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**I. Introduction.**

This diploma paper is the logic continuation of course paper. The choice of a theme of this paper is caused by the small studying of this question by way of teaching it in primary school. The word-formation, as one of branches of lexicon, is a difficult and volumetric question, therefore requires the careful studying. The basic theme of this paper is the question on conversion, as the most productive way of a word-formation however the other kinds of formation of new words: prefix and suffix word-formation, also are mentioned. The special place is allocated for productivity of adjectives of a colourmarking. Having the rather large ability to formation the new words it is interesting the fact, that formed from them by any of ways of a word, it is more often nouns, formed on conversion, have a tendency to enter into the structure of various phraseologies, phraseological word combinations, that speaks about connection between phraseological and word-formation systems of the language.

The paper consists of two basic parts: theoretical and practical ones, which examine one problems, but from the different corners of sight. The theoretical part includes some subitems. At first it is necessary to tell some words about the term "word", which is the main one in the paper and should be definite. The term "word" is taken to denote the smallest independent unit of speech susceptible of being used in isolation. Also it is impossible to disregard the definition of the field of word-formation. The mention about affix (suffix and prefix) word-formation in the paper is not casual, the conversion is more productive way, in comparison with them, because the formation of new words on conversion is possible practically from any part of speech, including prepositions and proper names. Speaking about the abilities to a word-formation of colourmarking adjectives, it is necessary to note three ways, on which this process passes: The suffix, conversion word-formation and the word addition way , though the more often English language prefers a word combination. Also the formation of derivative verbs on conversion is typical for the English language.

Having analysed some courses of studying the foreign language it was interesting to find out, that the conversion is not mentioned at all there, though, being one of the most productive ways of a word-formation, could be a good way of updating the child’s active and passive vocabulary. Taking into account the opportunities, which are given by the knowledge of this way of formation the new words, it is easy to estimate a role of studying this material at school, it is natural that the beginning of presenting some items of this phenomenon to children is necessary to start from that moment, as soon as the children would have the sufficient lexical base for this purpose. It is possible to consider the third year of training as the most successful moment for the beginning of presenting the essence of this phenomenon to children. For confirmation of this hypothesis three experiments were spent: ascertaining, forming and control ones, with group of children studying the English the third year. By the purpose of all these experiments was to establish: have the children a representation about this phenomenon, can they acquire the offered information, is it possible to develop the skill of using such words in their speech .

It would be desirable to note the works of some authors, which were used in this work, such as: “English word-formation” by L. Bauer, “The categories and types of present day word-formation” by H. Marchand, “The word-formation abilities of colourmarking adjectives in modern German languages” by M. Jirmunskaya.

II. Theoretical part.

The term «word».

The term «word» should be defined. It is taken to denote the smallest independent, indivisible unit of speech, susceptible of being used in isolation. A word may have a heavy stress, thought, some never take one. To preceding the ‘infinitive’ never has a heavy stress, but it is a word as it can be separated from the verbal stem by an adverb (as in *to carefully study*). A composite may have two heavy stresses so long as it is not analyzable as a syntactic group. There is a marked tendency in English to give prefixes full stress thought they do not exist as independent words. Indivisible composites such as *arch-enemy, crypto-communist, unlucky, therefore*  are morphological units whereas combination, like *stone, wall, gold watch,*  are syntactic groups. As for the criterion of indivisibility, it is said that the article *a* is a word as IT can interpolate words between article and substantive (a nice man, a very nice man, an exceptionally gifted man). But *a* as in *aglitter*  can’t be separated fromthe verb stem with which it forms a group and therefore is not a free morpheme (word). With regard to the criterion of usability, it must not be assumed that all words can be used by themselves, in isolation. It is in the very nature of determiners like the article *the* to be used in conjunction with the word they determiners.

**Definition of the field of word-formation.**

Word-formation is that branch of the science of language which studies the patterns on which a language forms new lexical units, i.e. words. Word-formation can only treat of composites which are analyzable both formally and semantically. The study of the simple words, therefore, insofar as it is an , unmotivated sign, has no please in it. It is a lexical matter. A composite rests on a relationship between morphemes though which it is motivated. By this token, *do-er, un-do, rain-bow* are relevant to word-formation, but *do, rain, bow* are not.

## Conversion.

### *Conversion* is the change in form class of a form without any corresponding change of form. Thus the change whereby the form *napalm,* which has been used exclusively as a noun, came to be as a verb (*They decided to napalm the village*) is a case of conversion.

### The exact status of conversion within word-formation is unclear. For some scholars (Marchand/10/) conversion is a brunch of derivation, for others (Koziol /Marchand/10/) it is a separate type of word-formation, on a level with derivation and compounding. Whether this distinction has any real effect on the structure of a theory of word-formation is not clear.

### Conversion is frequently called **zero-derivation**, a term which many scholars prefer (Adams, Jespersen, Marchand/1,5,8/). Most writers who use both terms appear to use them as synonyms (although Marchand/10/ is an exception). However, as Lyons/9/ points out, the theoretical implications of the two are rather different. Cruber/2/, for example, argues that to treat ordinary derivation and zero-derivation differently in the grammar is to lose a generalization, since both involve changes of form class, but claims that they can only by treated the same way, if a zero-affix is permitted. Otherwise, he says, derivation can be treated as a rule-governed process, but zero-derivation can’t be; that is, the relation between *some napalm* and *to napalm* and other similar pairs must be, considered to be totally coincidental Lyon’s/9/ own view (as noted by Matthews) is that in cases of so-called zero-derivation, an identity operation can be said to have been carried out between the base and the new lexeme. This means that there is a process linking the two lexeme, *napalm,* lent that this process defines the form of the derived lexeme as being identical to the form of the base. This is also more or less the line taken by Matthews himself, when he speaks of a ‘formation involving zero operation’. The theoretical dubiousness of speaking of zero affixes in language leads Bauer/2/ to prefer the theoretical position enshrined in the term ‘conversion’, especially when this can be given a dynamic interpretation, and that term will be used exclusively from now (on in this book). It should, however, be noted that this is an area of dispute in the literature. For a comprehensive review of the literature on conversion and a discussion of the implication of talking in terms of zero-derivation, the reader is referred to Pannanen.

### **Productivity.**

Conversion is an extremely productive way of producing new words in English. There do not appear to be morphological restrictions on the forms can undergo conversion, so that compounds, derivatives, acronyms, blends, clipped forms and simplex words are all acceptable inputs to the conversion process. Similarly, all ford classes seem to be able to undergo conversion, and conversion seems to de able to produce words of almost any form class, particularly the open form classes (noun, verb, adjective, adverb ). This seems to suggest that rather than English having specific rules of conversion (rules allowing the conversion of common nouns into verbs or adjectives into nouns, for example) conversion is a totally free process and any lexeme can undergo conversion into any of the open form classes as the need arises. Certainly, if there are constraints on conversion they have yet to de demonstrated. The only partial restriction that it is award of is that discussed by Marchand. Marchand/10/ points out that derived nouns rarely undergo conversion, and particularly not to verb. This is usually because of blocking. To take one of Marchand’s/10/ examples, a derived noun like *arrival* will not de converted into a verb if that verb means exactly the same as *arrive,* from which *arrival* is derived. In cases where blocking is not a relevant concern, even derived nouns can undergo conversion, as is shown by the series *a sign > to sign > a signal > to signal* and *to commit > commission > to commission.*

The commonness of conversion can possibly be seen as breaking down the distinction between form classes in English and leading to a system where there are closed sets such as pronouns and a single open set of lexical that can be used as required. Such a move could be seem as part of the trend away from synthetic structure and towards analytic structure which has been fairly typical of the history of English over the last millennium. This suggestion is, of course highly speculative.

#### Conversion as a syntactic process.

Conversion is the use of a form which is regarded as being basically of one form class as though it were a member of a different form class, without any concomitant change of form. There are, however, a number of instances where changes of this type occur with such ease and so regularly that many scholars prefer to see that as matters of syntactic usage rather that as word-formation.

The most obvious cases are those where the change of form class is not a major one (such as from noun to verb or adjective to noun ) but a change from one type of noun to another or one type of verb to another. The clearest example of this type is the use of countable nouns as uncountable and vise versa. In *some tea, tea* is used as an uncountable noun, while in *two teas* it is used as a countable noun; *goat* is normally a countable noun, but if a goat is being eaten it is quite in order to ask for a *slice of goat,* where *goat* is used as an uncountable noun. In general, given a suitable context, it is possible to use almost any noun on either way: for example, when the Goons took part in a mountain-eating competition, it would have been perfectly possible to ask whether anyone wanted *some more mountain,* using *mountain* as an uncountable noun. Similarly, proper nouns can be easily used as common nouns as in *Which John do you mean?* or *The Athens in Ohio is not as interesting as the Athens in Greece.* Intransitive verbs are frequently used as transitive verbs, as in *He is running a horse in the Derby* or *The army flew the civilians to safety.* Finally, non-gradable adjectives are frequently used as gradable adjectives, as in *She looks very French or New Zealander are said to be more English.* Such processes are very near the inflectional end of word-formation.

Another case where it is not completely clear whether or not conversion is involved is with conversion to adjectives. This depends crucially on how an adjective is defined. For some scholars it appears to be the case that the use of an element in attributive position is sufficient for that element to be classified as an adjective. By this criterion *bow window, head teacher, model airplane* and *stone well* all contain adjectives formed by conversion formed by conversion. However, it has already been argued that such collocations should be seen as compounds, which makes it unnecessary to view such elements as instances of conversion. Quirk suggest that when such elements can occur not only in attributive position but also in predicative position, it is possible to speak of conversion to an adjective. On the basis of:

\*This window is bow

This teacher is head

\*This airplane is model

This wall is stone

they would thus conclude that, in the examples above, *head* and *stone* but not *bow* and *model* have become adjectives by conversion. But this introduces a distinction between two kinds of modifier which is not relevant elsewhere in the grammar and which masks a great deal of similarity. It is therefore not clear that this suggestion is of any great value. This is not meant to imply that conversion to an adjective is impossible, merely that it is least controversial that conversion is involved where the form is not used attributively. Where the form is used attributively, criteria for concluding that conversion has taken place must be spelled out with great care. Apart from those mentioned, possible criteria are the ability to be used in the comparative and superlative, the ability to be modified by and *very,* the ability to be used as a base for adverbial -*ly* or nominal -*ness* suffixation. It must be pointed out that very few adjectives fit all these criteria.

##### **Marginal cases of conversion***.*

There are cases of change in form class from a verb to a noun and from a verb to an adjective which do not involve any affixation, but which are not clearly instances of conversion. These are cases there is a shift of stress, frequently with a concomitant change in segmental form, but no change in the morphophonemic form (or in the orthography). Established examples of verb >noun shift kind are *abstract, discount, import, refill, transfer* Gimson/2/, and of verb > adjective shift: *abstract, frequent, moderate, perfect.* There is a certain amount of evidence that, at least in some varieties of English, these distinction are no longer consistently drawn, and such examples are becoming clear cases of conversion. Nevertheless, the pattern is still productive, particularly so in the nominalization of phrasal verbs: established examples are *show off, walr-over* and recent examples are *hang-up, put-down.*

There is also a kind of partial conversion where a noun ending in a voiceless fricative (but excluding / /) is turned into a verb by replacing the final consonant with the corresponding voiced fricative. The process is no longer productive. Examples are *belief / believe, sheath / sheathe, advice / advise.*

###### **Clear cases of conversion**.

The least clear cases of conversion have been considered first, but there are innumerable perfectly clear cases. For many types a variety of subclassifications is possible. Thus instances of noun > verb conversion can be classified according to whether the noun shows location (*to garage the car )* or instrument ( *to hammer a nail )* and so on, or according to formal criteria of whether the base is simplex or complex and so on. No attempt is made below to distinguish of these kinds.

The major kinds of conversion are noun > verb, verb >noun, adjective > noun and adjective >verb. Established examples of noun > verb conversion are *to badger, to bottle, to bridge, to commission, to mail, to mushroom, to skin, to vacation.* Recent examples are *to chopper, to data-dank, to leaflet, to network,* and *to trash.* Established examples of verb >noun conversion are *a* *call*, *a command, a dump, a guess, a spy* and recent examples are *a commute, a goggle,* and *an interrupt.* Established examples of adjective > verb conversion are *to better, to dirty, to empty, to faint, to open, to right* and a recent example is *to total (a car)*. Established examples of adjective >noun conversion are relatively rare and are frequently restricted in their syntactic occurrence. For example, *the poor* cannot be made plural or have any other determiner. Less restricted examples are *a daily, a regular, a roast.* This type seems to have become much more productive recently, and recent examples includes *a creative, a crazy, a double, a dyslexic, a gay, a given, a nasty*.

Prepositions, conjunctions, adverbs, interjections and even affixes can all act as bases of conversion, as in shown by *to up* (prices), *but me no buts, the hereafter, to heave-no* (a recent example) and *a maxi* (this might be a case of clipping). Moreover, most of these form classes can undergo conversion into more than one form class, so that a preposition *down*, for example, can become a verb (*he downed his beer*), a noun (*he has a down on me*) and possibly an adjective (*the down train*).

Extrocentric phrase compounds might also be classified here as instances of conversion of whole phrase. Established examples where the phrase acts as a noun are *an also-ran, a forget-me-not, a has-been* and a recent examples as *a don’t-know.* An established example where the phrase acts as an adjective is *under-the-weather.*

**Derivation by a zero-morpheme.**

**The term ‘zero-derivation’.**

Derivation without a derivative morpheme occurs in English as well as mother languages. Its characteristic is that a certain stem is used for the formation of a categorically different word without a derivative element being added. In synchronic terminology, they are syntagmas whose determinatum is not expressed in the significant (form). The significate (content) is represented in the syntagma but zero marked (i.e. it has no counterpart in form): *loan* vb ‘(make up) loan’, *look* substantive is ‘(act, instance of) look(ing)’. As the nominal and verbal forms which occur most frequently have no ending end (a factor which seems to have played a part in the coining of the term ‘conversion’ by Kruisinga/8/) are those in which nouns and verbs are recorded in dictionaries, such words as *loan, look* may come to be considered as ‘converted’ nouns or verbs. It has become customary to speak of the ‘conversion’ of substantive adjectives and verbs. The term ‘conversion’ has been used for various things. Kruisinga/8/ himself speaks of conversion whenever a word takes on function which is not its basic one, as the use of an adjective as a primary (*the poor, the British, shreds of pink, at his best*). He includes quotation words (*his «I don’t knows»*) and the type *stone wall* (i.e. substantives used as preadjuncts). One is reminded of Bally’s ‘transposition’. Koziol/10/ follows Kruisinga’s/8/ treatment and Biese/4/ adopts the same method. Their standpoints is different. The foregoing examples illustrate nothing but syntactic patterns. That *poor* (presented by the definite article, restricted to the plural, with no plural morpheme added) can function as a primary, or that *government*, as in *government job*, can be used as preadgunct, is a purely syntactic matter. At the most it could be said, with regard to *the poor,* that an inflectional morpheme understood but zero marked. However inflectional morphemes have a predominantly function character while the addition of lexical content is of secondary importance. As for *government job* the syntactic use of primary as a preadjunct is regularly unmarked, so no zero morpheme can be claimed. On the other hand, in *government-al, -al* adds lexical content, be it ever so little: ‘pertaining to characterizing government’. Therefore *governmental* is a syntagma while *government (job)* is not. That the phrase *jar-off* can be used as a preadjunct is again a syntactic matter. Characterized adverbs do not develop such functions in any case. We will not therefore, used the term conversion. As a matter of fact, nothing is converted, but certain stem are used for the derivation of lexical syntagmas, with the determinatum assuming a zero form. For similar reasons, the term ‘functional change’ is infelicitous. The term itself doesn’t enter another functional category, which becomes quite evident when it is considered the inflected forms.

**Endings and derivation.**

In inflected languages the derivant and derivative usually have a characteristic nominal or verbal ending. But, ending are not derivative morphemes. When English was still a more amply inflected language, the present type existed, but inflectional differences were more in evidence. Cf. the OE verbs *besceopian, fugelian, gamenian, hearmian, freon (freogian), dernian* and their respective bases *besceop, fugol,* and the weakening of ending was little bearing on this subject. With regard to denominate derivation, however, it is interesting to note that the levelling of endings brought about the loss of distinction in ME between the OE conjugations. The *-an* of *ryth-an* as well as the *-ian* of *loc-ian* resulted in *-en.* This reducted the number of patterns for denominal verbs to one.

**Derivation connection between verbs and nouns.**

With respect to both denominal verbs (type *loan* verb f. *loan* substantive) and deverbal substantives (type *look* substantive f *look* verb) it can be seen that as early as Old English a derivational connection existed between the present-infinitive stem of weak verb on the one hand and the stem of nouns on the other. As for deverbal substantive, there was some competition in the early stages of the language. Like other Germanic languages, Old English had strong verbs that were connected with substantives containing an ablaut vowel of the verb (*ridan/rad, bindan/bend, beran/bora*). However , this derivational type was unproductive so far back as Old English. The present-infinitive stem of strong verbs came to be felt to represent the derivative basis for deverbal substantives in exactly the same way as did the corresponding stem of weak verbs: *ride verb/ride substantive=look verb/look substantive.* But this contention of Biese’s/4/ needs qualification: ‘these facts indicate the resistance should by strong verbs to the process of converting them into nouns before, owing to the introduction of weak inflections, a distinct idea of a universal verb-stem had been developed’. Many of the verbs had weak forms that derived substantives at an early date have either never had weak forms are rare or later than the substantives. Verbs such as *bite, fall, feel, fold, freeze, have, grind, hide* make steal, tread are cases in point. This goes to show that the existence of weak verb forms is incidental to the rise of a derivational connection between the present infinitive stem of strong verbs and the stem of substantive.

This derivational connection is partly due to class where a strong verb and a substantive of the same root existed in OE and where phonetic development resulted in closely resembling forms for both in ME. OE *for, faru* was *fare* by the end of the 12th century while the corresponding OE verb *faran* had reached the stage of *faren* or *fare* about the same time. Other examples of pairs are *bidan* ‘stay’/*bid* ‘delay, dwelling place’, *bindan* ‘bind’/*bind* ‘band, tie’, *drincan* ‘drink’/*drinc, drinca* ‘drink’, *fleotan* ‘float’/*fleot* ‘place, where water flows’, *helpan* ‘help’/*help, hreowan* ‘rue’/*hreow* ‘rue’, *slepan* ‘sleep’/*sl p, slep* ‘sleep’. The derivational relation as it have been described them were fully established around 200.

**Zero-derivation as a «specifically English process».**

It is usually assumed that the loss of ending gave rise to derivation by a zero morpheme. Jespersen/7/ gives a somewhat to simplifying picture of its rise and development . ‘As a great many native nouns and verbs had...come be identical in form..., as the same things happened with numerous originally French words..., it was quite natural that the speech-instinct should take it as a matter of course that whenever the need of a verb arose, it might be formed without any derivative ending from the corresponding substantive’. He called the process ‘specifically English’. As a matter of fact, derivation by a zero morpheme is neither specifically English nor does it start, as Jespersen’s/7/ presentation would make it appear when most ending had disappeared. Biese’s/4/ study shows quit clearly that it began to develop on a larger scale at the beginning of the 13th century , i.e. at a time when final verbal *-n* had not yet been dropped, when the plural ending of the present was not yet *-en* or zero, and when the great influx of French loan words had not yet started. Bauer/2/ doesn’t think that the weakening of the inflectional system had anything to do with the problem of zero derivation. Stems are immediate elements for the speaker, who is aware of the syntagmatic character of an inflected form. He therefor has no trouble in connecting verbal and nominal stems provided they occur in sufficiently numerous pairs to establish a derivational pattern. In Latin which is a highly inflected language, denominal verbs are numerous: *corona/coronare, catena/catenare, lacrima/lacrimare; cumulus/cumulare, locus/locare, truncus/truncare, nomen, nomin-/nominare; sacer/sacrare.* In Modern Spanish there are full sets of verbal ending (though in the declension only gender and number are expressed) both types of zero-derivation are very productive. The weakening of the inflectional system in English, therefor , can’t have much to do with development of zero-derivation.

On the other hand, it cannot be denied that despite the relative productivity of corresponding derivational types in other languages, the derivative range the English patterns, that of denominal verbs, is still greater. The explanation of this seems to de that English, unlike Latin, French, Spanish, or German, never had any competitive types. So, whenever a derivation was made nouns, it followed the one pattern that existed, i.e. derivation by zero morpheme. The only derivative morphemes PE has for denominal verbs are -*ate, -ize, -ify.* They have restricted range of derivative force: *-ate* is latinizing and leaned, *-ify* is learned while *-ize* is chiefly technical. All three derive almost exclusively on a Latin morphologic basis. The suffixal type *dark-en* was not originally a deadjectival pattern; in any case, it would have to a certain extent rivaled the type *idle verb* f. *Idle* adjective only. Derivation *by* a morpheme, esp. The type *loan verb* f. *Loan substantive,* must therefore be considered the norm and is quite naturally very strong in English. In German, there are many competitive types. It is bath mutated and unmutated verbs (*faul-en, hart-en, draht-en, haut-en).* There are also denominal verbs with a derivative morpheme ( *stein-ig-en, rein-ig-en;* with a foreign morpheme *telefon-ier-en, lack-ier-en ).* In addition, German makes use of the prefixes *be-, er-, ver-.* Such types as *ver-rohen, ver-jung-er, vergrosser-n; er-kalt-en, er-leichter-n; be-end-ig-en, be-herz-ig-en, ver-eid-ig-en* have no counterparts in English. English *be-* has never played a serious role in denominal derivation. Nor has the type *em-bed* ever become productive to any larger extent. The productivity of the type *loan verb* f. *Loan* substantive seems to be thus reasonably for. The deverbal type *look substantive* f. *Look verb* has been less prolific and is partly bound up with certain syntactic patterns of grouping. For this, it is do had competitive patterns. There are the suffixal types *arriv-al, break-ade, guid-ance, improve-ment, organiz-ation* and the verbal substantive type *writ-ing* though the latter has now chiefly role of deriving action nouns proper. This is the reason why so many zero-derivatives from verbs of Latin and French origin, coined the 15th and 16th centuries, were subsequently replaced by suffixal derivatives in *-al, -age, -ance, ment.* «After 1650 the suffix formation have completely gained the upper hand of the direct conversion of the disyllabic and trisyllabic words derived from French and Latin verbs»(Biese/4/).

**Zero-derivation with loan-words***.*

As for Latin and French words and derivation from, there are comparatively few derivatives before (Biese/4/). French words were for some time felt to be foreign elements and were not «converted» with the same ease as native stems were. The phenomenon is in no way different from the one it is observed with derivation by suffixes. Loan words remain strangers for a time, and it usually takes time before a derivation type is applied to a heterogeneous class of words. Zero - derivation was facilitated by the eo-existence of borrowed substantives and verbs., as *anchor* substantive a 880 (=L) / *anchor* verb e 1230 (the OED has doubts, but F *ancrer* is recorded in the 12th e., as Bloeh ). *Account* substantive 1260/verb 1303, *change* substantive 1225/verb 1230, *charge* substantive1225/verb 1297, *cry* substantive1275/verb 1225, *dance* substantive 1300/verb 1300, *double* adjective 1225/verb 1290, *doubt* substantive 1225/verb 1225, *poison* substantive 1230/verb 13.., *rule* substantive 1225/verb 1225.

There are quite a few verbs with French roods for which no French verbs are recorded and which may accordingly be treated as zero derivatives: *feeble* verb 1225/adjective 1175, *hardy* verb 1225/adjective 1225, *master* verb 1225/substantive a 1000, *pool* verb 1275/adjective 1200, *saint* verb 1225/substantive 1175. On the other hand, the substantive *grant* 1225 may be derived from the verb *grant* 1225. It is only after 1300 that the process of zero-derivation is as firmly rooted with French as with native words. Though French originals for later English words may occur, it is just as safe to consider them as derivatives, as *centre* verb 1610 fr, *centre* substantive 1374, *combat* verb 1564 fr, *combat* substantive 1567 (or the reverse), *guard* verb 1500 fr, *guard* substantive 1426 and others.

Words of Scandinavian origin were more easily incorporated than French words, and derivation occurs as early as the 13th c.: *trist* «trust», *boon* «ask as a boon, pray for», *brod* «shoot, sprout», *smithy* «make into a smithy» a.o. (see Biese /4/).

**The illustration of various types.**

**Type loan verb fr. loan substantive**

**(desubstantival verbs.)**

Many PE verbs. go back to OE : *answer (andsharu / andswarian), blossom (blostm / blostnian), claw (clawu / clawian), fish (fisc / fiscian), fire (fyr / fytian), harm (hearm / hearmian),wonder (wundor / wundrian), bill* «strike with the bill, peck», *ground* «bring to the ground», *loan* (1240), *back* (OE), *butter* (OE), *experiment* (ME), *lamb* (OE), *night* (OE), *piece* (ME), *pit* «cart into a pit»(OE), *plank* (ME), *plate* (ME), *plow, plough* (OE), *plague* (ME), *priest* (OE), *promise* (ME), *prose* (ME), *ridge* (OE), *rivet* (ME), *rode* (ME), *root* (EME), *sack* (OE), *sauce* «season» (ME), *scale* (ME), *screen* (ME), *shoulder* (OE), *side* (OE), *silver* (OE), *sponge* (OE), *spot* (ME), *story* (ME), *streak* (OE), *summer* (OE), *table* (ME), *thong* (OE), *tin* (OE), *veil* (ME), *winter* (OE), all before 1500.

*Angle* «run into a corner» (ME), *balance* (ME), *butcher* (ME), *cipher* (ME), *cloister* (ME), *coffin* (ME), *collar* (ME), *colt* «run wild as a colt» (ME), *cipher* (ME), *fancy* (1465), *fin* (OE), *gesture* (ME), *girdle* (OE), *glove* (OE), *gossip* (OE), *grade* (1511), *husk* (ME), *kennel* (ME), *knob* (ME), *ladle* (OE), *latch* (ME), *launder* (ME), *lecture* (ME), *libel* (ME), *mother* (OE), *neighbor* (OE), *place* (ME), *pole* (ME), *riddle* «speak in riddles» (OE), *shell* (OE), *shop* (ME), *star* (OE), *stomach* «be offended» (ME), *sun* (OE), *vision* (ME), all 16th century *blanket* (ME), *casket* (1467), *lamp* (ME), *leaf* (OE), *pilot* (1530), *race* «run» (ME), *soldier* (ME), all 17th century *Capture* (1541), *diamond* (ME), *onion* (ME), *stocking* (1583), *tour* (ME), all 18th century *Scrimmage* (1470), *shin* (OE), *signal* (ME), *torpedo* (1520), *vacation* (ME), *wolf* «eat like a wolf» (OE), 19th century, *major* 1927.

It would be difficult to give a complete list of derivatives as there is an ever growing tendency verbs from substantives without derivative morphemes. A few recent are *service, contact* (1929), *audition, debut, package, chairman, page, date* (1928), *process* (1945), *waitress* (1946), *pressure* (not in OED or Spl.), *feature* (rec., as in *the play features*). Mencken/11/ gives many more, most of which are, however, hardly used.

It is likewise useless to try a classification to sense-groups, as there is no class-denoting formative. The verb may denote almost any verbal action connected with the basis of the underlying substantive. The verb *bed* has or has had the meanings «spread a bed», «put to bed» (with various implications), «go to bed», «sleep with», and there are more technical meanings. Bladin/5/ had already pointed out that «every action or occurrence can be designated by a verb derived from the very noun the idea of which most easily enters the mind of the person wanting to state a fact», and if Jespersen/7/ says that «it is difficult to give a general definition of the sense-relation between substantive and de-substantival verbs», this is rather an understatement. It may be recognized certain groups, as «put in ...», «furnish, cover, affect ...», but it should be noted that each of these senses is only one the many which the same verb has or may have. Biese/4/, therefore, makes no attempt at classification, and he is certainly right in doing so. It may, however, be worthy of note that the privative sense as in *dust* «remove the dust (from)» is frequent only with technical terms denoting various kinds of dressing or cleaning. Exs are *bur wool or cotton, burl cloth, poll, pollard trees, bone, gut, scale fish.*

The meaning of a certain verb is clear in a certain speech situation. That *brain* means «smash the b.»,*can* «preserve in cans», *winter* «pass the winter», is a result of given circumstances which establish the bridge of understanding between the speaker and the person or persons spoken to.

There are derivatives from proper names, as *boycott* 1880 (orig. spelt with a capital, from the name of Captain Boycott who was first boycotted), *Shanghay* 1871 ‘drug and press on board a vessel’, *Zeppelin* 1916 ‘bomb from a zeppelin’ (also clipped = *zap*).

Some verbs often occur in the *-ing* substantive only (originally or chiefly), while finite verb forms or infinitives are not or rarely used, as *hornpiping* ‘dancing a hornpipe’ (no verb rec.), *slimming, orcharding* ‘cultivation of fruit trees (no verb rec.). *Dialling* ‘the art of construction dials’, *speeching, electioneering, engineering, parlamenteering, volunteering* are the original forms. Converted cpds with *-monger* for a second-word are current only in the *-ing* form (*merit-mongering, money-mongering* etc.). *Innings* are not matched by any other verb form, nor are *cocking* ‘cock-fighting’, *hopping* ‘hop-picking’, *moon-shining* ‘illicit distilling’ and others.

**Type idle verb fr. idle adjective. (deadjectival verbs).**

To the OE period go back *bitter, busy, cool, fair, fat, light, open, right, yellow* (obs *black, bright, dead, strong, old*).

From the period between about 1150 and 1200 are recorded obs *sick* ‘suffer illness’, *soft, low* (obs *meek, hory, hale*). The following date from the period between about 1200 and 1300 (Biese/4/ has included the Cursor Mundi in this period): *black, brown, loose, slight, better, blind* (obs *hardly, certain, rich, wide, broad, less*). From the 14th century are recorded *ready, clear, grey, sore, pale, full, dull, round, gentle, English, tender, perfect* (obs *able, sound, weak, unable, honest, noble*). From the 15th century *purple, stale, clean,* from the 16th century *shallow, slow, quiet, empty, bloody, idle, equal, dirty, parallel* (and many other now obs words, as Biese/4/ points out). The 17th century coined *crimson, giddy, worst, blue, gallant, shy, tense, ridicule, unfit, ruddy* (and many how obs words. Biese/4/). From 18th century Are recorded *net* ‘gain as a net sum’ 1758, *total* (once 1716, then 1859), *negative, northern* (said of landscape), *invalid* ‘enter on the sick-list’, *queer* ‘cheat’ , from the 19th century *desperate* ‘drive desperate’, *stubborn, sly*  ‘move in a stealthy manner’, *chirk* ‘make cheerful’, *gross* ‘make a gross profit’ 1884, *southern* (said of wind), *aeriform, true.* From our century there are such words as *pretty, wise, lethal, big.*

Usually, deadjectival verbs denote change of state, and the meaning is either ‘become ...’ or ‘make ...’. Intransitive verbs with meaning ‘be...’ (as *idle, sly, equal*) from quite a small group. Some verbs have a comparative or superlative as root: *better, best, worst,* perhaps *lower.*

**Type out verb fr out particle (verbs derived from**

**locative particles).**

Derivation from locative particles is less common than the preceding types. In Old English there are *yppan, fremman* (with *i-*mutation from *up, fram*), *framian, utian.* Later are *over* ‘to master’ 1456, obs *under* ‘cast down’ 1502, *off* ‘put off’ 1642, *down* 1778, *nigh* ‘draw near’ 1200, *thwart* 1250, *west* ‘move towards the west’ 1381, *south* 1725, *north* 1866, *east* 1858.

These words, however, are not very common (except *out* and *thwart*).

**Type hail verb fr hail interjection (verbs derived from minor particles).**

Derivation from exclamation and interjection (most of there onomatopoeias) is more frequent. It will, however, be noted that many of these conversions have undergone functional and formal changes only without acquiring a well - grounded lexical existence, their meaning merely being «say..., utter the sound...». Exs are *hail* 1200, *nay* «say nay, refuse» 13.., *mum* 1399, obs. *Hosht* «reduce to silence» etc., *whoo* (16th century), *humph* (17th century), *encore, dee-hup* (to a horse), *pshaw, halloa, yaw* (speak affectedly», *hurrah* (18th century), *tally-ho* (fox-hunting term), *boo, yes, heigh-ho* «sigh», *bravo, tut, bow-wow, haw-haw, boo-hoo* «weep noisily» etc. (Biese/4/ also Jespersen/7/).

The meaning ‘say...’ may occur with other words also when they are used as exclamation or interjections, as with *iffing* (other verb forms are not recorded), *hence* ‘order hence’ (obs., 1580). And it may be reckoned here all the words of the type *sir* ‘call sir’.

From about 1600 on, geminated forms also occur as verbs. A few have been mentioned in the foregoing paragraph; others are snip-snap (1593),*dingle-dangle, ding-dong, pit-pat* (17th century), *pitter-patter, wiggle-waggle* (18th century), *criss-cross, rap-tap, wig-wag* (19th century) etc.

**The limits of verbal derivation.**

Derivation from suffixed nouns is uncommon. Biese’s/4/ treatment of the subject suffers from a lack of discrimination. He has about 600 examples of substantives and adjectives; but the ‘suffixes’ are mere terminations. Words such *herring, pudding, nothing, worship* are not derivatives. The terminations *-ace, -ice, -ogue, -y* (as in *enemy*) have never had any derivative force.

Theoretically it would seem that the case of a suffixal composite such as *boyhood* is not different from that of a fill compound such as *spotlight*. But obviously the fact that suffixes are categorizes generally prevents suffixal derivatives from becoming the determinants of pseudo-compound verbs. There are very few that are in common use, such as *waitress* (rec.), *package* (rec., chiefly in form *packaged, packaging*), *manifold* OE (obsolescent today), *forward* 1596, *referee* 1889, such adjectives as *dirty, muddy.* Many more are recorded in OED (as *countess, patroness, squiress, traitress* ‘play the...’, *fellowship, kingdom* a.o.).

Another reason seems to be still more important. Many of the nominal suffixes derive substantives from verbs., and it would be contrary to reason to form such verbs as *arrival, guidance, improvement, organization* when *arrive, guide, improve, organize* exist. Similar consideration apply to deadjectival derivatives like *freedom* or *idleness.* The verb *disrupture* is recorded in OED (though only in participial forms) but it is not common. *Reverence* is used as a verb, but it is much older (13.., 1290) than the verb *revere* (1661). It should also be noted that the alternation *revere/reverence* shows characteristics of vowel change and stress which are irregular with derivation by means of *-ance, -ence*. For same reason *reference* is not a regular derivative from *refer,* which facilitated the coinage *reference* ‘provide with references’ etc. 1884.

There are no verbal derivatives from prefixed words either. The verb *unfit* ‘make unfit’ 1611 is isolated.

**Type look substantive fr. look verb (deverbal**

**substantives).**

Deverbal substantives are much less numerous than denominal verbs. The frequency-relation between the two types has been approximately the same in all periods of the language. An exception is to be made for the second half of the 13th century «when the absolute number of conversion-substantives is larger that of the verbs formed from substantives» (Biese/4/).

Form the 13th century are recorded (unless otherwise mentioned in parentheses, the resp. Verbs are OE) *dread* (1175), *have, look, steal, weep, call* (1225), *crack,* ‘noise’, *dwell, hide, make, mislike, mourn, show, spit,* ‘spittle’, *stint, wrest* ‘act of twisting’ a.o.

From the later ME period are recorded (indications in parentheses refer to the respective verbs) *fall* (OE), *feel* (OE), *keep* (OE), *lift* (ME), *move* (ME), *pinch* (ME), *put* (ME), *run* (OE), *snatch* (ME), *sob* (ME), *walk* (OE), *wash* (OE).

From the 16th century date *craze* (ME), *gloom* (ME), *launch* (ME), *push* (ME), *rave* (ME), *say* (OE), *scream* (ME), *anub* (ME), *swim* (OE), *wave* (OE); from the 17th century *contest* (1579), *converse* (ME), *grin* (OE), *laugh* (OE), *produce* (1499), *sneeze* (1493), *take* (ME), *yawn* (OE); from the 18th century *finish* (ME), *hand* (OE), *pry* (ME), *ride* (OE), *sit* (OE). From the 19th century *fix* (ME), *meet* (OE), *shampoo* (1762), *spill* (OE).

As for the meaning of deverbal substantive, the majority denote the act or rather a specific instance of what the verbal idea expresses *quote, contest, fall, fix, knock, lift* etc. This has been so from the beginning (Hertrampf and Biese/4/). «The abstract nouns, including nouns of action, are not only the most common type of conversion-substantives; they are also those of the greatest importance during the early periods of the development of conversions» (Biese/4/). «The conversion-substantive used in a personal or concrete sense are, especially in the earlier stages, of comparatively slight importance» (ib.).

Concrete senses show *mince* ‘minced meat’, *produce* ‘product’, *rattle* ‘instrument’, *sprout* ‘branch’, *shoot* ‘branch’, *shear* ‘shorn animal’, *sink* ‘sewer’, *clip* ‘instrument’, *cut* ‘passage, opening’, *spit* ‘spittle’, *stride* ‘one of a flight of steps’.

Sbs denoting the result of the verbal action are *catch*, *take, win* ‘victory’, *cut* ‘provision’, *find, melt* ‘melded substance’, *snatch* ‘excerpt from a song’ e.c.

Place-denoting are *fold, bend, slip, wush* ‘sandbank’, *dump* etc.

Sbs denoting the impersonal agent are *draw* ‘attraction’, *catch* (of a gate, a catching question etc.), *sting* ‘animal organ’, *tread* ‘part of the sole that touches the ground’, *do, take-in,* all ‘tricky contrivance’, *wipe* ‘handkerchief’ sl etc.

There are also number of substantives denoting a person. OE knew the type *boda* ‘bode’ (corresponding to L *scriba,* OHG *sprecho*) which in ME was replaced by the type *hunter.* Several words survived, however, as *bode, help* (OE *help*), *hint* (the last quotation in OED is from 1807), and they are occasional ME formations, as *ally* 1380 (if it is not rather French *allie*); but could be apprehended as formed after the type. Obs. *Cut* (a term of abuse) 1490 does not seem to have any connection with the verb *cut,* and *scold* ‘scolding woman’ 1200 is doubtful, the verb is first quoted 1377.

The word *wright,* which now occurs only as a second-word of cpds (*cart-wright* etc.) is no longer apprehended as an agent noun (belonging to *wolk*). Otherwise all deverbal substantives denoting a personal agent are of Modern English origin, 16th century or more recent. The type probably came into existence under the influence of the types *pickpocket* and *runabout.* Exs are *romp* ‘child or woman fond of romping’ 1706, *flirt* 1732, *crack* ‘cracksman’ 1749 (thieves’ sl), *bore* ‘tiresome p.’ 1812, *sweep* ‘chimney sweeper’ 1812, *coach* ‘tutor, trainer’ 1848 (misleadingly classed in OED, as if from substantive *coach*), *discard* ‘discarded person’. The great number of depreciative terms is striking.

For the sake of convenience it is repeated here the examples of such personal deverbal substantives as form the second-words of cpds: *upstart* 1555, *by-blow* 1595=obs. *By-slip* 1670 ‘bastard’, *chimney-sweep* 1614, *money-grub* 1768, *shoeblack* and *bootbleck* 1778, *new-come* ‘new arrival’ 1577, *bellhop, carhop* rec.

The formation if deverbal substantives may be considered from the angle of syntactical grouping. No doubt there are different frequency-rates for a word according to the position which it has in a sentence. Biese/4/ has devoted a chapter to the question and has established various types of grouping which have influenced the growth of the type. It can be seen that deverbal substantives frequently occur in prepositional groups (*to be in the know*), that type are often the object of *give, make, have, take* (less so of other verbs), that only 11% of the examples show the deverbal substantives as subject of the sentence and that they are frequently by adjuncts. The most important patterns are ‘(be) *in the know*’ and ‘(*have*) *a look*’. Exs of the first type are phrases such as *in the long run, upon the go, with a thrust of his hair, after this sit, for a tell, for the kill, for the draw, of English make, at a qulp,* etc.

As for the t. ‘(*have*) *a look*’, «the use of phrasal verbs with conversion-substantives may be said to be a very marked feature during all periods from early ME up to the present time. As shown by these quotations, the origins of this use may be said to go back as far as the OE period» (Biese/4/). Exs are; *have a wash, a smoke, a swim, a chat* etc., *give a laugh, a cry, a break, a toss, a whistle, the chick, the go-by* etc., *take a ride, a walk, a swim, a read, the lead* etc., *make a move, a dive, a bolt, a bow* etc. etc.

It will be interesting to compare zero-derivatives with the *-ing* substantives. Historical speaking there is no longer a competition so far as the formation of common substantives is concerned. The number of new-formed *-ing* substantives has been steadily decreasing since the beginning of the MoE period. According to Biese/4/ the figures for newly introduced *-ing* substantives, as compared with zero-derivatives of the same verbs, are as follows: 13th century = 62, 14th = 80, 15th = 19, 16th =12, 17th century =5, 18th century =2, 19th century =0. Biese/4/ has obviously considered the rise of new *forms* only, but the semantic development of *-ing* substantives. Otherwise his figures would have been different. Any verb may derive an *-ing* substantive which can take the definite article. The *-ing* then invariably denotes the action of the verb: *the smoking of the gentlemen disturbed me.* The zero-derivative, as compared with the *ing,* never denotes the action but gives the verbal ideal in a nominalized form, i.e. the notional content of the verbal idea (with the secondary implication of the idea ‘act’): *the gentlemen withdrew for a smoke.* «In their use with phrasal verbs *-ing* forms have become obsolete, whereas there is an ever increasing number of conversion substantives used in conjunction with verbs like *make, take* etc....»(Biese/4/). On the other hand, common substantives in *ing* are now chiefly denominal, denoting something concrete, chiefly material which eliminates *ing* as a rival for zero-derivatives. According to Biese/4/ this distinction is already visible in the early stages of conversion. Biese/4/ points out that a prepositional substantive following a substantive is almost always a ‘genitivus subjectivus’ (*the grind of wheels*), whereas the same type of group following an *-ing* substantive is most often a ‘genitivens objectivus’ which is certainly an observation to the point, as it shows the verbal character of the *-ing* substantives as compared with the more nominal character of zero-derivatives.

A few instances of semantically differentiated derivatives are *bother/bothering, build/building, proceeds/proceedings, meet/meeting, set/setting, turn/turning, bend/bending, find/finding, sit/sitting, cut/cutting, feel/feeling, paint/painting.*

Sometimes deverbal substantives are only idiomatic in the plural: *it divers me the creeps (the jumps), turn on the weeps* A sl, *have the prowls* A sl, *the bends* ‘caisson disease’, *for keeps* ‘for good’.

An apparent exception are derivatives from expressive verbs in *-er* (type *clatter*) and *-le* (type *sparkle*) which are pretty numerous (Biese/4/), but in fact most of these verbs are not derivatives in the way verbs in *-ize* or *-ify* are, because few simple verbs exist alongside of the composites. These words are better described as composites of expressive elements, so the suffixes are not categorizes.

Derivation from prefixed verbs is restricted to composites with the prefixes *dis-, mis-, inter-,* and *re-* (see the respective prefixes). With other prefixes, there have only been attempts at nominal derivation. Biese/4/ has *befall, beget, begin, behave, belay, belove, beseech, bespeak, bestow, betide, betrust* as substantives. But they were all short-lived and rare. With the exception of *belay* 1908, a technical term, none seems to be in use today.

Biese/4/ has established a so-called *detain-* type, i.e. substantives derived from what he considers to be prefixed verbs. It do not seen the point of this distinction as one could analyze very few of his 450 words or so. The majority are unit words.

**Zero-derivation and stress.**

It shall now be made a few remarks about such types as have not been treated in this chapter. The stressing tendencies differ according to whether the basis is a unit word or a composite, also according to whether derivation is made from a noun or a verb.

Nominal derivation from composite verbs involves shift of stress. Examples are the types *runaway / blackout, overthrow, interchange, misfit, reprint* which are derived from actual or possible verbal composites with the stress pattern --. The process has not yet come to an end which will explain that the OED, Webster and others very often give stress indications which no longer tally with the speech habits of the majority. Many cbs of the *blackout* type and all the substantives of the types *misfit* and *reprint* are stressed like the verbs resp. Verbal phrases in OED.

Of prefixal types only verbs with *inter-, mis-* and *re-* have developed stress-distinguished substantives. No similar pairs exist for neg. *un-* (no verbal type exists, anyway), reversative *un-, be-, de-* (*be-* and *de-* are only deverbal).

Verbs derived from composite substantives do not change their stress pattern. Cp. such verbs as *backwash, background, afterdate, by-pass, counterweight, outlaw, outline, underbrush* which are forestressed like their underlying nominal bases. This also explains the fluctuation in the stressing of *counter-* verbs, as *counter-sign, counter-sink,* stressed like the substantives though the verbal stress pattern is middle stress/heavy stress.

With unit words the current tendency is to retain the stress of the underlying basis in deverbal nouns as well as in denominal verbs. We may call this homologic stressing. Bradin/5/ had stated the fact for denominal verbs without, however, discussing the problem as to the obvious exceptions, while Jespersen/7/ speaks of ‘such an important thing in ford-formation as the stress-shifting in *record* substantive and verb’.

To a certain extent, it is a stress distinction between nouns and verbs which are otherwise homophonous. This distinctive stress pattern occurs chiefly with disyllabic words, *record* substantive / *record* verb. examples are *contract, accent, affix, infix, prefix, suffix, augment, impress, concert, contrast, convert, escort, essay, export, object, subject, project, present, progress, protest, survey, torment, transfer*.

The number of non-shifting examples is much greater, however. It will be first given instances of forestressed words with homologic stress: *comment, compact, exile, figure, plaster, preface, prelude, prison, quarrel, climax, focus, herald, process, program, triumph, waitress, rivet, segment, sojourn, turmoil, contact,* ‘bring or come into contact’, *congress* ‘meet in a congress’, *incense* ‘burn incense’, *probate*. To these may be added such verbs as are felt to be derived from a substantive and therefore forestressed like the underlying bases, at least in AE: *accent, conflict, concrete* (as in *concrete a wall,* also in OED), *contract* (as in *contract a document*), *digest* (as *digest a book*), *export, import* (prob. originating in contrastive stressing), *recess* (as *recess a wall*), *survey* (in certain senses), *torment* (frequent), *transfer* (the regular stressing as a railway team).

The group of non-shifting endstressed words is considerably larger. Unit words beginning with *de-, dis-, re-* are especially numerous. Examples are: *accord, advance, assent, attack, decay, delay, defeat, dispatch, despute, escape, exclaim,* (as a deverbal substantive ‘presenting position of a rifle’), *precise, relax, remove, repay, reform, support* (Biese/4/).

On the other hand, it is found instances of distinctive stressing in AE: *address, conserves, discard, discharge* are often heard with forestress when substantives, also *relay* and *research; reject* substantive with forestress is the only pronunciation possible. Of these, *relay* and *research* may be explained as reinterpretations after the t. *reprint* substantive /*reprint* verb; *reject* is perh. influenced by *subject, object, project, traject*. In any case, this tendency towards distinctive stress in deverbal substantives is weak as compared with that towards homologic stress.

To sum up: the tendency with denominal verbs is to give them the stress of the underlying nominal basis, which has in many cases led to homologic stress with all or part of the verbal meanings versus older distinctive stress. Deverbal substantives, on the whole, show the same inclination to homologic stress. But there is also a weak tendency towards distinctive stress, though chiefly in AE. As for the tendency toward stress distinction between nominal and verbal homophones pointed out by Jespersen/7/, it was perhaps vaguely on the analogy of composites that it came into existence. The original stress with these loans from French or Latin was on the last syllable (F *absent,* L *abstract(um)*), so verbs retained this stress all the more easily as many native verbs were so stressed: *become, believe, forbid, forget, mislead* etc., whereas almost all disyllabic native substantives, unit words as well as composites were forestressed (the few contrary examples such as *unhealth, unrest, untruth, belief*  hardly count against the overwhelming majority). This may have led to a tendency towards forestress with non-native disyllabic substantives too. But what has taken on the character of a strong derivative device with composites has proved much weaker with unit words on account of their entirely different structure. Further development seems to point in the direction of homologic stressing.

Combination of the type *hanger-on* may be mentioned here. As they are functionally characterized by the suffix *-er*, the absence of stress shift is only natural. The stress pattern of the underlying verbal phrase is retained.

**The abilities in production new words from colourmarcking adjectives**.

The world around of us is the world of colour and paints, for which a variety of combinations and shades is characteristic. The colour is one of properties of objects of the material world and is perceived as the realized visual sensation. The adjectives are used as a special part of speech serving for a colour designation . The word-formation serves for a designation of colour shades of adjectives, and also for the parts of speech formed from them. Between that, the word-formation aspect of lexic has remained indifferently, word-formation relations inside this layer, with its originality, deserves the attention by way of their description and study in the language.

The word-formation is a system, which unites grammatical and lexical, that speaks about its enterlevel character and allows to apply the complex approach to the investigated phenomena. Essence of grammar of a word-formation suffix, which signals about the belonging a derivative word to this or that part of speech and defines its paradigm, confirms this idea. Also, on the basic purpose, which consists in creation of a new word and updating of the vocabulary , the indissoluble unity of a word-formation and lexicon is shown. Besides the word-formation, having own sphere of research, studies word-formation resources and processes conducting to creation of word-formation models, and also condition of functioning and filling the lasts.

As the adjectives of a colourmarking concern to the most ancient layer of lexicon, at their analysis there was necessary to pay attention to the facts of diachronic, and also to consider an originality of the given group of words, which is allocated with the various symbolic. This circumstance finds the reflection in formation of portable meanings which are included in lexical-semantic structure of initial adjectives, and influences the lexical filling of word-formation models their derivatives.

The study of lexical-semantic structures of colourmarking adjectives has shown unusual connection of colour and noncolour meanings, variety of their shades, the influence of the nonlanguage validity on semantics of a word. It was established, that the contextual environment of colourmarking adjectives has the large importance for the adequate description of their lexical-semantic structures.

The word-formation model is closely connected to word-formation paradigm. Each adjective has own paradigm having unequal extent and various morpheme filling of models, included in it. On the basis of research of each separate paradigm, it is possible to deduce the generalized word-formation paradigm of the given group of words, which is characterized by presence constant, basic, facultative and even “unique” participants, that is shown in the limits of the language.

The word-formation can be made:

1) inside one part of speech: A+suf=A1

2) by a transposition: - A+suf=N,

- A+suf=V,

* A+suf=D,
* V+suf=N,

where A - initial adjective, suf - word-forming suffix, A1, N, V, D - derivatives: adjective, noun, verb, adverb.

1. A+suf=A1.

The basic suffixes -ish, -y are the constant and obligatory members of general word-formation paradigm, i.e. enter into the paradigm of each adjective.

2.1 A+suf=N.

-ness is the conducting suffix here. The abstract nouns belong to this model in the English language: blueness.

Other derivatives, in which formation the various suffixes take part, are facultative, i.e. can be found in paradigm of one or two adjectives.

The presence of the facultative members depends on portable and minor meanings which are included in lexical-semantic structure of initial lexises. So in a derivative noun “blueism” one of meanings of the adjective “blue” - "интеллектуальный", "ученый", "премудрый" etc. is realized, and the suffix -ism introduces in the semantics of the derivative the generalized meaning.

The portable meaning of an adjective “green” - "неопытный", "незрелый" is shown in the appropriate derivatives – “greener, greenie” - carriers of this quality. It is necessary to note, that paradigmatic lines can have unequal extent because of the facultative members. “Green - greenness, greenery, greenth, greenage, greener, greenie, greenlet, greening, greenling”.

Speaking about the semantic of the derivatives it is necessary to note that their polysemantic is in the direct dependence on character of lexical-semantic structure of an initial basis. Depending on a context the suffix noun “blueness “ one of the meanings of motivating adjectives realizes: « синева, лазурь, синий цвет » (blue – “синий, голубой” -the actualizing of the basic colour meaning), "синяк" ( the actualizing of minor meaning), «ученость, премудрость, интеллектуальность» (blueism), "«непристойность" (blue-joke - « неприличная, непристойная шутка » - the actualizing of portable meaning).

The realization of the model A+suf=N is connected to redistribution of semas and one-radical parts of speech in semantic structure. General-categorical sema of that part of speech, in which the initial lexis was transposed - here it is a sema of a subject inherent by a noun, become the basic one. After it, semas, subordinated to it: abstract, concrete and animate, follow, depending on character of a derivative noun. Only then the general-categorical sema of an initial adjective - sema of an attribute settles down.

2.2 A+suf=V.

The suffix verbs formed from colourmarking adjectives, carry facultative character (redden, blacken, whiten) and differ by the ramified lexical-semantic structure. Its size is defined not only because of entrance simultaneously of semas of transitivity and intransitivity in it, but also due to more various lexical semantics. The given model also is characterized by redistribution of semas, which occurs at a verbal transposition. The conducting place is occupied by a general-categorical sema of verbs – the sema of process, and also semas, subordinated to it, of transitivity and intransitivity. Only after them the sema of an attribute inherent in initial adjectives, follows.

2.3 A+suf=D.

This model is submitted in the English language by a suffix -ly, and the derivative adverbs are the constant members of the paradigm (bluely, brownly, greenly, yellowly).

2.4 V+suf=N.

In the English language this model is submitted by suffix nouns formed from verbs. To blue bluer « тот, кто воронит сталь ». The English deverbal nouns with a suffix *-ing* are characterized by constant participation in paradigm (blueing, browning, greening, redding, yellowing).

Besides the affix models, examining the word-formation opportunities of colourmarking adjectives the important role is played by models of an affixless wordmaking. They assume an obligatory transposition of parts of speech. If the distinctive feature of an affix word-making is the presence of a marker as a final word-forming suffix, then such marker is not present at the affixless (implicit) word-making. Because of its complexity the problem of an affixless word-making is examined from various points of view, and the ways for its solution are planned:

1. The word-formation means of this way of a word-making come to light;

2. The processes occurring at an affixless word-making, are examined in connection with typological features of the language and its morphological build;

3. The criteria for a synchronous establishment of a direction of a derivation are developed;

4. Various methods of the analysis are applied, supplementing each other.

Two basic models of an affixless word-making were allocated: A🡪N, A🡪 V.

The model A🡪N reflects the phenomenon of a substantivation.

The English language, where the category of a gender is absent, aspires to include various meanings in one lexeme structure and to expand volume of its lexical-semantic structure by that, at realization of this model. An indispensable condition of functioning derivative, formed on the given model, is the change of categorial semantics of a part of speech and redistribution of semas in their semantic structure. Besides an obligatory general-categorial sema of a noun -the sema of a subject, for the English derivative lexeme the entry in its structure simultaneously of semas abstract and concrete, animate and inanimateness etc. is peculiar, that is the specific feature of the English language. In the English language, with its analytical tendency, there is an aspiration to a full semantic filling of a word.

The character of semantic shifts occurring at realization of this model, can be explained with help of lexical-semantic structure, where the meaning contains, which is modified in appropriate derivatives. The nouns formed on this model, are included into the structure of various phraseologies: out of blue - is "неожиданно". It shows the connection of word-formation and phraseological systems of the language.

There is an interest in the cases when in a basis of phraseologies the various colour associations lay: to fire into the brown - « стрелять мимо цели, неметко ».

The comparison of models of an affix and affixless word-making shows, that the distinctive attribute of the lasts is in their poly-semantic not as in the appropriate suffix models , the most important feature is the opportunity of being included in various phraseologies.

A🡪V. The typological feature of these verbs is that they include the semas of transitivity and intransitivity in their lexical-semantic structure and it expand the categorial semantic because of it.

The portable meanings of the colourmarking adjectives find their reflections in the English verbs : to green « обманывать, мистифицировать »🡨 green « доверчивый, простодушный ».

The word addition has the wide circulation among the suffix and prefix word-formation during the all extent of development of the language.

The number of questions are allocated from all of problems concerning formation of complex words,: 1) the compatibility of the appropriate colourmarking adjectives with other categories of words; 2) what element of meaning, basic or portable, is realized there; 3) distribution of models of complex words in the parts of speech; 4) feature of their structure and functioning.

To typological criteria also belong: a) number of components forming a new word; b) a way of the connection components:

· full complete;

· is incomplete combined;

· connection with the help of service words;

c) A type of the semantic connection between the components of a complex word, which carries an attribute character in the examined models.

Complex nouns including the colourmarking adjective as one of the components, makes out the lexical groups of words. The names of plants, animal, minerals etc. concern to them. The complex words which in result of metonym carry from a part on whole serve the name of an animal or plant widely submitted among them : redbreast "малиновка". It, so-called, "bahoovrihs". The group of words is also allocated, where the colourmarking adjectives, combining with the name of clothes, form " bahoovrihs ", used for calling the man: blue jacket "матрос". At the same time there is a number of differences in еру realization of models of complex nouns and their functioning. In the English language there are difficulties in the differentiation of complex word from word combination. It is depend on the nonexpressed morphological structure of the English word. Frequently English language prefers word combinations: to look blue «выглядеть унылым ». Because of that the English language has a plenty of phraseological word combinations including colourmarking adjectives : blue devils "хандра", brown study « мрачное раздумье ». The increased

lexical-semantic structure with a metamorphosing of meanings is the characteristic feature of the English complex word : blue-cap «круглая плоская синяя шапочка (ее раньше носили в Шотландии)», «шотландцы», «лосось первого года жизни», «синица», «василек», «сорт пива».

The basic type of a complex word is two-componented, the basic way of connection of the components is full complete. The connection with the help of a connecting element is not very typically for the English language.

The models of complex adjectives including colourmarking adjectives as one of components, are present in the English language. As the basic part of speech expressing colour shades, are the adjectives, the basic attention is given to the appropriate complex adjectives. The English language, besides complex words, aspires to use the word combinations, and also derivative and radical lexemes: purple.

The formation of compound verbs on conversion is typical of the English language: to bluestocking « быть синим чулком », to brownbag (slang) « приносить в ресторан свою еду ». Last word is rather new, that speaks about the role of the given tendency in a word-formation of the English language, it is also possible the further word-making - brown – bagger.

**III. Practical part.**

It is impossible to underestimate a role of studying of a word-formation in an primary school. As the teaching of foreign language should pass in complex, i.e. the studying English should include the basic directions: grammar, phonetics and lexicon, the importance of studying of word-formation aspect of lexicon becomes doubtless. The studying of conversion, which because of the extreme productivity is one of conducting ways of creation the new words in the English language, can become one of the ways of updating of the child’s vocabulary . Here it should be noted the importance of lexicon, in general, in studying of foreign language in primary school. The lexicon should be acquired in system, therefore the work above the child’s vocabulary should begin from the first day of studying English and proceed during the all period of training, day-to-day.

One of the basic principles of selection of lexicon in primary school is the common use, i.e. the opportunity of the using in the colloquial speech, hence, in the younger classes is not selected special lexicon as the words for studying. The very small quantity of time is allocated for acquaintance and training of that lexicon, which is not of a situation, necessary for creation of a dialogue.

The plenty of time is allocated for studying of a word, acquaintance with its meaning, its role in the sentence, in the system of language, however items of information about its formation and opportunity of formation new words from it are given, only if the speech goes about a word formed suffix, seldom prefix, way of a word-formation. The words formed on conversion, are simply showed, as two different parts of speech, that does not give an opportunity to children itself to make words, basing on the knowledge of this way of a word-formation. For comprehension of importance of this aspect of language it is necessary to address to a psychological linguistic nature of lexicon. You see in psychology the word is the complex activator, for example, at perception and understanding of oral and written speech, this complex speech action (at expression of thoughts). At understanding of a word the acoustical and visual analyzers will be involved, and this integrated approach promotes the best mastering. The dialogue in foreign language is rather difficult activity for the child. It occurs that, first, for the younger schoolboy it is much easier to communicate on the native language much and it is not clearly, why he should express in English, secondly, for this purpose it is necessary to make rather difficult mental operation - to choose the words, suitable on sense, from the vocabulary to construct the sentence grammatically correctly, observing thus the words order , i.e. to do so that to be understood. Becomes obvious, that the updating of the child’s vocabulary is one of the basic problem for the teacher, you see the word is a basic minimal unit of any language.

The studying of conversion, as one of ways of a word-formation, will help to do the child‘s vocabulary more rich, to make his speech more expressive, and also to fill up passive and active vocabulary, by means of formation the new words himself. Now, reading, for example, a book, it will not be necessary to him to look for a word formed on conversion, in the dictionary, but to define its meaning, using the knowledge of this phenomenon of language. Especially, the nouns and verbs formed from adjectives of a colourmarking by this way, are included into structure of various phraseologies, where carry more often portable meaning.

Some courses, foreign and Russian were analysed, where English is taught, as foreign language. It is interesting to note, that the word-formation is not studied neither in primary, nor in secondary school, however, it is possible to find some items concerning this aspect of lexicon. Courses: Russian (English by Vereshchagina, Pretykina and Learning English by Skulta) and foreign (Magic Time and Hot Line by Tom Hutchinson) have various methodical base, usually it is: some text books, teacher's book, reading book , active book, audio cassettes. There is not any word about conversion in this courses, however, words formed in this way are given simply as different parts of speech, and the connection between them is not explained.

With the purpose of revealing a level of children’s knowledge about a conversion word-formation the ascertaining experiment was done, where children were offered to do the following task (see appendix 1). Every pupil have received individual card, in which a number of pairs sentences on English with translation and the missed words was given. The list of words was located below, from which it was necessary to choose a word, suitable on sense, and to insert it into the appropriate sentence. In 10 minutes the works were gathered. (Results of experiment see appendix 7, table 1)

For formation the skill of the conscious using words formed by a way of conversion ,in oral and written speech and also for acquaintance with its role in the English language the forming experiment including number of the tasks, promoting to achievement of this purpose was done. The final aim was not in remembering the term conversion and its definitions by the pupils, but in understanding of sense of the phenomenon, as one of the most productive ways of formation of new words in the English language. At the first stage, on an example of two sentences, using the leading questions, children come to a conclusion, that the same word can represent various parts of speech (see appendix 2). At the following stage was primary fastening of this material, i.e. the schoolboys were offered to explain the statement of this or that word in the sentence on an example of a material of ascertaining experiment (see appendix 3). The following task consist in the following: a number of adjectives of a colourmarking was offered to children who needed to translate them; it is quite natural, that the schoolboys have apprehended them as adjectives. Further before the younger schoolboys the dilemma was put: whether these words can have the pair, which would be the other part of speech without changing the form of the word. All children successfully have coped with this task, using the dictionaries, conclusion that these pairs of words illustrate the phenomenon of conversion, was made by schoolboys by themselves (see appendix 4). Further group of children was divided into the brigades, the individual word was offered to every one, with which they needed to do the following operations: to find out, one or several parts of speech can be represented by this word to prove it, it was necessary to make the sentences with these words and to explain an belonging the word to this or that part of speech. By the purpose of this task was to fix the pupils’s knowledge of this theme, and also to train in the using of these words in the sentence, in particular, and in speech in general (see appendix 4). At the following stage of generalization of the knowledge and fastening, automation of skill of the using the words formed on conversion the task consist in, that 1) to define a part of speech of the allocated words in the sentence, 2) to make the sentences similar by the given ones, 3) to define a part of speech of the words submitted outside of a context. The third part of the task is obviously impracticable, because it was given only the graphic form of a word, that in general ruled out any opportunity to differentiate it as part of speech. It is natural, that children have done only the two first parts of the task, last part has caused them the quite justified difficulties, and by the method of group work succeeded to come to the conclusion that the words given only in a graphic form, can designate different parts of speech, for the confirmation it the schoolboys had to use the dictionaries (see appendix 5). If to speak about the whole forming experiment, it is possible to note, that the children liked the tasks, they tried to do everything in time. Though this experiment did not put as the purpose the remembering the term conversion and its definitions by the children , however, almost all children used it in the demonstration and independent explanation.

The purpose of a check experiment was revealing the level of children’s knowledge . For this purpose the test was offered to the schoolboys, where answering on questions "yes", "no", they came to a certain pictogram, which designated the certain mark. The questions are made by a principle from simple to difficult, therefore children at first have apprehended this task, as a game (see appendix 6). The results of check have shown a rather high level of the knowledge (see appendix 7, table 2).

Considering the results of the done work, it is possible to come to conclusion that the studying of this theme regularly, can give quite acceptable results. Though there is no sufficient methodical base, which could help with formation of the skill of using the words formed on conversion in oral and written speech, mastering children of knowledge on this theme however is possible. As the adequate moment of a beginning studying of this phenomenon it is possible to consider the third year of training of foreign language in a primary school. The studying of this aspect of the English language promotes the enrichment of the child’s dictionary , and as it was spoken plays not the last role in studying of the language, forms the skill of independent work, develops such mental processes, as memory, logic thinking, ability to analyze and to compare. The next years of training the deepening and expansion of this theme with a support on the items of information received in an elementary school is possible.

**IV. Conclusion.**

The examination of the works of some authors (Adams, Jespersen, Marchand/1, 7, 10/), shows such problem, as the exact status of conversion within word-formation is unclear. For some scholars conversion is a brunch of derivation, for others it is a separate type of word-formation, on level with derivation and compounding. Whether this distinction has any real effect on the structure of a theory of word-formation. Most writers use both terms appear to use them as synonyms. However many authors agreed that the conversion is one of the most productive ways of a word-formation and is a lexical category, though many of them show it as a grammatical category too. Then the word changes the form class of a form without any corresponding changes of form, it accepts all grammatical attributes of this class. The significant productivity of conversion word-formation is shown also in ability of formation the new words practically from any part of speech, including prepositions. In the paper the models of conversion word-formation are submitted, such as: verb🡨substantive, verb🡨adjective, verb🡨locative particles, verb🡨interjections, substantive🡨verb. Examining the opportunities of formation the new words from adjectives of a colourmarking, it is possible to note, that they participate in suffix, conversion word-formation, and also form new words by word adding. And at any of these ways can be realized both direct, and portable meaning, and the words formed on conversion (more often nouns) can be included into structure of phraseologies.

The purpose of the put experiments of a practical part of this paper was achieved. Children have acquired the offered initial knowledge of a theme of a conversion word-formation, have learned to use such words in oral and written speech. Besides it, they have remembered the term "conversion".

Taking into account the quite good results, received during the experiment, it is possible to plan the further ways of development of studying this way of word-formation at school and, in particular, in primary classes. The further studying of this phenomenon can be done by offering serially one of the models V🡨A, N🡨V etc. It is possible to predict the successful result of this studying,, and at the end, children would be able to find the examples of conversion word-formation and use them in oral and written speech
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**Appendix 1. Ascertaining experiment**.

Цель: выявить уровень знаний учащихся об употреблении слов, образованных по конверсии.

Задание: вставить слова подходящие по смыслу вместо … в предложения.

1. She … very well. Она готовит очень хорошо.

She is a good … . Она хороший повар.

2. There is a small … room in this flat. В этой квартире есть маленькая квадратная комната.

There are a lot of parks and … in our city. В нашем городе много парков и площадей.

3. The bush of … grows under the window. Куст сирени растет под окном.

I have very beautiful … dress. У меня есть очень красивое … платье.

4. There are red and … flowers in the vase. В вазе стояли красные и желтые цветы.

Leaves … in autumn. Листья желтеют осенью.

Слова для справки: cook, round, violet, yellow, sweet, look, lilac, square.

**Appendix 2. Forming experiment. Stage 1.**

Цель всего формирующего эксперимента: сформировать навык сознательного употребления слов, образованных по конверсии, в устной и письменной речи.

Задачи:

1. образовательная:

* грамматическая: повторять употребление времен группы Simple и Continuous;
* лексическая: привести детей к пониманию смысла изучаемого явления, пополнение активного словаря ребенка посредством знакомства с новыми словами, с конверсией, как одним из способов словообразования, посредством перевода некоторых слов из пассивного словаря в активный;
* фонетическая: тренировать в произнесении необходимых звуков, особенно звуков второй и третей группы сложности.

1. воспитательная: учить детей самостоятельно находить информацию, в т.ч. пользоваться словарями, воспитывать чувство взаимопомощи и взаимовыручки;
2. развивающая: развивать такие психические функции, как память, логическое мышление, произвольное внимание.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| этапы | | содержание | примерные ответы учащихся | |
| Основная часть  Вывод: | Look at the blackboard. Who can read these sentences?  *I like this* ***sweet.***  *This apple is* ***sweet.***  Who can translate these sentences?  Right. Как вы думаете, почему именно эти два слова выделены?  А я сейчас вам докажу, что это не совсем так. Давайте внимательно посмотрим, какой частью речи является это слово в первом предложении?  А во втором?  Так что же это получается, может одно из них неправильное?  Значит, действительно так бывает, что одно и то же слово может обозначать разные части речи. Это бывает только в английском языке, или кто-нибудь знает подобные примеры и в русском?  Значит, какой вывод мы можем сделать из того, что мы сейчас выяснили? | | | -мне нравится эта конфета. Это яблоко сладкое.  -потому что они одинаковые.  Это существитель-ное.  Это прилагательное  Нет, оба правильные.  Мороженое –и прилагательное, и существитель-ное.  В английском языке, так же как и в русском есть такие слова, внешне ничем не отличающиеся, но обозначающие разные части речи. |

**Appendix 3. Forming experiment. Stage 2.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| этапы | содержание | примерные ответы учащихся |
| Основная часть  Итог: | Давайте вспомним ту работу, которую мы писали. Те слова, которые нужно было вставить я выделила другим цветом. Вам нужно только объяснить, какой частью речи они выражены и почему вы так решили.  1. She **cooks** very well. Она готовит очень хорошо.  She is a good **cook** . Она хороший повар.  2. There is a small **square** room in this flat. В этой квартире есть маленькая квадратная комната.  There are a lot of parks and **squares** in our city. В нашем городе много парков и площадей.  3. The bush of **lilac** grows under the window. Куст сирени растет под окном.  I have very beautiful **lilac** dress. У меня есть очень красивое сиреневое платье.  4. There are red and **yellow** flowers in the vase. В вазе стояли красные и желтые цветы.  Leaves **yellow** in autumn. Листья желтеют осенью.  Давайте подумаем, почему вы не справились с этим заданием раньше. Что нам еще раз подтвердили эти предложения?  Такое превращение слова из одной части речи в другую в английском языке называется «конверсия». Посмотрите, какими частями речи может быть обозначено одно слово?  Какими частями речи может быть одно и то же слово? Кто запомнил, как называется это явление? | -здесь это слово является глаголом, т.к. обозначает действие, является сказуемым и оканчивается на **s,** а это окончание глаголов 3 л. н. вр.  -это существи-тельное, т.к. перед ним стоит артикль и прилагательное.  -это прилагательное, т.к. стоит перед существительным и говорит о том, какая это комната  - существительное, здесь оно оканчивается на **s,** потому что существительное стоит во множественном числе.  -существительное, обозначает название растения.  -прилагательное, т.к. обозначает признак предмета.  -прилагательное, т.к. обозначает признак предмета.  -глагол, т.к. обозначает действие и в предложении является сказуемым.  -мы не знали о том, что одинаково написанные слова могут обозначать разные части речи.  Сущ. - глагол, прил. –глагол, прил. – сущ.  Конверсия. |

**Appendix 4. Forming experiment. Stage 3.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| этапы | содержание | Примерные ответы учащихся |
| Основная часть:  Мини вывод: | Скажите, все ли вы знаете об английских прилагательных, обозначающих цвета?  Посмотрите на доску, прочитайте слова и переведите: Blue, black, pink, yellow, violet, lilac. А теперь возьмите словари и проверьте, нет ли у этих слов, кроме этого значения цвета, другие значения, выраженные другой частью речи? Какой вывод мы можем сделать? | -да.  -голубой, черный, розовый, желтый, фиолетовый, сиреневый.  -небо, траур, гвоздика, желтеть, фиалка, сирень.  У прилагательных , обозначающих цвета тоже встречается такое явление «конверсия». |

Stage 4.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Работа в бригадах.  Проверка: | Теперь вам нужно разделиться на бригады по три человека. Задание будет общим, но слова будут разные:  green, look, bath, dry. У каждой бригады свое слово, с ним нужно сделать следующее: найти все его значения в словаре, узнать, в роли каких частей речи оно может выступать, составить предложения, в которых бы отражались по возможности все значения. (15 мин.)  (один чел. из бригады читает все значения, другой записывает предло-жение на доске, остальные-проверяют.) |  |

**Appendix 5. Forming experiment. Stage 5.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Этапы | Содержание | примерные ответы учащихся |
| Повторение:  Основная часть:  Проверка:  Итог: | Что вы знаете о конверсии в английском языке?  Какими частями речи может быть одно и то же слово?  С.р.:1)Указать часть речи выделенных слов:   * I heard a **cry** from the closed door.   They **cry** because they can’t go for a walk.   * I have a very tasty **fish** for dinner.   We are going to **fish** next Sunday.   * I don’t like when the weather is **cold.**   The **cold** helps to safe food fresh.   * I like to **dance.**   We liked their **dance**.  2) Составить пару предложений, чтобы слова ***hate –*** *ненависть, ненавидеть****, hunt –*** *охота, охотиться****, lift –*** *лифт, поднимать*употреблялись в первом предложении как существительное, а во втором как глагол**.**  3) определить часть речи следующих слов: **round, fly, harm, alarm**.  (дети проверяют работы друг друга по образцу, написанному на доске: 1. Сущ., гл., сущ., гл., прил., сущ., гл., сущ).  Второе задание я проверю сама. А вот скажите мне, какой части речи слово **round?**  А можем мы определить часть речи?  Почему?  Действительно вне контекста мы не можем с точностью сказать, какая это часть речи, конечно, если перед словом стоит артикль, то мы можем сказать, что это существительное. Если же дано только графическое изображение слова, мы не сможем определить часть речи. | В английском языке есть такие слова, которые, не меняя формы, могут выражать разные части речи.  Существительное – глагол, прилагательное – глагол, прилагательное – существительное.  Сущ., прил.  Нет.  Потому что это слово может быть и существительным, и прилагательным. |

**Appendix 6. Control experiment.**

Цель: выявление уровня знаний учащихся по пройденному материалу.

Задачи:

1. образовательные:

* грамматическая: повторение времен группы Simple, Continuous;
* лексическая: проверка усвоения начальных сведений о явлении конверсии, контроль формирования навыка употребления таких слов;

1. воспитательная: воспитывать самостоятельность;
2. развивающая: развивать психические функции, такие как память, логическое мышление, произвольное внимание.

Детям предлагается следующий тест:

В английском языке слова могут обозначать не одну, а несколько частей речи (присутствует понятие конверсии).

Слово green является прилагательным.

Это такие слова, как: clean, green, cook, orange.

A pink-«гвоздика, розовый»

Pink перево-дится -«розовый».

Предложение: “ The leaves on this tree yellows in autumn.” построено правильно.

Слово black может быть и существительным, и прилагательным.

Предложения: “My hat is violet.

I have a violet hat.” подтверждают выводы по нашей теме.

Yellow переводится, как желтый и как желтеть (to yellow).

Этот тест сложный для тебя?

A violet переводится, как «фиалка».

Blue может переводиться как «небо».

Предложение: «В сиреневой вазе стояла ветка сирени.» переводится так: “There was a branch of **lilac** in the **lilac** vase”.

Неправильно, потому что оба выделенные слова являются существительными.

Первое выделенное слово- прилагательное, второе- существительное.

Оба выделенных слова являются прилагательными.

**Appendix 7. The results of Ascertaining and Control experiment.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Не справились с работой. | Средний уровень. | Все выполнено верно. |
| Количество человек из 12. | 9 | 3 | 0 |
| Количество в % от 100%. | 75% | 25% | 0% |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Не справились с работой. | Средний уровень. | Все выполнено верно. |
| Количество человек из 12. | 1 | 3 | 8 |
| Количество в % от 100%. | 8,3% | 25% | 6,7% |