

Ім'я користувача:  
Моца Андрій Андрійович

ID перевірки:  
1011191093

Дата перевірки:  
15.05.2022 21:43:30 EEST

Тип перевірки:  
Doc vs Internet + Library

Дата звіту:  
15.05.2022 21:58:40 EEST

ID користувача:  
100006701

Назва документа: Бондаренко\_Бакалаврська робота 02

Кількість сторінок: 49 Кількість слів: 16912 Кількість символів: 109531 Розмір файлу: 526.83 KB ID файлу: 1011084865

## 16% Схожість

Найбільша схожість: 8.01% з Інтернет-джерелом (<https://cwetochki.ru/files/topik-Modern-English-Word-Formation.docx>)

15.4% Джерела з Інтернету

323

Сторінка 51

0.71% Джерела з Бібліотеки

58

Сторінка 54

## 0% Цитат

Вилучення цитат вимкнене

Вилучення списку бібліографічних посилань вимкнене

## 30.1% Вилучень

Деякі джерела вилучено автоматично (фільтри вилучення: кількість знайдених слів є меншою за 8 слів та 0%)

Немає вилучених Інтернет-джерел

30.1% Вилученого тексту з Бібліотеки

1

Сторінка 54

## Модифікації

Виявлено модифікації тексту. Детальна інформація доступна в онлайн-звіті.

Замінені символи

464

**Закарпатський угорський інститут імені Ференца Ракоці II  
II. Rákóczi Ferenc Kárpátaljai Magyar Főiskola**

Реєстраційний № \_\_\_\_\_

**Кваліфікаційна робота**

**СТИЛІСТИЧНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ФУНКЦІОНУВАННЯ НЕОЛОГІЗМІВ  
СУЧАСНОЇ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ  
(НА МАТЕРІАЛІ БРИТАНСЬКОЇ ПРЕСИ)**

Бондаренко Владіслава Віталіївна

Студентки 4-го курсу

Освітня програма 014 Середня освіта. Англійська мова і література

Ступінь вищої освіти: бакалавр

Тема затверджена Вченою радою ЗУІ

Протокол № / 2021 року

Науковий керівник:

Врабель Томаш Томашович  
канд. філ. наук, доцент

Завідувач кафедри:

**Берегсасі Аніко Ференцівна, професор  
д-р габілітований, доцент**

Робота захищена на оцінку \_\_\_\_\_, «\_\_» \_\_\_\_\_ 2022\_ року

Протокол № \_\_\_\_\_ / 2022\_

Берегово/Beregszász – 2022 р.

**ЗАКАРПАТСЬКИЙ УГОРСЬКИЙ ІНСТИТУТ ІМЕНІ ФЕРЕНЦА РАКОЦІ П**  
**Кафедра філології**

**Кваліфікаційна робота**  
**СТИЛІСТИЧНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ФУНКЦІОНУВАННЯ НЕОЛОГІЗМІВ**  
**СУЧАСНОЇ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ**  
**(НА МАТЕРІАЛІ БРИТАНСЬКОЇ ПРЕСИ)**

Ступінь вищої освіти: бакалавр

Виконав(ла): студентка 4-го курсу

Освітня програма  
014 Середня освіта. Англійська мова і література

Бондаренко Владіслава Віталіївна

Науковий керівник: Врабель Томаш Томашович  
канд.філ.наук, доцент

Рецензент:  
Лехнер Ілона Густавівна  
доктор філософії

Берегове

2022

**Ferenc Rákóczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education**  
**Department of Philology**

**STYLISTIC PECULIARITIES OF FUNCTIONING OF NEOLOGISMS IN MODERN  
ENGLISH (BASED ON BRITISH PRESS)**  
BACHELOR'S THESIS

Presented by  
*Vladislava Bondarenko*  
4<sup>th</sup> year student

**Professional Education program:**

014 Secondary education. English language and literature

**Thesis supervisor:** T. Vrábely,  
Candidate of Philological Sciences

**Second reader:**  
Ilona Lechner, PhD

Beregszász, 2022

## ЗМІСТ

ВСТУП.....	6
РОЗДІЛ 1. ПРОЦЕСИ СЛОВОТВОРЕННЯ.....	8
1.1 Походження слова як предмет.....	8
1.2 Історія вивчення словотворення.....	9
1.3 Афіксація. Загальна характеристика суфіксів та префіксів.....	10
1.4 Перетворення.....	22
1.5 Словоскладання.....	23
1.5.1 Звуковий обмін.....	23
1.5.2 Обмін наголосом.....	23
1.5.3 Звуконаслідування.....	24
1.5.4 Телескопія.....	24
1.5.5 Регресивна деривація.....	25
РОЗДІЛ 2. ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ФУНКЦІОНУВАННЯ НЕОЛОГІЗМІВ СУЧАСНОЇ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ.....	26
2.1 Функціонування неологізмів у сучасній англійській мові.....	26
2.2 Структурні особливості.....	26
2.3 Фонетичні особливості.....	27
2.4 Графічні особливості.....	27
2.5 Семантичні особливості.....	28
РОЗДІЛ 3. НЕОЛОГІЗМИ В БРИТАНСЬКІЙ ПРЕСІ.....	35
3.1 Засоби масової інформації як джерело нової лексики.....	35
3.2 Тематичний аналіз лексичних одиниць.....	38
3.3 Аналіз неологізмів з точки зору лінгвокультурного підходу.....	40
3.4 Особливості використання нових номінацій в англомовних медіатекстах.....	40
3.5 Результати дослідження.....	42
ВИСНОВКИ.....	44
СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ.....	45
РЕЗЮМЕ.....	47
ДОДАТОК А.....	49

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	6
PART I. WORD-FORMATION PROCESSES.....	8
1.1 Subject Of Word-formation.....	8
1.2 History Of The Study Of Word-formation.....	9
1.3 Affixation. General characteristics of suffixes and prefixes.....	10
1.4 Conversion.....	22
1.5 Compounding.....	23
1.5.1 Sound Interchange.....	23
1.5.2 Stress Interchange.....	23
1.5.3 Sound Imitation.....	24
1.5.4 Blends.....	24
1.5.5 Back Formation.....	25
PART II. PECULIARITIES OF FUNCTIONING OF NEOLOGISMS IN MODERN ENGLISH.....	26
2.1 The functioning of neologisms in modern English.....	26
2.2 Structural peculiarities.....	26
2.3 Phonetic peculiarities.....	27
2.4 Graphic peculiarities.....	27
2.5 Semantic peculiarities.....	28
PART III. FEATURES OF NEOLOGISMS IN ENGLISH MEDIA TEXTS.....	35
3.1 Mass media as a source of new vocabulary.....	35
3.2 Thematic analysis of lexical units.....	38
3.3 Analysis of the neologisms from the point of view of the linguocultural approach.....	40
3.4 Features of the use of new nominations in English-language media texts.....	40
3.5 Findings of the research.....	42
CONCLUSIONS.....	44
REFERENCE LIST.....	45
SUMMARY.....	47
APPENDIX A.....	49

## INTRODUCTION

*Topicality:* a new perspective on analyzing structural and semantic features of neologisms that corresponds to the current state of development of linguistics. Research to find and analyze information not only linguistic but also culturological factors that shape the content of neology in English. The need to replace obsolete material in most methodological and training manuals on the new one that meets trends in the English language development.

*Theme:* formation, functioning and use of neologisms in English media.

The *object:* the research material used for this study was a corpus of English texts from the newspaper discourses, specifically articles published on the websites of high-quality British newspapers such as "The Guardian" and "Independent".

The *subject:* stylistic peculiarities of functioning of neologisms in the British press.

The *Aim:* Through analyzing media texts of online publications of British newspapers, determine the specifics of the appearance and use of neologisms in everyday communication in England. The realization of this goal is carried out by solving the following *tasks:*

1. to define the concept of neologism in modern linguistics;
2. to establish general principles of classification of neologisms in English;
3. to substantiate structural, semantic, and functional features of the studied vocabulary;
4. to analyze English-language media texts using materials of the British press to give examples of structural and semantic features of neologisms.

The *scientific value* of the work: the study results make a significant contribution to the theory of word formation and general lexical neology, as well as the neology of English, communicative linguistics, pragmalinguistics, Internet linguistics, and the theory of mass and media communication.

The *theoretical value* is that the general conclusions of the work can be used in theoretical courses and special courses in lexicology to teach language disciplines in higher education.

The *practical value* of the work is that the data obtained during the study can be used when compiling dictionaries of modern English neologisms and writing textbooks and research for scientists.

The problem of innovation processes in the vocabulary of modern English is quite relevant because today, the processes of integration, globalization, computerization, and politicization require language to provide speakers with the necessary number of new lexical

items. Many of them appear in English every year, which requires researchers to record and analyze them, trying to keep up with trends in English.

Among the problems and tasks of neology are the following: the discovery of new words and a correct understanding of their meaning, the formulation of new trends in language development based on new language units, identifying ways of their formation, translation, and lexicographic processing.

The structure of the work consists of the following parts: an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion, reference list, and an appendix.

The *introduction* explains the topicality of this work, the aim, and the specific difficulties involved.

*Part I* describes ways of forming lexical units and identifies the main areas of using neologisms.

*Part II* highlights the study results of neologisms taken from British newspapers such as “The Guardian” and “Independent”.

*Part III* reports on features of neologisms in English media texts.

The chapter generalizes all the work results and forms its primary conclusions.

The *appendix* contains Table 1. Quantitative analysis of thematic groups of lexical innovations.

In *conclusion*, the results of the study and its main conclusions are described.

Generalization of the work we made gives the reason to confirm that all the tasks are solved. The aim of the research is attained, but this research does not exhaust a variety of questions connected with neologisms of the English language. It may take a certain period before neologism will become popular among the authors of media texts since media journalists are directly relevant to neologisms through their pragmatic labeling.



## **PART I**

### **WORD-FORMATION PROCESSES**

As a starting point, let us take a look at some theoretical aspects of word formation. As a starting point, let us define this phenomenon clearly. Plag's (2005: 13) interpretation of "how new complex words are built based on other words or morphemes" might be generally accepted. The process of word-formation itself is sometimes called derivation, lexeme formation, or lexical word-formation. The last concept mentioned is crucial to consider as it excludes all formations of words by inflectional processes.

Secondly, we must not forget the issue that is closely connected with the topic of our conversation. Word-formation is "an place in which grammar and lexicology share a common ground" (Quirk et al. 2006: 1517). There are commonnesses, for example, in word directive in the case of grammar, and matching ones are to be found in the structures of words, i.e., its parts (mainly affixes) cannot transpire in an arbitrary series. Other resemblances could be drafted and touched upon several times in the chapter.

Furthermore, word-formation is a highly beneficial source of neologisms. It is not expected for it to form words we have never experienced before. Despite this, orators can comprehend the newly forged formations. Nevertheless, rules within the word-formation permit us to deteriorate the word, separate its components, and conclude its meaning based on the sense of the elements (cf. Plag 2005). This is the primary importance of word-formation. It creates new words and allows us to see how the new lexical pieces function. Moreover, word-formation is often subject to style rather than need (Katamba 1994, Bauer 2002).

#### **1.1 Subject of Word-Formation**

In the first instance, the position mentioned above of word-formation in the linguistic system and its complexity must be highlighted. Word-formation does not check all words of a language. It focuses on motivating naming branches treated as fundamental units of word-formation. However, it is not due to its analyzability but the word-formative relation. The critical requirement is that one unit is motivated by another, allowing processes like conversion, blending, and back-derivation to word-formation despite their unary structure. Unmotivated words, on the other hand, are considered lexical. The term motivated naming unit is given preference to lexeme and word because the area of naming units also contains collocations, and therefore it is more comprehensive.

Plus, word-formation encounters in a variety of word-formative methods, word-formative structure, and sign character of naming units. Additionally, it study motivation and motivational phenomena as well as the methods of investigation for these phenomena. (Marchand H.;71)

As the next matter of word-formation, we have a productivity of word-formation. This refers to a language's ability to create new naming units when necessary. There is no surprise that this area is also explained in several ways and that there is no clear distinction between productive and unproductive processes. There is an argument that productivity is determined by the degree of generality. Therefore, a process becomes more productive as it becomes more generalized. (Auto J. Longman;1987).

Productivity and creativity should be distinguished. Production is governed by generative grammar, but creativity is not, as it is a native ability of the speaker who spreads the language system in however (unpredictable) way that they wish. Both of these phenomena lead to an increase in neologisms. Productivity is, however, the only factor discussed because creativity is unpredictable.

## **1.2 History of the Study of Word-Formation**

The study of word-formation has undoubtedly always been closely related to interest in language in general. The work of Panini started an analysis of this matter. Panini was born about 520 BC in Shalatala in today's Pakistan. He is regarded as a founder of the language and the civilization of Sanskrit.

He offered a profound explanation of Sanskrit word-formation, identical to the modern one. Following Panini, the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries did not see any noticeable advancements. As has already been noted, linguists were not interested in this subject. Accordingly research works were carried out against the background of other linguistic problems.( Henry Sweet;1876; p.471)

A change in this regard occurred in the 20th century. We should start with two works from this era, Herbert Koziol's *Handbook der Englischen Wortbildungslehre* (1937) (an overview of earlier studies) and Otto Jespersen's "A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles" (1942). Jespersen attempted to address grammatical problems from an outer perspective, but his approach is still considered to be historical. Nevertheless, these works have not indicated a meaningful interest change in word-formation. Linguists focused on grammatical issues. American structuralism concentrated on morphemes rather than words, and linguists in the transformational stream concentrated on sentences, which they considered more significant than words.

The publication of two important works in 1960 led to a breakthrough in word-formation. "The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation" by Hans Marchand and "The Grammar of English Nominalizations" written by R.B. Lees.

Hans Marchand provided in his work a fantastic value of particular theoretical information. According to him, "Word-formation is a component of the science of language which studies the ways on which a language creates new lexical items, words."

The main subject of his book is the supposed concept of words. It means that every word must be written of significance and signifies to be viewed as motivated. The impact of Ferdinand Saussure is transparent. The word-formation of this period describes forming words through existing lexical items and formatives (suffixes, prefixes, etc.). Only compounding and affix-derivation belong to this classification. Nevertheless, Marchand appointed to the word-formation also not syntagmas (motivated signs). This point directed to mortification in his work.

As noted previously, Lees is the so-called "father" of the transformational stream because he was the first tested to apply these methods to word-formation. (Dmitri Borgmann;1965).

Publication of these two assignments caused a fundamental transformation in the perception of word-formation among linguists. There have been several books produced on this topic, including "An Introduction to Modern English Word Formation" by Valerie Adams published in 1973, "English Word-Formation", written by Laurie Bauer in 1983, "Wortbildung und Semantik" by Dieter Kastovsky (1982), "Lexikologija anglijskogo jazyka" by A.I. Smirnitckij (1956) and "Word Formation in Generative Grammar" by Mark Aronoff (1976). Czech and Slovak linguists also contributed to this smash, namely Miloš Dokulil, Josef Filipec, or Ján Horecký.

In spite of differences in views and approaches, the contemporary situation of word-formation can be described as one of rapid development and increasing interest among linguists. What is the reason? According to Kastovsky, "*Word-formation lies on the "crossroads" of different aspects of language - synchrony and diachrony, morphology, phonology, syntax and semantics. And this is what makes it very interesting and attractive.*" (Dieter Kastovsky;37)

### **1.3 Affixation. General Characteristics of Suffixes and Prefixes.**

The affixation process entails combining an affix or several affixes with a root morpheme to form an entirely new word.

In modern English, suffixation is typical of nouns and adjectives, while prefixation is typical of verbs (incoming, trainee, principal, promotion).

As with words, affixes fall into two large groups: native and borrowed from an etymological standpoint. It is wrong to assume that affixes are borrowed in the same way and for the same reason as words. Affixes are never borrowed as such; they are only borrowed as parts of borrowed words, so the term "borrowed affixes" is inaccurate. English affixes must meet certain conditions for them to enter the morphological system. Affixes may be borrowed only if significant numbers of words contain the affix, if its meaning and function are sufficiently defined and clear, and if its structural pattern corresponds to structural patterns that already exist in the language. If these conditions are met, the foreign affix can even become productive and be combined with native or borrowed foundations in the English Dictionary system like *-able* < Lat *-abilis* in such words as *laughable* or *unforgettable* and *unforgivable*. French is the source of the words *balustrade*, *brigade*, and *cascade*. By analogy with them, words such as *blockade* are coined in the English language itself. (Тиховець Н.М.;253)

Affixes are either living or dead. Live affixes can easily be distinguished from the base (take care). The dead affixes have entirely merged with the root. However, a diachronic analysis can still be located (admit – L. ad+mittere).

During a certain period of language development, productive affixes are involved in creating new words. By productive affixes, we mean active ones in creating new words. It is best to look for productive affixes among neologisms and so-called one-time words, meaning words only used for this purpose. Typically, letters are composed at the level of living speech and reflect the most productive and progressive models of word creation. According to Professor Pringle, they are described as *unputdownable* thrill, "*I don't like Sunday evenings: I feel so Mondayish*", according to Professor Pringle. He was a thinnish, baldish, *dyspeptic-looking* cove with an eye like a haddock. (From *Right-Ho, Jeeves* by P.G. Wodehouse)

The use of affixes can serve as a mechanism for expressing a different meaning in many cases:

*uninterested* – *disinterested*;

*distrust* – *mistrust*.

There should be no confusion between the productivity and frequency of affixes. Several commonly used affixes are no longer used (e. g. native suffixes such as *-full*, *-ly*; Latin basis suffixes such as *-ant*, *-ent*, *-al*).

There is a significant contrast between prefixes and suffixes, in that prefixes come "before" the stem while suffixes come "after." This differentiates their functions and meanings as well as how they are fixed. There is a significant difference between prefixes and suffixes, in that prefixes come "before" the stem while suffixes come "after." This differentiates their functions and meanings as well as how they are fixed. (Мостовий М.І;1993).

Derivational morphemes such as *-en*, *-y*, and *-less* in *hearten*, *heartly*, and *heartless* create a new derivative in a different part of speech or word class after the stem. By rendering a very general lexico-grammatical meaning when both underlying and resultant forms belong to the same part of speech, suffixes differentiate between lexico-grammatical classes. A verb suffix like *-ify* or *-er*, for example, is a verb suffix. On the other hand, the first type of verb is primarily associated with causative verbs, such as *terrify*, *purify*, *rarefy*, or *simplify*. In contrast, the second type concerns frequentative verbs, *such as flicker*, *shimmer*, or *tweet*.

The reason why suffixes are, as a rule, semantically fused with the stem can be explained by the fact that suffixes render the most general aspect of the word's lexical meaning by indicating the general category of phenomena to which the referent of the word belongs.

As a derivational morpheme, a prefix modifies the meaning of the root; for example, *hearten* versus *dishearten*. Only with verbs and stative can a prefix distinguish between parts of speech; for example, *earth* n versus *unearth* v, *sleep* n versus *asleep* (stative).

Interestingly, the prefix *en-* may carry the exact meaning of being or bringing into a particular state as the suffix *-en*, cf. *enable*, *encamp*, *endanger*, *endear*, *enslave* and *fasten*, *darken*, *deepen*, *lengthen*, *strengthen*.

Several prefixes precede verb stems to indicate transitive and intransitive usage: *stay* v and *outstay* (sb) vt. With a few peculiarities, prefixes change the stem for time (*pre-*, *post-*), location (*in-*, *ad-*), or negation (*un-*, *dis-*) and stay semantically somewhat independent of the stem. ( Демченко Н.;94)

+ An infix is an affix placed within the word, like *-n-* in *stand*. This type does not work. An affix is not the same as a bound form. In order to distinguish it from affixes historically, it should be noted that it is always borrowed from a different language, namely, Latin or Greek, where it existed either as a separate word or as a combination of words. This makes them different from all other borrowings. Often these compounds and derivatives do not exist in their original languages but were created in contemporaneous languages, including English, Russian, French, etc., cf. *polyclinic*, *polymer*; *stereophonic*, *stereoscopic*, *telemechanics*, *television*. Combining forms are primarily international. Descriptively a combining form differs from an affix. It can appear as one component of a form whose only other member is an affix, as in *graphic*, *cyclic*.

Furthermore, affixes are denoted by prepositions concerning the root (prefixes) or postposition (suffixes). Indifference, the same combining structure, may appear in both places. Cf. *phonograph*, *phonology* and *telephone*, *microphone*, etc.

Regressive derivation (back-formation) denotes the emergence of new words by removing real or imagined affixes from existing words (usually by misinterpreting their structure), e.g. *an editor* > *to edit*, *enthusiasm* > *to enthuse*, etc.

Early examples of back-formation include *a beggar* > *to beg*; *a burglar* > *to burgle*; *a cobbler* > *to cobble*.

The most common type of backformation in present-day English is that of verbs derived from compounds ending in -er or -ing, e.g. *sightseeing* > *to sightsee*; *proofreading* > *to proofread*; *mass-production* > *to mass-produce*; *self-destruction* > *to self-destruct*; *a baby-sitter* > *to baby-sit* etc. (Auto J. Longman;1987).

"Onomatopoeia" (Gr., *onoma*, "name," and *poiein* "making") (sound imitation, echoisms) is the creation of words from miniature reproductions of sounds related to products that produce them.

Onomatopoeic words are categorized semantically as follows:

- the sound produced by humans: *to babble*, *to chatter*, *to giggle*, *to grumble*, *to titter*, *to grumble etc.*;

- sounds produced by animals (*to moo*, *to neigh*, *to mew*, *to purr* etc.), birds (*to twitter*, *to crow*, *to cackle* etc.), insects and reptiles (*to buzz*, *to hiss*);

-water imitating sounds: *to bubble*, *to splash* etc.;

-sounds imitating the noise of metallic things: *to clink*, *to tinkle* etc.;

-sounds imitating a violent movement: *crash*, *whisk*, *clash*, etc.

-sound-interchange is the gradation of sounds occupying the same place in the sound form of the same morpheme in various cases of its occurrence.

Good exchanges have historically been caused by:

- Ablaut (vowel gradation), i.e. a change from one vowel to another associated with a change of stress, e.g. *to ride* - *a road*; *to carry* - *a burden*; *to bite* - *a bit*; and so forth.
- An umlaut (vowel mutation) refers to the partial assimilation of vowels to succeeding sounds, as in the example of *complete* - *to fill*, *a tale* - *to tell*.
- consonant interchange, e.g. *live* - *a life*, *to speak* - *a speech*, *bake* - *a batch*, etc.

The available linguistic literature on this subject mentions various types and methods of word formation. Word formation and vocabulary growth were discussed in earlier books, articles, and monographs in morphological, syntactic, and lexico-semantic terms. Currently, classifications of types of word formation, as a rule, do not include lexico-semantic word formation. Of interest is the classification of word-forming means based on the number of motivating grounds, which many scientists adhere to. The word-formation process can be classified into two main groups. The Class consists of words built on a single motivating base

(e.g. the noun *doer* is built on the basis of *do-* and the suffix *-er*). In Class II, a word can contain more than one motivating base. Compounding is the basis of them (*letter-opener, e-mail, looking-glass*). (Dieter Kastovsky;1982).

According to most linguists, the main processes underlying English word formation are affixation, conversion, and compounding. In addition, there are several secondary ways of forming words, such as reverse formation, sound exchange, distinctive accent, onomatopoeia, mixing, clipping, acronym.

Some of the ways of word formation in modern English can be restored to create new words when the occasion requires - this is called productive ways of word-formation. Now, other ways of forming words cannot create new words, usually called unproductive or unproductive. R. S. Ginzburg gives an example of affixation as a productive way of forming new words since the Old English period. In contrast, the exchange of sounds must have been a means of word-formation. Nevertheless, in Modern English, its role is only to differentiate between various categories and forms of words ( Rand McNally;74).

Accordingly, the productivity of word-building ways, individual derivational patterns, and the impact of derivational affixes is understood as their ability to generate words that all English speakers can understand (such as *lungful* (of smoke), *Dickensish* (office), *collarless* (appearance)). The term refers to the fact that a speaker coined such words when he needed them. He coined it anew in situations where the same word is needed again. Nonce-words are built from standard language material in familiar ways. As a rule, glossaries do not list infrequent words.

Linguists do not accept the distinction between productive and nonproductive methods of word-formation without reservation, as stated above. Linguists believe that the term productivity should be defined more precisely if words are to be built. Word-formation methods and means that are considered productive are only those that can use to form an unlimited number of new words in the modern language, i.e., methods that "know no bounds" and can quickly generate words on their own. This divergence of opinion is reflected in various lists of derivational affixes considered productive in English lexicology.

However, recent studies indicate that a derivational fund's productivity is often relative. Additionally, there are no production facilities. Word-formation patterns and word-formation affixes have different degrees of productivity. Consequently, conditions conducive to performance and the degree of performance of a particular drawing or affix must be established. All word-formation patterns experience both structural and semantic limitations. The fewer restrictions, the higher the degree of productivity and the more new words are created based on it. Two general restrictions imposed on all word-formation patterns are part of speech. The

functions of the template and the meaning attached to it convey a regular semantic correlation between two classes of words. It is characteristic of each part of speech to have its distinctive patterns of word-formation. For derivational models and individual derivational affixes, there are three degrees of productivity: (1) highly productive, (2) productive or semi-productive, and (3) unproductive. R. S. Ginzburg asserts that the frequency of occurrence in speech should not determine the productivity of derivational patterns and affixes. However, there may be some relationship between them. The frequency of occurrence is characterized by the fact that a significant number of words containing this derivational affix are often used in speech, especially in various texts. Productivity is characterized by the ability of this suffix to form new words.

Another variation of derivational productivity in the linguistic literature is derived from a quantitative approach. A word-formation pattern or a word-formation suffix qualifies as productive under the condition. The model or the suffix in question has been used by dozens and hundreds of derivative works worldwide. In this interpretation, word-formation productivity differs from word-formation activity. This means the ability of the language to create new words, in particular random words or one-time words. Hence, for example, *-er* is both a productive and an active suffix: on the one hand, the English word-stock possesses hundreds of nouns with this suffix (such as *writers, reapers, lovers, runners*, and so on), on the other hand, the suffix *-er* in the pattern  $v + -er - N$  is freely used to conceive an unlimited number of nonce-words that express active agents (such as *interrupters, respecters, laughers, breakfast*) (Marchand H.;1974).

The suffix *-ful* denotes productive, but not necessarily active behavior. There are hundreds of adjectives that end with this suffix (e.g. *hope, practical*). However, no new words have been created by adding this suffix.

In terms of this approach, the suffix *-th* is considered non-productive and non-active. Now let's look at the main ways of forming words in English.

As the name suggests, affixation is the method of forming words by adding derivational affixes to various types of bases. The outcome can be derived by applying different elements of the word-formation rule. Thus, the bases of the words that make up the word-formation cluster enter into derivational relations of varying degrees. It is clarified zero degrees of derivation to simple words, i.e., words whose branches are homonymous with words and often root morphemes (e.g., *atom, haste, devote, anxious, horror*, etc.). It is common to refer to derived words (e.g., *atomic, hasty, devotion*, etc.) as having the first degree of derivation since their roots are built on simple stems and derived with one derivational affix. Those words deriving from two successive steps of coinage are said to have second-degree derivations (*atomical, hastily, devotional*, etc.).



Derivational affixes are divided into suffixes and prefixes, and affixation is divided into both suffixes and prefixes. The last stage of derivation distinguishes between prefixal and suffixal derivatives, which indicate the nature of the immediate constituents of the pattern that indicate the relationship between the word and its motivating source unit, such as *unjust* (*un* – +), *justify* (*just* + *-if*), *arrangement* (*arrange* + *-ment*), *nonsmoker* (*non-*) *smoke*. Prefixal-suffixal derivatives include *reappearance*, *unreasonableness*, and *denationalize*. According to Ginzburginsists, this classification can be applied only to words from the viewpoint of their constituent morphemes, that is, from the perspective of morphemic analysis. Based on derivational analysis, such terms tend to be suffixal or prefixal derivatives, e.g. *subatomic* = *sub* – + (*atom* + *-ic*), *unreasonable* = *un-* + (*reason* + *-able*), *denationalize* = *de-* + (*national* + *-ize*), *discouragement* = (*dis-* + *courage*) + *-ment* .

Numerous suffixal and prefixal derivatives have been carefully analyzed to determine their differences. Nouns and adjectives are formed via suffixation in modern English, while verbs are formed via prefixation. In addition, distinctions are also made based on the types of meaning associated with the suffixes and prefixes. A suffix's part-of-speech meaning is much more influential than a prefix, which has it to a lesser degree. Because of this, prefixes may be limited to one part of speech like *enslave*, *encage*, and *unbutton*, or they may work in more than one part of speech like *over* - in *overkind*, *overfeed*, and *overestimation*. As opposed to prefixes, suffixes as a rule function in any **one** part of speech often form a derived stem of various parts of speech than the base, e.g., *careless* – *care*; *suitable* – *suit*, etc. Likewise, suffixes are closely entwined with their respective base forms. Fusions retain a lesser degree of independence than prefixes that generally possess greater semantic independence, such as '*the act of reading*', '*re-read*,' '*the ability to read*', or '*to read again*'. (Noam Avram Chomsky;1957).

When a word is formed with a prefix, it is referred to as a prefix. Prefixation and prefixation have undergone a remarkable evolution in linguistic literature. Some linguists once considered prefixation part of compounding (or word-composition). As prefixes and suffixes have greater semantic independence, linguists have associated prefixes with the first part of compound words.

Pupils generally view prefixes as derivational affixes that are fundamentally different from root morphemes as well as non-derivational prepositive morphemes. There are sometimes differences of opinion regarding whether or not particular morpheme groups are functional as first parts of words. According to H. Marchand, words such as *overlook*, *overdo*, and *underestimate* have the first component: a locative particle rather than a prefix. Additionally, he interprets words such as *income*, *onlooker*, and *outhouse* as compounds with locative particles at their first components.

R. S. Ginzburg states that Modern English has about 51 prefixes.

The prefix is often considered more neutral than suffixation, which is closely tied to the paradigm of the unavoidable part of speech. Language literature always distinguishes nominatives, adjectives, etc., for various derivational suffixes, but prefixes have different interpretations. They are arranged either alphabetically or are divided into several classes according to their origin - meaning or function, but never according to speech. Prefixes may be classified on different principles. On a diachronic basis, prefixes of native and foreign origin are distinguished. Synchronously, prefixes can be categorized as follows:

1. Concerning the words, they primarily form. Using this principle, it is possible to classify prefixes. Modern English has 51 prefixes, which are found in structural and structural-semantic patterns, and the majority are found in more than one part of speech. Only five of these prefixes are believed to form verbs (*en-*, *be-*, *un-*, etc.).

2. They can be divided into three types of lexical-grammatical types: (a) verbal, for example, *rewrite*, *outstay*, *overdo*, etc; (b) denominal, for example, *unbutton*, *detrain*, *ex-president*, etc; and (c) deadjectival, *uneasy*, for instance, *biannual*, etc. Prefixing adjectives with the prefix "*un*"; from prefixes like "*unknown*," "*unsmiling*," "*untold*," and "*untold*" gives the most exciting results, e.g., *untold*, *unknown*, *unsmiling*, *untold*.

3. In terms of semantics, prefixes can be classified as either mono- or polysemantic.

4. The linguistic literature distinguishes several groups of generic denotational meanings: (a) negative prefixes such as *un-*, *non-*, *in-*, *dis-*, *a-*, *im-/in-/ir-* (e.g. *employment* - *unemployment*, *politician* - *non-politician*, *correct* - *incorrect*, *advantage* - *disadvantage*, *moral* - *amoral*, *legal* - *illegal*, etc.); (b) reversative or privative prefixes, such as *un-*, *de-*, *dis-*, *dis-* (e.g. *tie* - *untie*, *centralize* - *decentralize*, *connect* - *disconnect*, etc.); (c) pejorative prefixes, such as *mis-*, *mal-*, *pseudo-* (e.g. *calculate* - *miscalculate*, *function* - *malfunction*, *scientific* - *pseudo-scientific*, etc.); (d) prefixes of time and order, such as *fore-*, *pre-*, *post-*, *ex-* (e.g. *see* - *foresee*, *war* - *pre-war*, *Soviet* - *post-Soviet*, *wife* - *ex-wife*, etc.); (e) prefix of repetition *re-* (e.g. *do* - *redo*, *type* - *retype*, etc.); (f) locative prefixes such as *super-*, *sub-*, *inter-*, *trans-* (e.g. *market* - *supermarket*, *culture* - *subculture*, *national* - *international*, *Atlantic* - *trans-Atlantic*, etc.). (Zellig S. Harris; 1951).

5. From the perspective of stylistic reference, English prefixes are divided into those characterized by a neutral stylistic reference and those with a well-defined stylistic value. Since a complete lexico-stylistic classification of English prefixes has not yet been proposed, only a few examples can be given here. Undoubtedly, prefixes such as *un-*, *out-*, *over-*, *re-*, *under-* and a few others can be characterized as neutral (e.g. *unnatural*, *unlace*, *outgrow*, *override*, *redo*, *underestimate*, etc). Nevertheless, they tend to imply literary-bookish features, such as *pseudo-*,

*super-*, *ultra-*, *uni-*, *bi-* and some others (e. g. *pseudo-classical*, *superstructure*, *ultra-violence*, *unilateral*, *bifocal*, etc.).

Prefixes are frequently paired with one neutral prefix and one stylistically coloured prefix. Here is a simple example: the prefix *over-* appears in all functional styles, whereas *super-* is exclusive to scientific prose.

6. Additionally, prefixes can also be categorized as to productivity levels into highly productive, productive, and non-productive (K. Zimmer;18).

The process of suffixation involves the development of words through the use of suffixes. Suffixes usually modify the lexical meaning of the base and transfer words to a different part of speech. However, some suffixes do not change the semantic group of a word; they transfer the word to another part of speech. For example, a concrete noun becomes an abstract noun, as with *child* -- *childhood*, *friend* -- *friendship*.

When it occurs in words with more than one suffixal morpheme, it is sometimes referred to as a compound suffix: *-able* = *-able* + *-ly* (such as *profitably*, *unreasonably*); *-ical-ly* = *-ic* + *-al* + *-ly* (such as *musically*, *critically*); *-ation* = *-ate* + *-ion* (such as *fascination*, *isolation*). It is not always the case that compound suffixes are simply a succession of two or more suffixes originating from several successive derivation stages. Some of them develop a new differentia that operates as a whole. As a result, let us examine the suffix *-ation* in terms of *fascination*, *translation*, *adaptation*, and so forth. At first glance, *adaptation* may seem parallel to *fascination* and *translation*. Nevertheless, both are first-degree derivatives built with the suffix *-ion* on *fascinate-*, *translate-*. There is no base *adaptate -*, only *adapt*. Likewise, *damnation*, *condemnation*, *formation*, *information*, and many others do not match shorter bases ending in *-ate*, but rather by still shorter ones such as *damn-*, *condemn-*, *form-*, *inform-*. As such, *-ation* is a composite suffix. Generally speaking, it is referred to as a coalescent or group suffix in the linguistic literature. Although it consists of two suffixes, the suffixes *-ate* and *-ion* function in first-degree derivatives as a single unit. After *adaptation*, a coalescent suffix is placed on the base of the first degree of derivation. (Dieter Kastovsky;1982).

Another interesting group-suffix is *-manship* consisting of the suffixes *-man* and *-ship*. As a term of excellence, it means the ability to do something perfectly, e. g. *authormanship*, *quotemanship*, *lipmanship*, etc.

Moreover, we should comment on the morphological changes related to the fusion of derivational and base morphemes. There have been a few observations and some data on this problem so far. In the case of female nouns ending in *-ess*, there is a specific phonetic shift in their corresponding male nouns, provided those have the respective endings *-er*, *-or*, e.g. *actress*

(*actor*), *sculptress* (*sculptor*), *tigress* (*tiger*), etc. One can easily observe that feminine nouns in such cases make use of the contracted sound [ə].

Furthermore, there are suffixes which cause the primary stress to be transferred to the syllable directly preceding it, e.g., *courageous* (*courage*), *stability* (*stable*), *investigation* (*investigate*), *peculiarity* (*peculiar*), etc. The suffix -ity changes the phonetic sound of a base with the suffix -able/-ible, namely, the vowel [i] is inserted between [b] and [l], e. g. *possible* - *possibility*, *changeable* - *changeability*, etc. In words with certain suffixes, the primary stress is placed on them, and a secondary stress is placed on the first syllable, e. g. *'employ'ee* (*em'ploy*), *govern'mental* (*govern*), *'pictu'resque* (*picture*).

Depending on the linguistic principle, there are several ways to classify suffixes in linguistic literature:

First, one could say that classification begins with the part of speech formed. Suffixes naturally fall into a number of categories within the context of the classification of parts of speech, including:

a) noun-suffixes, i.e., those that occur or form with nouns, e. g. *-er*, *-dom*, *-ness*, *-ation*, etc. (*teacher*, *Londoner*, *freedom*, *brightness*, *justification*, etc.);

b) adjective-suffixes, i.e., those that form or occur at the end of an adjective, e. g. *-able*, *-less*, *-ful*, *-ic*, *-ous*, etc. (*agreeable*, *careless*, *doubtful*, *poetic*, *courageous*, etc.);

c) verb-suffixes, i.e. those forming or resulting from verbs, e. g. *-en*, *-fy*, *-ize* (*darken*, *satisfy*, *harmonize*, etc.);

d) adverb-suffixes, i.e., the part of the word used to form an adverb, e. g. *-ly*, *-ward* (*quickly*, *eastward*, etc.).

(2) There are also various groups of affixes according to lexico-grammatical characteristics of the bases to which they are typically added. Following this principle, suffixes may be classified into:

a) deverbial suffixes (addenda to verbs), e. g. *-er*, *-ing*, *-ment*, *-able*, etc. (*speaker*, *reading*, *agreement*, *suitable*, etc.);

b) Denominal suffixes (added to nouns), e. g. *-less*, *-ish*, *-ful*, *-ist*, *-some*, etc. (*handless*, *childish*, *mouthful*, *violinist*, *troublesome*, etc.);

c) de-adjectival suffixes (added to an adjective base), e. g. *-en*, *-ly*, *-ish*, *-ness*, etc. (*blacken*, *slowly*, *reddish*, *brightness*, etc.).

As an extension of the criterion of sense, suffixes are also grouped according to their meaning. As an example, noun-suffixes fall into those that denote:

a) An agent of a proceeding, e. g. *-er*, *-ant* (*baker*, *dancer*, *defendant*, etc.);

b) appurtenance, e. g. *-an, -ian, -ese*, etc. (*Arabian, Elizabethan, Russian, Chinese, Japanese*, etc.);

c) collectivity, e. g. *-age, -dom, -ery (-ry)*, etc. (*freightage, officialdom, peasantry*, etc.);

d) diminutiveness, e. g. *-ie, -let, -ling*, etc. (*birdie, girlie, cloudlet, squirreling, wolfing*, etc.). (Dieter Kastovsky;1982).

(4) If one examines suffixes from a stylistic perspective, one can find another classification of them. Prefixes and suffixes both possess quite definite stylistic references and fall into two classes:

a) Those that are neutral stylistically, such as *-able, -er, -ing*, etc.;

b) those with a particular stylistic value, such as *-old, -i/form, -aceous*, etc.

Various lexico-stylistic layers may include suffixes with neutral stylistic references. Concerning second-class suffixes, they apply primarily to definite lexico-stylistic layers of words, such as *rhomboid, asteroid, cruciform, cyclotron, synchrotron*, etc.

Also, suffixes are categorized based on their productivity.

Generally, living affixes are distinguished from dead ones. In Modern English, dead affixes are those that are no longer considered parts of words; they have been fused with the word base to the extent that they have lost their independence. The only way to separate them is by etymological analysis, e. g. *-d* in *dead, seed*, *-le, -l, -el* in *bundle, sail, hovel*; *-ock* in *hillock*; *-lock* in *wedlock*; *-t* in *flight, gift, height*. As far as present-day English word-formation is concerned, dead suffixes belong to its diachronic study.

It is easy to isolate living affixes from words, e. g. the noun-forming suffixes *-ness, -dom, -hood, -age, -ance*, as in *darkness, freedom, childhood, marriage, assistance*, etc. or the adjective-forming suffixes *-en, -ous, -ive, -ful, -y* as in *wooden, poisonous, active, hopeful, stony*, etc.

It is important to note that not all living derivational affixes of modern English are capable of generating new words. Some of them can be used to create new words under the influence of the moment. Others can't, so they differ in terms of their performance. Accordingly, they are divided into two main classes — productive and unproductive word-forming affixes (Zellig S. Harris; 255).

Linguists dispute the definition of the productivity of derivational affixes.

Following the first approach, all living affixes should be assumed productive in differing degrees from highly-productive (e. g. *-er, -ish, -more minor, re -*, etc.) to non-productive (e. g. *-ard, -cy, -ive*, etc.).

A necessary step is to describe the constraints imposed on affixational patterns and the factors promoting their productivity. In addition to structural, lexicographic, and semantic characteristics of bases and affixes, affixational patterns are produced in response to environmental factors. There has been some study of how noun-stems can be converted into verbs by the suffix *-ize*, and adjective-stems can also be turned into verbs by the suffix *-ize*. In contrast, verb-stems and adverb-stems do not, e. g. *criticize* (*critic*), *organize* (*organ*), *itemize* (*item*), *mobilize* (*mobile*), *localize* (*local*), etc. An analysis of the semantic structure of a verb in *-ize* compared to the base it is built on reveals that the stem usually contains more meanings than the verb. Because of its basic meaning, the suffix *-ize* is more productive than its marginal meaning, e. g. *to characterize* — *character*, *to moralize* — *moral*, *to dramatize* — *drama*, etc.

The concept of productivity also affects how certain affixes are interpreted as unproductive. A derivational affix cannot be used to form a new word in modern English using the existing definition of non-derivative derivatives. According to the definition, non-productive affixes are those unlikely to form new words, e. g. *-ous*, *-th*, *fore-* and some others (*famous*, *depth*, *foresee*).

Imagine accepting the other concept of productivity described above. Then, non-productive affixes cannot be combined with occasional words, for example, *-dom*, *-ship*, *-ful*, *-en*, *-ify*, *-ate*. Other observations on English word formation also support the theory of relative productivity of derivational affixes. For instance, different kinds of productive affixes are found at different times in language development. For instance, the Old English verb-forming suffixes *-en* survive but with less productivity today than the others (e. g., *to soften*, *to darken*, *to whiten*).

Depending on the community's needs at a particular period in history, an affix may be productive in only one sense. The prefix *de-* can be seen as a way of undoing what has been done, reversing a process, e.g. *deacidify* (*paint spray*), *decasualize* (*dock labour*), *decentralize* (*government or management*), *deration* (*eggs and butter*), *de-reserve* (*medical students*), *desegregate* (*coloured children*), and so on (R. Quirk; 154).

Further, it is not uncommon for technical or scientific terms to be derived from derivational affixes, which would not be productive in the non-specialized part of the vocabulary. For instance, in electrical engineering, the suffix *-ance* forms terms, e. g. *capacitance*, *impedance*, *reactance*. In physics and chemistry, the suffix *-ity* has been used to create terms such as *alkalinity*, *emissivity*, *luminosity*, and *luminescence*.

## 1.4 Conversion

Conversion, one of the main axes of word formation in modern English, is very productive in replenishing the stock of English words with new words. The term conversion, which some linguists find inadequate, refers to the numerous cases of the phonetic identity of word forms, primarily the so-called initial forms, of two words belonging to different parts of speech. Here are some examples of this: *work* — *to work*; *love* — *to love*; *paper* — *to paper*; *brief* — *to brief*, etc. Generally, we use simple words, although there are a few exceptions, for example, wireless - to wireless. (Zellig S. Harris;1951).

The number of inflectional categories in English has decreased significantly in the last eight to nine centuries. Various parts of speech have specific morphological differences, primarily between nouns and verbs. Similarly, in Modern English, there exists a distinct distinction between the noun doctor and the verb to doctor - there is no one form of the word doctor, but a variety of forms and variants.

Some of the forms are indeed identical in sound, i.e. homonymous. Although they are both grammatically and semantically different, there is an excellent distinction between them.

The morphemic structure of such word-pairs as doctor - doctor, water - water, brief - brief indicates that they are root words. In derivational terms, one of them is a derived word. Nevertheless, a semantic and structural relationship between them; it is a separate part of speech, i.e., is motivated by it. The question then arises: what constitutes a word-building means in these situations? There is no apparent morphological change between the noun and the verb (or vice versa). However, upon closer examination, we conclude that the two words differ in their paradigms. In this way, the paradigm is used to build words. As a result of changes in a paradigm, conversion may be defined as the formation of a new word (A. Chomsky;50).

The paradigm is essential in word-formation as a whole and when it comes to conversion. So, the noun cooker (in gas-cooker) can be formed by adding an -er suffix and by changing its meaning. In this case, however, the paradigm's role in building words is less prominent, as the suffix -er plays a more significant role. Thus, conversion refers not only to the use of paradigm as a means of word-building but rather the formation of a new word by changing its paradigm. This is why paradigm change is the only means of conversion that builds words. As a paradigm, morphological category conversion is a way to form words morphologically.

## 1.5 Compounding

Among the effective forms of word-formation in Modern English is compounding or word-composition. The means used in constructing a composition, the nature of the bases and their distribution, the range of applications, the scope of semantic classes, and the factors conducive to productivity are all unique to that composition.

A compound is composed of two ICs that are both derivational bases, as mentioned elsewhere. Compound words are vocabulary units that cannot be separated. In terms of their formal and semantic components, they reflect the relationships between the motivating units and the constituent bases. All three structural types have ICs as their bases. A stem can be built on a variety of bases, such as, for example, *week-end*, *office-management*, *postage-stamp*, *aircraft-carrier*, *fancy-dress-maker*, etc. However, complex bases are uncommon in Modern English compounds ( D. Borgmann;91).

Note that compound words should not be confused with polymorphic words of secondary derivation, i.e. words built from an affixal pattern but based on a compound stem, e. g. *school-mastership* ( $[n + n] + suf$ ), *ex-housewife* ( $prf + [n + n]$ ), *to weekend*, *to spotlight* ( $[n + n] + conversion$ ).

### 1.5.1 Sound Interchange

Changing sounds to form a new word is called sound interchange. Modern English is unable to meet this requirement. Old English met this requirement, as can other Indo-European languages. Different factors can influence sound interchange. There can be a result of Ancient Ablaut, which phonetic laws cannot explain during language development known to scientists, e.g. to strike - stroke, sing - sung, etc. It can also be the result of Ancient Umlaut or vowel mutation, which is the result of palatalizing the root vowel because of the front vowel in the syllable coming after the root (regressive assimilation), e.g. *hot* - *to heat* (*hotian*), *blood* - *to bleed* (*blodian*) etc. Vowels and consonants are often interchanged in many cases. In nouns, we have voiceless consonants. The corresponding voiced consonants are in verbs. Traditionally, Old English consonants appeared at the end of nouns and intervocalic positions in verbs, e.g. *bath* - *to bathe*, *life* - *to live*, *breath* - *to breathe* etc. ( Смирницкий А.И.;73)

### 1.5.2 Stress Interchange

Nouns and verbs of Romanic origin often alternate in stress, with nouns emphasizing the first syllable and verbs voicing the last. For example, \**accent* - *to accent*. French verbs and nouns



had different structures when borrowed into English, and verbs had more syllables than their corresponding nouns. The emphasis was placed on the syllable immediately preceding the final one (second from the end) throughout these borrowings. (Eckler;93) Stressed syllables were later dropped in verbs borrowed from French (except in native verbs). After that, the emphasis was placed on the last syllable of nouns and verbs. Consequently, in English, we find the following pairs: *to af`fix - `affix*, *to con'flict- `conflict*, *to ex'port - `export*, *to ex'tract - `extract* etc. In such words, vowels are pronounced differently when stressed or unstressed.

### 1.5.3 Sound Imitation

The process of creating words by imitating different sounds. Sound imitation can be used for the following semantic groups:

- a) Human sounds: *to whisper, to giggle, to mumble, to sneeze, to whistle etc.*
- b) Animal, bird, and insect sounds, such as: *to hiss, to buzz, to bark, to moo, to twitter etc.*
- c) Natural sounds, such as: *to splash, to rustle, to clatter, to bubble, to ding-dong, to tinkle etc.*

In this case, the nouns are formed by converting, e.g. *clang (of a bell)*, *chatter (of children)* etc. (K. Zimmer;1964).

### 1.5.4 Blends

An abbreviation and a composition are combined to form blends. Blends are words formed from two synonyms or word groups. As a result, a compound-shortened word results from clipping the ends of the first component (apocope) and the beginning of the second component (apheresis). A compound-shortened word is created by combining two synonyms: smoke and fog, which means smoke mixed with fog. The beginning is taken from the first component. Eventually, it is followed by "o" in both. Synonyms formed from two synonyms include: *slanguage*, *to hustle*, *gasohol*, etc. A blend is usually composed from a word-group, such as: *acromania* (acronym mania), *cinemaddict* (cinema adict), *chunnel* (channel, canal), *dramedy* (drama comedy), *detectifiction* (detective fiction), *faction* (fact fiction) (fiction based on actual facts), *informercial* (information commercial), *Medicare* (medical care), *magalog* (magazine catalogue) *slimnastics* (slimming gymnastics), *sociolite* (social elite), *slanguist* (slang linguist) etc. (Marchand H;1974).

### 1.5.5 Back Formation

A word is formed when the last morpheme of a word is dropped to form a new one. Because this is the opposite of suffixation, it is called back-formation. It first appeared in the language as a result of a misunderstanding of the structure of a borrowed word. According to Prof. Yartseva, this mistake was caused by the effect of the whole system of the language on the individual words. By adding the suffix -er to a verb stem (speak- speaker), English nouns denoting the agent of an action are common. The final syllable «ar» in the French word "beggar" was pronounced the same way as the English -er, and Englishmen dropped the end of the noun when using the verb "to beg." There are a number of other ways to back-form: to accreditate (from accreditation), to bach (from bachelor), to collocate (from collocation), to enthuse (from enthusiasm), to compute (from computer), to emote (from emotion), to televise (from television) etc..( Smirnitsky;18)

Due to back-formation, we can observe that a primary word's definition has changed, and nouns are transformed into verbs.

**PART II**  
**PECULIARITIES OF FUNCTIONING OF NEOLOGISMS IN MODERN**  
**ENGLISH**

**2.1 The Functioning of Neologisms in Modern English**

The rapidly evolving society, constant changes, and innovations in the social, economic, scientific, and technical spheres of life can not but be reflected in the language. The vocabulary of the language is constantly replenished with new units. They are constantly changing and developing neologisms. That is why the task of the practical part of the thesis was to analyze which ways of creating neologisms prevail in modern English.

The study also included materials from the Oxford Dictionary of English to analyze the neologisms found in the British media. As a result of the material analysis, it was revealed that the most often used word formation (whole and incomplete) and affixation in the last ten years. Less popular were creation methods such as conversion, reduction, and borrowing.

**2.2 Structural Peculiarities**

Modern English rigidly fixes the order in which the two bases are arranged within a compound to define structurally complex words. In addition to preconditioning both the lexicogrammatical and semantic features of the first component, the head member plays an important role as well. In some compounds, especially compound adjectives, the difference between stems (which serve as bases) and the word forms they coincide with is the most evident. There are grammatical forms of comparison for adjectives such as long, wide, rich. Those stems that serve as bases for compound words do not possess grammatical independence or forms appropriate for the words, retaining only the meaning of the part-of-speech. In the case of compound adjectives with adjectival stems for their second components, such as age-long, oil-rich, inch-wide, degrees of comparison are not formed. The compound adjective oil-rich does not form them as the word rich does. However, it conforms to the general rule of polysyllabic adjectives and has analytical forms of degrees of comparison. In compound nouns that have the noun-stem for their second component, the exact difference between words and stems is not so noticeable. (Leonard Bloomfield;1933).

### 2.3 Phonetic Peculiarities

Phonetically, the compounds are also marked by their specific structure. There are no phonemic changes in the basics of the composition. It does, however, acquire a new pattern of stress distinct from the motivating words. Fundamental and hole or hot and house are one-stress words, but these words have a stressful combination when added together, such as *'keyhole* – 'a hole in a lock into which a key fits', or *'hothouse* – a heated building where delicate plants are grown', the latter is given a different stress pattern – unity stress on the first component in our example. There are three patterns of stress in compound words:

a) An intense or uniform stress on the first component, such as in *'honeymoon*, *'doorway*, etc.

b) Double stress, which occurs when the first component is under primary stress and the second component is under secondary stress, e. g. *'blood-vessel*, *'mad-doctor*, *'washing-machine*, etc.

c) Both ICs are not infrequently overwhelmed by level stress such as, for example, *'arm-chair*, *'icy-cold*, *'grass-green*, etc. (Robins, R. H;183)

### 2.4 Graphic Peculiarities

There are two main types of writing found in most compounds: solid and hyphenated. It is both the structural and phonetic features of spelling that provide sufficient evidence as to why complex words are inseparable from phrases. When used in large groups of words, hyphenation can convey a misleading message since it emphasizes the phraseological character of the whole sentence, as in *daughter-in-law*, *son-in-law*, *brother-in-arms*, etc. *In addition, when multiple words are combined to indicate semantic unity, as with, for example, the I-know-what-you're-going-to-say expression, the we-know-it-all jargon and the young-must-be-right attitude.* Compounds do not strictly follow the two types of spelling characteristic of them. Especially in nominal compounds of the n+n type, there are numerous variations between solid or hyphenated spelling, and spelling with a break between the components. It varies from author to author and dictionary how these compounds are spelled. For instance, the words *war-path*, *war-time*, and *money-lender* are spelled both solidly, and with a hyphen, *blood-poisoning*, *money-order*, *wave-length*, and *war-ship* are spelled both solidly and with a break, and *underfoot*, *insofar*, and *underhand* are spelled both solidly and with a break (Kucera, 213). There is a tendency for new compounds of this type to be spelled solidly or hyphenated. Compound words, which often have irregular spellings and a level stress pattern (similar to word-groups),

make it hard to contrast between compound words (of the n + n type in particular) and word groups. (Rand McNally;32)

It is essential to recognize that Modern English nouns (in the Common Case, Sg.) possess an attributive function and are universally recognized. Variable noun phrases are often formed from the meanings of two nouns, e. g. peace years, stone steps, government offices. They are semantically entirely derived from the meanings of two nouns. Unlike compound words, they have homogeneous attributive semantic relations. In addition to this specific and numerous class of nominal compounds, which are expressed in nominal phrases, another class of nominal compounds is also found that also has an additional semantic component.

This is also a point worth highlighting that the two types of lexical units - complex words and free phrases - are in close correspondence and opposing each other.

## **2.5 Semantic Peculiarities**

As a general rule, semantically compound words are motivated units. Their meaning is derived from the combination of their lexical meanings. Complex words exhibit the semantic peculiarities of derivational bases and the semantic difference between their bases and the bases on which they are built. Word boards can serve as illustrations for complex words with standard second or first components. Their basis is ambiguous. There are several derivational bases for it, each with its own selective range of semantic features derived from the other part, which together form a distinct set of complex words based upon certain derived relationships. Therefore, the base board, which means 'a flat piece of wood square or oblong', makes chess boards, notice boards, key boards, diving boards, foot boards, sign boards. The base board – meaning 'thick, stiff paper' – makes compounds pasteboard and cardboard; the base board – meaning 'an authorized body of men' – forms compounds schoolboard, boardroom. It is also possible to observe words with unclear stems, such as foot. The base foot refers to the terminal part of the leg in foot-print, foot-pump, foothold, foot-bath, and foot-wear, the base foot refers to the lower part of a leg in foot-note, foot-light, and foot-stone, and the foot-high, the foot-wide, and the footrule refer to the length measure. The meanings of the bases of compound words are interdependent from the examples given above. As in variable word-groups, each choice is characterized as a compound (hereinafter - IC) by its nature. In this way, the combination of bases serves as a sort of minimal inner context that distinguishes the individual meanings of each component. Moreover, we need to remember that the differential values found in the path components have great significance, as can be seen clearly in a set of compounds that contain identical bases.

Different principles can be used to describe and categorize complex words. They can be viewed from the point of view of:

1. The degree of semantic independence between components and the general relationship between them;
2. Compound words represent one of the parts of speech;
3. The composition of the link between the two ICs;
4. ICs used for forming a compound when brought together;
5. Relating the free word groups with the correlative relations.

In linguistic literature, two types of relationships between the ICs of complex words are generally recognized as having a degree of semantic independence. It is common to divide complex words into coordination compounds (often called copulative or additive) and subordinate compounds (often called determinative) based on their relations of coordination and subordination. A coordinative compound such as fighter-bomber, oak-tree, girl-friend, and Anglo-American relies heavily on both ICs. Coordinative compounds are a relatively small group of words. Their constituent bases belong to the same class and often to the same semantic group.

a) Reduplicative compounds are those made up of repetition of the same base as in *goody-goody*, *fifty-fifty*, *hush-hush*, *pooh-pooh*. The compounds all have a partial motivation. (Zellig S. Harris;64)

b) It consists of pairing the phonically variegated chordal twin forms to form a compound that rhymes by changing the initial consonants as in *clap-trap*, *zigzag*, *sing-song*, or alliterates by using the same initial consonant but varying the vowels as in *chit-chat*, *a walky-talky*, *a helter-skelter*. (Acheson R.M.;408) This subgroup stands very much apart. The uncertain morphemic status of their components makes them irrelevant to productive word-formation, according to some linguists. Usually, the constituent members of compound words in this subgroup possess a unique meaning, are extremely vague or have no lexical meaning of their own, and do not function as stems of independent words. In their compositions, elaborate sonic clusters are mainly doubled rhythmically.

Coordinative compounds in both subgroups (b, a) are mostly confined to colloquial layers, are also characterized by a serious emotional charge, and have minimal productivity.

In contrast to the compounds of the first two subgroups, the bases of additive compounds such as a *queen-bee*, and an *actor-manager* are formed through the stems of words of a single part of speech. Genus-species relations are often semantically associated with these bases. They refer to something that is both something and something else at the same time. *Therefore, a secretary-stenographer is a person who is both a secretary and a stenographer at the same*

*time*. Bed-sitting rooms (bed-sitters) are both living rooms and bedrooms in one. Compound adjectives are one subgroup of additive compounds. A bound root morpheme is one of the ICs. The names of nationalities that are part of this group are Sino-Japanese, Anglo-Saxon, Afro-Asian, etc.

This group of compounds is mostly fully motivated but has low productivity. (J. Longman;127)

Although a distinction is usually made between coordinate and subordinate compounds, this distinction is extremely questionable, and there is no clear and distinct boundary between the two. The boundary is instead rather vague. Sometimes, the same connection can be interpreted differently depending on the circumstance. For instance, a female doctor can be conceived as a woman and a doctor at the same time," with a difference in the importance of the differences between the two. The first component can be imagined as a doctor who becomes a woman" (also Mother Goose, clock tower).

Although the components of insubordinate compounds are neither structurally nor semantically equal, their dominance is based on the head member, which is usually the second IC. In stone-deaf, age-long adjectives, a watch, a road-building, a babysitter, which are nouns, the second IC is the semantically and grammatically predominant part of the word, which preconditions its part-of-speech meaning.

Considering compounds functionally, they are understood as words belonging to different parts of speech. The compound's head member, i.e., its second IC, indicates the grammatical and lexical category it belongs to.

Each part of speech has its own set of word-formation models and semantic variants, but compound words are primarily nouns and adjectives. There is only a small number of words used to represent compound adverbs, pronouns, and connectives, for instance somewhere, somebody, inside, upright, otherwise moreover, elsewhere, by means of, etc. There are no new compounds derived from this pattern. The repeated first and second IC like "body, ever, thing" build compound pronouns and adverbs.

Compounds such as these do not produce adverbs, pronouns, or connectives in the whole composition.

Language retains some verbal and adverbial stems from earlier stages to form a small group of compound verbs, such as to bypass, inlay, and offset. Some authors have claimed that this type of compound is no longer productive and is rarely found in new compounds (Мостовой M.I.;64)

Derivationally, polymorphic verbs are all words of secondary derivation in which existing compound nouns serve only as bases for derivation, whereas they are represented by

morphemic sequences of two root-morphemes, such as weekend, gooseflesh, spring-clean. Such polymorphic verbs are commonly called pseudo-compound verbs. They are divided into two groups:

There are certain verbs which are formed from the stems of compound nouns, for example to spotlight from a spotlight, to sidetrack from a sidewalk, to handcuff from handcuffs, to blacklist from a blacklist, to pinpoint from a pinpoint;

To baby-sit is formed from a babysitter, to playact is formed from playing, to housekeep is formed from housekeeping, and to spring-clean is formed from spring-cleaning.

Compound words fall into the following categories based on their composition:

It is necessary to arrange components in a particular order to form words, indicating both their semantic meaning as well as their morphological unity, e. g. rain-driven, house-dog, pot-pie (as opposed to dog-house, pie-pot). Modern English compounds in all parts of speech use a similar method of linking the components.

Subordinative compounds are classified based on the order of their components:

a) asyntactic compounds in which the order of bases runs counter to the order in which the motivating words can be brought together according to the language's syntax rules. An adjective cannot be altered by a previous immutable adjective phrase, and a modifier does not appear before a participle or adjective. But this syntactic order is common for connections, for example, red-hot, bluish-black, pale blue, rain-driven, oil-rich. Asyntactical order is typical for most compound words in Modern English(L. Bloomfield,39)

b) syntactic compounds whose components are arranged in an order similar to the order of words in free phrases arranged following the syntax rules of modern English. As an example, the order and arrangement of the corresponding words in phrases such as *blue-bell*, *mad-doctor*, *blacklist* ( $a + n$ ) reference the order of the corresponding words in phrases such as *a blue bell*, *a mad doctor*, *a black list* ( $A + N$ ). Combinations of the type *door-handle*, *day-time*, *spring-lock* ( $n + n$ ) have the same word order as the first noun in phrase nouns ( $N + N$ ), e. g. *spring time*, *stone steps*, *peace movement* .

Compound words with very distinct linking elements - which can be either vowels [ou] or occasionally consonants [s/z] - that indicate composition, as in speedometer, tragicomic, and statesman. Nouns and adjectives, subordinate and additive, can be used with compounds of this type.

There are no adaptive compound adjectives for the vowel [ou], as they are reserved for nationalities and represent a specific group with a related root, e. g. *Sino-Japanese*, *Afro-Asian*, *Anglo-Saxon*.



A subordinate adjective or noun also has a productive connecting element, [ou], and complex words of this type are best suited for scientific terms. Compounds of this type are distinguished by the fact that their components are not assimilated related roots, but are mainly borrowed from classical languages. For example, electrodynamics, filmography, technophobia, videophones, sociolinguistics, videodiscs, etc.

The connecting consonant [s/z] can also be used to combine a small number of complex nouns, including sportsmen, landmen, salespeople, and bridesmaids. Among the three bases man-, woman-, people -, this small group of words is restricted by the second component. Man is the most common of these. (Кубрякова Е.С.;1974).

As well as their nature, compounds can also be classified into proper compounds and derivational compounds based on their relationships with other ways of forming words.

It is possible to build proper connections using steps or word forms of independently functioning words, with or without specific connecting elements. For example, doorstep, age-long, babysitter, looking-glass, streetfighting, handiwork, sportsman are examples of connecting elements. The bulk of English conjunctions come from proper conjunctions, which include both subordinate and coordinated classes, as well as productive and unproductive patterns.

The compounds that have been derived, such as long-legged, three-cornered, breakdowns, pickpockets, differ from compounds that have been constructed. In the compound long-legged — 'having long legs' — the two ICs are the suffix -ed meaning 'having' and the base built upon a free word-group long legs whose member words lose their grammatical independence and become a single component, the derivational base. Secondly, segmentation of such words, such as long- and legged, is impossible because adjectives like \*legged do not exist in Modern English, and thirdly, it would contradict their lexical meaning. This newly formed base is then transformed into a word by the adjectival suffix -ed. It can be graphically represented as long legs - [ (long-leg) + -ed] - long-legged . As the word's main component, the suffix-ed becomes the dominant component grammatically and semantically. An adjective can be interpreted semantically as "with (or has) what is denoted by what is denoted by a motivating group of words", as the meaning of a part of speech is combined with its lexical meaning.

Analysis of the structure of actual compounds, such as baby-sitter and pen-holder

The difference between [ n + (v + -er ) ] and the pattern of derivational compounds like long-legged [ [ (a + n) + -ed] ] is that derivational compounds form by the derivational method. In the long-legged type, suffixes are applied to bases that are formed anew each time on a free word-group and are not recurrent in any other type of word. A word of this type is a pseudo-compound or a unique group of derivatives, according to strict definition. As a result of the peculiarity of their derivational bases, they are often called derivative compounds, as they are

felt as being constructed by composition, by bringing together the stems of the member-words of a phrase that lose their independence in the process. A suffix derivative, such as long-legged, is a word that can be constructed by applying a suffix, i.e., by derivation. (Смирницкий А.И.; 1986)

Despite their subordinate status, derivative compounds and pseudo-compounds are divided into two groups based on the type of variable phrases that serve as their basis and the means used to obtain them:

Based on attribute phrases A + N, Num + N, and N + N, derived compound adjectives were formed using the highly effective suffix -ed. The derivational adjectives under discussion are therefore derived from the pattern [ (a + n) + -ed], such as long-legged, flat-chested and broad-minded; [(pit + n) + -ed], such as two-sided, three-cornered; [(n + n) + -ed], such as doll-faced, heart-shaped, etc.

b) compound nouns generated mainly by converting verb-adverb phrases, verb-nominal phrases, and attribution phrases.

This group of derivational compounds is typically composed of V + Adv type of word groups. For example, a breakdown, a breakthrough, a castaway, and a layout are typical examples of phrases that serve as the derivational bases. It is common for semantically derivational compound nouns to form lexical groups typical of conversion, such as an act or instance. For example, a holdup means 'a delay in traffic', which comes from to hold up means to delay, stop by force. The breakdown of machinery — which causes work to cease — from the breakdown — 'become disabled'; the active agent or recipient. For example, cast-offs are clothing that the owner will not wear again. From to cast off — 'throw away as unwanted'; a show-off is a person who demonstrates one's ability in an attempt to impress others. As part of this group, derived compounds are often separated by a hyphen or written together with emphasis on their main level. As a result, they represent the colloquial vocabulary layer and are motivated by transparent derived relationships with a motivating basis of phrasal verbs. Due to its high conversion rate, derivational compound nouns are highly productive.

In addition, the semantic subgroup of complex derivational nouns denoting agents should be mentioned. These nouns fall into attributive and verb-noun groups. There is only a partial semantic motivation in each of these nouns, which are often marked by strong emotional charge or lack of motivation and can refer to terms such as, for instance, *a kill-joy*, *a wet-blanket* — 'one who kills enjoyment'; *a turnkey* — 'keeper of the keys in prison'; *a sweet-tooth* — 'a person who likes sweet food'; *a red-breast* — 'a bird called the robin'.

They can only be understood through transformation, as their second ICS cannot function as their structural or semantic centers. Their second ICS cannot function as their structural or semantic centers. There are a number of compounds that belong to different

grammatical and lexical groups. All of them are animate nouns, whereas their second ICS is an inanimate object. In the active agent, the value is not contained within any of its components but is instead transmitted as a result of a transformation applied to a group of words, which becomes a basis for derivation (H.Sweet; 471).

As mentioned above, they belong to the same group of derivatives or pseudo-compounds.

Its idiomaticity and stylistic and emotional coloring severely limit the productivity of this small group of derived nouns.

It is evident from a linguistic analysis of extensive linguistic data that the system of free phrases is correlated with all types of subordinate compounds (and additive compounds). Compound words are correlated not only in their structure but also in their meaning. The correlation is the basis for all productive modern English compositions, conditioning word-formation patterns, and compound lexical types.

**PART III**  
**FEATURES OF NEOLOGISMS IN ENGLISH MEDIA TEXTS**

**3.1 Mass Media as a Source of New Vocabulary**

One of the carriers of recording the development of any modern language is the mass media (radio, television, press, advertising, internet). After all, the most rapid updating of socio-political, economic, cultural, and scientific vocabulary and phraseology generated by the new reality is conveyed to the native speaker by the media. They respond surprisingly quickly to the latest developments in the country and the world, spread scientific knowledge, promote political ideas, and form and express public opinion, thanks to their ability to quickly reach large audiences. The language of mass media is a rich source for studying the latest trends in the development of the modern literary language. It reflects the versatility of the national language and the degree of its intellectualization, mainly through the spread of terms from different branches of knowledge and their adaptation in modern society. Thanks to this fact, new formations in the media language have become an object of research in our work.

According to M. A. Zheltobryukh, the importance of the Periodical Press in the development of the literary language depends on the role that it plays in public life. The development of the press is inseparable from the economic, political, and cultural life of the people. Given this, the revival of public life is positive it is reflected in the development of periodicals. Now the language of the press is changing its functions in the life of society.

The modern development of language dictates more and more new conditions: neologisms are increasingly appearing in oral and written speech, and in this respect, journalistic texts are no exception. Journalists often resort to using new words in their texts with a greater semantic capacity and imagery than well-known lexical units. (Noam Avram Chomsky;45)

In the mass media, neologisms perform the same function as a language. They serve to indicate new phenomena, objects, and events.

According to scientists, the appearance of new words is determined by extralinguistic factors, one of which is the variety of topics covered by journalists.

The main reasons for the use of new words in modern media, modern scientists include:

1. increase information content. Most of the new words fall on areas that do not yet have a system of terms and designations.
2. there is a need to differentiate various highly specialized concepts.
3. the presence of stable terminology in international use.

4. compliance with the "language fashion", that is, foreign borrowings are used to give the text prestige and introduce the effect of novelty into it.

Most of the neologisms inherent in modern media are lexical. However, semantic neologisms are not uncommon in media texts, but there are much fewer of them. Most of the new words are borrowings, which are characteristic trends in the functioning of the modern literary language. It should be noted that many borrowings are "overgrown" with derivatives, thereby getting a chance to gain a foothold in the language.

Word-forming practice of mass media allows us to develop such types of neologism formation that are simple in their morphological construction and, at the same time, diverse in semantic terms. The obvious one is also evaluative and emotional labeling of many media neoplasms, which will make it possible to reflect the author's subjective attitude to the statement as a whole.

First of all, let us talk about the role of neologisms in modern media. New words update the language, make journalistic texts more modern, and allow the author to avoid language clichés and patterns. The positive aspects of using neologisms in media texts include that new words have a larger semantic capacity than their original counterparts in speech, and innovations play a unique stylistic role in the text.

However, the use of new words is not always successful. We are talking about cases when neologisms are used in a journalistic text to please the "language fashion". It is necessary to understand that new words in texts should not become an end in themselves because in this case, they dramatically degrade the quality of the text, complicating the process of reader perception. Neologisms are a means of implementation and an integral part of the language game, which is necessary for the texts of modern media.

After analyzing the texts of modern mass media, you can see that new words do not always play a positive role in creating an article. Many of them "clog up" the language and make it rough and primitive. Based on this, it should be noted that if a neologism (in particular, borrowing) has an equivalent analog in a language that borrows words, then it is more expedient to use it than to overload the language with new borrowed words.

Excessive use of neologisms often leads to a loss of mutual understanding between the author and the addressee, which can be considered an act of speech aggression. This is equally applicable in both interpersonal and Mass Communication. Communication difficulties, in this case, are associated with the inability to instant feedback. If, during direct communication, some incomprehensible word for the addressee can be clarified by asking a question, then in the case of mass communication, the addressee is deprived of this opportunity. I have to be at a loss, doubting either my language competence or the competence of the addressee.

Mass media texts have become stylistically heterogeneous, and there is a rejection of generally accepted ways of expressing meaning. If the subtleties of using someone else's language do not reach the addressee, the communication distance between the sender and the recipient of information increases. Researchers quite rightly believe that the lack of a common language space manifests the addressee's speech aggressiveness. Violation of the public language space occurs primarily due to vocabulary with a limited scope of use, especially new or sparsely distributed borrowings (including terms), which make texts incomprehensible.

The function of increasing information content (where most of the new words fall on areas that are not yet in the system of terms and designations of the borrower language) can be illustrated with the following example:

"However, screenshots of Brushowitz's blasphemous comments spread online and reached his superiors and Riga mayor Ushakov, known for his sympathy for Russia.

Screenshot – "an image obtained by a computer and showing exactly what the user sees on the screen of a monitor or other visual output device".

Another reason for the appearance of new words is to follow the "language fashion", where foreign borrowings are used to give the text prestige, and bring the effect of novelty to it. Such neologisms are a significant majority. For example:

*"In any case, this is exactly what we were told in the very showroom where we are supposed to appear within five days."* (Смирницкий А.И ;16.).

Showroom-" the premises of a permanently functioning exhibition - sale of goods of a particular company, commercial enterprise, or a temporary exhibition-sale, the participants of which are several firms, usually of the same profile ".

One of the most justified functions of using neologisms in the media is the presence of stable terminology in international use. So, stable terminology can include:

1. names related to electronic systems and internet technologies:

*"The cooperation agreement signed in March this year with Huawei will allow, first of all, to improve the equipment of the hosting provider's data center near Moscow."*

Hosting – is "a service provided by a specialized company for hosting equipment, data, and sites on its technical sites".

2. names of sports and various sports directions:

*"Four years after his injury, he became the ESPN X - Games World Freestyle champion."*

Freestyle – "in parachuting – free fall in any position other than classical".

3. international terminology also includes names related to aviation:

*"The flight was operated by the low-cost airline FlyDubai."*

A low-cost airline is "an airline that offers a low fare in exchange for eliminating most traditional passenger services".

The last function that should be noted is the emergence of the need to differentiate various highly specialized concepts. For example:

*"Which was published not only on the official website of the Federal Migration Service, but also in the form of copy-paste appeared in a number of Lipetsk media outlets.*

Copy-paste is "a method of creating text that consists of mechanically combining citations from one or more sources, sometimes even without editing the resulting text".

So, we can conclude that most of the neologisms found in texts are associated with following the "language fashion", since they have a greater semantic capacity and contribute to an increase in informativeness.

However, it is not only the role of neologisms to determine their number in texts. The use of neologisms in various media outlets depends on the publication's focus, the form of periodic distribution of products, and the target audience. For example, youth publications will have more neologisms than publications aimed at a more adult audience. The same can be said about specialized publications: their terminology and neologisms will have them. It was also found that the number of neologisms in online publications is higher than in print publications. This is because online publications are aimed at a younger audience than print media.

### **3.2 Thematic Analysis of Lexical Units Represented by Lexicographic Online Publications**

Several online English dictionaries with regularly updated corpora were used to select the lexical innovations: Macmillan Buzzword Dictionary (2020), Oxford Dictionaries, and Collins English Dictionary for 2016 through 2019.

A shortlist of words and phrases was generated based on analyses of these online publications as the year's words. In spite of the fact that the word was not necessarily counted in the past twelve months, usage statistics confirm its appearance; it should have become noticeable at that time. By analyzing this trend, we can see how the language has changed over the past year and how it can develop in the future (Table 01).

Table 1. Quantitative analysis of thematic groups of lexical innovations

Years	Politics	Technology	Economy and Business	Social life (communication and behaviour)	Ecology and environment	Everyday life activities	Character reference
2016	16%	19%	3%	28%	0%	25%	9%
2017	16%	7%	19%	32%	6%	13%	6%
2018	23%	10%	0%	33%	10%	23%	0%
2019	6%	9%	0%	38%	38%	6%	3%

Data compiled by the author from dictionaries

The ratio of lexical units was calculated within one year based on the thematic division, where the annual indicator equaled 100%. A large number of these are words and phrases that relate to social communication and behavior, including "echo chamber", "gaslighting", "influencer", "mic drop", "milkshake duck", and "orbiting", among others. Moreover, the words studied have their roots in political and activist circles, for example, "entryist", "cakeism", "youthquake", and "take a knee". Many people's current emotional and political state is reflected in their words. (H.C. Wyld;1952).

Clearly, English-speaking society is becoming increasingly concerned with ecology, environment, and climate issues. Climate-related issues were evident in all lexical units. The Oxford Dictionary named "climate emergency" The word of the year for 2019. As part of an all-environmental shortlist, I chose "climate action," "climate denial," "eco-anxiety," "extinction" and "flight shame." Over the past decade, the term "climate emergency" has grown a hundredfold. The most common compound involving "emergency" was this one.

After identifying both famous and new formations within the thematic groups, we studied the pragmatic potential of those formations using English-language newspapers. The corpus of English-language texts of newspaper discourse served as the material for the study. Namely, articles submitted by the websites of high-quality British newspapers such as "The Guardian" and "Independent".

### 3.3 Analysis of the Neologisms from the Point of View of the Linguocultural Approach

The process of neologization is complex. As society transforms and the image of the world changes, so does the conceptual framework of the language (Ionova, 2016). Our method



is descriptive-analytical and incorporates a chronological criterion indicating neologism's emergence and development during the modern period of society and language development, as well as a functional criterion that takes into account the denotative significance of a new word to symbolize a new reality (object, phenomenon, and concept). Post-truth has existed for a decade, but was first introduced in 2016. The term is a semantic euphemism implying the existence of false, inaccurate, and false information in journalistic works (Ershov, 2018). Collins English Dictionary named "fake news" the phrase of the year in 2017, since its frequency of use grew 365% in 2017. "Deepfake" has been included in the shortlist of the year by Collins English Dictionary in 2019. "Deepfake" is a technical term. In our interconnected world, fake news, post-truth, and deepfake are pressing issues in modern society (Chudinov et al., 2019). Therefore, "fake news," "post-truth," and "deepfake" are among the pressing issues in our time.

However, in The Guardian and Independent, the combination of "fake news" is much less in demand. However, the number of articles using this combination in 2019 has increased significantly compared to 2018. The phrase "post truth" is also more commonly used in British media. The Guardian, in particular, used it more than the Independent in 2017 and 2019. The Independent also used the phrase more frequently in 2016. Nowadays, "post-truth" is viewed as a communicative process in a mediated world. In a crisis of objective fact, new words continue to emerge not only in connection with political events and events but also in the context of exposing inaccurate information of any type.

### **3.4 Features of the Use of new Nominations in English-Language Media Texts**

This approach to studying neologisms in different languages is crucial to an explanatory study of neologisms and the systematization of productive methods in modern linguistics. But also to establish trends and patterns in forming new words from a communicative-pragmatic approach. Media tests use neologisms to connect the narrative to modern times.

A number of political and cultural movements were prevalent during the indicated period: "antifa", "bopo", "climate strike", "hopepunk", "#Metoo", and "youthquake". In 2017, young adults had unexpectedly caused significant tremors to vibrate through the political landscape. The combination of their collective influence resulted in what has been dubbed a "youthquake". The word is derived from the words "youth" and "earthquake". In spite of this, it is undoubtedly a refreshing antidote to the divisive overtones of newcomers, such as "fake news" and "post-truth". The results of our study indicate that British newspapers were strongly

interested in this movement.

Besides political movements and events, social problems become increasingly urgent. #MeToo (the Me Too Movement) received a significant response in 2018 (Shkapenko & Milyavskaya, 2020). This term is defined by Collins English Dictionary (2019) as a cultural movement dedicated to exposing and eliminating predatory sexual behavior at work.

The desire for expressiveness dictates the creation of words for journalists. The pragmatics of the new word differs from the pragmatics of the usual commonly used word, in our case “movement”. Therefore, we consider these words (incident, reportage, epoch, effect, debate, reckoning, accusation, hurricane, reaction, history) to be a remy. They perform an expressive function much more effectively.

Users of social networks are also susceptible to misinformation in interpersonal communication. So, in 2017, a new word, “kittenfishing” was noticed. The Collins English Dictionary (2019) defined this as “using heavily edited or otherwise flattering photos of you on online dating sites.” The word “catching a kitten” as a lexical innovation, it was rarely used in the period 2017-2019 by British media authors. However, there is also “catfish fishing”. The meaning of this neologism was presented in the 2010 documentary *Catfish* as “someone who uses a fake identity to maintain online relationships on social networking sites.” The word remains relevant to this day. A number of aspects of “fishing” are discussed in newspapers on a regular basis. “Catching a kitten” is a hyponym for “catching a cat”. Of course, it takes time for a lexical innovation to become understandable to readers and become popular on the pages of newspapers.

In 2018, several editions of the dictionary included the word “gas lighting” in the shortlists. As explained in the Oxford Dictionaries, this is “the act of manipulating someone by psychological means to force him to accept a false image of reality or to doubt his sanity.” “Gas lighting” is not a lexical innovation. However, in 2018, the term “gaslight” appeared in the psychotherapist's notebook. It was widely used in public discussions, which was facilitated by the public's growing sensitivity to the importance of mental health and well-being. This problem is relevant to British society.

Neologisms are characterized by their number, their emergence, and their mass use revealing the state of speech during a given time period, the mentality of the population, and the pressing problems they face

### **3.5 Findings of the research.**

This work was done, and the research was conducted with the involvement of the British press, in particular newspapers such as “the Guardian” and “Independent”. Various dictionaries were also used to analyze neologisms themselves.

A study of factual material between 2016 and 2019 found that 3% of all lexical units contained abbreviations, namely JOMO ("Joy of missing out"), STEAM ("science, technology, engineering, art, and maths: an educational approach"), BDE ("Big Dick Energy"), and VAR ("video assistant referee"). Online newspapers in Britain use VAR most often. Jomo and be me from time to time in media texts. However, steam is not yet in demand in the media due to its narrow specifics. Well-known phrases and words that have received a new meaning make up 17% of the total. Among them, we note the famous and exciting cases: "unicorn", "influencer", "cancel", "gammon", "floss", "upsum", etc. Combinations like "deep learning" and "gig economy" are also possible. Media texts have established new meanings for these terms.

We did not consider lexical innovations for some words, such as "climate action," "global heating," "extinction," etc. In the studied units, these cases constituted 4-5% of the total. However, approximately 65% are new. We found new forms, such as "flight shame", "plogging" when we analyzed media texts about environmental issues. These words originate from Swedish. The activity of jogging while picking up trash is known as plogging.

The Collins Dictionary shortlisted it in 2018. A shortlist of Oxford Dictionaries included "flight shame" in 2019. "Flight shame" is defined as "reluctance to travel by plane or discomfort at doing so due to the damaging emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants by aircraft.". Although both "flight shame" and "plogging" are created in the most productive ways, such as compounding and blending. However, the ideological concept of these lexical innovations is not widely used in British media texts. It becomes clear that many small words will have a low frequency of use, since they appeared in the language not so long ago.

Therefore, a general pattern should be noted. It takes at least 3-4 years for lexicographers to observe a massive interest in new words. A similar trend is observed on the pages of high-quality newspapers with the use of new words. Originally appearing in 2012, Brexit was named Collins' Word of the Year for 2016.

Today, its popularity in British media is also high. Also, derivative forms have been appearing. These derivatives include "Brexiety", "Brexiteer", "Brextemist", and "Brexodus". There is a noticeable difference between linguistic and cultural terms in the two diatonic versions of English. It is important to note that the editorial offices of journalists and newspapers themselves open up new perspectives for using neologisms. From the very beginning, "cakeism" was used in the political sphere. However, lexicographers from Oxford Dictionaries have seen examples of the use of the word "cakeism" in other industries. Several news outlets, including the Guardian, use the terms "climate crisis" or "climate emergency" instead of "climate change" to indicate the severity of the issue.

Of course, the pages of newspapers do not contain all lexical innovations. As a rule, these words originated in an oral environment. The use of such neologisms enhances the sense of modernity. However, when working with the media, there is a risk of alienating part of the audience older generation. Nevertheless, we cannot deny that lexical innovations from social networks appear from time to time in newspapers.

It is possible to gain a deeper understanding of lexical developments by studying the vocabulary of a language, especially neologisms. We can also discuss how different language variants differ in productivity and creativity and how mutual lexical influences emerge.

## CONCLUSIONS

This paper is dedicated to the stylistic peculiarities of the functioning of neologisms in Modern English. It is based on the British press.

According to a rapidly developed industry, this work was conducted based on neologisms, which represent a pragmatic linguistic theory based on the communicative theory of language.

In light of the results of the study, most neologisms deal mainly with political issues, economic issues, contemporary technological trends, and social phenomena.

In the era of global mediatization and changed communication conditions, publications cannot ignore the emerging new lexical units. Because neologisms, with their inherent relevance, denote processes, objects, and phenomena in the life of modern society. This research showed that after the word was marked in terms of its widespread use. A certain period may pass when neologism will become popular among the authors of media texts since the relevance of neologisms for journalists is directly related to their pragmatic labeling. Sometimes a new lexical unit acquires a stylistic connotation that restricts its use. The dynamics of using new words are cyclical due to the importance of problems arising in society. Interest in the neologisms of the past years may change, their relevance may increase, and lexical innovations similar in meaning may also appear. We can also discuss hyponyms and hyperonyms involving already known lexical units over time. This means that the study of neologisms in multiple languages is even more fascinating.

In this process, we analyzed both well-known and new formations within the thematic groups and then examined their pragmatic potential by using English-language newspapers. The corpus of English-language texts of newspaper discourse served as the material for the study. Namely, articles submitted by the websites of high-quality British newspapers such as “The Guardian” and “Independent.”

Methods of interpretation and translation of neologisms were used to analyze this material.

In the analysis of this topic, each of the aforementioned specific tasks was verified.

## REFERENCES

1. Верба Л.Г. Порівняльна лексикологія англійської та української мов.
2. Демченко Н. (2002). Шляхи утворення неологізмів в англійській мові // Південний архів. Філологічні науки: Збірник наукових праць. Випуск XVII. - Херсон: Видавн. ХДУ.
3. Кубрякова Е.С. (1974). Основи морфологічного аналізу.
4. Карашук П. И. (1987). Словообразование английского языка / П. И. Карашук..
5. Левицький А. Е. (2005). Актуальні проблеми розвитку неології (на матеріалі сучасної англійської мови) / А. Е. Левицький
6. Мостовий М.І. (1993). Лексикологія англійської мови: [Підруч. для ін-тів і фак. інозем. мов]. - Х.:Основа.
7. Роулінг Дж. К. Гаррі Потер і таємна кімната / Пер. з англ. – К.: А-Ба-ба-га-ла-ма-га, 2002. Теорії перекладу // Перекладацька майстерня 2000-2004. Енциклопедія літературознавства. – [www.humanities.lviv.ua](http://www.humanities.lviv.ua)
8. Смирницький А.И. Лексикология английского языка
9. Смирницький А.И. (1991) Неологизмы в английском языке.
10. Смирницький А.И. (1986) Синтаксис английского языка. Морфология английского языка.
11. Тиховець Н.М. (1988). Запозичення серед англійських неологізмів (70-ті роки)//Мовознавство.
12. A. Ross. (2001). Eckler's letters to Daria Abrossimova.
13. Acheson R.M. (1967). An Introduction to the Chemistry of Heterocyclic Compounds. New York-London-Sydney: Interscience Publishers.
14. Auto J. Longman. (1987). Register of New Words. - Longman.
15. Dieter Kastovsky. (1982). Wortbildung und Semantik.
16. Dmitri Borgmann. (1965). Beyond Language. Charles Scribner's Sons.
17. Ginzburg R. A. (1979). Course in Modern English Lexicology. p.113
18. Henry Sweet. (1876). History of Language. Folcroft Library Editions. p.471
19. Jukka Pennanen.. (1972). Aspects of Finnish Grammar.
20. K. Zimmer. (1964). Levels of Linguistic Description.
21. Kucera, H. & Francis, W. N. (1967). Computational analysis of present-day American English. University Press of New England.
22. Leonard Bloomfield. (1933). Language.
23. Marchand H. (1974). Studies in Syntax and Word-Formation.

24. Noam Avram Chomsky. (1957). Syntactic Structures.
25. Prof. Smirnitsky calls them "potential words" in his book on English Lexicology. p.18
26. Rand McNally. (2000). Commercial Atlas and Marketing Guide. Rand McNally & Co.
27. Randolph Quirk, Ian Svortik. (1966). Investigating Linguistic Acceptability. Walter de Gruyter.p.127-128
28. Robins, R. H. (1967). A short history of linguistics. London: Longmans.p.183
29. The spelling is given according to Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. (1956);
30. H.C. Wyld. (1952). The Universal English Dictionary.
31. The Times Atlas of the World. (1994).
32. Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language. (1996). Random House Value Pub.
33. Zellig S. Harris. (1951). Structural Linguistics. p.255
34. Англійські неологізми (Електронний ресурс). Режим доступу:  
<https://greenforest.com.ua/journal/read/zamist-tisyachi-sliv-19-korisnih-neologizmiv-anglijskoju-movoju>. [2020, 10 Грудня]
35. До питання перекладу англійських неологізмів (Електронний ресурс). Режим доступу:  
[http://drohobych.net/youngsc/AQGS/2015\\_13/176-Драбов.pdf](http://drohobych.net/youngsc/AQGS/2015_13/176-Драбов.pdf). [2020, 10 Травня]
36. Запозичення як один із способів творення неологізмів  
(на матеріалі творів сучасних британських авторів)  
(Електронний ресурс). Режим доступу: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nznuoaf\\_2012\\_26\\_3](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nznuoaf_2012_26_3).  
[2012, 26 Березня]
37. Неологізми та способи їхнього перекладу (Електронний ресурс). Режим доступу:  
<http://molodyvcheny.in.ua/files/journal/2018/3.1/35.pdf>. [2018, Березень]
38. Неологізми у сучасній англійській мові. (Електронний ресурс). Режим доступу:  
<http://bibliofond.ru/view.aspx?id=667656>. [2013, 2 Липня]
39. Неологізми у сучасній англійській мові (Електронний ресурс). Режим доступу:  
<https://nauka-online.com/ua/publications/filologiya/2018/1/neologizmi-v-suchasnij-anglijskij-movi/>. [2018, Січень]
40. Нові слова. Їх творення і функціонування в сучасній англійській мові (Електронний ресурс). Режим доступу: <http://www.refine.org.ua/pageid-9057-1.html> [2018, 28 Січня]
41. Neologism - Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia (Електронний ресурс). Режим доступу:  
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neologism>. [2018, 24 Березня]
42. The International Dictionary of Neologisms (Електронний ресурс). Режим доступу:  
[www.neologisms.us/](http://www.neologisms.us/). [2019, 13 Вересня]

## РЕЗЮМЕ

У ході нашої роботи ми дійшли висновку, що неологізми це досить поширене явище в англomовній пресі. Вони можуть бути використані в статтях різної тематики і виконувати різні стилістичні завдання, функції.

Аналіз структурних моделей неологізмів ЗМІ показав високу продуктивність таких методів, як: скорочення, а саме телескопія, словосполучення і усічення.

Виявивши не тільки популярні, але і нові освітні тематичні групи, ми звернулися до вивчення їх прагматичного потенціалу на основі англomовних газет. Матеріалом для дослідження послужив корпус англomовних текстів газетного дискурсу. А саме, статті, представлені сайтами високоякісних британських газет, таких як "The Guardian" і "Independent".

Таким чином, можна зробити висновок, що частіше усього у публіцистичних текстах неологізми виконують функцію привернення уваги адресата. Як правило, такі неологізми емоційно забарвлені і відображають ставлення автора до теми, оскільки для здійснення успішної медійної діяльності потрібно вміти зацікавити свою аудиторію і привернути її увагу.

Номінативна функція використовується дещо рідше. Оскільки сучасне інформаційне суспільство постійно змінюється і реагує на соціальні виклики, культурні та політичні зміни, словниковий запас англійської мови постійно змінюється, оновлюється. Існує потреба в назві не тільки нових продуктів науково-технічного прогресу, але і в назві об'єктів людей за угрупованням, певних типів особистості людини, та його якостей.

Деякі з проаналізованих нових слів мають тенденцію до стислості форми, мінімального споживання мовних засобів для вираження думки, вони швидше поширюються і частіше використовуються в мові. Завдяки цьому привертають увагу і легко запам'ятовуються, таким чином, вони виконують функцію економії лексичних засобів.

Таким чином, отримані результати дослідження можуть бути використані для подальшого вивчення неологізмів сфери ЗМІ, відстеження їх існування в мові, виявлення подальших тенденцій в появі і розвитку лексики в окремих і нових областях людської діяльності.

Практичне значення зумовлюється можливістю використання отриманих результатів у нормативних курсах з лексикології, соціолінгвістики та стилістики англійської мови. Результати дослідження також роблять вагомий внесок у теорію словотворення і загальну лексичну неологію, а також неологію англійської мови, у



комунікативну лінгвістику, прагмалінгвістику, інтернет-лінгвістику, теорію масової й медійної комунікації. Отримані в ході дослідження дані, можуть використовуватися при укладенні словників сучасних англійських неологізмів, а також при написанні навчальних посібників і в дослідженнях науковців.

## APENDIX A

Table 1. Quantitative analysis of thematic groups of lexical innovations

Year	Politics	Technology	Economy and Business	Social life (communication and behaviour)	Ecology and environment	Everyday life activities	Character reference
2016	16%	19%	3%	28%	0%	25%	9%
2017	16%	7%	19%	32%	6%	13%	6%
2018	23%	10%	0%	33%	10%	23%	0%
2019	6%	9%	0%	38%	38%	6%	3%

Source: compiled by the author based on the dictionaries' data