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Abstract
This article discusses diachronic changes in the vocabulary of the English language. The language system is constantly moving and evolving. The most mobile level is the lexical system since it is it that primarily reacts to all changes in society. In this article, the correlation between the original, proper English, and borrowed vocabulary of the English language in the process of its historical development is studied on the material of the lexicographic sources studied. The qualitative-quantitative dynamics of the variation of borrowed vocabulary are analyzed, taking into account the source languages within the considered periods of the development of the vocabulary of the English language. The most priority socially determined lexico-semantic group of the main parts of speech is presented, taking into account their dominance in various periods of the development of the English language; Also, in this article, an etymological analysis of the main parts of speech in the English language is carried out, and general and particular trends of their etymological development are identified in this lexicographic material.
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Introduction
This study focuses on interlingual transmission discursive markers from English in audiovisual translation, namely when subtitling and dubbing feature films. For a deeper understanding of the problems we are considering, the central concept of "discursive marker" should be highlighted. In the first chapter, we will define the investigated functional category, discuss several terms competing for its designation, and offer our reasons for using the term "discursive marker." In the chapter, we will also provide an overview of the history of the study of discursive markers and highlight their key features and functions. The concept of "discursive marker" has been long enough in the field of view of linguists. Over the half-century history of its study, thousands of articles and monographs on the topic and the area of problems have been investigated in connection with discursive markers. If in early works, discursive markers were studied exclusively in the aspect of textual coherence, researchers today are interested in their formal-discursive and pragmatic functions in different genres (Brizuela, Andersen, Stallings, 1999), (Kogut, 2016), situations, interlingual contact, and translation (Sankoff et al., 1997; Mattson, 2009). The study of markers is carried out not only in synchronous (Schweinberger, 2014; Viktorova, 2016) but also in the diachronic cross-section (Brinton, 1996) and in a typological perspective. However, no definition has yet been formulated for discursive markers that would be widely recognized in the linguistic community. As many researchers have noted, defining discursive markers as class is highly problematic because this category includes units with a variety of structural, semantic, and stylistic properties (well, so to speak, I mean, there is no doubt, etc.). Some researchers also note that observation of the use of discursive markers suggests that the only possible feature that unites them is functional. We agree with this assertion and also believe that the basis for the definition of the class, the functional commonality of its members, must
be assumed. Hence, B. Fraser defines discursive markers (researcher uses the term "pragmatic markers") as functional class lexical expressions that, being part of a discourse segment, do not are part of its propositional content but indicate ("mark") to the pragmatic attitude of the addressee (Fraser, 1990: 386). A.A. Kibrik gives the following definition of discursive markers: discursive markers are "non-significant words or phrases, regulating the discursive process between the speaker and the addressee. Like B. Fraser, the researcher notes that markers "do not carry nineteen propositional information," and their functions "are in the sphere organization and regulation of the discursive flow" (Kibrik, Podlesskaya, 2009). I.P. Massalina also defines discursive markers as "special a class of words whose fundamentally important property is a direct connection with the functioning of discourse" (Massalina, 2009: 212). We agree with the above definitions in the way they represent the functional specificity of discursive markers and note that markers do not contribute to the informative content of the utterance, i.e., in what is reported in a statement. To see this, it suffices to remove the discursive marker from the sentence - this will not affect the proposition of the utterance. However, they are endowed with a certain functional value, which is to organize the discourse, i.e., promote its coherence and integrity, and regulate interpersonal and "status-role" (Andreeva, 2005: 84) relations of interlocutors. So, the main property of discursive markers, which we put in the basis for the definition of the concept under study, is their auxiliary role in the organization and regulation of discourse. Discourse is understood as coherent text in conjunction with the dynamic communicative situation of its generations (Arutyunova, 1990; Mishiev, 2015).

In addition to functional generality in defining discursive markers, it is important to point out essential (morphological and syntactic) properties from our point of view. First, we note that discursive markers do not constitute a separate lexico-grammatical class of language units: the class of markers includes words of different parts of speech (and, well, probably, um), as well as phrases (in a way, more or less) and suggestions (there is no doubt that…). Therefore, following E.Yu. Viktorova, we call discursive markers a transcategorical group of units (Viktorova, 2016: 21). Secondly, it is essential for us that discursive markers do not are included not only in the proposition of the utterance but also in the syntactic the structure of the corresponding sentence, i.e., they are not part of the leading members of the proposal and their groups” (Mishieva, 2015: 64), and can also be removed from the proposal without compromising its structural integrity. In other words, discursive markers are characterized by syntactic "non-inclusion" (Aijmer, 2002: 2). So, taking as a basis the functional and grammatical properties units under study, we give the following definition of the concept of "discursive marker." Discursive markers are a transcategorical class of linguistic units that play a supporting role in organizing and regulating discourse, are not included in the proposition of the corresponding utterance, and are not included in the sentence’s syntactic structure.

Firstly, we attempted to present the concept and term "discursive marker," identify critical features and functions of discursive markers, and give a brief overview of the history of the study of this concept in foreign and domestic linguistics. We have established that discursive markers are structurally heterogeneous language units (words, phrases, and sentences), which are united by a functional commonality - an auxiliary role in the organization of discourse, i.e., communication to him of coherence and integrity, as well as in the regulation of communicative contact between interlocutors. It was noted that having the indicated functional meaning, discursive markers are not part of the proposition of the utterance and "are not part of main members of the proposal and their groups. Based on functional and grammatical properties units under study, we formulated the following definition of the concept "discursive marker." Discursive markers are a transcategorical class of language units that play a supporting role in the organization and regulation of discourse, are not
included in the proposition of the corresponding statements, and are not included in
the sentence’s syntactic structure. We noticed that along with the term "discursive
marker" for the designation of the functional category under study, a set is used in
other terms. The choice of the term "discursive marker" was justified by the general
functional orientation of our research and topics that, unlike competing designations,
this term directly indicates the connection of the studied units with the functioning of
the discourse.

We also covered the history of the study of discursive markers by foreign and
domestic linguists. It was revealed that the study of auxiliary units of discourse began
abroad a little earlier, namely in the 1970s, and was carried out in three directions:
proper linguistic, linguocognitive and sociolinguistic. AT Within the appropriate
linguistic approach framework, markers are understood as building units functioning
at the text level (discourse is understood as a coherent text) and responsible for its
linear organization and structuring. Within the framework of the linguocognitive
approach, markers are considered units of the cognitive level, allowing you to look
into the process of constructing and shaping thoughts by the addressee and their
subsequent interpretation by the addressee. Within the sociolinguistic approach,
markers are interesting as units of social interaction to avoid threats to the positive or
negative public face of both interlocutors and enable polite communication. Further,
we noted that a special study of discursive markers as a functional class began in
Russian linguistics in the 1990s. However, units traditionally referred to as markers
were studied earlier within the framework of the usual categories of grammar
(particles, conjunctions, modal and introductory words). The national tradition is
characterized by attention to the semantics of discursive markers and methods of their
context-semantic description. Because many theoretical questions concerning markers
as a class have been sufficiently developed in recent years, domestic linguists turn to
particular aspects of the functioning discursive markers in different languages and
types of texts. Based on our review of the scientific literature, we compiled a list of
signs of discursive markers, the significance of which is recognized by foreign and
domestic linguists.

In the latter part of this paper, we focus on the problem of the interlingual
transmission of discursive markers. Considering that our research has a functional
focus, we will start with a brief overview of the functional approach to translation in
general. Next, we will look at the functional approach to the translation of discursive
markers. We will highlight the concept of "functional equivalence" and present basic
principles and stages of translation of discursive markers from the positions of
functionalism.

Within this approach, the translation process was interpreted as a reformulation of the
text into one language using another language. The emphasis was on the original text.
It was argued that the translator should strive to create such translation text that will
 reproduce as closely as possible formal features and content of the original text
(Munday, 2001: 27). However, over time, according to J. Munday, it became apparent
that the traditional, static approach does not apply to the analysis of an accurate,
dynamic picture of the translation process (Munday, 2001: 27). In reality, translation
is not just a linguistic relationship between two texts but a complex act of
communication that involves speakers of different languages and cultures
(Schweitzer, 1988: 75; Minyar-Beloruchev, 1996: 25, 29; Moonday, 2001: 87;
Garbovsky, 2004: 11; Schaffner, 2010: 157). At the same time, bilingual Translation-
mediated communication differs from monolingual communication only because it
doubles the number of participants (Minyar Beloruchev, 1996: 29). Otherwise, it is
like communicating in one language, and, like monolingual communication, it has one
goal or another (Minchenkov, 2004: fifteen). This understanding of translation as a
communicative action that pursuing a specific purpose within the framework of a
complex communicative context and interaction of cultures was fundamental for functional direction in translation theory. The founders of the functional approach are German researchers G. Fermeer and K. Rice. According to the idea they developed called skopos (Greek. "goal"), researchers proceed from the fact that translation is a practical activity, and its success, like the success of any other activity, is determined by whether it achieves its goal (Vermeer, 1989: 221). Researchers emphasize that it cannot be said that all acts of translation follow one goal (for example, to be faithful to the original text) (Reiss, 1977; Reiss, Vermeer, 1984: 234). The purpose of the translation should be determined individually for each act of translation. In many cases, this goal will indeed be achieving maximum closeness to the original and communicating all the information it contains. Still, in some cases, the purpose will be to share only parts of information or even misinformation with the recipient.

As K. Nord clarifies, skopos, i.e., the purpose of the translation, which speaks G. Fermeer, is determined by two factors. The first factor is the communicative intention of the customer of the translation or another person, according to who initiated the translation (Nord, 2010: 122). The second factor is the socio-cultural context for which the translation’s text is intended (Nord, 2010: 123). G. Fermeer notes that, depending on the goal set by the customer, the same source text can be translated in different ways. At the same time, it does not matter to what extent the text of the translation is close to the original, provided that it fulfills its purpose in the context of the language and culture of the translation. Thus, the equivalence between the source text (IT) and the target text (PT) turns out to be secondary in comparison with the requirement of adequacy (Reiss, Vermeer, 1984: 139). Recall that, according to A.D. Schweitzer, equivalence is oriented on the result of the translation and consists in such a ratio of IT and PT, within which the translation text corresponds to some (formal and meaningful) parameters of the original (Schweitzer, 1988: 99). In its turn, adequacy is focused on translation as a process. In accordance with the purpose of the text’s translation, requirements, and conditions, it consists of a particular act of interlingual communication (Schweitzer, 1988: 93, 95, 99). Thus, if the relationship equivalence is established between IT and PT, then the relationship of adequacy is rather established between the PT and the secondary context in which it functions. In the theory of skopos, it is adequacy that comes to the fore in translation, which is determined by how the text of the translation corresponds to the communicative intention of the customer and the socio-cultural context in which it is intended to function. Like the authors of the skopos theory, G. Fermeer and K. Rice, a Finnish researcher J. Holz-Manttyari understands translation as a functionally oriented and socioculturally conditioned communicative process. Starting from the theory of communicative action, she develops the theory of translation actions (Holz-Manttari, 1984). J. Holz-Manttyari argues that the need for translation arises whenever linguistic and cultural barriers hinder cooperation between people. To overcome these barriers, translation action. The translation action includes several operators, including which the initiator (the one who needs the translation), the customer (the one who contacts the translator), IT creator, the PT creator (translator), the PT user, and the ultimate beneficiary of the PT (Holz-Manttari, 1984: 109–111). Each operator pursues its goal. The ultimate goal of the translation action is to "ensure functional communication through linguistic and cultural barriers" (Schaffner, 2010: 157).

According to A.D. Schweitzer, by revealing the functional dominant source text, the translator gets an idea of the communicative installation of its creator about the effect that the sender of the text wants to produce on the recipient. The translator’s task is to produce an identical effect on the new recipient using the target language. At the same time, what means are needed to achieve the desired effect is influenced by the secondary communicative situation, and it is the new socio-cultural context and the specific communicative purpose of translation (Schweitzer, 1988: 79, 99). Thus, according to A.D. Schweitzer, the purpose of the translation is to "transfer the
communicative effect of the primary text" (Schweitzer, 1988: 75), which can be modified under the influence of differences "between two languages, two cultures, and two communicative situations" (Schweitzer, 1988: 75). Such a translation follows the functional dominant source text, corresponds to the socio-cultural communicative context, and will be an adequate replacement for the original. After reviewing the functional theories of translation, we come to the following conclusion. Fundamental to the functional approach to translation is the thesis about the communicative nature of translation activities. The translation is understood as bilingual communication within a complex communicative context and interaction of cultures. The purpose of this communication is determined in each case by the translator himself or the customer. In general, within the framework of the functional approach, the foreground is the adequacy of the translation text, firstly, to the communicative setting sender of the original text (functional dominant of the original text) or communicative attitude of the customer and, secondly, socio-cultural and communicative conditions of a particular act of translation. At the same time, the degree of formal equivalence between the source text and target text is secondary.

Results
The driving force of language development is recognized as the need for thought and developing cognitive activity of a person, the evolution of his perception. At the same time, understanding the nature of human interaction with the environment helps us to get closer to understanding human consciousness and the nature of those systemic connections that are reflected in the language, to study in depth both a separate stage of the development of modern English and the model of displaying reality as a whole. The vocabulary of a language is a complex system that has emerged in the process of centuries-old historical development, characterized by diachronic variability, variability, and the ability to transform at all levels of its linguistic structure. Studying the language system of modern English, linguists inevitably face the fact of its etymological heterogeneity, with the presence of the most diverse words in the vocabulary, since the language, performing a communicative function, exists only in society and native speakers enter into political, social, cultural ties with native speakers of other languages (Brysbaert, Biemiller, 2021).

The relevance of the research of this article is due to the growing interest of scientists in diachronic linguistics, to the problems of linguistic changes and transformations over time, the expediency of a comprehensive comparative historical study of linguistic phenomena and processes, which allows us to assess the possibilities of the vocabulary of the language in all aspects of its synchronous-diachronic existence, as well as the prospects for the study of the methodology of semantic analysis of lexical units in etymological studies.

In general, such an angle of consideration of the problems under study is due to the need to fix the diachronic processes of the development of the English language, allowing to penetrate into the laws of the structure and functioning of the morphological subsystem and, thereby, into the mechanisms of organization and functioning of the language as a whole, which, in turn, brings closer and ensures the success of its formalized description.

The vocabulary of the English language in various periods of its development is structured by the main parts of speech (nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs). The subject of the study is the process of the historical development of the vocabulary of the English language (Blasi, 2021).

The research material of this article was the data obtained by continuous sampling from the dictionaries The Oxford Dictionary of Word Histories, New edition 2022, The Oxford Dictionary of New Words, New edition 2022, The New Oxford Dictionary of the English Language, 2020, The Concise Dictionary of English
For more accurate etymological characteristics, data from other sources were used — The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology by Hoad, Oxford Dictionary of English, The Barnhart Dictionary of Etymology, Chambers 21st Century Dictionary, Random House Webster's College Dictionary, The Oxford Dictionary of Foreign Words and Phrases, Etymological Dictionary of the Russian language, Diccionario Etimológico de la Lengua Castellana, including with the involvement of Internet information resources (a list of sources is attached to the dissertation) (Monaghan, 2019).
The considered factual material refers to the most commonly used vocabulary and, therefore, most clearly reflects the trends in the historical development of the English language.
The purpose of the research of this article is to identify and describe a set of etymological features of the main parts of speech of the English language in various periods of its existence.
The methodological basis of the research of this article is based on the general philosophical principles reflected in the dialectical laws on the relationship and interdependence of objects and phenomena of real reality, according to which language is represented as a material, objective, dynamic and developing system. The general scientific prerequisites of the research are based on the principles of consistency, anthropocentrism, interaction with the environment, the principle of the study of linguistic units in all the diversity of their manifestations and are reflected in the works of B. Pascal, R. Descartes, D. Bruno, G. Leibniz, I. Newton (Anthony, 2019).
The research uses methods of linguistic observation and description, word formation and semantic analysis, field structuring, comparative and statistical methods, the method of analyzing dictionary definitions, and component and etymological analysis. The reliability and degree of verification of the research results recorded in tables and diagrams are ensured by the use of quantitative calculation elements.
The vocabulary of the English language is a complex system determined by diachronic variability, the etymological features of which are characterized by the predominance of native English language units in the Old English period and an increase in borrowings in the Middle English period, a decrease in the number of borrowings in the New English period and the predominance of proper English vocabulary in modern English XX-XXI centuries.
In the qualitative-quantitative aspect, the source languages range from the dominance of Latin and Greek in the Old English period to the predominance of French, Greek, Italian, and Scandinavian languages in the Middle English period. The main source languages in the early New England period are Latin, French, Greek, Italian and Spanish. Modern English (XX-XXI centuries) is characterized by the largest number of source languages according to lexicographic material. The most significant, in addition to European languages such as Greek, French, Italian, and Spanish, are Japanese and Arabic (Arnold, Greenfield, 2016).
The most priority socially determined lexico-semantic group of the main parts of speech in various periods of language development include: in the Old English period, nouns naming household items; verbs denoting actions aimed at acquiring, selling items, cooking and consuming food; anthroponymic adjectives; qualitative adverbs; in the Middle English period, nouns naming clothing items, food, persons on a professional basis; verbs denoting economic, political, military activity; adjectives characterizing persons on a political, tender basis; adverbs of place, method and mode of action; in the period of modern English (XX-XX I centuries) – nouns denoting new
sports, computer terminology, musical directions; verbs representing sports, criminal activity, computer technology and arts; parametric adjectives; adverbs of the method and mode of action (Brandt, Haak, 2020).

Etymological features of the development of nouns, verbs, and adjectives of the English language are universal (the predominance of native English vocabulary — the growth of borrowings — the predominance of proper English vocabulary), adverbs are characterized by the use of proper English vocabulary in the Middle English and New English periods, the absence of borrowings in modern English XX-XXI centuries. The vocabulary of the English language is characterized by a general trend of development leading to its active enrichment at the expense of its own resources, a significant decrease in borrowings during the period of modern English (XX-XXI centuries), as well as particular trends: an increase in the number of source languages, the use of Oriental languages, the appeal to languages of other groups (Fowler, Harding, Hofmann 2016).

Along with European languages, the languages of the Indian group (Hindi, Punjabi, Gujarati, Marathi, Nepali, Sanskrit), the Far East (Japanese, Korean), Afroasiatic (Arabic, Hebrew), Nigerocongolese (Mandae languages) and Sino-Tibetan (Chinese, Tibetan) dominate. For the first time, a comprehensive comparative-historical analysis of the main parts of the speech of the English language is carried out, starting from the Old English period and up to the modern state. The work clarifies the hierarchy of source languages in the process of vocabulary formation, including in modern English of the late XX - early XXI centuries; defines general and particular trends of historical changes and transformations of language structures based on the material of lexicographic sources that were not previously involved (Haak, 2022).

A comprehensive methodology for analyzing the developing, constantly changing vocabulary of the English language, which takes into account a number of parameters relevant to the phenomenon under study: breadth of coverage, degree of coverage and ways of penetration of lexical units. Contribution to the study of Germanic languages by deepening and systematizing knowledge about the mechanisms of the historical development of the vocabulary of modern English, clarifying the role of English and borrowed vocabulary in its replenishment, as well as deepening the understanding of the semantics and functioning of the lexico-semantic group of nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs in various periods of the existence of the English language (Laufer, 2018).

It is also significant that the developed principles of describing etymological features in the system of parts of speech at a new methodological level expand the understanding of the dynamics of the development of the modern English language and can be used in modeling diachronic processes of various parts of speech and languages (Piaget, 2020).

Observations and generalizations made in the course of the study reveal the content and statistical sources of borrowed vocabulary and can also be useful in modeling the diachronic development of the vocabulary of the language in the course of lexicology, the history of the English language, in special courses on word formation and etymology, in practical classes in English, when students write term papers and theses (Wilkins, 2019).

Another example of analyses
As a result of the analysis of the dictionaries "Oxford Dictionary of Word Histories", "The Oxford Dictionary of New Words" and "The New Oxford Dictionary of the English Language", we found 4054 adjectives (17.5% of the total number).
11% of adjectives (472 words) of the total number of title articles belong to the Old English period. By the Middle English period - 37% (1536 words) of all adjectives. 46% (1879 words) of all adjectives belong to the early New England period.

Adjectives of the modern English language since the XX century have been found in the amount of 104 words, which is 6.5% of the total amount of analyzed material (Verschueren, 2019).

Proper English adjectives make up 39.9%, and native English - 11.8%.

In the early New England period, we found 77.7% of proper English adjectives (1,461 words), among which we distinguish 377 hybrid formations.

In the period of late modern English (XX-XXI centuries), English adjectives themselves represent 96.2%.

In the Old English period, borrowings were insignificant and made up 0.1% of the total number of borrowed adjectives. The bulk of borrowings falls in the Middle English period (77.9%). In the early New England period (XVI — the end of the XX century), the number of borrowings is reduced to 21.6%. The period of late modern English (XX-XXI centuries) is represented by a small number of borrowings (0.2%). (Cardona G. R. 2021).

The main groups of borrowings are Latin (42%), French (23%), Scandinavian (8.2%), and Greek (7%).
The number of borrowings from Latin and Old French in the early New England period is decreasing (Latinisms: ME — 43%; NE — 27%; French borrowings: ME — 27%; NE — 16%). The number of 163 adjectives from the Greek language increased in the XVIII-XIX centuries (ME — 43%; NE - 67%). Borrowings from Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Sanskrit, Polynesian, and Chinese belong to the New England period (Carling, Johansson, 2021).

In the course of our research, we identify 6 lexico-semantic groups of adjectives, namely: anthroponymic, social, parametric, adjectives of color, causative, and modal-evaluative. The most capacious group are anthroponymic adjectives in all periods of language development: in the Old English period — 85% of the total number of adjectives. In the Middle English period — 52%. In the early New English period — 45%, and in the late modern English period (XX-XX I centuries) — 88%. The second significant group in the early New England period are social adjectives -17%.

Productive ways of word formation of adjectives in the period of modern English are conversion, affixation and word composition. Affixal adjectives make up 894 words (89%). Among affixal adjectives, we found 377 hybrid formations (38.2%). Productive word composition models are presented as follows: Numeric + N, Adj + Adj, Adj+N (Chudak, 2017).

As a result of the analysis of the actual material, we found 148 adverbs. 66.2% (98 adverbs) of the total number of title articles belong to the Old English period. Borrowings in this period are insignificant and amount to 1.02% (1 word). The Middle English period includes 36 adverbs, of which 41.7% (15 words) are actually English, 52.7% (19 words) are borrowings from various languages, 5.5% are hybrid formations (2 words). (Firth J. R. 2017). The early New England period is characterized by a small number of borrowings. Adverbs found during this period make up 6.7% of the total number of adverbs (10 words), of which 30% are borrowings. In the period of the late modern English language (XX-XX I centuries), we found only 4 adverbs that are actually English (Constantinescu, 2020).

Having carried out a diachronic and etymological analysis of the vocabulary of the modern English language, we can identify the following trends in its development:

- the Old English period is characterized mainly by native English words (94.3%); 5.6% of the basics are borrowed during this period from various languages;
- in the Middle English period, there is a tendency to actively borrow words from French, Latin, Greek, Scandinavian languages, as well as from Spanish, Italian, Arabic. Borrowings in this period amount to 96.8%; (Fischer, 2019).
- the early New England period is characterized by a significant decrease in the number of borrowed words, which make up 24.2%, the actual English words — 75.8%. The tendency to decrease the number of borrowings is most clearly observed in nouns, verbs, adverbs;
- in the period of the late modern English language (XX-XXI centuries), there is a tendency to significantly reduce the number of borrowed words, which are represented in the number of 38 bases, i.e., 5.6% of the total number of bases of this period.

Discussion
In the Middle English period of language development, European languages — sources of borrowings - predominate. In the early New English period, there was an expansion of groups of languages — sources of borrowings. The languages of the Indian group (Hindi, Punjabi, Gujarati, Marathi, Nepali, Sanskrit), Afroasiatic languages (Arabic, Hebrew), languages of the Far East (Japanese, Korean), Nigerocongolese languages (Mandae), Sino-Tibetan (Chinese, Tibetan), etc. participate in the formation of the etymological model of the development of early modern English.

The modern period of the development of the English language in the production of the main parts of speech indicates that modern English has changed the trends of its development and enrichment. The borrowing of new words decreases (7.9%), and various ways of word formation come into force, the most productive of which are word composition, affixation and conversion. The actual English words make up 92.1% (Otis, Sagi, 2018).

Conclusion
The English language, with its specific features, is a complex dynamic system characterized by diachronic variability. The language is in a state of continuous development, reflecting a variety of phenomena and processes taking place in the socio-cultural space. Due to the fact that the development of the language, all its aspects, occurs gradually, we find in the vocabulary of the modern English language words that have developed in different historical epochs.

One of the main sources of replenishment of the vocabulary of the English language are borrowings, for consideration of which in our study, we turn to a diachronic approach that helps to penetrate deeper into the patterns of development of the vocabulary of the English language and the specifics of its organization and functioning.

In the course of the study, the following results were obtained:
- the main basic theoretical prerequisites of the concepts of "development", "change", "statistical and dynamic laws", "synchrony", "diachrony" in philosophical and linguistic aspects are characterized and clarified;
- various approaches to the study of the etymological composition of the English language are considered;
- the main criteria of etymological analysis have been clarified, including the breadth of coverage, the degree of coverage and the ways of penetration of lexical units;
- the main socially determined groups of the considered parts of speech are identified, taking into account their dominance in various periods of language development;
- the main ways of word formation of the main parts of speech of the modern English language are considered;
- qualitative and quantitative characteristics of nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs have been determined, starting from the Old English period and up to the modern state of the English language (XX-XXI centuries) (Palmer, 2016);
- the dynamics of variation of the source languages of borrowings within the considered periods of the development of the English language is analyzed, and the percentage ratio of native English, proper English and borrowed vocabulary of the main parts of speech on this lexicographic material is clarified;
- both general and particular trends in the historical development of both the main parts of speech and the entire vocabulary of the English language as a whole are highlighted.

All this ultimately allowed us to comprehensively present the vocabulary of the English language in the process of its historical development, including native English words (12.2%), English proper (29%), as well as borrowed vocabulary (57.3%).

To identify the diachronic features of the vocabulary of the English language to determine the trends of its development, we clarify the main criteria of etymological analysis, including the breadth of coverage, the degree of coverage and the form of penetration. The concept of the breadth of coverage in our study reflects the time frame of the etymological analysis carried out, taking into account the main periods of the development of the English language: the Old English period (hereinafter referred to as O.E.) – VI-VII centuries, the end of the XI century, Middle English (hereinafter M.E.) XII–XV centuries, early or New English - XVI – the end of the XX century, the late period of the modern English language, from the end of the XX century to the present. (Brysbaert, Biemiller, 2021).

The criterion of the degree of coverage in our work is associated with the identification of etymological features at the partial level within the analysis of LSG and individual lexical units in a synchronous-diachronic section.

This indicator makes it possible to identify the qualitative and quantitative characteristics of lexico-grammatical classes of words in an etymological format, to establish a hierarchy of lexico-semantic groups in different periods of language development, to compare etymological features of different parts of speech, to describe general and particular trends in the diachronic development of the English language.

Borrowed vocabulary penetrates into the language under the influence of various extralinguistic factors. And this naturally assumes the existence of different dynamics of variation of source languages and the existence of intermediary languages involved in the replenishment of the vocabulary of the English language in different periods of its existence.

Thus, the Old English period of the development of the English language is characterized by the predominance of native English vocabulary (95.4%). Borrowings at this stage of English language development are insignificant (4.6%). The main languages are the sources of borrowings: Latin, French, Greek, Scandinavian. In the Old English period, specific nouns predominating, naming food and beverages, geographical locality, human body parts and organs, clothing items, animals and plants; verbs of action and state; anthroponymic adjectives; adverbs of place, qualitative adverbs (Arnold, Greenfield, 2016).

As the results of our study show, the largest number of borrowings falls in the Middle English period (97.3%), where Latin, Greek, French, Old French, Scandinavian, Italian, Spanish, Arabic are dominant. The vocabulary of the English language during this period includes nouns naming items of clothing, food, or persons on a professional basis; verbs denoting economic, political, and military activities; adjectives characterizing persons on a political, tender basis; adverbs of place, method and mode of action.
It should be noted a universal trend led to a decrease in borrowed vocabulary in subsequent periods of the development of the English language. The early New England period is characterized mainly by the proper English vocabulary (90.9%). A significant decrease in the number of borrowings is caused by an increase in the volume of derived vocabulary by various methods of word formation, among which affixation, word composition, abbreviation, and fusion are productive for nouns and for verbs — conversion and affixation. Affixation is a productive way of word formation of adjectives and adverbs (Laufer, Paribakht, 2018).

Attention is drawn to the fact that the early New England period of the development of modern English is characterized by a change and expansion of groups of source languages. This is due to the expansion of language contacts, the emergence of new household items and fabrics, and the appearance of exotic dishes.

During the period of early modern English, there has been a significant increase in source languages. Their total number reaches 77 groups. In addition to European languages, the languages of the Indian group (Hindi, Punjabi, Gujarati, Marathi, Nepali, Sanskrit), Afroasiatic languages (Arabic, Hebrew), languages of the Far East (Japanese, Korean), Nigerocongoese languages (Mandae), Sino-Tibetan (Chinese, Tibetan), etc. participate in the formation of the vocabulary of the language (Wilkins, 2019).

The modern period of the development of the English language in the production of the main parts of speech indicates that the English language has changed the trends of its development and enrichment. The borrowings of new words decreases (7.9%), and various ways of word formation come into force, the most productive of which is conversion, affixation and word composition. In the XX-XXI centuries, there was an expansion of the old and the emergence of new fields of nomination caused by the rapid development of science and mass media.

In the period of modern English (XX- XXI centuries), nouns denoting new sports, computer terminology, and musical directions are distinguished; verbs representing sports, criminal activity, computer technology and arts; parametric adjectives; adverbs of the method and mode of action (Firth, 2017).

Taking into account the fact that the language system is in constant motion and development, it should be assumed that the vocabulary of the modern English language may change in the context of globalization, the emergence of new groups of borrowed vocabulary as a result of interlanguage contacts, an increase in the composition of some and a decrease in the influence of others.

The diachronic changes in the vocabulary of the English language identified and described in this work made it possible to more accurately describe the main causes of lexical borrowings in all periods of the development of the English language, to comprehensively present the etymological features of the main parts of speech, reflecting general and particular trends in the historical development of the vocabulary of the English language.

The proposed criteria for analyzing the etymological features of the main parts of speech will allow us to trace the diachronic development of other parts of speech, compare the etymological characteristics of languages of various types, clarify the time frame of the periods of the English language, establish the main directions of its development in the future.
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