PHONETIC TRANSCRIPTION AND CONSTRUCTION OF OLD ENGLISH

Sulaymanova Nilufar Jabbarovna
Sam SIFL Head of the chair,
Ansorova Mutriba Muazzamovna
Dean of the Foreign languages
TPPI, Tadjikistan

Abstract: In this article we will learn about the Old English vowel system, which had a clear trend towards symmetry and balance because practically every long vowel had a corresponding short counterpart in this course work. Consonants have typically been more stable than vowels, though there have been shifts throughout history. The Old English consonant system was made up of numerous connected groups of consonants. The consonants were divided into two categories: noise consonants and sonorants. Plosives and fricatives were created from the noise consonants. The distinction between voiced and voiceless plosives was made on the basis of phonemic differences.

Key words: International Phonetic Alphabet, allophony, Anglo-Frisian languages, closing diphthongs, height-harmonic diphthongs,

Old English words, reconstructed parent forms of various kinds, and reconstructed Proto-West-Germanic (PWG), Proto-Germanic (PG), and Proto-Indo-European (PIE) forms are all described using the following conventions:

• Italicized forms are either Old English words in their orthography or reconstructed forms of various kinds. Extra diacritics are used when there is phonemic uncertainty in Old English spelling

• Forms between /slashes/ and [brackets] denote broad (phonemic) or limited (allophonic) pronunciation, respectively. Standard IPA notation is used to represent the sounds. The following table indicates the correspondence between spelling and pronunciation transcribed in the International Phonetic Alphabet. For details of the relevant sound systems, see Proto-Germanic phonology and Old English phonology [3.233].

Proto-Germanic /b d ɡ/ had two allophones each: stops [b d ɡ] and fricatives [β ð ɣ]. The stops occurred:

1.   following a nasal;
2.   when geminated;
3.   word-initially, for /b/ and /d/ only;
4.   following /l/, for /d/ only.

By West Germanic times, /d/ was pronounced as a stop [d] in all positions. The fricative allophones are sometimes indicated in reconstructed forms to make it easier to understand the development of Old English consonants. Old English retained the allophony [ɡ~ɣ], which in case of palatalization became [dʒ~j]. Later, non-palatalized [ɣ] became [ɡ] word-initially. The allophony [b~β] was broken when [β] merged with [v], the voiced allophone of /f/.

Phonological processes

In the period before the oldest documentation, a number of phonological processes influenced Old English. The processes impacted vowels in particular, which is why many Old English words differ greatly from related terms in languages like Old High German, which is much closer to both languages' common West Germanic parent. The events occurred in roughly the order listed below (with uncertainty in ordering as noted).

Nasal absorption prior to fricatives

This is the origin of modern English five, mouth, us against German fünf, Mund, uns, for example. See Ingvaeonic nasal spirant law for more information. First a-fronting

The Anglo-Frisian languages underwent a sound change in their development from Proto-West-Germanic by which *ā* [ɑː], unless followed by /n, m/ or nasalised, was fronted to *ǣ* [æː].[1] This was similar to the later process affecting short *a*, which is known as Anglo-Frisian brightening or First Fronting (see below). Nasalized *ą̄* and the sequences *ān, ām* were unaffected and were later raised to *ǭ, ōn, ōm* (see below). (This may be taken to imply that a nasal consonant *n, m* caused a preceding long vowel to nasalise.) In the non-West-Saxon dialects of English (including the Anglian dialect underlying Modern English) the fronted vowel was further raised to *ē* [eː]: W.S. *slǣpan*, *sċēap* (< Proto-West-Germanic *slāpąn*, *skāpă* < Proto-Germanic *slēpaną*, *skēpą*) versus Anglian *slēpan*, *sċēp*. The Modern English descendants *sleep* and *sheep* reflect the Anglian vowel; the West Saxon words would have developed to *sleap*, *sheap*.

The vowel affected by this change, which is reconstructed as being a low back vowel *ā* [ɑː] in Proto-West-Germanic, was the reflex of Proto-Germanic /ɛː/. It is possible that in Anglo-Frisian, Proto-Germanic /ɛː/ simply remained a front vowel, developing to Old English *ǣ* or *ē* without ever passing through an intermediate stage as the back vowel [ɑː].[2] However, borrowings such as Old English *strǣt* from Latin *strāta (via)* and the backing to *ō* before nasals are much easier to explain under the assumption of a common West Germanic stage *ā*.

Monophthongization

Proto-Germanic /ai/ was monophthongised (smoothed) to /aː/ ([ɑː]).[3] This occurred after first a-fronting. For example, Proto-Germanic *stainaz* became Old English *stān* (modern *stone*) (cf. Old Frisian *stēn* vs. Gothic *stáin*, Old High German *stein*). In many cases, the resulting [ɑː] was later fronted to [æː] by i-mutation: *dǣlan* "to divide" (cf. Old Frisian *dēla* vs. Gothic *dáiljan*, Old High German *teilen*). It is possible that this monophthongisation occurred via the height harmonisation that produced the other diphthongs in Old English (presumably through an intermediate stage: /ai/ > [ɑæ] > /aː/).

Second a-fronting

The second part of a-fronting, called Anglo-Frisian brightening or First Fronting, is very similar to the first part except that it affects short *a* instead of long *ā*. Here *a* [ɑ] is fronted to *æ* [æ] unless followed by /n, m/ or nasalised, the same conditions as applied in the first part.[4]

Importantly, a-fronting was blocked by *n, m* only in stressed syllables, not unstressed syllables, which accounts for forms like *ġefen* (formerly *ġefæn*) "given" from Proto-Germanic *gebanaz*. However, the infinitive *ġefan* retains its back vowel due to *a*-restoration (see the explanation given in that section for the similar case of *faren* vs. *faran*).

Diphthong height harmonisation

Proto-Germanic had the closing diphthongs /ai, au, eu/ (and [iu], an allophone of /eu/ when an /i/ or /j/ followed in the next syllable). In Old English, these (except /ai/, which had been monophthongised, as noted above) developed into diphthongs of a generally less common type in which both elements are of the same height, called height-harmonic diphthongs. This process is called diphthong height harmonisation. Specifically:

- /au/ [ɑu] underwent a-fronting to /æu/ and was then harmonised to /æːɑ/, spelled *ea* (or in modern texts *ēa*).
- /eu/ [eu] was harmonised to /eːo/, spelled *eo* (or in modern texts *ēo*).
- [iu] was already harmonic; it became a separate phoneme /iːu/[who?], spelled *io* (or in modern texts *īo*). (This interpretation is somewhat controversial; see below.)

Other later processes, such as breaking, palatal diphthongisation, back mutation, and i-mutation, resulted in an extra diphthong ie /iy/ in Old English. Short (monotonic) /aea, eo, iu, iy/[who?] and long /a, eo, iu, iy/ diphthongs are possible. For some or all of these Old English diphthongs, some sources reconstruct additional phonetic forms that are not height-harmonic. The first elements of a, o, and o are thought to have had the qualities [], [e], and I (evidence for these qualities comes from the behavior of breaking and back mutation described below; the Middle English development of short ea into /a/ could also provide some evidence for the phonetic realization of a). The second parts of these diphthongs, on the other hand, have a wider range of interpretations. There are some analyses that consider all of these diphthongs as ending in the schwa sound []; for example, a, o, o = [ae], [e], I [5] The height-harmonic interpretations /iu/ and /iy/[who?] for io and ie are debatable, with many (especially older) sources suggesting that the pronunciation corresponded to the spelling (/io/, /ie/), and hence that these diphthongs were of the opening rather than the height-harmonic kind. Io (both long and short) amalgamated with eo late in the evolution of the standard West Saxon dialect, which is one of the most noticeable variations between early Old English (p. 900) and late Old English (p. 1500). (p. 1000).

Breaking and retraction

When the short front vowels /i, e, ae/ are followed by /x/, /w/, or /r/ or /l/ plus another consonant in Old English, they are diphthongized to short diphthongs /iu, eo, /. [6] Long /i, / broke to /iu, a/ in the same way, but only when followed by /x/. The geminates rr and ll are normally counted as r or l plus another consonant, however in West Germanic gemination, breaking does not occur before ll (the /i/ or /j/ in the following syllable prevents breaking).

In late Old English, /iu, iu/ was shortened to /eo, eo/. (see above).

Depending on the sound to be broken, the specific criteria for breaking vary: Short /æ/ breaks before *h, rC, lC*, where C is any consonant.

- Short /e/ breaks before *h, rC, lh, lc, w*, i.e. compared to /æ/ it is also broken before *w*, but is broken before *l* only in the combination *lh* and sometimes *lc*.

- Short /i/ breaks before *h, rC, w*. However, it does not break before *wi*, and in the Anglian dialects breaking before *rCi* happens only in the combination **rzi* (e.g. Anglian *iorre* "anger" from **irziją* but *afirran* from **a+firrijaną*).
- Long *ī* and *ǣ* break only before *h*.

Examples:
- *weorpan* [ˈweorpɑn] "to throw" < **/ˈwerpɑn/
- *wearp* [wæɑrp] "threw (sing.)" < **/wærp/
- *feoh* [feox] "money" < **/feh/
- *feaht* [fæaxt] "fought (sing.)" < **/fæht/
- *healp* [hæaɫp] "helped (sing.)" < **/hælp/ (but no breaking in *helpan* "to help" because the consonant after /l/ is not /h/)
- *feorr* [feorr] "far" < **/ferr/
- *feallan* [ˈfæallɑn] "to fall" < **/ˈfællɑn/ (but *tellan* < earlier **/ˈtælljɑn/ is not broken because of the following /j/)
- *eolh* [eoɫx] "elk" < **/elh/
- *liornian, leornian* [ˈliurniɑn], [ˈleorniɑn] "to learn" < earlier **/ˈlirnoːjɑn/
- *nēah* "near" [næːɑx] (cf. "nigh") < **/næːh/
- *lēon* "to lend" [leːon] < **/liːun/ < **/ˈliuhɑn/ < **/ˈliːhɑn/

The i-mutation of broken /iu, eo, æa/ (whether long or short) is spelled *ie* (possibly /iy/, see above).

Examples:
- *hwierfþ* "turns" (intr.) < /ˈhwiurfiθ/ + i-mutation < /ˈhwirfiθ/ + breaking < Proto-Germanic *hwirbiþi < early Proto-Germanic *hwerbiþi
- *hwierfan* "to turn" (tr.) < /ˈhwæarfijan/ + i-mutation < /ˈhwærfijan/ + breaking < /ˈhwarfijan/ + a-fronting < Proto-Germanic *hwarbijaną
- *nīehst* "nearest" (cf. "next") < /ˈnæːahist/ + i-mutation < /ˈnæːhist/ + breaking < /ˈnaːhist/ + a-fronting < Proto-Germanic *nēhist
- *līehtan* "to lighten" < /ˈliːuhtijan/ + i-mutation < /ˈliːhtijan/ + breaking < Proto-Germanic *līhtijaną

Note that in some dialects /æ/ was backed (retracted) to /a/ ([ɑ]) rather than broken, when occurring in the circumstances described above that would normally trigger breaking. This happened in the dialect of Anglia that partially underlies Modern English, and explains why Old English *ceald* appears as Modern English "cold" (actually from Anglian Old English *cald*) rather than "*cheald" (the expected result of *ceald*).

Both breaking and retraction are fundamentally phenomena of assimilation to a following velar consonant. While /w/ is in fact a velar consonant, /h/, /l/, and /r/ are less obviously so. It is therefore assumed that, at least at the time of the occurrence of breaking and retraction (several hundred years before recorded Old English), /h/ was pronounced [x] or similar – at least when following a vowel – and /l/ and /r/ before a consonant had a velar or retroflex quality and were already pronounced [ɫ] and [rˠ], or similar.

A-restoration

After breaking occurred, short /æ/ (and in some dialects long /æ:/ as well) was backed to /a/ ([ɑ]) when there was a back vowel in the following syllable.[7] This is called *a-restoration*, because it partly restored original /a/, which had earlier been fronted to /æ/ (see above). (Note: The situation is complicated somewhat by a later change called second fronting, but this did not affect the standard West Saxon dialect of Old English.)

Because strong masculine and neuter nouns have back vowels in plural endings, alternations with /æ/ in the singular vs. /a/ in the plural are common in this noun class:

A-restoration occurred before the **ō* of the weak verb suffix **-ōj-*, although this surfaces in Old English as the front vowel *i*, as in *macian* "to make" < **makōjan-*.

Breaking (see above) occurred between a-fronting and a-restoration. This order is necessary to account for words like *slēan* "to slay" (pronounced /slæːɑn/) from original **slahan*: /ˈslahan/ > /ˈslæhan/ (a-fronting) > /ˈslæahan/ (breaking; inhibits a-restoration) > /ˈslæa.ɑn/ (h-loss) > /slæːɑn/ (vowel coalescence, compensatory lengthening).

Palatalization

Palatalization of the velar consonants /k/ and /g/ occurred in certain environments, mostly involving front vowels. (The phoneme /g/ at that time had two allophones: [g] after /n/ or when geminated, and [ɣ] everywhere else.) This palatalisation is similar to what occurred in Italian and Swedish. When palatalised:
- /k/ became /tʃ/
- /sk/ became /ʃ/
- [g] became [dʒ]

- [ɣ] became [j] (a voiced palatal fricative; it would later become [j], but not before the loss of older /j/ in certain positions discussed below)

The contexts for palatalisation were sometimes different for different sounds:
- Before /i, iː, j/, for example:
  ○ *čīdan* ("to chide"), *bēċ* ("books", from earlier */ˈboːkiz/), *sēċan* ("seek", from earlier */ˈsoːkijanã/) (/k/ > /tʃ/)*bryċġ* ("bridge", from earlier West Germanic */ˈbruggjoː/ after Proto-Germanic */bruɣjoː/) ([gg] > [ddʒ])*ġiefþ* ("gives") ([ɣ] > [j])

List of used literature

1. Sh.M.Mirziyoyev. President Decree 4947 «On Uzbekistan's development Strategy " February 7, 2017. p.87-88

2. Arakin V.D. The History of English Language, 2003.Old English/Anglo-Saxon (Englisc). p.129.

3. *Baker, Peter S. (2007).* Introduction to Old English *(2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.* ISBN 978-1-4051-5272-3. *p.233*

4. *Campbell, A. (1959). Old English Grammar.* Oxford*:* Oxford University Press*.* ISBN 0-19-811943-7*. p.98-102.*

5. Cercignani, Fausto *(1983). "The Development of */k/ and */sk/ in Old English". Journal of English and Germanic Philology. 82 (3): p.313–323.*

6. Lass, Roger *(27 January 2000).* The Cambridge History of the English Language Volume 3. *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 64.*

7. Юсупов, О. (2019). Инглиз лексик дублетларининг лингвокультурологик таҳлили. *Иностранная филология: язык, литература, образование*, (3 (72)), 69-73.

8. Tukhtasinov, I., & Otabek, Y. (2022). Teaching a Foreign Language According to Age Groups. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, *22*(2), 238-246.

9. Jabbarovna, S. N. (2020). DISCURSIVE-PRAGMATIC AND LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF THE EVENT OF THE EVALUATION CATEGORY IN THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF THE WORLD (IN THE MATERIAL IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES). *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, *17*(7), 8303-8312.

10. Sulaymanova, N. J. (2020). ABOUT DIVIDING SYNTACTIC SEMANTIC FEATURES OF COMPONENTS. In *НАУКА И ИННОВАЦИИ В XXI ВЕКЕ: АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ, ОТКРЫТИЯ И ДОСТИЖЕНИЯ* (pp. 124-128).

11. Yusupov, O. Y. (2021). The russification legacy of historical monuments of Uzbekistan. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *5*(S1), 1535-1539.

12. Сулайманова, Н. Ж. (2019). ЯЗЫКОВЫЕ БАРЬЕРЫ И МЕТОДЫ ИХ ПРЕОДОЛЕНИЯ В ПРОЦЕССЕ ОБУЧЕНИЯ ИНОСТРАННЫМ ЯЗЫКАМ. In *Россия-Узбекистан. Международные образовательные и социально-культурные технологии: векторы развития* (pp. 220-221).

THE USAGE OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH PROPER NAMES

Xushmuradova Xolida (master degree student)
SamSIFL, teacher
Ochilova Noila Farmonovna

Annotation: The analysis of language means used to reflect cultural realias is a topical problem of modern linguistics development. Among its important directions is the studyof the phraseological consistency. The analysis of systemic connections and relations within the limits of phraseological units is of the primary importance. Among the least investigated aspects of phraseological unit analysis are those connected with the nature and the peculiarities of its constituent parts. This fact points to the ***topicality*** of the paper, which **aims** a tthe analysis of phraseological units with proper names in the English language. The primary **task** of the study is to consider syntactical characteristics of the phraseological units with the component proper name.

Keywords: Proper names, phraseological units, language, analysis, method.

Proper names are very important units of communication. Their functional and social significance is proved by the fact that there is no a single person without a name [1, p. 3]. Proper name is the means of individualization and identification of a number of geographical objects, playing an important role in the