Vinogradov's phraseological theory has some shortcomings which were pointed at by N.N.Amosova, A.V.Koonin and some other linguists. For example, phraseological combination of the third type of his classifiction, that is phraseological combinations are not considered as phraseological units by many linguists. Then V.V.Vinogradov did not pay attention to the structure of phraseological units and so on.

Various parts of English phraseology have been described by many former Soviet linguists and a great number of dissertations have been defended on this topic. The most comprehensive scientific works on English phraseology are the doctorial theses of N.N.Amosova and A.V.Koonin and their articles and books on this topic.

In their works they have viewed almost all the important problems connected with phraseology and they have worked out very significant classifications of English phraseological units. Their classification differs from the classification suggested by academician V.V.Vinogradov. In studying phraseology of different languages linguists will come back to their works on more than one occasion.

It should be stressed that in solving such problems as problem of definition of phraseological units, problem of stability of phraseological units, problem of variation and synonymy in English phraseology, problem of classification of English phraseological units, etc. N.N.Amosova and A.V.Koonin differ in opinion. For ex.: N.N.Amosova distinguishes two kinds of contexts. They are:

a) fixed context or invariable context;
b) fixed context or variable context.

She defines phraseological units as units of the fixed context. But free word combinations are regarded by her as units of the unfixed context. She divides all the phraseological units into two main groups; phrasemes and idioms. Phrasemes are subdivided into moveable and immoveable idioms.

According to A.V.Koonin's classification all the phraseological units are divided into the following four main groups:

1. Nominating (or nominative) phraseological units;
2. Nominating communicative phraseological units;
3. Interjectional phraseological units;
4. Communicative phraseological units.

A.V.Koonin's classification is based on a combination of functional, semantic and structural features, that is in his classification he takes into consideration function, meaning and structure of phraseological units.

Speaking about phraseology we must stress that a valuable contribution to the study of Azerbaijani phraseology

was made by prof. H.A.Bayramov. He has devoted many articles and his doctoral thesis to various problems of Azerbaijani phraseology. A.S.Ragimov, A.H.Hajiyeva also have devoted a lot of articles on the English and Azerbaijani phraseology. In their articles and thesises they have investigated various ptoblems of the English and Azerbaijani phraseology and gave a valuable contribution to the study of the phraseology of these languages. Their works are of great importance.

On the whole at present there are different phraseological theories and various approaches to the study of problems of phraseological units and we are not able to speak about all of them.

Such terms as *phraseological units*, *set expressions*, *set phrases*, *idioms*, *word equivalents* are used to name word combinations which are reproduced in speech as ready-made units. But these terms are treated differently by different linguists, and it creates some confusions in studying phraseological units.

At present, many linguists admit that all the phraseological units are set expressions but not all the set expressions are phraseological units. The main task standing before the linguists is to differ phraseological units from set expressions which do not possess the basic features of the formers.

The basic features of phraseological units are the followings:

1. **Stability of structure, meaning and usage**, which means that phraseological units are not freely made up during the speech but exist and are reproduced as ready-made units of the given language. The substitution of components of phraseological units is very limited and it's possible only in the synonymic row without changing the meaning of the whole phraseological unit. E.g. to *cast smth in smb's teeth (üzünə çırpmaq -(sözlə).*

Its component *"to cast"* may be replaced only by its synonym *to throw* or *to fling*. But in many phraseological units their components are not replaced by other words.

2. **Idiomaticity of meaning.** The components of phraseolgical units are used figuratively. Phraseological units are metaphorical and metonymic expressive word combinations. A phraseological unit denotes a single idea which is not deduced from the meanings of its components. That's why many of phraseological combinations which were regarded by academician V.V.Vinogradov as phraseological units cannot be treated as phraseological units. At present, for example, such set expressions as: *to pass an examination, to pay a visit*, etc. are not treated as phraseological units.

There are phraseological units in which all the components are used figuratively, but there are also phraseological units in which one of the components is used in its literal meaning and the other component or components possess figurative meaning. E.g. *to kill a novel* - the word *novel* retains its literal meaning, but the component *to kill* is used figuratively. In the phraseological unit *to pull smb's leg* all the components are used figuratively (bir kəsi axmaq yerinə qoymaq, bir kəsin başını dəng eləmək), etc.

**3. Separability of components.** A phraseological unit consists of separate words and each of them has its own stress. Speaking about the differences between phraseological units and other units of a language and word combinations we must know that a word consists of morphemes, but a phraseological unit consists of separate words with its own stress.

## PROVERBS, SAYINGS, FAMILIAR QUOTATIONS AND CLICHÉS

A proverb is a familiar saying expressing a true or moral lesson in an emotional and imaginative way. The people's wisdom is reflected in proverbs. The place of proverbs, sayings and familiar quotations with respect to set expressions is a controversial issue. A proverb is a short familiar epigrammatic saying expressing truth or a moral lesson in a concise and imaginative way. Proverbs have much in common with phraseology because their lexical components are also constant, their meaning is traditional and mostly figurative, and they are introduced into speech ready-made. E.g.

*A friend in need is a friend indeed; Live and learn; No use crying over spilt milk; All is not gold that glitters.*

Proverbs are common sayings. However, they usually do not make sense at first sight and do not offer any advice. For example, *to blow one's own trumpet,* which means "to praise oneself or boast", it is an idiom. It may be converted to a proverbial expression as follows:

*It is but a fool who blows his own trumpet or Don't blow your own trumpet.*

There is no clear dividing line between idiomatic phrases and proverbial expressions. If and when an idiomatic phrase becomes widely popular, it may be regarded a proverb. E.g. *Don't put the cart before the horse.*

Quite a number of idiomatic phrases come from proverbs or proverbial sayings. E.g. *Talk of the devil-( and he will appear); a black sheep (there is a black sheep in every flock), silver lining (every cloud has a silver lining), old bird ( old birds are not to be caught with chaff),* etc.

Some scientists include them into phraseology (V.V.Vinogradov, A.V.Koonin, H.Bayramov, Ch.H.Gurbanov. A.H.Hajiyeva and others). Following V.V.Vinogoradov they think proverbs must be studied together with phraseological unities. Others like J.Casares and N.N.Amosova think that unless they regularly form parts of other sentences it is erroneous to include them into the system of language because they are independent units of communication. N.N.Amosova even thinks that there is no more reason to consider them as part of phraseology than riddles and children's counts. This standpoint is hardly acceptable especially if we do not agree with the narrow limits of phraseology offered by N.N.Amosova. Riddles and counts are not as a rule included into utterances in the process of communication whereas proverbs are. Whether they are included into an utterance as independent sentences or as part of sentences it is immaterial. If we follow that line of reasoning, we shall have to exclude all interjections such as *hang it* (all)! (*Şeytana lənət, lənət şeytana!*), because they are also syntactically independent. As to the argument in many proverbs the meaning of component parts does not show any specific changes when compared to the meaning of the same word in free combinations. It must be pointed out that in this respect they do not differ from very many set expressions, especially those which are emotionally neutral.

A.V.Koonin includes proverbs in his classification of phraseological units and labels them communicative phraseolgical units. From his point of view, one of the main criteria of a phrasrological unit is its stability. If the quotient of phraseological stability in a word-group is not below the minimum, it means that we are dealing with a phraseological unit. The structural type – that is, whether the unit is a combination of words or a sentence – is irrelevant.

The criterion of nomination and communication cannot be applied here either, says A.V.Koonin, because there are a considerable number of verbal phraseological units which are word-groups (i.e. nominative units) when the verb is used in the active voice and sentences (i.e. communicative units) when the verb is used in the Passive Voice. E.g. to *cross (pass) the Rubicon – the Rubicon is crossed (passed) ; to shed crocodile tears – crocodile tears are shed.*

Hence, if one accepts nomination as a criterion of referring or not referring this or that unit to phraseology, one is faced with the absurd conclusion that such word-groups, when with verbs in the Active Voice are phraseological units and belong to the system of the language, and when with verbs in the passive voice are non-phraseological word-groups and do not belong to the system of the language.

It may be added as one more argument in support of this concept, that it does not seem to exist any rigid or permanent border-line between proverbs and phraseological units as the latter rather freguently originate from the former.

So, the phraseological unit *the last straw* originated from the proverb *The last straw breaks the camel's back* (səbr kasası dolmaq), the phraseological unit *birds of feather* from the proverb *Birds of feather flock together* (Su axar, çuxurun tapar), the phraseological unit *to catch at a straw* (saman çöpündən yapışmaq) from *A drawning man catches at a straw* ( Suda boğulan saman çöpündən yapışar), etc.

What is more, some of the proverbs are easily transformed into phraseological units. E.g. *Don't put all your eggs in the basket — to put all one's eggs in one basket ; don't cast pearls before swine — to cast pearls before swine.*

Another reason why proverbs must be taken into consideration together with set expressions is that they often form the basis of set expressions. For example: *the last straw*

*breaks the camel's back - the last straw; a drawning man will clutch at a straw - to clutch at a straw; it is useless to lock the stable door when the steed is stolen - to lock the stable door*;

Sometimes both phraseology and proverbs are split and changed for humorous purposes, as in the following quatations, where the proverb *"All is not gold that glitters"* combines with an allusion to the phreaseology *golden age*, e.g. *It will be an age not perhaps of gold, but at least of glitter.*

Consider the following examples of proverbs:

*We never know the value of water till the well is dry* (Yaxşının qədrini pisi görəndən sonra bilmək olar);

*You can take the horse to the water, but you cannot make him drink* (Polad sınar, əyilməz); *Those who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones* (Yediyin qaba tüpürmək olmaz).

Even these few examples clearly show that proverbs are different from those phraseological units which have been discussed above. The first distinctive feature that strikes one is the obvious structural dissimilarity. Phraseological units, as we have seen, are a kind of ready-made blocks which fit into the structure of a sentence performing a certain syntactical function, more or less as words do. E.g. *George liked her for she never put on airs* (predicate). *Big bugs like him care nothing about small like ourselves:* a) subject; b) prepositional object.

Proverbs, if viewed in their structural aspects, are sentences, and so cannot be used in the way in which phraseological units are used in the above examples.

If one compares proverbs and phraseological units in the semantic aspect, the difference seems to become even more obvious. Proverbs could be best compared with minute fables for, like the latter, they sum up the collective experience of the community. They moralize (*Hell is paved with good intention),* give advice *(Don't judge a tree by its bark),* give warning (If

*you sing before breakfast, you will cry before night),* admonish (*Liars should have good memorise),* criticize *(Everyone calls his own geese swans*).

No phraseological unit ever does any of these things. They do not stand for whole statements as proverbs do but for a single concept. Their function in speech is purely *nominative* (i.e. they denote an object, an act, etc.). The function of proverbs in speech, though, is *communicative* (i.e. they impart certain information).

The question of whether or not proverbs should be regarded as a subtype of phraseological units and studied together with the phrasology of a language is a controversial one.

**Proverbs** are also phraseological unities. They can be figurative and non-figurative but all have an emotinal colouring. Their meaning is widened when compared to their homonymic free combination of words.

The followings belong to the figurative: 'I percieve', said Jolyon, 'that you are trying *to kill two birds with one stone*' (J.Galsworthy); 'Bastaple – How about Mr. Tregay? *Walls have ears, care killed the cat* (J.Galsworthy);

*Kill the goose that lays the golden eggs.*

With many of these it is sufficient to mention only a part to suggest the whole: 'It has not been his fault, but *he has played much with... with pitch?* (J.London, Martin Eden);

*With pitch* is a part of the proverb *touch pitch and you will be defiled* (*– şübhəli işlə məşğul olmaq).*

It is interesting to note here that the word *pitch* is important in the context. *Pitch* is the characteristic feature of the whole phrase, and is its vertex. Similarly with: 'Charles – You're *making mountains?*' *Making mountains* alludes to the saying *to make mountains out of molehills*. 'Mr.March – Now take her away! Cook, go and open the front door for Mr. Bly

and his daughter'. 'Mr. Bly – *two many cooks!'* (J.Galsworthy, 'Windows').

*Too many cooks* is an allusion to *too many cooks spoil the broth;*

*Birds of a feather flock together* may be suggested by *birds of a feather; a rolling stone gathers no moss* – by *a rolling stone; still waters run deep* – by *still waters; every cloud has its silver lining* – by *silver lining,* etc.

The proverb *a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush* means that one has to keep to the realizable and not lose it by striving after the possible attainable. This has given rise, in turn, to two other phraseological units: *a bird in the hand* meaning 'something possible of attainment'.

Many of these proverbs are reshaped according to the extra-linguistic circumstances. For instance, *a stitch in time saves nine* is used by J.Galsworthy as: 'Odiham – Thank you, ma'ma. *A sniff in time saves nine* ('The Show'). *A word in time saves nine* (The Man of Property); 'When there's *a straw going, you catch at it*'. Here allusion is made to the proverb *a drowning man will catch at a straw*'.

Such paraphrasing is based on the assumption that the corresponding proverbs are well known. From the lexical point of view such phraseological units seem to lose their unity, become amorphous, so to speak, and a starting point for new phraseological units. They are no longer treated as units ready to be used in the language but as building material for new phraseological units.

Lexicology does not deal more fully with the peculiarities of proverbs: created in folklore they are studied by folklorists, but in treating units introduced into the act of communication ready – made we cannot avoid touching upon them too.

As to **familiar quotations**, they are different from

proverbs in their origin. They come from literature but by and by they become part and parcel of the language, so that many people using them do not even know that they are quoting, and very few could accurately name the play or passage on which they are drawing even when they are aware of using a quotation from Shakespeare.

The Shakespearian quotations have become and remain extremely numerous – they have contributed enormously to the store of the language. Some of the most often used are: *I know a trick worth two of that – yaxşı yol (üsul) bilmək, tədbir bilmək;*

Very many come from "Hamlet". For example, *Give every man thy ear, but few thy voice – Az danış, çox eşit; Something is rotten in the state of Denmark - nə isə çatışmır.*

Excepting only Shakespeare, no poet has given more of his lines than Pope to the common vocabulary of the English – speaking world. The followings are only a few of the best known quotations: *A little learning is a dangerous thing – dad yarımçıq əlindən; az bilmək bəla gətirər.*

Qotations from classical sources were once a recognized feature of public speech. It is a fragment of human expression that is being referred to by somebody else. Most often a quotation is taken from literature, but also sentences from a speech, scenes from a movie, elements of a painting, etc. may be quoted. They are about love, friendship and so on:

*I don't want to live, I want to love first, and live incidentally* (Zelda Fitzgerald);

*There is a battle that goes on between men and women. Many people call it love* (Edvard Munch);

*Do you love me because I am beautiful, or am I beautiful because you love me?* (Oscar Hummerstein);

*Pure love and suspicion cannot dwell together: at the door where the latter enters, the former makes its exit*

(Alexandre Duma's Son);

*Never apologise for your terrible friends. We are all somebody's terrible friends* (J.Gallagher, Dean of Trinity).

Some quotations are so often used that they come to be considered **clichés**. The term comes from the printing trade. The cliché is a metal block used for printing pictures and turning them out in great numbers. The term is used to denote such phrases as have become hackneyed and stale. Being constantly and mechanically repeated they have lost their original expressiveness and so are better avoided. H.W.Fowler in a burst of eloquence in denouncing them even exclaims: "How many a time has Galileo longed to recant his recantation, as *e pur si muove* was once more applied or misapplied". *E pur si muove* (It) 'Yet it does move' – the words attributed to Galileo Galilei. He is believed to have said them after being forced to recant his doctorine that the Earth moves round the sun.

The non-idiomatic phraseological unities have the same origin as the idiomatic, i.e. they come from a free combination of words. Here too, due to frequent usage they begin to function as a single unit.

Clichés and hackneyed phrases are phraseological unities. With these it is not figurative use that is the motivating force in their becoming phraseological units but it is rather the other way round. Although such phrases might have been figurative they lose their emotional connotation, on becoming clichés. Figurativeness completely fades away and the only emotion they provoke infinite boredom. In this type of phrases an interesting kind of desemantization is to be observed, a desemantization of the whole phrase as a unit.

Fowler in his 'Modern English Usage" gives a long list of such phrases which unfortunately can be made very much longer. We have chosen here only a few as an illustration: *the*

*sleep of the just* (*zarafatla deyilən ifadə) — sakitcə yatmaq; the feast of reason* (and flow of soul) – *ağıllı, intellektual söhbət; one's better half – həyat yoldaşı, arvad; one's worse half – (zarafatla) bir kəsin pis yarısı (one's better half – in contrast); young hopeful - ümidverici cavan (adətən zarafat və ironiya ilə deyilir).*

Phrases of address and greeting are also in this group. *'Dear so-and-so'* may be a free combination when *dear* is taken in its literal meaning. But in business or official letters '*Dear so-and-so"* is a phraseological unity and is merely a phrase of address. The same is true of the ending of a letter. *Yours truely, Yours sincerely, Your obedient servant,* etc.

Such phrases are not taken at their own value which makes them different from the free combinations. They become phraseological units because they are on the way to desemantization. The phrase *how do you do* has gone furthest in this respect. When two strangers are introduced they pronounce this formula which does not mean anything at all. Very probably it is used to mean something, i.e. as a free combination. But times have changed and people too. Today *how do you do* is a phrase pronounced out of civility in order to cover the gap of silence which naturally may set in between two persons who meet for the fist time.

In giving his review of English phraseology we have paid special attention to the fact that the subject is a highly complex one and that it has been treated by different scholars in very different ways. Each approach and each classification have their advantages and their drawbacks. The choice one makes depends on the particular problem one has in view, and even so there remains much to be studied in the future. Proverbs are often elliptical in their structure. E.g. *No smoke without fire.* Some of them are formed by alliteration. E.g. *No pains, no gains; so many men, so many minds; Don't trouble trouble,*

*until trouble troubles you.*

Sayings are less than proverbs. Most of the sayings carry colloquial characteristic features. They mean concreet meaning and hit the target. They can express either negative or affirmative colourings. E.g. *May your shadow never grow less! – Allah ömrünü uzun eləsin!; His word is as good as his bond – O, sözünün ağasıdır; The coast is clear – Yol aciqdir.*

## STANDARD AND SUBSTANDARD ENGLISH

Standard English is a universal form of English used in the English speaking countries by educated people. It is an international standard of English. Standard English is the official language of Great Britain which is taught at schools and universities, used by the press, the radio and the television. It is used for public information and administration, and spoken by educated people, it equally serves all the people speaking English.

But this world-wide standard English is spoken with a great number of different regional accents. There exist some regional varieties of standard English which possess a standard literary form, but are spoken with regional accents and are called variants of standard English. Regional varieties which have no normalized literary form are called local dialects. In Great Britain there are two variants: Scotish English and Irish English, and five main groups of dialects: Northern, Midland, Eastern, Western and Southern. Every group contains several dialects. They originate from the dialects of the Germanic tribes which invaded Britain in the $5^{th}$ century.

Local dialects are marked off from the English national literary language and from each other differ by some phonetical, grammatical and lexical peculiarities. But local dialects coexist with the national literary language and serve as a means of communication to the broad people's masses. Their role is different at different historical stages. On the basis of such dialects many of the national languages were formed. For ex.: the English national language .

In some cases words from dialects and variants enter the vocabulary of the national language. For ex.: *to rove = to wander*; *lass = a girl,* etc.

Dialects have no literary form, but many English writers include dialectal speech in their books. Bernard Show in his famous play 'Pygmalion" presents Cockney - the local Southern dialect of London. Cockney is spoken by the uneducated Londoners. Cockney differs greatly from standard English in phonetics, vocabulary and grammar. The characteristic features of Cockney are:

1. Phonetically - the omission of initial "h". E.g. *orse* instead of horse ; *im* instead of "him";
   The omission of final"g". E.g. *goin* instead of "going".
2. Grammatically – the confusion of the first and third person singular in Present Indefinite Tense. E.g. *I says, he say*, etc.

Local dialects are now chiefly preserved in rural communities, in the speech of elderly people. It should be stressed that dialects undergo rapid changes under the pressure of standard English, which is taught at schools and the speech habits which are cultivated by press, radio, television and cinema. Local varieties of the English language peculiar to some districts in England and having no literary form are called dialects.

In every nation some social groups try to force on the national literary language their own terms and expressions.

## THE STYLISTIC DIFFERENTIATION OF THE ENGLISH VOCABULARY

There are words equally fit to be used in a lecture, a poem or when speaking to a child. These are said to be stylistically neutral.

The English nouns *horse, steed, gee-gee* have the same denotational meaning in the sense that all refer to the same animal, but the stylistical colouring is different in each case. *Horse* is stylistically neutral and may be used in any situation. *Steed* is dignified and belongs to poetic diction, but *gee-gee* is a nursery word neutral in a child's speech.

Stylistically words can be roughly subdivided into literary, neutral and colloquial layers. The grater part of the literary layer of Modern English vocabulary are words of general use and known as neutral words. We can distinquish two main subgroups:

**Standard colloquial words and literary or bookish words.**

If we compare the words *parent – father – dad – sire* we can see identity in their denotational meaning. But *father* is stylistically homogeneous. It is a neutral word, *parent* is a bookish word, *dad, daddy* are used in colloquial speech, they are nursery words, but the word *sire* is a poetic word, and can be come across in poetic diction.

We may single out various specific subgroups:

1) terms or scientific words (*genocide, teletype, computer, file,* etc.);
2) poetic words and archaisms. For ex.: *whilome* – formaly; *aught* – anything, *morn* - morning, *ere* – before, *nay* –no, etc.;
3) barbarisms and foreign words: *bon mot* – a clever and witty saying;

Besides there is slang and argot. E.g. *job* – a place got by protection; *chit* – a short letter, message; *tiffin* – lunch, *weed* – druges, *gag* – joke, etc.

These words serve to denote a special vocabulary and idioms used by a particular social or age group.

It is a common knowledge that colloquial English is very emotional: *On earth* or *God's name!*

These are colloquial and emotional only after interrogative words :

*Why in God's name……; Why on earth….; Where in God's name;*

On the other hand, there exist oaths, swear words and their euphemistic variations *(Damn your eyes!)* that function as emotional colloquialisms independent on the context. For ex.: *By God!, Goodness!, Gracious!* (Ay Allah! Aman Allah!), *For Goodness sake! (Allah xatirinə)!, More power to your elbow!* (Allah qoluna qüvvət versin!), *God bless his heart!* (Allah onu qorusun!), *I wish you dog death!* (Görüm səni it kimi gəbərəsən!)*!, Let the earth take you! (Yerə girəsən!), I wish you speedy recovering!* (Allah şəfa versin!)*; I wish you covered with your own blood!* (Səni qanına bələnəsən!)

etc.

Slang words are identified and distinquished by contrasting them to standard English literary vocabulary. They are expressive, mostly ironically for some things. E.g.

- slang words for money: *beans, brass, dough, chink, wads;*
- for the word "head": *attic, brain pan, nut, upper storey;*
- for the adj. "drunk": *boozy, cock-eyed, soaked, tight* and many more.

There are many slang words for *food, alchohol drinks*, *stealing* and other variations of the *law*, for *jail*, *death*, *madness,* etc.

If the slang words denote a new and necessary notion, they may prove an enrichment of the vocbulary and be accepted into standard English, on the other hand, they make just another addition to a cluster of synonyms and have nothing but novelty to back them, they die out very quickly.

Under the substandard English we understrand jargons, colloquialisms, slang words. Such class jargons cannot be considered as languages because they have neither vocabulary nor grammatical structure of their own, but use those of the national languages.

In English dictionaries some words of social groups are marked as "slangs" (sl.) (that's not literary words).

Webster's Dictionary (3rd international dictionary) gives the following meanings of the term slang:

1. language peculiar to a particular group:
   a) the special and secret vocabulary used by a class (as thieves, beggars, etc.).
   b) the jargon used by a particular trade, profession, etc.
2. a nonstandard vocabulary expressing quick popularity and relatively rapid decline into disuse. They are grouped as followings:
   a) the special vocabulary used by any sets of persons;
   b) the cant or jargon of a certain class or period;
   c) language of a highly colloquial type considered as below the level of standard educated speech, etc.

As it is seen from those quotations slang is represented both as a special vocabulary and as a special language. Here are some more examples of words that are considered slang:

*bread-basket = the stomach ( a jocular use);*

*to do a flit = to quit one's flat or lodgings at night without paying the rent; rot! = nonsense!; the cat's pyjamas = the correct thing.*

**Jargonisms** — words marked by their use within a particular social group and bearing a secret and cryptic character, e.g. a sucker – is a person who is easily deceived. In the non-literary vocabulary of the English language such kinds of words and expressions are called jargonisms. Jargon is a recognized term for a group of words that exist in almost every language and the aim of which is to preserve secrecy within one or another social group. Jargonisms are generally old words with entirely immaterial, only the new, improvised meaning is of importance.

Thus, the word *grease* means money; *leaf* = head; *a lexer* = a student preparing for a law course, *a tiger hunter = a gambler,* etc.

Jargonisms are social in character. They are not regional. In Britain and in the USA almost any social group of people has its own jargon. They are: the jargon of thieves, the jargon of jazz people, the jargon of army, known as military slang, the jargon of sporsmen, and many others. Jargon belongs to all social groups and is therefore easily understood by everybody. That's why it is difficult to draw a hard and fast line between slang and jargon. Here are some examples of jargon:

*Piou-Piou* = a French soldier – has passed from military jargon to ordinary colloquial speech;

*Hammen* = a false arrest (american);

*Malto* (n) – a sailor (from the French word "matelot");

*Man and wife* – a knife, etc.

When a jargonism becomes common, it has pressed on to a higher step and becomes slang or colloquialism.

The term colloquial is old enough. The great English lexicographer wanted to reform the English language clearing it from colloquial barbarisms (E.Patridge).

Colloquialisms do not mean "slangy" and jargon. This term is used to denote the vocabulary used by educated people in the course of ordinary conversation.

There is familiar colloquial which is charactarized by a great number of jocular or ironical expressions. It is more emotional and much more free and careless than literary colloquial. Low colloquial is used for illiterate popular speech. It is different from familiar colloquial in that it contains more vulgar words and sometimes also elements of dialects. Here are some colloquial words:

*daily* = a woman who is paid to come and do housework everyday; *greens* = green vegetables, such as spinach, cabbage, etc.

Vulgarisms – coarse words that are not generally used in public, e.g. *hell, damn, shut up, etc.*

Words among different social groups we find:

1. colloquial vulgarism; 2. special professional words; 3. jargonic words and set expressions of declassed elements (thieves, tramps), etc.

The third group is called cant– (jargon). The words and expressions of the two above mentioned groups have a certain stylistic colouring and are very expressive. E.g. *rubbish - tommy rot = nonsense; yes - man - toady - lickspittle* = (a person who says to everybody *"yes"); bore = a dull person, a tiresome person. E.g.* He is a bore.

Professional jargonic words are used by people having the same profession. So, they may be student's jargon, journalistic jargon, etc. E.g. *The greats = state examination; to be ploughed = to fail at an examination; prof = proffessor; maths = mathematics; cabbage — synopsis; trig = trigonometry, etc.*

Today all these words belong to the student's jargon.

*A penny dreadful = a cheap adventurous novel;*

*Sob - sister = a woman writer; ad = advertisement.*

These words belong to journalistic jargon.

**Cant** is the jargon of declassed elements . E.g. *can-opener* – means *key* used by thieves; *fence* (its literary meaning is "hasar") - a person who buys stolen things;

*to nim* = to steal; *a wipe* –(jarg.) - göy, qançır; *cop* – a policeman, etc.

**Professionalisms** are special words in the non-literary layer of the English vocabulary, whereas terms are a specialized group belonging to the literary layer of words. Professionalisms generally remain in circulation within a definite community, as they are linked to a common occupation and common social interests. The semantic structure of the term is usually transparent and is therefore easily understood like terms. Professionalisms do not allow any polysemy, they are monosemantic. Here are some professionalisms used in different trades: t*im-fish - submarine; block-buster - a bomb especially designed to destroy blocks of big buildings; outer - a knock out blow,* etc.

Jargons of some special groups are also called by the French word *argot*. As a jargon of the upper classes in England we can mention the argot of merchants in which the following words are used: *Job - a place got by protection; chit - a short letter, message; tiffin - lunch, etc.*

The last two words (chit and tiffin) are Hindoo. They were brought by merchants..

Jargonic words should not be allowed to penetrate into the national literary language, because they spoil it. Linguists and literary men always struggle against them.

In England these puristic tendencies were too strong before the World war. But in spite of them many colloquialisms and jargonic words (among them americanisms) entered the national language.

*Cushy* - easy and pleasant; *eye-wash* - (jarg.) flattering; *window-dresssing* - art of arranging goods attractively in shop; *to get (have) cold feet* - to be frightened; *come again* -

repeat, please; *to fire* - to dismiss (to make free); *pep* - vividness, etc.

Jargons create neologisms very easily but not all of these new words enter the popular language. Many of them remain to serve the narrow circle of people in which they were created.

In conclusion it should be noted that Standard English is the national literary English language spoken by educated people and taught at schools. Local dialects are varieties of the English language. Jargonic words and expressions of different social groups belong to substandard English.

**Differences between American English and British English**

American English differs greatly from British English in pronunciation and in vocabulary. Besides, there are some minor features of grammar and spelling. Historically American English is based on the language of the first American settlers, that is on English of the 17th century.

The dictionary gives a lot of information about words that are only used in American English or that have different meanings in British and American English. E.g. US – *elevator*, British English –*lift*; US – *gas*, British English – *petrol.*

Lexical peculiarities have been brought about several historical processes: some absolute words of the 17th century have survived in America (*fall* for autumn; *guess* for think); a number of words changed their meanings due to the new conditions of social and economic life: *corn*-maise; *racket* – racketeer, etc.

In American English it is common to use *like* instead of *as if /as though*. This is not correct in BE. For example,

*He talks as if he knew everything (BE);*

*He talks like / as if he knew everything (AE).*

The development of american variants shows how extralinquistic factors influence the language. On the whole the language spoken in the USA differs greatly from the English language spoken in England. Here are some examples:

| In American English | In British English |
|---|---|
| airplane | aeroplane |
| apartment | flat/apartment |
| busy | engaged (phone) |
| cab/taxi | taxi |
| can | tin |
| candy | sweets |
| check/bill | bill |
| cookie/cracker | biscuit |
| centre | center |
| crazy | mad |
| engine | motor |
| film | movie |
| handbag | purse |
| holiday | vacation |
| jam | jelly |
| lift | elevator |
| lorry | truck |
| luggage | baggage |
| main road | highway |
| maths | math |
| band-aid | plaster |
| bathroom | Loo/WC/toilet |
| fries | chips |

When a word is pronounced differently in American English, this is given after the British pronunciation: tomato

[tə'mæ:təu], US- [tə'meitɔu]. Here are some of the main differences:

1. Stressed vowel is usually longer in American English, e.g. in the word "packet" the sound [æ] is longer; in the word "shop" the sound [o] is longer.

2. In British English the letter [r] is only pronounced before a vowel (e.g. in words like "red, bedroom", etc.) and is silent in all other words (e.g. in "car, learn, over", etc.). In American English the letter "r" is always pronounced.

3. In American English the letter "t" and "d" have a very similar light [d] sound, when they come between two vowels, so that words "writer" and "rider" sound almost the same; in British the "t" is much stronger.

Grammatically americans often use the simple past tense when British people use present perfect:

British: *I have just seen her* - American: *I just saw her.*

British: *Have you heard the news?*- American: *Did you hear the news?*

Americans often use *"have"* when British people use *"have got".*

British: *I haven't got much time* - American: *I don't have much time.*

There are often small differences in the use of prepositions and adverbs:

British: *Stay at home* - American: *Stay home.*

British*: Monday to Friday* - American*: Monday through Friday.*

Grammar and spelling peculiarities are: *"will"* for all persons; *were* for all persons; *-our* is changed into *–or; colour = color; labour =labor.*

*He talks as if he was rich (BE);*

*He talks as he were rich (AE).*

Some words end in - *tre* in British English, *-ter* in American English, for example: *cenre/theatre, center/theater.*
Spelling of some words in BE and AE:

| British English | American English |
|---|---|
| colour | colour |
| humour | humor |
| favourite | favorite |
| theatre | theater |
| kilometre | kilometer |
| mum,mam, mom | mom |
| cosy | cozy |
| realise | realize |
| dialogue | dialog |
| traveller | traveler |
| cheque | check |
| jewellery | jewelry |

## LEXICOGRAPHY

Lexicography is the science of dictionary - compiling. It is closely connected with lexicology, as they both have the same object of study and deal with the same problem – the form, meaning, usage, and origin of vocabulary units. Both make use of each other's achievements. It is an important branch of applied linguistics.

But there are some differences between these two sciences. Lexicography studies recurring patterns of semantic relations, any formal phonological and grammatical devices by which they may be rendered. It studies characteristic features of words and oppositions concerning the vocabulary of a language. But lexicology cannot claim any completeness as regards units themselves, because the number of units is very great. As to lexicology it deals with the semantic, formal and functional descriptions of all individual words.

It goes without saying that neither lexicology, nor lexicography can develop successfully without each other, because they both deal with the same object of reality, that is with the vocabulary of a language.

As it is said above lexicography is the theory and practice of compiling dictionaries. The term dictionary is used to denote a book listing words of a language with their meanings and often with the data concerning pronunciation, usage or origin. A dictionary is a collection of words in one or more specific languages, often listed alphabetically, with usage information, definitions, etymologies, phonetics, pronunciations and other information or a book of words in one language with their equivalents in another. English lexicography is considered to be the richest in the world. It has a remarkable

history. The history of dictionary – making for the English language goes as far back as the Old English period. The first explanatory unilinqual English dictionary appeared in 1604. It was compiled by Robert Cowdray, a school master. The first etymological dictionary was made by Nationial Bailey in 1721.

The entries of a dictionary are usually arranged in alphabetical order, but derivatives, compounds and word combinations are given under the same head-word.

**One of the debatable problems** in the theory and practice of dictionary is compiling the number of vocabulary units in Modern English. Different dictionaries register different number of words. It depends upon basically different approaches to the vocabulary units. In some cases, e.g. the distinction between various meanings of one polysemantic word and the meanings of two homonymous words is not sharp and clear.

Thus, in some dictionaries "seal" is regarded as one word, in others as five different words.

**Another debatable problem is** phraseological units. This term itself is rather vague, and allows different interpretations. From one point of view all kinds of idiomatic expressions must be regarded in the dictionary as separate vocabulary entries .

**Another approach to the problem** of phraserology considers that only phraseological units functioning in the language as word equivalents should be treated as individual vocabulary units.

The word stock of Modern English is constantly growing and changing. The words constantly appear in the language, but we don't consider them belonging to the English vocabulary until they are *assimilated*. At the same time some words disappear in the language or gradually lose their vitality and are not used in present day English, but may be

found in poetical works of outstanding English poets of the 19th century.

A great number of vocabulary units are used as terms in various branches of science (radio, electronics, statistic are international words).

There is a considerable difference between the vocabulary units a person uses and those who understand. The passive vocabulary of a normally educated person comprises about 30.000 words. But only about 20.000 are used in speech. The number of vocabulary units to be included in the dictionaries also depends on the aims of dictionary-compilers.

## Different Types of Dictionaries

A dictionary is the most widely used reference book in English homes, schools and business offices. The term "dictionary" denotes a book listing words of a language with their meanings, pronunciation, usage and sometimes origin. All the dictionaries may be divided into two main types: linquistic and non-linguistic dictionaries. Non-linguistic dictionaries give information on all branches of knowledge. They deal not with words, but with facts and concepts. Such dictionaries are called encyclopaedic dictionaries. E.g. *The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 24 volumes, London-Chicago -Toronto. 10th edition, 1961.*

Linguistic dictionaries deal with words, their meanings, pronunciation, etymology or give their equivalents in another language. Linguistic dictionaries are divided into: general dictionaries and special dictionaries.

**General dictionaries** present a wide-range of data about the vocabulary items in ordinary use. General dictionaries are subdivided into the following types:

1) Explanatory dictionaries (or unilingual dictionaries). In such dictionaries words and their definitions belong to the same language. Such as:

a) The New English Dictionary on Historical Principles (NED) = also the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) – (ed.by J.A.H.Murray and others, vols, I –XIII, Oxford, 1933);

b) Shorter Oxford Dictionary on Historical Principles (SOD), vol. I-II, 3rd ed., Oxford, 1956;

c) Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language (NID) Springfield Mass., USA, 1981 ;

d) The Coincise Oxford Dictionary, ed. by H.W.Fowler, Oxford, 1944, etc.

2) Translation dictionaries = bilingual dictionaries = parallel dictionaries.

Translation dictionaries explain words of a given language by giving their equivalents in another language. E.g. English-Russian dictionary by prof. V.K.Muller; Russian-English Dictionary under prof. A.I.Smirnitsky's general direction; New English-Russian Dictionary edited by I.R.Galperin; Azerbaijanian – English Dictionary by O.I.Musayev, Baku, 1996; English Azerbaijani Dictionary by O.I.Musayev, Baku, 2003, etc.

Azerbaijani – English and English Azerbaijani dictionary by I.M.Rahimov, Baku, 2003.

3) Learner's Dictionaries

Learner's Dictionaries usually contain such words and their meanings which are likely to be used or met by the learner in his studies. Usually the selection of head words and their meanings is based on frequently of current use. Learner's dictionaries are compiled for foreign language learners of different stages of advancement.

a) The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English by A.S.Hornby, Oxford, 1982, and others;

b) The learner's English Russian Dictionary by S.Folomkina and H.Weiser (contains about 3500 words), etc.

**Specialized Dictionaries**

Specialized dictionaries restrict themselves to one particular aspect (e.g. synonyms and antonyms, phraseological units, neologisms, terms, etymology, pronunciation), etc.

Specialized dictionaries may be:

1.Dictionary of synonyms:

a) A Dictionary of English Synonyms and Synonymous Expressions by R.Soule , Boston, 1938;

b) Webster's Dictionary of Synonyms, USA, 1942;

c) English Synonyms Explained and Illustrated by A.F.Gandelsman,

M., 1963;

A Dictionary of Synonyms, by I.Mammadov, H.Hasanov, Baku, 1990.

Dictionaries of synonyms explain the differences between synonyms in semantic structure, use and style.

2. **Phraseological Dictionaries.** They deal with set-expressions, proverbs, explain their meanings, origin, etc. E.g.

a) The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs.

b) V.H.Collins, Book of English Idioms.

c) An Anglo-Russian Phraseological Dictionary by A.V.Koonin, M., 1967, in two volumes.

d) English - Azerbaijani and Azerbaijani - English phraseological dictionary, by Kh.Ahmadova, I.M.Rahimov, Baku, 1968.

e) English-Azerbaijani Phraseological Dictionary by A.H.Hajiyeva, A.K.Hajiyeva, Baku, 2006.

f) Azerbaijani – English - Russian Phraseological Dictionary by N.Ch.Valiyeva, Baku, 2006.

g)Azerbaijani – English - Russian Phraseological Dictionary by N.Ch.Valiyeva, Baku, I-II c., 2010.

h) English - Azerbaycani - Russian Proverbial Dictionary, Baku, 1981, by T.Abasquliyev, etc.

3. **Dictionaries of Collocations**

Dictionaries of collocations contain words which freely combine with the given head-word. E.g.

A Reum's Dictionary of English Style (about 10.000 English words). This dictionary is compiled for German students of English in order to help them to carry English correspondence.

4. **Dictionaries of Word-Frequency.** These reference-books are based on frequency value of words included by numbers stating the occurrence per million words. E.g. The Teacher's Book of 30 000 words by E.L.Thornike and I.Lorge.

**Other Types of Specialized Dictionaries**

1. Usage dictionaries make it their business to pass judgement on what is right or wrong. E.g. N.W.Fowler, Dictionary of Modern English Usage, Oxford, 1940; N.W.Nickolson, A Dictionary of American-English Usage.

2. Etymological Dictionaries. Such dictionaries explain the sources and origin of words. E.g. W.Skeat, Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, Oxford, 1931.

3. Pronouncing Dictionaries. Record contemporary pronunciation of words. E.g. Daniel Jones, English Pronouncing Dictionary (the world-famous dictionary).

4. Idiographic Dictionaries. In idiographic dictionaries words are not arranged in alphabetical order, they are arranged according to a logical classification of notions expressed, that is according to the semantic fields, such as kinship terms, colour terms, names for parts of human body, abstract relations, space, etc. But dictionaries of this type always have an alphabetical

index attached, which helps to find the necessary word. E.g. P.M.Roget. Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases.

This idiographic dictionary is the oldest one in the world. It was first published in 1812. Since then it was reprinted about 80 times. Its last edition appeared in 1962.

Besides above mentioned dictionaries there are also such dictionaries as spelling reference books, hard-words dictionnaries, different technical dictionaries, dialect and slang dictionaries, multilingual (or poliglot) dictionaries, etc.

Besides above mentioned dictionaries there are different types of dictionaries in the Azerbaijani language as well. They are: Foreign Words Dictionary, Baku, 1960; Arabic and Persian Words Dictionary, Baku, 1981; Orphographic Dictionary, Baku, 1975, Dialect Dictionary, Baku, 1964; Russian - Azerbaijani Dictionary in III volumes, Baku, 1971, 1975, 1978.

They were published under the edition by A.A.Orujov; Azerbaijani -Russian Dictionary, Baku, 1965, edited by Kh.A.Azizbayov; A Dictionary of Proverbs, Baku, 1985, edited by Hamid Gasimzadeh, etc.

**Structure of Dictionaries**

Most dictionaries have much in common in their structure . They usually have such items as:

1. Introduction or Preface (author's explanatory remarks at the beginning of a book) or Foreword.
2. Guide to these dictionaries.
3. Key to the pronunciation.
4. Abbrevitions and symbols used in the dictionary.
5. A dictionary of the English language (list of words).
6. Supplements (geographical names, personal names, foreign words).

English lexicography is probably the richest one in the world with respect to variety and number of the dictionaries published. The demand for dictionaries is great.

## Some Problems of Dictionary Compiling

The work at a dictionary consists of the following stages: the collection of material; the selection of entries and their arrangement; the setting of each entry.

At different stages of his work the lexicographer comes across with different problems:

1. the selection of lexical units;
2. their arrangement;
3. the setting of entries;
4. the selection and arrangement of word – meaning;
5. the definition of meaning;
6. illustrative material;
7. supplementary material.

The selection is obviously necessary for all dictionaries. First of all the type of lexical units to be chosen for inclusion is to be decided upon. Then the number of items to be recorded must be determined.

Explanatory or translation dictionaries are usually recorded words and phraseological units, some of them also include affixes as separate entries. Synonym books, pronouncing, etymological dictionaries and some others deal only with words. In most dictionaries various types of entries are given in a single alphabetical listing .

In some explanatory and translation dictionaries, entries are grouped in families of words, are arranged in synonimic sets and its dominant member serves as the head-word of the entry. The meanings of words may be defined in different ways:

a) by means of definitions that are characterized as encyclopaedic;
b) by means of descriptive definitions or paraphrases;
c) with the help of synonymous words and expressions;
d) by means of cross-referents (antonyms).

All types of dictionaries may be monolingual (unilingual) - giving information in the same language and translation dictionaries - giving information in another language.

Unilingual dictionaries may be diachronic (Oxford dict.) and synchronic (or descriptive ). Diachronic dictionaries reflect the historical development of the form and meaning of every word. The descriptive dictionaries are concerned with present day meaning and usage of words.

There are a lot of dictionaries (general, unilingual) compiled in English speaking countries. Translation and poliglot (multilingual) dictionaries are those that give equivalents in another language or several foreign languages. The main problem in compiling dictionaries of this type is to give adequate (satisfactory) translation of vocabulary.

## List of Used Literature

### In English:

1. Abdulrahimov E.H. The ABC of the History of the English Language, Baku, 2005.
2. Anatoly Liberman, Word Origins: Etymology for Everyone.
3. Andrew Sihler, Language History.
4. Antrushina G.B., Afanaseva O.V., Morozova N.N. English Lexicology, M., 2001.
5. Arnold I.V. The English Word, M., 1986.
6. Charles W. Kreider, Introducing English Semantics, London and New York, 1998.
7. Cruse D.A. Polysemy and related homonymy from a cognitive linguistic viewpoint, In Computatianal Lexical Semantics, Cambridge University Press, 1995
8. Ginsburg R.S., Khidekel S.S., Knyazeva G.Y., Sankin A.A. A Course in Modern English Lexicology. M.,1979.
9. Gozalova K.M. Manual Aid on English Semasiology, Baku, 2001
10. Grinberg L.E., Kuznets A.V., Kumacheva A.V., Meltser G.M. Exercises on Modern English Lexicology, M., 1960.
11. Fred W.Riggs. Homonyms, Heteronyms, and Allonyms. www.webdata.soc.hawail.edu/fredr/wwelcome.htm-1999
12. Hajiyeva A.H. Lectures and Exercises on English Lexicology, Baku, 2000
13. Hajiyeva A.H., Najafli E.B., Cafarov A.M., English Phraseology, Baku, 2009