

Pragmalinguistic aspect of the functional extension of the Derived nouns in
Discourse

**Pragmalinguistic aspect of the functional extension of the Derived nouns in
Discourse**

Contents

Introduction	3
Chapter I. The review of linguistic literature on the problems of word formation in Modern English	6
1.1 On the problems of investigating the pragmalinguistic aspect of linguistic units	6
1.2 Semantic properties of the noun as a notional part of speech in Modern English Grammar	12
1.3 The problem of morphological structure of nouns in Modern English Grammar	16
2.0 Chapter II. The analysis of pragmalinguistic aspect of the functional extension of the derived nouns in Discourse	23
2.1 The analysis of derivational productivity degrees in Present Day Word-formation as a types of functional extension	23
2.2 Lexico-grammatical analysis of derived nouns used in different discourse	30
2.3 The analysis of the functional extension of the derived nouns used in different discourse	42
3.0 Chapter III. Problems of teaching pragmalinguistic aspects of the grammatical structures to the students of the intermediate and advanced level students	53
3.1 On the effectiveness of textbooks on ELT teachers' use of pragmalinguistic features in language material	53
3.2 Pragmatic awareness with the explicit but contextual and meaningful teaching in developing linguistic competence of students	59
Conclusion	69
Bibliography	71

Introduction

The Republic of Uzbekistan is establishing closer economic, political, scientific and cultural relations with various peoples of the world. International relations are extended and strengthened through the exchange of delegations as well as scientific, technical and cultural information. As President of the Republic of Uzbekistan I.A. Karimov stated: “The Uzbek people want to know what is going on in the world in all spheres of human activity: science, engineering, culture, politics etc. And they don’t want to be only observers. They want to acquaint other peoples with their life and achievements gotten in the years of Independence”¹.

The qualification paper deals with the study of the pragmalinguistic aspect of the functional extension of the Derived nouns in Discourse. It presents a certain interest both for theoretical investigation and for practical usage in accordance with the requirements of CEFR. We have the full basis to approve that many linguists have brought the invaluable contribution to studying various properties of the pragmalinguistic aspect of the functional extension of the Derived nouns (in more detail see L.S. Barkhudarov, M.Y. Blokh, G.G. Pocheptsov, A.I. Smirnitsky, Ch. Fillmore, W. Chafe, A. Khudyakov, B.V. Reznik, E.S. Kubrjakova, Ch. Hockett’ works and etc.), that has created necessary theoretical preconditions for describing the functional extension of the Derived nouns. Also I looked through the works written by the scholars of our university to introduce innovative technologies in teaching English to B1 and B2 levels.

The **topicality** of the investigation is expressed on the one hand by the profound interest in learning the derived nouns, on the other hand by giving a detailed analysis of pragmalinguistic aspect of the functional extension of the Derived nouns in used in different types of discourses.

The **aim** of this research is a detailed study of the functional extension of the derived nouns and the structural patterns with them.

According to this general aim the following particular **tasks** are put forward:

¹ Karimov I. A. “Fort the further development of the socio-political and economic base of the society” – A speech made in the session of the Olij Majlis, December, 2013. Halq so’zi, December 12, 2013.

1. To review of the linguistic literature on the problems of word formation and pragmalinguistic aspect of linguistic units in Modern English.

2. To study semantic properties of the noun as a notional part of speech in Modern English Grammar.

3. To reveal linguistic status of the problem of morphological structure of nouns in Modern English Grammar.

4. To analyse pragmalinguistic aspect of the functional extension of the derived nouns in used in different discourse and derivational productivity degrees in Present Day Word-formation.

5. To analyse lexico-grammatical features of derived nouns used in different discourse.

6. To reveal types of the functional extension of the derived nouns used in different discourse.

7. To analyse the effectiveness of textbooks on ELT teachers' use of pragmalinguistic features in accordance with CEFR requirements.

The **methods** of investigation used in this research are as following: complex approach to the study of the sentences with the derived nouns, including functional, morphological, structural, distributional way of analysis of the English language unit.

The **object** of given investigation is the derived nouns and the different structural types of the sentences with them.

The **subject** is the structural-semantic and functional-contextual features of the derived nouns in discourse.

Hypothesis of the research. Pragmalinguistics focuses primarily on the study of linguistic phenomena from the point of view of their usage. Derived nouns are used to perform different functions in discourse. they are usually needed when the speaker has to express an idea, which was never met earlier by him in his linguistic experience. That new thing has no name and it may be seen as the unity of at least two concepts → a thing and its quality. For *example a blackboard, noser, mouser, a sleeping-car, to beg, to book, washing – machine, underwear,*

reading-hall, etc. In discourse the meaning of compound words may be extended depending on the aim of communication, the intention of the speaker, the type of the situation, age, gender, race and etc. These factors let the speaker to choose corresponding forms of extension for the derived nouns. One of the main types of extension is forming new nouns from the familiar verbs, like *baby-sit* → *baby-sitter*, *to go and get* → *go-getter*, *to move last* → *last-mover*, *to move the lawn* → *lawn-mover*, etc. Functional extension of the derived nouns play a very important role in constructing and enriching the speech act. It will be thoroughly investigated according to modern methods.

Methodological basis of research is Decree of the President of Republic of Uzbekistan about development of languages, education and science, the national programme on a professional training, and also basic researches in the field of the theory of linguistics, in particular Theoretical Grammar of English and Comparative Typology of English and Russian Languages.

The **novelty** of work is determined by the analysis of the works of leading scholars, concrete results of investigation, and the problems and specificity of the linguistic status of the derived nouns.

Theoretical value is that it can serve as a basis for studying the functional extension of the derived nouns will allow understanding the importance of studying sentence structures with them.

Practical value of this work is that the theoretical statement of this paper can be used in delivering lectures and seminars on theoretical grammar, general linguistics, typology, and methodology of Teaching English.

The **material** includes:

1. Textbooks, monographs, articles, written by the leading scholars.
2. Internet websites with corresponding headings and data-base.
3. Magazines and journals containing articles on teaching technologies.

The **structure** of the given qualification paper consists of an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion and a bibliography.

Chapter I. The review of linguistic literature on the problems of word formation in Modern English

1.1 On the problems of investigating the pragmalinguistic aspect of linguistic units

Pragmatics is the branch of linguistics that studies how utterances communicate meaning in context. The study of **meaning**, commonly known as **semantics**, has long been one of the most daunting and difficult areas of language study. In the 1950s and 1960s, however, linguists and philosophers slowly began to realize that part of the difficulty lay in their failure to distinguish two quite different aspects of meaning. The first type of meaning is intrinsic to a linguistic expression containing it, and it cannot be separated from that expression. The study of this kind of meaning is the domain of semantics, as we now understand the term. But there is a second kind of meaning, one which is not intrinsic to the linguistic expression carrying it, but which rather results from the interaction of the linguistic expression with the context in which it is used.

Consider the sentence *Nodir is a heavy smoker*. In all circumstances, this sentence carries with it its intrinsic meaning: Nodir smokes a large quantity of tobacco every day. This meaning is intrinsic and inseparable. But now consider what happens when this sentence is uttered as a response to three different utterances produced by Nargiza in three different contexts.

First [Nargiza is trying to have smoking banned in offices]: *Can you ask Nodir to sign this petition?*

Second [Nargiza is trying to arrange a blind date for Dave, a non-smoker who hates cigarette smoke]: *Would Nodir like to go out with Saida?*

Third [Nargiza, a medical researcher, is looking for smokers to take part in some medical tests]: *Do you know of anybody I could ask?*

In each case, you will agree, something very different is being communicated. In the first case: Nodir is unlikely to sign the petition, so there's no point in asking him. In the second: Saida and Nodir won't get on, so there's no point in fixing them up. Third: Nodir will be a suitable person for your study. Now,

it is not possible to maintain that this single unvarying sentence actually means all of these different things. Rather, these three meanings have been communicated as a consequence of the interaction between what was said and the context in which it was said.

Every time the context changes, what is communicated changes as well. And it is this variable, context-bound relation between what is said and what is communicated that is the subject-matter of pragmatics. It should be noted that, in continental Europe, the term pragmatics is often used in a much broader sense than in the English-speaking countries, so as to include a great number of phenomena that linguists in English-speaking countries would regard as belonging strictly to sociolinguistics.

While the field of pragmatics in its widest sense is constituted of many diverse approaches (without clear-cut boundaries) united by a common functional (social, cultural, cognitive) perspective on language in communication, **pragmalinguistics** (linguistic pragmatics, pragmatic linguistics, internal pragmatics) focuses primarily (though not exclusively) on the study of linguistic phenomena (i.e., code) from the point of view of their usage. As it is impossible to offer an exhaustive definition of pragmatics, it might be easier simply to present a list of the topics studied: deixis, implicature, presupposition, speech acts and aspects of discourse structure.

The phenomenon of **deixis** fixes the utterance in the physical and social (**social deixis**, which includes **person deixis** and **attitudinal deixis**) context of its use. Deixis, which may also be used 'self-referentially' to point to itself, is realized by indexical (deictic) expressions, such as personal and possessive pronouns, adverbials, verbal categories of person and tense, but also by politeness and phatic formulae.

Presupposition represents the amount of information assumed to be known by participants (background knowledge, common ground) and has direct impact on how much is explicitly said and how much remains implicit. Since it is normally not necessary, let alone possible, to be fully explicit, a certain level of balance is

strived for by the participants who take into consideration various factors; for example, the medium of writing tends to be more explicit as participants do not share the time and space, often an unknown (general) addressee is projected with whom the amount of the shared knowledge can only be estimated.

The theory of **speech acts** concerns the language user's intention to attain certain communicative goals by performing acts through the use of language. From the stylistic perspective, Austin's three types of speech act (*locutionary, illocutionary, perlocutionary*) are of special relevance, since it is esp. the variety of possible illocutions (i.e., uses which language can be put to) which offers innumerable choices. The types of speech acts as proposed by Searle (*assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, declarations*) are (loosely) associated with certain linguistic categories (utterance types).

Of special significance is the relation between locution (locutionary meaning or propositional meaning) and illocution (illocutionary meaning, or illocutionary force) as this is not always of the one-to-one type: one locution may have more than one illocution. For example, The dinner is ready may be announcement, invitation, threat, command, etc. Conventionally, this utterance will be interpreted as an invitation to join the table rather than an announcement, hence an example of an **indirect speech act**. The use of indirect illocutions in preference to direct ones is often driven by the need to protect partner's face (i.e., politeness concerns, esp. in requests and refusals).

Similarly, the strategy of **hedging** is used to play down the illocutionary force of utterances (while demonstrating the metapragmatic awareness by explicitly referring to CP maxims) while employing a variety of linguistic manifestations (hedges, mitigators: sort of, kind of, in a sense, I hate to say this, partial agreement before presenting disagreement: Yes, but..., using performatives in business correspondence: *We are sorry to have to tell you...*, etc.).

Weasel words are used to temper the straightforwardness of a statement making thus one's views equivocal (e.g., *borrow* instead of *steal*, *crisis* instead of *war*); in the pejorative sense they help avoid responsibility for one's claim (e.g.,

The results of the experiment appear to be in direct contradiction with the stated hypotheses). Explicit use of performative verbs may cause a shift in formality level and create an atmosphere of authoritative claim (*Sit down, I beg you*).

What is implied can be, and often is, 'strategically manipulated' with, if not for outright lying, then certainly for attaining our goals in mundane conversational encounters. The **conversational implicature** was proposed as a rational model guiding conversational interaction. Better known as the **Cooperative Principle** (CP), it includes four conversational maxims: quantity, quality, relation, manner. Although presupposed to be adhered to by the participants, the maxims are often deliberately flouted, e.g., *in phatic* or *small talk* (quantity), '*white lies*' (quality), humour, irony, teasing, banter, puns (manner), topic shift, seemingly irrelevant remarks whose relevance is implied and may only be disclosed by inference (relation).

Some **tropes** (figures of speech) are built on the breach of CP: hyperbole (exaggeration: to wait an eternity), litotes (understatement, esp. that in which an affirmative is expressed by the negative of its contrary: *not bad at all*), tautology (repetition: *War is war, and there will be losers*), paraphrase, euphemism, metaphor and esp. irony (conveys a meaning that is the opposite of its literal meaning: *How nice!* said after someone's I failed another exam). The maxims of CP are successfully applied in literary stylistics, for example in order to draw 'pragmatic portraits' of fictional heroes.

As can be seen from the previous examples, the maxims of CP are often conventionally suppressed in favour of maintaining the 'social equilibrium' which may be just as important as the cooperation itself (it may even be more important as in white lies, i.e., minor, polite, or harmless lies). The need not to cause any damage to and to uphold each others' **face** (e.g., not criticizing the quality of service or food in the restaurant directly) is the central problem of the theories of **politeness**. G. Leech proposes the six maxims of **Politeness Principle** (PP) as a way of complementing the CP and thus 'rescuing' it from serious 'trouble' (i.e.,

accounting for the situations when a strict adherence to CP would be unacceptable): tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, sympathy.

The tact maxim regulates the operation of the directive speech acts (which are marked with highest face-threatening potential) and addresses the dominant type of politeness which, with regard to the addressee, can be 'measured' on the **cost-benefit scale**: the more costly an action, the less polite it is, and, conversely, the more beneficial it is to the addressee, the more polite it is. This helps explain why, for example, imperative mood is not necessarily associated with impoliteness: *Bring me some water* vs. *Have another drink*.

Next, **optionality scale** is used to rank options according to the degree of choice offered to the addressee - the degree of politeness matches the degree of indirectness (tentativeness), and, vice versa, increased directness results in greater impoliteness (e.g., *Lend me your car* vs. *Do you think you could possibly lend me your car?*). It appears that while imperatives offer little option of whether or not to comply with the action requested (*Give me some change*), questions (*Have you got a quarter, by any chance?*), hypothetical formulations (*Could I borrow some money?*), and ones using negatives (*You couldn't lend me a dollar, could you?*) provide greater freedom to deny that request. Of course, politeness formulae (please) can always be added to give extra politeness.

We should also differentiate between **absolute** and **relative** politeness; in the absolute sense, *Lend me your car* is less polite than *I hope you don't mind my asking, but I wonder if it might be at all possible for you to lend me your car*. However, in some situations, the former request could be over-polite (among family members) and the latter one impolite (as an ironic remark).

The aspects of **face** (i.e., a self-image or impression of oneself presented publicly) are studied within the theories of politeness among which a prominent place is held by Brown and Levinson's model. They claim that in any social interaction participants devote much of their time to **face-work**, i.e., strategies attending to aspects of their own face (viz. attempting not to lose it) as well as of

other's face (not threatening it by performing a **face-threatening act**, such as requesting, denying an invitation, rejecting an offer, or an other-repair).

There are two types of face: **negative face** (the freedom of individual action, a desire to be unimpeded) and **positive face** (the need to be treated as equal, a desire for approval). Corresponding to these are the two types of strategies: **negative politeness strategies** (strategies of independence, also called deference politeness strategies) attend to hearer's negative face and include the use of expressions indicative of indirectness, tentativeness, impersonality, social distance: mitigators (*Sorry to interrupt, but...*), euphemisms and politically correct language; **positive politeness strategies** (strategies of involvement, also called solidarity politeness strategies) attempt to save hearer's positive face by emphasizing closeness, intimacy, commonality and rapport.

The key factors determining the choice of appropriate strategy are, a) the relationship between participants, i.e., their relative power (social status) difference, and their social distance (the degree of closeness), and, b) the degree of imposition/urgency (K.C.C.Kong adds a mutual expectation of relationship continuity as another factor). Depending on the degree of threat upon the addressee's face, five **politeness strategies** can be identified:

a) **bald-on-record** (open, direct) in case the risk of loss of face is minimum (*Fetch me some water*);

b) **solidarity politeness** which addresses the common ground (*I know I can always rely on you, could you lend me your typewriter?*);

c) **deference politeness**, when the imposition is serious (*I hate to impose on you but I wonder if you could possibly let me use your computer?*);

d) **off record**, an imposition is so great that it must be proffered indirectly (*I'm all out of money - this may be a source of ambiguity since it is up to the hearer to interpret this as a request*);

e) **not saying anything**, since the threat of loss of face is too great. From the viewpoint of language users' intentions, their choices from the total pool of

resources and the effects upon other participants, the legitimacy of the pragmatic perspective for stylistically-oriented study can hardly be denied.

1.2 Semantic properties of the noun as a notional part of speech in Modern English Grammar

The word *noun* comes from the Latin *nomen* meaning «name». Word classes like nouns were first described by Sanskrit grammarian Panini and ancient Greeks like Dionysius Thorax, and defined in terms of their morphological properties. For example, in Ancient Greece, nouns can be inflected for grammatical case, such as dative or accusative. Verbs, on the other hand, can be inflected for tenses, such as past, present or future, while nouns cannot. Aristotle also had a notion of onomata (nouns) and rhemata (verbs) which, however, does not exactly correspond our notions of verbs and nouns. In her dissertation, Vinokurova has a more detailed discussion of the historical origin of the notion of a noun. Expressions of natural language will have properties at different levels. They have formal properties, like what kinds of morphological prefixes or suffixes they can take, and what kinds of other expressions they can combine with but they also have semantic properties, i.e. properties pertaining to their meaning. The definition of nouns on the top of this page is thus a formal definition. That definition is uncontroversial, and has the advantage that it allows us to effectively distinguish nouns from non-nouns. However, it has the disadvantage that it does not apply to nouns in all languages. For example in Russian², there are no definite articles, so one cannot define nouns by means of those. There are also several attempts of defining nouns in terms of their semantic properties.

In traditional school grammars, one often encounters the definition of nouns that they are all and only those expressions that refer to a person, place, thing, event, substance, quality, or idea, etc. This is a semantic definition. It has been criticized by contemporary linguists as being quite uninformative. Part of the problem is that the definition makes use of relatively general nouns («thing», «phenomenon», «event») to define what nouns are. The existence of such general

² Смирницкий А.И. Морфология английского языка М., 1955 , 480 с

nouns shows us that nouns are organized in taxonomic hierarchies. But other kinds of expressions are also organized in hierarchies. For example all of the verbs «*stroll*», «*saunter*», «*stride*», and «*tread*» are more specific words than the more general «*walk*». The latter is more specific than the verb «*move*»/ But it is unlikely that such hierarchies can be used to define nouns and verbs. Furthermore, an influential theory has it that verbs like «*kill*» or «*die*» refer to events, and so they fall under the definition. Similarly, adjectives like «*yellow*» or «*difficult*» might be thought to refer to qualities, and adverbs like «*outside*» or «*upstairs*» seem to refer to places. Worse still, a trip into the woods can be referred to by the verbs «*stroll*» or «*walk*». But verbs, adjectives and adverbs are not nouns, and nouns aren't verbs. So the definition is not particularly helpful in distinguishing nouns from other parts of speech. Another semantic definition of nouns is that they are prototypically referential. That definition is also not very helpful in distinguishing actual nouns from verbs. But it may still correctly identify a core property of nounhood. For example, we will tend to use nouns like «*fool*» and «*car*» when we wish to refer to fools and cars, respectively. The notion that this is prototypical reflects the fact that such nouns can be used, even though nothing with the corresponding property is referred to:

Rustam is no fool. If I had a **car**, I'd go to **Moscow**.

The first sentence above doesn't refer to any fools, nor does the second one refer to any particular car. In most cases in treating English nouns we shall keep to the conception of scientists that we refer to post-structural tendency It's because they combine the ideas of traditional and structural grammarians³. The noun is classified into a separate word – group because:

1. they all have the same lexical – grammatical meaning: substance / thing
2. according to their form – they've two grammatical categories: number and case
3. they all have typical stem-building elements: -er, – ist, – ship, – ment, – hood....

³ Iriskulov M.A. Kuldashv A.M. Theoretical Grammar of the English Language. Tashkent, 2008, 208 pages

4. typical combinability with other words: most often left-hand combinability.

5. function – the most characteristic feature of nouns is – they can be observed in all syntactic functions but predicate.

From the grammatical point of view most important is the division of nouns into countable and un-countable with regard to the category of number and into declinable and indeclinable with regard to the category of case⁴. Nouns fall under two classes: (A) *proper nouns*; (B) *common nouns*⁵.

a) **Proper nouns** are individual, names given to separate persons or things. As regards their meaning proper nouns may be personal names (*Mary, Peter, Shakespeare*), geographical names (*Moscow, London, the Caucasus*), the names of the months and of the days of the week (*February, Monday*), names of ships, hotels, clubs, etc. A large number of nouns now proper were originally common nouns (*Brown, Smith, Mason*). Proper nouns may change their meaning and become common nouns:

George went over to the table and took a sandwich and a glass of champagne.

b) **Common nouns** are names that can be applied to any individual of ad ass of persons or things (e.g. *man, dog, book*), collections of similar individuals or things regarded as a single unit (e. g. *peasantry, family*), materials (e. g. *snow, iron, cotton*) or abstract notions (e.g. *kindness, development*).

Thus there are different groups of common nouns: class nouns, collective nouns, nouns of material and abstract nouns.

1. **Class nouns** denote persons or things belonging to a class. They are countable and have two. numbers: *singular* and *plural*. They are generally used with an article.

⁴ В.Л. Каушанская и др. Грамматика английского языка (на английском языке). 1973 стр.22

⁵ The word proper is from Lat. proprius 'one's own'. Hence a proper name means one's own individual name, as distinct from a common name, that can be given to a class of individuals. The name common is from Lat. communes and means that which is shared by several things or individuals possessing some common characteristic

«Well, sir», said Mrs. Thomson, «I wasn't in the shop above a great deal.»

[Twain]

He goes to the part of the town where the shops are. [Dickens]

2. **Collective nouns** denote a number or collection of similar individuals or things as a single unit. Collective nouns fall under the following groups:

(a) nouns used only in the singular and denoting a number of things collected together and regarded as a single object: *foliage, machinery*.

It was not restful, that green foliage. []

Machinery new to the industry in Australia was introduced for preparing land.

(b) nouns which are singular in form though plural in meaning: *police, poultry, cattle, people, gentry*. They are usually called nouns of multitude. When the subject of the sentence is a noun of multitude the verb used as predicate is in the plural:

I had no idea the police were so devilishly prudent.

Unless cattle are in good condition in calving, milk production will never reach a high level.

The weather was warm and the people were sitting at their doors.

(c) nouns that may be both singular and plural: *family, crowd, fleet, nation*. We can think of a number of crowds, fleets or different nations as well as of a single *crowd, fleet*, etc.

A small crowd is lined up to see the guests arrive.

Accordingly they were soon afoot, and walking in the direction of the scene of action, towards which crowds of people were already pouring from a variety of quarters.

3. Nouns of material denote material: *iron, gold, paper, tea, water*. They are uncountable and are generally used without any article.

There was a scent of honey from the lime-trees in flower.

There was coffee still in the urn.

Nouns of material are used in the plural to denote different sorts of a given material.

... that his senior counted upon him in this enterprise, and had consigned a quantity of select wines to him...

Nouns of material may turn into class nouns (thus becoming countable) when they come to express an individual object of definite shape. Compare:

– To the left were clean panes of glass.

«He came in here,» said the waiter looking at the light through the tumbler, «ordered a glass of this ale.»

But the person in the glass made a face at her, and Miss Moss went out.

4. **Abstract nouns** denote some quality, state, action or idea: *kindness, sadness, fight*. They are usually uncountable, though some of them may be countable.

Therefore when the youngsters saw that mother looked neither frightened nor offended, they gathered new courage.

Accustomed to John Reed's abuse – I never had an idea of plying it.

It's these people with fixed ideas.

Abstract nouns may change their meaning and become class nouns. This change is marked by the use of the article and of the plural number:

beauty a beauty beauties

sight a sight sights

He was responsive to beauty and here was cause to respond.

She was a beauty.

... but she isn't one of those horrid regular beauties.

1.3 The problem of morphological structure of nouns in Modern English

Grammar

The noun as a part of speech has the general meaning of substance in the widest sense of the term. This is the main nominative class of words for they are used to name living beings (*a man, a woman, a girl-friend, a bird, a dog*), objects (*a pen, a flower*) and abstract notions, such as qualities (*kindness, strength*), states

(*fear, fight, sleep*), processes (*discussion, reading*) viewed as substances. The most characteristic formal feature of this class of words is the use of the article — a specific word of three types — *definite* (the), *indefinite* (a(n)) and *zero* or the *meaningful absence of the article*, which determines or specifies nouns in the most general way: Anyone who knows a language knows what sounds are in the language. Experts disagree about the origins of language. According to their morphological structure nouns may be classified as **simple, derivative, compound**⁶.

Simple nouns are structurally simple in the sense that they are devoid of affixes — prefixes and suffixes and have only a root-stem. In other words they cannot be further segmented: *book, pen, bird, shirt, 'lamp, house, system, work,* etc.

Derivative nouns derive from the root-stem of words which may belong to various parts of speech — nouns, adjectives, verbs. They are formed mainly with the help of numerous suffixes: *writer, warmth, linguist, systematization, kingdom, childhood* and so on. A great number of derivative nouns may contain prefixes which are traceable to verbs or adjectives and thus are typically verbal or adjectival prefixes, *disagreement < disagree < agree, misunderstanding < misunderstand < understand, irresponsibility < irresponsible < responsible, impatience < impatient < patient.*⁷

The suffixes used in the noun-formation may be productive, i.e. most widely and regularly recurrent, and non-productive one that are characteristic of a limited number of words. The most productive nounal suffix is **-er** (with its **-or** variant) which may theoretically be added to any verbal stem: *doer, cleaner, gardener, singer, worker, conductor, inventor, distributor,* etc.

Other productive suffixes of nouns are:

-ness: *blackness, dullness, uselessness;*

-ist: *linguist, economist, typist;*

⁶ Бархударов Л.С. Структура простого предложения современного английского языка. М., 1966. 250 р

⁷ Бўронов Ж. Инглиз ва ўзбек тилларининг қиёсий грамматикаси. Т. Ўқитувчи, 1974, 280 б.

-ism: *nationalism, capitalism, dualism;*

-ion/-ation/-ition: *collection, creation, dictation, persuasion, division/aspiration, consideration, recommendation/acquisition. repetition, disposition.*

The non-productive noun-forming suffixes are:

-ess: *actress, heiress, waitress, lioness, tigress;* **-ian:** *mathematician, historian, librarian;* **-ure:** *picture, literature, nature, temperature;*

-ant: *assistant, attendant;*

-ful: *handful, spoonful;*

-ie/-y: *birdie, daddy, Jimmy;*

-dom: *boredom, freedom, kingdom;*

-hood: *childhood, brotherhood, motherhood;*

-ship: *friendship, relationship;*

-ance/-ence: *resistance, importance/decadence, dependence, difference;*

-ment: *agreement, announcement, statement;*

-y/-ry: *biology, geography, anatomy/chemistry, psychiatry;*

-s: *economics, linguistics, physics;*

-ty/-ity: *cruelty, difficulty/generosity, majority, visibility;*

-th: *length, strength, warmth.*

Some prefixes rather typical of verbs or, more frequently of adjectives, especially negative ones, can still be found in nouns. They are as follows:

anti-: *anticlimax, antimatter;*

co-: *coauthor; copilot, coeducation;*

dis-: *disagreement, disjuncture, disarmament;*

ex-: *ex-wife, ex-minister, ex-president;*

il-: *illegality, illiberality, illiteracy;*

in-: *indecent, incompatibility, indecorousness;*

im-: *impracticality, impregnability, impropriety;*

ir-: *irresponsibility, irresolution, irritability;*

mis-: *misunderstanding, misfortune, miscalculation, misuse;*

non-: *non-smoker, non-event, non-story, non-character*;

un-: *unpleasantness, unreality, unruliness*.

Compound nouns may be of 2 types. Nouns of the first type are made up of two or more stems — nominal, adjectival, verbal, adverbial, prepositional — which are brought together in an arbitrary way and spelt either as one word or with a hyphen. Here are the subtypes of them:

- a) nominal stem + nominal stem: *manservant, bathroom, roommate*;
- b) nominal stem + prepositional stem + nominal stem: *brother-in-law, grant-in-aid, man-of-war, commander-in-chief*;
- c) nominal stem + adverbial stem: *looker-on, passerby, hanger-on*;
- d) pronominal stem + nominal stem: *he-goat, she-goat, he-bear, she-bear*;
- e) adjectival stem + nominal stem: *blackbird, smallpox, tenderloin*;
- f) adjectival stem + adverbial stem: *close-up, grownup, low-down*;
- g) adjectival stem + verbal stem + adverbial stem: *merry-go-round*;
- h) adverbial stem + nominal stem: *by-stander, byproduct, overcoat, overspill*;
- i) adverbial stem + adjectival stem: *bygone, overall, overpowering*;
- j) adverbial stem + verbal stem: *outlook, offshoot, overlap*;
- k) verbal stem + pronominal stem + adverbial stem: *forget-me-not*,
- l) verbal stem + adverbial stem: *sit-in, take-off, feedback, look-out*;
- m) participial stem + nominal stem: *swimming-pool, dining-room, reading-hall*.

Nouns of the second type called unstable compound (нестойкое сложное слово) consist of the two separate nouns and function in speech as a complex equivalent of one word: stone wall, life span, college courses, surface differences, etc. The first element of the unstable compound describes the second one and therefore is pro-sodically brought out by stress. Not infrequently unstable compounds are equivalent to and used on a par with the corresponding attributive word-combinations: language change — linguistic change, grammar rules — rules of grammar, grammatical rules, speech sounds — sounds of speech, language

origin — origin of language⁸. Sometimes the first element of unstable compounds may be complex itself: phrase-structure rules, second-language learning and so on.

1. As a rule in compounds it is the second component that takes the plural form: *housewives, tooth-brushes, boy-scouts, maid-servants*.

2. Compounds in **-ful** have the plural ending at the end of the word: *handfuls, spoonfuls, mouthfuls*, (though *spoonsful* and *mouthsful* are also possible).

3. Compounds in which the first component is **man** or **woman** have plurals in both first and last components: *men-servants, women-doctors, gentlemen-farmers*.

4. Compounds ending in **-man** change it into *-men* in spelling. In pronunciation, however, there is no difference between the singular and plural forms, both having [ə]: *policeman* [ən] - *policemen* [ən].

Such nouns as *German, Roman, Norman* are not compounds, and therefore they have regular plurals: *Germans, Romans, Normans*.

5. In compounds originating from a prepositional noun phrase where the preposition is a linking element only the first noun takes the plural form: *editors-in-chief, mothers-in-law, commanders-in-chief, coats-of-mail, men-of-war* (военные корабли).

6. In compounds with a conjunction as a linking element the plural is taken by the second noun: *gin-and-tonics*.

7. In compound nouns formed by a noun plus a preposition, or an adverb, or an adjective only the first element takes the plural: *passers-by, lookers-on, courts-martial, attorneys-general*.

8. When the compound is a substantivized phrase which does not contain a noun, the last element takes the plural ending **-s**: *forget-me-nots, breakdowns, stand-bys, grown-ups, close-ups, pick-ups* (случайные знакомства), *drop-outs* (дезертиры), *go-betweens* (посредники).

1. Nouns are derived from verbs; as, from "*to love*," comes "*lover*;" from "*to visit, visiter*;" from "*to survive, survivor*," etc. In the following instances, and in many others, it is difficult to determine whether the verb was deduced from the

⁸ Iofik L.L., Chakhoyan L.P. *Readings in the Theory of English Grammar*. Leningrad, 1972, 440 p

noun, or the noun from the verb, viz. "*Love, to love; hate, to hate; fear, to fear; sleep, to sleep; walk, to walk; ride, to ride; act, to act,*" and etc..

2. Verbs are derived from nouns, adjectives, and sometimes from adverbs; as, from the noun *salt*, comes "*to salt*;" from the adjective *warm*, "*to warm*;" and from the adverb *forward*, "*to forward*." Sometimes they are formed by lengthening the vowel, or softening the consonant; as, from "*grass, to graze*;" sometimes by adding **-en**; as, from "*length, to lengthen*;" especially to adjectives; as, from "*short, to shorten; bright, to brighten*."

3. Adjectives are derived from nouns in the following manner: adjectives denoting plenty are derived from nouns by adding **-y**; as, from "*Health, healthy; wealth, wealthy; might, mighty*," etc. Adjectives denoting the matter out of which any thing is made, are derived from nouns by adding **-en**; as, from "*Oak, oaken; wood, wooden; wool, woollen*," etc. Adjectives denoting abundance are derived from nouns by adding **-ful**; as, from "*Joy, joyful; sin, sinful; fruit, fruitful*," etc. Adjectives denoting plenty, but with some kind of diminution, are derived from nouns by adding *some*; as, from "*Light, lightsome; trouble, troublesome; toil, toilsome*," etc. Adjectives denoting want are derived from nouns by adding *less*; as, from "*Worth, worthless*;" from "*care, careless; joy, joyless*," etc. Adjectives denoting likeness are derived from nouns by adding **ly**; as, from "*Man, manly; earth, earthly; court, courtly*," etc. Some adjectives are derived from other adjectives, or from nouns by adding *ish* to them; which termination when added to adjectives, imports diminution, or lessening the quality; as, "*White, whitish*;" i.e. somewhat white. When added to nouns, it signifies similitude or tendency to a character; as, "*Child, childish; thief, thievish*." Some adjectives are formed from nouns or verbs by adding the termination **-able**; and those adjectives signify capacity; as, "*Answer, answerable; to change, changeable*."

4. Nouns are derived from adjectives, sometimes by adding the termination **_ness_**; as, "*White, whiteness; swift, swiftness*;" sometimes by adding **-th** or **-t**, and making a small change in some of the letters; as, "*Long, length; high, height*."

5. Adverbs of quality are derived from adjectives, by adding **-ly**, or changing **-le** into **-ly**; and denote the same quality as the adjectives from which they are derived; as, from "*base*," comes "*basely*;" from "*slow*," "*slowly*;" from "*able*," "*ably*."

There are so many other ways of deriving words from one another, that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to enumerate them. The primitive words of every language are very few; the derivatives form much the greater number. A few more instances only can be given here. Some nouns are derived from other nouns, by adding the terminations **-hood** or **-head**, **ship**, **ery**, **wick**, **rick**, **dom**, **ian**, **ment**, and **-age**. Nouns ending in **-hood** or **head**, are such as signify character or qualities; as, "*Manhood*, *knighthood*, *falsehood*," etc. Nouns ending in **ship**, are those that signify office, employment, state, or condition; as, "*Lordship*, *stewardship*, *partnership*," etc. Some nouns in **ship** are derived from adjectives; as, "*Hard*, *hardship*," etc.

Nouns which end in **ery**, signify action or habit; as, "*Slavery*, *foolery*, *prudery*," etc. Some nouns of this sort come from adjectives; as, "*Brave*, *bravery*," etc. Nouns ending in **-wick**, **rick**, and **-dom**, denote dominion, jurisdiction, or condition; as, "*Bailiwick*, *bishopric*, *kingdom*, *dukedom*, *freedom*," etc. Nouns which end in **-ian**, are those that signify profession; as, "*Physician*, *musician*," etc. Those that end in **-ment** and **-age**, come generally from the French, and commonly signify the act or habit; as, "*Commandment*," "*usage*." Some nouns ending in **-ard**, are derived from verbs or adjectives, and denote character or habit; as, "*Drunk*, *drunkard*; *dote*, *dotard*." Some nouns have the form of diminutives; but these are not many.

They are formed by adding the terminations **-kin**, **ling**, **ing**, **ock**, **el**, and the like; as, "*Lamb*, *lambkin*; *goose*, *gosling*; *duck*, *duckling*; *hill*, *hillock*; *cock*, *cockerel*," etc. The semantics of a noun derived from a gradable adjective is linked to that of the adjective. Examples of such pairs include: *wise* → *wisdom*, *generous* → *generosity*.

2.0 Chapter II. The analysis of pragmalinguistic aspect of the functional extension of the derived nouns in Discourse

2.1 The analysis of derivational productivity degrees in Present Day Word-formation as a types of functional extension

Word-formation is that branch of the science of language which studies the patterns on which a language forms new lexical units, i.e. words. Word-formation is the process of creating new words from the material available in the language after certain structural and semantic formulas and patterns. For instance, the noun *driver* is formed after the pattern **v+ -er**, i.e. a **verb-stem+the noun-forming suffix -er**. The meaning of the noun *driver* is related to the meanings of the skill drive- and the suffix **-er**: 'a driver is one who drives (a carriage, motorcar, railway engine, etc.)'. likewise compounds resulting from two or more stems joined together to form a new word are also built on quite definite structural and semantic pattern and formulas cf., for instance, adjectives the snow-white type built according to the formula **n+adj.**, ie.

The ways in which new words are formed, and the factors which govern their acceptance into the language, are generally taken very much for granted by the average speaker. To understand a word, it is not necessary to know how it is constructed, whether it is simple or complex, that is, whether or not it can be broken down into two or more constituents. We are able to use a word which is new to us when we find out what object or notion it denotes. But when we meet new coinages, like *tape-code*, *freak-out*, *shut-up-ness* and *beautician*, we may not readily be able to explain our reactions to them. Innovations in vocabulary are capable of arousing quite strong feelings in people who may otherwise not be in the habit of thinking very much about language.

A **noun-stem+an adjective stem**; *coal-bad*, *age-long*, *care-free*, etc. It can easily be observed that the meaning of the whole compound is also related to the meaning of the component parts. It should be noted that the understanding of word-formation as expounded here excludes semantic word-building.

By semantic word-building some linguists understand any change on word-meaning, e.g. stock - 'the lower part of the trunk of a tree'; 'something lifeless or stupid'; *'the part of all instrument that serves as abase'*, etc; bench - *'a long seat of wood or stone'*; 'a carpenter's table', etc. the majority of linguists, however, understand this process only as a change in the meaning of a word that may result in the appearance' of homonyms, as is the case with Flower.' - *'a blossom'* and *flour* - *'the fine meal'* ,etc. Word-formation can only treat of composites which are analyzable both formally and semantically.

All derivational patterns experience both structural and semantic constraints. The fewer are the constraints, the higher is the degree of productivity, the greater is the number of new words built on it. The two general constraints imposed on all derivational patterns are: the part of speech in which the pattern functions and the meaning attached to it which conveys the regular semantic correlation between the two classes of words. It follows that each part of speech is characterized by a set of productive derivational patterns peculiar to it. Three degrees of productivity are distinguished for derivational patterns and individual derivational affixes:

- 1) **highly productive**,
- 2) **productive or semi-productive** and
- 3) **non-productive**.

In linguistic literature there is another interpretation of derivational productivity based on a quantitative approach. A derivational pattern or a derivational affix are qualified as productive provided there are in the word-stock dozens and hundreds of derived words built on the pattern or with the help of the suffix in question. Thus interpreted, derivational productivity is distinguished from word-formation activity by which is meant the ability of an affix to produce new words, in particular occasional words or nonce-words. For instance, the agent suffix **-er** is to be qualified both as a productive and as an active suffix: on the one hand, the English word-stock possesses hundreds of nouns containing this suffix (e.g. writer, reaper, lover, runner, etc.), on the other hand, the suffix **-er** in the

pattern **v + -er ~ N** is freely used to coin an unlimited number of nonce-words denoting active agents (e.g. interrupter, respecter, laugher, breakfaster, etc.).

In conformity with the division of derivational affixes into suffixes and prefixes affixation is subdivided into suffixation and prefixation. Distinction is naturally made between prefixal and suffixal derivatives according to the last stage of derivation, which determines the nature of the immediate constituents of the pattern that signals the relationship of the derived word with its motivating source unit, e.g. unjust (un- + just), justify (just + -ify), arrangement (arrange + -ment), non-smoker (non- + smoker). Words like reappearance, unreasonable, denationalize, are often qualified as prefixal-suffixal derivatives. R. S. Ginzburg insists that this classification is relevant only in terms of the constituent morphemes such words are made up of, i.e. from the angle of morphemic analysis. From the point of view of derivational analysis, such words are mostly either suffixal or prefixal derivatives, e.g. **sub-atomic** = sub- + (atom + -ic), unreasonable = un- + (reason + -able), **denationalize** = de- + (national + -ize), discouragement = (dis+ courage) + -ment.

A careful study of a great many suffixal and prefixal derivatives has revealed an essential difference between them. In Modern English, suffixation is mostly characteristic of noun and adjective formation, while prefixation is mostly typical of verb formation. The distinction also rests on the role different types of meaning play in the semantic structure of the suffix and the prefix. The part-of-speech meaning has a much greater significance in suffixes as compared to prefixes which possess it in a lesser degree. Due to it, a prefix may be confined to one part of speech as, for example, enslave, encage, unbutton, or may function in more than one part of speech as over- in overkind, overfeed, overestimation. Unlike prefixes, suffixes as a rule function in any one part of speech often forming a derived stem of a different part of speech as compared with that of the base, e.g. careless - care; suitable - suit, etc. Furthermore, it is necessary to point out that a suffix closely knit together with a base forms a fusion retaining less of its independence than a

prefix which is as a general rule more independent semantically, e.g. reading - 'the act of one who reads ', 'ability to read ', and to re-read - 'to read again '.

Prefixation is the formation of words with the help of prefixes. The interpretation of the terms prefix and prefixation now firmly rooted in linguistic literature has undergone a certain evolution. For instance, some time ago there were linguists who treated prefixation as part of word-composition (or compounding). The greater semantic independence of prefixes as compared with suffixes led the linguists to identify prefixes with the first component part of a compound word.

The semantic subgroup of derivational compound nouns denoting agents calls for special mention. There is a group of such substantives built on an attributive and verbal-nominal type of phrases. These nouns are semantically only partially motivated and are marked by a heavy emotive charge or lack of motivation and often belong to terms as, for example, a kill-joy, a wet-blanket - 'one who kills enjoyment'; a turnkey - 'keeper of the keys in prison'. Suffixation is the formation of words with the help of suffixes. Suffixes usually modify the lexical meaning of the base and transfer words to a different part of speech. There are suffixes however, which do not shift words from one part of speech into another; a suffix of this kind usually transfers a word into a different semantic group, e. g. a concrete noun becomes an abstract one, as is the case with child-childhood, friend-friendship, etc.

Chains of suffixes occurring in derived words having two and more suffixal morphemes are sometimes referred to in lexicography as compound suffixes: **-ably** = -able + -ly (e. g. profitably, unreasonably) **-ical-ly** = -ic + -al + -ly (e. g. musically, critically); **-ation** = -ate + -ion (e. g. fascination, isolation) and some others. Compound suffixes do not always present a mere succession of two or more suffixes arising out of several consecutive stages of derivation. Some of them acquire a new quality operating as a whole unit. Let us examine from this point of view the suffix -ation in words like fascination, translation, adaptation and the like. Adaptation looks at first sight like a parallel to fascination, translation. The latter

however are first-degree derivatives built with the suffix *-ion* on the bases *fascinate-*, *translate-*. But there is no base *adaptate-*, only the shorter base *adapt-*. Likewise *damnation*, *condemnation*, *formation*, *information* and many others are not matched by shorter bases ending in *-ate*, but only by still shorter ones *damn-*, *condemn-*, *form-*, *inform-*. Thus, the suffix *-ation* is a specific suffix of a composite nature. It consists of two suffixes *-ate* and *-ion*, but in many cases functions as a single unit in first-degree derivatives. It is referred to in linguistic literature as a coalescent suffix or a group suffix. *Adaptation* is then a derivative of the first degree of derivation built with the coalescent suffix on the base *adapt-*. Of interest is also the group-suffix *-manship* consisting of the suffixes *-man* and *-ship*. It denotes a superior quality, ability of doing something to perfection, e. g. *authormanship*, *quotemanship*, *lipmanship*, etc.

It also seems appropriate to make several remarks about the morphological changes that sometimes accompany the process of combining derivational morphemes with bases. Although this problem has been so far insufficiently investigated, some observations have been made and some data collected. For instance, the noun-forming suffix *-ess* for names of female beings brings about a certain change in the phonetic shape of the correlative male noun provided the latter ends in *-er*, *-or*, e.g. *actress* (*actor*), *sculptress* (*sculptor*), *tigress* (*tiger*), etc. It may be easily observed that in such cases the sound [0] is contracted in the feminine nouns.

Further, there are suffixes due to which the primary stress is shifted to the syllable immediately preceding them, e.g. *courageous* (*courage*), *stability* (*stable*), *investigation* (*investigate*), *peculiarity* (*peculiar*), etc. When added to a base having the suffix *-able/-ible* as its component, the suffix *-ity* brings about a change in its phonetic shape, namely the vowel [i] is inserted between [b] and [l], e. g. *possible* -> *possibility*, *changeable* -> *changeability*, etc. Some suffixes attract the primary stress on to themselves, there is a secondary stress on the first syllable in words with such suffixes, e. g. *'employ'ee* (*em'ploy*), *govern'mental* (*govern*), *'pictu'resque* (*picture*).

Forming new words, suffix -ist expresses meaning of the actively working person. But depending on meaning of making bases suffix -ist expresses various shades of major importance. Be combined it can with the following semantic classes of bases:

1. Nouns designating instruments of work (name of machines, musical tools and or item). In these cases suffix -ist designates the person, which activity is connected to a subject designated by a basis. For example: motor (motor) - motorist, machine (machine) - machinist, automobile (automobile) - automobilist (motorist); harp - harpist.

2. Nouns designating names of various branches of labour activity of the people (science, culture, literature, art and o. Item). In a combination to such bases suffix -ist expresses meaning(importance) of the person engaged in that sphere of activity, which the making basis specifies. For example: technology - technologist, geology - geologist, biology - biologist.

3. Nouns designating names, known in a history, of the persons, authors of the various doctrines, theories, directions in a science certain sights and o. Item. In a combination to them suffix -ist designates the followers of these doctrines, theories, ideological currents, directions in a science, sights and o. Item. For example: Darwin - Darwinist, Pushkin - Pushkinist

4. Nouns designating political and scientific currents. Being combined with bases of the given semantic class, suffix -ist *designates the supporter, follower of these currents, directions*. For example: *defeatism - defeatist*.

Derivation is a word formation process that involves the addition of affixes to create new words. This paragraph explains how to form agent nouns, or names for people, by adding the suffixes **-er**, **-or**, and **-ar** to the base forms of verbs. Also included is a printable sheet of common English agent nouns.⁹

Derivation is the process whereby the addition of affixes, chiefly prefixes and suffixes in English, to base forms results in the creation of new words. In English, the affixation of the suffixes **-er**, **-or**, and **-ar** to verbs creates nouns.

⁹ Бўронов Ж. Инглиз ва ўзбек тилларининг қиёсий грамматикаси. Т. Ўқитувчи, 1974, 280 б.

The **-er**, **-or**, and **Â-ar** are referred to as agentive suffixes because their affixation to action verbs produces agent nouns, or nouns that identify the person or other entity performing the action. In other words, agent nouns are usually names for people. For example, affixing **-er** to the base form of the verb learn results in the noun learner, meaning someone who learns, and affixing **-or** to the base form of the verb interrogate results in the noun interrogator, meaning someone who interrogates.

The following three lists provide examples of some common agent nouns in English organized by **-er**, **-or**, and **Â-ar** suffix.

<i>bake - baker</i>	<i>clean - cleaner</i>	<i>dance - dancer</i>
<i>employ - employer</i>	<i>farm - farmer</i>	<i>garden - gardener</i>
<i>lead - leader</i>	<i>listen - listener</i>	<i>manage - manager</i>
<i>mourn - mourner</i>	<i>observe - observer</i>	<i>paint - painter</i>
<i>publish - publisher</i>	<i>read - reader</i>	<i>research - researcher</i>
<i>sell - seller</i>	<i>teach - teacher</i>	<i>travel - traveler</i>
<i>use - user</i>	<i>write - writer</i>	<i>Verb - Noun</i>
<i>act - actor</i>	<i>advise - advisor</i>	<i>animate - animator</i>
<i>administrate - administrator</i>	<i>audit - auditor</i>	<i>conduct - conductor</i>
<i>decorate - decorator</i>	<i>direct - director</i>	<i>edit - editor</i>
<i>educate - educator</i>	<i>govern - governor</i>	<i>instruct - instructor</i>
<i>invent - inventor</i>	<i>investigate - investigator</i>	<i>negotiate - negotiator</i>
<i>operate - operator</i>	<i>possess - possessor</i>	<i>sail - sailor</i>
<i>supervise - supervisor</i>	<i>visit - visitor</i>	<i>beg - beggar</i>
<i>lie - liar</i>		

For verbs spelled with a final consonant preceded by either two vowels or additional consonants or with a vowel preceded by a consonant, simply add the agent suffix:

act - actor *design - designer* *ski - skier* *teach - teacher*

For verbs spelled with a final w, x, or y preceded by a vowel, simply add the agent suffix:

box - boxer brew - brewer play - player survey - surveyor

For verbs spelled with a final "silent" e preceded by a consonant, remove the e and then add the agent suffix:

drive - driver love - lover
observe - observer supervise - supervisor

For verbs spelled with a final y preceded by a consonant, change the y to i and then add the agent suffix:

cry - crier fly - flier supply - supplier worry - worrier

For two-syllable verbs spelled with a final le, remove the e and then add the agent suffix:

cobble - cobbler handle - handler
meddle - meddler tumble - tumbler

For two-syllable verbs spelled with a final er, simply add the agent suffix:

discover - discoverer gather - gatherer
murder - murderer suffer - sufferer

For one-syllable verbs that end in a single vowel followed by a single consonant other than w, x, or y, double the final consonant and then add the agent suffix:

beg - beggar drum - drummer
jog - jogger plan - planner

For two-syllable verbs that end in a single vowel followed by a single consonant other than w, x, or y, double the final consonant and then add the agent suffix: *begin - beginner; format - formatter.*

For verbs that end with the letter c, add the letter k after the c and then add the agent suffix:

frolic - frolicker mimic - mimicker
picnic - picnicker traffic - trafficker

2.2 Lexico-grammatical analysis of derived nouns used in different discourse

There is no grammatical gender in Modern English. The noun does not possess any special gender forms, neither does the accompanying adjective,

pronoun or article indicate any gender agreement with the head noun. Unlike many languages that have gender, English has very few clear formal markers that indicate the gender of nouns; the situation in English is much less rigid and clear-cut since many words (*dog*, for instance) may have *he*, *she* or *it* as substitutes. It thus seems justified to restrict the term "gender" to those languages that have precise and mutually exclusive noun-classes marked by clear formal markers. Not every noun possesses such grammatical categories as number and case. The lexicogrammatical meaning of the **noun** is denoting "substance".¹⁰

In Modern English the marked formal characteristics of nouns are as follows: nouns have inflections for number and case, they may be associated with the definite or indefinite article. Modern English like most other languages distinguishes two numbers: *singular* and *plural*. The meaning of singular and plural seems to be self-explanatory, that is the opposition: one — more than one. With all this, expression of number in different classes of English nouns presents certain difficulties for a foreigner to master. As already mentioned, plural and singular nouns stand in contrast as diametrically opposite. Instances are not few, however, when their opposition comes to be neutralised. And this is to say that there are cases when the numeric differentiation appears to be of no importance at all. Here belong many collective abstract and material nouns. If, for instance, we look at the meaning of collective nouns, we cannot fail to see that they denote at the same time a plurality and a unit¹¹.

They may be said to be doubly countables and thus from a logical point of view form the exact contrast to mass nouns: they are, in fact, at the same time singular and plural, while mass words are logically neither. The double-sidedness of collective nouns weakens the opposition and leads to the development of either *Pluralia tantum*, as in: *weeds* (in a garden), *ashes*, *embers*, etc., or *Singularia tantum*, as in: *wildfowl*, *clergy*, *foliage*, etc. In some cases usage fluctuates, and the two forms are interchangeable, e. g. *brain* or *brains*: *he has no brains* or *little*

¹⁰ Бўронов Ж. Инглиз ва ўзбек тилларининг қиёсий грамматикаси. Т. Ўқитувчи, 1974, 280 б.

¹¹ Iriskulov M.A. Kuldashv A.M. Theoretical Grammar of the English Language. Tashkent, 2008, 208 pages

brains; victuals is more common than *victual*; *oats* than *oat*; similarly: His wages were high. How much wages does he get? That is a fair wage. They could not take too much pains. The dual nature of collective nouns is shown linguistically in various ways: by the number of the verb or by the pronoun referring to it, as for instance, My family are early risers, they are already here. Cf. My family is not large.

It is important to observe that the choice between singular and plural depends on the meaning attached to the noun. Compare also: We have much fruit this year and The rich fruits of the heroic labour of people are visible from all the corners of the earth. Similarly: The football team is playing very well. Cf. The football team are having bath and are coming back here for tea. A word should be said about stylistic transpositions of singular nouns in cases like the following: *trees in leaf, to have a keen eye, blue of eye, strong of muscle*. Patterns of this kind will exemplify synecdoche — the simplest case of metonymy in grammar ("pars pro toto").

The Germans won the victories. By God they were soldiers. **The Old Hun was a soldier.** But they were cooked too. They were all cooked... **The Hun would come down** through the Trentino, and cut the railway at the Vicenza and then where would the Italians be?

The chap was so big now that he was there nearly all his time, like some **immovable, sardonic, humorous eye** nothing to decline of men and things.

Other "universals" in expressing plurality will be found in what may be called "augmentative" plurals, i. e. when the plural forms of material nouns are used to denote large amounts of substance, or a high degree of something. This is often the case when we see the matter as it exists in nature. Such plural forms are often used for stylistic purposes in literary prose and poetry, e. g.: the blue waters of the Mediterranean, the sands of the Sahara Desert, the snows of Kilimanjaro.

Attention must also be drawn to the emotive use of plural forms of abstract verbal nouns in pictorial language:

...it was **a thousand pities** he had run off with that foreign girl — a governess too!

The look on her face, such as he had never seen there before, such as she had always hidden from him was full of secret **resentments**, and **longings**, and fears.

Oh! Samuel has **emotions, hates, pities, wants**; at least, sometimes; when he does, his stuff is jolly good. Otherwise, he just makes a song about nothing — like the rest.

It should be noted, in passing, that the plural form is sometimes used not only for emphasis in pictorial language but to intensify the aspective meaning of the verb, the iterative character of the action, in particular, e. g.:

Oh, this was just the kind of trouble she had feared would come upon them. All the work of this last year would go for nothing. All her **struggles** and **fears** and **labours** in rain and cold had been wasted.

Relentless and stealthy, the butler pursued his **labours** taking things from the various compartments of the sideboard.

The small moon had soon dropped down, and May night had failed soft and warm, enwrapping with its grape-bloom colour and its scents the billion caprices, intrigues, passions, longings, and regrets of men and women.

The emotive use of proper nouns in plural is also an effective means of expressive connotation. Expressive connotation is particularly strong in the metaphoric use of the plural of nouns denoting things to be considered unique, e. g.:

Ahead of them was a tunnel of fire where buildings were blazing on either side of the short, narrow street that led down to the railroad tracks. They plunged into it. A glare brighter than **a dozen suns** dazzled their eyes, scorching heat seared their skins and the roaring, crackling and crashing beat upon ears in painful waves.

Very often the plural form, besides its specific meaning may also retain the exact meaning of the singular, which results in homonymy.

- 1) **custom** = habit, customs = 1) plural of habit; 2) duties
- 2) **colour** = tint, colours = 1) plural of **tint**; 2) flag

3) **effect** = result, effects = 1) results; 2) goods and chattels

4) **manner** = mode or way, manners = 1) modes, ways; 2) behaviour

5) **number** = a total amount of units, numbers = 1) in counting; 2) poetry

6) **pain** = suffering, pains = 1) plural of suffering; 2) effort

7) **premise** = a statement or proposition, premises = propositions surrounding to a house

8) **quarter** = a fourth part, quarters = 1) fourth parts; 2) lodgings.

There are also double plurals used with some difference of meanings:

1) *brother* 1) brothers (sons of one mother); 2) brethren (members of one community)

2) *genius* 1) geniuses (men of genius); 2) genii (spirits)

3) *cloth* 1) cloths (kinds of cloth); 2) clothes (articles of dress)

4) *index* 1) indexes (tables of contents); 2) indices (in mathematics)

Mention should be made in this connection of nouns which have two parallel variants in the plural exactly alike in function but different in their stylistic sphere of application, e. g.:

cow — *cows* and *kine* (*arch.*, now chiefly poetic)

foe — *foes* and *fone* (*arch.*)

shoe — *shoes* and *shoen* (*arch.*)

Morphological variation will be found in nouns foreign in origin. Through the natural process of assimilation some borrowed nouns have developed parallel native forms, as in: *formula* — *formulae*, *formulas* *terminus* — *termini*, *terminuses* *focus* — *foci*, *focuses* *stratum* — *strata*, *stratums*. Foreign plurals are decidedly more bookish than the native ones. For all the details concerning the grammatical organisation of nouns and their patterning in different kind of structures students are referred to the text-books on English grammar. Two things should be noted here. It is important to observe that in certain contexts nouns can weaken their meaning of "substance" and approach adjectives thus making the idea of qualities of the given substance predominant in the speaker's mind. Nouns functioning in this position are generally modified by adverbials of degree, e. g.:

"You were always **more of a realist** than Jon; and never so innocent".

"We're all fond of you", he said, "If you'd only" —he was going to say, "behave yourself", but changed it to — "if you'd only be **more of a wife** to him".

"Why had he ever been **fool enough** to see her again".

"**Not much of an animal**, is it?" groaned Rhett. "Looks like he'll die. But he is the best I could find in the shafts".

The use of a noun rather than an adjective is very often preferred as a more forcible expressive means to intensify the given quality. Compare the following synonymic forms of expression:

He was quite a success.— He was quite successful.

It was good fun.— It was funny.

And here are illustrative examples of nouns weakening their meaning of "substance" and approaching adverbs. Such adverbial use shows great diversity. Deep-rooted in English grammar, this use is most idiosyncratic in its nature. We find here patterns of different structural meaning:

a) **adverbial relations of time**, as in: life long, week long, age long, etc.;

b) **adverbial relations of comparison**: straw yellow, silver grey, ash blond, ice cold, snow white, iron hard, sky blue, dog tired, paper white, pencil thin, ruler straight, primrose yellow, brick red, blade sharp;

c) **different degree of quality**: mountains high, a bit longer, a trifle easier, a shade darker, ankle deep.

Patterns of this kind are generally used metaphorically and function as expedients to express intensity and emphasis, e. g.: "I'll send Pork to Macon tomorrow to buy more seed. Now the Yankies won't burn it and our troops won't need it. Good Lord, cotton ought to go **sky high** this fall".

He is world too modest. That was **lots better**. This was **heaps better**. He was **stone deaf** to our request. Waves went mountains high. The mud was ankle deep.

Adverbial use of nouns will also be found in such premodification structures as: *bone tired, dog tired, mustard coloured, horror struck*, etc.

In the grammar of nouns there have also developed interjectional uses which seem to convert nouns into special kind of "intensifiers", e. g.: What the dickens do you want? What the mischief do you want?

The **hell** you say = you don't say so.

Like **hell** I wish \

I will like **hell** / I will not

Where in the hell you are going?

How the devil should I know?

Adverbs of affirmation and negation *yes* and *no* are intensified in emphasis by the proximity of a bald bawling *hell*, e. g.: *Hell, yes! Hell, no!*

Grammarians seem to be divided in their opinion as to the case-system of English nouns. Open to thought and questioning, this problem has always been much debated. The most common view on the subject is that nouns have only two cases: a common case and a genitive or possessive case ¹. The common case is characterised by a zero suffix (*child, boy, girl, student*), the possessive case by the inflection [-z] and its phonetic variants [-s], [-iz], in spelling -'s. The uses of the genitive are known to be specific, those of the common case general. In terms of modern linguistics, we can therefore say that both formally and functionally, (the common case is unmarked and the genitive marked. There are grammarians, O. Curme and M. Deutschbein¹, for instance, who recognise four cases making reference to nominative, genitive, dative and accusative: the genitive can be expressed by the -'s-inflection and by the of-phrase, the dative by the preposition *to* and by word-order, and the accusative by word order alone. E. Sonnenschein insists that English has a vocative case since we may prepose an interjection *oh* before a name. It is to be noted that the choice between the two opposite viewpoints as to the category of case in English remains a matter of linguistic approach. From the viewpoint of inflectional morphology the inadequacy of "prepositional declension" is obvious. Using Latin categories which have no relevance for English involves inventing distinctions for English and ignoring the distinctions that English makes. The meaning of "accusative" in a two-term system *nominative* — *accusative*, for instance, is different from the meaning of

"accusative" in a four- or five-term system. The term "common case" seems therefore more justified than "the accusative". If we call *him* an "accusative" in expressions like *I obey him, I am like him, It was on him*, the term "accusative" may actually hinder when we translate into another language which has an accusative along with several other cases and in which the word for *obey* takes the dative, the word for *like* the genitive and the word *on* ablative, as they do in Latin.

Of course, the morphological opposition nominative — accusative must be expressed by something in English. But this "something" is not a morphological opposition, for there is no morphological differentiation between the nominative and the accusative of nouns". We must not, of course, look at English through the lattice of categories set up in Latin grammar. The extent to which one can remain unconvinced that English has a grammar like Latin is probably the basis of the faulty viewpoint that English has no grammar at all. Latin distinguishes subject, direct object, indirect object by case-differences (differences in the inflexion of the word) and arrangement is not very important. English also distinguishes subject, direct object, and indirect object, but it does so largely by arrangement, e. g.:

The pupil handed the teacher his exercise.

He bought his little girl many nice toys.

With all this, it can hardly be denied that there exist in Modern English prepositional structures denoting exactly the same grammatical relation as, say, the possessive case inflection or word order distinguishing the accusative from the dative. These are the so-called "*of-phrase*" and "*to-phrase*", in which the prepositions *of* and *to* function as grammatical indicators of purely abstract syntactic relations identical with those expressed by cases.

The grammatical analysis of such phrases for their frequency, variety and adaptation must, surely, go parallel with the study of the morphological category of case which in present-day English is known to have developed quite a specific character¹². It is important to remember that the grammatical content of the

¹² Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A Grammar of Contemporary English. Lnd., 1972, 1040 p

possessive case is rather complex. Besides implying possession in the strict sense of the term, it is widely current in other functions. Compare such patterns, as:

a) *my sister's room* (genitive of → *the room of my sister* possession)

b) *my sister's arrival* (subjective → *the arrival of my sister* genitive)

c) *the criminal's arrest* (objective → *the arrest of the criminal* genitive)

a child's language / (qualitative → *the childish language* *a woman's college* / genitive) → *a college for women*

a month's rent \ (genitive of → *a monthly rent*; *three hours' delay* / measure) → *a delay for three hours*

There is no formal difference between subjective and objective *genitive*, between *genitives* denoting possession and qualitative *genitives*, but this kind of ambiguity is usually well clarified by linguistic or situational context. Thus, *mother's care* may mean «ЛЮБОВ МАТЕРІ» —with reference to some individual, and «МАТЕРИНСЬКА ЛЮБОВ» in its general qualitative sense. The meaning of the phrase may vary with the context. The same is true of such uses as *wife's duty*, *child's psychology*, *lawyer's life*, *man's duty*, etc. The genitive of measure or extent is easily recognised as fairly common in expressions of a certain pattern, e. g.: *a moment's silence*, *a day's work*, *a minute's reflection*, *to a hair's breadth*, etc.

The genitive inflection is also used with certain words which otherwise do not conform to noun patterning, as in *yesterday's rain*, *to-day's match*, *to-morrow's engagement*. These are not idioms, with their total lexical meaning fixed, but only fixed patterns or usage. Limits of space do not permit to take notice of all idiomatic patterns established in this part of English grammar. A few further examples will suffice for illustration. These are, for instance: *I'm friends with you*, where *friends* is probably part of the indivisible idiom "*be friends with*" + + *noun/pronoun*, used predicatively. Patterns with "*of + genitive*" usually have a partitive sense denoting "*one of*", e. g.: *It is a novel of J. London's*(=one of his novels). Cf. *It is a novel by J. London.* (=a novel written by J. London). Similarly: *Jannet's a cousin of ours*, *Jon.*

In expressive language this form may become purely descriptive. Endowed with emotive functions in special linguistic or situational context it may weaken its grammatical meaning and acquire subjective modal force denoting admiration, anger, praise, displeasure, etc., e. g.: Margaret ... was taken by surprise by certain moods of **her** husband's. The -'s inflection offers some peculiar difficulties of grammatical analysis in idiomatic patterns with the so-called group-genitives, e. g.: Mr. what's-his-name's remark, or He said it in plenty of people's hearing. There are also patterns like "*the man I saw yesterday's son*" quoted by H. Sweet.

The blonde I had been dancing with's name was Bernice something Crabs or Krebs.

We cannot fail to see that the 's belongs here to the whole structure *noun + attributive clause*. Different kind of such group-genitives are not infrequent and seem to be on the increase in present-day colloquial English. Mention should also be made of the parallel use of the 's form and the preposition *of* found in patterns like the following:

In the light of this it was **Lyman's** belief and it is mine — that it is a **man's** duty and the duty of his friend to see to it that his exit from this world, at least, shall be made with all possible dignity.

And here are a few examples of special use of the possessive case in fossilised expressions of the formula character, such as: *to one's heart's content*, *for pity's sake*, *out of harm's way*, *at one's fingers' ends*, *for old acquaintance's sake*, *for appearance's sake*. These expressions were grammatically regular and explicable in their day, but they follow grammatical or semantic principles which have now fallen into disuse. There are also pleonastic patterns with the post-positional genitive intensifier *own* used with the 's-form, e. g.: *Mary's own dressing-table*. A word should be said about the purely idiomatic absolute use of the genitive case with locative force in patterns like the following:

I bought this at the grocer's.

The baker's is round the corner.

The famous St. Paul's is one of the principal sights of London.

Formations of this kind are on the borderline between grammar and vocabulary; the -'s-inflection seems to have developed into a derivative suffix used to form a noun from another noun. The relative distribution of the *of*-phrase and the 's-inflection, as a recurrent feature of the language, must be given due attention in learning style and usage in English. It is interesting to note, in conclusion, that there is a change going on in present-day English which runs counter to the general trend towards loss of inflections, that is the spreading of 's-genitive at the expense of the *of*-genitive. Until a few years ago, the genitive with 's was used in modern times mainly with nouns which could be replaced (in the singular) by the pronouns *he* and *she*, but not with nouns which could be replaced by the pronoun *it*: so that people normally said *the man's face* and *the woman's face*, but *the face of the clock* and *the surface of the water*. The 's-genitive was used in certain expressions of time and distance (*an hour's time*), and could be used with many nouns replaceable in the singular by *it* or *they* (*the Government's decision*); as is well known, there was also a number of commonly used phrases where the 's-genitive was used even though the noun was one which could be replaced in the singular only by *it* (*New Year's Day*, *the water's edge*). In recent years, however, the 's-genitive has come into common use with nouns which are replaceable in the singular only by *it*. Here are a few examples taken from reputable sources: *resorts' weather* → *the weather of seaside towns*; *human nature's diversity* → *the diversity of human nature*; *the game's laws* → *the laws of the game*. Many more examples will be found in books and in newspapers. We cannot fail to see that this tendency for 's to replace *of* is a development from the analytic to the synthetic: the *of*-phrase is replaced by the 's-inflection.

The relative distribution of the *of*-phrase and the 's-genitive as a recurrent feature of the language, must be given due attention as relevant to synonymy in grammar. It will be important to remember that the distinction between living and lifeless things is not closely observed, and the 's-genitive is often used in designations of things to impart descriptive force and at the same time stress the governing noun. A few typical examples given by G. Curme are:

When I think of all the sorrow and the barrenness that has been wrought in my life by want of a few more pounds per annum, I stand aghast at **money's** significance.

...for the sake of the **mind's** peace, one ought not to inquire into such things too closely.

A **book's** chances depend more on its selling qualities than its worth ¹.

He had chosen the furniture himself, and so completely that no subsequent purchase had ever been able to change the room's atmosphere.

Associations with life are certainly strong in personification, e. g.: *the ocean's roar* or *Truth's greatest victories*, etc. Further illustrations taken from reputable sources are:

resorts' weather → *the weather of seaside towns*

human nature's diversity → *the diversity of human nature*

the game's laws → *the laws of the game*

The spreading of the 's-genitive in present-day English at the expense of the *of*-phrase is, in fact, a development from the analytic to the synthetic which seems to run counter to the general trends towards the loss of inflections. The synonymic encounter of the 's-genitive and the *of*-phrase may be illustrated by examples with "genitive of possession", "subjective and objective genitive", but the use of the 's-genitive in Modern English is comparatively restricted here and the *of*-phrase is very extensively used in virtually the same sense:

his sister's arrival → *the arrival of his sister*

duty's call → *the call of the duty*

the children's education → *the education of the children*

It is to be noted that in many cases the special meaning of the genitive depends on the intrinsic meaning of each of the two words connected, and is therefore in each case readily understood by the hearer. The *of*-phrase denoting possession is generally preferred when the noun is modified by a lengthy attributive adjunct attached to it. The 's-form is rarely used as the objective genitive. The *of*-phrase in this function is fairly common, e. g.: *the sense of beauty*,

the sense of smell, love of life, the reading of books, the feeling of safety, a lover of poetry, etc.

The, *of*-phrase in Modern English is widely current in various types of structures, denoting:

- **the idea of quantity or part** ("partitive genitive"), e. g.: *a piece of bread, a lump of sugar, a cake of soap, etc.*;
- **material of which a thing is done**, e. g.: *a dress of silk*;
- **position in space or direction**, e. g.: *south of Moscow, within 10 miles of London*;
- **relations of time**, e. g.: *of an evening, of late, all of a sudden*;
- **attributive relations**, e. g.: *the language of a child = a child's language, the voice of a woman = a woman's voice, etc.*;
- **composition or measure**, e. g.: *a group of children, a herd of cattle, a flock of birds, a swarm of bees, etc.*

There are also patterns with the *of*-phrase functioning as the appositive genitive, e. g.: *the city of Rome, the Republic of France, etc.* Alongside with this appositive construction there is another. The appositive may be placed after the governing noun, e. g.: *Lake Michigan, the River Thames, etc.*

2.3 The analysis of the functional extension of the derived nouns used in different discourse

Derivation is constructing new words by adding affixes to existing words. In most languages, derivation is one of the principal ways of obtaining new words from existing words, and its study is one of the major branches of morphology.

The key point is to distinguish derivation from inflection. When we add certain affixes to *write*, producing forms like *writes, writing and written* (and also, in a more complex manner, *wrote*), we do not get any new words, but only grammatically distinct forms of the same word: this is inflection. You wouldn't expect to find different dictionary entries for all these forms: there would just be the one entry for all of them, under *write*. However, other affixes produce genuinely different words, such as *rewrite, underwrite and writer*, and these are

examples of derivation. This time you would expect to find separate dictionary entries for these words, though a small dictionary might not bother with *rewrite*, since its meaning is so obvious.

Like many languages, English is rich in both derivational prefixes and derivational suffixes. Examples of the first **are re-, anti-, syn-, counter-, non-, un-, trans-, pre- and mis-**. Examples of the second are **-ness, -ity, -less, -wise, -ize, -dom, -ly** (two different ones), **-er and -(at)ion**. Multiple affixes are possible, though normally there are strict rules governing the order in which affixes may be added. Starting from *happy*, we can derive first *unhappy* and then *unhappiness*. Starting with *derive*, we can obtain first *derivation*, then *derivational*, and finally the very obscure technical term in linguistics *transderivational*. Starting with *exist*, we can successively derive *existent*, *existence*, *existential* and *existentialism*. In every case, at every stage, the result is a new word which deserves its own entry in the dictionary.

In transformational grammar, the complete set of stages linking the deep structure of a sentence to its surface structure. Among the various theories of grammar, transformational grammar is distinguished by its claim that the syntactic structure of a sentence is not a single tree, but rather a series of trees. The most fundamental level of structure is the deep structure of the sentence, and the most superficial, the surface structure. These two levels of representation are typically linked by a whole series of trees, each one resulting from the application of a transformation to the preceding one. The ordered series of trees which results is the derivation of that particular sentence. In this sense, the term derivation is also applied to the series of stages involved in process-based theories of phonology like generative phonology in converting an underlying form into a surface form.

In terms of part of speech, nominal compounds fall into the three sub-classes mentioned above, involving nouns, verbs and adjectives as non-heads. Noun-noun compounds are the most common type of compound in English. The vast majority of noun-noun compounds are right-headed, i.e. they have a head and this head is

the right member of the compound¹³. There is, however, also a number of compounds which do not lend themselves easily to an analysis in terms of headedness. We will therefore turn to this problem first. Consider the difference between the forms in (1a) on the one hand, and (1b) and (1c) on the other: laser printer

- a. *book cover* *letter head*
b. *redneck* *loudmouth* *greenback*
c. *pickpocket* *cut-throat* *spoilsport*

The forms in (1a) all have in common that they are noun-noun compounds and that they denote a subclass of the referents of the head: a *laser printer* is a kind of printer, a *book cover* is a kind of cover, a *letter head* is the head of a letter. We could say that these compounds have their semantic head inside the compound, which is the reason why these compounds are called endocentric compounds (cf. the neo-classical element *endo-* ‘inside’). With the forms in (1b) and (1c) things are different. First, they are not noun-noun compounds but contain either an adjective (1b) or a verb (1c) as first element. Second, their semantics is strikingly deviant: a *redneck* is not a kind of neck but a kind of person, *loudmouth* does not denote a kind of mouth but again a kind of person, and the same holds for *greybeard*. Similarly, in (1c), a *pickpocket* is not a kind of pocket, but someone who picks pockets, a *cut-throat* is someone who cuts throats, and a *spoilsport* is someone who spoils enjoyable pastimes of other people.

The compounds in (1b) and (1c) thus all refer to persons, which means that their semantic head is outside the compound, which is why they are traditionally called exocentric compounds. Another term for this class of compounds is *bahuvrihi*, a term originating from the tradition of the ancient Sanskrit grammarians, who already dealt with problems of compounding. It is striking, however, that the exocentric compounds in (1b) and (1c) can only be said to be semantically exocentric. If we look at other properties of these compounds, we observe that at least the part of speech is inherited from the right-hand member, as

¹³ Francis W. N. The Structure of American English. New York, 2008, 450 p.

is generally the case with right-headed compounds: *redneck* is a noun (and not an adjective), *loudmouth* is a noun (and not an adjective), and *pickpocket* is also a noun (and not a verb). One could therefore state that these compounds do have a head and that, at least in terms of their grammatical properties, these seemingly exocentric compounds are in fact endocentric.

Semantic exocentricity with English compounds seems to be restricted to forms denoting human beings (or higher animals). Furthermore, of the semantically exocentric compounds, only the class exemplified in (1b) is (moderately) productive, whereas those of the type (1c) are extremely rare. The compounds in (1b) are also sometimes called possessive compounds, because they denote an entity that is characterized (sometimes metaphorically) by the property expressed by the compound. A *loudmouth* is a person that possesses ‘a loud mouth’, a *greybeard* is a person or animal with a grey beard, and so on. Possessive exocentric compounds usually have an adjective as their left element. Apart from endocentric, exocentric and possessive compounds there is another type of compound which requires an interpretation different from the ones introduced so far. Consider the hyphenated words in the examples in (2):

- a. *singer-songwriter* *scientist-explorer*
 poet-translator *hero-martyr*
- b. *the doctor-patient gap* *the nature-nurture debate*
 a modifier-head structure *the mind-body problem*

Both sets of words are characterized by the fact that none of the two members of the compound seems in any sense more important than the other. They could be said to have two semantic heads, none of them being subordinate to the other. Given that no member is semantically prominent, but both members equally contribute to the meaning of the compound, these compounds have been labeled copulative compounds (or dvandva compounds in Sanskrit grammarian terms).

Why are the copulative compounds in (2) divided into two different sets (2a) and (2b)? The idea behind this differentiation is that copulatives fall into two classes, depending on their interpretation. Each form in (2a) refers to one entity

that is characterized by both members of the compound. A *poet-translator*, for example, is a person who is both as a poet and a translator. This type of copulative compound is sometimes called appositional compound. By contrast, the dvandvas in (2b) denote two entities that stand in a particular relationship with regard to the following noun.

The particular type of relationship is determined by the following noun. The *doctor-patient gap* is thus a gap between doctor and patient, the *nature-nurture debate* is a debate on the relationship between nature and nurture, and so on. This second type of copulative compound is also known as coordinative compound. If the noun following the compound allows both readings, the compound is in principle ambiguous. Thus a *scientist-philosopher crew* could be a crew made up of scientistphilosophers, or a crew made up of scientists and philosophers. It is often stated that dvandva compounds are not very common in English, but in a more recent study by Olson (201) hundreds of attested forms are listed, which shows that such compounds are far from marginal.

Copulative compounds in particular raise two questions that have to do with the question of headedness. The first is whether they are, in spite of the first impression that they have two heads, perhaps equally right-headed as the other compounds discussed above. The second is whether the existence of copulative compounds is an argument against the view adopted above that all compounding is binary. We have already seen that compounds that have traditionally been labeled exocentric, pattern like endocentric compounds with regard to their grammatical properties (e.g. *pickpocket* is a noun, not a verb). The same reasoning could be applied to copulative compounds, which show at least one property expected from righthanded compounds: plural marking occurs only on the right member, as illustrated in (3):

(3) There are many **poet-translators**/***poets-translator**/***poets-translators** in this country.

Admittedly, this is only a small piece of evidence for the headedness of copulative compounds, but it supports the theory that English compounds are

generally headed, and that the head is always the right-hand member. Turning to the question of hierarchical organization and binarity, it may look as if copulative compounds could serve as a prime case for non-hierarchical structures in compounding, because both members seem to be of equal prominence. However, there are also arguments in favor of a non-flat structure. Under the assumption that copulative compounds are headed, we would automatically arrive at a hierarchical morphological structure (head vs. non-head), even though the semantics may not suggest this in the first place. In essence, we would arrive at a more elegant theory of compounding, because only one type of structure for all kinds of compounds would have to be assumed, and not different ones for different types of compound. Whether this is indeed the best solution is still under debate. Having discussed the problems raised by exocentric and copulative compounds, we may now turn to the interpretation of the more canonical endocentric noun-noun compounds.

As should be evident from all the examples discussed so far, these compounds show a wide range of meanings, and there have been many attempts at classifying these meanings. Given the proliferation and arbitrariness of possible semantic categories (e.g. *'location'*, *'cause'*, *'manner'*, *'possessor'*, *'material'*, *'content'*, *'source'*, *'instrument'*, *'have'*, *'from'*, *'about'*, *'be'*) such semantically based taxonomies appear somewhat futile. What is more promising is to ask what kinds of interpretations are in principle possible, given a certain compound. Studies investigating this question have shown that a given noun-noun compound is in principle ambiguous and can receive very different interpretations depending on, among other things, the context in which it occurs. In isolation, i.e. without preceding or following discourse, the compound is interpreted chiefly by relating the two members of a compound to each other in terms of the typical relationship between the entities referred to by the two nouns.

What is construed as 'the typical relationship' depends partly on the semantics of the noun. We have to distinguish at least two different classes of nouns, sortal nouns and relational nouns. Sortal nouns are used for classifying entities. A given object might for example be called either *chair*, *stool*, or *table*. In

contrast to that, relational nouns denote relations between a specific entity and a second one. For example, one cannot be called a *father* without being the father of someone (or, metaphorically, of something). Similarly, one cannot do surgery without performing surgery on something. The second, conceptually necessary, entity (e.g. the child in the case of *father*) to which the relational noun relates is called an argument. Note that a similar analysis can be applied to the relations between the participants of an action as expressed by a verb. The necessary participants in the event denoted by the verb are also called arguments, to the effect that a verb has at least one argument. With intransitive verbs the only argument of the verb is the subject, for example *I* in *I am sleeping*. With transitive verbs there are either two arguments, i.e. the subject and object, as in *I hate morphology*, or three arguments, as in *She gave me the ticket* (arguments are underlined).

Coming back to our problem of interpretation, we can now say that if the right-hand member of a compound is a relational noun, the left-hand member of the compound will normally be interpreted as an argument of the relational noun. For example, the left-hand member of a compound with the relational noun *surgery* as head will be interpreted as an argument of *surgery*, i.e. as the entity which is necessarily affected by the action of surgery. Thus *brain surgery* is interpreted as surgery performed on the brain, *finger surgery* is interpreted as surgery performed on fingers. This process, by which some entity in the neighborhood of a head word is assigned the status of the head word's argument is called argument-linking. The idea behind this term is that relational nouns and verbs have empty slots in their semantic representation (the so-called argument structure), which need to be filled by arguments. These empty slots in the argument structure are filled by linking the slots with arguments that are available in the neighborhood of the noun or verb in question.

Argument linking is also important for compounds whose right-hand member is a noun that is derived from a verb, and whose left-hand member serves as an argument of the verb. Such compounds, which are often referred to as synthetic compounds, are illustrated in (4):

- (4) *beer drinker pasta-eating* *car driver window-cleaning*
 bookseller shop clearance *church-goer soccer-playing*

In principle, there are two possibilities to analyze synthetic compounds structurally. Either the suffix is attached to a compound consisting of the two words, or the suffix is attached to the right-hand word and the derived word then forms a compound together with the non-head. In the first case, we would be dealing with compounding inside derivation, in the second with derivation inside compounding. The two possibilities are depicted in an exemplary fashion for *bookseller*:

- (5) a. [[*book sell*] -er] b. [*book* [*sell-er*]

Given that **booksell* and similar noun-verb compounds (such as **car-drive*, **beer-drink*, **church-go*) are not possible formations, it seems that (27b) provides the better analysis. After all, a *bookseller* is a seller of books, which means that the derivative *seller* inherits an empty argument slot from the verb *sell*, and this argument slot can be filled either by an *of*-phrase (*a seller of books*) or by the first member of the compound. Sometimes, however, argument linking in compounds fails. Thus, if the first element of the compound is semantically not compatible with its possible status as argument, an alternative relationship is construed. For example, a *Sunday driver* is not someone who drives a Sunday, but who drives on a Sunday, and a street seller usually does not sell streets, but sells things on the street. Similarly, *computer surgery* is normally not interpreted as surgery performed on computers, because computers are usually not treated by surgeons in the way human organs are. If this interpretation is ruled out, a new interpretation can arise that relies on other possible links between the referents of the two nouns. In the case of *computer surgery* the following inferencing procedure is likely to happen. Given that computers are used in all kinds of medical instruments, and complex medical instruments are used by surgeons, another possible interpretation of *computer surgery* would be ‘surgery with the help of a computer, computer-assisted surgery’.

Similar inferencing procedures are applied by default whenever non-relational nouns occur in a compound. For example, in isolation *stone wall* will be interpreted preferably as a wall made out of stone, because it is a typical relationship between stones and walls that the latter are built with the former. However, and crucially, such an interpretation is not compulsory. Given the right context, we could interpret *stone wall* quite differently, for example as a wall against which a stone was flung, a wall that is painted with a graffiti showing a stone, etc. Or take another example, *marble museum*. Two interpretations come to mind, depending on which aspects of the two nouns are highlighted. The first interpretation is based on the concept of a museum as a building. Given that buildings are made of stone, and marble is a kind of stone used for constructing buildings, a *marble museum* might be a museum built with marble. Another interpretation could be based on the concept of a museum as a place where precious objects are displayed. Given that marble is an expensive type of stone that is also used to make cultural artefacts (e.g. sculptures), a *marble museum* could be a museum in which marble objects are exhibited. These examples show how the interpretation of compounds depends on the possible conceptual and semantic properties of the nouns involved and how these properties can be related to create compositional meaning in compounds.

The last example, *marble museum*, brings us to the second major factor involved in compound interpretation, the surrounding discourse. Which interpretation of *marble museum* will finally be evoked may largely depend on the preceding discourse. If the word occurs, for example, in an article about an exhibition of marble sculptures, the interpretation of *marble museum* as a museum where marble objects are on display will automatically surface. In a context where the building material of public buildings is the topic, the interpretation ‘museum building made of marble’ will be favored. To further illustrate the discourse dependency of compound interpretation have a look at the following example. While in isolation you might want to interpret *snake girl* as a girl that has

extremely flexible limbs, Adams (201:88) cites the following headline from the *Guardian*, which shows that the context provides for a very different reading:

(6) Snake girls' record: Two Chinese girls set record living for 12 days in a room with 888 snakes. After having read the sub-headline, the reader will interpret snake girls as 'girls living with snakes'.

This example also highlights the general discourse function of compounding, namely to, loosely speaking, squeeze complex concepts into very short expressions, which is particularly important for writing headlines or advertisement texts. In sum, the interpretation of noun-noun compounds is highly variable and depends on the argument structure of the head, the semantics of the two nouns, the possible conceptual relationship between the two nouns, and on the surrounding discourse. Talking about the interpretation of nominal compounds, we have focused mainly on noun-noun compounds. When we turn to adjective-noun and verb-noun compounds the picture does not look very different. We saw that words like *loudmouth* or *greybeard* form a productive pattern of semantically exocentric compounds referring to human beings or higher animals. It would be wrong, however, to assume that all A-N compounds are exocentric. In (7) we have listed some examples that show that there are also semantically headed compounds of the A-N type:

<i>greenhouse</i>	<i>High Court</i>	<i>blackbird</i>	<i>hothouse</i>	<i>easy chair</i>
<i>blackberry</i>	<i>smallpox</i>	<i>blueprint</i>	<i>soft-ball</i>	<i>White House</i>

What is striking about most of the above compounds is that their meaning is not fully compositional. Thus a *blackbird* is a black bird (an indication of the semantic righthheadedness of *blackbird*), but being a *blackbird* involves more than being a black bird. Similarly an *easy chair* is a kind of chair, but what kind of chair it really is, is not predictable on the basis of the first element *easy*. The high proportion of lexicalized A-N compounds is an indication of the fact that this type of compounding is not nearly as productive as noun-noun compounding. However, we can still see that the interpretation of these compounds largely follows the modifier-head pattern we have encountered with noun-noun compounds.

Verb-noun follow the same interpretative mechanisms as noun-noun and adjective-noun compounds. Apart from the few semantically exocentric compounds such as *pickpocket* or *spoilsport* there are also a small number of endocentric verb-noun compounds, examples of which are *swearword*, *think tank*, *playboy*. Unlike in the exocentric compounds mentioned, the right-hand member in endocentric verb-noun compounds such as *swearword*, *think tank*, *playboy* is not an argument of the verb, but acts as a head which is modified by the initial verbal element.

Preposition-noun compounds are again of the modifier-head structure and mostly involve the prepositions *after* (e.g. *afterbirth*, *afterbrain*, *afterlife*), *out* (e.g. *outbuilding*, *outpost*, *outroom*), and *under* (e.g. *underarm*, *underbrush*, *underhair*).

3.0 Chapter III. Problems of teaching pragmalinguistic aspects of the grammatical structures to the students of the intermediate and advanced level students

3.1 On the effectiveness of textbooks on ELT teachers' use of pragmalinguistic features in language material

Although it is important to develop pragmatic and sociolinguistic features of the L2, acquisition of these rules is considerably a hard task for learners in EFL environments due to the contextual limitations. Since pragmatic development is not one of the outcomes of learners' grammatical development specific emphasis needs to be given to help learners develop pragmatic awareness. However, as a primary source of input, the textbooks ability to accommodate this need is skeptical. Pragmatic competence is one of the vital aspects of communicative competence, which requires the ability to choose and recognize the appropriate forms of utterance in a given context. As a constituent of pragmatic competence requests are one of the speech acts that are widely investigated along with the politeness strategies. Requests are attempts on the part of a speaker to get the hearer to perform or to stop performing some kind of action. The topic has been an interest to SLA research for several reasons:

1. They are face-threatening and, therefore, call for considerable linguistic expertise on the part of the learner,
2. They differ cross-linguistically in interesting ways and
3. They are often realized by means of clearly identifiable formulas”.

Politeness has been one of the important considerations for many researchers when investigating speech acts. The term is often considered formal and distancing and it is used to avoid any impositions or intrusions. The current study uses Brown and Levinson's¹⁴ politeness theory, which consists of three fundamental notions known as face, face threatening acts (FTAs), and politeness strategies. Yule¹⁵ defines face as “the public self-image of a person”. People expect their face-wants

¹⁴ Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. *Politeness: Some universals in language se.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1987, 450 p.

¹⁵ Yule, G. *Pragmatics.* Hong Kong: Oxford University Press. 1996, p. 60

to be respected in social interactions. A person can have two face wants: positive and negative. Positive face want is one's need to be approved and accepted by others, and his need to be considered as one of the group members. On the other hand, negative face want is one's need to have freedom of their actions and not to be impeded by others. If an action threatens the "public self-image" it is called a "FTA". The degree of risk or the weight of FTA to the hearer (H) is determined by three factors: The degree or the rank of imposition, social distance and power. These are referred to as Power (P), Distance (D) and Rank (R). D is basically the degree of intimacy between the Speaker (S) and the hearer (H). P is H's power over S. R is the weight of imposition on the H. In this theory, politeness is described as a redressive action, that is, an action "that attempts to counteract the potential face damage"¹⁶ to prevent the effects of a FTA. FTA's can be reduced by using five different politeness strategies defined by Brown and Levinson¹⁷. These strategies are: positive politeness, negative politeness, bald-on-record, off-record and say nothing.

Positive politeness strategies are used to save positive face wants. In these strategies solidarity, informality and formality are emphasized with expressions involving hearer's interests, wants and needs, such as exaggerating interest, avoiding disagreement, showing approval, and indicating common grounds. Conversely, negative politeness strategies are used to save negative face wants by using expressions that show restraint, formality and distancing. By apologizing, being indirect, expressing pessimism, minimizing imposition, and giving deference hearer's desire to not being imposed and being respected by others is satisfied. Among the other strategies bald-on-record strategies are used when the social distance between the H and S is small and when the power of S is higher than H. These include the use of directives, warnings, criticisms....etc. Off-record strategies require the use of indirect language. The utterance is vague, ambiguous,

¹⁶ Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. *Politeness: Some universals in language se.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1987, 68 p.

¹⁷ Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. *Politeness: Some universals in language se.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1987, 450 p.

or incomplete. Hints are an example of such strategy. Say-nothing strategy is simply the speakers being and remaining silent. If we consider that sometimes keeping our silence means something, this strategy can play an important role in understanding conversations. According to Suh¹⁸, requests are considered as FTAs. That is, when making a request the speaker asks the hearer to be involved in an action that is beneficial for the speaker but not for the hearer. Requests threaten the hearer's negative face wants, since s/he is imposed by the speaker. Therefore, the speaker needs to reduce the imposition by using a face saving act, and these face saving acts are the politeness strategies that the speaker uses.

We investigated learners ELT teacher trainees' use of politeness strategies when making requests to identify their pragmatic knowledge. It is argued that such pragmatic knowledge is the outcome of their previous language education. As one of the most important components of language education in EFL contexts, the textbooks provide input on the pragmatic features of the language being learned. The previous research showed that textbooks contain restricted use of pragmatic issues. It is hypothesized that the under representation of such features in the textbooks would reveal itself in learners use of the language. Therefore, the learners' choice of linguistic features and the range of these features would be an indication of how much and how well the textbooks could reflect on the pragmalinguistic features of the L2.

As the participants of the research are ELT teacher trainees, their efficacy in using pragmalinguistic features of the L2 is critical, considering the fact that the teacher is one of the primary sources of input in the classroom in addition to the textbook. Therefore, their ability to use these features are decisive when teaching them directly or indirectly to the language learners. Teacher trainees' ability to use these features are mostly determined by their former education. In an earlier study by Karatepe¹⁹ conducted in two Turkish EFL teacher training institutions, it was claimed that pragmalinguistic issues are underrepresented and are not

¹⁸ Suh, J. S. Pragmatic perception of politeness in requests by Korean learners of English as a second language. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 37, 1999, pp. 195-213.

¹⁹ Karatepe, C. Pragmalinguistic awareness in EFL teacher training. *Language Awareness*, 2&3, 2001, pp. 178-188.

systematically integrated in the teacher training syllabus. In a follow-up study by Karatepe it was claimed that there are striking differences between native speakers and non-native ELT teacher trainees in their linguistic choices due to Turkish ELT teacher trainees' restricted range of modal verb choices. Thus, the current study is significant in that it aims to emphasize the importance of teaching pragmatic features of L2 below and during tertiary level especially in teacher training programs. The study tries to find answers to the following research questions:

1. Do ELT trainees use language forms appropriately when making requests?
2. Do ELT trainees use a wide range of language forms?
3. Are the ELT trainees limited to language forms that can be frequently found in textbooks?
4. Are the participants aware of the ways to reduce FTAs by using politeness strategies?

The participants of the study constitute only the learners year trainees. The upper grades gain more pragmatic knowledge through the course of their study and as the aim of the study is to identify the possible effects of language education prior to university they were excluded from the study. 68 learners of ELT students were inquired about their politeness strategies. 58 of these subjects were given a questionnaire designed as a discourse completion task (DCT) (see appendix) and asked to write an appropriate request to each of the 12 situations. 10 of them completed the discourse orally on the same situations during an interview. The reason for choosing the learners year trainees were to eliminate any possible effects of university education and to focus on the outcomes of their previous language education. Eight (1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 12) of the twelve situations were designed according to the Power (P), Social Distance (D), and Rank of Imposition (R) as described by Brown and Levinson (1987). These are accompanied by an additional feature named as “psychological factor” by Suh²⁰. According to Tanaka and Kawade's²¹ Distance-Politeness (DP) hypothesis, politeness strategies are also

²⁰ Suh, J. S. Pragmatic perception of politeness in requests by Korean learners of English as a second language. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 37, 1999, pp. 195-213.

²¹ Tanaka, S. and Kawade, S. Politeness strategies and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language*

determined by social (status) and psychological (like/dislike) distance. According to the DP hypothesis as the relationship between the H and S gets bigger the speaker will use more polite strategies, however, if this relationship is close (psychologically and socially) less polite strategies will be used. Finally, psychological variables are more important than the social variables.

The other four situations (3, 6, 9, and 11) were designed to see the effects of contextual factors on users' linguistic preferences. According to Yule²² in understanding the meaning of a speech act, the context plays a preliminary role. Similarly, the context enables the students to determine the appropriate form of a speech act. Karatepe²³ claims that the knowledge of the politeness markers are not enough to be able to use them appropriately if the learners do not understand the relation between the forms and the context of situation. Thus, restaurant context is chosen and varied by additional factors to see if there is such an effect. Two different restaurant settings are used. The first one is a fast-food restaurant, and the other is a medium priced restaurant where the customers give their orders to the waiter on their tables. In addition to seeing the possible differences of language use while ordering a meal in these two different restaurant contexts, it is assumed that the linguistic preferences might be different depending on the fact that the requester is alone or accompanied by some other people one of whom is older than the requester in both of the contexts. To compare any differences in these contexts the same situation is given twice. In the first of these situations the requester is accompanied by a friend and friend's father, and in the second the requester is alone when making his order.

All 12 situations were created so that the respondents, all of whom were university students, might face a similar situation in real life. It is thought that if the situations are far from their real life or their imagination the results might be deceiving. As a result, the restaurants are either fast-food or medium-priced that the students can afford. The situations were presented in random order. To take any

Acquisition, 5, 1982, p. 52-63.

²² Yule, G. *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2004, p.350

²³ Karatepe, C. Pragmalinguistic awareness in EFL teacher training. *Language Awareness*, 2&3, 2001, pp. 178-188.

possible pressures off, the subjects were not given any time limit to complete the questionnaire. Five requesters were used in the eight situations (1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 12). Four of these requesters were taken from Tanaka and Kawade²⁴. These are a distinguished professor (psychologically distant), a young sociable professor (psychologically close), a best friend (psychologically close), an old neighbor who is disliked by the requester (psychologically distant). The fifth requester, added to these four, is a neighbor whose age is close to that of the requester and have good relations with him/her (psychologically close) (see table 1 for situations).

Table 1. Situations and the weight of D, P, and R

		D	P	R
Sit.1	the requester asks for a book from a distinguished professor that s/he is going to use for one of her/his projects.	<i>High</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Low</i>
Sit.2	the requester asks for money from her/his best friend.	<i>Equal</i>	<i>Equal</i>	<i>High</i>
Sit.3	requester is invited to a medium-priced restaurant by his friend and friend's father, where he orders her/his meal.	<i>Restaurant</i>		
Sit.4	the requester asks his older neighbor, that s/he doesn't like much, to keep the peace at home, since his children are making a lot of noise.	<i>High</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>High</i>
Sit.5	the requester asks her/his young sociable professor to buy a party ticket.	<i>High</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>High</i>
Sit.6	the requester, his friend and friend's father are at a fast-food restaurant, and s/he is going to order her/his meal.	<i>Restaurant</i>		
Sit.7	the requester asks his best friend's lesson notes a week prior to their exam.	<i>Equal</i>	<i>Equal</i>	<i>Low</i>
Sit.8	the requester needs to ask for the distinguished professor's handouts that s/he distributed in class when the requester was not at school.	<i>High</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>High</i>
Sit.9	the requester is at Burger King alone, and is going to order her/his meal.	<i>Restaurant</i>		
Sit.10	the requester asks for the help of a young sociable professor to write her/his paper.	<i>High</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>High</i>
Sit.11	the requester is in a medium-priced restaurant alone, and he is going to order her/his meal.	<i>Restaurant</i>		
Sit.12	the requester asks for a piece of bread from a neighbor who s/he likes and who is around the same age.	<i>Equal</i>	<i>Equal</i>	<i>Low</i>

The first group of analysis includes situations 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 12. The second group of analysis concerns restaurant situations (3, 6, 9, and 11) to see the effect(s) of contextual factors. Seven categories were determined when making the analysis (see table 2).

²⁴ Tanaka, S. and Kawade, S. Politeness strategies and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5, 1982, p. 52-63.

Table 2. Categories used in the analysis

Categories	
Category 1	pronoun choice
Category 2	modal verb choice in the first group and modalised and non-modalised verb choice in restaurant contexts
Category 3	Use of hints (as this is an off-record strategy it is not used in restaurant contexts, instead an additional category named “changing the turn” appeared in the restaurant context)
Category 4	Giving reasons
Category 5	Use of “please” (to identify the possible transfer of native conventions to foreign language)
Category 6	Use of imperatives (a bald-on-record strategy)
Category 7	the use of “apology”, as a “negative politeness” strategy

The restaurant contexts will be analyzed among themselves separate from the other eight situations due to their different purpose.

3.2 Pragmatic awareness with the explicit but contextual and meaningful teaching in developing linguistic competence of students

Category 1 (pronoun choice). When the written responses to situations 1 and 8 with the distinguished professor are analyzed (table 1), an increase in the use of the pronoun “You” in the 8th situation, which might be a result of higher rank of imposition can be identified (Table 1). In this situation, P and D is high thus, higher use of the pronoun “I” might be expected to reduce the FTA, because by using the pronoun I the requester takes the responsibility of action and thus reduces the amount of Face Threat on the hearer. The interview answers for the 1st situation do not show a change, but for situation 8 a decrease in the use of pronoun “I” can be seen (Table 2). This result may indicate that in spoken form respondents are less careful to the FTA and use less polite forms. This may be due to the limited time that respondents have to think and to respond. Moreover, the result might be an indication of the fact that trainees’ pragmatic knowledge is not internalized.

Table 3. Written Responses to situations 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 12

Category		Sit.1	Sit.2	Sit. 4	Sit. 5	Sit.7	Sit. 8	Sit.10	Sit.12
Pron. Choice	<i>I</i>	50%	10%		3%	67%	62.5%	2%	19%
	<i>You</i>	50%	90%	100%	97%	33%	37.5%	98%	81%
Modal V. Choice	<i>Could</i>	40%	26%	39%	7%	10%	27%	56%	22%
	<i>Would</i>	31%		11%	50%	9%	27%	16%	9%
	<i>Can</i>		59%	32%		52%		16%	36%
	<i>May</i>	12%				15%	25%		
	<i>Others</i>	5%			5%		11%		7%
	<i>Other</i>								

	<i>Structures</i>	12%	15%	18%	38% ²⁵	14%	10%	12%	26%
Hinting		-	2%	-	14%	-	-	5%	-
Giving Reasons		36%	29%	63%	21%	16%	41%	17%	37%
Using Pls. (Total)		22%	9%	40% ²⁶	3%	9%	16%	23%	14%
	<i>Beginning</i>	46%	2%	21%	1.5%	2%	5%	7%	2%
	<i>End</i>	54%	7%	19%	1.5%	7%	11%	16%	12%
Imperatives		-	3%	14%	2%	3%	-	-	-
Apology		10%	-	18%	2%	-	34%	5%	35%

The results from the 2nd and 7th situations (with the best friend) are conflicting. Although R is higher in situation 2, since they are asking for some money, the majority of the respondents used the pronoun “You” and increased the FTA. Whereas, in situation 7, although R is low, since the majority used the pronoun “I”, which indicates lack of pragmatic awareness. The interview answers (table 2) are similar to the written answers, which supports the claim that the respondents are not fully aware about the ways of reducing FTA, which signals limited pragmatic awareness. When we look at situations 4 and 12 with the neighbors, we see that in situation 4 with the “not-liked” neighbor, all respondents preferred using the pronoun “you” and increased the FTA, though the R is high. Tanaka and Kawade’s²⁷ DP hypothesis argues that if the relationship is psychologically and socially close less polite strategies are used. Yet, here the H is not liked by the S, thus s/he is psychologically distant. Moreover, s/he is older than the S, which creates a social distance. Therefore, it would be expected that the S use more polite strategies and reduce FTA. In this situation DP hypothesis is not proved. Contrastingly, in situation 12, although R is still high, S is socially and psychologically close to the H, which might be an explanation to use the pronoun “I” more than the pronoun “you”. In this situation DP hypothesis is proved. However, the conflicting results between the two situations once again indicate limited pragmatic awareness.

The interview answers are also very similar to the written responses. Thus, absence of pragmatic awareness can be observed in both data. Although R is

²⁵ In situation 5 category 2, 28% of other structures are formed by using “do”.

²⁶ In situation 4 in two instances please is used both at the beginning and at the end of the same sentence. For ex: *Could you please be more silent please.* The percentage of such sentences among all answers is 4%.

²⁷ Tanaka, S. and Kawade, S. Politeness strategies and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5, 1982, p. 52-63.

different in situations 5 and 10 with the young sociable professor the S is psychologically close to the H. As the relationship between S and H is big one might expect to see the use of more polite strategies as the DP hypothesis suggests. Yet, psychological closeness of the S to the H might reinforce the use of less polite strategies and increase the use of pronoun “I”. Further, DP hypothesis argues that psychological variables are more important than social variables. There is a similarity between situation 10 and 5 although the R in this situation is low. DP hypothesis is proved in this situation. Due to psychological closeness respondents did not reduce the FTA. The results indicate the importance of psychological variables.

Table 4. Oral responses to situations 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 12

Category		Sit.1	Sit.2	Sit.4	Sit.5	Sit.7	Sit. 8	Sit.10	Sit.12
Pron. Choice	<i>I</i>	50%	30%	-		60%	30%	-	10%
	<i>You</i>	50%	70%	100%	90%	40%	70%	100%	90%
	<i>We</i>				10%				
Modal V. Choice	<i>Could</i>	10%	10%		10%	10%	10%	20%	-
	<i>Would</i>	40%	20%	50%	70%	-	40%	50%	-
	<i>Can</i>	20%	70%	40%	-	60%	20%	30%	80%
	<i>May</i>	30%	-	-	-	10%	20%	-	-
	<i>Others</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Other</i>		-						
	<i>Structures</i>	-		10%	20%	20%	10%	-	20%
Hinting		-	-	-	10%	-	-	-	-
Giving Reasons		60%	70%	70%	30%	60%	70%	50%	70%
Using Pls. (Total)		-	20%	60%	-	10%	20%	30%	40%
	<i>Beginning</i>	-	-	40%	-	-	20%	30%	10%
	<i>End</i>	-	20%	20%	-	10%	-	-	30%
Imperative		-	-	10%	-	-	-	-	10%
Apology		40%	10%	20%	10%	10%	40%	10%	60%

Category 2 (modal verb choice). When the modal verb choice in situation 1 and 8 in written responses are compared, it is seen that in the first situation, although R is lower than the eighth situation, more people used (71%) polite forms (in situation 8 it is 54%). In both situations the use of more polite forms indicates that the most of the respondents are aware of being polite when power and distance are high and the H is psychologically and socially distant. Thus, the DP hypothesis is proved in this situation. According to the interview results the use of more polite forms decreases in both situations (50% in situation 1 and 20% in situation 8)

probably due to the fact that the respondents had less time to think about. However, when we compare both situations more people used more polite forms in situation 1 where the rank is low. In situations 2 and 7 little more than half of the respondents (59% and 52%) preferred a less formal modal “can” in their requests, because P and D are equal and the S is psychologically and socially close to the H. The interview results indicate an increase in the use of “can” (70% in situation 2 and 60% in situation 7). In situations 4 and 12, with the neighbors, 50% used more polite forms with the “not-liked neighbor and only 31% used such forms with the liked neighbor. DP hypothesis is proved in these situations and category because as the relationship of the S and H gets bigger the tendency to use more polite strategies is increased as in the modal verb choice category. The interview results indicate an increase in the use of “can” in situation 12, which might be due to social and psychological closeness. As in category 1 in situation 5 fewer people (57%) used more polite forms although R is higher than situation 10. In situation 10, 72% preferred more polite forms. In the interview, though 70% of the respondents used more polite forms in situation 5, which indicates an increase 40% chose such forms for situation 10 as well. This indicates a conflict between written and oral answers, which might be due to limited pragmatic awareness.

Category 3 (*hinting*). Hinting, which is an off-record strategy is rarely used in these situations. In written responses it was seen in situation 2 (best friend money), 5 (young professor, ticket) and 10 (young professor-help for a paper). During the interview hinting is used only in situation 5 by 10% of the respondents. Using hinting in requests indicates a high mastery of a language. As native speakers we often use hinting in our conversations and requests. Limited use of this strategy is also an indicator of limited or lack of awareness about native conventions.

Category 4 (*giving reason*). In all situations more people gave reasons if R is high, except in situation 4 with the ‘not liked neighbor’. R is high in both situations (4 and 12) concerning the neighbor, yet more reasons are given in situation 4 where the S has negative feelings towards the H. When we compare the

written responses with the interview results it is observed that there is an increase in giving reasons when making a request in the oral responses.

Category 5 (using “please”). Both in written and oral groups “please” was mostly used in situation 4, when requesters asked their older neighbor to keep the peace at home. The use of “please” in all situations in both groups is very small. This might be because in requests “please” is an optional element. However, when it is used it is placed correctly either at the end of the sentence or just before the verb in most of the situations.

Category 6 (imperatives). Imperative use is another least used category among both groups. This is because in none of the eight situations the requester’s P is higher than the requestee. According to Garcia²⁸, imperatives are most likely to be used by those speakers whose power is higher than the hearer and when the social distance between the speaker and the hearer is small. Although the distance between the speaker and the hearer varied in these eight situations, speaker’s power was never higher than the hearer.

Category 7 (apology). In both groups the highest percentage of apology use is seen in situation 12, when the requester asked for a piece of bread at 10.00 p.m. from their neighbor, who they like and who is close to their age. Second, they used it in situation 8, when they asked for the handouts from a distant professor. This result is contrary to our expectations that apology is used when P, D and R are high. However, in situation 12, D and P are equal, but R is high, because the request is made at 10.00 p.m. It can be suggested that time is an important factor to use apology when making requests. In both groups, in all situations (3, 6, 9, and 11) “I” was the most preferred pronoun (Table 3 written group, Table 4 oral group). “You” and “We” came afterwards; “We” being the least used one. The appearance of “We” is due to the fact that some respondents did not use the interrogative form and preferred saying: “We’d like ...”.

Table 5. Written responses to situations 3, 6, 9, and 11 (the restaurant contexts)

Category		Situation 3	Situation 6	Situation 9	Situation 11
----------	--	-------------	-------------	-------------	--------------

²⁸ Garcia, C. Making a request and responding to it: A case study of Peruvian Spanish speakers. Journal of Pragmatics, 19, 1993, pp.127-152.

Pronoun	<i>I</i>	74%	77%	84%	90%
	<i>You</i>	24%	15%	13%	10%
	<i>We</i>	2%	8%	3%	-
	<i>'d like</i>	21%	13%	17%	13%
	<i>Want</i>	15%	11%	30%	44%
	<i>Bring</i>		8%		
	<i>Can</i>	29%	44%	17%	23%
	<i>Could</i>	10%	8%	10%	
	<i>May</i>	10%	8%	13%	
	<i>Other Modals</i>	2%	-	-	12%
	<i>Other verbs</i>	13%	13%	13%	8%
Give Reasons		2%	-	-	-
Using please		37%	52%	61%	43%
Total					
	<i>Beginning</i>	2%	4%	1%	-
	<i>End</i>	35%	48%	60%	43%
Imperative		19%	23%	51%	34%
Apology		-	-	-	2%
Changing the turn		9%	-	-	-

In the oral group in three out of four situations (6, 9, and 11) respondents used the verb *want* more than the others. The written group used “*want*” most in situations 9 and 11. “*'d like*” was the second most used form (3, 6, and 9) among the written group, whereas, “*Can*” was the second most preferred modal (6, 9, and 11) in the oral group. When the modal verb choice of the respondents are compared, it is seen that there is a tendency to use more polite forms such as “*'d like, could, can and may*” instead of giving directives such as “*Bring me a, or I want a*” in situations with a friend and friend’s father. This indicates that being alone or being with somebody, especially someone who is older than you, plays a role in being more polite in one’s requests. Nobody in the oral group gave a reason when they ordered their meal. Similarly, in the written group only 2% gave a reason in situation 3. This is because when ordering a meal people usually do not discuss or explain why they preferred what they are going to eat with the waiter.

Table 6. Oral responses to situations 3, 6, 9, and 11

Category		Situation 3	Situation 6²⁹	Situation 9³⁰	Situation11
Pronoun	<i>I</i>	60%	89%	90%	90%
	<i>You</i>	20%	-	-	10%

²⁹ In this situation 9 out of 10 respondents used either a modalised or a non-modalised verb. One person did not use a verb (a hamburger and a coke please).

³⁰ As in situation 6 one of the respondents ordered the meal without using a pronoun or a verb.

	<i>We</i>	20%	11% ³¹	-	-
Modalised/ Non-Modalised Verbs	<i>'d like</i>	30%	11%	22%	20%
	<i>Want</i>	10%	33%	33%	50%
	<i>Bring</i>	-	-	-	-
	<i>Can</i>	30%	22%	22%	20%
	<i>Could</i>		11%	11%	-
	<i>May</i>	20%	-	-	-
	<i>Other Modals</i>	-	-	-	-
	<i>Other verbs</i>	10%	22%	11%	10%
Give Reasons		-	-	-	-
Using please		20%	20%	40%	30%
Total					
	<i>Beginning</i>	-	-	-	-
	<i>End</i>	20%	20%	40%	30%
Imperative		-	10%	10%	-
Apology		-	-	-	-
Changing the turn		-	-	-	-

“Please” was mostly used in situation 9 by the written (61%) and oral (40%) groups. They were used after meal names, such as “A hamburger and a coke, please”. It was least used in situation 3, by both groups, where they were in a medium-priced restaurant with their friend and friend’s father. This is because unlike situation 9 they used sentences. Imperatives are mostly used by the written group specifically in situation 9, where the S is at a fast food restaurant alone. Only 10% of the oral group used imperatives and each time at the fast food context. Apology is almost never used at the restaurant contexts, except in situation 11 (2%). This is an expected result since apologizing is not something common when ordering a meal. Turn changing is only seen in situation 3 in the written group. Only 9% of the participants gave their turn to the person accompanying them. This behavior seems pretty cultural, because, when one is invited to a dinner, it is considered a polite behavior if s/he orders after the host or asks the host to advise or choose the meal for him/her. Therefore, this category is seen only in situation 3. Nobody in the oral group used this strategy.

The results in general indicate that the majority of the trainees used certain modals such as would, could, can, and may in their requests and written and oral answers show similarities. This is because most of them learned such structures

³¹ One of the respondents did not use any pronoun and preferred saying a hamburger and a coke please.

from the textbooks to use in various situations that range from more polite to less polite. However, although these forms were used appropriately (research question 1) (more polite forms are used with people who are socially and psychologically distant and whose power is higher than the speaker), they are very restricted and are not always what native speakers choose to use when making their requests (research questions 2 and 3). Often a variety is seen in native speaker conversations. The small use of the hinting strategy is a good example to this. Native speakers of all languages use hinting often in their requests. Although the aim is not to blame any teacher or textbook, it is clear that, in order to raise pragmatic awareness, native conventions need to be taught and exemplified in the classroom. Considering the fact that the participants of the current research are trained to become English Language teachers, a part of their education needs to involve a wide variety of native speaker conventions. Moreover, such information should be presented in a way that students can use it meaningfully and automatically in communicative contexts. The results of the research indicate that the participants are mostly bound to the textbook language and they are mostly rule oriented.

Early in the paper, Tanaka and Kawade's³² DP hypothesis was mentioned. The current study does not aim to test this hypothesis. However, the results reveal that except for situation 4 (with the "not-liked neighbor"), when the relationship between H and S is socially and psychologically distant the S will use more polite strategies. In that specific situation negative attitude and feelings towards the hearer did not cause the S to use more polite strategies. All of the respondents increased the FTA by using the pronoun "You" and only half of the respondents (50%) preferred using would or could in their requests. The rest used less polite forms and a few even used directives. This might be due to a limited pragmatic knowledge or it might be because negative feelings have a stronger effect on politeness strategies for this specific group.

³² Tanaka, S. and Kawade, S. Politeness strategies and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5, 1982, p. 52-63

Moreover, “please” was rarely used in the requests which might be because it is considered as an optional element. It was mostly used in restaurant contexts. Although it was not used frequently, the majority of the participants used “please” in an appropriate location; either at the end of the sentence or before the verb. Except from a few instances, transfer from the native language is not seen in the use of “please”. We can say that these subjects are aware of the correct use of this word. In addition, the results indicate that the majority of the participants are not aware of the FTA of using the pronoun “You” instead of “I”. In most of the situations “You” is used more often than “I”. Hence, trainees need to be made aware about the FTA of pronouns (research question 3). When we look at the restaurant contexts, we see that, as expected, when the context is less formal, like a fast-food restaurant, and when the requester is alone in that context, less polite forms are used by the participants. In such contexts “can”, “would like” and “want” are the most used forms when talking to the waiter to order a meal. “Bring, have, and take” were rarely used.

In the restaurant contexts, turn changing category is worth mentioning. This category is seen only in situation 3, where the requester is invited to a dinner at a medium-priced restaurant by her/his friend and friend’s father. A small percentage of the respondents (9 %) gave their turn to their host. For example:

“I’ll have what my friend orders”,

Turning to her/his friend and asking *“What would you like to eat?”*

It is thought that this is a cultural behavior. It is considered polite when guests order after the host in the Uzbek culture. The present research did not aim at investigating and L1 or native language culture transfer. However, the results indicated that a small number of these respondents transferred their native language behavior to foreign language use. Thus, further research is necessary to identify any L1 and cultural behavior transfer when investigating the use of pragmatic features. The results of the study showed that the pragmatic awareness, or lack of it, is very much affected by the textbooks used and by the classroom practices. As the need for communication increased with the mobility of the

people, effective language teaching and appropriate use of the foreign languages gain importance to develop linguistic competence. The limited pragmatic awareness of the ELT teacher trainees indicates the necessity of explicit teaching of the native-like conventions. With the growing demand to communicate in a foreign language, both the teacher education and language teaching processes require specific attention not only to form and meaning but also to the pragmatic features of a language as pragmatic competence is one of the most important components of communicative competence. In an EFL context such pragmatic awareness and knowledge could be developed by the help of the teacher and the textbook. However, it is argued by Vellenga³³ that the presentation of speech acts in textbooks are pragmatically unsatisfactory, they are not supported well with contextual information, nor they are given explicit metapragmatic discussion. Similarly, Kasper³⁴ blames textbooks as one of the factors for learners' ineffective pragmatic strategy use. By looking at the results it can be said that it is necessary to help language learners in general, and language teachers and trainees, in specific, develop pragmatic awareness with the explicit but contextual and meaningful teaching of daily speech conventions. In addition, it is vital that the textbooks and the teachers involve such type of input in the classroom. Grammar based teaching needs to be replaced with communicative approaches to meet the needs of the learners for learning a foreign language. During the teacher training process, trainees' should be provided with extensive pragmatic knowledge and be guided to develop theirs. The results of the study emphasize the need for explicit teaching of pragmatic features. Language learners should be given opportunities to be exposed to native-like conventions through the use of authentic materials, audio-visual aids, teacher talk and the textbook. To increase such exposure, teacher training needs to involve explicit teaching of pragmatics to increase awareness. In addition, textbooks need to carry out pragmatic features and classroom methodologies to provide realistic, purposeful, and meaningful language practices.

³³ Vellenga, H. Learning pragmatics from ESL & EFL textbooks: How likely? *TESL-EJ*, 8(2). 2004. Retrieved from <http://www.tesl-ej.org>

³⁴ Kasper, G. Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 1990, pp.193-218.

Conclusion

Having thoroughly analysed the problem of pragmalinguistic aspect of the functional extension of the derived nouns in discourse we have come to the following conclusions:

1. Pragmatics is the branch of linguistics that studies how utterances communicate meaning in context. Every time the context changes, what is communicated changes as well. And it is this variable, context-bound relation between what is said and what is communicated that is the subject-matter of pragmatics. While the field of pragmatics in its widest sense is constituted of many diverse approaches (without clear-cut boundaries) united by a common functional (social, cultural, cognitive) perspective on language in communication, pragmalinguistics (linguistic pragmatics, pragmatic linguistics, internal pragmatics) focuses primarily (though not exclusively) on the study of linguistic phenomena (i.e., code) from the point of view of their usage. As it is impossible to offer an exhaustive definition of pragmatics, it might be easier simply to present a list of the topics studied: deixis, implicature, presupposition, speech acts and aspects of discourse structure.

2. The noun as a part of speech has the general meaning of substance in the widest sense of the term. This is the main nominative class of words for they are used to name living beings, objects and abstract notions, such as qualities, states, processes viewed as substances. The most characteristic formal feature of this class of words is the use of the article — a specific word of 3 types — definite, indefinite and zero or the meaningful absence of the article, which determines or specifies nouns in the most general way: Anyone who knows a language knows what sounds are in the language. Experts disagree about the origins of language. According to their morphological structure nouns may be classified as simple, derivative, compound.

3. **Derivation** is a word formation process that involves the addition of affixes to create new words. Derivation is the process whereby the addition of affixes, chiefly prefixes and suffixes in English, to base forms results in the

creation of new words. Derivative nouns derive from the root-stem of words which may belong to various parts of speech — nouns, adjectives, verbs. They are formed mainly with the help of numerous suffixes: writer, warmth, linguist, systematization. kingdom, childhood and so on. A great number of derivative nouns may contain prefixes which are traceable to verbs or adjectives and thus are typically verbal or adjectival prefixes.

5. All derivational patterns experience both structural and semantic constraints. The two general constraints imposed on all derivational patterns are: the part of speech in which the pattern functions and the meaning attached to it which conveys the regular semantic correlation between the two classes of words. It follows that each part of speech is characterized by a set of productive derivational patterns peculiar to it. Three degrees of productivity are distinguished for derivational patterns and individual derivational affixes: (1) highly productive, (2) productive or semi-productive and (3) non-productive.

6. There are so many other ways of deriving words from one another, that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to enumerate them. The primitive words of every language are very few; the derivatives form much the greater number. Some nouns are derived from other nouns, by adding the terminations – hood or -head, ship, ery, wick, rick, dom, ian, ment, and -age. Nouns ending in -hood or head, are such as signify character or qualities. Nouns ending in ship, are those that signify office, employment, state, or condition. Some nouns in ship are derived from adjectives. Nouns are derived from verbs. Nouns are derived from adjectives, sometimes by adding the termination –ness. Derivational productivity is distinguished from word-formation activity by which is meant the ability of an affix to produce new words, in particular occasional words or nonce-words.

Bibliography

1. Karimov I. A. "Fort the further development of the socio-political and economic base of the society" – A speech made in the session of the Olij Majlis, December, 2013. Halq so'zi, December 12, 2013.
2. Alagozlu, N. and Buyukozturk, S. Aural pragmatic comprehension. *Novitas-Royal*, 3(2), 2009, pp. 83-92.
3. Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. *Politeness: Some universals in language se.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1987, 450 p.
4. Francis W. N. *The Structure of American English.* New York, 2008, 450 p.
5. Garcia, C. Making a request and responding to it: A case study of Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19, 1993, pp.127-152.
6. Iofik L.L., Chakhoyan L.P. *Readings in the Theory of English Grammar.* Leningrad, 1972, 440 p
7. Iriskulov M.A. Kuldashev A.M. *Theoretical Grammar of the English Language.* Tashkent, 2008, 208 pages
8. Karatepe, C. Pragmalinguistic awareness in EFL teacher training. *Language Awareness*, 2&3, 2001, pp. 178-188.
9. Kasper, G. Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 1990, pp.193-218.
10. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. *A Grammar of Contemporary English.* Lnd., 1972, 1040 p
11. Suh, J. S. Pragmatic perception of politeness in requests by Korean learners of English as a second language. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 37, 1999, pp. 195-213.
12. Tanaka, S. and Kawade, S. Politeness strategies and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5, 1982, p. 52-63.
13. Vellenga, H. Learning pragmatics from ESL & EFL textbooks: How likely? *TESL-EJ*, 8(2). 2004. Retrieved from <http://www.tesl-ej.org>
14. Yule, G. *Pragmatics.* Hong Kong: Oxford University Press. 1996, 500 p.

15. Yule, G. The study of language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2004, p.350
16. Бархударов Л.С. Структура простого предложения современного английского языка. М., 1966. 250 р
17. Бўронов Ж. Инглиз ва ўзбек тилларининг қиёсий грамматикаси. Т. Ўқитувчи, 1974, 280 б.
18. Каушанская В.Л. и др. Грамматика английского языка (на английском языке). 1973 стр.22
19. Смирницкий А.И. Морфология английского языка М., 1955 , 480 с
20. www.grammarstudies.com/nouns/derived.html
21. www.grammatika.ru/nouns/derived.html
22. www.learnenglish.co.uk/derived_nouns.html
23. www.english4u.us/nouns/derived/functions.html