

# SHAKESPEAREAN NEOLOGISMS AND THEIR PECULIARITIES

**Dilorom, FerSU, Master Student**

**Abstract:** The article discusses the contributions of William Shakespeare to the development of the English speech culture. The author highlights the neologisms of the dramatist and their special features according to the formation.

**Key words:** neologism, affixation, morphological word-formation, conversion, syntactic word-formation.

## **INTRODUCTION.**

It is irrefutable fact that, neologisms have own value in the realm of Shakespearean contributions to the improvement of the English speech culture. Because they are broadly acknowledged as a great proof of genius and novatory. However, the world linguists have been discussing the exact amount of his neologisms so far.

The Oxford English dictionary- the most honourable dictionary in the history of English, stated more than 2000 words as Shakespearean neologisms. This number has been decreasing as time elapses. According to the conclusions of the devoted luminary, Warrepn King who conducted rigorous researches on the legacy of the dramatist, Shakespeare utilized 17677 words in his works and he coined 1700 words by himself.

Significantly, having scrutinized other contemporary writers and poets as well as the written resources of that period, another decision was made by linguists and lexicographers. Due to the researches, not all words among the total number belong to Shakespeare. Because these words had existed earlier, but people saw them in the works of Shakespeare for the first time. Furthermore, everybody loved him and had a great respect toward him. Consequently, they would like to connect those words with the name of the skilled writer.

After long debates and researches, the real amount of Shakespearean neologisms was announced to the public. According to the latest judgement, 422 words are real Shakespearean coinages respectively.

One of the famous linguist David Crystal, stated own attitude towards this amount of neologisms: "If I introduced at least one word to the English language, I would be delightful. On this occasion, Shakespeare is very lucky person".

### **MAIN PART.**

Interestingly, how did he bring the new words into language? What kind of peculiarities do we differentiate from other writers?

Initially, his neologisms consist of two independent words which are combined together and form compound words. Besides, the writer coined the words adding suffixes and prefixes. Converting nouns into verbs and changing verbs into adjectives can be noted as a fruitful way of creating new words.

What is noteworthy that, his minted words were so expressive and meaningful. As a consequence, they were easily absorbed in the English lexicon and become most frequently used lexicon.

Their common nature can be demonstrated as the crucial reason for their quick acceptance by common people. People understood them without difficulties and then used in daily speech and caused the popularization of his works too. The opinions abovementioned were proved by the Shakespearean scholars Charles and Mary Cavden Clark : "Shakespeare wrote in a royal style as he was "king of the poets". He created powerful works and coined the essential words. Everybody digested them well, because his words were so colourful and sensitive certainly. So those words were used so often in oral speech."

The neologisms by the dramatist are divided into 4 categories considering their ways of formation. They are following:

1. The neologisms that were coined by affixation.
2. The neologisms that were minted by syntactic way.
3. Originally new-born words.
4. The neologisms that were coined by conversion.

We would like to analyse some features of forming those words.

In the meantime we scrutinized the neologisms, we assured that, majority of them were coined by affixation. Affixation is based on adding prefixes and suffixes to the stem of the word.

Significantly, it is irrefutable fact that, the words created by the means of the prefix –un weighs more than other affixes. David Crystal emphasized the importance of this prefix –un in the realm of neologisms, during the interviews: “It is evident that, the words beginning with –un belong to Shakespeare. The tradition of coining words with the help of –un is still continuing. The word unamerican can be sheer example for the coinage.”

Whose fresh repair if now thou not renewest,  
Thou dost beguile the world, unbless some mother.

(Sonnet 3)

Unthrifty loveliness why dost thou spend,  
Upon thy self thy beauty’s legacy?

(Sonnet 4)

The unused beauty must be tombed with thee,  
Which used lives th’ executor to be.

(Sonnet 4)

As an unperfect actor on the stage,  
Who with his fear is put beside his part.

(Sonnet 23)

The great writer relied on the prefix –dis in order to create new words respectively.

Therefore, when he sees reason of fears, as we do, his fears, out of doubt, be of the same relish as ours are, yet, in reason, no man should possess him with any appearance of fear, lest he, by showing it, should dishearten his army.

(Act IV, Scene I, King Henry, King Henry)

Therefore much drink may be said to be an equivocator with lechery: it makes him, and it mars him; it sets him on, and it takes him off; it persuades him and disheartens him.

(Act II, Scene III, Porter, Macbeth)

To let these hands obey my blood

They are apt enough to dislocate and tear!

(Act IV, Scene II, Albany, King Lear)

Well, sir, the poor distressed Lear's i' th' town;

(Act IV, Scene III, Kent, King Lear)

Another prefix which is peculiar to Shakespeare is – in and these words are used frequently in modern English too. Surprisingly, only handful native speakers know about the surviving of neologisms since XVI century and their author unfortunately.

However, there is another nice reason that, his words are universal, they seem to be modern in different periods.

One dowle that's in my plume; My fellow-ministers

Are like invulnerable, If you could hurt,

Your swords are now too massy for your strenghs.

(Act III, Scene III, Ariel, The Tempest)

For it is as the air, invulnerable,

And our vain blows malicious mockery.

(Act I, Scene I, Marcellus, Hamlet)

And shake the yoke of inauspicious stars,

From this world-wearied flesh. Eyes, look your last!

(Act IV, Scene III, Romeo, Romeo and Juliet)

Why no, you ruinous butt; you whoreson

indistinguishable cur, no.

(Act V , Scene I, Patroclus, The history of Troilus and Cressida)

Shall be my surety; for whose thorne 'tis needful;

(Act IV, Scene IV, Helena, All is well that ends well, )

The words minted by adding the prefix *-y* are stylistically colourful and very expressive for all readers. Apparently they were formed to express the character's feelings and attitudes at that time. Currently they are considered as literary words in English language.

A most harsh one, and not to be understood without bloody succeeding. My master!

(Act II, Scene III, Parolles, All is well that ends well)

It is broadly claimed that, Shakespeare was the innovator for his fruitfully utilizing of own neologisms. Vivaly, he used both connotational and denotational meaning of the coinages. For instance, he used the word *bloody* in many comedies and tragedies. Bloody napkins, bloody teeth, bloody pillow, bloody handkerchief, bloody hands, bloody cloth are examples for denotational meaning of the word.

We can demonstrate many phrases with connotational meaning too:

bloody brother, bloody deeds, bloody tyranny, bloody thoughts, bloody battles, bloody acts, bloody day, bloody youth, bloody book, bloody times.

Another coinage formed by adding *-y* is *gloomy* and utilized with denotational meaning.

Forc'd in the ruthless, vast, and gloomy woods?

(Act IV, Scene I, Titus, The tragedy of Titus Andronicus)

But darkness and the gloomy shade of death

Environ you, till mischief and despair.

(Act V, Scene IV, Pucelle, King Henry VI)

We can add many other adjectives coined in the same way: palmy, eventful, fitful, majestic, generous, suspicious, impartial, baseless, critical, lonely and others.

The researches prove the novatory features of Shakespeare. He was not satisfied with the existed words at his time and dared to "break" the boundaries of the language. He borrowed words, he converted and created new ones. Harold Bloom, who collected all works of the dramatist and analysed them skillfully,

stated own opinion on this matter:” If the sign of a great writer is that they’re still read, then perhaps the mark of a genius is that they’re is still spoken, too”

Skilled writer preferred conversion in most cases. So this way of word-formation is called shakespearean style of coining. Conversion- is changing one word into another category. Naturally, when the category is changed, the lexical meaning is also changed.

However, Shakespeare was quoted more than other contemporaries in “The dictionary of the English language”, some his words were not attributed to him. They are neologisms such as manager, fashionable, marketable, eyeball, laughable and other conversed words.

Thus he his special nothing ever prologues.

(Act II, Scene I, All is well that ends well, King)

I have not wrong’d you!

Shall be my surety; fore whose thorne ‘tis needful;

(Act IV, Scene 4, All is well that ends well, Helena,)

I wonder, sir, this wives are monsters to you.

(Act III, Scene 6 All is well that ends well, King,)

### **CONCLUSION.**

All things considered, William Shakespeare was the quintessential writer in the period of Renaissance. He contributed to the development of the English language as well as literature. As humankind uses his words, reads his works Shakespeare never dies. Despite the fact that, at least one article is written devoted to the legacy of him, many secrets have not been revealed yet. Because his contribution is like an ocean, one is able to discover own findings.

### **REFERENCES**

V. King, Purley Language School, Facebook page, 2006.

D. Crystal, The World in words, podcast, July 23, 2014.

H. Bloom, The invention of the Human, Berkley Publishing, 1999, p 17

S. Johnson. A dictionary of the English language, Heidelberg, 1878, p 35

Ch. Clarke, *The Shakespeare Key*, Rivington, 1878, p 75