Добре знання префіксів та суфіксів має велике значення при вивченні мови, оскільки воно дає можливість студентам розуміти без словника більшу кількість незнайомих їм слів, утворених від знайомого їм кореня. Так, наприклад, знаючи значення слова **happy** *щасливий*, студенти можуть легко перекласти незнайомі їм слова happi**ly**, happi**ness**, **un**happy, **un**happi**ly**, **un**happi**ness**.

Список літератури

1. Macmillan English Dictionary. Macmillan Education, –Bloomsbury Publishing. Oxford, 2002.
2. К.Н. Качалова, Е.Е. Израилевич. Практическая грамматика английского языка. –Киев, 2004.

Т. Тимошенко, Н. Гречихина.
Общие процессы словообразования

В этой статье объясняются общие процессы словообразования в английском языке. Приведены примеры новообразованных слов при помощи приставок и суффиксов.

T. Timoshenko, N. Grechykhina.
General process of wordformation

This article explains the general process of wordformation in English. The examples of new formed words with the help of prefixes and suffixes are given here.

Одержано 30.05.11

Н.В. Гречихіна, викл., Т.В. Тимошенко, викл.
Кіровоградський національний технічний університет

Sociolinguistic causes of language change

Sociolinguistic causes of language change are considered in this article. It deals with three proposed external sociolinguistic factors – fashion, foreign influence and social need which can potentially affect the language and accelerate hidden trends already existing in the language.
sociolinguistic factors, fashion, pronunciation, accent, fluctuation theory, substratum theory, adopted language, foreign influence, bilingual, trilingual, borrowing, syntax, cultural contract, donor language, social need, conversion, accelerating agents.

For centuries, people have speculated about the causes of language change. The problem is not one of thinking up possible causes, but of deciding which to take seriously. In the quotation above, Phaedrus, a scientist is overwhelmed by the number of possible theories which come to mind in his work on physics. A similar problem faces linguists. As one noted: 'Linguists are a marvellously clever bunch of scholars; there is really no limit to the imaginative, elegant, and intellectually satisfying hypotheses they can dream up to account for observed linguistic behaviour.'

In the past, language change has been attributed to a bewildering variety of factors ranging over almost every aspect of human life, physical, social, mental and environmental. At one time, for example, there was a suggestion that consonant changes begin in mountain regions due to the intensity of expiration in high altitudes. 'The connection with geographical or climatic conditions is clear,' asserted one scholar, 'because nobody will deny that residence in the mountains, especially in the high mountains, stimulates the lungs.' Luckily this theory is

easily disprovable, since Danish, spoken in the flat country of Denmark, seems to be independently undergoing a set of extensive consonant changes - unless we attribute the Danish development to the increasing number of Danes who go to Switzerland or Norway for their summer holidays each year, as one linguist ironically suggested.

Even when we have eliminated the 'lunatic fringe' theories, we are left with an enormous number of possible causes to take into consideration. Part of the problem is that there are several different causative factors at work, not only in language as a whole, but also in any one change. Like a road accident, a language change may have multiple causes. A car crash is only rarely caused by one overriding factor, such as a sudden steering failure, or the driver falling asleep. More often there is a combination of factors, all of which contribute to the overall disaster. Similarly, language change is likely to be due to a combination of factors.

In view of the confusion and controversies surrounding causes of language change, it is not surprising that some reputable linguists have regarded the whole field as a disaster area, and opted out altogether: 'The causes of sound change are unknown', said Bloomfield in 1933. 'Many linguists, probably an easy majority, have long since given up enquiring into the why of phonological change', said Robert King in 1969. 'The explanation of the cause of language change is far beyond the reach of any theory ever advanced', said yet another around the same time.

This pessimism is unwarranted. Even if we cannot consider all possible causes, we can at least look at a range of causes that have been put forward over the years, and assess their relative value. We can begin by dividing proposed causes of change into two broad categories. On the one hand, there are external sociolinguistic factors - that is, social factors outside the language system. On the other hand, there are internal psycholinguistic ones - that is, linguistic and psychological factors which reside in the structure of the language and the minds of the speakers.

Fashion and random fluctuation

An extreme view held by a minority of linguists is that language change is an entirely random and fortuitous affair, and that fashions in language are as unpredictable as fashions in clothes.

There is no more reason for language to change than there is for automobiles to add fins one year and remove them the next, for jackets to have three buttons one year and two the next... the 'causes' of sound change without language contact lie in the general tendency of human cultural products to undergo 'non-functional' stylistic change argued an American linguist, Paul Postal, in 1968.

Another similar view is that random fluctuations occur subconsciously, as sounds gradually drift from their original pronunciation. A theory that speakers accidentally 'miss the target' was prevalent in the 1950s, popularized by an American, Charles Hockett. He suggested that when we utter a speech sound, we are aiming at a certain ideal target. But since words are usually comprehensible even if every sound is not perfectly articulated, speakers often get quite careless, and do not trouble too much about hitting the 'bull's-eye' each time. As he expresses it:

When a person speaks, he aims his articulatory motions more or less accurately at one after another of a set of bull's-eyes ... charity on the part of hearers leads the speaker to be quite sloppy in his aim most of the time. The shots intended for initial [t] will be aimed in the general direction of that bull's-eye, but will fall all about it - many quite close, some in the immediate vicinity, a few quite far away.

The actual shots, he suggests, will cluster round a single point at which there will be a 'frequency maximum'. As time passes, and quite a lot of shots miss the target, people hear numerous near misses. Eventually they begin to think the bull's-eye is in a different place:

How are we to assess these theories? Certainly, fashion and social influence cannot be ignored, as we saw in the case of New York. It is also clear that a person's speech can gradually alter over the years in the direction of those around, as is shown by British people

who pick up an American accent in a very short time. Nevertheless, there are three reasons why fashion and 'wandering targets' cannot be regarded as major causes of language change.

First, if sounds wandered around randomly in the way Postal and Hockett suggest, language would soon end up in chaos. Their theories suggest that sounds are like a room full of blindfold or drunken men randomly weaving and wandering around, and occasionally crashing into one another. Instead, language remains a well-organized patterned whole, and never disintegrates into the confusion implied by random fluctuation theories.

A second argument against random fluctuation is that similar changes tend to recur in quite unconnected languages. This cannot be chance. If language were purely governed by fashion, we would not expect so many different, far-flung languages to hit on the same whims of fashion in pronunciation over the centuries.

Thirdly, there seem to be hidden and inbuilt constraints concerning which elements can change in a language. There are often identifiable 'weak spots' in a language structure where change will be likely to strike, as well as stable elements which are likely to resist change.

For these reasons, the majority of linguists regard fashion changes simply as a triggering factor, something which may set off a tendency whose deeper causes lie hidden beneath the surface.

Foreign bodies

According to some people, the majority of changes are due to the chance infiltration of foreign elements. Perhaps the most widespread version of this view is the so-called substratum theory - the suggestion that when immigrants come to a new area, or when an indigenous population learns the language of newly arrived conquerors, they learn their adopted language imperfectly. They hand on these slight imperfections to their children and to other people in their social circle, and eventually alter the language. Consider four lines from Joel Chandler Harris's 'Uncle Remus' (1880):

Oh, whar shill we go we'en de great day comes,
Wid de blowin' er de trumpits en de bangin' er de drums?
How many po' sinners'll be kotched out late
En find no latch ter de golden gate?

This is an attempt, accompanied by a certain amount of poetic licence, to represent the pronunciation of an American speaker of Black English. According to one theory, this variety of English arose when speakers of a West African language such as Mandingo or Ewe were brought over to America as slaves. When these Africans learned English, they carried over features of their original language into their adopted one.

In this type of situation the adopted language does not always move in the direction of the substratum language. Sometimes immigrants attempt to overcorrect what they feel to be a faulty accent, resulting not only in a movement away from the substratum language, but also in a change in the adopted language. Labov found an interesting example of this phenomenon in New York. He noticed a tendency among lower-class New Yorkers to pronounce a word such as door as if it were really doer (rhyming with sewer). At first he was puzzled by this finding. When he looked more closely, he found that this pronunciation was related to ethnic groupings. He discovered that it was most prominent in the speech of youngish lower-class people of Jewish and Italian extraction, and suggested that this may be a case of children reacting against their parents. He points out that the Jewish immigrants who came to New York at the beginning of the century spoke Yiddish. Yiddish speakers would normally find it difficult to hear differences between English vowels when these distinctions did not exist in Yiddish. They would therefore tend to ask for a cop of coffee, making the vowel in cup the same as the first vowel in coffee. Italian immigrants would have a similar problem. The second generation of immigrants, however, would be aware and perhaps ashamed of the foreign-sounding speech of their parents. They therefore made an exaggerated difference

between the vowels confused by their parents, so making a word such as coffee sound like cooefee and door sound like doer.

Another situation in which the infiltration of foreign elements commonly causes change is when different languages come into contact, which often happens along national borders. Inhabitants of such regions are frequently bilingual or have a working knowledge of the other language(s) in the area, in addition to their native language. In this situation, the languages tend to influence one another in various ways. The longer the contact, the deeper the influence.

A number of strange and interesting cases of language mixture have been reported in the literature. One of the most bizarre occurs in southern India, in the village of Kupwar, which is situated roughly 200 miles south-east of Bombay. Here, two dissimilar language families, Indo-European and Dravidian, come into contact. In this village of approximately 3,000 inhabitants, three languages are in common use: Kannada, which is a member of the Dravidian language family, and Urdu and Marathi, which are Indo-European languages. These languages have probably been in contact for more than six centuries, since many of the inhabitants are traditionally bilingual or trilingual. The Kupwar situation is strange in that, due to social pressures, borrowing of vocabulary has been rare. This is unusual, because vocabulary items normally spread easily. The inhabitants seem to have felt the need to maintain their ethnic identity by keeping separate words for things in different languages. Meanwhile, the syntax of all three languages has crept closer and closer together, so that now the Urdu, Marathi and Kannada spoken in Kupwar are fairly different from the standard form of these languages, with Urdu in particular having changed. The translation of the sentence 'I cut some greens and brought them' would normally be very different in the three languages concerned, both in word order and vocabulary. In the Kupwar versions, however, the syntax is surprisingly similar, with each translation having the same number of words in the same order, so that each language says, as it were, 'Leaves a few having cut taking I came'. It is unusual for the syntax of adjacent languages to affect one another to the same extent as the Kupwar example, though it illustrates the fact that with enough time and enough contact there is no limit to the extent to which languages can affect one another.

Ma'a, a language spoken in Tanzania (east Africa), provides another extreme contact situation. Ma'a is usually classified as Cushitic, a language family loosely related to Ancient Egyptian and Arabic, whose thirty-five or so languages are spoken in northeast and east Africa. Two or three hundred years ago, a group of Ma'a speakers moved southwards. Some of the migrants adopted local languages from the Bantu family. But today's Ma'a speakers, a proud, reserved people, anxious to preserve their own customs, tried to retain their own native tongue. However, partly through contact with their Bantu neighbours, and partly through continued connections with their own kinfolk who had switched to Bantu languages, Ma'a has become increasingly 'bantuized'. It has retained a lot of its own vocabulary, but in many ways it has become more like a Bantu language than a Cushitic one. For example, Bantu languages and Ma'a have objects following their verbs (Lions eat meat), but Cushitic languages have the reverse order {Lions meat eat). The Bantu languages and Ma'a have prefixes (attachments to the front of words) to show distinctions such as singular and plural. Cushitic languages mainly have suffixes (word endings). The result is a language which is neither truly Bantu, nor truly Cushitic. According to some, it is a rare but genuine example of a 'mixed language'.

So-called linguistic areas provide a further example of the way in which languages can influence one another over the course of centuries. These are areas in which some striking linguistic feature has spread over a wide range of geographically adjacent languages, which otherwise have little in common. In south-east Asia, Chinese, Vietnamese and Thai are all tone languages. In Africa, Bush-Hottentot languages and the neighbouring unrelated Bantu languages contain a set of rare sounds known as clicks, which involve clicking noises somewhat like the tut-tut of disapproval, and gee-up sound made to horses. In India, Hindi and other Indo-European languages share with the Dravidian language family certain unusual

consonants known as retroflex sounds, in which the tongue is curled backwards to the roof of the mouth. It seems unlikely that these uncommon features arose coincidentally in the languages concerned, and most linguists assume that they spread from their neighbours due to cultural contact.

The Balkans are another well-studied linguistic area. Modern Greek, Albanian, Romanian and Bulgarian are all Indo-European languages, but from different branches. Yet they show unexpected syntactic similarities. For example, they all say the equivalent of Give me that I drink for 'Give me something to drink.' The similarities probably spread when Byzantine culture was a unifying force in the region. Meso-America, the link between North and South America, may be another linguistic area. Here, a variety of languages have a surprising amount in common, such as the expression of possession by the equivalent of his-dog the man 'the man's dog. The infiltration of external foreign elements can therefore be extensive.

Need and function

A third, widely held view on sociolinguistic causes of language change involves the notion of need. Language alters as the needs of its users alter, it is claimed, a viewpoint that is sometimes referred to as a functional view of language change. This is an attractive notion.

Need is certainly relevant at the level of vocabulary. Unheeded words drop out: items of clothing which are no longer worn such as *doublet* or *kirtle* are now rarely mentioned outside a theatrical setting. New words are coined as they are required. In every decade, neologisms abound. A *twigloo* is 'a tree-house'. A *netizen* is a 'net citizen', a keen user of the Internet. *Twocking* 'taking without the owner's consent' is car theft. These words all became widely used recently. Names of people and objects are switched if the old ones seem inadequate. The word *blind* rarely occurs in official documents, and tends to be replaced by the 'politically correct' phrase *visually challenged,* which is supposedly less offensive to those who can't see. Similarly, in an American novel, garbage at the Board of City Planning in New York was not called garbage: it was called 'non-productive ex-consumer materials' - a new name which was probably coined in order to attract employees to an otherwise unattractive-sounding job. The introduction of slang terms can also be regarded as a response to a kind of need. When older words have become over-used and lose their impact, new vivid ones are introduced in their place. As one writer expressed it: 'Slang is language that takes off its coat, spits on its hands, and goes to work.'

Sometimes, however, social needs can trigger a more widespread change than the simple addition of new vocabulary items. Let us look at some situations in which social factors have apparently led to more widespread disruption.

Consider sentences such as:

Henry downed a pint of beer Melissa went to town and did a buy.

English, we note, lacks a simple means of saying 'to do something in one fell swoop'. This may be why the word *down* can be converted into a verb to mean 'drink down in one gulp', and the word *buy* into a noun which, when combined with the verb *do,* means 'go on a single massive spending spree'. This type of fast-moving, thorough activity may represent a change in the pace of life, which is in turn reflected in the language, since we increasingly make use of **conversions** - the conversion of one part of speech into another. If this trend continues, the eventual result may be complete interchangeability of items such as nouns and verbs, which were once kept rigidly apart. However, while it is true that conversions are becoming more numerous, there is no evidence that social need initiated them in the first place. Usages such as *Drusilla garaged her car,* or *Bertie upped his score,* have been around in the language for a long time. In other words, social need has accelerated a tendency which has been in existence for a considerable number of years. It did not in itself instigate a change, but is merely carrying an ongoing one along a little faster.

A more complex, and perhaps more interesting, example of need fostering a syntactic change is found in New York Black English. Consider the sentence *It ain't no cat can't get in no coop,* spoken by Speedy, the leader of the Cobras, a gang of New York City adolescents, in a discussion about pigeon coops. What does he mean? is one's first reaction. Speedy, it appears, means 'No cat can get into any of the coops.' Has Speedy made a mistake, or does he really talk like that? is one's second reaction. We confirm that Speedy's sentence was intentional by noting a number of other similarly constructed sentences. For example, an old folk epic contains the line *There wasn't a son of a gun who this whore couldn't shun,* meaning 'This whore was so good, no man could shun her.' One's third reaction is to ask how such a seemingly strange construction came about in the first place. On examination, it seems to have arisen from a need for emphasis and vividness. Let us look at the stages by which such sentences developed.

We start out with a simple negative sentence such as *No cat can get in any coop,* which was at one time found in both Standard and Black American English. However, in order to make the negatives emphatic, and say as it were 'Not a single cat can get in any coop at all', Black English utilized a simple strategy of heaping up negatives, a device common in Chaucerian and Shakespearian English, and in many languages of the world. So we find emphatic negative sentences such as *No cat can't get in no coop.* In the course of time, the heaping up of negatives was no longer treated as an extra optional device used for emphasis, but became the standard obligatory way of coping with negation. Therefore a new method of expressing emphasis had to be found. This was to attach the phrase *it ain't* 'there isn't' to the front of the sentence.

So we get *it ain't + no cat can't get in no coop,* giving Speedy's sentence: *It ain't no cat can't get in no coop,* parallel to a more standard 'There isn't a single cat that can get into any coop.'

Here, then, we have a state of affairs where a need for vividness and emphasis has led to the adoption of a new, optional stylistic device, in this case the heaping up of negatives. In the course of time, the optional device is used so often that it becomes the normal, obligatory form. So a newer, different device is brought in to cope with the need for emphasis - a process which could go on *ad infinitum.* Note, however, that although a new and superficially odd type of sentence has been introduced into the language, it came about by the utilization of two constructions already in the language: the heaping up of negatives and the use of *it ain't* at the beginning of the sentence. The example just discussed arose out of a need for vividness or emphasis, a requirement which is probably universal.

All the changes considered in this article were superficially caused by sociolinguistic factors – fashion, foreign influence, or social need. On closer examination, many turned out not to be 'real' causes, but simply accelerating agents which utilized and encouraged tendencies that are already under way.

The list of literature

1. Aitchison J. Language origin and evolution. -Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
2. Cheshire J. Syntactic variation, the linguistic variable and sociolinguistic theory. –Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
3. Chambers J.K. Sociolinguistic theory: Linguistic variation and its social significance. –Oxford, 1995.

Н. Гречихіна, Т. Тимошенко
Соціолінгвістичні причини зміни мови

В статті розглядаються соціолінгвістичні причини зміни мови. Пропонується розгляд трьох зовнішніх соціолінгвістичних факторів – мода, іноземний вплив та соціальна потреба, які можуть потенціально впливати на мову та розвивати вже існуючі у мові приховані тенденції.

Н. Гречихина, Т. Тимошенко
Социолингвистические причини изменения языка

В статье рассматриваются социолингвистические причины изменения языка. Предлагается рассмотрение трех внешних социолингвистических факторов – мода, иностранное влияние и социальная необходимость, которые могут потенциально оказывать влияние на язык и развивать уже существующие в языке скрытые тенденции.

УДК 631.3.0

М.М. Петренко, проф., канд.техн.наук, Т.К. Марченко, ст. гр. ОМ-06
Кіровоградській національний технічний університет

Напрямки досліджень у галузі грунтозберігаючих технологій та знарядь для основного обробітку ґрунту

Проаналізовано переваги та недоліки існуючих технологій проведення оранки з екологічної точки зору, наведено основні напрямки збереження агрегатного стану грунту під час обробітку
деградація грунтів, оранка, збереження агрегатного стану грунту

Загальновідомо, що обробіток грунту є одним із важливих чинників антропогенного впливу на стан грунтів на планеті. Сільськогосподарська освоєність земель в Україні найвища в світі. Рівень розораності її території сягає 55%.

Інтенсивна система землеробства з багатократним використанням робочих органів та рушіїв мобільних агрегатів, в кінцевому рахунку, веде до деградації грунтів. За останні 25 років площа еродованих грунтів на Україні збільшилася на 2 млн. га і складає 10 млн. га. За підрахунками Інституту охорони земель, по Україні за рік втрачається 344.6 млн. т грунту, або біля 20 т/га. На ефективні екологічно безпечні способи обробітку грунту, що розроблені і застосовуються в Україні, припадає не більше 20%. Застосування недосконалих способів обробітку грунту в Україні приводить до поступової деградації земель, поширенню ерозійних процесів.

Нині оранка в Україні є найбільш поширеним способом обробітку грунту (біля 55%о). До основних прийомів оранки належать відвальний обробіток грунту (плугом), безвідвальний (чизелювання). культивація, пласкорізна та фрезерна обробка.

Основними недоліками відвальної оранки є те. що при обробці полів на схилах, де переміщення шару ґрунту можливе лише в один бік. відбувається поступове зміщення родючого шару грунту вниз, що призводить до оголення схилів; при обробітку полів з рівним рельєфом для виключення великих холостих проходів орного агрегату поле розбивають на загінки, при оранці яких утворюються звальні гребені та розвальні борозни, а також огріхи при стикуванні.

Використання ж оборотних плугів з двома комплектами робочих органів, які працюють поперемінно, дає можливість поліпшити якість оранки, тобто забезпечити гладку оранку, але це призводить до збільшення металомісткості плуга, тобто підвищення ступеню переущільнення.