

CHANGES IN THE WORD FORMATION IN OLD, MIDDLE AND EARLY MODERN ENGLISH

English teacher at the Department of
“Foreign languages” at Nordic International University

Azimova Aziza Alisher qizi

ИЗМЕНЕНИЯ СЛОВООБРАЗОВАНИЯ В СТАРОМ, СРЕДНЕМ И РАННЕМ СОВРЕМЕННОМ АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

Преподаватель английского языка кафедры
«Иностранных языков» в Международном университете Нордик

Азимова Азиза Алишер кизи

ESKI, O‘RTA VA ILK ZAMONAVIY INGLIZ TILIDA SO‘Z YASALISHIDAGI O‘ZGARISHLAR.

Azimova Aziza Alisher qizi

Nordik xalqaro universiteti "Chet tillari" kafedrası ingliz tili o'qituvchisi

Annotation: This article describes the history of Old English word formation and the changes that have occurred over time. Besides that, lexical, semantic, orthographic changes in words are also analyzed according to the theoretical approaches.

Key words: suffix, prefix, phonology, morphology, syntax, lexical unit, original root.

Аннотация: В данной статье описана история древнеанглийского словообразования и изменения, произошедшие с течением времени. Кроме того, согласно теоретическим подходам анализируются также лексические, семантические, орфографические изменения в словах.

Ключевые слова: суффикс, префикс, фонология, морфология, синтаксис, лексическая единица, первоначальный корень.

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada qadimgi inglizcha so'zlarning shakllanishi tarixi va vaqt o'tishi bilan sodir bo'lgan o'zgarishlar tasvirlangan. Bundan tashqari, so'zlardagi leksik, semantik, orfografik o'zgarishlar ham nazariy yondashuvlar asosida tahlil qilinadi.

Tayanch so‘zlar: qo‘shimcha, prefiks, fonologiya, morfologiya, sintaksis, leksik birlik, asl ildiz.

The English language has gone through several stages before it came to the present, and it has undergone many changes during these periods. After watching The Lord's Prayer's video about the changes that took place in the 3 periods of Old English, Middle English and Early English, I witnessed that in spite of the changes in most of the words in modern English, the original root of the words of that period has been preserved in most cases. If we look at the changes that have taken place in these three periods, we can

observe changes in all aspects: spelling, pronunciation, morphology, grammar, and syntax.

Spelling changes:

Old English	Middle English	Early Modern English
faeder	fadir	father
heofonum	heuenes	heaven
willa	wille	will

Besides that we can see that the some changes related with syntax in the structure of sentences. For example, the usage of adjective pronoun differs from current English: our father. In this word combination we use possessive pronoun + noun, but in Old English it is vice versa: faeder ure. Another change occurs in the use of prepositions in morphology:

Old English	Middle English	Early Modern English
on eorðan	in erthe	in earth

Contemporary English sometimes returns to the Old period English. Although the preposition “on” was merged to “in” next two periods, according to contemporary modern English “on” is used with the word “Earth”. In addition to, some words were expressed with suffixes compared with modern English:

Old English	Middle English	Early Modern English
forgyfað	foryeue	forgiue

Plural suffix “s” was also used in different version: dettouris-debtors.

Another interesting fact is that the letter “u” was pronounced as “v” in some words such as deliuer, euill, forgiue and coming to contemporary English period they changed to (deliver, evil, forgive).

It is clearly seen from these historical version that each period had its own influence on the change in the English language, and laid the foundation for its formation the words.

According to Barry’s (2008), chapters phonological, morphological, grammatical and syntactical perspectives are through theories and examples. One of the problematic situations associated with phonology is that these sounds are pronounced differently in different situations. And this leads to misunderstandings among readers, for example, the words "merry", "marry" are pronounced the same by

non-native speakers, and for them the difference is not obvious but only for native New York people can differentiate these two contrasting vowels. Phonetically identical words except only one sound are named “minimal pairs”. As an example the words “rid” and “lid” are considered minimal pairs having difference in meaning. Besides that, the words which are contrast in sounds can be found anywhere different phonemes in words. These two sounds (l and r) can be heard as the same sound among people. In my experience I also witnessed such kind phonological issues with my students and as a solution I would explain them usage of these words in detail by giving examples from native speaker’s speech. And I would emphasize commonly used sounds: (m) and (n), (s) and (z), or (t) and (d).

Barry (2008) mentioned that morphology is the study of word construction and morpheme is a meaning of each individual piece. If I consider a hypothetical situation, problem connects with bound morpheme. Morphology wants to make sentences a word with prefix for all words. For example, the word “happy” accepts prefix (un) not (in or im) in order to express negative meaning while “polite”, possible” accept (im) and “secure”, “advisable” accept (in). From linguistic knowledge, this situation can be explained as a phonological side. To illustrate, (p), (b), (m) sounds does not match with (n), therefore it is impossible to use (in) for (polite, balance, mature or possible). Actually the unit of morphology is a bit more complicated as well as interesting unit with its usage.

In Zhao’s (2011) article, I found different kind of actors who distributes to Language Proposal. Firstly, I would like to mention actors who have power in Status Planning. In most cases, the main issues in language have been debated by people with expertise. It is emphasized that last decisions are set by those people and it can be discussed whether status quo to be merged or another proposal can be suggested. (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2010).

Corpus planning involves people who are primary linguists to internal language. (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997, p.38). According to Haugen (1983),” paper exercises”, selections, codification should be done by a competent linguist. Though the authority of LPP made it obvious that unofficial scheme, intellectual enthusiastic shows how significant impact can influence on LLP outcomes.

Third type of actors can be seen among official institutions in Language-in-Education Planning. The

individuals are considered as predominant policy makers in educational institutions at different official levels, expert developers and linguists (Haugen, 1983). As Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, p. 303) stated, "Individual decision is the ultimate test for the language planner". Teachers and Local governance have more autonomy in improving policies in language education. (Butler & Lino, 2005; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). But according to Baldauf and Zhao (2008), non-mainstream types language teaching is combined into three categories: communal, promotional and commercial purposes.

The article about "Implementing Communicative Language Teaching in Uzbekistan" addresses that the importance of CLT method in the classroom. The article mainly highlights the shortcomings of teaching English in Uzbekistan. Since gaining independence, Uzbekistan has achieved many positive results in teaching English. But there are still a number of shortcomings and problems in the learning process. One of the things described in the article accurate is that English teachers are supported well. Their salary is lower and they have to find another extra job as well. Another thing is that the English classrooms are not equipped with modern technologies and students have difficulties with lack of textbooks. If I describe an inaccurate thing in this article, authors indicate varied problems and challenges in teaching English. Besides that they showed most common issues that should be taken into the consideration by the educational authority but there is no relevant solution for these issues. The bad thing is that despite the fact that the problems in the education system have been exposed for several years, the education government has taken a partial approach to it, and some problems remained unsolved.

Reference list:

1. Barry, A. K. (2008). Linguistic perspectives on language and education. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.
2. Baldauf, R. B. Jr, Li, M. L & Zhao, S. H. (2008). Language acquisition management Inside and outside the school. In B, Spolsky & F. M. Hult (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 233-250). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
3. Butler, Y. G., & Iino, M. (2005). Current language reform in English language education: The 2003 "Action Plan." *Language*

Policy, 4, 25-45.

4. Hasanova, D., & Shadieva, T. (2007). Implementing communicative language teaching in Uzbekistan.

TESOL Quarterly, 42(1), 138–143.

5. Haugen, E. (1983). The implementation of corpus planning: Theory and practice. In J. Cobarrubias and J.

A. Fishman (Eds.), *Progress in language planning* (pp. 269-290). Berlin: Mouton.

6. Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B., Jr (1997). *Language planning: From practice to theory*. Quedon:

Multilingual Matters.

7. Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B., Jr (2010). North Korea's language revision and some unforeseen

consequences. In J. A.

Fishman & O. Garcia (Eds.), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity: Vol 2: Success and failure*

continuum. Oxford:

Oxford University Press (in press).

8. Ricento, T. K., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the

ELT professional.

TESOL Quarterly, 30(3), 401-427.

9. Zhao, S. (2011). Actors in language planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second*

language teaching and learning: Volume 2 (905-923). New York: Routledge.