HISTORICAL ASPECTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF ARCHAISMS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

ІСТОРИЧНІ АСПЕКТИ РОЗВИТКУ АРХАЇЗМІВ У АНГЛІЙСКІЙ МОВІ

Галина Олейнікова
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент
E-mail: oleinikova1211@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-5483-1964
Ізмаїльський державний гуманітарний
університет, Україна

Galina Oleinikova
PhD of Philology, Associate professor
E-mail: oleinikova1211@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-5483-1964
Izmail State University of Humanities,
Ukraine

ABSTRACT

Language, like everything around us, is constantly evolving and changing. Its development is influenced not only by historical events, but also by the development of the economy, medicine and new technologies. Some words lose their relevance and go into the past, new ones appear instead. Some words and expressions remain in the language and gradually acquire additional meanings, while others are used for a very short time and quickly disappear from their use. There are words that denote objects that are no longer relevant in our life, but without them we will not be able to communicate normally and understand each other. Thus, the language of each historical era is unique and has its own characteristics. Today, the English language is of significant importance in the international arena, therefore, an in-depth study of specific points at different levels: grammatical, semantic, phonetic, is being actively carried out. Language modification occurs regularly and, accordingly, arouses an increased interest of linguists in the study of vocabulary, which is becoming obsolete and disappearing from the sphere of use. This article discusses archaisms which are considered to be like obsolete words, word-combinations of speech or lexical-semantic variants of words, units of obsolete vocabulary replaced by a synonym from among units of neutral vocabulary. There are a number of classifications of archaisms based on lexical, semantic, grammatical or other features. According to the semantic classification, archaisms are divided into lexical, words that are completely outdated and semantic, words that have outdated meaning. Grammatical archaisms are words that have changed their grammatical form in modern language. Based on the classification data, the article presents an analysis of archaisms in the work of W. Shakespeare "Hamlet". The role of archaisms is emphasized and it is noted that many linguists agree that these lexical units are used to recreate the historical flavor of the era; to give speech a touch of solemnity, for example, in poetry, in an oratory speech; to create a comic effect, irony, satire, parody; for the speech characteristics of the character.

Key words: archaisms, obsolete words, semantic classification, grammatical classification.

Any language is constantly developing and changing over time, which leads to the emergence of new words, new expressions and forms. It means that words which were used in the language and do not correspond to reality, which have been supplanted by more modern and convenient synonymous words and expressions, lose their frequency of use and gradually become obsolete and leave the language. This is the process how historicisms, archaisms and neologisms appear. In their general totality, it is these lexical units that are the «building material» without which any language is unthinkable (Виноградов, 1971).

Formulation of the problem. Changes in the language, and in particular in the vocabulary, reflect the ongoing social processes. Some words appear in the language, while others leave it. Thus, the language of each historical era is unique and has its own characteristics. Today, English is of significant importance in the international arena, therefore, an in-depth study of specific points at different levels of the language (grammatical, semantic, phonetic) is being actively held. Language modification occurs regularly and, accordingly, arouses an increased interest of linguists in the study of vocabulary, which is becoming obsolete and disappearing from the sphere of use.

Analysis of recent publications. The problems of classification of obsolete vocabulary and the peculiarities of its translation have been studied by a number of Russian and foreign scientists. The ideas of G.I. Richter, B.N. Golovina, E.V.Lesnykh on the distribution of archaisms and historicisms as a separate lexical and semantic category of outdated vocabulary. The thought by N.G.Edneralova. on the classification of historicisms based on thematic groups (Еднералова, 2003), the conclusions of D.A. Salimova, A.A. Timerkhanova, L.S. Barkhudarov that changes in the structure of a particular language can serve as a kind of identifier for any social change (Салимова, 2012). A.N. Gorokhova and other linguists speak about what methods translators use in their work to convey the meaning of a particular unit of outdated vocabulary from the original text as accurately as possible (Горохова, 2011).

The purpose of this article is to analyze and provide clear classifications of units of obsolete vocabulary or archaisms and demonstrate the use of this vocabulary in the work of the famous English playwright W. Shakespeare.

Presentation of the main material. Language is not a static system, and as time progresses and changes eras is undergoing changes at all levels: phonetic, lexical and grammatical. Due to these changes, the so-called active and passive vocabulary. Active vocabulary includes words that do not leave constant use and do not cause any difficulties in understanding most of its speakers. Active vocabulary includes not only common vocabulary, but also words, the use of which limited by the environment of use (professionalism, terms, book emotionally expressive words).

Passive vocabulary includes lexical units that are rarely used, are not known to most native speakers, and require additional explanations. In the passive vocabulary, two groups are distinguished: words that, due to changes in extra-linguistic reality, have left the language, that is, obsolete; words, archaisms, historicisms and words that have not completely entered general literary use or have just appeared in the language, they are neologisms.

Archaisms refer to multifunctional literary and book vocabulary, which is a heterogeneous category of words that differ in function. In addition to archaic words, it also includes historicisms, outdated terms and others. Let us consider in more detail the distinctive features of historicisms and archaisms (Арнольд, 1996: 331).

Historicisms are words that have completely disappeared from modern language. They describe objects and phenomena that no longer exist. You cannot find synonyms for them. Many historicisms are unknown to modern people, others refer to a passive vocabulary and are familiar from history books or other specialized literature. Historicisms are completely out of active use in the language. English-speaking linguists call historicisms obsolete words. These are the words like *goblet, mace, yeoman* (Арнольд, 1996: 331).

Semantic and grammatical transformations of linguistic units in the course of the development of society are usually explained by changes in the historical plan, the peculiarities of the perception of the surrounding world, the formation of new mental structures of native speakers, reflecting their attitude to reality at a given linguistic level of language development (Фоменко, 2019; 24-26). Some words in the process of historical development may become irrelevant on their own; they are simply replaced by other, new synonymous words that are more convenient to use in speech. This is how archaisms appear.

Archaisms are obsolete words that in modern language have more relevant synonyms. They describe ordinary, non-specific objects and phenomena that began to be called differently (Aitchison, 2003). Unlike historicisms, archaisms are preserved to some extent in the active lexical stock of a native speaker. They continue to be used in specific areas for specific purposes. They are stylistically marked – that is, their meaning is not neutral, but has a coloration (for example, sublime, formal or ironic). As a rule, archaisms and historicisms have corresponding notes in dictionaries. In English, archaisms are called *archaisms or archaic words*.

Some words are falling out of their use and begin to acquire old-fashioned shades of meaning, but it is still difficult to attribute them to archaisms. They can be actively used by older people; they can be found in fiction of previous decades. From the linguists' point of view, these are relevant words, but native speakers already feel that they are outdated. From an everyday point of view, they can be called *outdated or old-fashioned*, in English – *outdated words*.

There are also obsolete words known in English as fossil words. These are archaisms and historicisms that have fallen out of use in ordinary speech, but have survived in idioms. The idioms themselves are widely used, so such words are still included in the vocabulary of native speakers. For example, the archaic word ado still exists in English thanks to the expression *«without further ado»*.

Each of us may ask the question – why do we study archaisms or other obsolete words if they are no longer used in our speech? To answer this question, we will demonstrate several reasons that clearly show the need and benefit of studying these lexical units.

First of all, when reading the English-language fiction of the past centuries in the original, we often come across similar words. For example, in fiction you can find such archaic or outdated words as *whence – where, thine – yours, verdant – green*. This includes not only W. Shakespeare, who wrote several centuries ago and in his works there are quite a large number of archaisms, but also the literary texts of such writers as Charles Dickens, Jane Austen, Somerset Maugham, the Bronte sisters and even more modern writers like John Fowles or James Baldwin. It is especially important to know archaisms if you are interested in English-language poetry. So, in poetry, historical novels and other works of art, to make the text more solemn, you can find the following archaisms: *Thou – you; Morn – morning; Eve – eve; Woe – grief; Behold – to behold; Billow – wave; Pray – please.*

Quite often you can find archaisms in the language of official prose, in documents, laws. Many British laws were written centuries ago and have not changed since then. The new ones repeated their language. Modern legal documents in English traditionally continue to use words and phrases from old laws. In jurisprudence, archaisms have become professional jargon. If your work is related to official documents, you need to know words like *thereof, hereby, aforesaid, Beg to inform – we inform you; There with – with that; Aforesaid – the above; Hereby is this.*

Another argument for the study of archaisms is the ability to maintain a conversation and give the impression of an erudite person. Sometimes archaisms and obsolete phrases are specially used in modern speech. Educated and erudite people can insert archaic words into sentences in order to achieve the desired effect with the help of their stylistic coloring. For example, they give speech a solemn and sublime look. Or, conversely, this is an ironic trick: using an outdated word in a modern context will help defuse the situation.

It is worth noting that some words that were used not so long ago in the speech of many people lose their use and are replaced by synonymous words. They are still found in English textbooks or in the speech of the older generation. It is better not to use them in modern speech, because they look old-fashioned and ridiculous. Here are some examples with more modern synonyms: *Pupil – student; It goes without saying – obviously; Television – TV; How do you do – how is it going?; Rather – kind of, fairly.*

There are many definitions of the concept of "archaism". In a number of definitions, it is noted that archaism is an outdated element of the language. Other definitions emphasize that archaisms are replaced by synonymous units of neutral vocabulary. In addition, some linguists

note that not only a word or a turn of speech, but also a lexico-semantic version of a word can be archaism (Еднералова, 2003). Thus, archaism is an obsolete word, a turn of speech or a lexico-semantic version of a word, a unit of outdated vocabulary replaced by a synonym from a number of neutral vocabulary units.

There are a number of classifications of archaisms based on certain lexical, semantic, grammatical and other features. Some researchers of obsolete vocabulary adhere to a lexical classification, distinguishing three classes of archaisms:

1) archaisms – realities – words denoting disappeared objects and phenomena;

2) archaisms – losses – words completely forgotten by the bulk of native speakers, supplanted by synonyms;

3) archaisms – synonyms – words that are in the process of obsolescence, they have synonyms, but which are still understandable to native speakers (Арнольд, 1996).

A number of scholars offer a semantic classification of archaisms. The classification is based on the division of archaisms into lexical (words that are completely obsolete as certain sound complexes) and semantic (semantic) (words that are obsolete meanings of a word), which in turn are divided into subgroups (Шестакова, 2000).

There is also a grammatical classification of archaisms, in which, in addition to lexical and semantic archaisms, grammatical archaisms are distinguished – words that have changed the grammatical form in the modern language.

The most complete classification seems to be based on lexical and grammatical classifications, according to which three classes of archaisms are distinguished:

• *Lexical archaisms* – words that are completely obsolete as

certain sound complexes;

• proper lexical (words that are completely obsolete as certain sound complexes);

• lexico-phonetic (words that differ from modern

options with only a few sounds);

• lexical and morphological (words that differ from modern versions by individual grammatical features);

• lexico-derivational (words that differ from a synonymous word of the modern language only by a derivational element, most often a suffix);

• accentological (words that differ in stress);

• semantic archaisms – words that are outdated meanings of a word;

- • *grammatical archaisms* – words, the grammatical form of which has undergone changes (Арнольд, 1996).

Referring to the classification proposed by I.V. Arnold, three types of archaic words are traditionally distinguished:

• obsolete words – words that are not used native speakers and are gradually leaving the sphere of use. An example is morphological forms – *thou, thee, thy, words – garniture – furniture, a palfrey – a small horse;*

• words that have completely disappeared. For example, *methinks – it seems, nay – no.*

• words that are considered to be pure archaisms, since they are no longer recognized in modern English, although these lexical units were widely used in Old English. For example: *thou, losel is a lazy guy, descant is a melody* (Арнольд, 1996).

In addition, archaisms can be divided into the following thematic groups:

• everyday, everyday vocabulary (for example: *to outrival – archaic; surpass in competition or comparison*) (Collins, 2007);

• professions, occupations (for example: *abigail – archaic; a lady's maid)* (Oxford English Dictionary, 2013);

• garments (for example: *habit – archaic; clothes*);

• food, food (*sweetmeats – archaic; an item of confectionery or sweet food*);

• words that give the hero's speech a sublime character (for example: *to behold - archaic; see or observe someone or something, especially of remarkable or impressive nature)* [Collins, 2007];

• words that give the hero's speech a vernacular shade (for example: *harlot – archaic; a prostitute or promiscuous woman*);

• words that are references to religion, the text of the Bible (for example: *Hebrew ark – archaic; the wooden chest which contained the tablets of the laws of the ancient Israelites. Carried by the Israelites on their wanderings in the wilderness, it was later placed by Solomon in the Temple at Jerusalem)* (Collins, 2007);

• words used to describe the appearance, characteristics features of a character (for example: *ruth - archaic; a feeling of pity, distress, or grief*) (Oxford English Dictionary, 2013);

• words related to the field of jurisprudence (for example: *to entailed – archaic; cause to experience or possess permanently or inescapably*) (Collins, 2007);

• time indicators (for example: *ever and anon – archaic; occasionally*);

• direction signs (for example: *thither – archaic; to or towards that place)* (Collins, 2007).

For a more detailed examination of archaisms, we turned to the works of the famous English writer W. Shakespeare. The wealth of W. Shakespeare's language lies not so much in the number of words as in the huge number of meanings and shades in which he uses the word. His works are full of the introduction of archaic word forms and the influence of the playwright on the formation of English words was the strongest in terms of the composition of words, in particular adjectives, but also in the field of converting nouns into verbs and vice versa, which allows many linguists to study these lexical units.

For the analysis, we took the work of W. Shakespeare «Hamlet», where we selected 80 archaic lexical units and divided them according to the classification of IV Arnold, which is presented above.

The conducted research has demonstrated the fact that these lexical units can be divided into the following groups: lexical archaisms, which in turn are subdivided into proper lexical, lexical-semantic, lexico-word-formative and grammatical archaisms.

The results of our analysis of archaisms according to I.V. Arnold's classification indicate that in the tragedy «Hamlet» lexical archaisms (65%) significantly prevail over grammatical ones (35%). In general, the current situation is quite natural, as the vocabulary is the most mobile sphere of the language. Lexical units change faster than all other tiers of the language system, since they are the first to reflect all changes taking place in the world, in contrast to the phonetic, morphological and syntactic systems, which are more conservative. The lexical layer is constantly replenished with new words, and obsolete units of the language end up in dictionaries.

It should be noted that the most frequent group of lexical archaisms is the group of lexical archaisms proper (35%). These words were used only in everyday life of a person and subsequently they were ousted from the active vocabulary with a different root and completely disappeared from their use. As stated above, it is in the vocabulary that all the processes of the historical development of society are reflected. With the emergence of new objects, phenomena, new concepts arise, and with them – and words for the names of these concepts. With the withering away of certain phenomena, they go out of use or change their sound image and the meaning of the words that call them. For example: *Prithee* (adv.) – please: *«I prithee, take thy fingers from my throat»;Aught* (adv.) – at all; in any respect: *«Since no man knows of aught he leaves, what is't to leave betimes?»; Cutpurse* (n.) – pickpocket, thief: *«A cutpurse of the empire and the rule...»; Reechy* (adj.) – dirty, filthy*: «And let him, for a pair of reechy kisses...»; Yesternight* (n.) – last nigh: *«My lord, I think I saw him yesternight»* (Shakespeare, 1915).

The second place is occupied by lexical and semantic archaisms (20%) – these are words preserved in the active vocabulary, in which the meanings are outdated. Certain words at different times could have different meanings. Thus, some of these meanings were forgotten, replaced by new ones that still exist. In Shakespeare's tragedy «Hamlet» we can trace this change

in the meanings of archaic lexical units. An example is the following lines: *«I take him to be a soul of great article ...»*, where the well-known word *«article»* carries the obsolete meaning of *«a special moment, a difficult combination of circumstances»*.

In the following statement W. Shakespeare uses the word *«jump»* as an adverb in the meaning of *«exactly, completely, completely»*, in which it is not used or is used very rarely in modern English: *«Thus, twice before, and jump in this dead time»*. The word *«sport»* is victorious in the play in the unusual meaning of «light flirting»: *«Neither the earth gives me food, nor the heavenly light, Sport and peace block me day and night»*.

Our analysis revealed that the smallest in terms of quantity is the group of lexical – derivational archaisms, which occupies only 9% of lexical archaisms. This means that this type of archaism was not so common in the English language. The place of an obsolete word in the vocabulary is taken by a word of the same root synonymous with it, which differs from it by the presence of an affix or, as in this case, by its absence. These lexical units were used to represent the character's excitement. Considering the subsequent appearance of new word-formation models, these archaisms were transformed by adding an affix, and have become commonly used today. Typical examples are pairs such as: *morn – morning («The cock, that is the trumpet to the morn ...»), attent - attentive («With an attent ear till I may deliver ...»), oft – often («Your loneliness. We are oft to blame in this ...»), hap – happen («And whatsomever else shall hap tonight ...»).*

Having considered the lexical archaisms and their subgroups, we proceed to the analysis of grammatical archaic lexical units, accounting for 35%. It should be noted that the typical features inherent in the language of the New English period, and especially grammar, presented in W.Shakespeare are quite vivid. The latter is manifested in the declension of verbs, simplification of the system of inflections, normalization of the use of analytical forms, changes in the pronoun system.

As for the verbs, which were analyzed in the work? We can admit that they have not yet lost the ability to convey the meaning of a person. Typical second person singular endings «-st» and «-est»: *I know – thou knowest; I have – thou hast; I do – thou doest (dost); I should – thou shouldst; I would – thou wouldst.*

The example taken from W. Shakespeare's tragedy «Hamlet»:

«I prithee, when thou seest that act afoot ...»
«So is it, if thou knowest our purposes».
«Thou still hast been the father of good news».
«O Jephthah, judge of Israel, what a treasure hadst thou»
«If thou dost marry ...»
Thus didest thou [29].

In that period of time the category of number in the second person verb was in the process of disappearance, but has not yet disappeared completely. Under certain conditions the ability to express the difference between singular and plural in the second person verb is still preserved. The form of the second person singular on «-*st*», associated with the personal pronoun «thou», during the XVII century is gradually being replaced by the usual literary language.

The verb «to be» in the second person can vividly demonstrate the situation: *I am – thou art; I was – thou wast; I were – thou wert; If thou art privy to the country fate ...; Thou art a scholar .....*

In many works of W. Shakespeare, the pronouns *«thou, thy, thine, thee»*, the reflexive form of the pronoun *«thyself»* were widely used:

«If thou hast any sound, or use of voice, speak to me» «Thou comest in such a questionable shape» «Give thy thoughts no tongue ...» «Give every man thine ear, but few thy voice ...» [29]

The above example clearly demonstrates the variant when the possessive pronoun is used in two variants *«thine» and «thy»*. In this case, *«thine»* as a definition was used before words beginning with a vowel sound, and *«thy»* – before words beginning with a consonant.

So, the analysis showed that the grammatical structure of speech, which was inherent in the work of W. Shakespeare, significantly differs from the grammatical structure of modern English. But in order to create a natural historical atmosphere and its image in the translations of W. Shakespeare's works, we observe a variety of grammatical archaisms.

Conclusions and prospects for further exploration. The language of a person is mobile, like his thought. Words enter the layer of active vocabulary, leave it, return or disappear altogether. This is a continuous and irreversible process that affects not only the language, but also the public consciousness.

Summing up the above, it can be noted that from the point of view of a modern person, a reader, archaisms that are used in modern language help, first of all, to recreate the atmosphere of a historical era. Archaisms of such thematic groups as professions / occupations, garments, food / drinks allow the reader to imagine the life of the heroes in a particular historical period of time. These lexical units give the author's speech a sublime character and allow to demonstrate the peculiarities of the language of the main characters of the work.

ДЖЕРЕЛА ТА ЛІТЕРАТУРА

Арнольд И. В. Лексикология современного английского языка. М.: Высшая школа. 1996. 376 с.

Aitchison J. Words in the Mind: An Introduction to the Mental Lexicon. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.

Виноградов В.В. О теории художественной речи. М.: Высшая школа, 1971. 240 с.

Горохова А. И. Способы достижения эквивалентности в синхронном и письменном переводах. Якутск: Северо-Восточный федеральный университет, 2011. 117 с.

Еднералова Н. Г. Устаревшая лексика русского языка новейшего периода и её восприятие языковым сознанием современных школьников: автореф. дис. . канд. фил. наук. Воронеж, 2003. 26 с.

Кухаренко В.А. Интерпретация текста. М.: Просвещение, 1988. 192 с.

Салимова Д. А. Двуязычие и перевод: теория и опыт исследования. М.: ФЛИНТА, 2012. 280 с.

Фоменко Л.Н. Влияние классических языков на современный английский. *Вестник ИМСИТ*. Вип. 2 (78). 2012. С. 24-26.

Шанский Н.М. Лингвистический анализ художественного текста. Л.: Наука. 1990. 450 с.

Шестакова Н.А. Архаическая лексика современного русского языка по данным толковых словарей XVIII-XX вв.: дис. на соиск. учен. степ. к.филол.н.: специальность 10.02.01; Брянск, 2000. 309 с.

Barfield O. History in English words: 2nd edition. West Stockbridge, MA: Lindisfarne Press, 2002. 236 p.

Collins English Dictionary. 10th edition. London: HarperCollins UK, 2007. 2340 p

Crystal D. Words in Time and Place: Exploring Language Through the Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary, 1st edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. 304 p

Jespersen O. Growth and Structure of the English Language. Leipzig: Published by B.G. Teubner. 1905. URL: file:///C:/Users/%D0%93%D0%B0%D0%BB%D0%B8%D0%BD%D0%B0/Downloads/Growth andStructureoftheEnglishLanguage_10541242.pdf

Nordquist R. Archaism Word and Syntax. 2019. URL: https://www.thoughtco.com/archaism-words-and-syntax-1689130

Ogilvie S. Words of the World: A Global History of the Oxford English Dictionary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. 256 p.

Shakespeare W. Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. New York: Collins Edition, 1915. 170 p.

Oxford English Dictionary. 7th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 1056 p.

REFERENCES

Arnol'd Y. V. (1996). Leksykolohyya sovremennoho anhlyyskoho yazyka. M.: Vysshaya shkola. 376 s. [in Russian].

Aitchison J. (2003). Words in the Mind: An Introduction to the Mental Lexicon / Aitchison J. – Oxford: Blackwell.

Vynohradov V.V. (1971). O teoryy khudozhestvennoy rechy. M.: Vysshaya shkola. 240 s. [in Russian].

Horokhova A. Y. (2011). Sposoby dostyzhenyya эkvyvalentnosty v synkhronnom y pys'mennom perevodakh. Yakutsk: Severo-Vostochnjy federal'nыy unyversytet. – 117 s. [in Russian].

Edneralova N. H. (2003). Ustarevshaya leksyka russkoho yazyka noveysheho peryoda y eye vospryyatye yazykovym soznanyem sovremenogo shkol'nykov: avtoref. dys. . kand. fyl. nauk. Voronezh. 26 s. [in Russian].

Kukharenko V.A. (1988). Interpretatsyya teksta. M.: Prosveshchenye. – 192 s. [in Russian].

Salimova D. A. Dvujazychie i perevod: teorija i opyt issledovanija. – M.: FLINTA, 2012 – 280 s. [in Russian].

Fomenko L.N. (2019). Vlyyanye klassycheskykh yazykov na sovremennujy anhlyyskyy. Vestnyk YMSYT. Vyp. 2 (78), 24-26. [in Russian].

Shanskyy N.M. (1990). Lynhvystycheskyy analyz khudozhestvennoho teksta. L.: Nauka. – 450 s. [in Russian].

Shestakova N.A. (2000). Arkhaycheskaya leksyka sovremennoho russkoho yazyka po dannym tolkovykh slovarey XVIII-XX vv.: dys. na soysk. uchen. step. k.fylol.n.: spetsyal'nost' 10.02.01; Bryansk. 309 s. [in Russian].

Barfield O. History in English words: 2nd edition. West Stockbridge, MA: Lindisfarne Press, 2002. – 236 p.

Collins English Dictionary (2007). 10th edition. London: HarperCollins UK. 2340 p

Crystal D. Words in Time and Place: Exploring Language Through the Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary, 1st edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. 304 p

Jespersen O. (1905). Growth and Structure of the English Language. Leipzig: Published by B.G. Teubner. URL: file:///C:/Users/%D0%93%D0%B0%D0%BB%D0%B8%D0%BD%D0%B0/Downloads/Growth andStructureoftheEnglishLanguage_10541242.pdf

Nordquist R. (2019) Archaism Word and Syntax. URL: https://www.thoughtco.com/archaism-words-and-syntax-1689130

Ogilvie S. (2012). Words of the World: A Global History of the Oxford English Dictionary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – 256 p.

Shakespeare W. (1915). Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. New York: Collins Edition. 170 p.

Oxford English Dictionary (2013). 7th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1056 p.

АНОТАЦІЯ

Динамічні зміни ХХ – початку ХХІ ст. проявляються в багатьох сферах людського розвитку: економіці, медицині, технічному та інформаційному просторі, політичній ситуації тієї чи іншої країни. Всі вищеперераховані процеси знаходять своє відображення в інтенсивній неологізації, тобто входженні в мовну систему, вживання і використання людиною нових лексичних одиниць, нових понять, але одночасно відбувається процес архаїзації, тобто слова перестають вживатися, застарівають. Одні слова втрачають свою актуальність і йдуть у минуле, замість них з'являються нові. Деякі слова й вирази залишаються у вживанні й поступово набувають додаткових значень, а інші використовуються упродовж дуже короткого часу і швидко зникають з ужитку. Можна стверджувати, що з розвитком культури, техніки і науки відбувається лексичний розвиток суспільства. З'являються нові слова, які з історичним розвитком суспільства витісняють старі. Важливість застарілої лексики, архаїзмів проявляється в розумінні темпів розвитку суспільства і дослідженні історичних подій. Отже, кожна історична епоха унікальна і має свої особливості в мовному плані. Для сучасної людини архаїзми є частиною історії, їх можна вивчати для аналізу різних історичних періодів мови, а також суспільства в цілому. У даній статті розглядаються архаїзми як застарілі слова, мовні звороти або лексико-семантичні варіанти слів, одиниці застарілої лексики, замінні синонімом з числа одиниць нейтральної лексики. Існує цілий ряд класифікацій архаїзмів, заснованих на лексичних, семантичних, граматичних чи інших ознаках. Архаїзми традиційно розглядались як важливий стилістичний засіб зі строго обумовленою сферою застосування, і, перш за все, враховувалась роль архаїзмів у створенні історичної стилізації в художніх текстах. Дана стаття представляє аналіз архаїзмів у творі В. Шекспіра «Гамлет». Підкреслюється роль архаїзмів і відзначається, що багато вчених сходяться на думці, що дані лексичні одиниці використовуються для відтворення історичного колориту епохи, надання мові відтінку урочистості, в ораторському виступі, а також для мовної характеристики персонажа.

***Ключові слова:** архаїзми, застарілі слова, семантична класифікація, граматична класифікація.*