

**The Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized
Education of Republic of Uzbekistan**

**Andizhan State University
Named After Zakhiriddin Mukhammad Babur**

Faculty of Foreign Languages

Department of English Language and Literature

Speciality: Foreign Languages (English Language and Literature -
5141400)

Graduating Qualification Paper

**Theme: Lexical and semantic analysis of neologisms in English
(Инглиз тилидаги неологизмларнинг лексик-семантик
таҳлили)**

Compiled by: D.Numanova, 407 gr

Supervisor: I.S.Saliev, associate professor

Andizhan-2016

This qualification paper's theme was approved and recommended to defend at the State Examination Commission at the meeting of the Andizhan State University, Faculty of Foreign Languages, Department of English Language and Literature in 2016, May

The dean of the faculty of foreign languages

docent M.A. Abduvaliyev

The head of the department of English language

and literature B.Jalilov

Supervisor I.S.Saliev, associate professor

Reviewers:

Contents

Introduction.....	5
Chapter I. General notes on Neologisms in English	
1.1 The nature of neologisms in English.....	11
1.2. Word formation means in creation of neologisms.....	17
1.3 The influence of globalization on the creation of neologisms.....	28
 Chapter II. Linguistic features of neologisms in English	
2.1. Neologisms and their types	
2.1.1. Derived words.....	35
2.1.2. Abbreviations.....	36
2.1.3. Collocations.....	39
2.2. Lexical analysis of neologisms.....	46
2.3. Semantic derivation as a means for formation of neologisms.....	52
Conclusion.....	58
List of literature used.....	61

Introduction

**“The youth is not only our hope and future,
but it is a decisive force of our today
and tomorrow”**

Islam Abduganievich Karimov

During the years of independence deep structural and substantial reforms and transformations in the system of higher education has taken place in the Republic of Uzbekistan. Main purpose of these reforms was to provide the adequate place of the Republic of Uzbekistan in the world community. Indeed, it was impossible to provide the independent economy, social and political stability, and development of intellectual and spiritual potential of the nation without rebuilding the system of education and upbringing. The first President of Independent Republic of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov, understanding this reality from the first days of independence, stated the necessity of deep reforms in the system of education and upbringing of new generation. The state policy in the field of education that could transform it into the priority sphere has been developed and conducted.

Thus, beginning from 1991 the system of education has been reconstructed according to the requirements of independent state meeting the needs of the new era. This process was carried out step-by-step in correlation with the types and forms of education– pre-school education, secondary school education, secondary specialised, professional (vocational) education, higher education.

The first document– Decree of the President dated September 17, 1991 «On releasing Republican state administrative bodies, as well as the system of public education from political parties » was dedicated to these goals. From this date it was prohibited for political parties to interfere with the activity of educational institution.

Since 1991 the structural reconstruction of higher educational institutions has been commenced. With the purpose of providing the renewal of educational system the first law - «Law on Education» of the Republic of Uzbekistan was adopted on July 2, 1992. The priority of the sphere of education in social-economic and spiritual-cultural development of the country was stated in this law. Main directions of educational policy, structure and system of administration, rights and obligations of participants of education were defined in this document.

The “Law on Education” and “National Programme for Training Personnel” of the Republic of Uzbekistan, adopted on August 29, 1997, are the main normative-legal basis determining the reforms and substance of the sphere of education in the Republic of Uzbekistan.

Today there is no need to prove that the 21st century is commonly acknowledged to be the century of globalization and vanishing borders, the century of information and communication technologies and the Internet, the century of ever growing competition worldwide and in the global market.

On December 10, 2012 the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan signed the Resolution "About Measures for Further Improvement of System of Learning of Foreign Languages".

In accordance with the document, beginning from 2013/2014 academic year, the study of foreign languages secondary schools, mainly English, will start from the first grade in the form of gaming and speaking lessons, and in the second grade children will learn the ABCs, reading and grammar.

In higher education institutions, especially in technical and international faculties, certain core subjects will be taught in foreign languages.

Our President also approved a program of measures to enhance the study of foreign languages at all levels of the education system. Also, in 2015/2016 academic year, admission tests for all higher education institutions will include questions on foreign language. In addition, teachers will receive 30% monthly

bonus to their base rates in educational institutions located in rural areas, and 15% premium in other educational institutions.

We know that in recent years much attention is being paid to the problems of teaching and its methods. At the faculties of higher establishments of our country the undergraduates are also involved in this task. In order to become good specialists, students must hear enough in all the fields of their professions, they should be able to write graduation thesis (qualification papers) and maintain them at the end of their studies.

So my qualification paper is devoted to one of the problems of linguistics – to the analysis of the study of neologisms in Modern English. The problem of neologisms is one of the main problems in the study of Lexicology.

Actuality of the research: The actuality of our theme is preconditioned by the fact that every period in the development of a language produces an enormous number of new words or new meanings of established words. Most of them do not live long. They are not meant to live long. They are coined for use at the moment of speech. No living vocabulary is ever stable. “It is not today what it was a century ago, still less what it will be a century hence. Its constituent elements are in a state of slow but incessant dissolution and renovation. Old words are ever becoming obsolete and dying out; new words are continually pressing in”[11.125].

The XX century is reputed to be the most neogeneous one. The influx of new words has never been as rapid as in the past 25 years. It is evident by now that science transforms man’s environment at a pace which is not merely rapid, but swiftly accelerating. Throughout all the ages the elderly have lectured their juniors on the happiness of the old days and the decadence of present manners, but nowadays change is so rapid that anyone out of the first flush of youth tends to feel slightly out of date.

So the great influx of new words can be accounted for not only by intra-linguistic systematic factors, but by a number of extra-linguistic stimuli of

language development, such as science-technological progress, mass media development, etc.

The English language just like other European languages is now facing “a neological boom”. This process has boosted a new branch of linguistics-neology. It’s a science concerned with the investigation and description of the new vocabulary items.

Neology is a branch of linguistics which studies new words – neologisms. These studies are related to such topics as the essence of neologisms, their origin in the English language, means by which they are created, their assimilation in speech, delimitations of neologisms and nonce words, problems of nomination processes in the language, the role of motivation in creation of new words, etc. Thus, neology presents so many disputable areas that it can still be considered as a timely and relevant topic for linguistic investigation. The most crucial problem is that of the term itself. So far no universal definition has been proposed, though the term is clearly motivated: neos/new/ + logos/word/. So the simplest definition is “any new word or expression”. It is quite laconic, but not quite scientifically correct. We proceed from the assumption that language evolution is expressed in the change of nomination, i.e. correlation between form and meaning of a vocabulary unit. A neologism then is any unit new either in form or in meaning. It is but another testimony to a well-known fact that language reflects faithfully the spirit of the age and the latest outlook of a given society. So a neology is a very much socially bound science and implies some sociological study.

The aim of the work is the study of neologisms in Modern English. The problem of neologisms is one of the main problems in the study of Lexicology. The topic of neology is one of the disputable themes in Modern English and that is why we consider our work to be **scientifically relevant**.

The aim of our work is to investigate the neologisms in deferent spheres of life and their usage in Modern English language. To achieve the goal the following **tasks** have been carried out:

1. To observe the causes and results of nomination processes in the English language;
2. To examine the influence of globalization process on creation of neologisms;
3. To explore the productivity of word formation means in creation of neologisms;
4. To investigate the assimilation processes in borrowed neologisms;
5. To investigate the use of neologisms in different spheres of life;

The novelty of this research lies in fact that we focus our attention on description of the means of replenishing English vocabulary and the study of neologisms.

In this paper we have used different **methods** of linguistic research, such as descriptive and analytical methods, as well as some elements of componential, contextual, distributional and dictionary definition analyses.

The language material of the work is gathered from the various English and American periodicals, magazines, mass media sources, internet sites as well as from economic, political magazines and dictionaries. Thus, words, their definitions are taken from the following new words dictionaries which have it as their aim adequate reflection of the continuous growth of the English language:

- Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English,
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English,
- International Dictionary of Finance
- The Dictionary of Banking and Finance
- Macmillan Dictionary of Modern Economics

The following Internet dictionaries and databases were used as well:

<http://www.urbandictionary.com/>

<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/dictionary.htm>

<http://www.randomhouse.com/features/rhwebsters/>

The theoretical value of this paper lies in presentation of the traditional and modern points of view on the problem of neology, influence of globalization

process on creation of neologisms and assimilation processes in borrowed neologisms; the close study of neologisms and their subtypes presents an opportunity to have a deeper insight into the mechanisms of the language functioning and provides better understanding of the semantic and lexical peculiarities of the English language and the mechanisms of word formation as well.

The practical value of the paper lies in its applicability to the course of English Lexicology, General Linguistics and practical English classes.

The structure of the work consists of the Introduction, two Chapters, Conclusion, and The List of Used Literature.

The Introduction describes the theoretical foundation of the work and its relevance. The main part includes two chapters, which present the problems of neologisms and in Conclusion we present the main findings and the theoretical and practical results of the work.

Chapter I. General notes on Neologisms

1.1 The nature of neologisms in English

Nowadays, there is no doubt that the English language is the most widely used language for international communication. The language is constantly changing and developing. There are numerous factors that influence on this process one of which is neologisms. Language is the sphere of human activity that first brings social, political and other changes in human life. Every change, innovation, revolution is preceded by introduction of new words or phrases. They can be borrowed from another language by some reasons, or can be existing words which change their meaning, or words that creating through abbreviation, or they can be slang words. It is difficult to follow the number of words in the English language, since neologisms – new words – are coined every day. Also linguists have different opinions on such problem as how long the word is neologism. Some linguists claim that a word or phrase is no longer a neologism, when it is no longer „new”. And some scholars think that the word should not be older than 25 years to be a neologism. So we can say that neologisms are the main problem of modern scientific research.

The problem of neologisms in the English language is researched by numerous linguists and philologists, such as I. Arnold, V. Eliseev, R. Fischer, I. Galperin, C. Gauker, M. Janssen, O. Jespersen, F. Katamba, A. Koonin, A. Metcalf, M. Mostovy, P. Newmark, E. Rozen, V. Zabolotkina and others.

First of all, we begin with the etymology of „neologism”. This term comes from Greek „neo”, what is meant as a „new”, and „logos”, what is meant as a „speech, utterance” [15.40]. Neologisms are words that have appeared in the language in connection with new phenomena, new concepts, but which have not yet entered into the active vocabularies of a significant portion of the native speakers of the language [22.94]. The term, neologism is first attested in English in 1772. But the English variant of this term was not new because French (1734), Italian and German had their respective terms.

The Ukrainian philologist professor M. Mostovy states that there are no clear criteria of defining neologism as a linguistic phenomenon.

J. Algeo defines neologisms as new-coined words or new senses of an existing word that are constantly being introduced a language, often for the purpose of naming a new concept. The „Dictionary of Linguistic Terms” by O. Akhmanova provides a more detailed definition, where there are distinguished two kinds of neologisms. The first definition runs as follows:

„Neologism is a word or phrase created for defining a new (unknown before) object or expressing a new notion”. The second one says that it is a „new word or expression that has not received the right for citizenship in the national language and thus is perceived as belonging to a specific, often substandard style of speech” [14.263]. The second definition refers to some kind of barbarism or xenism (the old meaning of neologism is synonymous with „barbarism”, „gallicism” (in English), „anglicism” (in French), and even „archaism”) and is not appropriate in research of neologism that are mainly relevant and in demand in a certain linguistic community.

According to A. Rey, neologism is a „unit of the lexicon, a word, a word element or a phrase whose meaning, or whose signifier – signified relationship, presupposing an effective function in a specific model of communication, was not previously materialized as a linguistic form in the immediately preceding tag of the lexicon of the language. According to the model of the lexicon chosen, the neologism will be perceived as belonging to the language in general or only to one of its special usages; or as belonging to a subject – specific usage which may be specialized or general” [17. 77].

Neologisms tend to occur more often in cultures which are rapidly changing, and also in situations where there is easy and fast propagation of information. They are often created by combining existing words or by giving words new and unique suffixes or prefixes. Neologisms can also be created through abbreviation or acronym, by intentionally rhyming with existing words, or simply through playing with sounds. We can say that a neologism may be a

slang word that has to find its way into mainstream conversation, or it may be the creation of a non-native speaker who has made for example a grammatical error. The so-called slip of the tongue may also be seen as neologisms. Neologisms are usually formed under the laws of the language, by its productive patterns of word formation. However, literary neologisms are sometimes created by unproductive ways of word formation [19.47]. Neologisms can be also borrowed from other languages. Borrowing can be the result of political, economic, trade and cultural contact or commercial, cultural, scientific exchange. Neologisms can come from a variety of places and might be gleaned from scientific or technical language, come from other languages, be derived by putting two words together, or they may be solely invented, as in the case of words like „Jabberwocky” from the famous Lewis Carroll poem. Linguistic specialists suggest new words often migrate into a language most with great cultural changes or with the integration of two cultures that speak two different languages [10. 166 – 167].

Many neologisms have come from popular literature, and tend to appear in different forms. Most commonly, they are simply taken from a word used in the narrative of a book. For example, „McJob” from Douglas Coupland’s „Generation X: Tales for an Accelerated Culture” and „cyberspace” from William Gibson’s „Neuromancer”. Sometimes the title of the book will become the neologism. For instance, „Catch – 22” (from the title of Joseph Heller’s novel) and „Generation X” (from the title of Coupland’s novel) have become part of the vocabulary of many English-speakers [11. 92].

Neologisms often become popular by way of mass media, the Internet, or word of mouth – especially, many linguists suspect, by younger people. Every word in a language was, at some time, a neologism, though most of these ceased to be such through time and acceptance.

Neologisms often become accepted parts of the language. Other times, however, they disappear from common usage. Whether or not a neologism continues as a part of the language depends on many factors, probably the most

important of which is acceptance by the public. Acceptance by linguistic experts and incorporation into dictionaries also plays a part, as does whether the phenomenon described by a neologism remains current, thus continuing to need a descriptor. It is unusual, however, for a word to enter common use if it does not resemble another word or words in an identifiable way. In some cases however, strange new words succeed because the idea behind them is especially memorable or exciting. The problem of neologisms lies in the relativity of the concept of novelty, newness as it depends on what period is taken into consideration, for how long the word has status of being new, etc. When a word or phrase is no longer „new”, it is no longer a neologism. Neologisms may take decades to become „old”, though some scholars claim that the word should not be older than 25 years so that it could be considered a neologism. Opinions differ on exactly how old a word must be to no longer be considered a neologism; cultural acceptance probably plays a more important role than time in this regard [12. 102].

Another problem aspect is classification of neologisms. One of the methods used by scholars in any science is the classification of the phenomena under investigation. For instance, in linguistics we study different parts of speech; we know the functions of words in sentences. What concerns neologisms, we have to state that the question of classification of neologisms has not been settled yet; there is no single way of classifying them. In different classifications worked out by scholars different aspects of neologism have been taken into account.

Linguists often classify the neologism by its degree of use in a language. The newborn word is at first unstable, and it's hard to guess whether it will take hold and eventually be a word that most people know and use. A *diffused* neologism means that many people are using the word, but it doesn't yet have formal recognition as a word, and ultimately, if the word remains popular it may attain stable status. It has become part of the language and is likely to be defined in dictionaries [13.78].

The study of new vocabulary in the functional aspect involves the analysis of how neologisms appear and this analysis set the stage for the transition to the pragmatic aspect of the new words. According to the way of creation, neologisms are divided into: 1) phonological neologisms which are created from individual sounds [14. 78] (e.g. „zizz”, „to whee”);

2) borrowings are strong neologisms that are different by the phonetic distribution, not characteristic of the English language, as well as the unusual morphological division and lack of motivation (e.g. cinematheque, anti-roman (from French) [18. 65]; 3) morphological neologisms are created by samples that exist in the language system, and by the morphemes are presented in the system (such regular derivational processes such as affixation, conversion, compounding, and less regular, such as cutting, lexicalization) [16. 54].

J. Buranov and A. Muminov in their book „A practical course in English lexicology” say that neologisms may be divided into:

1) root words (e.g. jeep is a small light motor vehicle, zebra is street crossing place, etc);

2) derived words (e.g. collaborationist is one in occupied territory works helpfully with the enemy, to accessorize is to provide with dress accessories);

3) compound (e.g. air is a drop, microfilm is a reader). There are a lot of classifications of neologisms according to their features and we have described some of them in our article.

Neology is one of the many translation problems that have no standardized solutions. In journalism, neologisms occur very often for their ability and power of information condensation and their expressive effect. Translators have to render them in the target language by using quite complicated reasoning, which involves many factors, such as text type, creative traditions, literary norms and conventions that are familiar to the reader of a certain society [18. 124].

So, neologisms can be new words or phrases that appeared in the language in connection with new phenomena or they can be existing words with a new

sense that are constantly being introduced by the language. Neologisms are often created by combining existing words or by giving words new and unique suffixes or prefixes. They can also be created through abbreviation or simply through playing with sounds. They can be also borrowed from other languages and popular literature. There is no single way to track all neologisms because they are created every day, every moment of our life.

With the development of technology, science many “new words” appeared in English language as well. Most of them are terms. The layer of terminological neologisms has been rapidly growing since the start of the technological revolution. The theme of our investigation is “Neologisms in Modern English language”.

The sphere of the Internet alone gave birth to thousand of new terms which have become international (network, server, browser, e-mail, e-news, provider, site, netscape communicator, facebook, Internet explorer etc.). Recent discoveries in biochemistry, genetic engineering , cosmonautics and other sciences demanded new words to name new concepts and ideas. However, the vocabulary of our everyday usage is also being enlarged by neologisms.

1.2. Word formation means in creation of neologisms

Neologisms stand for innovation in every language. New words are created every day and their number in English is growing fast. Thus it is important to analyze the reasons for appearance of neologisms in a language. Newspapers are one of the media which has a significant role in creating and spreading neologisms by using these new words in their articles. It is significant to learn how these words are created, because neologisms undergo certain linguistic processes, the so-called word formation processes, and to try to find out to what structural-semantic types neologisms belong and in which sphere of life they are used more frequently. The theoretical findings of the research allow putting forth the following hypothesis: mass media is one of the main discourses in the framework of which neologisms are created, and the most frequently used structural-semantic types of neologisms to be encountered in the newspaper language are the neologisms with new form and already existing meaning.

Neologisms have been allotted a lot of different definitions. In dictionaries, *neologism* is generally defined as ‘a new word or a new meaning for an established word’. To be more specific, Peter Newmark defines neologisms as “newly come lexical or existing units that acquire a new sense”[26.20-23].

New words are a sign of a growing, evolving culture. With new discoveries, new technologies, and new perceptions, we need terms to describe and represent them. Also, some words become dated or worn-out, and need to be refreshed or replaced over time. Groups and subcultures (e.g., sports, gangs, musicians) often create esoteric words and phrases, some of which spill over into everyday language. These and other sources account for the burgeoning harvest of English neologisms that seem to be increasing every year⁵¹.

Not all new words come into this world the same way. In fact, there are several basic sources for coining words:

Naming: Some neologisms are simply “assigned” to stand for something new. When physicist Murray Gell-Mann identified subatomic particles, for example,

he needed to call them something. He assigned the term “*quark*”, a nonsense word from Joyce’s *Finnegan’s Wake*. Italian author M. Rosano dubbed a dumb or loose woman a “*bimbo*”, and jazzmen chose “*bebop*” for a 40’s dance craze (and now, we have “hiphop”).

Fusion: The biggest hatchery of them all, this is the joining of two or more words or word-parts into new coinage. Since all words were once neologisms, the vast majority of English words were fused from Latin, Arabic, Greek, or other ancient language parts (e.g., universe, from Latin *unus* (“one”) and *versus* (“to turn”). Fusion continues at an accelerating level, producing “ebonics” (“ebony” + “phonics”), “wordplay”, “coopetition”, “carjacking”, “vegan”, among many others.

Similar to fusion, the portmanteau is a combination of two words that homogenize into a new word that carries both of their meanings. The newly coined “*jobstacle*,” means “anything that prevents you from doing your work,” while “*burniture*” is defined as “furniture you buy at a fire sale”.

Description: When computer programmers introduced the “\” symbol, it became known as the “*backslash*.” It describes it. So does “*turnstile*” depict a rotating gate, “*gofer*” suggests someone read to fetch, and “*flip-flops*” captures the essence of the thong sandal.

Contraction: Some words are shortened versions of their parent term. Examples of abbreviations-turned-words include: “*carb*” for carbohydrate, “*phone*” for telephone, “*email*” for electronic mail, and “*cords*” for corduroy pants. The fused word “*weblog*” (a portmanteau from World Wide Web and log) has now been contracted to “*blog*,” just as “*sitcom*,” “*modem*,” and “*defcon*” derive from combining parts of two words.

Extension: Words are also enlarged, by having parts added to the front or back. Eighteenth century author Horace Walpole, for example, added a y to “Serendip” (the ancient name of Sri Lanka) and coined a term we couldn’t do without today. Other examples of words on steroids include “*discography*”

(based on disc, as in vinyl recording), *“hyperactive”*, and *“brookage”*. (WordRight, Leslie Brook of Plymouth NH, USA).

Acronyms: We live in an age of acronyms, as government, technical, and organizational names seek shorthand references. When all letters are capitalized, they remain acronyms (ASAP, FYI, NASA). But some become so familiar they turn into words. The military acronym “G.P.” (for General Purpose vehicle) became *“jeep”* to the US Army, and has now further moved to a capitalized brand name. A few other common examples: *“scuba,” “laser,” “okay,”* and *“snafu.”*

Morphing: Words can evolve. Your mother might “ring you” on the telephone, using a verb that began as a noun that derived, in turn, from bell sound. You might *“google”* (here, a verb) something, borrowed from today’s premier search engine Google™, itself derived from “googol” (a coined term from mathematician Edward Kasner, meaning 10¹⁰⁰).

Random: Sometimes words just seem to pop up and become adopted by popular culture. Your grandpa smoked a *“stogie”* despite your grandma’s *“phooey”* reaction (both terms arose spontaneously). And today, *“gnarly”* people are *“jones’n”* (no, not “jonesing”) for whatever *“fix”* they crave. As the aim of our work is to investigate the problem of neologisms, and ways of their forming, we will overview the word-building means. At first we will tackle the problem of various classifications of word-formation, linguists used to mention morphological, syntactic and lexico-semantic types of word-formation. At present the classification of the types does not, as a rule, include lexico-semantic word-building. Of interest is the classification of word-formation means based on the number of motivating bases, which many scholars follow. Some of the ways of forming new words in present – day English can be resorted to for the creation of new words whenever the occasion demands – these are called productive ways of forming words. Other ways of forming words cannot produce new words as readily and these are commonly termed non-productive or unproductive. For instance, affixation has been a productive way of forming

new words ever since the Old English period, whereas, sound-interchange must have been at one time a productive word-building means but in Modern English its function is actually only to distinguish between different classes and forms of words[29.224].

The high productivity of conversion finds its reflection in speech where numerous occasional cases of conversion can be found, which are not registered in dictionaries and which occur momentarily, through the immediate need of situation. Conversion is universally accepted as one of the major ways of enriching

It follows that productivity of word-building ways, individual derivational patterns and derivational affixes is understood as their ability of making new words which all who speak English find no difficulty in understanding, in particular their ability to create what is called occasional words or nonce-words (more unstable, serve the immediate purpose as compared to neologisms, but the border is very slight). The term means that the speaker coins such words when he needs them, if on another occasion the same word is needed again, he coins it afresh. Needless to say dictionaries do not as a rule record occasional words. The following words may serve as illustration: collarless (appearance), a Dickensish (office), to unlearn (the rules), etc[24.156].

Recent investigations seem to prove however that productivity of derivational means is relative in many respects. Moreover there are no absolutely productive means, derivational patterns and derivational affixes have different degrees of productivity. 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.

By productive affixes we mean the ones, which take part in deriving new words at this particular period of language development. The best way to

identify productive affixes is to look for them among nonce words. They are usually formed on the level of living speech and reflect the most productive and progressive patterns in word building. One should not mix the productivity of affixes with their frequency of occurrence.

There are quite a number of high-frequency affixes which, nevertheless, are no longer used in word derivation (the adjective-forming native suffixes – ful, – ly; the adjective-forming suffixes of Latin origin – ant, – al which are quite frequent)[25.51-64].

As for compounding, we can say that the structural type of compound words and the word-building type of composition have certain advantages for communication purposes. Composition is not quite so flexible (productive) a way of coining new as conversion but flexible enough to create numerous nonce words.

These words are comparatively laconic, absorbing into one word an idea that otherwise would have required a whole phrase (cf. The hotel was full of weekenders and The hotel was full of people spending the week-end there).

We should also mention the reason why such word building ways as shortening, acronyms and blendings are so productive. It can be explained by their brevity and it is due to the ever-increasing tempo of modern life. In meeting the needs of communication and fulfilling the laws of information theory requiring a maximum signal in the minimum time the lexical system undergoes modification in its basic structure: namely it forms new elements not by their combining existing morphemes and proceeding from sound forms to their graphic representation but the other way round – coining new words from the initial letters of phrasal terms originating in texts[9.121].

The basic means in word-derivation are affixation and conversion. Derived words usually consist of a root and an affix, which in their turn fall into prefixes which proceed the root in the structure of the word (re-write, mispronounce) and suffixes which follow the root (teach-er, dict-ate). Derived words are extremely popular in the English vocabulary. Successfully competing

with this structural type is the so-called root word which has only a root morpheme in its structure. This type widely represented by a great number of words belonging to the original English word stock or to earlier borrowings (house, book, work), and in Modern English, has been greatly enlarged by the type of word building, called conversion (pale, adj. – to pale, v; to find, v- a find, n.) Conversion sometimes is referred to as an affixless way of word-building or even affixless derivation. Conversion is a process of creating a new word from some existing one or by changing the category of a part of speech, the morphemic shape of the original word remaining unchanged. The new word has a meaning which differs from that of the original one though it can more or less be easily associated with it. It has also a new paradigm peculiar to its new category as a part of speech (nurse, n. – to nurse, v)[23.195].

Another type includes the means of building words containing more than one motivating base. Needless to say, they are all based on compounding (countryclub, door – handle). This type of word building, in which new words are produced by combining two or more stems, is one of the most productive types in Modern English, the other two are conversion and affixation. Compounds, though certainly fewer in quantity than derived or root words, still represent one of the most typical and specific features of English word-structure. Compounds are not homogeneous in structure. Traditionally three types are distinguished: neutral, morphological, syntactic. In neutral compounds the process of compounding is realized without any linking elements, by a mere juxtaposition of two stems (shop-window, bedroom, tallboy). Morphological compounds are fewer in number. This type is not productive and it is represented by words in which two compounding stems are combined by a linking vowel or consonant (Anglo – Saxon, statesman, handiwork). In syntactic compounds we find a feature of a specifically English word-structure. These words are formed from segments of speech, preserving in their structure numerous traces of syntagmatic relations typical of speech: articles, prepositions, adverbs, prepositions, as in lily-of-the-alley, good-for-nothing.

Syntactical relations and grammatical patterns current in present-day English can be traced in the structures of such compound nouns as pick-me-up, know-all, and whodunit. In this group of compounds, we find a great number of neologisms, and whodunit is one of them. The structure of most compounds is transparent, and it is clear that the origin of these words is a simple word combination.

Most linguists in special chapters and manuals devoted to English wordformation consider as the chief processes of English word formation affixation, conversion and compounding[28.122]. Apart from these a number of minor ways of forming words such as back-formation, sound interchange, distinctive stress, sound imitation, blending, clipping and acronyms are traditionally referred to Wordformation.

Some minor types of word-formation can not belong neither to word derivation nor to compounding, as some words while shortening, for example, can have two bases, e.g. V-day, some can have one, e.g. lab. The same reason can be applied to other minor types. We will not be strict and consider them as minor word building means.

Shortenings are produced in two different ways. The first is to make a new word form a syllable (rarer two) of the original word. The latter may lose its beginning (as in phone made from telephone), its ending (as in hols – holydays, ad– advertisement) or both the beginning and ending (as in flu-influenza). The second way of shortening is to make a new word form the initial letters (similar to acronymy) of a word group: U.N.O. from the United Nations Organization. This type is called initial shortenings and found not only among colloquialisms and slang. So, g.f. is a shortened word made from the compound girlfriend.

As a type of word-building shortening of spoken words, also called clipping or curtailment, is recorded in the English language as far back as the 15 century. It has grown more and more productive ever since. This growth becomes especially marked in many European languages in the 20th century,

and it is a matter of common knowledge that this development is particularly intense in English.

Shortenings of spoken words or curtailment consists in the reduction of a word to one of its parts (whether or not this part has previously been a morpheme), as a result of which the new form acquires some linguistic value of its own.

Newly shortened words appear continuously: this is testified by numerous neologisms, such as *demo* from *demonstration*; *frog* or *fridge* from *refrigerator*; *trank* from *tranquilizer*. Many authors are inclined to overemphasize the role of «the strain of modern life» as the mainspring of this development. This is, obviously, only one of reasons, and the purely linguistic factors should not be overlooked. Among the major forces are the demands of rhythm, which are more readily satisfied when the words are monosyllabic.

When dealing with words of long duration, one will also note that a high percentage of English shortenings is involved into the process of loan word assimilation. Monosyllabism goes farther in English than in any other European language, and that is why shortened words sound more like native ones than their long prototypes.

The other word building means can be called: blends, blendings, fusions or portmanteau words. The process of formation is called telescoping, because the words seem to slide into one another like sections of a telescope. Blends may be defined as formations that combine two words and include the letters or sounds they have in common as a connecting element. Blends or portmanteau words i.e. fusions are the “formations that combine two words and include any letters or sounds they have in common. The two words are literally blended or fitted into each other”[20.96]. E.g. *Adulthood*- moving back in with your parents after graduating from college; *Amerindians*-This word refers to the people who were on the North American continent before the arrival of Europeans. These people are also called Indians, Native Americans, or

American Indians. This term was coined to make one of the more politically correct phrases shorter and therefore more convenient.

English is continuing to expand through borrowing but at a drastically lower rate than in the Middle English or the Renaissance. Among borrowings there's a group of barbarisms/ non-assimilated items/ which are characterized by the highest degree of novelty: *dolce vita*/ *fr. Italian* / - "sweet life"; *inshallah* / *fr. Arab interjection*/ - God willing; *petit dejeuner*/ *fr. French*/ - breakfast. As it appears, the spelling of recent loanwords is generally faithful to the system of the original language[Internet 40].

Borrowings just like phonological neologisms present sound-clusters nonexistent in English. They may be qualified as 'strong' neologisms. It can be accounted for by their lack of motivation, irregular morphological deviation, phonemic distribution non-typical for English. The analysis into immediate constituents is helpful so far as it permits the definition of a blend as a word with the first constituent represented by a stem whose final part may be missing, and the second constituent by a stem of which the initial part is missing. The second constituent, when used in a series of similar blends may turn into a suffix. A new suffix – on is, for instance, well under way in such terms as *nylon*, *rayon*, *silon*, formed from the final element of cotton.

Depending upon prototype phrases with which they can be correlate two types of blends can be distinguished. One may be termed additive, the second, restrictive. The respective type is transformable into an attributive phrase where the first element serves as modifier of the second: *cine (matographic pano) rama* – *cinerama*. Other examples are: *medicare* – *medical care*, *telecast* – *television broadcast*[Internet,39]..

Both types involve the sliding together not only of sound but of meaning as well. Yet the semantic relations, which are at work are different. The additive type is transformable into a phrase consisting of the respective complete stems combined with the conjunction and, e.g. *smog* – *smoke and fog* 'a mixture of *smoke and fog*'. The elements may be synonymous, belong to the same semantic

field or at least be members of the same lexico-grammatical class of words: *French + English=Frenglish*.

Blends, although not very numerous altogether, seem to be on the rise, especially in terminology and also in trade advertisements. Another way of forming new words is acronymization, as for this process, we can say, that, because of ever closer connection between the oral and the written forms of the language it is sometimes difficult to differentiate clippings formed in oral speech from graphical abbreviations. They are becoming more employed in oral speech and widely used in conversation.

During World War I and after it the custom became very popular not only in English-speaking countries, but in other parts of the world as well, to call countries, governmental, social, military, industrial and trade organizations and officials not only by their full titles but by initial abbreviations derived from writing. Later the trend became even more pronounced; e.g. the USSR, the U.N.O., MP. The tendency was to omit full stops between the letters: GPO (General Post Organization). Some abbreviations nevertheless appear in both forms: EPA and E.P.A. (Environmental Protection Agency). Such words formed from the initial letter of each of the successive parts of a phrasal term have two possible types of orthoepic correlation between written and spoken forms.

If the abbreviated written form lends itself to be read as though it were an ordinary English word and sounds like an English word, it will be read like one. The words thus formed are called acronyms (from GREEK *acros* – ‘end’ + *onym* ‘name’). This way of forming new words is becoming more and more popular in almost all fields of human activity, and especially in political and technical vocabulary: U.N.O., also UNO (ju:nou) – United Nations Organization, NATO – the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, SALT – Strategic Arms Limitation Talks[35].

The last example shows that acronyms are often homonymous to ordinary words: sometimes intentionally chosen so as to create certain associations. Thus, for example, the National organization for Women is called NOW. Typical of

acronymic coinages in technical terminology are JATO, laser, radar. Acronyms present a special interest because they exemplify the working of the lexical adaptive system.

As for semantic word – building, we can say, that it is any change in word – meaning, for instance the word bench – ‘a long seat of wood or stone’; ‘a carpenter table’. The majority of the 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, «powder made from wheat and used for making bread», etc. The application of the term word-formation to the appearance of homonyms due to the development of polysemy seems to be debatable for the following reasons: As semantic change does not, as a rule, lead to the introduction of a new word into the vocabulary, it can scarcely be regarded as a word-building means (neither can we consider the process a word-building means even when an actual enlargement), the vocabulary does come about through the appearance of a pair of homonyms. Actually, the appearance of homonyms is not a means of creating new words, but it is the final result of a long and laborious process of sense development [21.145].

Furthermore, there are no patterns after which homonyms can be made in the language. Finally, diverging sense-development results in a semantic isolation of two or more meanings of a word, whereas the process of word formation proper is characterized by a certain semantic connection between the new word and the source lexical unit. For these reasons diverging sense development leading to the appearance of two or more homonyms should be regarded as a specific channel through which the vocabulary of a language is replenished with new words and should not be treated on a par with the processes of word-formation, such as affixation, conversion and composition.

1.3 The influence of globalization on the creation of neologisms

There is no doubt that the English language today is the most widely used language for international communication. Words and expressions are born, live for a short time and then die or find their place in our vocabulary according to the temporary or permanent nature of the phenomena they describe.

Indeed, if no new words were to appear, it would be a sign that the language was moribund; the progress of arts and sciences gives birth to a large majority of new words: each new word that does appear should be severely scrutinized before it becomes generally accepted.

No new science is possible without neologisms, new words or new interpretations of old words to describe and explain reality in new ways. How could Aristotle have developed the logic of syllogisms or Newton the theory of dynamics without new vocabularies and definitions? They were neologists, and everybody wanting to contribute new knowledge must be. «To reject neologisms, often despicably, is to reject scientific development. No sign of scientific conservatism is so telling as the rejection of all but the established concepts of a school of thought. Neologisms are, however, relative to the terminological paradigm actually dominating a field of knowledge. It may be a radical renewal to introduce terms from a tradition believed to be outmoded»[27.121].

There exist various definitions of such a linguistic notion, as neologism, and every of them expresses the gist of this notion taking into the consideration one of the numerous aspects of neologism. The most general are: «Neologism: Neologisms are «words that have appeared in a language in connection with new phenomena, new concepts, but which have not yet entered into the active vocabularies of a significant portion of the native speakers of the language»³⁹.

«A neologism is the term used to describe a word that has been made-up or invented by a speaker, which appears in a transcript of spontaneous speech dialogue. It can also be described as a word which does not appear in the dictionary of the primary spoken language, but which is also not a foreign

word»⁴⁰ (**Internet 39**). The common thing in these both definitions is that neologism is not yet registered in dictionaries and in most cases it is a colloquialism for the time being.

If we consider the cultural acceptance, we can reckon that after being coined, neologisms invariably undergo scrutiny by the public and by linguists to determine their suitability to the language. Many are accepted very quickly; others attract opposition. Language experts sometimes object to a neologism on the grounds that a suitable term for the thing described already exists in the language.

Non-experts who dislike the neologism sometimes also use this argument, deriding the neologism as «abuse and ignorance of the language» Some neologisms, especially those dealing with sensitive subjects, are often objected to on the grounds that they obscure the issue being discussed, and that such a word's novelty often leads a discussion away from the root issue and onto a sidetrack about the meaning of the neologism itself.

Proponents of a neologism see it as being useful, and also helping the language to grow and change; often they perceive these words as being a fun and creative way to play with a language. Also, the semantic precision of most neologisms, along with what is usually a straightforward syntax, often makes them easier to grasp by people who are not native speakers of the language.

As it was pointed out by Andrew Lloyd James, a Welsh linguist, «A language is never in a state of fixation, but is always changing; we are not looking at a lantern-slide but at a moving picture». As English is a growing language new words and phrases emerge everyday at a pace that the Oxford English Dictionary and the Webster's cannot keep up with. While these dictionaries wait for years before they consider words 'fit to publish', the Web is working faster to bring these new terms to light.

It is estimated that more than 40% of the neologisms appeared in the nineties, it can be explained by the sudden jump in computer technologies and the more evident results of the sexual revolution. In the eighties, 24% of the new

words were coined, that was more or less a stable period of the contemporary society. As for the 2000–2004, for this period more than 36% of the neologisms were built. That is the richest period, as the progress became faster, as well as, the time itself[**Internet 42**].

It's the first time new words were fixed in newspapers. Such tabloids, as The INDEPENDENT (London), Chicago TRIBUNE, THE WASHINGTON POST, The AUSTRALIAN, CANADIAN Issues are the productive sources. The Internet sites give birth to the numerous words which deal with technologies, for instance, the esato.com gave life to the word BLUEJACKING. Not only English speaking countries tabloids are among the sources, THE JERUSALEM POST «bore» the floor time, etc. Some other local newspapers like THE DENVER POST, FLORIDA TIMES, THE TORONTO STAR, THE NATION, etc. can also be called the sources. Issues, discussed at conferences (Digital Rights Management Conference) can be the reasons for the new words appearance (dark net) as well.

Men and women links are also of interest, ¼ of all new notions (according to our investigation) make up in this sphere. *Irritable Male Syndrome* (-anger and irritableness in men caused by a sudden drop in testosterone levels, particularly when brought on by stress or the word) *men breasts* (excess fatty tissue that causes a man's chest to resemble a woman's breasts) show us how men begin to resemble a woman more and more, physically and psychologically. Or take for example, a *metrosexual individual*, who spends much money on his appearance and lifestyle.

The second richest branch is Computer. New computer technologies give rise to new words. Most of them are connected with the Internet and E – mail, as the Internet offers us more and more opportunities, as well as, all computer technologies. Software in many people's lifetime has been mostly a wonderful way to live, because we're just learning how to do it and anybody with some time and talent and initiative can try out any crazy idea. We have so much processing power and so much memory and such great tools and we still fail,

most times, to produce things that are fun to use. Neologisms like, GOOGLE, «SPIM» became an indispensable part of Internet users' speech. One can google and find any information he or she needs and the other gets IM every time he or she uses Instant Messenger.

Culture sphere is developing along with the society that is why it is the third richest. Television and food and drink branches have more fresh words, than ever now, and again, it is connected with the technological and social development.

Individuals suffer from passive over-eating, that is the excessive eating of foods that are high in fat because the human body is slow to recognize the caloric content of rich foods; eating whatever is put in front of you, even to the point of discomfort. The ground for it all is the change of the life rhythm – shortage of time. Science is the forth richest, new sciences and discoveries are made in this sphere – that is neurotheology, for example.

Technology and the world have the equal number, in the technology branch more than a half of all new words are connected with cell phones. The majority of civilized people have «cellies» to save time and money. Some have problems with BLUEJACKING while standing in a line in the supermarket (temporally hijacking another person's cell phone by sending anonymous messages using the Bluetooth system). Or one can make 911 butt call, that is definitely is not worth responding to.

Business and language are less influenced, these spheres are more or less stable, business – is because it is the matter of money. Market succeeds in creating immense quantities of (unevenly distributed) wealth, lifting people out of rural poverty and urban slums, in arranging that most people have jobs, that most things that are built that are needed, and the most things that are needed are built. These are not small accomplishments. Also, it can be marked that business is often a filthy practice. It encourages both vile venial and monstrous mortal sin, all as an organic consequence of the competitive marketplace. That explains our statistics, we have three new words, connected with this topic, and one of

them deals with crime – *419 scam* (fraud, making people pay money, which hope to get more later, the numbers «419» is the number of the law, prosecuting this type of a crime). The other word deals with the stock market – *dead cat bounce* (a temporary recovery from a major drop in a stock's price)[Internet 41].

Language is the sphere which is really flexible and prone to changes, but still people need more or less stable language system to communicate. New words in this sphere are *kippers* (an acronym) and *himbo* (an insult) or *hathos* (feelings of pleasure derived from hating someone or something), they are a rare case in point. In most cases words have a noun as another part of speech, like in words *neurotheology*, the new form is *neurotheologian* or *metrosexual* – metrosexuality, also *straight supremacist* – straight supremacy. As for creating the adjectives, we have such examples, as *hathos* – *hathotic*, or *spim* – *antisvim* and *lipstick lesbian* – lipstick with a suffix – *ic* highly employed. Verbs are also common: *bluejacking* – to bluejack, *manscaping* – to manscape, *flash mob* – to flash mob. Neologisms like, *spim*, *flash mob* are the brightest representatives to show how productive the words can be, they have a noun, a verb, an adjective and even they have a plural form – flash mobs, for example. Few words have a plural form. These facts show that while speaking sometimes people have to converse words into a different part of speech. The bigger paradigm of morphological forms the word develops the more probability it will have to survive for a while and even stay in the language. The reason for this event is that these new notions as well as words are gradually becoming the essential part of the civilized world[37.405].

According to our statistics, most words acquire a new meaning rather than a new word appears with a new notion. This can be explained by the fact, that there is not enough, we would say proper, words to express all the variety of newly created and used notions in the rapidly changing world⁴⁶.

Most majority of neologisms appeared with the development of press: *Bigger bang for a buck*, *Big lie*, *Black hats*, *Can carrier*, *Green power*, *Jane*

Crow, Larger than life, Logroller, Man on horseback, Potculture, Put-down, Trade off, Roll-cal.

With the development of aviation there appeared such lexical units: *airbus* - “аэробус”, *helibus* - “вертолет-автобус”, *seadrome* - “гидроаэродром”, *to bail out* - “катапультироваться” and others. When appeared planes which require a little space for taking –off and landing, such neologisms were born: *STOL* (Short Take-Off and Landing) - “укороченный пробег”, *STOL-port* - “аэродром для самолетов, с укороченным пробегом”, *verti-port* - “аэродром для самолетов с вертикальным взлетом и посадкой”.

In the sphere of arts happens a great process of experiments, new ways of pictures and other artistic works appear. So, in 60-s of XX century abstract arts appeared which is based on geometric forms. In connection with it the number of synonymous neologisms appeared: *minimal art, minimalism, rejected art, reductivism*. These years other artistic movements came into existence: *ABC art, soft art, kinetic art, luminal art, optical art, pop art, action painting, revivalism*. In the 70s with appearing of new trend further widening of this semantic group happened. This trend makes stress on processe which happen in the mind of artist during creation of new piece of art. This trend is reflected in following neologisms: *conceptual art, process art, antifoam art, impossible art*. In the sphere of cinema, television and video technology appeared many new technic means, after that appeared a lot of neologisms, e.g.: *inflight movies, inflight videosystem, serial, series, featurette, satellite-delivered show, HDTV (High Definition Television), chat show, kidvid, videoplayer, video cassette, video-cassette recorder, video - camera, video-screen movie*.

Most neologisms appeared with social changes which happened in English speaking states. One of the most widespread social phenomena typical for Britain is feministic movement. ⁴⁸ Due to this movement appeared very many new lexical units, e.g. : the *Lib Movement, libber, libbie*.

It is interesting to notice, that in 70s participants of feminist movement proclaimed English as a sexist language that is language which discriminates

female sex because English mostly consist of words in masculine gender than feminine (usually because of word *man* as a second component of names of professions).

In the result names with the second component *man* were changed, e.g.: instead of cameraman the word camera operator was used, *firemen* - *firefighter*, *policemen* - *police-officer*, *chairman* - *chairperson*, *Congressman* - *Congressperson*, *businessmen* - *businesspeople*, even in church *mankind* was changed into *people*.

An important aspect of human life is the system of education. In 1988 in Great Britain new law of education was published, in was named *Gerbil* (Great Education Reform Bill). In connection with this law many neologisms appeared, e.g.: *City Technology Colleges* – special type of school which is subsidized by central organs of education, *Standard Assessment Tasks (SATs)*, grand-maintained status, *City Technology Colleges*, *Teacher Appraisal*, *licensed teachers*, *star schools*, *non-star schools*, *sleep-teaching*, *CLASS* (*Computerbased Laboratory of Automated School System*), *TEFL* (*Teaching English as a Foreign Language*), *multimedia*, *telelecture*, *telecourse*, *megaversity*, *multiversity*, *para-university*, *para-school*. Instead of words student, pupil often are used terms as *educatee*, *schooler*; *educationalist* - “specialist in the sphere of enlightenment”[36.230].

English as well as other world languages actively enriches at the expense of lexicon inherent of representatives of different professions, social groups, ages.⁴⁹ So, e.g. jargonims are created with the second component *-speak*: *Artsspeak* - “jargonism of artists”, *Sportsspeak* - “jargonisms of sportsmen”, *Medspeak* - “jargonism of medical workers”, *Teacherspeak* - “jargonism of teachers”, *Videospeak* - “jargonism of video equipment users”, *Cablespeak* - “jargonism of workers of cable TV” and others. Characteristic lexicon of higher society like *dial-a-meal*, *dial-a-taxi* became well-known. Also some words usually used by teens became popular, e.g.: *Drugs!* used instead of OK, *sweat*, *task*, *brunch*(breakfast+lunch).

Chapter II. Linguistic features of neologisms in English

2.1. Neologisms and their types

2.1.1. Derived words

We know that linguists often classify the neologism by its degree of use in a language. The newborn word is at first unstable, and it's hard to guess whether it will take hold and eventually be a word that most people know and use. The great majority of neologisms are words derived by analogy from ancient Greek (increasingly) and Latin morphemes usually with suffixes as *-ismo*, *-ismus*, *-ija* etc., naturalised in the appropriate language. In some countries (e.g. pre-War Germany, Arabic-speaking countries) this process has been preferred. E.g. 'television' – *Fernsehen*. However, now that this word-forming procedure is employed mainly to designate (non-cultural) scientific and technological rather than cultural institutional terms, the advance of these internationalisms is widespread. Normally, they have naturalised suffixes. Many are listed in *Babel* appears to be the main non-European language that 'imports' them.

However, this does not mean that the translator can apply the process automatically. For example: "Bionomics" has given way to 'ecology', and 'ergonomics' (second sense) to 'biotechnology'. He has to consult the appropriate ISO (International Standards Organisation) glossary to find out whether there is already a recognized translation; secondly, whether the referent yet exists in the TL culture; thirdly, how important it is and therefore whether it is worth 'transplanting' at all. If he thinks he is justified in transplanting it (has he the necessary authority?), and he believes himself to be the first translator to do so. P. Newmark should put it in inverted commas.

For example: *televideo* – appears to be an earlier version of video, which has several meanings ('tape', 'recorder', 'cassette'). Not however that most of these words are virtually context-free.

But we should note the medical neologisms. Example: 'chronopharmacology' and etc., particularly approved chemical names of

generic drugs can often be reproduced with a naturalized suffix (French –ite, English –itis; French –ine, English –in).

2.1.2. Abbreviations

Abbreviations have always been a common type of pseudo-neologisms, probably more common in French and German than in English. Example: Uni, Philo, sympa, Huma, fac, fab, video; they are normalised (i.e. translated unabbreviated), unless there is a recognized equivalent (e.g. bus, metro, plus science-technical terms).

Abbreviations, one of the most noticeable features of present-day English linguistic life, would form a major part of any super dictionary. Often thought to be an exclusively modern habit, the fashion for abbreviations can be traced back over 150 years. In 1839, a writer in the New York Evening Tatler comments on what he calls ‘the initial language... a species of spoken shorthand, which is getting into very general use among loafers and gentlemen of the fancy, besides Editors, to whom it saves much trouble in writing...’. He was referring to OK (‘all correct’), PDQ (‘pretty damn quick’) – two which have lasted – GT (‘gone to Texas’), LL (‘liver loafers’), and many other forms introduced, often with a humorous or satirical intent, by society people.

The fashionable use of abbreviation – a kind of society slang – comes and goes in waves, though it is never totally absent. In the present century, however, it has been eclipsed by the emergence of abbreviations in science, technology, and other special fields, such as cricket, baseball, drug trafficking, the armed forces, and the media. The reasons for using abbreviated forms are obvious enough. One is the desire for linguistic economy – the same motivation which makes us want to criticize someone who uses two words where one will do. Succinctness and precision are highly valued, and abbreviations can contribute greatly to a concise style. They also help to convey a sense of social identity: to use an abbreviated form is to be ‘in the know’ – part of the social group to which the abbreviation belongs. Computer buffs the world over will be recognized by their fluent talk of ROM and RAM, of DOS and WYSIWYG. It

would only irritate computer-literate colleagues and waste time or space (and thus money) if a computer-literate person pedantically expanded every abbreviated form. And the same applies to those abbreviations which have entered everyday speech. It would be strange indeed to hear someone routinely expanding BBC, NATO, USA, AIDS, and all the other common abbreviations of contemporary English. Indeed, sometimes (as with radar and AIDS), the unabbreviated form may be so specialized that it is unknown to most people – a point not missed by the compilers of quiz games, who regularly catch people out with a well-known abbreviation as UNESCO and UNICEF, AAA, SAM and GI (context: military), or DDT and TNT (context: chemistry)[36].

There are 6 types of abbreviation: initialisms, acronyms, clipping, blends, awkward cases, facetious forms.

Initialisms – items which are spoken as individual letters, such as BBC, DJ, MP, EEC, e.g., and USA; also called alphabetizes. The vast majority of abbreviations fall into this category. Not all use only the first letters of the constituent words: PhD, for example, uses the first two letters of the word philosophy and GHQ and TV take a letter from the middle of the word.

Acronyms – initialisms which are pronounced as single words, such as NATO, laser, UNESCO, and SALT (talks). Such items would never have periods separating the letters – a contrast with initialisms, where punctuation is often present (especially in older styles of English). However, some linguists do not recognize a sharp distinction between acronyms and initialisms, but use the former term for both.

Clipping – a part of word which serves for the whole, such as ad and phone. These examples illustrate the two chief types: the first part is kept (the commoner type, as in demo, exam, pub, Gill), and the last part is kept (as in bus, plane). Sometimes a middle part is kept, as in fridge and flue. There are also several clippings which retain material from more than one part of the word, such as maths (UK), gents, and specs. Turps is a curiosity, in the way it adds an

–s. Several clipped forms also show adaptation, such as fries (from French fried potatoes), Betty (from Elizabeth) and Bill (from William).

Blends – a word which is made up of the shortened forms of two other words, such as brunch (breakfast+lunch), heliport (helicopter+airport), smog (smoke+fog), and Eurovision (European+television). Scientific terms frequently make use of blending (as in the case of bionic), as do brand names (a device which cleaned your teeth while you used the phone might be called Teledent) and fashionable neologisms.

A lexical blend, as its name suggests, takes two lexemes which overlap in form, and welds them together to make one. Enough of each lexeme is usually retained so that the elements are recognizable. Here are some longstanding examples, and a few novelties from recent publications.

Motor + hotel = motel

Advertisement + editorial = advertorial

Channel + Tunnel = Chunnel

Oxford + Cambridge = Oxbridge

Yale + Harvard = Yarvard

Slang + language = slanguage

Guess + estimate = guesstimate

Square + aerial = squaerial

Toys + cartoons = toytoons

Breath + analyser = breathalyzer

Affluence + influenza = affluenza

Information + commercials = informercials

Dock + condominium = dockominium

In most cases, the second element is the one which controls the meaning of the whole. So, brunch is a kind of lunch, not a kind of breakfast – which is why the lexemes are brunch and not say lunkfast. Similarly, a toytoon is a kind of cartoon (one which generates a series of shop toys), not a kind of toy.

Blending seems to have increased in popularity in the 1980s, being increasingly used in commercial and advertising contexts. Products are sportsational, swimsational, and sexsational. TV provides dramacons, docufantasies, and rockumentaries. The forms are felt to be eye-catching and exciting; but how many of them will still be around in a decade remains an open question.

Awkward cases – abbreviations which do not fall clearly into the above four categories. Some forms can be used either as initialisms or acronyms (UFO – ‘U F O’ or ‘you-foe’). Some mix these types in the one word (CDROM, pronounced ‘see-dee-rom’). Some can form part of a larger word, using affixes (ex-JP, pro-BBC, ICBMs). Some are used only in writing (Mr, St- always pronounced in full in speech).

Facetious forms: TGIF – Thank God It’s Friday, CMG – Call Me God (properly, “Companion of St Michael and St George”), GCMG – God Calls Me God (properly, “Grand Cross of St Michael and St George”), and above all AAAAAA – Association for the Alleviation of Asinine Abbreviations and Absurd Acronyms (actually listed in the Gale Dictionary).

2.1.3. Collocations

Where there is an accepted collocation in the SL, the translator must find and use its equivalent in the TL, if it exists. A collocation consists basically of two or three lexical (sometimes called full, descriptive, substantial) words, usually linked by grammatical (empty, functional, relational) words, e.g. ‘a mental illness’. The collocates within a collocation define and delimit each other by eliminating at least some of their other possible meanings; the defining may be mutual and equally balanced, but more often it is closer for one collocate than for the other. Thus ‘to pay attention’, since it reduces the number of senses in which ‘pay’ can be used to one. The word ‘attention’ is not so radically affected, but it excludes ‘attention’ in the sense of ‘care, solicitude’. ‘To buy a hat’ is not a collocation, since it does not appreciably delimit the sense of ‘buy’ or ‘hat’.

However, collocations shade off into other grammatically linked word-groups without a sharp division.

A collocation is the element of system in the lexis of a language. It may be syntagmatic or horizontal, therefore consisting of a common structure; or paradigmatic or vertical, consisting of words belonging to the same semantic field which may substitute for each other or be semantic opposites. These become collocations only when they are arranged syntagmatically.

Syntagmatic collocations can be divided into seven main groups:

a) Verb plus verbal noun. Examples: pay attention, suffer a defeat, run a meeting, make a speech. The verb is the collocate for which the translator must find the appropriate equivalent. The verbs in these collocations merely have an operative function (they mean ‘do’) and no particularized meaning since the action is expressed in the noun. Some verbal nouns have a small range of collocates; others, like discourse, Lob, Dients, have one obvious collocate (pronouncer, spenden, leisten).

b) Determiner plus adjective plus noun. The appropriate adjective has to be found for the noun. There is a much wider range of choices than in (a), and the force of this category of collocation is usually only established by contrast with another language. Thus ‘a large apple’ but *une grosse pomme*; ‘a tall man’ but *un home grand*; *un grand home* but ‘a great man’; *un beau garçon* but ‘a good looking man’; ‘a pretty girl’ but not (usually) a ‘pretty boy’. Some nouns have one particularly suitable adjective in an extensive variety of areas, particularly for physical qualities (e.g. woman: dark, slim, middle-aged, short, young) which, for other objects, would require different adjectives, whilst other nouns (e.g. ‘criticism’) have a narrow sheaf of adjectives for each segment of a variety of areas (*approfondi/grundlich*; *anodine/nichtssagend*).

c) Adverb plus adjective. The most suitable adverb must be looked for. These collocations tend to cliché (e.g. ‘immensely important’). The collocation is much rarer in Romance languages, where its equivalent transposition is ‘adjective plus adjectival noun’, e.g. *d’une immense importance*. Note however:

vachement dur, 'damn hard' or 'bloody hard'. This collocation, which is more restricted and less frequent (therefore far less important) than (a) and (b) is much at the mercy of fashion.

d) Verb plus adverb or adjective. This is much smaller category: the adverb or adjective must be looked for. Examples: work hard, feel well, shine brightly, and smell sweet.

e) Subject plus verb. There are two groups: first, the noun and verb may mutually attract each other: 'the dog barks', 'the cat purrs', 'the bell rings', and 'teeth chatter'. In some cases, particularly when referring to animals, the verb usually has no other subject. In the second group, there is merely a fairly high expectation that a particular verb will follow the subject: 'the door creaks', le clocher pointe, les champs se déroulent, and here the right verb must be looked for. In French, some of these verbs are often found as past participles or in adjectival clauses qualifying their subjects (used as *etoffement* with low semantic content), and then they require no translation in English: la maison qui se dresse sur la colline, 'the house on the hill'.

f) Count noun plus 'of' plus mass noun. This restricted collocation consists of a term denoting a unit of quantity and the word for the substance it quantifies. The appropriate unit must be looked for in the TL, e.g. 'a loaf of bread', 'a cake of soap', 'a pinch of salt', 'a particle of dust', etc, if it exists.

g) Collective noun plus count noun. The collective noun has to be discovered: e.g. 'a bunch of keys', 'a flock of geese or sheep', 'a pack of cards or hounds'.

Wider and less easily categorized collocations include nominalizations (in particular, nouns premodified by one or more nouns), introducing the name of an object (or unit of quantity) by a term for its size, composition, purpose, origin, destination, etc., which is now rapidly superseding the 'noun plus "of" plus noun' collocation; the whole range of phrasal verbs, and various items of a sequence including activity/agent/instrument/object/attribute/source/place, etc.: e.g. 'bake/baker/oven/bread/fresh,new,stale,musty/flour,yeast/bakery'.

Stylistically and semantically, clichés are a subgroup of collocations in that one of their collocates has diminished in value or is almost redundant, as often in ‘grinding to a halt’, ‘filthy lucre’, etc., and the translator may be entitled to replace a cliché with a less common collocation, if it clarified the content without distorting it.

Paradigmatic collocations may be based on well-established hierarchies such as kinship (‘fathers and sons’), colours (‘emerald is a bright green’), scientific taxonomies and institutional hierarchies where the elements of the culture for each language often have their own distinct linguistic likeness (Abbild), although the extralinguistic object may be the same. Alternatively they may consist of the various synonyms and antonyms that permeate all languages.

Antonyms may be classified under three heads:

a) Objects which complement each other to form a set (‘land, sea, air’), or a graded series (‘ratings, petty officers, officers’).

b) Qualities (adjectives or adjectival nouns) which are contrary, which may have middle term (e.g. ‘interested/disinterested/uninterested’), or are contradictory. Contradictory polar terms are shown formally, i.e. through affixes: ‘perfect/imperfect, loyal/disloyal’. (Suffixes have much stronger force than prefixes: cf. ‘faithless/unfaithful’). Contrary polar terms are usually shown lexically: ‘hot/cold, young/old, faithful/treacherous’. In a text, such collocations usually appear as alternatives, e.g. ‘hard or soft; clear, obscure or vague’.

c) Actions (verbs or verbal nouns). In two-term collocations, the second term is converse or reciprocal: ‘attack/defend; action/reaction’. In three-term collocations, the second and third terms represent positive and negative responses respectively: ‘offer/accept/refuse, besiege/hold out/surrender/’.

Actions may also complement each other as in (a); ‘walk/run, sleep/wake’.

There are two types of synonym collocation. The main type is the ‘inclusive’ collocation which include (a) the hierarchies of genus/species/subspecies, etc., and may indicate the degree of generality (or particularity) of any lexical item, and with in the appropriate category (Oberbegriffe or super ordinates): e.g. ‘the brass in the orchestra’; ‘pump or grease-gun’; ‘equity on the market’. Fleche is a generic term for ‘spire’, and a specific term for fleche (slender spire perforated with windows); (b) synecdoche, where part and whole are sometimes used indiscriminately with the same reference (e.g. chariot/prote-outil, ‘strings/violins’); (c) metonymy, where ‘Bonn” and ‘the West German government’, ‘the City’ and ‘British bankers’ may again be interchanged. The second type of synonym collocation is usually an old idiom such as ‘with might and main’ and ‘by hook or by crook’ – which is likely to have a Germanic (auf Biegen oder Brechen) but not a Romance (coute que coute) one-to-one equivalent.

Collocations are the lexical (not grammatical) tramlines of language. Where a translator finds current and equally common corresponding collocation in source and TL texts, it is mandatory to use them; they are among the invariant components of translation. They may be factual or extralinguistic, denoting institutional terms (e.g. le President Republique) as well as linguistic. A translator must be conversant with them not only to follow them but also to know when to ‘break’ them (going off the tramlines) when they are broken in the SL text.

New collocations (noun compounds or adjective plus noun) are particularly common in the social sciences and in computer language. Thus, ‘lead time’, ‘sexual harassment’, ‘claw back’, ‘cold-calling’, ‘Walkman’ (brand name for ‘personal stereo’), ‘acid rain’, ‘norm reference testing’, ‘rate-capping’, ‘jetlag’, ‘lateral thinking’, ‘narrow money’, ‘graceful degradation’, ‘hash total’.

The above represents varying problems. The computer terms are given their recognised translation – if they do not exist, you have to transfer them (if they appear important) and then add a functional-descriptive term – you have not the authority to devise your own neologism.

‘Sexual harassment’ is a universal concept at least in any culture where there is both greater sexual freedom and a powerful women’s movement. For a German it will come out as Sexualschikane;

‘Lead time’ – a term for the time between design and production or between ordering and delivery of a product, has at present to be translated in context;

‘Claw back’ (retrieval of tax benefits) may not last;

‘Narrow money’ (money held predominantly for spending), is contrasted with ‘broad money’ (for spending and/or as a store of value).

This brief discussion shows incidentally the difficulty of translating English collocations which appear arbitrarily to juxtapose nouns with verb-nouns because they indicate the two most significant meaning components, but have varied and sometimes mysterious case relations. Languages cannot convert verbs to nouns but, in the case of the Romance languages at least, suppress prepositions in such ruthless way, cannot imitate this procedure. For this reason, the English collocations are difficult to translate succinctly and an acceptable term emerges only when the referent becomes as important (usually as a universal, but occasionally as a feature of the SL culture) that more or less lengthy functional-descriptive term will no longer do.

In linguistics, a collocation is typically defined as the ‘habitual co-occurrence of individual lexical items’. For the translator, for whom the collocation is the most important contextual factor collocation, in as far as it usefully affects translation, is considerably narrower; it consists of lexical items that enter mainly into high-frequency grammatical structures. Here are some examples if this in English and German languages.

1. Adjective + noun

a. heavy labour – schwere Arbeit

b. economic situation – Konjunkturlage

2. Noun +noun (i.e. double-noun compound)

a. nerve cell – Nervenzelle

b. government securities – Staatspapiere

c. eye ball – Augapfel

3. Verb + object, which are normally a noun that denotes an action, as in ‘read a paper’.

a. pay a visit – einen Besuch machen

b. score (win) a victory – einen Sieg erzielen

c. read an (academic) paper – ein Referat halten

d. attend a lecture – eine Vorlesung hören or besuchen

There are various degrees of collocability. Some words such as ‘bandy’ and ‘rancid’ may only have one material collocate (‘legs’, ‘butter’) but figuratively they open up more choice (appearance, taste). They are always linked with the concept of naturalness and usage, and become most important in the revision stages of translation.

2.2. Lexical analysis of neologisms

Every nation is known by the culture represented through the language it keeps, and every aspect of the life of a people is reflected in their vocabulary. Some words get out of usage or get transformed; new words are created to represent the reality brought to us by mass media in particular through news reporting.

Nowadays the English language as many other languages passes through “neologistic boom”. Great amount of new words and necessity of their interpretation led to creation of special branch of lexicology-neology-science about neologisms. Great success in development theories of neology achieved French linguists[23.124].

A neologism (from Greek *neos* 'new' + *logos* 'word') is a newly coined word that may be in the process of entering common use, but has not yet been accepted into mainstream language. Neologisms are often directly attributable to a specific person, publication, period, or event. According to Oxford English Dictionary *neologism* was first used in print in AD 1483.

Although there are general patterns of word-formation, language is not a fixed, rigid system; according to the current stage of development new words enter the vocabulary continuously, and certain tendencies of forming new words appear and may disappear again. In linguistics, a neologism is understood as a recently invented word. Neologisms are especially useful in identifying new inventions, new phenomena, or old ideas which have taken on a new cultural context.

New words and expressions or neologisms are created for new things irrespective of their scale of importance. They may be all-important and concern some social relationships, such as a new form of state, e. g. *People's Republic* or something threatening the very existence of humanity, like *nuclear war*. Or again the thing may be quite insignificant and short-lived, like fashions in dancing, clothing, hairdo or footwear (e. g. *roll-neck*). In every case either the old words are appropriately changed in meaning or new words are borrowed, or

more often coined out of the existing language material either according to the patterns and ways already productive in the language at a given stage of its development or creating new ones.

Thus, a neologism is a newly coined word or phrase or a new meaning for an existing word, or a word borrowed from another language. The intense development of science and industry has called forth the invention and introduction of an immense number of new words and changed the meanings of old ones, e. g. *aerobic*, *black hole*, *computer*, *isotope*, *feedback*, *penicillin*, *pulsar*, *quasar*, *tape-recorder*, *supermarket* and so on.

The laws of efficient communication demand maximum signal in minimum time. To meet these requirements the adaptive lexical system is not only adding new units but readjusts the ways and means of word-formation and the wordbuilding means. Thus, when radio location was invented it was defined as *radio detection and ranging* which is long and so convenient abbreviation out of the first letter or letters of each word in this phrase was coined, hence *radar*²². The process of nomination may pass several stages. In other words, a new notion is named by a terminological phrase consisting of words which in their turn are made up of morphemes. The phrase may be shortened by ellipsis or by graphical abbreviation, and this change of form is achieved without change of meaning. Acronyms are not composed of existing morphemes according to existing word-formation patterns, but on the contrary revolutionise the system by forming new words and new morphemes out of letters. A language grows by infusion of new words. Anyone who has been on the Internet for more than a few days knows what a webmaster is. Yet only a few years ago if we came across a "webmaster", we wouldn't know what that person did for a living. There are many ways to coin words. You can make words out of thin air: googol, a word for a very large number (1 followed by 100 zeros) was coined by a nine-year-old boy. It was the inspiration behind the naming of the Google search engine. The language can redefine old words. The Google name, in turn, became generalized as a verb meaning to search for something, not necessarily on the

Web. You can find a 'sandwich' of two existing words (web + master) or you can fuse them together: lexpert (lexics + expert), someone who is an expert in words. Such an amalgamated word is also known as a portmanteau (from French, meaning a bag for carrying clothes, one that opens on two sides) since Lewis Carroll gave them this moniker in his 1872 classic "Through the Looking-Glass". Carroll himself coined some great portmanteaux, such as chortle (chuckle + snort), and slithy (slimy + lithe). Coining words is easy. Getting them into a dictionary and common use is another matter. Among neologisms different categories can be distinguished. A protologism is a new word created in the hope that it will become accepted. A protologism may be no more than suggestion of a word that might be used, whereas a neologism is a word that has been used. The term *protologism*, itself a neologism, was coined by Mikhail Epstein in 2003. Neologisms don't necessarily begin as protologisms since they may arise rapidly and unintentionally. Evolution of neologisms is another aspect for their study. Newly-created words entering a language tend to pass through the following stages:

- Unstable - extremely new, being proposed, or being used only by a small subculture (also known as Protologisms)
- Diffused - having reached a significant frequency of use, but not yet having gained widespread acceptance
- Stable - having become recognizable, being *en vogue*, and perhaps, gaining lasting acceptance
- Dated - the point where the word has ceased being novel, entered formal linguistic acceptance and, even may have passed into becoming a cliché
- Passe - when a neologism becomes so culturally dated that the use of it is avoided because its use is seen as a stigma a sign of being out of step with the norms of a changed cultural tradition, perhaps, with the neologism dropping from the lexicon altogether.

Sources of neologisms can be also very difference and diversified. Many examples of neologisms can be found in sciences, fiction, branding, literature,

linguistic and popular culture. Here we are presenting some neologisms from different areas of human activity presented in Internet sources:

Science

- *x-ray*. or rentgenograph (November 8, 1895, by Rentgen)
- *radar* (1941) from Radio Detection And Ranging
- *black hole* (in the 1960s)
- *laser* (1960) from Light Amplification by Stimulated Emission of Radiation
- *lidar* (late 1990s) from Light Detection And Ranging²⁵
- *alien space* (1998)²⁶
- *genocide* (1943)
- *homophobia* (1969)
- *political correctness* (1970)
- *pro-choice* (1975)
- *heterosexism* (1979)
- *doe-whistle politics* (1990)
- *Islamophobia* (1991)
- *soccer mom* (1992)
- *corporatocracy* (2000s)
- *Islamofascism* (2001)
- *Saddlebacking* (2009)[**Internet 41**].

Words or phrases evolved from mass media content or used to describe popular cultural phenomena (these may be considered a variety of slang as well as neologisms) include:

- *Internet* (1974); *queercore* (mid 1980s); *plus-size* (1990s); *webinar* (early 2000s); *wardrobe malfunction* (2004); *truthiness* (2005) (already existed as an obscure word previously recorded by the *Oxford English Dictionary*, but its 2005 usage on *The Colbert Report* was a neologistic one, with a new definition); *Simpsons* (1989) are now in common use. *Commerce and advertising* include many compound generalised trademarks:
- *consumerization* ; *hoover*; *kleenex*; *Laundromat* (2004).

Linguistics, as any other science, also have created many neologisms in its metalanguage to denote terms and notions:

- *hyperonym* (popularized in 1980); *backronym* (1983); *aptromm* (2003; popularized by Franklin Pierce Adams); *snowclone* (2004); *protologizm* (2005); *nonce words*— words coined and used only for a particular occasion, usually for a special literary effect. Many neologisms have come from popular literature and tend to appear in different forms. Most commonly, they are simply taken from a word used in the narrative of a book; a few representative examples are: "grok"- (to achieve complete intuitive understanding)"McJob', Vyberspace" "nymphet"³³from *Lolita* by Vladimir Nabokov. Kurt Vonnegut's *Cat's Cradle* was the container of the Bokononism , family of nonce words. Another category is words derived from famous characters in literature, such as *quixotic* (referring to the titular character in *Don Quixote de la Mancha* by Cervantes), a *scrooee* (from the main character in Dickens's *A Christmas Carol*). Lewis Carroll has been called "the king of neologistic poems" because of his poem, "Jabberwocky", which incorporated dozens of invented words³⁴. Neologisms are by definition "new", and as such are often directly attributable to a specific individual, publication, period, or event. The term "neologism" was itself coined around 1800. So in the early 19th century, the word "neologism" was itself a neologism. In psychiatry, the term is used to describe the use of words that only have meaning to the person who uses them, independent of their common meaning. It is considered normal in children, but a symptom of thought disorder (indicative of a psychotic mental illness, such as schizophrenia) in adults.

Use of neologisms may also be related to aphasia acquired after brain damage resulting from a stroke or head injury. People with autism may also create neologisms.

In theology, a neologism is a relatively new doctrine (for example, rationalism). In this sense, a neologist is an innovator in the area of a doctrine or instream clergy or religious institution(s)³⁶. Neologisms tend to occur more often in cultures which are rapidly changing, and also in situations where there is easy

and fast propagation of information. They are often created by combining existing words (see compound noun and adjective) or by giving words new and unique suffixes or prefixes. Those which are portmanteaux are shortened. Neologisms can also be created through abbreviation or acronym, by intentionally rhyming with existing words, or simply through playing with sounds. Neologisms often become popular through memetics by way of mass media, the Internet, word of mouth (including academic discourse, renowned for its jargon, with recent coinages such as Fordism, Taylorism, Disneyfication and McDonaldization now in everyday use). Every word in a language was, at some time, a neologism, ceasing to be such through time and acceptance.

Neologisms often become accepted parts of the language. Other times, however, they disappear from common usage. Whether a neologism continues as part of the language depends on many factors, probably the most important of which is acceptance by the public. Acceptance by linguistic experts and incorporation into dictionaries also plays a part as does whether the phenomenon described by a neologism remains current, thus continuing to need a descriptor. It is unusual, however, for a word to enter common use if it does not resemble another word or words in an identifiable way. (In some cases, however, strange new words succeed because the idea behind them is especially memorable or exciting; for example, the word 'quiz', which Richard Daly brought into the English language by writing it on walls all around Dublin.) When a word or phrase is no longer "new", it is no longer a neologism. Neologisms may take decades to become "old", however. Opinions differ on exactly how old a word must be to no longer be considered a neologism; cultural acceptance probably plays a more important role than time in this regard.

2.3. Semantic derivation as a means for formation of neologisms

The development of new meanings in existing words proves another fruitful source of new vocabulary. Semantic extension presents the qualitative aspect of vocabulary growth. Traditionally there have been distinguished such semantic processes as metaphor, metonymy, extension or generalization of meaning, specialization or narrowing of meaning; pejoration and melioration. Among these metaphor is predominating. A figurative sense can provide a vivid comparison. *Adrenalin*, a hormone used to stimulate the heart, when used figuratively is extended to mean “something that stirs to action; a stimulant or stimulus”. A similar vivid comparison is provided by figurative use of the word brandy- originally it meant “ a strong alcoholic drink distilled from wine of grapes” now it has developed a new meaning- “ something, that stimulates or excites. Do any words have meanings that are predictable- that is, meanings that can be worked out on the basis of the sounds or combinations of sounds that make them up? The answer is certainly “yes”, but not necessarily for reasons that immediately come to mind. It is true that there are some words whose sound seems to reflect their meaning fairly directly. These include so-called onomatopoeic words, But even here convention plays a large part. Onomatopoeic words are not the same in all languages; for example a cock-crow in German is *kikeriki*, and dog’s bark in French is *ouab ouab* (pronounced roughly ‘wah wah’).

There are also sets of words in which some similarity in sound (say, in the cluster of consonants at the beginning) seems to reflect a vague similarity in meaning, such as smoothness or wetness or both in the set of words *slip*, *slop*, *slurp*, *slide*, *slither*, *slick*, *sleek*, *slaver*, *slug*. A technical term for this situation is sound symbolism. But in sound symbolism, quite apart from the role of convention, the sound–meaning relationship is even less direct than in onomatopoeia. The fact that a word begins with *sl-* does not guarantee that it has anything to do with smoothness or wetness (consider *slave*, *slit*, *slow*), and

conversely there are many words that relate to smoothness and wetness but do not begin with *sl-*.

The idea that some words have meanings that are ‘natural’ or predictable in this way is really a leftover from childhood. Young children who have been exposed to only one language are often perplexed when they encounter a foreign language for the first time. ‘Aren’t *cat* and *dog* obviously the right words for those animals?’ , an English-speaking child may think; ‘ Why, then, do French people insist on calling them *chat* and *chien*?’ Pretty soon, of course, everyone comes to realize that, in every language including their own, the associations between most words and their meanings are purely conventional. After all, if that were not so, the vocabularies of languages could not differ as much as they do. Even in o people who know no English are unlikely to predict the meaning of *cock-a-doodledoo* or *bow-wow* any more accurately than they can predict the meaning of *cat* or *dog*. What kinds of word do have predictable meanings, then? The answer is: any words that are composed of independently identifiable parts, where the meaning of the parts is sufficient to determine the meaning of the whole word. Here is an example. Most ***readers of this book have probably*** never encountered the word *dioecious* (also spelled *diecious*), a botanical term meaning ‘having male and female flowers on separate plans’. (It contrasts with *monoecious*, meaning ‘having male and female flowers, or unisexual flowers, on the same plant’.) If you had been asked the meaning of the word *dioecious* before today, you would probably have had to look it up in the diction what this sentence means, do you now need to look up *dioeciously* in a dictionary? It is, after all, another word that you are encountering here for the first time! Yet, knowing the meaning of *dioecious*, you will agree that dictionary is unnecessary. You can confidently predict that means ‘Ginkgo trees reproduce by means of male and female flowers on separate plants’. Your confidence s based on the fact that, knowing English, you know that the suffix *-ly* has a consistent meaning, so that *Xly* means ‘in an X fashion’, for any adjective X. Perhaps up to now you had not realised that you know this; but that merely reflects the fact

that one's knowledge of one's native language is implicit, not explicit- at least until aspects of it are made explicit through schooling. *Dioeciously* is an example of a word that, although not brand new (it may even be listed in some dictionaries), could just as well be brand new so far as most readers of this book are concerned. The fact that you could nevertheless understand it (once you had learned the meaning of dioecious, that is) suggests that you should have no difficulty using and understanding many words that really are brand new words that no one has ever used before. It is easy to show that that is correct. Here are three sentences containing words that, so far as I know, had never been used by anyone before my use of them today, in the year 2000:

Vice-President Gore is likely to use deliberately un-Clintonish electioneering tactics.

It will be interesting to see how quickly President Putin de-Yeltsinises the Russian government.

The current emphasis on rehabilitative goals in judicial punishment may give rise to an *antirehabilitationist* reaction among people who place more weight on retribution and deterrence. You will have no difficulty interpreting these sentences. Un-Clintonish tactics are tactics unlike those that President Clinton would use, and a de- Yeltsinised government is one purged of the influence of Boris Yeltsin. The word antirehabilitationist may strike you as ugly or cumbersome, but its meaning is likewise clear. In fact, it is virtually inevitable that words with predictable meanings should exist, given that English vocabulary changes over time. If one examines words that first came into use in the twentieth century, one will certainly encounter some that appear from nowhere, so to speak, with meanings that are unguessable from their shape, such as jazz and gizmo.

The vast majority, however, are words whose meanings, if not predictable, are at any rate motivated in the sense that they can be reliably guessed by someone who encounters them for the first time in an appropriate context. Examples are *computer* or *quadraphonic* or *gentrification*, all of which

have meanings that are sufficiently unpredictable to require listing in any up-to-date dictionary, but none of which would have been totally opaque to an adult English-speaker encountering them when they were first used.

Semantic extension of words already available in the language is a powerful source of qualitative growth and development of the vocabulary though it does not necessarily add to its numerical growth; it is only the split of polysemy that results in the appearance of new vocabulary units thus increasing the number of words. In this connection it should be remembered that the border-line between a new meaning of the word and its lexical homonym is in many cases so vague that it is often difficult to state with any degree of certainty whether we have another meaning of the original word or its homonym — a new self-contained word, e.g. in the verb *to sit-in* — ‘to join a group in playing cards’ and a newly recorded use of *to sit-in* — ‘to remain unserved in the available seats in a cafe in protest against Jim-crowism, or ‘to demonstrate by occupying a building and staying there until their grievances are considered or until the demonstrators themselves are ejected’ — the meanings are so widely apart that they are definitely felt as homonyms.

The same may be said about the word *heel (sl.)* — ‘a traitor, double-crosser’ and *heel* — ‘the back part of a human foot’. On the other hand, the meaning of the verb *freeze* — ‘to immobilise (foreign-owned credits) by legislative measures’ and its further penetration into a more general sphere seen in *to freeze wages* and the correlated compound *wage-freeze* is definitely felt as a mere development of the semantic structure of the verb (*to freeze*). The semantic connection is felt between the meanings of such words as *hot*: 1) (*mus.*) ‘having an elaborate and stimulating jazz rhythm’ 2) (*financ.*) ‘just issued’ and 3) (*sl.*) ‘dangerous because connected with some crime’ as in the phrase *hot money*;

A great number of new meanings develop in simple words which belong to different spheres of human activity. New meanings appear mostly in everyday general vocabulary, for example a *beehive* — ‘a woman’s hair style’; *lungs (n*

pl.) — ‘breathing spaces, such as small parks that might be placed in overpopulated or traffic-congested areas’;

There is a strong tendency in words of specialised and terminological type to develop non-specialised, non-terminological meanings as, for example, the technical term *feedback* that developed a non-terminological meaning ‘a reciproca meaning ‘any defining or characteristic factor’, *scenario* — ‘any projected course or plan of action’. It is of interest to note that many new meanings in the sphere of general vocabulary are stylistically and emotively non-neutral and marked as colloquial and slang, for example *juice* (*US sl.*) — ‘position, power, influence; favourable standing’; *bread* (*sl.*) — ‘money’; *straight* (*sl.*) — ‘not deviating from the norm in politics, habits; conventional, orthodox’, etc. On the other hand scientific and technical terminological meanings appear as a result of specialisation as in, e.g., *read* (*genetic*) — ‘to decode’; *messenger* — ‘a chemical substance which carries or transmits genetic information’. New terminological meanings also appear as a result of expansion of the sphere of application, i.e. when terms of one branch of science develop new meanings and pass over to other branches, e.g. a general scientific term *system* (*n*) in cybernetics developed the meaning ‘anything consisting of at least two interrelated parts’; *logic* acquired in electronics the meaning ‘the logical operations performed by a computer by means of electronic circuitry’.

It follows from the foregoing discussion that the principal ways of enriching the vocabulary of present-day English with new words are various ways of productive word-formation and word-creation. The most active ways of word creation are clippings and acronyms⁵⁸. The semantic development of words already available in the language is the main source of the qualitative growth of the vocabulary but does not essentially change the vocabulary quantitatively. The above cited counts show that new meanings of the words already existing in the language and new homonyms account for 1/4 of the total number of new items.

Why this should be a large question, still not fully answered, involving the study of linguistic semantics, of language change, and of how knowledge about words is acquired and stored in the brain. For present purposes, what matters is to be aware that not every word can be listed in a dictionary, even in the fullest dictionary imaginable.

Conclusions

In our work, we tried to give a presentation of some aspects of such a linguistic event as neology in connection with word building means. New words and expressions or neologisms are created for new things irrespective of their scale of importance. They may be all-important and concern some social relationships, such as a new form of state, e. g. People's Republic, or something threatening the very existence of humanity, like nuclear war. Or again the thing may be quite insignificant and short-lived, like fashions in dancing, clothing, hairdo or footwear (e. g. roll-neck). In every case either the old words are appropriately changed in meaning or new words are borrowed, or more often coined out of the existing language material either according to the patterns and ways already productive in the language at a given stage of its development or creating new ones.

As a literary concept and term, neologism appeared in the 18th century and its old meaning was synonymous to «barbarism». In the modern meaning of neologism appeared early in the 19th century and, gained the acceptance towards the end of the century. Nowadays around 4000 words enter English vocabulary every year which reflects the fast development of the language and makes the phenomena interesting to analyze.

Thus, a neologism is a newly coined word or phrase or a new meaning for an existing word, or a word borrowed from another language.

The intense development of science and industry has called forth the invention and introduction of an immense number of new words and changed the meanings of old ones, e. g. aerobic, black hole, computer, isotope, feedback, penicillin, pulsar, quasar, tape-recorder, supermarket and so on.

The analysis of word building means presented in our investigation, are based on the structural principle (one or two motivating bases) in the first place. The words which have one motivating base are usually formed by derivation with the help of affixes and zero-derivation (conversion), which is the process of turning a word in a different part of speech and with a different

distribution characteristic but without adding any derivational element (*n.silence* – *v. to silence*). The second type of word building means employs two motivating bases (compounding), which is a convenient and laconic way to express some ideas, comprised in one word. Minor types of word building include shortening, acronymy, blending.

Shortening that consists in the reduction of a word to one of its parts, as a result the new form acquires some linguistic value of its own, blends that combine two words and include the letters or sounds they have in common as a connecting element. Acronymy is the process of creating new words when only initial letters are taken. These above mentioned means are frequently used in the sphere of technology and politics as well as everyday language (*girlfriend* – *g.f.*), the reason is ever-growing life rhythm, when maximum information should be transferred in a minimum time, the described types are the most suitable in this case, which also explains their high productivity. The semantic word building, which is any semantic change in the word meaning, it deals with sense development, and can be also treated as one of the sources of neologisms.

Recent investigations seem to prove that productivity of derivational means is relative in many prospects, and as a conclusion we can say that there are no absolutely productive means. Conversion is popular due to its simplicity and convenience; one doesn't have to add any affixes to create a new word.

In our work we also dealt with problems concerning the sources of new words as neologisms emerge every day and so fast that dictionaries can not keep up with. While the dictionaries wait for years for the words to be fit to be published, the World Wide Web is acting more efficiently to bring these words to life. Wordspy (creator Paul McFedries) is one of the largest sites keeping track of emerging vocabulary of the English language.

Nowadays the English language as many other languages passes through “neologistic boom”. Great amount of new words and necessity of their

interpretation led to creation of special branch of lexicology-neology-science about neologisms. This science discusses linguistic interpretation of the phenomenon of neology, and gives various definitions to the term neologism proposed by different scholars. Thus, a n e o l o g i s m is a newly coined word or phrase or a new meaning for an existing word, or a word borrowed from another language.

As we live in the period of globalization a lot of objects are created and lots of new words are created to name them. There is no doubt that the English language today is the most widely used language for international communication. Words and expressions are born, live for a short time and then die or find their place in our vocabulary according to the temporary or permanent nature of the phenomena they describe. In this research we tried to reveal the most productive spheres of human activity. Accordingly there are 4 leading spheres where business and language appear more or less stable:

- a) men and women links,
- b) computer technologies,
- c) culture and
- d) science.

Productivity of word formation means change from time to time. The theoretical findings of the research allow putting forth the following hypothesis: the high productivity of conversion finds its reflection in speech where numerous occasional cases of conversion can be found, which are not registered in dictionaries and which occur momentarily, through the immediate need of situation. Conversion is universally accepted as one of the major ways of enriching English vocabulary with new words. Recent investigations seem to prove however that productivity of derivational means is relative in many respects. Moreover there are no absolutely productive means, derivational patterns and derivational affixes have different degrees of productivity. Each part of speech is characterized by a set of productive derivational patterns, peculiar to it.

The development of new meanings in existing words proves another fruitful source of new vocabulary. Semantic extension presents the qualitative aspect of vocabulary growth. Traditionally there have been distinguished such semantic processes as metaphor, metonymy, extension or generalization of meaning, specialization or narrowing of meaning; pejoration and melioration.

The newly borrowed word develops the characteristics of a certain part of speech in the recipient language. In the practice of translational work the appreciable place is taken by a problem of translation of neologisms. Therefore if in the text there is a neologism which is absent in the dictionary, the translator is obliged to define independently its meaning, considering word-formation elements of the given word and leaning against a context. While translating neologisms-loans the basic means of disclosing a word meaning is the context and of course, the dictionary of that language from which the loan word is borrowed.

The List of Used Literature

1. Каримов И. А. Баркамол авлод орзуси. Тошкент: "Шарқ", 1999 й
2. Каримов И. А. Юксак маънавият - енгилмас куч. Тошкент: "Шарқ", 2008. й
3. Каримов И.А.Амалга ошираётган ислохотларимизни янада чуқурлаштириш ва фуқаролик жамияти куриш –ёруғ келажакимизнинг асосий омилидир. Т., “Ўзбекистон” , 2013.
4. Каримов И. А. Маънавий юксалиш йўлида. Тошкент: "Шарқ", 2002.й
5. Каримов И.А. “Ўзбекистон мустақилликка эришиш остонасида” Т. Ўзбекистон. 2011 йил.
6. “Чет тилларни ўқитиш тизимини янада такомиллаштириш чоралари тўғрисида”. Ўзбекистон Республикаси президентининг қарори. 2012 й. 10 декабрь. “Халқ сўзи” газетаси. 2012 й. 11 декабрь.
7. Ўзбекистон Республикасининг “Таълим тўғрисида”ги қонуни
8. “Кадрлар тайёрлаш Миллий дастури”
9. Арбекова Т.И. Лексикология английского языка. -М.: «Высшая школа», 1977.-121с.
10. Арбекова Т.И. Лексикология английского языка. Учеб. пособие для II-III курсов ин-тов и фак.иностр.яз.-М.: Высш.шк., 2007. -240с.
11. Арнольд И.В. Лексикология современного английского языка.- М.,1986.
12. Арнольд И.В. Семантическая структура слова и методика ее исследования. - М.: Просвещение, 2006.- 169с.
13. Ворно Е.Ф., Кашеева М.А., Малишевская Е.В., Потапова И.А. Лексикология английского языка. Пособие для учителей: Л.: Просвещение, 1955.-170с.
14. Дубенец Э. М. Лексикология английского языка – КАРО, 2004.-192 с.
15. Елисеева В. В. Лексикология английского языка - СПб: Изд-во СПбГУ, 2003.- 144 с.

16. Заботкина В. И. Новая лексика современного английского языка. – М. : Высшая школа, – 1989. – 126 с.
17. Заботкина В.И. Новая лексика современного английского языка. М.: «Высшая школа». 1989.-124с.
18. Иванова Г. А. Неонимы в метаязыке лингвистики: лексикографические исследования, 2001. - 216 с.
19. Лаврова Н. А. О некоторых особенностях авторских неологизмов (окказионализмах)// Актуальные проблемы гуманитарных и естественных наук. 2010.
20. Матюшенков В.С. Dictionary of slang in North America, Great Britain and Inc. New York., 1973.-230 с.
21. Потебня А. Полное собрание трудов. Мысль и язык.- Москва, 1999.- 300с.
22. Adams V. An introduction to Modern English Word formation Longman Inc. New York., 1973.-230 с.
23. Arnold I.V. The English word.-Москва, 1986. p.295
24. Australia. М.: «Флинта», «Наука», 2002.-176с.
25. Barnhart, R. (1995) Some Thoughts about Neologisms before Starting BDNE IV. Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America. №16.
26. Berrios G. E. (2009) Neologisms. History of Psychiatry №9.-P.20-23
27. Buranov J., A. Muminov. A Practical Course in English Lexicology М.: Высшая школа, 1979. – 221 p.
28. John Ayto Twentieth Century Words, oxford University Press, 1999
29. Plag I. Word-Formation in English.-Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.-p.254

Dictionaries and encyclopedia

30. Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English,
31. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English,
32. International Dictionary of Finance

33. The Dictionary of Banking and Finance
34. Macmillan Dictionary of Modern Economics
35. Barnhart C. A Dictionary of New English, 1963 — 1972.
36. Barnhart C.L., Steinmets S., Barnhart R.K. the second Barnhart Dictionary of new English. Lnd., 1980., 600p
37. Encyclopedia Britannica. See www.britannica.com
38. Green J. Bloomsbury Dictionary of New words. M.: Вече Персей, 1996

Web-sites

39. www.aetherlumina.com/gnp/listing.html
40. www.longman.com/webdictionary
41. neologia.org/html/word_birthing.
42. <http://en.wiktionary.org>
43. <http://www.urbandictionary.com/>
44. <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/dictionary.htm>
45. <http://www.randomhouse.com/features/rhwebsters/>