

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE

KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY

Department of English Philology and Philosophy of Language

Master's Qualification Paper

**THE PART OF SPEECH AND FUNCTIONAL CHANGE
OF WORDS IN MODERN ENGLISH**

KATERYNA ZOZULIA

Group MLa 55-22

Department of Germanic Philology

and Translation

Research Adviser

Assoc. Prof. T.D. Chkhetiani (Ph.D)

Kyiv 2023

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ

КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ
УНІВЕРСИТЕТ

Кафедра англійської філології і філософії мови

Кваліфікаційна робота магістра з лінгвістики

на тему:

ЧАСТИНОМОВНА ТА ФУНКЦІОНАЛЬНА
ЗМІНА СЛІВ У СУЧАСНІЙ АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ МОВІ

Допущено до захисту
«___» _____
року

студентки групи МЛа 55-22
факультету германської філології
освітньо-професійної програми
сучасні філологічні студії (англійська
мова і друга іноземна мова): лінгвістика
та перекладознавство
за спеціальністю 035 Філологія
спеціалізація 035.041 Германські
мови та літератури (переклад включно),
перша –англійська
Зозулі Катерини Сергіївни

Завідувач кафедри
Проф.Н.П.Ізотова

Науковий керівник:
Канд. філол. наук, доцент
Чхетіані Тамара Дмитрівна

(підпис)

Національна шкала _____
Кількість балів _____
Оцінка ЄКТС _____

КИЇВ – 2023

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
CHAPTER ONE. MODERN APPROACHES TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE PART OF SPEECH IN ENGLISH.....	7
1.1. The concept of part of speech in linguistic researches.....	7
1.2. Views of linguists on the typology of parts of speech in modern English.....	19
Conclusions to Chapter One.....	26
CHAPTER TWO. TRANSFORMATION OF THE PARTS OF SPEECH IN MODERN ENGLISH.....	28
2.1. Occasionalisms in modern English.....	28
2.2. Lexicalization in modern English.....	45
Conclusions to Chapter Two.....	59
GENERAL CONCLUSION.....	60
REFERENCES.....	62
PE3IOME.....	66

INTRODUCTION

The scientific relevance of the topic. The science of linguistics is an ordered system of knowledge, therefore in its description, linguists distinguish two main components: the composition of concepts, denoted by the corresponding terms with which it operates, and a logical structure, the feature of which is the establishment of clear relationships and the nature of relationships between concepts (Charleston, 2001, p. 31).

Parts of speech directly represent certain groups of vocabulary.

To interpret the concept of a part of speech in modern studies, the following parallel terms are used: lexical-grammatical classes of words, grammatical-semantic categories of words, grammatical classes of words, paradigmatic classes of words, formal classes of words, etc. (Griffiths, 2017, p. 55; Finegan, 1999, p. 101). It is worth noting that linguists interpret the concept of part of speech differently, namely depending on scientific concepts.

There is a large number of opinions regarding the definition of the part of speech. Scientists are of the opinion that the term part of speech refers to lexical-grammatical classes of words that are distinguished on the basis of the commonality of syntactic, morphological and semantic features, while by most of them the leading feature is recognized as morphological, because each part of speech can be characterized by a system of grammatical (morphological) categories, which cover all the words of a certain part of speech or the nucleus of these words.

The problem of form and meaning, semantics and grammar, their primacy and interrelation belongs to one of the central ones in linguistics, which is due to the understanding of language as a dichotomous system that has a plan of content and a plan of expression. Throughout the history of the development of linguistics, this problem has been studied by representatives of various scientific directions: formally oriented, semantically-centred, structural-semantic, logical-psychological, and functional. This created a solid basis for its further research.

Modern research on morphology is marked by the increased attention to parts of speech as multilevel units in general and to their grammatical organization. The study of grammatical categories of English parts of speech sets the task of revealing the dynamics of functional changes inherent in nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs in the English language, and describing the grammatical and structural features of these linguistic units.

The **purpose of the research is** to determine the patterns of changes in the functionality of parts of speech in modern English.

The purpose implies the need to solve the following **research tasks**:

- to consider the concept of part of speech in linguistic researches;
- to describe views of linguists on the typology of parts of speech in modern English;
- to determine transformations in the functionality of nouns in modern English;
- to characterize the verb as an object of transformations in modern English;
- to analyze transformed adjectives and adverbs in modern English.

The object of the study is a part of speech transformations in the English language.

The subject of research is the communicative-functional approach to the part of speech transformations in modern English.

The work used such **research methods** as the *analysis and synthesis* for critical processing of literature selected for the topic and a detailed consideration of each language unit; *descriptive method* – to represent the features of changes in the functionality of parts of speech in the English language with the provision of an accurate and complete description of language units; *comparative-typological method* – when comparing and determining the characteristic features of changes in the functionality of parts of speech in the English language at the lexical, grammatical and syntactic levels; *contextual analysis* – to determine the function of the transformed word in the given situation; *elements of the statistical method* –

to find out the frequency of use of the linguistic units in question; *the procedure of quantitative calculations* – to ensure the reliability of the obtained results.

The scientific novelty of the study is due to the fact that it initially systematizes basic transformations of parts of speech in English.

The practical value of the research is provided by the results obtained: the main provisions and conclusions can be used to create a complete theoretical, functional and functional-communicative grammar of the English language, in the development of special courses and seminars on morphology for students of higher educational institutions; writing course, diploma and master's theses, compiling textbooks and teaching aids in the English language.

The structure of the study corresponds to its purpose and tasks. The work consists of an introduction, two chapters with conclusions to each of them, general conclusions and references.

CHAPTER ONE. MODERN APPROACHES TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE PART OF SPEECH IN ENGLISH

1.1. The concept of part of speech in linguistic researches.

The problem of parts of speech, the identification of their number, nomenclature and criteria features, despite more than two thousand years of its existence, still does not lose its relevance. This is evidenced by a huge array of scientific literature on part-of-talk topics. No less relevant is the definition of the concept of *part of speech*.

The history of the issue indicates the existence of several basic approaches to its solution. Parts of speech are considered as:

- a) the structural elements of the sentence/statement;
- b) elements of oral/written language;
- c) lexical categories of words;
- d) grammatical classes of words;
- e) functional-semantic classes of words;
- f) lexico-grammatical classes of words;
- g) elements of “dissected type of speech” (Lyons, 1994, p.90).

A huge influence on the formation and evolution of the science of language, including the theory of parts of speech, was exerted by the logical and philosophical views of the representatives of ancients – ancient Greek, and later also ancient Roman philological science. Ancient authors did not differentiate between the concepts of parts of a sentence / statement and parts of speech.

Parts of speech under the influence of logic were considered as elements of an utterance. The term part of speech itself is a tracing paper from the ancient Greek *mere tou logou* and Latin *partes orationis*, where *partes* are “*parts*”, and *oratio* is “*speech, utterance, verbal expression or just a sentence*”.

That is, the parts of speech included everything that was divided in the structure of a phrase or statement. In this case, the latter was identified with a logical

judgment, the structural elements of which (subject and predicate), in fact, were considered as parts of speech (Macmillan, 2002, p. 162).

Speech (oral or written) included the following main elements, that is, “*parts of a verbal presentation*” according to Aristotle: *letter, syllable link, article / conjunction, name, verb, accident / deviation (case, number, question, command) and statement*. The authors of Latin grammars in their studies of the language system relied on the methods developed by ancient Greek thinkers. Works of Donatus and Priscian, *Ars Grammatica* by Aelius Donatus (4th century AD), one of the followers of the Greco-Roman grammatical tradition, was almost the main textbook of the Latin language in educational institutions in Europe until the end of the 18th century (Neisser, 1994, p. 225).

The ideas of ancient authors about parts of speech were based not only on purely logical and philosophical aspects of the analysis of linguistic material. They also included the beginnings of a semantic, formal-morphological and syntactic study of parts of speech, which later served to form, among other things, their number, nomenclature and criterial features.

The ideas expressed in ancient philology in the field of the theory of parts of speech served as the standard of scientific research practice for many centuries. They contributed to the formation and development, first of all, of European national grammatical traditions.

It was the structure of the sentence/statement that was the initial language given for the representatives of European linguistics, which underlay the construction of all further part-of-speech theories. This approach persisted not only in the Middle Ages, but it was also characteristic of most works on grammar until the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries. It is no coincidence that the primary source of “parts of speech ... is the articulation of the sentence” (Austin, 1973, p. 35).

The view of parts of speech as logical-grammatical categories was the leading one in the practice of grammatical studies until the end of the 18th – the middle of

the 19th century. The use in grammatical treatises of terms, concepts and methods of analysis typical of logic was a characteristic feature of this period.

The most common was the view of parts of speech as signs of language, reflecting logical categories. If the noun was considered as denoting an object (concrete or abstract), the verb – as denoting an action or state, then the adjective was presented as denoting a quality (or property) of an object (Collins, 2015, p. 49).

It should be noted that this approach to the definition of parts of speech is still preserved in many works on part-of-speech topics. This undoubtedly shows the influence of the Greco-Roman canon of grammatical description.

The dependence of linguistics on philosophy is so familiar and traditional that the authority of philosophy is often used to solve linguistic problems, using the philosophical conceptual apparatus. In the history of part-of-talk problems, periods were constantly changing, distinguished by their starting ideas, dictated by the corresponding philosophical and social paradigm. The philosophical component of the problem of parts of speech has not lost its significance even now, although it is considered in a different scientific context.

The opposition in part-speech theories of the concepts “a priori” and “a posteriori” became especially relevant in the era of rationalism. The certainty and self-evidence of pre-experimental knowledge is, according to rationalists, in the human intellect. From these positions, the idea of rational grammar as grammar in general, innate and independent of individual languages, is understandable.

Rational grammar and parts of speech are thus considered as a priori phenomena, from which it followed that there are no objective criteria for classifying parts of speech and cannot exist. With the a posteriori approach, the classification criteria are revealed only when its first results are achieved: the classification begins with the fact that first the links of the compared languages are determined by similarity in relation to as many features as possible, then the classes themselves are established based on the matrix of similarity coefficients.

The relationship between the empirical and the theoretical is not only the relationship of the stages of development of science, but also the relationship of the

forms of scientific knowledge, structural components and levels of scientific knowledge. Theoretical linguistics cannot be only a prescriptive discipline, which it became in its time with the light hand of modists. Descriptivists define parts of speech by their form, but never by real or imagined meanings, or by a predetermined scheme of a “*universal grammar*”.

In terms of the relationship between the empirical and the theoretical, the history of the theory of parts of speech quite naturally goes through a number of stages, the main criterion for distinguishing which is the attitude towards Aristotelian categories. The emergence and substantiation of the theory of parts of speech in ancient philosophy was the development of Aristotle's doctrine of categories on the example of the ancient Greek language. The transfer of this theory into Latin, and then its dogmatization over many, many centuries (until the end of the Middle Ages) became the second stage.

The collision of the linguistic empiricism of many, many languages and the old, in essence, philosophical theory turned out to be a very difficult third stage in the development of the theory of parts of speech. This stage is taking place before our eyes. Its essence lies in dissatisfaction with the old, traditional theory of parts of speech and, at the same time, the impossibility of opposing it with anything comparable in validity and recognition.

In the history of part-speech theory, the categories of descriptive and prescriptive, on the one hand, and empirical and theoretical, on the other, are interrelated. Thus, rationalist grammarians considered the living languages of Europe contemporary to them to be the result of the “*linguistic decline*” of the ancient, and therefore more advanced, forms, and considered themselves entitled to prescribe fictitious rules derived on logical grounds to the language (Biber, 2007, p. 357). For a significant period in the history of language learning, only philosophical tools were in its arsenal, and the language researchers themselves, starting with the scholastics, saw their task not as the study of a living language, but as the dogmatization of the philosophical laws established by ancient thinkers, and on their basis, prescribing, as it should be correct.

One of the most important aspects of part-of-talk problems is the connection between the form and content of linguistic phenomena. It was the formal and the content points of view that traditional grammar constantly mixed up.

The traditional parts of speech in many respects still serve as evidence of the universality of the content-oriented description of the language, on the other hand, they should become a tool for formal analysis in the grammatical descriptions of various languages. Raising the question of the priority of either formal or meaningful features of parts of speech is incorrect, since the form and content of linguistic units exist in dialectical unity as material and ideal.

Since its inception, the theory of parts of speech has considered the phenomenon of “parts of speech” not from a formal, but from a substantive (logical, ontological, epistemological, etc.) point of view. The imposition of formal criteria on substantive criteria has led to what is often called a mixture of classification criteria, but in fact is a mixture of the form and content of linguistic phenomena.

Part-of-speech concepts are based on the features of linguistics, which have both ontological and epistemological roots. The idealistic constructions of Plato's ontology anticipated not only the appearance itself, but also many of the contradictions inherent in the theory of parts of speech. Being according to Plato is not material, being is a set of intelligible forms, ideas (Cann, 2005, p. 45).

Plato's doctrine of ideas, the reflection of which is the surrounding world, became the root cause of such a cardinal contradiction in part-speech theory as a mixture of ontological and epistemological.

Since the time of Plato, part-of-speech theory has also been involved in the discussion of questions of epistemology. The grammars of ancient Greek written by ancient philosophers served as a prototype for describing national languages, outlining a trend towards revealing the universal properties of the human language. An analysis of the content of speech (judgments, sentences) was also carried out from the epistemological positions.

Any judgment necessarily consists of the subject of the message and the message itself. “*Logos*”, “*onoma*” and “*rheme*” in Plato and Aristotle – this is the

judgment, subject and message, and only then – the sentence, the name and the verb. Gnoseological analysis led at first to the opposition of two parts of speech – the name and the verb, and the selection and description of the rest became derivative, secondary.

Parts of speech must be considered in the broad context of their systemic relationships with everything related to the study of a person as a native speaker. An important role in the theory of parts of speech is played by the analysis of the problem of “*statemen*” and “*situation*”.

The theory of parts of speech is directly related to problems related to the general principles of conceptualization of reality and questions of ontology, the concepts of “*world*”, “*situation*” in the philosophical, logical and linguistic aspects, the forms of their manifestation in the language, the peculiarities of perception and the factor of knowledge about reality in the formation of an utterance and its connection with the situation (the world), the questions of the reference of the sentence, its components and the names and constructions derived from it, the problem of the truth of the statement and the questions of identity. With this approach, all factors of language are interpreted as means of conceptualizing the world in establishing the nomenclature, structure, and ways of connecting ontological objects. As the main language form of expression of a possible world, a proposition is considered, which is based on a name and a predicate.

The allocation of various parts of speech, their grammatical differentiation is based on ontological phenomenon. The non-identity of word classes clearly had its roots in the non-identity of the perceptually perceived world and the separation of separate wholes, their parts and attributes in it. It corresponded to observations of both different forms of matter and different types of motion, different events and situations, different sources of forces and energy, natural phenomena and man (Biber, 2007, p. 540).

The authors of the grammar of the general and rational Port-Royal define words “as articulate sounds that are used by people as signs to indicate their thoughts”. Therefore, it is difficult to comprehend the different kinds of meanings

contained in words without first comprehending what is happening in our thoughts, for words were created only for the transmission and comprehension of thoughts (Brendal, 1948, p. 95).

The authors of the grammar of the general and rational Port-Royal emphasize that “people, needing signs to indicate what is happening in their minds, must inevitably come to the most general division of words” (Brendal, 1948, p. 97). The sentence was understood by them as an expression with the help of words of a logical judgment.

As a logical-linguistic work, Port-Royal's General and Rational Grammar had a great influence on the development of European grammatical traditions. Following its authors, the compilers of national grammars considered this discipline “the natural system of logic” (Cann, 2005, p. 301), “the most elementary part of logic” and “the beginning of the analysis of the thought process” (Charleston, 1941, p. 57).

If we turn to the British and American grammatical tradition of the second half of the 19th – early 20th centuries, then here we can find examples of considering parts of speech from syntactic-grammatical positions. The American grammarist G. Brown emphasized that “parts of speech usually get their name and definition based on the use of words in sentences” (Collins, 2006, p. 58).

Famous English grammarian of the late XIX - early XX centuries John Earl emphasized that “a sentence does not consist of words, but of parts of speech, that is, words in function”. The term syntax corresponds to the term *part of speech* (Cowie, 1993, p. 304). The subject of grammar, in his opinion, is not words, but “the relations that words express in relation to each other in formed sentences, and these relations are named and classified for us in the scheme of parts of speech” (Crystal, 2002, p. 370, Crystal, 2003, p. 190, Fries, 1956, p. 201).

Parts of speech are sometimes considered as grammatical ranks of words. They are defined as general and necessary categories in the grammar of each language. Parts of speech are “grammatical categories (and not lexical or lexico-grammatical), the composition and arrangement of which in each language is special, and they are determined by a combination of morphological and syntactic

differences and possibilities, and by no means by their lexical properties” (Gurdiner, 1951, p. 308).

Parts of speech are grammatical classes of words that are formed gradually and differ in the nature and method of interpreting substances and signs of extralinguistic reality (Hartmann, 2008, p. 225).

The most common in modern linguistic literature, however, is the view of parts of speech as lexical and grammatical “categories” into which the words of a language are distributed (Hunston, 2000, p. 154).

The consideration of parts of speech as words in their relation to the sentence, that is, from the point of view of the functions they perform in the composition of the sentence, characterizes the work of most researchers on part-of-speech topics. True, with the advent of structuralism, there is an absolutization of the syntactic factor in the allocation of classes of words.

Dissatisfaction with the existing practice of considering parts of speech, the rejection of canonical, traditional schemes for their allocation, differentiation and analysis contributed to the search for new ways in considering old problems. As L. Bloomfield emphasized, despite the fact that some linguistic categories have correspondences in the material world, meaning such classes as “objects, actions, qualities, modes of action and relations”, many languages do not accept them in their systems of parts of speech.

At the same time, L. Bloomfield believes that the only possible criterion for referring words to certain parts of speech is “their functions in ... syntax. Linguistic categories ... cannot be defined in philosophical terms” (Jackendoff, 1992, p. 147). In his work “A series of postulates for the science of language”, he notes that the positions in which the linguistic form appears are its functions (Jeffries, 2006, p. 134).

Two significant points, two categories, which are key in the theory of parts of speech and which have been revised, should be highlighted. We are talking about the term “*part of speech*” itself and about the syntactic unit – the sentence/statement.

In this regard, it is enough to recall the structural paradigm of scientific knowledge, whose representatives considered traditional grammar as unscientific. The rejection of traditional linguistics was expressed, among other things, in the revision of the terminological apparatus used when considering parts of speech.

In particular, instead of the term “*part of speech*”, the structuralists introduced the term “*class of words*”. And if in traditional grammar the word and the sentence, as is known, are the central units of the language, then in structural grammar the word, being considered as a chain of morphemes in the sentence structure, as a rule, no longer has the same status. It is emphasized that words, as the smallest units of a language that have meaning, are characterized by “*internal stability and positional mobility*” (Jespersen, 1948, p. 250).

An analysis of the concept of a part of speech in the history of the European linguistic tradition indicates that, under the influence of formal logic, it is initially associated with an element of an utterance, and subsequently with a word. It is curious that already in the 20th century, taking into account the mental and discursive activity of a person, linguists are increasingly paying attention to the speech-thinking nature of parts of speech. The surrounding reality is reflected not in isolated words, but in messages, the minimum units of which are sentences (Kranich, 2010, p. 89).

The history of the evolution of the theory of parts of speech indicates that at first the attention of researchers was drawn mainly to the study of the elements of the structure of an utterance / sentence, and from the middle of the 20th to the beginning of the 21st centuries. attention is drawn to the text/discourse and their components. Going beyond the sentence has led to a reinterpretation of traditional language units, to new approaches to their consideration. If earlier the word was considered as the “*basic shortest unit of language*” (Hunston, 2000, p. 230), which is outside the field of communication, and at the same time its translation into speech meant the acquisition of the status of a part of speech, then with the advent of text theory, and then the theory of discourse, there is a theoretical rethinking of these two

non-identical concepts in grammar, which, however, does not provide a solution to the problem of the word and the problem of parts of speech.

It should be noted that the trend that emerged in the twentieth century in the theory of language (for example, in the British grammatical tradition) to abandon the concept of parts of speech in favor of the concept of a word can hardly be considered justified. After all, language exists in the form of samples of oral or written speech, which is realized in the process of communication with the help of sentences / statements, even if sometimes expressed by one language unit (word or phrase).

The departure from the traditional understanding of parts of speech as elements of the structure of a sentence/statement is characteristic of modern works on part-of-speech topics. An attempt to get away from this divisive word-part of speech dyad is made, for example, in the grammar of spoken and written English by D. Biber and co-authors. In it, the concept of part of speech in a sense “*dissolves*” in the concept of “*word class*”.

When analyzing the text, three groups of linguistic units are distinguished – spelling words (“*word forms separated by spaces in writing, and their corresponding forms in oral speech*”), grammatical words and lexemes (groups of word forms that have the same meaning and belong to the same and the same class of words). At the same time, the term word in its traditional sense refers directly to grammatical words.

The grammatical words themselves include functional and lexical words. The authors note that, in the broadest sense, words can also be divided into three classes according to their main functions and grammatical behavior: into lexical words, functional words, and insertion words (Lakoff, 1989, p. 159).

Primary is the connection of the concept of the part of speech not with the word, but with the type of speech, with the nature of the perception of reality through statements (Langacker, 1988, p. 147-148). According to this hypothesis, a person in his communication with others resorts to two types of verbalized communicative signals: firstly, filled with words, as a result of which statements turn out to be

segmented (dissected), and, secondly, not filled with words as linguistic signs, as a result of which utterances have an indivisible (non-partitioned) structure (Langacker, 1988, p. 148-149). Accordingly, the connection between the concept of a part of speech and the type of speech, and not with the concept of a word, is considered primary.

Parts of speech are elements of a dissected (segmented) type of speech, a part of dissected speech (Langacker, 1988, p. 165-166). And it's hard to disagree with that. With a certain degree of conventionality, one can notice that this is exactly how the parts of speech were interpreted by the ancient Greeks and their followers, for example, in the European grammatical tradition.

The concept of a part of speech is wider than the concept of a member of a sentence associated with the concept of a word. From the cognitive standpoint, the parts of speech “*conceptualize the structure of the perception of reality, primarily through linguistic structures of a dissected type*” (Langacker, 1988, p. 170-172).

The system of parts of speech was formed at the intersection of vocabulary, syntax and morphology, and their study in this aspect should be based on the material of various languages. The problem of parts of speech cannot be considered solved even today, since such debatable issues remain unresolved, such as:

1) the number of parts of speech. In different languages, an unequal number of parts of speech are distinguished;

2) units that are distributed between parts of speech - words, lexemes or word forms (Jackendoff, 1992, p. 110);

3) a sign of a class of words that is a part of speech - a grammatical (Hartmann, 2008, p. 95), lexico-grammatical (Crystal, 2002, p. 345) or semantic group of words (Cowie, 1993, p. 409);

4) hierarchical system of parts of speech;

5) the relation of words to a certain part of speech (ordinal numbers, pronouns, participles) (Jespersen, 1948, p. 210).

Most linguists consider the categorical meaning, morphological categories and syntactic properties of words to be the leading principles for classifying parts of

speech. The main differences in parts of speech are precisely in the conditions of their classification. It is obvious that the composition of parts of speech and their hierarchy are often determined by the criteria adopted by the researcher, in particular, differences in the choice of criteria.

The question of the application of one or more criteria in the classification of parts of speech for a long time has been and remains in modern linguistics the central problem of scientific grammar (Jeffries, 2006, p. 203).

In terms of the number of criteria, diametrically opposed views were sometimes expressed. Polar views include the recognition of a single classification criterion, on the one hand, and the need to apply a complex of different criteria, on the other (Gurdiner, 1951, p. 235).

Within the framework of classification according to one criterion (homogeneous classification) and classification according to several different criteria (heterogeneous classification), internal differences are also observed. Thus, supporters of a homogeneous classification recognize the only criterion for the distribution of words into parts of speech, or lexical, or morphological, or syntactic criterion (Grady, 1970, p. 75).

Attempts to build a classification of parts of speech according to a formal morphological feature were made back in antiquity, when four parts of speech were distinguished: a part of speech that has cases (names), a part of speech that has tenses (verbs), a part of speech that has both cases and tenses (participles), a part of speech that has neither one nor the other (particles). Since names (according to the type of declension) include not only nouns, but also adjectives and pronouns, this classification covers all significant parts of the language.

According to the formal morphological principle, all words are divided, first of all, into inflected (which have forms of inflection) and invariable (which do not have such forms). Variables, in turn, are divided into conjugated (that is, verbs) and declined. In the last group, there are words that do not have gender inflection forms (that is, nouns), and words that have gender inflection forms (adjectives) (Griffiths, 2017, p. 139).

Invariable words are also divided into two groups: words that have forms of word formation (adverbs), and words that do not have such forms (prepositions and conjunctions).

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that the problem of defining the concept of “*part of speech*” (from Chatroom) still does not lose its relevance. Its analysis testifies to the lack of theoretical unity in this area. Already in the middle of the twentieth century, with the advent of structural linguistics, there was a noticeable tendency to abandon the term “*part of speech*” in favor of the term “*class of words*” (from Chatroom), which, to some extent, testifies, among other things, to the recognition of the non-identity of the concepts “*word*” (from Chatroom) and “*part of speech*” (from Chatroom). In the considered linguistic works, parts of speech, on the one hand, are considered as classes (or categories) of words (lexical, grammatical, functional-semantic, lexico-grammatical), on the other hand, as structural components of speech.

1.2. Views of linguists on the typology of parts of speech in modern English.

The lexemes of each language are divided into classes, which are called “*parts of speech*” in accordance with their lexical meaning, morphological structure and syntactic functions. The theoretical foundations of the theory of parts of speech deal with the division of words into classes according to various approaches.

In a foreign linguistic school, the number of such approaches is large. They can be logical, psychological, psycholinguistic, morphological, communicative, etc.

The psycholinguistic approach is based on the study of deviations from generally accepted language norms (which parts of speech are not used by sick people). The structural approach studies the place of a word in a sentence. Semantic – correlation between parts of speech and extralinguistic reality (Quirk, 2000, p. 570).

The first scientific classifications of parts of speech began to appear in the 19th century, although they were all influenced by Aristotle's logical theory. In other

words, they were based on logical and grammatical principles (Charleston, 1941, p. 340).

During the first half of the 20th century, as a result of various discussions, three principles for classifying parts of speech emerged. O. Jespersen formulated them as follows (Jespersen, 1948, p. 190):

1. The grammatical meaning of the word;
2. Grammatical form;
3. The grammatical function of the word.

Despite the fact that these three principles cannot be applied equally in each case to any word in the class, they still remain basic for almost all normative grammars in the world. Each class of parts of speech consists of lexemes that have the same grammatical meaning, form, and function (Collins, 2006, p. 346).

So any lexeme that does not have inflections, like most of the given group of words, is excluded from the list. The word “beautiful” is not a morphological adjective, since it does not have endings (suffixes) inherent in other members of this class of parts of speech (we are talking about endings / suffixes of the comparative degree -er and the superlative degree -est) (Griffiths, 2017, p. 122).

For example: “*A long delayed request*” (from Chatroom)

“*Adjectival Nominal*” (from Chatroom)

“*Adverbial Adjectival*” (from Chatroom)

Such positional classes may be expressed in a single word, phrase, or sentence.

The most commonly recognized division of parts of speech into significant / independent and service / structural parts of speech. Significant parts of speech have a clear lexical meaning and perform independent syntactic functions in a sentence. In a sentence, they function as a subject, predicate, object, circumstance. They can be at the beginning or at the end of a sentence. This group includes nouns; verbs; adjectives; adverbs; pronouns; numerals; words denoting the category of the state; modal words (let).

Service parts of speech differ from significant ones in that their lexical meaning is more general. Sometimes the service parts of speech have no lexical meaning at all. They do not perform any syntactic functions in a sentence, but serve either to express various relationships between words in a sentence, or to clarify the situational meaning of a word (the article is a specific article), or to determine an independent part of speech (for example, the article is a “*marker of a noun*”, and the particle *to* is a sign of the verb). The service parts of speech include prepositions, articles; particles, unions (Hunston, 2000, p. 234).

However, the division of lexemes into significant and auxiliary in English is associated with certain difficulties. For example, verbs, which are generally regarded as a significant part of speech, in English include certain words that serve as structural elements. We are talking about auxiliary, modal verbs, linking verbs.

The division of verbs into auxiliary and independent sometimes depends on the context, since the same verb can be an independent, modal, auxiliary, linking verb. The basis for assigning a verb to a particular group is its complete or partial preservation of lexical meaning, or the absence of it, as well as the syntactic role played in the sentence (predicate or part of it).

An independent verb retains its lexical meaning in full (*have (got)*) (from Chatroom). The linking verb partially loses its lexical meaning (*have a rest, have a shower, have a good time, have meals*) (from Chatroom). The auxiliary verb is devoid of lexical meaning and performs the auxiliary role of agreement in person and number between the subject and the predicate (*have / has done smth.*) (from Chatroom). The modal verb expresses the speaker's attitude to reality, i.e. “modality” (*have/has to do smth.*) (from Chatroom).

Phrasal verbs are a characteristic feature of the English language. This is a unique example of how the lexical meaning of an independent part of speech (verb) is influenced by the auxiliary part of speech (preposition), as a result of which the unity of the verb and preposition acquires a new lexical meaning (*have one up*) (from Chatroom). However, neither the verb nor the preposition lose their basic morphological features.

So the question of dividing words into parts of speech is still debatable. Creating their classifications, domestic and foreign linguists relied on various principles (psycholinguistic, semantic, etc.)

Nevertheless, the key criteria by which a particular word is classified as part of speech are logical, morphological and syntactic. Despite the fact that the above criteria are universal in nature and can be applied to languages of various structures (synthetic, analytical), in the classes of parts of speech, subgroups of words can be distinguished (*more often, small ones*) with features that go beyond some criteria that are characteristic of most representatives. class.

In relation to the English language, we are talking, for example, about “*statives*” - word that describe the state (*alive, awake, asleep*) (from Chatroom). On the one hand, these lexemes describe the attribute of an object/subject (and should be assigned to the class of adjectives). On the other hand, they cannot perform the function of a definition, since they cannot be positionally placed before a noun, and can only perform the function of a predicate. Representatives of this subgroup do not have degrees of comparison. However, the vast majority of relative adjectives also do not have degrees of comparison.

The idea of trichotomy in the system of parts of speech was further developed half a century later in the Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English, where the authors single out the so-called inserts (insert words, inserts) as the third subgroup in the part-speech classification, whose place in the traditional division of words into parts speech was very controversial and controversial, and some lexical units *like please, good-buy, hi (greeting)* (from Chatroom) in general, in most cases, remained outside the classification.

On the basis of the sign of syntactic isolation and pragmatic meaning in the statement, inserts are divided by the authors of this grammar into 9 subclasses:

- 1) interjections;
- 2) greetings and farewells;
- 3) discourse markers;
- 4) attention signals;

- 5) response elicitors;
- 6) response forms;
- 7) hesitators;
- 8) various polite speech-act formulae;
- 9) expletives.

A characteristic sphere of the use of words-inserts is colloquial speech, therefore it seems possible for us to propose the term “discourse satellites” for them.

So, in terms of part-speech classification, words can be grouped into three main categories based on three traditionally accepted features: forms, functions and meanings.

These three features are most fully realized in significant parts of speech (**noun, adjective, verb, adverb**). The same features underlie the allocation of auxiliary parts of speech (**prepositions, conjunctions, articles, particles**), as well as discourse satellite words (**interjections, words of greeting and farewell, swear words**, and others), the main distinguishing feature of which is their ability to act as independent proposals or separately as part of another proposal: e.g.

- (1) “*Wow, that movie was amazing!*” (Radford, 2004, 150)
- (2) “*Hello, how are you?*” (Radford, 2004, 150)
- (3) “*Oh no, I can't believe I forgot my keys!*” (Radford, 2004, 150)

In each of these examples, the noun, adjective, verb, and adverb play a significant role in conveying meaning and adding depth to the sentence. The auxiliary parts of speech, such as prepositions, conjunctions, articles, and particles, help to connect and clarify the relationships between words and phrases. Finally, the discourse satellite words, like interjections and words of greeting and farewell, add emotional or social context to the sentence and can even function independently as standalone statements (Radford, 2004, 170).

The next important feature of discourse satellite words is in most cases their immutability and monomorphism: e.g. *Ah, o[^] please, hi, yes, no, thanks, etc.* (from Chatroom)

The third feature inherent in this class of words is their pragmatically determined meaning, which indicates the specificity of their meaning in comparison with significant and functional words, hence the division of inserts into various semantic groups expressing *greeting, farewell, gratitude, apology, and the like* (from Chatroom).

Thus, the three-part division of words in the system of parts of speech does not seem to contradict the traditional classification, but only clarifies the latter, leaving not a single word that really exists in the language outside the classification (Brendal, 1948, p. 302).

When considering satellite words of discourse, a number of controversial provisions arise, one of which is, in particular, their structural composition. As noted above, the core of discourse satellite words is made up of monomorphemic lexical units (see examples above), along with which, however, more complex formations are found among them, including not only individual monomorphemic words, but also polymorphemic lexical units of the type: *farewell, congratulations, etc.*, as well as offers: e.g. *good lord! good luck! No problem! good morning! Run your sorry! thank you! and many others* (Finegan, 1999, p. 435).

It should be noted here that the tendency to merge phrases and sentences into compound words is very characteristic of languages of the analytical system. Thus, the transition of substantive phrases with a noun definition into compound words, e.g. *fingertips < finger-tips < fingertips* (from Chatroom).

The process of forming compound words from phrases covers the entire system of parts of speech and is historically conditioned, finding its explanation in phonetic and lexical changes in the history of various languages. Suffice it to recall the history of such English words as *lady* (<hlaf+di 3 e), *lord* (<hlaf + weard), *window* (<wind + ea 3 e) and many others. We observe the same in a number of cases of the formation of individual words from sentences, for example, *good-bye*

developed from the sentence *God be with you; Farewell < Fare thee well!* (from Chatroom)

Along with historical examples, we can cite new cases of word formation that are taking place literally before our eyes, such as the swear word *goddammit*, which developed from the sentence *God damn it!*, (from Chatroom) which coexist in the modern stage of the English language.

The development of the vocabulary of the English language serves as confirmation of the growth and development of the class of discourse satellite words, which, undoubtedly, should take their respective place in the general classification of words by parts of speech (Cowie, 1993, p. 324).

Apparently, the process of turning phrases and sentences into single lexical units, explained to a large extent by the monosemantization of the former in the process of their functioning in speech, makes such a transition productive and easily predictable.

Thus, the words of each lexico-grammatical category (*part of speech*) (from Chatroom) have their own specific set of grammatical properties and specialized (basic) syntactic functions. Nevertheless, the system of dividing words into parts of speech, which is based on universal principles, allows for variability in interpretation depending on each particular language system, and each specific case, since in any language there will be deviations from some kind of stereotyping caused by the presence of all the criteria for the majority of representatives of one or another class of words.

The traditional classification of English words into parts of speech, which has a long history and has resisted many attempts to radically change it, is still unshakable in its basic, inherent general principles.

At the same time, the proposed changes, the main of which is the introduction of a trichotomous classification, and attempts to change the existing status of individual classes of words (interjections, pronouns, numerals, and some others) deserve attention as innovative, clarifying and developing the existing partial classification, which is the basis of morphology as a science of language.

Conclusions to Chapter One

The system of parts of speech was formed at the intersection of vocabulary, syntax and morphology, and their study in this aspect is based on the material of various languages. The problem of parts of speech cannot be considered solved even today, since such debatable issues remain unresolved, such as:

- 1) the number of parts of speech. In different languages, an unequal number of parts of speech are distinguished;
- 2) units that are distributed between parts of speech – words, lexemes or word forms;
- 3) a sign of a class of words that is a part of speech – a grammatical, lexico-grammatical or semantic group of words;
- 4) hierarchical system of parts of speech;
- 5) the relation of words to a certain part of speech (ordinal numbers, pronouns, participles).

Most linguists consider the categorical meaning, morphological categories and syntactic properties of words to be the leading principles for classifying parts of speech. The main differences in parts of speech are precisely in the conditions of their classification. It is obvious that the composition of parts of speech and their hierarchy are often determined by the criteria adopted by the researcher, in particular, differences in the choice of criteria.

The words of each lexico-grammatical category (part of speech) have their own specific set of grammatical properties and specialized (basic) syntactic functions. Nevertheless, the system of dividing words into parts of speech, which is based on universal principles, allows for variability in interpretation depending on each particular language system, and each specific case, since in any language there will be deviations from some kind of stereotyping caused by the presence of all the criteria for the majority of representatives of one or another class of words.

The traditional classification of English words into parts of speech, which has a long history and has resisted many attempts to radically change it, is still unshakable in its basic, inherent general principles.

At the same time, the proposed changes, the main of which is the introduction of a trichotomous classification, and attempts to change the existing status of individual classes of words (interjections, pronouns, numerals, and some others) deserve attention as innovative, clarifying and developing the existing partial classification, which is the basis of morphology as a science of language.

CHAPTER TWO. TRANSFORMATION OF THE PARTS OF SPEECH IN MODERN ENGLISH

2.1. Occasionalisms in modern English

Occasionalisms in modern English refer to the phenomenon where words change their part of speech or functional role based on the context or situation in which they are used. This can involve nouns becoming verbs or adjectives, and vice versa, as well as shifts in the functional usage of words within a sentence.

One example of occasionalism in modern English is the word “*email*” (from Chatroom). Originally, “*email*” (from Chatroom) was solely used as a noun to refer to electronic messages sent over the internet. However, it has now also become a verb, as people commonly say “*I will email you*” (from Chatroom) to mean that they will send a message electronically.

Another example is the word “*friend*” (from Chatroom). Originally, “*friend*” (from Chatroom) was a noun, referring to a person with whom one has a bond of mutual affection. However, with the rise of social media, “*friend*” (from Chatroom) is now also used as a verb, as people can

(4) “*Friend someone on the platform Facebook*” (from Chatroom).

Functional change can also be observed in phrases or expressions. For instance, the phrase “*to Google*” (from Chatroom) has become a common way to refer to conducting an internet search. It has transitioned from being the name of a specific search engine to a verb that represents the action of searching for information online.

Occasionalism in modern English is a reflection of the flexibility and adaptability of language. As society and technology evolve, words and phrases can change their part of speech or functional role to better serve the needs of communication.

For example, a noun can become a verb or an adjective, and vice versa. Take the word “*text*” (from Chatroom) as an example. Originally, “*text*” (from Chatroom) was solely used as a noun to refer to a written or printed piece of material.

However, in present-day English, it has also taken on the role of the verb, meaning to send a written message electronically.

Another example is the word “*google*” (from Chatroom). Originally, “*google*” (from Chatroom). was the name of a search engine, but it has now become a verb. People commonly say

(5) “*I’ll google it*” (from the chatroom).

to mean they will search for something online.

Functional change also occurs when words shift in their usage within a sentence. For instance, the word “*like*” has undergone functional change in present-day English. Apart from being a preposition, it is now commonly used as a discourse marker or filler word, similar to “*uh*”. People might say,

(6) “*I was like, What are you doing?*” (from the Chatroom).

to convey their thoughts or reactions.

In conclusion, occasionalisms in modern English show cases how words can change their part of speech and functional role based on the context in which they are used. This phenomenon reflects the dynamic nature of language and how it adapts to meet the needs of its speakers.

The vocabulary of a language is its most mobile part. Some lexical units appear only in speech and subsequently are not fixed in the vocabulary of the language. These words are occasionalisms. Occasional words are non-usual words that do not correspond to the generally accepted use, due to the specific context of use.

It is necessary to distinguish between the concepts of “neologism” and “occasionalism”. Occasional words retain their novelty and freshness regardless of the time of their creation. They are created in a certain situation and are not designed for wide distribution, while neologisms are designed for subsequent consolidation in the lexical system of the language. The most important features of occasional words are belonging to speech, functional one-time use, creativity, expressiveness, synchronous diffuseness, and individual belonging.

There are several types of occasionalisms. Phonetic occasionalisms appear as a result of sound play. Lexical occasionalisms are created using combinations of usual stems and affixes. Grammatical occasionalisms are formations in which, from the point of view of usage, lexical semantics and grammatical form are in conflict. Semantic occasionalisms appear as a result of semantic increments that transform the meaning of the original usual lexeme. Occasional combinations of words are a combination of lexemes, the combination of which is impossible in common speech. There are two main models for the formation of occasional words: unproductive and productive. A distinctive feature of occasional words of the first group is their structural atypicality and/or the desire to create a special stylistic effect. Such occasionalisms either partially deviate from the derivational norm, or are completely non-standard formations. Occasionalisms of the second group are usually produced on the model of words of productive types with the help of word-building means acting in the language: compounding, affixation and conversion.

The problem of the functioning of language units in the flow of speech is inextricably linked with the problem of the functioning of the language as a dynamic system in which various changes are constantly taking place. Thus, the changes fixed in the semantics of individual language units reflect the features of their functioning in speech and the foundations of the development trend of the systems of each of the languages. The source of changes in the language and its creative potential is nature and its relationship with a person, the essence of which is determined in the process of activity, and covers phenomena of various origins, ranging from material and practical operations external to a person and ending with internal intellectual actions. A person is able to carry out his activity only with the help of language and thinking. As a result, conceptual and linguistic pictures of the world are formed to him, which change reflecting the real world, and are also characterized by sufficient variability, like the objects and phenomena surrounding them.

First of all, it is important to clarify the issues related to the definition of the concept of “occasionalism”. The very word “occasionalism” is translated from Latin as “accidental”.

The lack of unanimity in the definition of the term is explained by objective difficulties in distinguishing unusual and usual new words. Despite certain common features of neologisms and occasionalisms, the difference in the purpose of their creation, different reasons and conditions of their appearance, and different functional direction do not allow them to be considered as identical concepts.

Thus, occasionalisms are a complex multi-level formation associated with the interaction of language and speech, an important means of creating a style in the language system. The translation of such an entity requires the translator to make an independent and original translation decision.

After analyzing occasionalisms and giving them comparative characteristics, some domestic linguists single out the main features of occasionalisms, namely:

- 1) belonging to the language.
- 2) productivity.
- 3) individual affiliation.
- 4) close connection with the context.
- 5) uniqueness.
- 6) expressiveness.

So, the formation of an occasional word is the creation of a lexical unit, previously unknown to the collective, which is distinguished by its originality, unusualness. Being purely improvisational-but-linguistic formations, such words go beyond the boundaries of the usual text. This determines such an important feature of occasionalisms as expressiveness. This feature is related to the expression of the speaker's feelings (*annoyance, reproach, anger, indignation*) and is the interlocutor's reaction in response to something expressed earlier in the original speech.

It is also worth noting that authorship is a characteristic feature of occasionalism. Under the pen of a skilled writer, an occasional word is a means for creating an original word image. A writer is a designer of words. Using occasionalism, the author of a work of art expresses his attitude to the subject of the description and exerts the necessary influence on the reader, directs his perception in the right direction. Widely used words can leave only a superficial trace in the

reader's mind. So that they do not slip past the reader's consciousness, it is necessary either to update the conceptual content of a familiar word or to create a new, unfamiliar one.

It should be noted that the use of occasionalisms in the text of an artistic work has a certain aesthetic value, since the specificity of the reflection of reality with the help of art is manifested in the fact that artistic thinking not only reflects objective reality, but at the same time creates its own reality, being an original interpretation of the existing picture of the world.

In the modern theory of occasionalism, certain types of occasionalisms are distinguished.

1. Phonetic occasionalisms are neoplasms that appear when the author puts forward some sound complex as a new word or phrase, calculating that such a complex will be able to convey certain semantics determined by the phonetic meanings of sounds.

2. Lexical occasionalisms are lexemes that are created by a combination of various usual bases and affixes in accordance with the word-forming norm or in some disagreement with it.

3. Grammatical occasionalisms are words based on the conflict of semantic content and grammatical form from the point of view of usage.

4. Semantic occasionalism – lexemes that acquire new shades of meaning from the context. It is worth noting that it is quite difficult to define this type of occasionalism in an artistic text, since the meaning of a word is conditioned by a semantic increase.

The problem of dynamism and the creative aspect of language is inseparable from the phenomenon of variability, that is, the unity of the constant and the variable. Along with the traditional static description of the language system, procedural-dynamic linguistic models have been successfully developed recently (Кубрякова, 1980, p. 81). Therefore, the inventory of language units, their structural organization can be considered in conjunction with the rules and procedures for their formation. Synchronic phenomena can be analyzed both in statics and in dynamics, i.e. in the

course of their development, which affects the need to describe the process and models of similar transformation.

Dynamics and statics in the language act in dialectical interaction, and in the dynamic aspect, problems arise of the introduction of some units of the language from others as a result of transformations, transformations, modifications of the linguistic sign. The formation of a dynamic representation of the synchronic language system has its own history, which is consistently described by E. S. Kubryakova (Кубрякова, 1980, p. 90). The new stage in the formation of procedural-dynamic ideas about the language of E. S. Kubryakova (Кубрякова, 1980, p. 95) rightly connects with the ideas of I. L. Bodun de Courtin, who can be recognized as the founder of the ideas of dynamic synchronization (Бодуэн, 1963, p. 250). Moreover, E. S. Kubryakova, developing this approach, proposes to distinguish between diachronic and synchronic reconstruction: the first serves to describe the linguistic past, the second describes its present, being a kind of methodological technique for restoring derivational transformations and processes in any individual state of the language.

We also note the main hypostases of the dynamic basis of the W. von Humboldt language system: external, that is, the constant process of the formation of new words and word forms; internal, i.e. word-building potential (Гумбольдт, 1984, p. 235). From this approach follows the statement generally recognized for Russian linguistics: *“Distinguishing between speech as material and language as the subject of linguistics contained in it is extremely important for a clear and deep understanding of the fundamental difference between language and superstructures. [Телія, 1996, p. 50] Language is inevitably studied in speech [Телія, 1996, p. 50]”*. Every speech work contains units of language that, in their given specific cumulative application, oppose a more or less complex thought, or a chain of thoughts (only in special rare cases, only emotion), which as a whole is “not is part of the language, but belongs to a certain sphere of human activity served by the language” (Телія, 1996, p. 56). Thus, the reproducibility of ready-made units of the language in speech is beyond doubt.

However, there is no doubt about another fact, when “older reopie encode new semantic associations differently than younger ones”. It is quite clear that the associative relations that arise in the new generation in the course of deriving a new meaning are based on the data that they have to match the incomprehensible concept of a certain representation to the context of its use and long-term memory. The closeness between the concept and its existing representations should be considered the basis for such transformations. The loss of a tangible nomination, in our opinion, is the driving force behind renaming, and their basis is the associative nature of human thinking.

Of course, this problem affects all aspects of the structure, language units, including the changes taking place in their semantics. It has been established that the inner side of the word is characterized by a high degree of variability and variability, depending on the tasks and goals of the communicative act and the contextual environment. At the same time, based on the features of the nominative function of a linguistic sign, it follows that the semantics of a linguistic unit cannot be devoid of a certain constancy. Thus, the core of the semantics of a lexical unit is a constant component, and the periphery is a variable one.

The process of formation of new meanings of a polysemantic word thus illustrates the development of peripheral areas of its semantics. While the features of associative thinking of a person make it possible to transfer the features of one subject to another in the process of nominations. An illustration of this phenomenon can serve as the English word *a morsel* with the objective meaning “*piece*”. However, in a certain context, which is an example of a colloquial everyday style, it takes on a completely different meaning - slightly:

(7) “*It's only because he's a morsel down today*”. (A. J. Cronin).

Some associative relationship between the concepts of very, “*and*” a “*large number*” make it possible to talk about the development of the variable zone of the semantics of the original lexical unit, which leads to its functional reorientation and the emergence of a homonym. Of course, this neoplasm is not included in the active part of the lexicon of native English speakers, but becomes clear to him due to the

existence of an indirect connection between the constant meaning of the original word and the contextual meaning of the neof ormation that appeared as a result of metaphorization. The contextual (*speech*) meaning of a word is usually considered as an actualization of its linguistic meaning in the text, i.e., a concretization of the lexical meaning.

In the semantic structure of an utterance, different language units are able to occupy different positions in predicative chains, have a distinctive valency, be characterized by different informative load, degree of autonomy, and obligation. All these differences are closely related to the peculiarities of the functioning of language units in the process of utterance and their semantics about specific speech acts. Thus, we have the right to speak of a special type of semantic derivation. In this case, the form already existing in the language is taken as the basis, and the process of derivation passes through the lexical objectification of the linguistic unit in the onomasiological context. In other words, we are talking about a consistent reflection of the transfer of a function in extralinguistic reality.

The ongoing changes appear to be a functional rethinking of the language unit, arising on the basis of a *functional shift* (the term of A. N. Morokhovsky). Following A. N. Morokhovsky, by functional we mean the use of a speech unit in a function that was not previously characteristic of it (Мороховский, 1980, p. 125). This usually leads to a change in the paradigm of this unit and its consolidation in a new function, and the language unit can be used in parallel in the new and old meanings. It should also be taken into account that the functional rethinking of units allows it to adapt semantically to its environment as a result of interweaving with its semes and creating original contextual chains. The sign, entering new contexts, expands its connections, acquires new extensions and, thus, takes part in the creation of new structures. The lexical meaning sometimes even conflicts with the grammatical meaning of the model, for example, *Thoughts father ideas*. Such cases in speech are explained by the communicative attitude of the speaker, his speech characteristics and the norm of a particular language. Moreover, in each particular language, such changes will have their own characteristics, since “they are carried out on the basis

of structural differences in the language, which develop historically and which establish certain rules for its functioning” (Левицкий, 1997, p. 57).

Such changes, although not always characterized by significant formal indicators, have different semantic and lexical-grammatical indicators: Cf. *respective :: respectively, definite :: definitely, particular :: particularly, close :: closely, deep :: deeply*, etc. Units like *fast (adj.)* and *fast (adv.)*, *daily (adj.)* and *daily (adv.)*. In them, grammatical homonymy is most concentrated, fixing different indicators in units that have a similar material shell *alone (adj.)* and *alone (adv.)*, *far (adj.)* and *far (adv.)* (from Chatroom).

The syntactic position of a linguistic unit signals its morphological relatedness. In addition, the syntagmatic connection allows you to remove the ambiguity of a linguistic unit. However, only a functional approach contributes to the recognition of homonymous units in situations like

(8) *He was quite alone* and

(9) *He belonged to her alone* (from Chatroom).

G. M. Hoenigswald (Хенигсвальд, 1996, p. 5) believes that homonymy is a random, unstructured polysemy (*swallow* “ластівка” and *swallow* “ковток” which are semantically unrelated to each other in the sense that the contexts of their use do not significantly intersect and do not form any similar matrix.) A word is able to actualize its inherent potentialities only under certain contextual indicators.

As a result of such a view of the problem, “classical” homonyms can be defined as words that coincide in form and differ in meaning and do not have a common etimon. They can belong both to the same part of speech differing in this case, by its functional-semiotic, functional-cognitive and functional-syntactic data.

Only in the course of implementation, language units are able to reveal the potential for updating new characteristics, which actually contributes to the diamism of the language system, on the one hand, and the blurring of its boundaries, as well as the classes located in it, on the other. Thus, specific lexemes with greater or lesser completeness combine the features necessary for a certain part of speech. So, with respect to any part of speech, it can be concluded that there are more typical

(prototypical) units in it. Such units most fully cover the referential zone of a given part of speech, while less typical ones designate only “certain” objects, actions, signs, signs of signs, etc. In addition, in any part of speech, deep processes of the gradual withering away of the old quality and the accumulation of a new one take place, which makes it possible for a word to move from one part of speech to another.

Transitional (or syncretic) words are words that combine in their grammatical structure (in the general grammatical meaning, morphological and syntactic properties) to one degree or another the features of two or more parts of speech. The possibility of this phenomenon is rooted in the field structure of parts of speech, where these atypical cases are located on the periphery. If we use a diachronic approach to the results of the interaction of parts of speech, then in English the numeral, pronoun, impersonal forms of the verb, words of the state category that arose as a result of contacts of units belonging to different categories should be recognized as syncretic.

However, the most numerous cases of occurrence of syncretic lexemes arise as a result of their movement separately, and not as a whole group. They have varying degrees of presence of features of a particular part of speech, becoming functional homonyms within a certain syntagmatic context. Functional homonyms, from our point of view, fix a significant rethinking of a language unit, its acquisition of a new syntactic function, valence characteristics, fixation of a previously uncharacteristic categorical meaning.

L. D. Chesnokova distinguishes between primary and secondary syntactic functions of parts of speech (Чеснокова, 1988, p. 17). Primary functions are distinguished by the coincidence of the categorial and syntactic meanings of the language unit, while secondary functions differ by their non-coincidence. Therefore, only secondary functions can acquire uncharacteristic features, since the primary syntactic functions of parts of speech are always non-transformational.

Considering the essential features of the system and the main trends in the development of modern English, the functional parts of speech (*pin (n)*, *deep (adj, adv)*), and within the service parts of speech, as well as between significant parts of

speech and service, modal words and interjections (*over* (*adv, prep*), *rabbit* (*n, interj*), *in* (*n, prep, adj*), *can* (*n, mod v*)) (from Chatroom). Such a variety of forms of functional homonymy reflects the reality of the living process of language enrichment and changes in its structure. Synchronous functional homonyms are syncretic in nature. In this regard, there is no doubt the assertion of V. G. Gak that polyfunctionality and syncretism are based on the asymmetry of the linguistic sign (Гак, 1984, p. 43), i.e., the formally meaningful asymmetry of the language and categories generated by it.

Without rejecting the original theories of mutual transition of parts of speech (Вихованець, 1988, p.180) note that in this issue we enter from a slightly different position. The fact that the analysis in the above studies is carried out at a formal linguistic level, which ignores a person as a producer of an utterance, that is, an active, acting linguistic personality, seems very obvious. First of all, we are talking about the emergence of a new language unit; homonymous original, with the complete identity of their material form. It is more legitimate, in our opinion, to raise the question of the implementation of the language unit of its potential characteristics that have not been shown before. Such actualization is the result of a functional reorientation of the units in certain atypical contexts, when their functionality is manifested. Most clearly, in our opinion, this process can be traced on the example of multi-level linguistic units to meet the functional needs of the utterance.

In addition, it is very difficult to recognize that the basis of such a transformation is syntax, and only then morphological indicators are subject to change (cf. three stages of the transition of parts of speech - 1) syntactic; 2) morphological; 3) semantic (Вихованець, 1988, p. 250). The main thing, in our opinion, in this situation is still information, which should be conveyed to the recipient of the statement, a certain linguo-cognitive structure that is verbalized as adequately as possible, corresponding to the understanding of the transmitted knowledge on the part of its producer. On the other hand, in modern English, language units are characterized by significant positional mobility, which contributes to their semantic-syntactic variation in the framework of the realization

of their potentials (*and, as already noted, they are great*). Undoubtedly, the producer of an utterance, who has sufficient linguistic and speech competence, actualizes these potentialities much richer than a subject with low cognitive indicators who is less educated or has less ability for figurativeness, metaphorical thinking.

As for the adaptation of a new language unit to the required syntactic and morphological parameters for a given position in the context, they either completely acquire the syntagmatic and paradigmatic indicators of the part of speech usually used in this position, or only some of them. Note that due to the relative poverty of inflection forms, the second case in modern English is relatively rare.

The so-called stages of interaction of parts of speech by B. E. Zernov (Зернов, 1986, p. 90) can rather be presented as a possible adaptation of a language unit to perform an atypical syntactic function and contribute to the emergence of new morphological indicators.

However, all new formations are still characterized by a non-wave association with all indicators of the traditional part of speech in this function. The presence of a complex of differential features in each entity of such a plan completely excludes such a possibility. In addition, in the internal lexicon, each language unit has its own part-of-speech parameters, which, one way or another, are present in the minds of native speakers, preventing the indicators from becoming the main ones again. Thus, some occasional nature of reoriented units is quite common. If we take into account the field structure of parts of speech, then they are located on the periphery of parts of speech that are not typical for them.

That is why the integration of parts of speech by B. E. Zernov (Зернов, 1986, p. 95) does not seem to be fully consistent with linguistic reality. For example

(10) *“The music wa-wa-was out, fifties-style, in a movie-title sequence thatt ends on a big, geitzy juke box” [..] (D. Potter);*

(11) *Hopper sighs, seriously bored, looks around with enormous discontent, and then side-of-mouth to Vertu – Bum tit-tit Bum tit-tit” (Ibid.);*

(12) *Faintly at first, or even mockingly, and familiar boo-wah-ba fifties pop-chorus begins (Ibid.).*

Therefore, to the question asked by M. F. Lukin “Transition of parts of speech or their substitution?” (Лукін, 1982, 78) we answer: “Substitution”. Verbalization of the statement is rather determined by the facts of the syntactic use of speech, rather than language. Thus, this is not a transition, but a qualitative lexical and grammatical phenomenon that can be qualified as substitution, i.e. the formation by certain parts of speech of their potential forms and relatively regular use as substitutes for potential word forms of other parts of speech. In the act of communication, we are not dealing with a word - lexeme in the full scope of its meanings, but only with its individual word forms, which, when substituting, become original. In the meaning and function of other parts of speech, only secondary forms of original units. As a result of such substitution, a secondary (derived) meaning appears, which leads to functional homonymy, allowing various degrees of assimilation.

The functioning of a materially identically formed lexeme as part of various grammatical classes is often considered as a homonymy that arises on the basis of a functional exchange between linguistic categories. In addition, the ability of one linguistic unit to perform several functions demonstrates the asymmetric nature of the linguistic sign, which manifests itself in this case in a mismatch between the boundaries of a linguistic unit as a static and dynamic entity. Note that in speech the language units are represented by functional variants. In paradigmatics, there is a combination in one material shell of several options, for example, lexemes that are in relation to additional distribution to each other. A kind of neutralization takes place, i.e., the removal of formal oppositions of individual linguistic categories in paradigmatics, while potentially preserving the difference in their functions.

So, from considering the consequences of functional reorientation, one should move on to the mechanism of its action. It should be noted that the mechanism of functional reorientation is significantly different from conversion - a word-formation technique, in which the derived element retains the basis of the original, but differs from it in grammatical class. When converting to the original unit, it is as if a double is created in another grammatical class.

The main thing seems to be that the conversion is an unaffixed, unmarked transition to another syntactic role. Converted units are a special type of derivatives, since their derivation is internal. Based on the close relationship between semantics and pragmatics, a pragmatic analysis of the subsequent semantic processes that accompany conversion education is also important. Thus, during conversion, the content of the concept is enriched (new semes are added). Gradual conversion in modern linguistic studies is presented as a substance, if as a result of it a noun is formed by adjective, if an adverb is formed, we will also add pronominalization as a means of forming pronouns.

However, there is also a somewhat different opinion, which interprets substantiation as a complex lexico-grammatical phenomenon caused by a whole complex of lexical, syntactic and morphological factors. Conversion, therefore, is a separate phenomenon, characterized by different temporal parameters, different motivating bases, semantics of the unit of the final result, and semantic links between homonyms. In addition to this approach, substantiation is also analyzed as a transposition of phonemes, morphemes, words, phrases, sentences into nouns.

Substitution, i.e., the replacement of a certain occasional syntactic position, as a result of which syncretic formations arise, is evidenced by the implementation of potential characteristics, in particular, on the material of interjections, modal words, particles, prepositions (Алиева, 1996, p. 3).

Functional reorientation leads to a change in the paradigms of language units and its consolidation in a new function. The parallel use of the new formation and its prototype creates the basis for multi-functionality and syncretism of single-level units, as well as the equivalence of multi-level units. This process differs significantly from conversion - a purely word-building means of enriching the vocabulary of a language, which does not reveal the mechanism of its action. The differences between functional reorientation and functional transposition lie in the fact that the latter phenomenon is a long-term process affecting the restructuring of the deep layer of language systems. Thus, transposition seems to be a more general concept in relation to conversion; in other cases, transposition is defined not as a

lexical process of word formation, but a lexico-grammatical process of interaction of parts of speech in synchrony, therefore, the implementation of a “secondary syntactic function without rethinking its categorial-lexical semantics” is not a transposition, which, in our opinion, seems pretty narrow. Also, a narrow understanding of syntactic, or functional transposition, as a means of creating peripheral parts as part of different classes of words, the syntagmatic process of moving a word belonging to one grammatical class into the syntactic sphere of another class, in which it realizes a syntactic meaning that is not characteristic of its class, belongs to V. N. Teliya (Телия, 1996, p. 159).

The emergence of such rather narrow, on the one hand, purely derivational, and, on the other hand, exclusively syntactic approaches to the definition of transposition is associated with a rather broad understanding of functional transposition by the French scientist S. Bally.

A linguistic sign, while fully preserving its semantic meaning, can change its grammatical meaning by assuming the function of any lexical category (noun, verb, adjective, adverb) to which it does not belong. Then it is quite reasonable to ask about the reorientation of such units as *lady's-laces*, *super* (*n*, *adj.*), *teac-in*, *mickey-mouse* (*adj*, *n*), *Jack Jones* (*adj*, *adv*), *to adam and eve*, *o* (*n*) “*opium*”, *Nuts!*, *acid house* and the like.

Since the original scheme in our opinion, was later understood solely as a separation of the syntactic and lexical means of the language, in our version the main attention is paid to the relationship between the potency and implementation of language units, on the one hand, as well as a clear distinction between the phenomenon of language and speech. This approach allows us, among other things, to focus on the possibility of the existence and functioning of the established and improvisational in the language, which can arise as a result of functional reorientation. The principle on which the mechanism of the psychosystematics of speech activity is based is that thinking can be realized in the process of its own activity. The choice of the necessary linguistic unit is always carried out among a limited number of units and their forms, therefore there are options when separate

forms are compared, which in principle are difficult to imagine together. Despite the fact that the sum of the essential lexical tacks that occur in the human mind is finite and constitutes the language, their implementation in speech can be classified as infinite; finding their embodiment in speech, and only then, after a certain time, they become part of linguistic entities. It should also be emphasized that the foundations of the speech implementation of any functions of language units are laid down in their potency, i.e., in the possibility hidden in their existence in the language.

The meaning of forms in the language system is conventionally fixed and its realizations are known to most native speakers of a given language. The possible speech meaning of forms or a new combination of linguistic units has a touch of occasionality and is not always adequately decoded. The role of the language is to represent speech on the basis of the forms named in the system and the interaction of language units. The meaning of systemic forms and their combinations implies a certain range of occasional meanings or their functions in speech.

Speech activity is based on the individual (the individual ability of the speaker) and the general (given to him as a member of the collective language), which then manifests itself in speech, which consists of individual acts of communication. Here - already on other grounds - speech mechanisms (including psychophysical ones) collide with proper linguistic meanings (Кубрякова, 1986, p. 135).

In the course of the analysis of speech activity as coming from a person and serving to transmit the necessary information, it is impossible not to take into account the role of the human factor: the mechanism of speech exists in a person and is used by him in the process of speech creation based on the use of language data, his potentialities.

In general, human activity is a complex and systemically organized entity with its own functional and constructive principles, its own structure. Note that speech activity is understood by us as one of the types of activity. Conscious activity of people becomes a part of such activity. In its process, the material is transformed into the ideal, and then, with the development of speech, the ideal becomes more

and more connected with the language and equates ideal concepts as such with their “linguistic correlates” (Кубрякова, 1986, p. 149). They appear only when necessary, i.e. in speech activity, which requires objectivation of the ideal concept by linguistic means.

The ideas of native speakers about the “*picture of the world*” necessary for speech and realized in it, which often differ significantly from the objective properties of objects, phenomena and relations of the outside world and from scientific ideas about them (Бодуэн, 1963, p. 345). In all cases, we do not mean individual representations of communicants, but “typified representations” contained in the meanings of linguistic units and their combinations (Бондарко, 1996, p. 196).

The speech meaning expressed by the utterance acts as a source of information and consists of: 1) the plan of the content of the utterance, which is formed from the semantic functions of its elements in the act of predication; 2) contextual information; 3) situational information; 4) encyclopedic information (Бондарко, 1978, p. 98). This approach is consistent with the principle of singling out in the semantics of an utterance a verbally expressed component and a component arising from background knowledge and knowledge of a particular situation. The functional interpretation of living meaning emphasizes the importance of the intention factor in relation to the result achieved in the course of communication.

Note also that the word itself outside the text is not communicative. The communicative aspect of the word is manifested only when analyzing the communicative act (text) from the position of the researcher and when seeing it in speech from the position of a participant in the act of communication (Раєвська, 1979, p. 234).

The word in a communicative act acts as a nominative and communicative unit at the same time, but only individual components of the meaning of the word, which are necessary due to the communicative task, turn out to be communicatively relevant. The meaning is associated with the use and with the communicative orientation of the speech act.

The concretization of the subject relatedness of the word is manifested in the process of speech activity due to the combination of the meaning of the word and the phenomena associated with them. Therefore, the emerging word as a specific sign becomes a stimulus - not only a label of certain associations and their substitute: it itself sets in motion the chain of connections, connotations, and representations standing behind them.

The communicatively relevant components of meaning are important not in themselves, but from the point of view of how the non-verbal components of speech communication are woven into the text of a speech work.

2.2. Lexicalization in modern English

Lexicalization in modern English refers to the process by which new words or phrases become a part of the lexicon, or vocabulary, of the language. This can occur through various means, such as borrowing words from other languages, creating new words through word formation processes like affixation or compounding, or giving new meanings to existing words.

Another way lexicalization happens is through the creation of new words through word formation processes. For instance, the addition of prefixes or suffixes to existing words can create new words with different meanings. Examples include words like *“unfriend”*, *“selfie”*, or *“blogosphere”*.

Additionally, compounding is a common process in English word formation. This involves combining two or more existing words to create a new word with a distinct meaning. Examples include words like *“blackboard”*, *“sunflower”* or *“laptop”*.

Finally, existing words can undergo a process of semantic expansion, where their meanings are extended or modified to include new concepts or ideas. For instance, the word *“tweet”* originally referred to the sound a bird makes, but in the context of social media, it now refers to a message posted on Twitter.

Overall, lexicalization in modern English is an ongoing process that reflects the dynamic nature of language and the constant evolution and adaptation of vocabulary to meet the needs of its speakers.

In modern linguistics, much attention is still paid to establishing ways of lexicalization of conceptual categories corresponding to certain areas of extralinguistic reality. In line with this current topic is the study of how one of the most important categories for understanding the uniqueness of human consciousness is expressed in the system of language means - the category of creation.

Creation is considered as one of the forms of human activity, its activity in relation to the surrounding world, aimed at development and movement. In turn, activity implies a certain opposition of the subject, endowed with activity and directing it to objects or other subjects, and view metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk brought to you by core of the object to which the activity of the subject is directed. Thus, creation, like other types of activity, denotes a purposeful action, indicating a certain kind of subject-object relationship. This gives reason to believe that the main means of describing the concept of “*creation*” in the language are transitive verbs, suggesting the presence of a subject and an object of action.

In the system of subject-object relations described by transitive verbs, two main types of situations are possible.

The first type is associated with one or another impact on the object that exists regardless of the action, for the sake of achieving a wide variety of goals, excluding the creation of a new one, and is described mainly by verbs of physical influence and knowledge.

Verbs of physical impact, which include verbs of impact on an object (*hit, kick, push, bite, blow*), changes in spatial relations between objects (*put, place, direct, move*), changes in the state of an object (*increase, peel, chop, warm, scratch, gild, repair, twist, cure, fatten, shave, dress*), destruction (*destroy, kill, burn*), describe “the real interaction of the actor with the object, the specific process of spatial-subject contact and impact”, the result of which may be preservation, a

change in the state of the object, including a change in the position of the object in space, quantitative and qualitative changes, or destruction.

The verbs of cognition (*analyze, explore, investigate, study*) characterize the ideal interaction of the actor with the existing object, the abstract process of cognition, the result of which is the reproduction of the object by consciousness, obtaining information about the object, but not changing it.

The second type of situations in the system of subject-object relations is the creation, creation, real or ideal, of new, previously non-existent objects through the physical, intellectual, organizational efforts of the subject, performed in the process of his creative or reproductive activity, and is described by the verbs of creation.

The subject of creation, like any other activity, including physical impact and cognition, is a person capable of performing conscious and purposeful actions that require creative efforts and labor from him, for example: *He created a new movement in painting*. In a metaphorical sense, the creative abilities of a person can be attributed to other biological forms (animals, plants), as well as phenomena and processes of natural reality (elemental forces of nature), but in reality, they are only “the cause that caused the emergence of an object”: *The apple tree bore delicious apples this year. The rain brought relief to the drought-stricken area*. Another event that implicates the action of an animated subject can be the reason for the creation: *Her company developed a new kind of building material that withstands all kinds of weather. The computer bug generated chaos in the office*.

Creation, as well as physical impact or knowledge carried out by an active subject, involves the physical and mental efforts of the subject, however, these activities, expressed by transitive verbs, differ in the nature of their implementation and the result. Creation denotes an action as a result of which an object is re-created or arises, but does not change, is destroyed in reality or is reflected in consciousness.

Thus, the specificity of the components of the situation with subject-object relations, described by the verbs of creation, lies in the purpose of the action and the result. The purpose of creation is the causation of emergence, the emergence of the new, the result is the emergence of a material or ideal object.

Lexicalization means giving words a specific lexical semantics that was previously missing. The process of lexicalization can occur in various ways, including word form change, semantic alternation, abbreviation, reduplication, word-formation contamination, and others.

In this regard, one of the methods of morphological and syntactic word formation - the lexicalization of the plural forms of nouns such as *pains*, *colors*, *drops* - is one of the types of lexicalization, when the word form (i.e. the grammatical form of the word) acquires the features of a separate lexeme and new, independent functional-semiotic parameters.

E. S. Kubryakova expresses the possibility of lexicalization of grammar, which gives the right to state that the lexicalization of the word-formation structure, i.e. word formation products. As a result of this process, without involving additional elements (affixes and interstitial elements), without changing the morphological structure of the word (reverse word formation) in speech, individual language units are able to change their characteristics under the influence of neighboring discourse components. The driving mechanism of this process is functional reorientation. We also note that the semantic alternation of stress and alternation of sounds is driven by another mechanism. Units that have undergone abbreviation, reduplication, word-formation contamination, comparative composition, conversion, syntactic composition, and proper lexicalization of the plural of nouns are lexicalized. Based on the need for an act of communication and because of the capabilities of the linguistic-cognitive mechanism of a person, as well as taking into account their functional characteristics, full-fledged language units can be located in a certain way. Such positions are subsequently fixed in the human mind, and new language units acquire the corresponding semiotic, syntactic, morphological, and semantic characteristics. If in the case of abbreviation, comparative compounding and word-formation contamination, there is a simple summation of the meanings of the juxtaposed, i.e., jointly functioning, components of the statement, then in all other cases, functional reorientation leads to the formation of a new meaning, sometimes not directly related to the usual meaning of its components.

The lexicalization of the syntactic structure in modern English is one of the manifestations of the functional reorientation and, ultimately, the flexibility of the language structure to replenish its nominative potential. A word with a complex structure retains the features of these two methods of word formation. It acquires not only a new paradigm and distribution, but also a new semiotic status in the linguistic hierarchy.

It is known that one of the categorical features of a word, including a complex one, is its integral form and indivisibility. The indivisibility of a word, which means the impossibility of inserting any other components between its components, is recognized by some linguists as the main criterion for distinguishing between a word and a phrase. As observations on the facts of the language show, indivisibility is also inherent in a number of phrases. It is the impenetrable phrases that are functionally persuasion, filling up the intermediate zone “word-phrase”. In terms of form, the units included in this zone belong to the syntactic level, and in terms of functional semiotic parameters they belong to the lexical level. In addition, if the nomination consists of two components, then there is a semantic contamination of the components of its formal structure, which is realized as a combination of actant semes, semantic roles and propositions. This cognitive-nominative complex is impenetrable neither formally nor semantically.

At the same time, occasional formations that spontaneously arise in the context are also possible in the context. They can also undergo semantic contamination based on conceptual interaction, which also leads to their functional semiotic unification.

The process of lexicalization of syntactic structures Bortnychuk E.N., Verba L.G. (Бортнічук, 1985, p. 20) propose to subdivide into: a) lexicalization of phraseological units (no noticeable changes in their semantics are observed, formal universalization is determined by the use of phraseological units in a function that is usually not characteristic of it): *let-sleeping-dogs-lie approach*, *sink-or-swim justice*; b) lexicalization of free phrases (simultaneously with the change in their functions in the statement, shifts in semantics are also observed, which brings these

phrases closer to exocentric compound words of the usual type: *bob-in- the-slot electric fire*, *the-beer-and-raincoat forties*; c) occasional lexicalization of sentences and their fragments that can function like traditional verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbs: *Monday-morning ish (adj)*, *out-of-starter (n)*, *Don't "My dear" me (v)*, "Then he went on *stitch and-thread* through the question (C. P. Snow). A feature of occasional lexicalization of a sentence is the inclusion of two components into the composition of the nomination - the explicitly expressed semantics of the sentence and the communicative orientation arising from its structural and semantic features.

So, the lexicalization of syntactic units means the formation of lexical units, in which various ways of functional reorientation have been embodied (*brownware*, *light-hearted*, *go-between*, *simple-Simonly*, *pepper-and-salt*, *put-you-up* etc.). Among these lexical units are easily distinguishable, on the one hand, compound words formed by deformation and morphological modifications of the phrase (*left-winger*, *trigger-happy*, *many-voiced* etc.); from the other, compound words formed from the phrase in its natural form (*cat's eye*, *no-man's-land*, *blackboard* etc.).

Word-conjunctions, representing complex nominative-cognitive complexes, in the linguistics of Ukraine and Russia were described either as quotation groups (Quotation Groups), attributive word complexes (Attributive Groups of Words), widespread attributive groups (Extended Attributive Groups), configuration clusters (Configuration Clusters), Quotation Nouns (Quotation Nouns), premodification sentences, compound words-phrases (Царев, 1984, p. 7), compound nouns of syntactic, phrasal additions, compressives (Арнольд, 1985, p. 11), occasional lexicalisation of phrases, phrases like bread and butter, phrase compounds.

The cohesion of word conjugations, in our opinion, is facilitated by the fact that, due to semantic and grammatical interdependence, each previous element, i.e. the previous component, seems to "cling" to the next one, forming a kind of "chain" (*cotton > yarn > production > figure*). The device of this language unit can be modeled as follows: *Adj/N + N/Adj + N*, where the true noun occupies the extreme right position, then the noun with a less constant feature is located to the left, then as you move to the right, the permanent feature fades away, and in the functional

characteristic noun, the prototypic features of the adjective appear. So, as you move away from the nucleus located on the right, the prototypical features of the noun fade away, and the adjective, on the contrary, increase.

If these formations create a new designation, then they, therefore, serve the divisions of the nomination. Three-component structures with conjunctions and/or and various prepositions and adverbs are especially actively subjected to lexicalization (Бодуэн, 1963, p. 275): *sink-or-swim*, *to-and-fro*, *out-of-season*, *out-of-doors*, *behind the back*. Even phraseological units are able to lose their separate design, retaining figurativeness and stylistic marking, as a result of their lexicalization:

(13) “*Really, let-sleeping-dogs-lie approach*” (J. B. Priestley).

The contraction of individual components of a phrase or sentence and the transformation of the latter from units of communication into units of nomination are marked on the letter with a hyphen, quotation marks, both together, or have no special designations. The transition of a unit from one class to another is marked by its functional semiotic fusion, the ability to take shape in grammatical and derivational formants, and does not allow any wedging:

(14) *She's the movie-and-books freak* (J. Fowles);

(15) *././ we can just see a good example of a twelwe-and-sixer – though here I mean the room and not the guest* (G. Show);

(16) *It seemed so spur-of-the moment on his part* (J. Fowles).

The preservation of the communicative characteristics of lexicalized sentences is facilitated by their use with an anthropocentric lexeme - in the attributive function they are most often found with the words man, fellow, crowd, voice, gesture, etc. The implication of the speaker (“*as if speaking*”) and his communicative intention can be traced in the form of a quotation:

(17) “*She had almost the “thank-you-I'm-not-that-sort-of-girl” stiffness about it*” (R. Aldington);

(18) *Jason, had he been present, would have recognized that Derek was in a one-man-of-the-world-to-another role* (J. Symons).

We also note the general trend towards information compression and nominalization, which are characteristic of modern Germanic and Slavic languages. This trend reflects the desire of people to save lexical means. The process of functional reorientation is capable of culminating in various types of compression of phrases and sentences into compound words and collocations. The semantics of such units within the boundaries of the text is a kind of development of the clarification of the meanings given by the motivating unit at the SFU level. These innovations act as a kind of actualizers of the text due to their novelty. They are not fixed in the language and have the ability to express the attitude of the author of the statement to the objective reality realized in the language. Such units are highly emotional.

According to E. S. Kubryakova (1986, p. 150), a derivative or compound word, being formed, goes from a sign-message to a sign-name. In phrases and compound words, the asymmetry of the relation of content and plan of expression is presented in different ways. For phrases, the level of multicomponent phrases is separately distinguished and two levels are fixed for endocentric names. Exocentric phrases show a gap between the plan of expression and the plan of content due to the indirect nomination of the supporting component with the participation of the rethought attributive component. Such nominative units have the same three levels of relations between the content plane and the expression plane, as in compound words.

The use of multi-level language units in speech production to express a close meaning or to designate close entities becomes possible due to the fact that in every real language unit, this content arises on the basis of a certain propositional structure. Different foci of the implementation of the same frame behind the different structural units of the nomination depend on topicalization, empathy, intellect of the producer of the utterance, and assignment of the entire speech act.

Syntactic expansion depends on the meaning of the components of such formations and their semantic connection, which, in turn, is predetermined by the nature of the name of the denotation. At the same time, in the composite and

parasyntetic lexeme, the morphological indicators of syntactic relations are eliminated, which distinguishes them from motivating judgments and syntactic constructions, since in the syntactic whole the signs are grammatically designed in accordance with the morphological rules of the modern English language (Полюжин, 1997, p. 67). Thus, we have the right to assert that, despite the spontaneity of the process of functional reorientation of language units, their results fit into the system of the modern English language, generally corresponding to it.

E. S. Kubryakova (1980, p. 81) understands a derivative word as any secondary, i.e. due to another sign or set of signs, nomination unit with the status of a word, regardless of the structural simplicity or complexity of the latter. She interprets the “derivative word” more broadly as opposed to the “simple”, “non-derivative” (“/.../ the existence of some intermediate formations arising due to the fact that the genesis of many derivatives is associated with certain syntactic models”).

If the structure of the language allows the action of functional reorientation, which contributes to absolute grammaticalization or lexicalization, then the reoriented verbal complexes acquire all the functional and semiotic characteristics of the word as a lexical unit. Recall that the flexible system of modern English encourages such transformations. This is quite natural, since analytical derivational, i.e., functionally reoriented, structures (for example, the considered cases of verbal complexes) are welcomed in the structure of the language of a predominantly analytical form. At the same time, analytical formations function in parallel with simple lexemes as synonyms. True, the choice in favor of one or another language unit depends on the producer of the statement.

The process of nomination, as has already been proven in linguistics, begins with the formation of a two-component unit (definition + defined), which is one of the elements of a tseti complicated by a modifier. Such a two-component unit arises due to certain social-psychological prerequisites. When a new reality appears before a person in a certain situation, he opposes it to the old reality that usually appeared in this situation. Consequently, he transfers the name of the old one to the new

reality, complicating it with a modifier formed in the predicative core of the statement that reflects the given situation. A similar process is quite typical for proper names that have a transparent motivation, such as *Long Island is a land island*, as well as *столяр Ваня* (the name is a proper definition of a common noun, specifies it) and *Ваня-столяр* (a common noun defines the *name Vanya*). T. N. Moloshnaya noted a closer connection between complexes of the NN compared to the model.

The cognitive aspect of the meaning of such complexes is associated with the ability of the latter to function as a means of expressing fragments of meaning - cognitive structures. The cognitive structure is understood as a certain set of cognizable objects, which are designated by words in the language, and cognitive connections, the way of expressing which are various language means. The semantic structure of such formations reflects cognitive structures that have arisen on the basis of cognitive connections between the part and the whole, the object and its attribute, the active object and its function, connections based on quantity or quality. The complication of the cognitive structure due to the expansion of the number of cognitive connections and cognizable objects entails the complication of the semantic, and consequently, the syntactic structures of the complex. The level of predication indicates the nature of the relationship of a particular feature with the subject of description, i.e. with the subject of speech.

The pragmatic aspect of the meaning of these complexes correlates with information about the relation of the producer of the statement to the cognizable objects, to the subject of speech, their assessment, their subjective attitude to the phenomena of extralinguistic reality. The carriers of the pragmatic meaning are the modus elements in the composition of this nominative-cognitive formation, which can be either one of the definitions or the defined.

The desire to convey the maximum amount of information with minimal language means leads to the emergence of new compressive forms. Abbreviations, in particular, are included in the utterance as ready-made complexes and are perceived as unified nominative-cognitive formations that do not cause difficulties

in the process of perception. New formations function like lexical units, responding to all lexico-grammatical indicators of a full-fledged word. More details on the functional reorientation of abbreviations are discussed in section 3.4. Now let's dwell in detail on the functional features of the formations of the hybrid type “*compressive noun + noun*”. In contrast to the functional reorientation of abbreviations, units that function attributively, in addition to the actual functional reorientation, can also be compressed to the initial letter: *victory (Day) > V (Day)*. An already compressed unit functions like an uncompressed unit (*Atomic bomb > A-bomb*). Despite the fact that the original form of this nomination already functioned as a single complex, as an integral unit, the new form is much more economical for communication.

The attributive connection in terms of cohesion strength in modern English approaches the connection between the components of a compound word. In the examples above, the semantic dominant is the uncompressed element (*V-day, A-bomb, M-hour*). It is the semantic dominant that acts as a derivative for functional reorientation according to a model like *V-day > D-day, M-day, R-day, A-day*.

At the same time, the first component of complex amplifying adjectives, expressed by a noun, adjective or adverb, has the ability to raise the ghost indicated by the second component to a high degree: *brand-new, stone-cold, stone-deaf, steel-grey, pitch-black, ice-cold, dog-tired* and other occasional formations. With the loss of figurativeness and emotionality, such complex lexical units acquire an elative meaning and become synonymous with combinations: “*qualifier-intensifier + specific feature*”. These units, structurally reminiscent of phrases, fit into one phonetic beat, determine one complex significat and represent a functional-syntactic unity in the statement.

Levitskyi A.E., Panchenko I.B., Slavova L.L. (1997, p. 50), Raevska N.M. (1979, p. 201), Vyhovanets I.R (1988, p. 250). and other linguists pointed to the interlevel interaction of linguistic elements and their functional changes. The synonymy of the word and phrase is confirmed by examples from fiction and colloquial speech, as well as politically correct language, in which euphemisms for *blind, silly, short, poor, wicked, old* are respectively optically *challenged, wisdom-*

challenged, vertically-challenged, economically disadvantaged, kindness-impaired, chronologically gifted.

He also noted that it is enough for a newly created word to be repeated in speech, as it is considered reproduced, and a phrase like green grass can be repeated as many times as you like, but this will not become the property of the language, while stable phrases like railroad and phraseological types like headlong, on the contrary, they are part of the language system. On the other hand, when the structure of the phrase is clear, a compound word of the same model must have a property different from the phrase. The boundary of a compound word passes in the same place as the boundary of a member of the phrase, which includes this compound word. A morpheme is only part of a compound word when, in a particular sentence, it is grouped with another morpheme so that none of them separately can be a member of a phrase. Unlike a morpheme and a phrase, the word flexibly uses indicators of specified relativity. It acquires greater reliability than a morpheme and a phrase. So, in determining the boundaries of the word, one must proceed simultaneously from content and form. When the sound complex is deformed, the word is recognized by the content; when the concept tends to lose autonomy in the face of referents merged into one, the word is recognized.

The phrase as a nominative unit can have various forms of manifestation of nominativity. Not only can it be equivalent to a word (*scant supply = shortage, to move on foot = to walk*), but it can also represent the dismembered name of one of some objects, as PU does. It is free, i.e. the values of its components are equal to the sum of their values in isolation. In addition, when nominating a phrase, polysemy and homonymy are almost completely excluded.

Free phrases are equal in denotative meaning of phraseological units. They act as equivalents of phraseological units, differ from them along the “motivation / unmotivated” axis, and, as a rule, the connotative meaning is more pronounced in phraseological units: *very quickly = like a shot, very soon = in no time*.

At the same time, there are free phrases - nominative units that do not have equivalents-words and equivalents-PU. Each word retains its isolated meaning, but

the entire phrase as a whole names some object, phenomenon, action, etc., without single-word synonyms: “*happy end*”, “*Sense and Sensibility*” etc.

The existence of such diverse types of nomination confirms the close relationship between the communicative and cognitive functions of the language, i.e., any act of communication contains a nomination. We also emphasize that the word enters the statement through the phrase, in accordance with its current system.

Of course, in addition to formal differences between the phrase *профспілковий комітет* and the word *профком*, there is no impassable abyss: they are variants of the same semantheme. In this case, they act not only as absolute synonyms, but also as functional variants of one nomination unit. Within the framework of functional semiotics, a phrase is considered as a nominatively intended sign that has a signifier and a signified. “*A sign of this — word-combination — kind is a semantic system, parts of which are words or simpler phrases*” (Рудяков, 1992, p. 134). It is important to realize the fundamental difference between the word as an independent nominative unit and the word as a part subordinate to the purpose of being its whole - the phrase. Regardless of whether the words included in the word combinations are free or not free in their valence properties, they should be considered as parts of the system oriented towards the expression of a common meaning.

The problem of phrasal verbs stands somewhat apart in the implementation of the functional reorientation that caused lexicalization. The use of a postposition completely changes the functional and semiotic characteristics of education: *to turn up*, *to turn back*, *to break through*, *to break up*, *to go on*, *to look after* etc. Some of them undergo functional reorientation repeatedly, resulting in a fundamentally new meaning with new functional-semiotic parameters: cf. *(break in) (v) > (break in) (n)*, *(carve up) (v) > carve up (n)*, *fill in (v) > fill in (n, adj)*, *ice out (v) > ice out (n)*, *run in (v) > run in (n)*, *turn on (v) > turn on (n)*, *gross out (v) > gross out (n)*, *turn off (v) > run off (n)*, *take over (v) > take over (n)*, *wind down (v) > wind down (n)* etc. Deeper integration is also possible as a result of continued functional reorientation: *carry on (adj) : : carryon (n)*, *shake-out (n) : : shakeout (n)*. In such

pairs, the reoriented unit is characterized by a greater degree of integration in both functional and semantic aspects.

Thanks to the action of functional reorientation, the intermediate zone “word-phrase” is actively replenished, which is made up of lexicalized units that are formally and genetically related to word combinations, but have functional indicators of words: *music centre, dawn rain, nuts and bolts, face to face, a future, to mellow-out, to fast-forward, a Don Quixote, in-house, oven-to-table, spit-spot, racon, RPM, to R.S.V.P. etc.* This zone also includes structures that have arisen as a result of grammaticalization (complexes of non-finite predication), structurally consisting of two components, but functioning like full-fledged linguistic units as single cognitive-communicative blocks.

Conclusions to Chapter Two

In present-day English, there are several examples of words that have undergone a change in their part of speech and functional use. This process is known as lexicalization.

One common example is the word “*text*”, which has transitioned from being a noun referring to a written work to also being used as a verb meaning to send a text message. This change in part of speech and functional use demonstrates how language evolves to adapt to new technologies and communication methods.

Another example is the word “*google*”, which originally referred to the name of a search engine but has now become a verb meaning to search for something online. This change in part of speech and functional use highlights the influence of technology on language and the incorporation of brand names into everyday language.

Furthermore, the word “*tweet*” has undergone a similar transformation. Originally referring to the sound made by a bird, it now also serves as a verb meaning to post a message on the social media platform Twitter. This change in part of speech and functional use demonstrates the impact of social media on language and the creation of new words and meanings.

In conclusion, the part of speech and functional use of words in present-day English can change over time, often due to technological advancements and cultural shifts. Lexicalization is a natural process that reflects the evolution of language to meet the needs of its speakers.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The system of parts of speech was formed at the intersection of vocabulary, syntax and morphology, and their study in this aspect should be based on the material of various languages. The problem of parts of speech cannot be considered solved even today, since such debatable issues remain unresolved, such as:

1) the number of parts of speech. In different languages, an unequal number of parts of speech are distinguished;

2) units that are distributed between parts of speech – words, lexemes or word forms;

3) a sign of a class of words that is a part of speech – a grammatical, lexico-grammatical or semantic group of words;

4) hierarchical system of parts of speech;

5) the relation of words to a certain part of speech (ordinal numbers, pronouns, participles).

Most linguists consider the categorical meaning, morphological categories and syntactic properties of words to be the leading principles for classifying parts of speech. The main differences in parts of speech are precisely in the conditions of their classification. It is obvious that the composition of parts of speech and their hierarchy are often determined by the criteria adopted by the researcher, in particular, differences in the choice of criteria.

The words of each lexico-grammatical category (part of speech) have their own specific set of grammatical properties and specialized (basic) syntactic functions. Nevertheless, the system of dividing words into parts of speech, which is based on universal principles, allows for variability in interpretation depending on each particular language system, and each specific case, since in any language there will be deviations from some kind of stereotyping caused by the presence of all the criteria for the majority of representatives of one or another class of words.

In present-day English, there are several examples of words that have undergone a change in their part of speech and functional use. This process is known as lexicalization.

One common example is the word “*text*”, which has transitioned from being a noun referring to a written work to also being used as a verb meaning to send a text message. This change in part of speech and functional use demonstrates how language evolves to adapt to new technologies and communication methods.

Another example is the word “*google*”, which originally referred to the name of a search engine but has now obtained a verb meaning to search for something online. This change in part of speech and functional use highlights the influence of technology on language and the incorporation of brand names into everyday language.

Furthermore, the word “*tweet*” has undergone a similar transformation. Originally referring to the sound made by a bird, it now also serves as a verb meaning to post a message on the social media platform Twitter. This change in part of speech and functional use demonstrates the impact of social media on language and the creation of new words and meanings.

In conclusion, the part of speech and functional use of words in present-day English can change over time, often due to technological advancements and cultural shifts. Lexicalization is a natural process that reflects the evolution of language to meet the needs of its speakers.

The traditional classification of English words into parts of speech, which has a long history and has resisted many attempts to radically change it, is still unshakable in its basic, inherent general principles.

At the same time, the proposed changes, the main of which is the introduction of a trichotomous classification, and attempts to change the existing status of individual classes of words (interjections, pronouns, numerals, and some others) deserve attention as innovative, clarifying and developing the existing partial classification, which is the basis of morphology as a science of language.

REFERENCES

1. Алієва В. Н., Сидоренко І. Я. (1996). Еміграційна трансформація прислівників як один із способів поповнення прийменників в українській мові *Функціональна лінгвістика. Принципи організації тексту*. Сімферополь: Освіта. С. 3-5.
2. Арнольд І. В. (1985). Варіативність як фактор процесу адаптації лексичної системи. *Вісник Київського університету. Романо-німецька філологія*. К. Вип.19. З. 11-15.
3. Бодуен де Куртене І. А. (1963). Вибрані праці із загального мовознавства. К.: Вид-во "Знання". Т.1. 384 с.; Т.2. 391 с.
4. Бондарко А. С. (1996). Проблеми граматичної семантики. СПб: Вид-во СПбУ, 220 с.
5. Бондарко А. С. (1978). Граматичне значення та зміст. К.: Наука. 175 с.
6. Бортничук Є. Н., Вербя Л. Г. (1985). Прагматичні аспекти лексикалізації синтаксичної структури. *Вісник Київ. ун-ту. Романо-німецька філологія*. К. Вип. 19. С. 20 - 24.
7. Вихованець І. Р. (1988). Частини мови в семантико-граматичному аспекті. К.: Наукова думка. — 256 с.
8. Гак Д. Р. (1984). Граматика та тип словника: *Слово в граматиці та словнику*. К. :Наука. С. 42 - 50.
9. Гумбольдт В. (1984). Вибрані праці з мовознавства. -К.: Наукова думка. – 397 с.
10. Зернов Б. Є. (1986). Взаємодія мовних частин в англійській мові (статико-динамічний аспект). Вінниця : Вид-во Книга. - 126 с.
11. Кубрякова О. С. (1986). Номінативний аспект мовної діяльності. К.: Наука. 158 с.
12. Кубрякова Е. С. (1980). Семантика похідного слова. *Аспекти семантичних досліджень*. М. Вища школа. С. 81-155.

13. Левицький А. Е., Панченко І.Б., Славова Л. Л. (1997). На шляху до взаєморозуміння. Житомир : Поліграфіка. 70 с.
14. Лукін М. Ф. (1982). Перехід частин мови або субституція? *Філол. науки*. 1982. №2. С. 78.
15. Мороховський О. М. (1980). Слово та пропозиція в історії англійської мови. - К.: Вища школа. 216 с.
16. Полюжин М. М., Омельченко Л. Ф. (1997). Функціональне словоскладання та префіксальні ономазіологічні категорії в англійській мові. - Ужгород: Ужгород. ун-ту. 99 с.
17. Раєвська Н. М. (1979). Лексикологія англійської мови. – К.: Вища школа. 303 с.
18. Рудяков А. Н. (1992). Функціональна семантика. - Сімферополь: Таврія. 154 с.
19. Телія Н. (1996). Англійська фразеологія Семантичний, прагматичний та лінгвокультурологічний аспекти. Ужгород: Наукова Школа 288 с.
20. Хенігсвальд Г. М. (1996). Полісемія: погляд історика. *Зап. мовознавства*. №5. С. 3 – 6
21. Царьов П. В. (1984). Транспозиція в англійському словотворі. *Іноземні мови у школі*. №5. С. 6 - 10.
22. Чеснокова Л. Д. (1988). Первинність та вторинність синтаксичних функцій словоформ (іменник, прикметник, дієслово, прислівник). *Системно-функціональний опис словосполучення та простої речення*. Вінниця: ВДУ. С.16 – 22.
23. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. (2000) . *Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Harlow: Longman. 1779 p.
24. Austin J.L (1973). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 329 p.
25. Biber D., Johansson S., Leech G., Conrad S., Finegan E. (2007). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Pearson Education Ltd. 1175 p.

26. Brendal V. (1948.) *Les Parties du Diskours. Partes Orationes.* Copenhague : Munksgaard, 203 p.
27. Cann R., Kempson R., Marten L. (2005). *The Dynamics of Language: An introduction. Syntax and Semantics.* Amsterdam, London, New York : Elsevier Academic Press. Vol. 35. 440 p.
28. Charleston B.M.(1941). *Studies of the Syntax of the English Verb.*Bern.455p.
29. Collins Cobuild (2006). *English Grammar. Second Edition / Ed. In Chief J. Sinclair: Glasgow : Harper Collins Publishers.* 486 p.
30. Cowie A.P. (1993). *Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms.* London : Oxford University Press. 686 p.
31. Crystal D. (2002). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 472 p.
32. Crystal D. (2003). *English as a global language.* Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 212 p.
33. Finegan E. (1999). *Language: Its Structure and Use. Third Edition.* New York: Harcourt Brace College Publishers. 613 p.
34. Fries Ch. (1956). *The Structure of English.* New York: Black Forest. 304 p.
35. Grady M. (1970). *Syntax and Semantics of the English Verb Phrase.* The Hague: Mouton. 84 p.
36. *Grammatical Change in English World-Wide (2015) / Ed. Collins* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 488 p.
37. Griffiths P., Cummings C. (2017). *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics. Second Edition.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 174 p.
38. Gurdiner A. (1951). *The Theory of Speech and Language.* Oxford: OUP. 348p.
39. Hartmann R. K. (2008). *Dictionary of Lexicography.* London, NY. 193 p.
40. Hunston S., Francis G. (2000). *Pattern Grammar: A Corpus-Driven Approach to the Lexical Grammar of English.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 288 p.
41. Jackendoff R. (1992). *Languages of the mind : Essays on Mental Representations.* Oxford : The MIT Press. 205 p.

42. Jeffries L. (2006). *Discovering Language. The Structure of Modern English*. New York. 252 p.
 43. Jespersen O. (1948). *Essentials of English Grammar*. London. Routledge. 390 p.
 44. Kranich S. (2010). *The Progressive in Modern English: A Corpus-Based Study of Grammaticalization and Related Changes*. Amsterdam: 276 p.
 45. Lakoff G. (1989). *More than Cool Reason : A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago : Chicago Univ. Press. 230 p.
 46. Langacker R. W. (1988). *Autonomy, Agreement and Cognitive Grammar. Parasession on Agreement in Grammatical Theory : Papers from the 24th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society. Part Two. P. 147–180.
 47. Leech G., Hundt M., Mair C., Smith N. (2009). *Change in Contemporary English: A Grammatical Study*. Cambridge: CUP. 341 p.
 48. Lyons J. (1994). *Semantics*. New York : Cambridge University press. 893 p.
 49. *MacMillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*. (2002). London : Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. 1692 p.
 50. Neisser U. (1994). *Multiple Systems: A New Approach to Cognitive Theory. The European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*. Vol. 6. Issue 3. P. 225– 241.
- Radford A. (2004). *English Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 259 p.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Визначення закономірності зміни функціональних можливостей частин мови в сучасній англійській мові є актуальною проблемою дослідження в лінгвістиці.

Наука про мовознавство є впорядкованою системою знань, тому в її описі лінгвісти виділяють дві основні складові: склад понять, що позначається відповідними термінами, якими вона оперує, і логічну структуру, особливістю якої є встановлення чітких зв'язків та характер зв'язків між поняттями.

Частини мови безпосередньо представляють певні групи лексики.

Для тлумачення поняття частини мови в сучасних дослідженнях використовуються такі паралельні терміни: лексико-граматичні класи слів, граматико-семантичні категорії слів, граматичні класи слів, парадигматичні класи слів, формальні класи слів тощо. Варто зазначити, що поняття частини мови лінгвісти трактують по-різному, а саме залежно від наукових концепцій.

Структура дослідження відповідає його меті та завданням. Робота складається зі вступу, двох розділів з висновками до кожного з них, загальних висновків та списку літератури.

Ключові слова: частина мови, сучасна англійська мова, трансформація, , частиномовна переорієнтація слів.