O'ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI OLIY VA O'RTA MAXSUS TA'LIM VAZIRLIGI

SAMARQAND DAVLAT CHET TILLAR INSTITUTI

Факультет английской филологии

KHAKIMOV K. A

Mavzu: **DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF WORD BUILDING PROGRESS**

Ilmiy raxbar: Shomurodova SH. J

Bitiruv malakaviy ish

Ingliz tili leksikasi va stilistika

kafedrasi yig'ilishida muhokama qilinib,

himoyaga tavsiya etildi.

Bayonnoma №_____may, 2013 yil

Samarqand 2013

Table of contents

Introduction

To highlight that a complex system for learning and teaching of foreign languages focused on upbringing of comprehensively developed, educated and intellectual young generation of people, and further integration of the republic with the global community has been established within the frames of the Law on Education and the National Programme for Personnel Training. Teaching foreign languages in Uzbekistan has become very important since the first days of the Independence of our country, which pays much attention to the rising of education level of people, their intellectual growth. As our president I.A.Karimov said: "Today it's difficult to revalue the importance of knowing foreign languages for our country as our people see their great prosperous future in the cooperation with foreign partners" [2,38].

The actuality of the research. Word building is a widespread sociolinguistic phenomenon in the development of language. It is one of the most significant ways of acquiring new words and enriching the vocabulary of a language. Therefore, it is of great value to study word building and try to find the main principles underlying this phenomenon. Considering this, the present work gives a thorough analysis of word building and some specific peculiarities of English word formation. This paper, therefore, attempts to explore word formation process in a more thorough and systematic way, expound some theories on word building confirm some hypotheses.

Word – building is one of the main ways of enriching vocabulary. Affixation is one of the most productive ways of word building throughout the history of English. The main function of affixation in Modern English is to form one part of speech from another; the secondary function is to change the lexical meaning of the same part of speech. As we are future teacher must know the rules of word – formation. It will help us to teach our students. Besides if we know affixes we can easily form new words while we are writing or speaking.

The aim of the research is to study out and to explore word building

process in a more thorough and systematic way, detailed study of affixation, which play important role in word – formation and to single out, describe, compare and find the possible ways of classification of English affixes.

The purpose of the research stipulated the arrangement and consecutive solving of the following **tasks:**

1. to classify the affixes according to its structure and semantics.

2. to determine the reasons of enriching the vocabulary of English language;

3. to research fundamental and modern sources of English language formation and to give a contrastive view of the issue.

4. to show productive ways of word – building process of the English language.

5. to find out which affixes are used with stems of different parts of speech and what parts of speech they form together.

The object of the research: the process of word building.

The subject of the research is affixes, the peculiarities of their usage in English language and their influence on the development of the language in different stages.

The methodological ground of the research work consists of the theoretical issues and scientific articles of scientists and linguists in the sphere of sociolinguistics, anthropology, gender linguistics, comparative linguistics, psychology, culture study, etc. The research is founded on fundamental works of well-known scholars such as N.N.Amosova, I.V.Arnold, A.C.Baugh, K.Brunner, D.Crystal, R.S.Ginzburg, O.Jespersen, R.Phillipson, R.H.Robins, C.J.Richards, E. Sapir, R.L.Trask and many others.

The following methods of inquiry were used in research work: comparative method, analysis into immediate constituents, analytical, method of observation, descriptive, cognitive, psychological analysis and other methods.

Theoretical significance of the research. Our research work has confirmed past theories on word formation with sufficient language data collected from different kinds materials and consolidated them into an organic whole. The

research on word building among different types of languages was carried out in a systematic way and provides some reliable data and methodology for future research.

Practical significance of the research. The results and conclusion of this research can be applied in the sphere of lexicology, phraseology. It can be used at the lessons of special courses on lexicology, phraseology, sociolinguistics, in writing essays, scientific articles, diploma works on the theme of investigation, broadening students' outlook and for the further investigation of the problems of borrowings.

The structure of the research work. The research work consists of Introduction, 2 Chapters, Conclusion and the List of used literature.

The introduction covers topicality, theoretical base of research, as well as, methods of research and the structure of the work.

Each chapter consists of paragraphs and contains important information and explanation of the pointed tasks of the work.

The conclusion colligates the main propositions and ultimate results of the research.

List of used literature indicates the scientific issues, articles and thesis that were used in compiling the work.

Chapter I. Word – building is one of the main ways of enriching vocabulary

1.1. Main types of word building

The term word-building or derivational pattern is used to denote a meaningful combination of stems and affixes that occur regularly enough to indicate the part of speech, the lexico-semantic category and semantic peculiarities common to most words with this particular arrangement of morphemes. Every type of word-building (affixation, composition, conversion, compositional derivation, shortening, etc.) as well as every part of speech have a characteristic set of patterns [9,77].

There is a category which is even more remote from grammatical inflection, namely so-called word composition. Without going into the details of morphological theory, we can broadly describe a compound word as such a word the single parts of which have a lexical meaning of their own, if used alone. Let us consider the following example: *a gold-smith* is a smith who works in a gold.

There are three important categories of phenomena which can be observed when we study compound words.

First, we can observe different phenomena in the *dimension of form.* Sometimes, the form of an element which carries a certain lexical meaning is fully or nearly identical both if it is used as a part of compound word and if it is used alone, as a non-compound word. This can be observed in *blackbird* as compared with *black, bird,* except that it is the second part of the compound whose accent is reduced. But there are also compound words whose accentuation does not differ from that of the single parts. Texts written in some scripts (such as the Roman alphabet of our days) indicate the individual words by the absence of space, the hyphen, or a similar device, even if there is no other difference in the form of the compound in contrast to its single parts.

On the other hand, the single parts of a compound word have sometimes a different form from that used in isolation. Sometimes, the traditional spelling still suggests the single parts of the compound but the pronunciation does not, as e.g. in

cupboard, only the spelling of which suggests the composition. Sometimes, the single parts of a compound word are so changed either in the pronunciation, or in the spelling, or in both, that the fact that we have a compound before us is obscured. There are different degrees of obscuration; a word like *lord* is by now not a compound one, in Modern English, though it goes back to Old English *hlāford < hlāf-weard* "loaf-ward". This is the extreme case of obscuration: loss of the compound character.

The second type of phenomena connected with composition can be observed in the dimension of the *difference of meaning*. Sometimes there is no observable difference of the lexical meaning of the element in question when used in a compound word and when used in a non-compound one. Sometimes an element of a compound word is semantically depleted. In some cases, the semantic depletion is only partial. Such is, for example, the case with the word *blackboard*: in our days, this instrument very often has another colour but is called *blackboard* notwithstanding this change in the denotation.

So far we have been dealing with cases where the meanings of the component parts even if they are eventually depleted, are more or less known to average speakers. There are, however, cases where an unknown or extremely vague morpheme can serve as a component part of a compound word, for example, *huckleberry.*

The third type of phenomena to be observed in connection with compound words is the symptoms of their stability(10,37). There are also compound words which are stabilized as such, in the system of the language; they have, then, the same status as any other stabilized word irrespective of its morphological structure. Stabilized compounds can be recognized mainly by the frequency of their recurrence and by the unity of their designative meaning. Very frequently, these compounds are either terms or words which approach the status of terms.

As in all other cases, these three types of phenomena are not mutually exclusive; on the contrary, they can be conceived as being placed in different dimensions, so that one can find their different combinations in a single compound

word. Some of the combinations are typical, as, for example, when obscuration of form if combined with stabilization.

Word compounding is one of the productive types of word formation in Modern English. Compound words are words consisting of two stems. They usually function in a sentence as a separate lexical unit. The semantic integrity of compounding proofs that you can't put any words between its components. Compound words may consist of a simple and derived stems e.g. loud-speak/er of the structure is not difficult of English compounds, and it is more frequent for both components to be either simple or derived. Compound words are structurally and semantically based on the relationship between their components. A compound word may possess a single semantic structure. The meaning of the compound is first of all derived from the combined lexical meanings of the second component, which is restricted, by the lexical meaning of the first. We can say that the combination of the stems helps us to understand the meaning of the whole (6,172). The lexical meanings of the components don't make the meaning of the whole. The meaning of the compound is derived not only from the combined lexical meanings of its components but also from the meaning of the patter and order an arrangement of the stems, e.g. fruit-market, market-fruit. Thus, the structural pattern in compound words carries a certain meaning which is independent of the lexical meaning of the components. Compound are motivated through individual lexical meanings of the components and the meaning of the structure. There are three degrees of motivation:

1) completely motivated words, i.e. you can easily understand the meaning of the whole, e.g. door-handle, loud-speaker, bed-room;

2) partially motivated words in which one component is not used in its direct meaning (e.g. flowerbed) ;

3) non-motivated words, i.e/ we cannot guess the meaning of the whole from the meaning of its components. This problem is very closed to the problem of phraseological units, e.g. night cap- a drink taken before going to bed; dog days- the hottest days of July and August.

Conversion

Conversion is one of the principle ways of forming words in Modern English. It is highly productive type. The term "conversion" refers to numerous cases of phonetic identify of verbs and nouns, e.g. love noun-[to] love verb, paper noun- [to] paper verb, work noun-[to] work verb; the word paper exists in Modern English as a noun and a verb, but has no any additional endings or affixes. The difference between the two words is morphological, syntactic and semantic. The two words are grammatically different and they have different functions in the sentence. Conversion exists in many languages. It is very freguent in English and English is very rich in such words. The study of conversation in Present -day English is of great theoretical importance because in this type of word formation the interdependence of vocabulary and grammar is very clearly dislayed. The main reason for the widespread development for conversion in Present-day English is the paradigm, which is the only word building, means of conversions i.e. the absence of morphological elements making the part of speech to which the word belongs. Paradigm is a morphological category. So conver s10 n can be described as a morphological way of word formation. There are two types of conversion:

1). formation of verbs from nouns;

2). formation of nouns from verbs.

There is one more type, e.g. stone is formed from the noun "stone" only functions as an adjective. The English linguist Henry Sweet, was the first -who used the term conversion as a morphological way of word formation was suggested by professor Perlinskiy. The linguists in USA regarded conversion in Modern English as a kind of functional change(9,37). They define conversion as a shift from one part of speech at the same time. If we accept this point of view, we should arrive at the conclusion that in Modern English '"here are no parts of speech because one and the same word cannot belong to different parts of speech. Conversion may be studied diachronically. The cases that made conversion so widely spread are diachronic. Nouns and verbs have become identical in form

firstly as a result of the loss of endings, e.g. drink(en) . drink noun-drunken, drink verb.

Synchronically we deal with pairs of words related through conversion that coexist in Modern English. Conversion pairs are distinguished by structural identify of the root and the stem reveals that in one of the two words in conversion pair is semantically derived from the other, so it is great importance determine the semantic relations are distinguished:

1) verbs converted from nouns, this is the largest group of words related through conversion. If the noun refers to some object of reality the verb may denote:

a) action characteristics of the object e.g. butcher noun and verb

b) instrumental use of the object e.g. whip

c) acquisition or addition of the object e.g.. fish noun and verb

d) deprivation of the object e.g. dust noun and verb e.g. skin noun and verb

2) nouns converted from verbs. If the verb refers to an action the converted noun may denote: instant of the action e.g. jump noun and verb; e.g. move noun and verb; agent of the action: e.g. help noun and verb;

c) place of the action e.g. drive noun and verb;

d) object or result of the action e.g. find noun and verb. It is necessary to know the polysemantic character of some words, which can be member of a conversion pair, a verb or a noun, which belongs to several of the mentioned groups. As a matter of fact words formed by con version rarely adopt themselves to various semantic development and on the other hand there are many cases of repeated formation from the same polysemantic word e.g. the word bank was used as a basis for conversion several times; to bank means to preserve money. The investigations proved that the complicity of word-structure does not favour conversion. In modern English there are no verbs converted from nouns with suffixes -ing or -ation. Suffix -age also does not form conversion.

Conversion is typical of verb formation e.g. motor, star, and park some compound nouns also form conversion e.g. weekend verb honeymoon verb. Adjectives also form verbs e.g. cool verbs; thin verb; yellow verb. Thus it seems

possible to regard conversion as a highly productive way of word formation in modern English. The English word «stock: contains many words formed by means of conversion in different periods of its history. There are cases of traditional and occasional conversion. Traditional conversion refers to the words, which are registered in the dictionary. Occasional conversion is also very frequent, but they are not recoded in the dictionary and exist for a short period of time, sometimes they are typical of some writers.

Compositional derivation

The main line of distinction which should be drawn is that regarding what are considered derivative categories. It is necessary to distinguish, on the one hand, those cases where a change in the form of the word signals, or carries, a change in the grammatical category but leaves the word's lexical meaning unchanged (*book-books*) and, on the other hand, those cases where a change in the form of a word implies a change in the lexical meaning itself. The first type of morphological change is called (morphological) inflection, the other type is called word derivation, or (morphological) word formation: *bad-badly, swift-swiftly, girl-girlish, Turk-Turkish, waiter-waitress, count-countess, Jew-Jewess* and endless other cases. Types of word formation differ from one language to another.

The basic difference between grammatical morphology, inflection on the one side, and morphological word formation, or derivation on the other is that the former is more abstract. The difficulty is, however, that derivation is in many respects similar to inflection. The basic similarity is in the fact that derivation is frequently almost as regular as inflection. For instance, *frequent-frequently, mad-madly, silent-silently etc.* Obviously, cases like these are very similar, in their formal regularity, in their uniform effect on the lexical meaning, and in the openness of the series or at least in the great number of their members, to the grammatical inflection(15,59-66).

One must not, however, forget that word formation is not as regular and as uniform in all cases. For instance, let us consider pairs like:

jail "place of confinement" / *jailer* "person keeping people there";

prison "place of confinement" / *prisoner* "person kept there".

The difference between pairs as the one just quoted is so great that it is unlikely to be overlooked by the linguists. From this point of view, more difficult are those cases where the difference of meaning is not so great but still observable, as e.g.:

red – reddish "similar to the red colour";

girl – girlish "typical for a girl".

Cases of derivation are studied by linguists with even greater care than the purely grammatical categories. Let us suppose that an English dictionary does not list all adverbs derived by - *ly*. In such a case, e.g., *brusquely* can be omitted even if *brusque* is listed, because both the form and the meaning of the adverb are regular, predictable. On the other hand, an adverb like *badly* must be listed, though its form is regular, because it has some senses the adjective does not have (*to need something badly*). That an adverb like *well* must be listed is clear: the meaning is regular, predictable from the meaning of the adjective good, but the form is suppletive.

Obviously, not all cases of word derivation are as regular and as similar to grammatical inflections. In very general terms, one can state the following observation: the greater the number of words in which the same derivational morpheme causes the same change of the lexical meaning. Put in another way, the more frequently a derivational morpheme can be used, and the more uniform its effect on he lexical meaning, the more does its function resemble a grammatical function. On the contrary, if a derivational morpheme is not frequent and / or if its modifying effect on the lexical meaning is far from uniform, the similarity to a grammatical function will be incomparably smaller and we'll be more inclined to indicate the respective words as separate items. There is no absolutely sharp boundary between derivation and grammatical inflection; and the classification of single phenomena is often a matter of tradition and linguistic convention which is not always in complete accord with the facts of the language.

Differences in derivation sometimes imply no difference in meaning. For instance, the two adjective *lexicographic* and *lexicographical* are synonymic. The members of such synonymic pairs are frequently called doublets.

In our case, derivation is a morphological process (or can be conceived as such) which gives origin to units, usually words, that are morphologically delimited. This morphological clarity and the impression that one has to deal with well-delimited units should not, however, be accepted as a proof of the stabilization of the lexical unit in question, without any further inquiry. On the contrary, we have to deal, in the field of lexical derivation, with forms, with occasionality, as in any other field (35,129). For instance, no English dictionary in general use indicates the existence of an English word *girlless*. However, the suffix *–less* is very productive and the effects of its application semantically very uniform. Therefore, it is always possible to form with the suffix new derivations which may remain occasional nonces, or which may become stabilized. The result of this is that in the case of very productive derivational morphemes, whether they are suffixes, prefixes, or infixes, it is impossible to say how many and which words do really exist that are formed by their means, because there is a field of always new semi-stabilized forms around the stabilized formations.

We have described the variation of words in which either the lexical meaning remains generally unchanged (grammatical inflection) or is changed in a more or less regular pattern (derivation, word formation). It is clear that it is only the grammatical inflection which can be called "formal variation of the word" in the strict sense, because we regard all members of one paradigm as different, variant forms of one word. Derivation differs from this (according to the usual conception) in the important respect that it is the lexical meaning itself which is modified, so that we, just like everybody else, shall regard for example, *mad-madly, bad-badly* as pairs of different words. Since there is, however, a certain area of overlapping between the two categories, mainly because some cases of the derivation are so very regular and uniform.

Shortening

Shortening (abbreviation). Shortening is represented as significant substitute in which part of the original word is taken away. Destination should be made between shortening of words in written and in oral speech This phenomena has been recovered in the 15th century and since it has grown more productive .This century the development of shortening is particularly intense in English e.g fridge>refrigiator,vac>vacuum-cleaner, mike >microphone. Shortening of spoken Words request in the reduction of a word in one of its own. This part doesn't change phonetically,but spelling changes to some content, e.g dul >double The shortest its meaning and can form a new word by means of affixation or word composition e.g fantasy< fancy-fancier, fanciful, fanciful, fancifulness, ancy ball, fancy dress .Two possible development of shortening should be noted:

l) the shortened form may be regardedas a variant or a synchronic which differs from the vaginal word stylistically, emotionally and quantitatively e.g exam >examination, doc >doctor Japs-the Japanese; 2) the connection between the full and the short for can be established only etymologically e.g: fantasy<fanatic, fancy, miss>mistress.

1.2. Affixation is one of the most productive ways of word building

Word formation is the branch of lexicology that studies the patterns on which a language builds new words. It is clear that word formation deals only with words which are analyzable both structurally and semantically. The study of the simple words has no place in it. Word formation is a process of creating new words from the material of a given language after certain structural and semantic patterns. Word formation may be studied synchronically and diachronically. While analyzing word-formation synchronically we determine the type of word-formation and the structure of morphemes. So first of all its necessary to analyse what is a morpheme (15,59-66).

A morpheme is used in speech only as a part of the words. The morphemes can not be divided as the minimum meaningful language unit. There are two types of morphemes; free and bound. It is free if it exists in the language as a separate word. It is bound if it doesn't exist separately; E.g. read-able; express-ive; elegant.

All the morphemes is subdivided into roots and affixes. Affixes are subdivided into prefixes and suffixes. When an affix is taken away from the word the stem remains. It expresses the lexical meaning and the meaning of a part of speech. The stem may be the same as a root. Such stems are called simple stems. The stem may be derived if it contains one or more affixes, e.g. expressive-ness, dust-dust-y, dust-ier,... dustiest. A suffix is a derevational morpheme which stands after the stem and forms a new part of speech: just-just-ice- just-ify-just -ification. A prefix is a derivational morpheme standing before the root and modifying meaning, e,g, possible-im-possible, arrange-re-arrange, order-dis-order. Sometimes a prefix may serve to distinguish one part of speech from another, e.g. sleep-a-sleep, wake-a-wake. Lexicology is primary concerned with derivational affixes. There are functional affixes as well but they serve to render only the grammatical meaning. They build different, forms of one and the same word, e.g. decide-decided (Past Indefinite). The system of endings is called a paradigm, e.g. boy-boy's-boy-s, small-smaller-smallest.

Derivational affixes serve to supply the stem- with components of lexical and lexical-grammatical meaning and thus, form different words. One and the same lexical -grammatical meaning of the affix is sometimes accompanied by different combination of various lexical meaning. Thus, the lexical-grammatical meaning supplied by the suffix-y consists in the ability to express the qualitative idea peculiar to adjective and create adjectives from noun stems, e.g. cloudy, dirty, bushy. Derivational affixes do not combine so freely and regularly, e.g. the suffix -en cannot be added to any metal but "gold" and "lead".

The grouping of patterns, their description and study may be based on the same principle of explanatory transformations. Let us turn again to affixation and see how the dictionary defines words with the prefix *un-:*

unaccented a —without an accent or stress

unbolt v — to remove the bolt of, to unlock

unconcern n — lack of concern

undo v — to reverse the effect of doing

unfailing a — not failing, constant

These cases of semantic overlapping show that the meaning or rather the variety of meanings of each derivational affix can be established only when we collect many cases of its use and then observe its functioning within the structure of the word-building patterns deduced from the examples collected. It would be also wrong to say that there exists a definite meaning associated with this or that pattern, as they are often polysemantic, and the affixes homonymous. This may be also seen from the following examples. A very productive pattern is *out-*+ V = Vt. The meaning is 'to do something faster, better, longer than somebody or something'. E.g. *outdo, out-grow, out-live, outnumber, outplay.* The number of possible combinations is practically unlimited. The spelling, whether hyphenated, solid or separate is in many cases optional. When formed not on verbs but on names of persons it means 'to surpass this person in something that is known as his special property'. The classical example is *"to out-Herod Herod"* (Shakespeare) 'to outdo smb. in cruelty'.

On the other hand, the same formal pattern *out-*+V may occur with the locative *out-* and produce nouns, such as *outbreak* or *outburst.* The second element here is actually a deverbal noun of action.

The above examples do not exhaust the possibilities of patterns with *out-* as their first element. *Out-* may be used with verbal stems and their derivatives *(outstanding),* with substantives *(outfield),* with adjectives *(outbound)* and adverbs *(outright).*

The more productive an affix is the more probable the existence alongside the

usual pattern of some semantic variation. Thus, *-ee* is freely added to verbal stems to form nouns meaning 'One who is V-ed', as *addressee, divorcee, employee, evacuee, examinee,* often paralleling agent nouns in *-er,* as *employer, examiner.* Sometimes, however, it is added to intransitive verbs; in these cases the pattern *V+-ee* means 'One who V-s' or 'One who has V-ed', as in *escapee, retiree.* In the case of *bargee* 'a man in charge of a barge' the stem is a noun (10,273).

It may also happen that due to the homonymy of affixes words that look like antonyms are in fact synonyms. A good example is analysed by V.K. Tarasova. The adjectives *inflammable* and *flammable* are not antonyms as might be supposed from their morphological appearance (cf. *informal : : formal, inhospitable : : hospitable)* but synonyms, because *inflammable* is 'easily set on fire'. They are also interchangeable in non-technical texts. *Inflammable* may be used figuratively as 'easily excited'. *Flammable* is preferred in technical writing.

The fact is that there are two prefixes *in-.* One is a negative prefix and the other may indicate an inward motion, an intensive action or as in the case of *inflame, inflammable* and *inflammation* have a causative function.[2]

It is impossible to draw a sharp line between the elements of form expressing only lexical and those expressing only grammatical meaning and the difficulty is not solved by introducing alongside the term motivation the term word-formation meaning.

The word-building pattern is a structural and semantic formula more or less regularly reproduced, it reveals the morphological motivation of the word, the grammatical part-of-speech meaning and in most cases helps to refer the word to some lexico-grammatical class, the components of the lexical meaning are mostly supplied by the stem.

Depending on purpose of research, various classifications of suffixes have been used and suggested. Suffixes have been classified according to their origin, parts of speech they served to form, their frequency, productivity and other characteristics.

Within the parts of speech suffixes have been classified semantically according to lexico-grammatical groups, and last but not least, according to the types of stems they are added to.

In conformity with our primarily synchronic approach it seems convenient to begin with the classification according to the part of speech in which the most frequent suffixes of present-day English occur. They will be listed accordingly together with words illustrating their possible semantic force.

It shall be, noted that diachronic approach would view the problem of morphological analysis differently, for example, in the word complete they would look for the traces of the Latin complet-us.

Noun-forming suffixes:

– age (bondage, breakage, mileage, vicarage); – ance/ – ence (assistance, reference); – ant/ – ent (disinfectant, student); – dom (kingdom, freedom, officialdom); – ee (employee); – eer (profiteer); – er (writer, type-writer); – ess (actress, lioness); – hood (manhood); – ing (building, meaning, washing); – ion, – sion, – tion, ation (rebellion, creation, tension, explanation); – ism/ – icism (heroism, criticism); – ist (novelist, communist); – ment (government, nourishment); – nees (tenderness); – ship (friendship); – (i) ty (sonority).

Adjective-forming suffixes:

– able/ – ible/ – uble (unbearable, audible, soluble); – al (formal); – ic (poetic); – ical (ethical); – ant/ – ent (repentant, dependent); – ary (revolutionary); – ate/ – ete (accurate, complete); – ed/ – d (wooded); – ful (delightful); – ian (African, Australian); – ish (Irish, reddish, childish); – ive (active); – less (useless); – like (lifelike); – ly (manly); – ous/ ious (tremendous, curious); – some (tiresome); – y (cloudy, dressy).

Numeral-forming suffixes:

– fold (twofold); – teen (fourteen); – th (seventh); – ty (sixty)

Verb-forming suffixes:

– ate (facilitate); – er (glimmer); – en (shorten); – fy/ – ify (terrify, speechify, solidify); – ize (equalize); – ish (establish).

Adverb-forming suffixes:

– ly (coldly); – ward/ – wards (upward, northwards); – wise (likewise).

If we change our approach and become interested in the lexico-grammatical meaning the suffixes serve to signalize, we obtain within each part of speech more detailed lexico-grammatical classes or subclasses(10,273).

A lexico-grammatical class may be defined as a class of lexical elements possessing the same lexico-grammatical meaning and a common system of forms in which the grammatical categories inherent in these units are expressed. The elements of one class are substituted by the same prop-words the term prop-word is a term of syntax. It denotes a word whose main function is to provide the structural completeness of a word-group. A prop-word or an an aphonic word stands for another word already said or written. Personal pronouns <u>he</u> or <u>she</u> substituting nouns class them as personal nouns for either male or female beings.

The words <u>one</u>, <u>do</u> and <u>to</u> are the most specifically English examples of prop-words. Compare the various functions of <u>do</u> and <u>to</u> in the Following: <u>«Even if I did go, couldn't do any good»</u> <u>Charles paused and said:</u> «I m afraid that I want you to». «Why do you? (SAAU)» and characterized by identical morphological patterns and a common set of derivational affixes. Taking up nouns we can subdivide them into <u>proper</u> and <u>common nouns</u>. Among common nouns we shall distinguish personal names, names of other animate beings, collective nouns, falling into several minor groups, material nouns, abstract nouns and names of things.

Abstract nouns are signaled by the following suffixes:

– age, – ance/ – ence, – ancy/ – ensy, – dom, – hood, – ing, – ion/ – tion/ – ation, – ism, – ment, – ness, – ship, – th, – ty.

See examples above.

Personal nouns that are emotionally neutral occur with the following suffixes: – an (grammarian), – ant/ – ent (servant, student), – arian (vegetarian), – ee (examinee), – er (porter), – ician (musician), – ist (linguist), – ite (sybarite), – or (inspector), and a few others.

Feminine suffixes may be classed as a subgroup of personal noun suffixes. These are few and not frequent: – ess (actress), – ine (heroine), – rix (testatrix), – ette (suffragette).

The above classification should be accepted with caution. It is true that in a polysemantic word at least one of the variants witl show the class meaning signaled by the affix. There may be other variants, however, whose different meaning will be signaled by a difference in distribution, and these will belong to some other lexico-grammatical class. C.f. settlement, translation denoting a process and its result, or beauty which, when denoting qualities that give pleasure to the eye or to the mind, is an abstract noun, but occurs also as a personal noun denoting a beautiful woman. The word witness is more often used in its several personal meanings that (in accordance with its suffix) as an abstract noun meaning evidence or «testimony». The coincidence of two classes in the semantic structure of some words may be almost regular. Collectivity, for instance may be signaled by such suffixes as – dom, – ery, – hood, – ship. It must be borne in mind, however, that words with these suffixes are poly semantic and show a regular correlation of the abstract noun denoting state and a collective noun denoting a group of persons of whom this state is characteristic. CF. knighthood.

Alongside with adding some lexico-grammatical meaning to the stem, certain suffixes charge it with emotional force. They may be derogatory: – ard (drunkard); – ling (underling); – ster (gangster); – ton (simpleton). These seem to be more numerous in English that the suffixes of endearment.

Emotionally coloured diminutive suffixes rendering also endearment differ from the derogatory suffixes in that they are used to name not only persons but things as well. This point may be illustrated by the suffix – y/ – ie/ – ey: auntie, cabbie (cabman), daddie, but also: hanky (handkerchief), nightie (nightgown). Other suffixes that express smallness are – en (chicken): – kin/ kins (mannikin); – let (booklet); – ock (hillcack); et (cornet).

The connotation of same diminutive suffixes is not one or endearment but of some outlandish elegance and novelty, particularly in the case of the borrowed

suffix – ette (kitchenette, launderette, lecturette, maisonette, etc). The diminutive suffixes being not very productive, there is a tendency to express the same meaning by the semiaffix mini– : mini-bus, mini-car, mini-crisis, mini-skirt, etc. Which may be added to words denoting both objects situations (15,57).

A suffix is a derivative final element which as or formely was productive in forming words. A suffix has semantic value, but it does not occur as an independent speech unit.

It is necessary to point out the similarity and difference between derivative and functional morphemes. Morphologically, two words such as citizen and citizenry are formed after the same principle of root plus affix. At first sight, the conceptual structure also looks very much alike: the-s of citizens and the – ry of citizenry both express the idea of plurality, collectivity. But the difference in valued is one between grammatical function and lexical meaning. The – s of citizens is the inflectional formative of the grammatical category «plural» where – ry forms a class of words with the semantic basis «group», collectivity of…».

A suffixal derivative is primarily a lexical form. It is a two-morpheme word which behaves like a one-morpheme word in that it is «grammatically equivalent to any simple word in all the constructions where it occurs» (Bloch-Trager, OLA 54). An inflected word is primarily a grammatical form which does not meet the requirements just stated. While in a sentence such as this citizenry feels insulted we could substitute the simple, one-morpheme words crowd, multitude, nation for bi-morphemic citizenry without any change in the behavior of the other members of the sentence, replacement by the two-morpheme word citizens would involve a change of this to these and of feels to feel. The formatives – er, – est as expressing degree of comparison are endings, not suffixes. In a sentence such as Paul is older than Peter we could not substitute any one-morpheme word for bi-morphemic old-er whereas in he is rather o l dish the adj old can take the place of old-ish. It will also be interesting to note the different phonetic make-up of comparatives and super lateness compared with derived adjectives. Youngish, longish betray the morpheme boundary before – ish in that the final consonant does not change before

the initial vowel of the derivative suffix whereas in <u>younger</u>, <u>longer</u> the consonants are treated as standing in medial position in unit words, just like <u>finger</u> or <u>clangor</u>, [jg] being the ante vocalic (and ante sonantic) allophone of [j].

As to the origin of suffixes, there are two ways in which a suffix may come into existence: 1) the suffix was once an independent word but is no longer one; 2) the suffix has originated as such, usually as a result of secretion. Case 1) applies to a few native suffixes only. The suffixes <u>– dem</u> and <u>hood</u> are independent words still in OE, so the process where by a second-word becomes a suffix can be observed historically. An instance of case 2) is the suffix <u>– ling</u> which is simply the extended form of suffix <u>– ing</u> in words whose stem ended in <u>– l</u>.

Hall-way between second-words and suffixes are certain second elements which are still felt to be words though they are no longer used in isolation: <u>– monger</u>, <u>wright</u> and-<u>wise</u> exist only as second parts of suffixs. I have treated them as semi suffixes. The fact that a word is frequently used as the second element of a suffix gives us no right to call it a suffix. Thus the following are not suffixes: <u>– caster</u> (as in <u>broadcaster</u>, <u>gamecaster</u>, <u>newscaster</u>), <u>fiend</u> (as in the AE words <u>cigarette fiend</u>, <u>opium-fiend</u>, <u>absinthe-fiend</u>, <u>cocaine – fiend</u> etc…), <u>craft</u> (as in <u>witchcrajt</u>, <u>leechcrajt</u>, <u>prestaraft</u>, <u>statecraft</u>, <u>smith raft</u>, <u>mother craft</u>), or – proof (as in <u>bomb-</u>, <u>fire-</u>, <u>rain-</u>, <u>sound-</u>, <u>water-</u>, <u>hole kiss-</u>, <u>humor</u>-etc. proof) which Jazzperson wrongly terms one (15,57).

The contact of English with various foreign languages has led to the adoption of countless foreign words. In the process, many derivative morphemes have also been introduced, suffixes as well as prefixes. As a consequence, we have many hybrid types of composites. We have to distinguish between two basing groups. A foreign word is combined with a native affix, as in <u>dear-ness</u>, <u>un-button</u>. Just as the in production of a foreign word is an essentially uncomplicated matter, so is its combination with a native derivative element. As no structural problem is involved in the use of a foreign lexical unit, it can be treated like native words. This is the reason why native prefixes and suffixes were added to French words almost immediately after the words had been introduced. Suffixes such as <u>– ful</u>, <u>–</u>

less, ness were early used with French words so we find <u>faithful</u>, <u>faithless</u>, <u>clearness</u> and others recorded by 1300. The case is different with foreign affixes added to native words. Here, the assimilation of a structural pattern is involved, not merely the adoption of a lexical unit. Before the foreign affix can be used, a foreign syntagma must have come to be familiar with speakers so that the pattern of analysis may be imitated and the dependent morpheme be used with native words. This is much more complicated. When it does happen, such formations are found much later than those of the first type. This is to be regarded as a general linguistic phenomenon. It explains why combinations of the types <u>break-age</u>, <u>hindr-ance</u>, <u>yeoman-ry</u> crop up much later and the less numerous. The early assimilation of <u>– able</u> is exceptional. Some foreign affixes, as <u>– ance</u>, <u>– al </u>(type arrival), <u>ity</u> have never become productive with native words.

The majority of foreign suffixes owe their existance to the reinterpretation of loons. When a foreign word comes to be analyzed as a composite, a syntagma, it may acquire derivative force. The syntagmatic character of a word there fore is a precondition for the development of a derivative morpheme.

From <u>landscape</u> (which is Du <u>landsdap</u>) resulted <u>scrape</u> which is almost entirely used as the second element of suffixs, as in <u>seascape</u> 1799 and later <u>earths cape</u>, <u>cloudscape</u>, <u>sands cape</u>, <u>mountains cape</u>, <u>moonscape</u>, <u>parks cape</u>, <u>skyscape</u>, <u>waterscape</u>, <u>house-scape</u>, <u>roads-cape</u>, <u>mindscape</u>. <u>Bottlegger</u> <u>attracted</u> <u>booklegger</u> <u>one</u> <u>trading</u> <u>in</u> <u>obscene</u> <u>books</u>, <u>foodlegger</u> «<u>illicit</u> <u>food-seller</u>, <u>meatlegger</u>, <u>tirelegger</u>» (used at a time when things were rationed in US).

The word <u>hierarchy</u> attracted <u>squir(e) archy</u> 1804, which does not, however, mean that there is a suffix <u>– arohy</u>. The attraction is prob due to the rime only, and other coinages have not been made.

Another AE suffix is-<u>eteria</u> with meaning «shop, store, establishment». The starting-point is prob. Mexican Spanish <u>cafeteria</u> which passed into American English (first used about 1898). As it was immediately analyzable in American English, with the first element interpreted as an allomorph of [kafi] it attected a good number of words (chiefly since 1930). Mencken has about 50 words, such as

basketeria, caketeria, candyteria, cleaneteria, luncheteria, drygoodsteria, drugteria, fruiteria, shoeteria, chccolateria, furnitureteria. The original implication was «place where articles are sold on the self-service plant» (so in the recent coinage gas-a-teria, Life International). The only common word, however, is cafeteria, stressed as indicated.

The process of secretion requires some more comment. The basic principle is that of re-interpretation: but there are several ways in which re-interpretation occurs.

1). A suffix may be analyzed by the general speaker as having two contituent elements, the basis as an independent morpheme and the suffix as a derivative element. This is the case of the preceding types lemonade and land-scape. This process of direct re-interpretation is the form secretion commonly assumes.

2). A suffix is not made up of two constituent elements as far as the general speaker is concerned. If aristocracy, democracy, plutocracy yield more or less jocular words such as landocracy, mobocracy, cottoncracy, this is due to a meeting and blending of two heterogeneous structural systems: a certain structural element of one linguistic system is isolated and introduced into another linguistic system. The speaker with a knowledge of Greek isolates – ocracy «rule» in a series of 6 reek-coined words and introduces it as a derivative element into the structural system of English. But dependent structural elements are tied up with certain morphologic conditions of the linguistic system to which they belong and cannot there fore be naturally transplanted, unlike words, which are independent lexical elements, not subject to any specific morphological conditions. Such coinages are felt to be hybrids by the word-coiner himself, so the process is not used for serious purposes as a rule. Admittance of such foreign derivative elements is also impeded by the fact that they bear no resemblance to any morpheme with which the hearer of the hybrid suffix is familiar(14,37). The linguistic situation is different with foreign-coined words of which one element is immediately associated with a morpheme of the hearers language. Words like barometer, thermometer are automatically connected with the independent word mater whose unstressed

allomorph the words contain. This explains the rise and currency of <u>speedometer</u>, <u>cream ometer</u> and quite recent <u>drunkometer</u>.

But otherwise, hybrid coinages of this derivative pattern will always have a limited range of currency or the tinge of faketiousness, as <u>bumpology</u>, bumposopher (both jocular from <u>hump «protuberance on the cranium as the sign of special mental faculies»</u>), <u>storiology</u>, weather logy, dollolaty a. o. Parallel to the above words in <u>– ocracy</u> are such in <u>– ocrat, as mobocrat bancrat bankocrat</u>. Very similar to the case of barometer / speed omoter is that of the American suffix <u>– fest</u>. Fom the German words <u>Sincerest</u> and <u>Turn fest</u>, which were first used in the early 50 s in U.S. a series of other words were derived, such as <u>smoke fest</u>, <u>walkfest</u>, <u>eatfest</u>, <u>stuntfest</u>, <u>bookfest</u>, <u>gabfest</u>. The element <u>– fest</u> was obviously interpreted as the allomorph of <u>feast</u>. The word <u>cavalcade</u> was re-interpreted as containing the element <u>caval-</u>» horse» and the suffix-cade «parade» and attracted such coining as <u>aerocade</u>, <u>aquacade</u> (on a Latin basis of coining), <u>autocade</u>, <u>camelcade, motorcade</u> (on a native basis of coining), recent words which may not stand the test of time. From the word <u>panorama</u> the characteristic ending-<u>rama</u> was secreted with the meaning «pageant, show» and has recently led to such words as <u>cinerama,</u> <u>motorama</u>, <u>autorama</u>.

Sometimes ignorant but pretentious people take to coining words, re-interpreting foreign word in their own way. They vaguely feel that there is some characteristic termination in a 6 reek or Latin word which they then attach to some English basis to give the c.b.a «learned» tinge. As a result, we get barbarisms in-<u>athon</u>, coined after <u>Marathon</u>, such as <u>danceathon</u>, <u>swimathon</u> etg, in-thorium, such as <u>corsetorium</u>, <u>lubritorium</u> etc.

Thus, the rise of suffix illustrated by types <u>aristocracy</u>/ <u>landocracy</u>, <u>barometer</u>/ <u>speedometer</u> and others treated in the preceding passage can stay out pf accounted for suffixal derivation.

There is yet a third way in which suffixes may arise. Words of apparently only one constituent element may develop derivative morphemes. If we take such a word as <u>hamburger</u>, we observe that it has attracted other coining like

cheeseburger, bufburger, fishburger. The analysis of the word cannot be, as one may feel tempted to assume, that of <u>ham</u> and <u>burger</u> as there is no ham in the humburger. So the word cheeseburger has not arisen from re-interpretation. What has taken place is a shortening of the morpheme <u>hamburger</u> into a fore-clipped <u>– burger</u>, this part being taken as representative of the semantic elements contained in <u>hamburger</u>. The suffix <u>cheeseburger</u> there fore is a clipped word for non-existent <u>cheese hamburger.</u> Parallel to <u>– burger</u> words are such in <u>– furture</u>, as <u>shrimpfurder</u>, <u>krautfurter</u>, chicenfurter. In election campaign words such as <u>Hoovercrat</u>, <u>Willkiecrat</u>, <u>– crat</u> was short for <u>democrat</u>. The word <u>telegram</u> 1852 gave rise to <u>cablegram</u>, <u>radiogram</u>, <u>pidgeongram</u>, <u>lettergram</u> where <u>– gram</u> is short for <u>telegram</u>/ Tnr diminutive suffix <u>– ling</u> prginated in the same way. <u>Wolfling</u> «young wolf» is a blend pf wol <u>fand, young-ling</u> «young animal»(9,38).

In ME there are nominal and verbal suffixes. The suffixs <u>– fold</u>, <u>– most</u> and <u>– ward</u> form words which are used both as adjectives and adverbs.

The meaning of a suffix is conditioned by the particular semantic character of the basis to which the suffix is attached, also by the linguistic circumstances in which the coinage is made. In general parlance, a <u>fiver</u> is a bill of five (dollars or pounds), in crikret, jargon it is a hit for five, in school life it may denote a boy who always scrapes through with a five. A <u>greening</u> is a green variety of apple or pear, but a <u>whiting</u> is a white variety of fish. For other possibilities see <u>– er</u> and <u>– ing</u>, for instance. Some concepts are apt to be represented by suffixes in many languages as those of condition (state, quality etc), appurtenance, collectivity, endearment agent a.o, but theoretically there is no telling what concept may not develop to find expression in a suffix. French has a suffix <u>– ier</u> (type <u>pommier</u>) to denote fruit trees, there I <u>– ile</u> for the idea of stable for demos tic animals, 0.6 has a suffix <u>– it is</u> (type nephritis) meaning disease. These have no parallels in English, or in German either. But no intrinsic linguistic principle is involved in the absence of such morphemes. The rise of new suffix in English goes to corroborate this.

A new words are needed with regard to adverbal derivatives. Adeverbal derivative is not fundamentally different from a cpd whose first member is a verb

stem, so as in the case of denominal suffixes, a great number of meanings are possible. In practice, however, the possibilities are much restricted. Deverbal suffixes express grammatical functions than semantic concepts, and the usual implications are «act, fact, instance of…» (arrival, quidanse, warning), sometimes «state of…» (starvation, bewilderment), «agent» (personal or impersonal: baker, eraser, disinfectant), «personal object» (direct or indirect, only with – ee, transferee, draftee), «object of result» (breakade, savings), «plase» (settlement, brewery, lodgings). Similar considerations apply to derivation by a zero morpheme (pickpocket, blackaut, look).

Another essential feature of affixes that should not be overlooked is their combining power or valency, i.e. the types of types of the stems with which they they occur.

We have already seen that not all combinations of existing morphemes are actually used. This, unhappy, untrue and unattractive are quite regular combinations, while seemingly analogous unsad, unfalse, un-pretty seems unusual. The possibility of particular stem taking a particular affix depends on phonomorphological, morphological and semantic factors. The suffix ance – ence, for instance, occurs onli after b, t, d, dz, v, l, r, m, n,: disturbance, insistence, indepence, but not after s or z: condensation, organization.

It is of course impossible to describe the whole system. To make our point clear we shall take adjectives as an example. The adjective-forming suffixes are mostly attached to noun stems. They are: – ed (barbed), – en (golden), – ful (careful), – less (careless), – ly (soldierly), – like (childlike), – y (hearty) and some others. The highly productive suffix-able can be combined with noun stems and verbal stems alike (clubbable). It is especially frequent in the pattern in the pattern un – + verbal stem + able (unbearable). Sometimes it is even attached to phrases producing compound derivatives (unbrushoffable, ungetatable). These characteristics are of great importance both structurally and semantically.

Their structural significance is clear if we realize that to describe the system of a given vocabulary one must know the typical patterns on which its words are

coined. To achieve this it is necessary not only to know the morphemes of which they consist but also to reveal their recurrent+ regular combinations and the relationship existing between them. This approach ensures a rigorously linguistic basis for the identification of lexico-grammatical classes within each part of speech. In the English language these classes are so far little studied, although inquiry info this problem seems very promising and begins to affect attention.

It is also worthy of note that from the viewpoint of the information theory the fact that not every affix is capable of combining with any given stem makes the code more reliable, protects it from noise. <u>Noise</u> as a term of the theory of information is used to denote any kind of interference with the process of communication, mistakes, and misunderstanding.

The valiancy of stems is not therefore unlimited. Noun stems can be followed by the noun-forming suffixes: – age (bondage), – dom (serfdom), – eer, – ier (profitter, collier), ess (waitress), – ful (spoonful), – hood (childhood), – ian (physician), ics (linguistics), – ie / – y (daddy), – ing (flooring), – ism (heroism), – ist (violinist), – let (cloudlet), – ship (friendship); by the adjective-forming suffixes: – a/ – ial (doctoral), – an (African), – ary (revolutionary), – ed (wooded), – ful (hopeful), – ic, – ical (historic, historical), – ish (childish), – like (businesslike), – ly (friendly)/ – ous/ – ious/ – eous (spacious), – some (handsome), – y (cloudy); verb – forming suffixes: – ate (aerate), – en (hearten), – fy/, – ify (speechify), – ize (sympathize)(9,58).

Verbal stems are almost equal to noun stems in valiancy. They combine with the following noun-forming suffixes: – age (breakage), – al (betrayal), – ance/ – ense (guidance, reference), – ant/ – ent (assistant, student), – ee (evacuee), – er/ – or (painter, editor), – ing (uprising), – ion/ – tion/ ation (action, information), – ment (government). The adjective – forming suffixes used with verbal stems are: – able/ – ible (agreeable, comprehensible), – ive/ – sive/ – tive (talkative), – some (meddlesome).

Adjective stems furnish a shorter list: – dom (freedom), – ism (realism), – ity/ – ty (reality, cruelty), – ness (brightness), ish (reddish), – ly (firmly), – ate (differentiate), – en (sharpen), – fy/ – ify (solidify).

The combining possibilities (or valiancy) are very important semantically because the meaning of the derivative depends not only on the morphemes of Wichita's composed but also on combinations of stave and affix that can be contrasted with it. Contrast is to be local for in the use of the same morpheme in different environment and also in the use of different morphemes in environments otherwise the same.

The difference between the suffixes – ity and – ism, for instance, will become clear if we compare them as combined with identical stems in the following oppositions: formality: formalism: humanity: humanist: reality: realism. Roughly, the words in – ity mean the quality of being what the corresponding adjective describes, or an instance of this quality. The resulting nouns are countable. The suffix – ism forms nouns, naming a disposition to what the adjective describes or a corresponding type of ideology. Beng uncountable they belong to a different lexico-grammatical class.

The similarity on which an apposition is based may consist, for the material under consideration in the present paragraph, in the sameness of a suffix. A description of suffixes according to the stems with which they are combined and the lexico-grammatical classes they serve to differentiate may be helpful in the analysis of the meanings they are used to render.

A good example is furnished by the suffix – ish, as a suffix of adjectives. The combining possibilities of the suffix – ish are vast but not unlimited. Boyish and waspish are used, where as enmesh and aspish are not. The constraints here are of semantic nature. It is regularly present in the names of nationalities as for example: British, Irish, Spanish. When added to noun stems, it formes adjectives of the type «having the nature of with a moderately derogatory colouring» bookish, churlish, monkeyish, sheepish, swinish. Chidish has a derogatory twist of meaning, the adjective with a good sense is childlike. A man may be said to behave with a

childish petulance, but with a childlike simplicity. Compare also womanly having the qualities befitting a woman, as in womanly compassion, womanly grace, womanly tact, with the derogatory womanish effeminate as in: Womanish tears, traitors to love and duty(9,58).

With adjective stems the meaning is not derogatory, the adjective renders a moderate degree of the quality named: greenish somewhat green, stiffish somewhat stiff, thinnish somewhat thin. The model is especially frequent with colours: blackish, brownish, reddish. A similar but stylistically peculiar meaning is observed in combinations with numeral stems. eightyish, fortyish and the like are equivalent to round about eighty, round about forty: Whats she like, Min? «Sixtyish Stout Grey hair. Tweeds. Red face.»(9,58).

In colloquial speech the suffix – ish is added to words denoting the time of the day: four-oclockish or more often fourish means round about four o'clock For example: Robert and I went to a cocktail party at Annette's. (Ituas called «drinks at six thirty ish» – the word «cocktail» was going out). (9,58).

The study of correlations of derivatives and stems is also helpful in bringing into relief the meaning of the affix. The lexico-grammatical meaning of the suffix– ness that forms nouns of quality from adjective stems becomes clear from the study of correlations of the derivative and the underlying stem. A few examples picked up at random will be sufficient proof: good: goodness: kind: kindness: lonely: loneliness: ready: readiness: righteous: righteousness: slow:slowness.

The suffixes – ion (and its allomorphs) and – or are noun-forming suffixes combined with verbal stems. The opposition between them serves to distinguish between two subclasses of noun abstract noun and agent nouns, e.g. accumulation: accumulator; action:actor; election:elector; liberation:liberator, oppressor; vibration:vibrator, etc. The abstract noun in this case may mean action, state or result of action remaining within the same subclass. Thus, cultivation denotes the process of cultivating (most often of cultivating the soil) and the state of being cultivated. Things may be somewhat different, with the suffix – or because a cultivator is a person who cultivates and a machine for breaking up ground,

loosening the earth round growing plants and destroying weeds. Thus two different subclasses are involved: one of animate beings, the other of inanimate things. They differ not only semantically but grammatically too: there exists a regular opposition between animate and inanimate nouns in English: the first group is substituted by he or she, and the second by the pronoun it. In derivation this opposition of animate personal noun to all other noun is in some cases sustained by such suffixes as – ard/ – art (braggart), – ist (novelist) and a few others, but most often neutralized. The term neutralization may be defined as c temporary suspension of an otherwise functioning opposition. Neutralization as in the word Cultivator, is also observed with such suffixes as – ant, – er that also occur in agent nouns, both animate and inanimate. CF. accountant a person who keeps accounts and coolant a cooling substance; fitter mechanic who fits up all kinds of metalwork and shutter (in photography) device regulating the exposure to light of a plate of film: runner a messenger and a millstone.

Structural observations such as these show that an analysis of suffixes in the light of their valiancy and the lexico-grammatical subclasses that they serve to differentiate may be useful in the analysis of their semantic properties. The notions of opposition, correlation and neutralization introduced into linguistics by N. Trubetzkoy and discussed in previous chapters prove relevant and helpful in morphological analysis.

We call prefixes such particle s as can be prefixed to full words but are them selves not words with an independent existence. Native prefixes have developed out of independent words. Their number is small: a-, be-, un-, (negative and reversative), fore-, mid-and (partly) mis-, Prefixes of foreign origin came into the language ready made, so to speak. Tey are due to syntagmatic loans from other languages: when a number of analyzable foreign words of the same strucure had been introduced into the language, the pattern could be extended to new formations. i. e. the prefix then became a derivative morpheme. Some prefixes have second le-rely developed uses as independent words, as counter, sub, arch

which does not invalidate the principle that primarily they were particles with no independent existence. The same phenomenon occurs with suffixes also.

There are many prefixes, chiefly used in learned words or in scientific terminology, which have come into the language through borrowing from Modern Latin, as ante-, extra-, intra-/ meta, para – etc. The practice of word coining with there particles begins in the 16th century, but really develops with the progress of modern science only, i.e. in the 18th and esp the 19th century. With these particles there is a practical difficulty. They may represent 1) such elements as are prefixes (in the above meaning) in Latin or 6 reek, as a – (acaudal etc.), semi – (semi-annual), 2) such elements as exist as prepositions or particles with an independent word existence, as intra, circum / hyper, para, 3) such as are the stems of full words in Latin or 6 reek, as multi-, omni-/ astro-, hydro.

This last group is usually termed combining forms (OED Webster). In principle, the three groups are on the same footing from the point of view of English wf, as they represent loan elements in English with no independent existence as words. That macro-, micro – a. o. should be termed combining from while hyper-, hypro-, intro-, intra – a. o. are called prefixes by the OED, is by no means justified (14,38).

Only such pts as are prefixed to fool English words of generals, learned, scientific or technical character can be termed prefixes. Hyper-in hypersensitive is a prefix, but hyper – in hypertrophy is not, as-trophy is no word.

We cannot, however, under take to deal with all the prepositive elements occurring in English. Such elements as astro-, electro-, galato-, hepato-, oscheo – and countless others which are used in scientific or technical terminology have not been treated in this book. They offer a purely dictionary interest in any case. In the main, only those pts howe been considered that fall under the above groups 1) and 2) But we have also in duded a few prefixes which lie outside this scope, as prfs denoting number (poly-, multi-), the pronominal stem auto, which is used with many words of general character, and pts which are type – forming with English words of wider currency (as crypto-, neo-, pseudo-).

There is often competition between prefixes as there is between suffixes and in dependent words: <u>over</u> – and <u>out</u> – sometimes overlap, there is overlapping between <u>un</u> – (negative) and <u>in-</u>, <u>un</u> – (reversative), <u>dis</u> – and <u>de-</u>, between <u>ante</u> and <u>pre-</u>, <u>super</u> – and <u>trans-</u>, <u>super</u> – and <u>supra</u>.

A pre-particle or prefix combination may be based on three different conceptual patterns and accordingly present the prefixing three functional aspects: 1) the prefix has adjectival force (with sbs, as in <u>anteroom</u>, <u>archbishop</u>, <u>co-hostess</u>, <u>ex-king</u>); 2) the prefix has adverbial force (with adjectives and verbs, as in <u>unconscious</u>, <u>hypersensitive</u>, <u>informal</u>, <u>overanxious</u>/ <u>unroll</u>, <u>revrite</u>, <u>mislay</u>); 3) the prefix has prepositional force (as in <u>prewar</u> <u>years</u>, <u>postgraduate</u> <u>studies</u>, <u>antiaircraft</u> <u>gun</u>) <u>afire</u>, <u>aflutter/anti-Nazi</u>, afternoon/encage: sbs and vbs must be considered syntagmas with a zero determinate, the suffixs <u>anti-Nazi</u>, <u>afternoon</u>, <u>encage</u> being the respective determinants)(9,174).

The preceding conceptual patterns are important in the determination of the stress: while a suffix. Based on an adjunct (primary relation tends to have two heavy stresses (as in <u>arch</u> – enemy)) or may even have the main stress on the prefix (as in subway), the prf. Has not more than a full middle stress in the other types.

The semi-independent, word-like status of prefixes also appears from their treatment in regard to stress. With the exception of regularly unstressed <u>a</u> – (as in <u>afire</u>, <u>aflutter</u>), <u>be</u> – (as in <u>befriend</u>), and <u>em-</u>, <u>en</u> – (as in <u>emplace</u>, <u>encage</u>) all prefixes have stress. To illustrate this important point a comparison with non-composite words of similar phonetic structure will be useful. If we compare the words <u>re-full</u> and <u>repeat</u>, morphemic <u>re-</u> / ri / in <u>refill</u> is basically characterized by presence of stress whereas non-morphemic <u>re</u> – [ri] is basically characterized by absence of stress. This is proved by the fact that under certain phonetically unpredictable circumstances, the phonemic stress of <u>re-</u>in <u>re-full</u>, though basically a middle stress, can take the form of heavy stress where as phonemic absence of stress can never rise to presence of stress. They <u>refilled</u> <u>the tank</u> may become <u>they refilled the tank</u> (for the sake of contrast) or <u>they refilled the tank</u> (for emphasis),

but no such shift is conceivable for mono-morphemic <u>repeat</u>, <u>incite</u>, <u>prefer</u> etc. Which invariably maintain the pattern no stress/heavy stress.

In diachronic analysis Lexical elements are compared with those from which they have been formed and developed and their present productivity is determined. The diachronic study of vocabulary establishes whether the present morphological structure of each element of the vocabulary is due to the process of affixation or some other word-forming process, which took place within the English vocabulary in the course of its development, or whether it has some other source. The possible other sources are: (1) the borrowing of morphologically divisible words, e.g. <u>i/-liter-ate</u> from lat. <u>Illiterates</u> or <u>litera-ture</u> from lat litteratura: (2) reactivation, e.g. When in a number of Latin verbs harrowed in the second participle form with the suffix <u>– at</u> (us), this suffix became <u>– ate</u> (<u>separate</u>), and came to be understood as a characteristic mark of the infinitive; (3) False etymology: when a difficult, usually borrowed, word structure is destroyed in to some form suggesting a motivation, as, for instance, in the change of <u>asparagus</u> into <u>sparrowgrass</u>, or OF r and ME <u>crevice</u> into <u>crayfish</u>.

Synchronic analysis concentrates on structural types and treats word-formation as a system of rules, aiming at the creation of a consistent and complete theory by which the observed facts cab be classified, and the non-observed facts can be predicted. This aim has not been achieved as yet, so that a consistently synchronic description of the English language is still fragmentary still requires frequent revision. Diachronic analysis concentrating on word-forming possesses is more fully worked out.

All the foregoing treatment has been strictly synchronic i.e. only the present state of the English vocabulary has been taken into consideration. To have a complete picture of affixation, however one must be acquainted with the development of the stock of morphemes involved. A diachronic approach is thus indispensable.

The basic contrast that must be detalt with in this connection is the opposition of <u>productive</u> and <u>non-productive</u> affixes.

Conclusion on chapter I

Affixation is the formation of words with the help of derivational affixes. Affixation is subdivided into prefixation and suffixation. Ex. if a prefix «dis» is added to the stem «like» (dislike) or suffix «ful» to «law» (lawful) we say a word is built by an affixation. Derivational morphemes added before the stem of a word are called prefixes (Ex. un+ like) and the derivational morphemes added after the stem of the word are called suffixes (hand+ ful). Prefixes modify the lexical meaning of the stem meaning i. e. the prefixed derivative mostly belongs to the same part of speech. Ex. like (v.) – dislike (v.).kind (adj.) – unkind (adj.) but suffixes transfer words to a different part of speech, ex. teach (v.) – teacher (n.). But new investigations into the problem of prefixation in English showed interesting results. It appears that the traditional opinion, current among linguists that prefixes modify only the lexical meaning of words without changing the part of speech is not quite correct. In English there are about 25 prefixes which can transfer words to a different part of speech. Ex. – head (n) – behead (v), bus(n) – debus(v), brown (adj) – embrown(u), title(n) – entitle(v), large (adj). – enlarge (v), camp(n). – encamp(u), war(n). – prewar (adj). If it is so we can say that there is no functional difference between suffixes and prefixes. Besides there are linguists[1] who treat prefixes as a part of word-composition. They think that a prefix has.he same function as the first component of a compound word. Other linguists[2] consider prefixes as derivational affixes which differ essentially from root– morphemes and stems.

Another problem of the study of affixes is homonymic affixes. Homonymic affixes are affixes which have the same sound form, spelling but different meanings and they are added to different parts of speech.

Ex. ful (1) forms adjectives from a noun: love (v) – loveful (adj/, man (n), – manful (adj).

– ful (2) forms adjective from a verb: forget (v.) – forgetful, (adj) thank (v.) – thankful (adj).

– ly(l) added to an adjective stem is homonymous to the adjective forming suffix – ly(2) which is added to a noun stem. Ex. quickly, slowly, and lovely, friendly.

The verb suffix-en (1) added to a noun and adjective stem is homonymous to the adjective forming suffix – en (2) which is added to a noun stem. Ex. to strengthen, to soften, and wooden, golden.

The prefix un – (l) added to a noun and a verb stem is homonymous to the prefix un – (2) which is added to an adj¬ective stem. Ex. unshoe, unbind, unfair, untrue.

In the course of the history of English as a result of borrowings there appeared many synonymous affixes in the language. Ex. the suffixes – er, – or, – ist, – ent, – ant, – eer, – ian, – man, – ee, – ess form synonymous affixes denoting the meaning «agent». Having the meaning of negation the prefixes un-, in-, non-, dis-, rnis – form synonymic group of prefixes. It is interesting to point out that the synonymous affixes help us to reveal different lexico–semantic groupings of words. Ex. the words formed by the suffixes – man, – er, – or, – ian, – ee, – eer, – ent, ant etc. belong to the lexico-semantic groupings of words denoting «doer of the action». The affixes may also undergo semantic changes, they may be polysemantic. Ex. the noun forming suffix «er» has the following meanings:

1) persons following some special trade and profession (driver, teacher, hunter); 2) persons doing a certain action at the moment in question (packer, chooser, giver); 3) tools (blotter, atomizer, boiler, transmitter).

The adjective forming suffix «-y» also has several meanings:

1) composed of, full of (bony, stony)

2) characterized by (rainy, cloudy)

3) having the character of resembling what the stem denotes (inky, bushy etc.)

Thus, affixes have different characteristic features.

The Comparative analysis of the English language with other languages showed that English is not so rich in suffixes as, for example, the Uzbek language.

The total number of suffixes is 67 in English but the Uzbek suffixes are 171 and, vice versa, prefixation is more typical to the English language than Uzbek (Compare: 79:8)

In Uzbek there are following prefixes: be-, no-, ba, bo-, nim– By their origin the Uzbek affixes like English ones are divided into native and borrowed. The suffixes:chi, – gar, – zor, – li, – lik, – o'q are native suffixes but. – izm, – atsiya, bo, no-, namo-, – ki are of borrowed origin. The affixes may be divided into different semantic groups. These semantic groups of affixes may be different in different languages.

There are different classifications of affixes in linguistic literature. Affixes may be divided into dead and living. Dead affixes are those which are no longer felt in Modern English as component parts of words. They can be singled out only by an etymological analysis. Ex.admit (fromL ad+mit-tere); deed, seed (-d) flight, bright(-t).

Living affixes are easily singled out from a word. Ex. freedom, childhood, marriage.

Living affixes are traditionally in their turn divided into productive and non-productive. Productive affixes are those which are characterized by their ability to make new words. Ex. – er (baker, lander (kosmik kema); – ist (leftist – (chap taraf)) – ism, – ish (baldish) – ing, – ness, – ation, – ee. – ry, – or – ance, ic are productive suffixes re-, un-non-, anti – etc are productive prefixes.

Non-productive affixes are those which are not used to form new words in Modern English. Ex, – ard, – cy, – ive, – en, – dom, – ship, – ful, – en, – ify etc are not productive suffixes; in, ir (im-), mis – dis-, are non-productive prefixes. These affixes may occur in a great number of words but if they are not used to form new words in Modern English they are not productive.

But recent investigations prove that there are no productive and non-productive affixes because each affix plays a certain role in wordformation. There are only affixes with different degrees of productivity, besides that productivity of affixes should not be mixed up with their frequency of occurence in speech.

Frequency of affixes is characterised by the occurence of an affix in a great number of words. But productivity is the ability of a given suffix or prefix to make new words. An affix may be frequent but not productive, ex, the suffix «-ive» is very frequent but non-productive.

Some linguists distinguish between two types of prefixes:

1) those which are like functional words (such as prepositions or adverbs) (ex. out-, over-, up – .)

2) those which are not correlated with any independent words, (ex. un-, dis-, re-, mis-, etc).

Prefixes out-, over-, up-, under-, etc are considered as semi bound morphemes. However, this view is doubtful because these prefixes are quite frequent in speech and like other derivational affixes have a generalized meaning. They have no grammatical meaning like the independent words. We think they are bound morphemes and should be regarded as homonyms of the corresponding independent words, ex. the prefix «out-» in outdoor, outcome, outbreak etc is homonymous to the preposition «out» in «out of door» and the adverb «out» in «He went out».

Chapter II. The semantics of the affixes and their comparative analysis

2.1. Semi-Affixes and Boundary cases between derivation and inflection

There are cases, however, where it is very difficult to drawer hard and fast line between roots and affixes on the one hand, and derivational affixes and in flexional formatives on the other. The distinction between these has caused much discussion and is no easy matter altogether.

There are a few roots in English which have developed great combining ability in the position of the second element of a word and a very general meaning similar to that of an affix. They receive this name because semantically, functionally, structurally and statistically they behave more like affixes than like roots. Their meaning is as general. They determine the lexicon-grammatical class the word belongs to. Cf <u>sailor</u>: <u>seaman</u>, where <u>– man</u> is a semi-affix (14,27).

Another specific group is farmed by the adverb-forming suffix <u>– ly</u>, following adjective stems, and the noun-forming suffixes: <u>– ing</u>, <u>– ness</u>, <u>– er</u> and by <u>– ed</u> added to a combination of two stems: <u>fainthearted</u>, <u>long legged</u>. By their almost unlimited combining possibilities (high valiancy) and the almost complete fusion of lexical and lexicon-grammatical meaning they resemble inflectional formatives. The derivation with these suffixes is so regular and the meaning and function of the derivatives so obvious that such derivatives are very often considered not worth an entry in the dictionary and therefore omitted as self-evident. Almost every adjective stem can produce an adverb with the help of <u>– ly</u> and an abstract noun by taking up the suffix <u>– ness</u>. Every verbal stem can produce the name of the doer by adding <u>– er</u> and the name of the process or its result by adding <u>– ing</u>. A suffix approaching those in productivity is <u>– ish</u> denoting a moderate degree of the quality named in the stem. Therefore these words are explained in dictionaries by referring the reader to the underlying stem. For example, in Concise Oxford dictionary we read: «<u>womanliness</u>–the quality of being womanly; <u>womanized</u> in senses of the verb; <u>womanishly</u>-in a womanish

manner; <u>womanly</u> adv-in a womanly manner, <u>womanishness</u>-the quality or state of being womanish.»

These affixes are remarkable for their high valence also in the formation of compound derivatives corresponding to free phrases. Examples are: every day: everydayness.

An English word does not necessarily contain formatives indicating to what part of speech it belongs. This holds true even with respect to inflexible parts of speech, i.e. nouns, verbs, adjectives. Not all roots are free forms, but productive roots, i.e. roots capable of producing new words, usually are. The semantic realization of an English word is therefore very specific. Its dependence on distribution is further enhanced by the widespread occurrence of homonymy both among root morphemes and affixes. Note how many words in the following statement might be ambiguous if taken in isolation: A change of work is as good as a rest.

These two types of approach, synchronic and diachronic, give rise to two different principles of arranging morphologically related words into groups. In the first case series of words with a common root morpheme in which derivatives are opposable to their unsuffixed and unprefixed bases, are combined cf. heart, hearty, etc..The second grouping results in families of historically cognate words, cf. heart, cor (Lat), etc.

Unlike roots, affixes are always bound forms. The difference between suffixes and prefixes, it will be remembered, is not confined to their respective position, suffixes being «fixed after» and prefixes «fixed before» the stem. It also concerns their function and meaning (6,59-66).

Lexicology is primarily concerned with derivational affixes, the other group being the domain of grammarians. The derivational affixes in fact, as well as the whole problem of word-formation, form a boundary area between lexicology and grammar and are therefore studied in both.

Language being a system in which the elements of vocabulary and grammar are closely interrelated, our study of affixes cannot be complete without some

discussion of the similarity and difference between derivational and functional morphemes.

The similarity is obvious as they are so often homonymous. Otherwise the two groups are essentially different because they render different types of meaning.

Functional affixes serve to convey grammatical meaning. They build different forms of one and the same word. A word-form, or the form of a word, is defined as one of the different aspects a word may take as a result of inflection. Complete sets of all the various forms of a word when considered as inflectional patterns, such as declensions or conjugations, are termed paradigms. A paradigm is therefore defined as the system of grammatical forms characteristic of a word, e.g. near, nearer, nearest; son, son's, sons, sons'.

Derivational affixes serve to supply the stem with components of lexical and lexico-grammatical meaning, and thus form different words. One and the same lexico-grammatical meaning of the affix is sometimes accompanied by different combinations of various lexical meanings. Thus, the lexico-grammatical meaning supplied by the suffix – y consists in the ability to express the, qualitative idea peculiar to adjectives and creates adjectives from noun stems. The lexical meanings of the same suffix are somewhat variegated: 'full of, as in bushy or cloudy, 'composed of, as in stony, 'having the quality of, as in slangy, 'resembling', as in baggy and some more. This suffix sometimes conveys emotional components of meaning. E.g. My school reports used to say: «Not amenable to discipline; too fond of organizing» which was only a kind way of saying: «Bossy?» Bossy not only means 'having the quality of a boss' or 'behaving like a boss'; it is also an unkind derogatory word (15,74).

This fundamental difference in meaning and function of the two groups of affixes results in an interesting relationship: the presence of a derivational affix does not prevent a word from being equivalent to another word, in which this suffix is absent, so that they can be substituted for one another in context. The presence of a functional affix changes the distributional properties of a word so much that it can never be substituted for a simple word without violating

grammatical standard. To see this point consider the following familiar quotation from Shakespeare:

Cowards die many times before their deaths;

The valiant never taste of death but once.

Here no one-morpheme word can be substituted for the words cowards, times or deaths because the absence of a plural mark will make the sentence ungrammatical. The words containing derivational affixes can be substituted by morphologically different words, so that the derivative valiant can be substituted by a root word like brave.

The first step in our studying English negative affixes is to give a definition of the affix itself. Here is a definition given in Oxford Advanced Lerner's Dictionary of Current English. **Affix** is a letter or group of letters added to the beginning or end of a word to change its meaning [8]. This definition takes into account only prefixes and suffixes. But it does not cover all the kinds of affixes. It is important to keep in mind that there are also different types of affixes present in the English language as well:

-circumfix (one portion appears at the front of a stem, and the other at the rear, like in ascattered),

-simulfix (changes a segment of a stem, like in mouse-mice),

-suprafix (changes a suprasegmental phoneme of a stem, for example, the change of an like in produce (noun)-produce (verb));

-duflifix (incorporates a reduplicated portion of a stem (may occur in front, at the rear, or within the stem), like in teeny-weeny) [9].

So we see that the definition should be wider. So, if we also take into account that the morphemes are generally divided into root- and affixal morphemes, the definition will be the following: **affifx** is a morpheme that is attached to the stem to form a new word with another meaning.

It was written much about semantics of an affix. There are heated debates in the linguistic literature, whether the affix has meaning in general, and if yes, what type of meaning. There are different points of view, frequently opposite, which,

however, can be reduced to several basic directions:

1) The affix has no independent meaning; it only forms the external side of a word;

2) The affix carries out basically only transporting function, translating a basis from one lexical and grammatical class in another, and lexically "is empty";

3) The affix can be characterized by presence of a various sort of meanings: one affixes express a wide and various circle of lexical meanings, others - only grammatic meanings [3, 138].

It is also important to notice that "affixes specify, or transform the meaning of the root. Affixal specification may be of two kinds: of lexical or grammatical character. So, according to the semantic criterion affixes are further subdivided into *lexical*, or *word-building (derivational) affixes*, which together with the root constitute *the stem* of the word, and *grammatical*, or *word-changing affixes*, expressing different morphological categories, such as number, case, tense and others. With the help of lexical affixes new words are derived, or built; with the help of grammatical affixes the form of the word is changed" [2, 57]. One of our further aims will be to study whether English negative affixes are lexical or grammatical or they can be of both types.

On this stage of the analyses rises the question of the criterion for referring affixes to negative and what affixes can be called negative. For the answer it is better to look up the word "negative" in the dictionary first. So, the Longman dictionary gives the following definition:

negative: 1) a refusing, doubting, or disapproving; saying or meaning 'no',

b containing one of the words 'no', 'not', 'nothing, 'never' etc.

2) without any active, useful or helping qualities; not constructive

3) showing the lack of what was hoped for or expected [6].

From the present definition we see that the first meaning of these words is better applicable to affixes, and this meaning should be the criteria for figuring out negative affixes.

Our next task is to see, which affixes are considered to be negative.

43

According to the previous statement they are the following: a-, ant(i)-, dis-, dys-, in-, mal-, mis-, nega-, non-, un-. From this list we can see, that they are all prefixes. So arises the question, is the negative function in English world-building performed only by prefixes. If we consult other sources we see that there is one suffix changing the meaning of the word to the opposite: -less (*motion-motionless*) [3, 137]. And we also add it to this list. As for the prefixes, de- can also carry the idea of oppositeness, and il-, im- and ir- must be added too, as they are the allomorphs of in-. So let us see what their meanings are.

So if we consult Longman Dictionary of English Language and culture, the result will be the following.

a-: (showing an opposite or absence of something) not; without: amoral (=not moral)

anti-: 1 apposed to; against: antinuclear (apposing the use of atomic weapons and power) 2 opposite of: an anticlimax (=an unexciting ending of the expected climax)

contra-: opposite (plants is contradiction to animals)

de-: (in verbs and nouns) (showing an opposite): a depopulated area (which all or most of the population has left)

dis-: (showing an opposite or negative): I disapprove (=do not approve)

il-: illogical (=not logical)

im-: immobilize

in-: (especially in adjectives and nouns) (showing a negative, an apposite, or a lack) not: insensible

ir-: not: irregular (=not regular)

mal-: bad or badly: a malformed (=wrongly shaped) limb

mis-: 1 bad or badly: misfortune;

2 wrong or wrongly: a miscalculation

3 (showing an opposite or the lack of something): I mistrust (=do not trust) him

non-: (especially in adjectives and nouns) (showing a negative) not: a non-

smoker (=someone who does not smokes)

un-: 1 (especially in adjectives and adverbs) showing a negative, a lack, or an opposite) not: unfair; 2 (especially in verbs) (showing an opposite): undress (take one's clothes off)

less (in adjectives): 1 without a ---: a childless couple (= who have no children); 2 that never ---s or can not be ---ed: helpless (= can not be helped) [6]

For the prefixes il-, im-, ir- there are no definitions in the dictionary, as they all refer to the suffix in-. The aspect of their difference is explained by allo-morphemic theory(15,74).

When studying morphemes, we should distinguish morphemes as generalized lingual units from their concrete manifestations, or variants in specific textual environments; variants of morphemes are called "allo-morphs". The allo-morphemic theory distinguishes morphemes according to their concrete realization. In the study of morphemes it was developed in Descriptive Linguistic by means of distributional analysis. There are three types of distribution then: contrastive distribution, non-contrastive distribution and complementary distribution. Contrastive distribution means that morphs express different meanings in identical environments, e.g.: He start<u>ed</u> laughing – He start<u>s</u> laughing. The morphs are said to be in non-contrastive distribution if they express identical meaning in identical environments; such morphs constitute 'free variants' of the same morpheme, e.g.: learned – learnt. The morphs are in complementary distribution when they express identical meanings in different environments, e.g.: He started laughing – He stopped laughing; such morphs constitute variants, or allo-morphs of the same morpheme [4, 60-61].

Allo-morphemic theory plays an important role in the descriptive analysis of negative affixes. One of the most active negative affixes is in-. Its allomorphs are il-, im-, ir-. That means that they carry on the same meaning, but they are attached to different stems. It can be a great problem for English learners, therefore it is important to clarify the rules of allo-morphemic affixes. The in- changes or is assimilated to **il-** if the stem begins with l, as in *illuminate*; to **im-** before b, as in

imbibe, before m, as in *immediate*, before p, as with *implant*; and to **ir-** before r, as in *irrigate.* So the distribution of the allo-morphs concerned is complementary.

It is quite reasonable to give the examples to these affixes and the definitions of these words given in the dictionary.

atypical: not typical; different from what is usual: Her reaction to the drug was atypical.

antiaircraft: directed against enemy aircraft: antiaircraft missiles

contraindication: a physical sign or condition that makes it inadvisable to take or continue taking a medicine: High blood pressure is a contraindication for this drug.

destabilize: to make less firm or steady, especially politically: a deliberate attempt to destabilize the economy of a rival country

disclaim: to state that one does not have or accept; to deny: He disclaimed all responsibility for the accident.

illiterate: who has nor learnt to read or write: (fig.) an illiterate note.

immodest: showing or tending to express a high opinion of oneself and oneself's abilities, perhaps higher than is really deserved; not modest: immodest behaviour.

inaction: lack of action or activity; quality or state of doing nothing

irrational: not using reason; against reasonable behaviour: After taking the drug she became quite irrational.

miscount: to count wrongly: The teacher miscounted the number of boys.

nonresident: a person not living in a certain place: Are nonresidents entitled to vote?

unannounced: having given no sign of being present; appear unexpectedly: He burst into doctor's room quite unannounced and started shouting at her.

countless: very many; too many to be counted: countless reasons against it.
[6]

Since we have even more examples of words with the negative affixes, it is more possible to apply the definitions of the affixes to the definitions of the words

with these affixes. It is becoming clear then that the meanings of the affixes given in the dictionary are quite general. It was stated above, that affix has no independent meaning, so only when attached to words, affixes acquire a more specific meaning in each case. The reason for it is that affix is not an independent unit; therefore its meaning taken separately can be stated only generally.

To make the analysis more complete we should consult at least one other dictionary. So if it is Oxford Advanced Lerner's Dictionary of Current English, the result will be the following.

a-: (in nouns, adjectives and adverbs) not; without: amoral (=not moral): atheists

anti-: 1 apposed to; against: anti-tank weapons 2 the opposite of: an anti-hero

contra-: (in nouns, verbs and adjectives) against; opposite : contraflow

de-: (in verbs and related nouns, adjectives and adverbs): the opposite of: decentralization

dis-: (in adjectives, adverbs, nouns and verbs): not; the opposite of: dishonest

il-suffix=in

im-=in

in-: (also il- im- ir-)(in adjectives, adverbs and nouns): not; the opposite of: infinite

ir-=in

mal-: (in nouns, verbs and adjectives): bad or badly; not correct or correctly: malpractice

mis-: (in verbs and nouns) bad or wrong; badly or wrongly

non-: (in nouns, adjectives and adverbs): not: nonsense

un-: 1(in adjectives, adverbs and nouns): not; the opposite of: unable 2 (in verbs that describe the opposite of a process): unlock

less-: (in adjectives): 1without: treeless 2 not doing; not affected by: tireless.

Such affixes like mys- and nega-, which are present in the list of negative

affixes, are not present in both Longman and Oxford dictionaries, as well as words with them, so we can make a suggestion that they are not productive nowadays, that is no words are built with it. But there are found some words beginning with dys-, like dysfunctional (=not working in a satisfactory or successful way), or dyslexia (=a slight disorder of the brain that causes difficulty in reading and spelling, for example, but does not affect intelligence). Therefore, it should be included in the list of negative affixes to make it more complete. It is obvious, that the prefix dys- really exists and has approximately the same meaning as the prefix dis-[4, 60-61].

Analyzing the meanings given by both dictionaries we can make a conclusion that they just slightly differ in meanings in different dictionaries (for example, contra- in Longman Dictionary means "opposite", while Oxford Dictionary gives a wider definition – "against; opposite", and like), and according to the examples the meanings given there reflect the additional meaning, which they bring to the derivative word. All the negative affixes posses the meaning of either opposition or lack of something that also carries the idea of negation. The Oxford dictionary marks the word class of the word the affix belongs to, what is not always done in Longman dictionary. It is very useful for our further classificatrional analysis.

But it is known that some words can acquire several negative affixes and new words can seem semantically similar to language learners. It is a rude mistake to misuse the affixes. So on this stage of analysis appears a question, why some words are attached with a certain negative affix and others are attached with others. And it is also very important to find out how not to mix up some affixes with very similar meanings. The Longman dictionary contains an article comparing prefixes un-, in- and non-, which look very much alike at the first sight. "The difference between them is the degree to which they suggest the idea of the opposite rather than negative. Non- is usually just negative (for example, nonalcoholic drinks contain no alcohol), but un- is often used to suggest an opposite quality. Compare: He is applied for a nonscientific job (=not connected with science) in the Civil

Service. | It was very unscientific (=showing too little attention to scientific principles) not to measure your results. Of the three prefixes (un-, in-, non-), in- tends most often to suggest opposite qualities. Compare: their inhuman (=very cruel) treatment of political prisoners | The archeologists discovered both human and non-human bones". This explanation is a great help for language learners and also for the practical purposes of our work.

2.2 Principles of morphemic and word-formation analysis

A synchronic description of the English vocabulary deals with its present-day system and its patterns of word-formation by comparing words simultaneously existing in it.

If the analysis is limited to stating the number and type of morphemes that make up the word, it is referred to as morphemic. For: instance, the word girlishness may be analysed into three morphemes: the root – girl – and two suffixes – ish and – ness. The morphemic classification of words is as follows: one root morpheme– a root word (girl), one root morpheme plus one or more affixes – a derived word (girlish, girlishness), two or more stems– a compound word (girl-friend), two or more stems and a common affix – a compound derivative (old-maidish). The morphemic analysis establishes only the ultimate constituents that make up the word.

A structural word-formation analysis proceeds further; it studies the structural correlation with other words, the structural patterns or rules on which words are built (11,79).

This is done with the help of the principle of oppositions, i.e. by studying the partly similar elements, the differences between which are functionally relevant; in our case this difference is sufficient to create a new word. Girl and girlish are members of a morphemic opposition. They are similar as the root morpheme – girl – is the same. Their distinctive feature is the suffix – ish. Due to this suffix the

second member of the opposition is a different word belonging to a different part of speech. This binary opposition comprises two elements.

A correlation is a set of binary oppositions. It is composed of two subsets formed by the first and the second elements of each couple, i.e. opposition. Each element of the first set is coupled with exactly one element of the second set and vice versa. Each second element may be derived from the corresponding first element by a general rule valid for all members of the relation.[1]

Observing the proportional opposition:

child = woman = monkey = spinster = book

childish womanish monkeyish spinsterish bookish

It is possible to conclude that there is in English a type of derived adjectives consisting of a noun stem and the suffix – ish. Observation also shows that the stems are mostly those of animate nouns, and permits us to define the relationship between the structural pattern of the word and its meaning. Any one word built according to this pattern contains a semantic component common to the whole group, namely: 'typical of, or having the bad qualities of.

In the above example the results of morphemic analysis and the structural word-formation analysis practically coincide. There are other cases, however, where they are of necessity separated. The morphemic analysis is, for instance, insufficient in showing the difference between the structure of inconvenience v and impatience n; it classifies both as derivatives. From the point of view of word-formation pattern, however, they are fundamentally different. It is only the second that is formed by derivation. Compare:

impatience n = patience n = corpulence n

impatient a patient a corpulent a

The correlation that can be established for the verb inconvenience is different, namely:

inconvenience v = pain v = disgust v = anger v = delight v

inconvenience n pain n disgust n anger n delight n

Here nouns denoting some feeling or state are correlated with verbs causing this feeling or state, there being no difference in stems between the members of each separate opposition. Whether different pairs in the correlation are structured similarly or differently is irrelevant. Some of them are simple root-words, others are derivatives; they might be compounds as well. In terms of word-formation we state that the verb inconvenience when compared with the noun inconvenience shows relationships characteristic of the process of conversion. Cf. to position where the suffix – tion does not classify this word as an abstract noun but shows it is derived from one. This approach also affords a possibility to distinguish between compound words formed by composition and those formed by other processes. The words honeymoon n and honeymoon v are both compounds, containing two free stems, yet the first is formed by composition: honey n+moon n=honeymoon n, and the second by conversion: honeymoon n>honeymoon v. The treatment remains synchronic because it is not the origin of the word that is established but its present correlations in the vocabulary and the patterns productive in present-day English (14,27).

The analysis into immediate constituents described below permits us to obtain the morphemic structure and provides the basis for further word-formation analysis.

A synchronic morphological analysis is most effectively accomplished by the procedure known as the analysis into immediate constituents[1] (IC's). First suggested by L. Bloomfield[2] it was later developed by many linguists.[3] The main opposition dealt with is the opposition of stem and affix. It is a kind of segmentation revealing not the history of the word but its motivation, i.e. the data the listener has to go by in understanding it. It goes without saying that unmotivated words and words with faded motivation have to be remembered and understood as separate signs, not as combinations of other signs.

The method is based on the fact that a word characterized by morphological divisibility (analysable into morphemes) is involved in certain structural correlations (28,210).

A sample analysis which has become almost classical, being repeated many times by many authors, is Bloomfield's analysis of the word ungentlemanly. As the word is convenient we take the same example. Comparing this word with other utterances the listener recognizes the morpheme un-as a negative prefix because he has often come across words built on the pattern un-adjective stem: uncertain, unconscious, uneasy, unfortunate, unmistakable, unnatural. Some of the cases resembled the word even more closely; these were: unearthly, unsightly, untimely, unwomanly and the like. One can also come across the adjective gentlemanly. Thus, at the first cut we obtain the following immediate constituents: un + gentlemanly. If we continue our analysis we see that although gent occurs as a free form in low colloquial usage, no such word as lemanly may be found either as a free or as a bound constituent, so this time we have to separate the final morpheme. We are justified in so doing as there are many adjectives following the pattern noun stem+ly, such as womanly, masterly, scholarly, soldierly with the same semantic relationship of 'having the quality of the person denoted by the stem'; we also have come across the noun gentleman in other utterances, The two first stages of analysis resulted in separating a free and a bound form: 1) un + gentlemanly, 2) gentleman + ly. The third cut has its peculiarities. The division into gent-+-leman is obviously impossible as no such patterns exist in English, so the cut is gentle+man. A similar pattern is observed in nobleman, and so we state adjective stem + – man. Now, the element man may be differently classified as a semi – affix or as a variant of the free form man. The word gentle is open to discussion. It is obviously divisible from the etymological viewpoint: gentle<.0Fr gentil<Lat gentilis permits to discern the root or rather the radical element gens – and the suffix – il. But since we are only concerned with synchronic analysis this division is not relevant (11,77).

This permits us to make one more conclusion, namely, that in lexicological analysis words may be grouped not only according to their root morphemes but according to affixes as well.

Conclusion on chapter II

In this chapter we managed to study different sources and to make one complete list of affixes. We found out that all affixes can be studied from two criteria: morphological and derivational. These two criteria were very useful in the further classificational analyses. We also studied one of the morphemic classifications and stated the place of affixes there.

There are different points of view on the semantics of affixes, but most scholars agree, that they have a kind of general, additional meaning. So, sticking to this opinion, we gave the meanings of the negative affixes from different dictionaries, compared them, and observed how they are expressed in different contexts.

There are numerous ways of classifying affixes. We tried to give as many classifications of both morphemes in general and affixes in particular as possible and also find out, what place is occupied by the negative affixes in any of then.

Different shades of meanings were also studied and the choice for different affixes for one and the same stem was explained. We also found out the main functions of the negative affixes, taken independently and in the context. A popular novel was used for the context, which is an example of contemporary British literature. We also studied which affixes are attached to different parts of speech and which parts of words they then build.

Analyzing the examples from the novel, we made a conclusion, which affixes are the most active nowadays (which affixes are used most frequently). After giving the examples of the negative affixes in context, we singled out several words containing them and gave a complete descriptive analysis of the negative affixes using all the possible ways of classification studied earlier.

Making this course paper, we gave a general overview to affixation as a way of word formation, familiarized ourselves with English negative affixes, learned how they differ in shades of meaning from each other, and learned to differentiate them. We studied which affixes are used with stems of different parts of speech and saw which of them are able to transform words of one part of speech into another, studied the peculiarities of their usage. It is very useful for a linguist and a translator, it can be a great help especially in our future study and work.

Conclusion

The system of English language is an open system. That means that it is constantly added by new words. According to the Oxford Dictionary, only 7,5% words in the vocabulary of English are borrowings. The vast majority of words appear through changings in the lexical units preserved in the language system, trough the word-formation. Word-formation is the process of building up new words from words of the same root, and as a result of this there is a formal-semantic correspondence between derivative and derived words [9, 56].

It should be mentioned, that there are certain patterns of word-formation in English. It is the circuit, sample, analogue, model, all that fix a rule of construction of derivative words, rule, which takes into account a type of derivative bases and word-building means and general semantics, formed as a result of their interaction, of the same words. One model can also correspond to different changes of meaning and be a source of confusion and misunderstanding for foreign learners. These patterns may be productive or not in different languages. It was noticed by many scholars long ago, that one derivative pattern can give almost infinite or, at least, significant number of derivatives, others are characterized by inability to free word-building.

There are several kinds of word-formation and different kinds of them are productive in different languages. The major ways of word-formation are compounding, affixation and conversion (also called zero-affixation). Affixation remains a very productive type of word-formation in English language. Affixation is the derivation of new words by adding affixes to them, which are suffixes and prefixes.

We can study a particular word from the point of **morphological** and **derivational analyses**. Dealing with morphological analysis we simply divide the word into constitute parts. When the word is divided into its ultimate constituencies the morphological analysis is completed. While doing derivational analysis we find how the word was constructed, which is its derivative and what

means have been used to build up the word [9, 59]. So, the process of affixation should be explored within derivational analysis, not morphological. But speaking of affixes in general we are interested in both morphological and derivational analyses.

There is a certain division of morphemes within the morphemic analysis. English grammarians usually point out two criteria, which are the bases of the morphemic structure. They are **the positional criterion** - the location of the morphemes with regard to each other, and **the semantic (or functional) criterion** - the contribution of the morphemes to the general meaning of the word. So according to the first there are root-morphemes and affixal morphemes, roots and affixes. The semantic difference between them is obvious: root morphemes have the concrete, "material" meaning, while affixes just specify the main meaning, or transform the meaning of the root [9, 59].

Finally, we can see that there are several types of word-building in English pointed out by many scholars and affixation is one of the most productive. There are certain patterns of word-formation and several types of morphemes. The latter can be studied from the point of view of two complementary analyses.

List of Used Literature

1. Каримов И.А. Либерализация общества, углубление реформ, повышение духовности и уровня жизни народа – критерий и цель всей нашей деятельности. // Собр. соч. -т.15 –Ташкент: "Ўзбекистон", 2007.С.154-155.

2.Каримов И. А. Юксак маънавият – енгилмас куч. Тошкент: "Маънавият", 2008. –Б.138

3. Каримов И.А. Наша высшая цель – независимость и процветание Родины, свобода и благополучие народа // Собр. соч.– т.8. Ташкент: "Ўзбекистон", 2000. – С. 322-340.

4. Национальная программа по подготовке кадров // Гармонично развитое поколение – основа прогресс Узбекистана. Ташкент: "Шарқ", 1997. – С. 31-61.

5. Arnold I.V. The English Word M. High School., 1986 pp.143–149.

6. Akhmanova O.S. Lexicology: Theory and Method. M., 1972 pp.59–66.

Bolinger D. Meaning and form. – New York: Longman, 2007. – 312 p.

7. Buranov J., Muminov, Readings on Modern English Lexicology. T. O'qituvchi 1985 pp.34–47.

8. Burchfield R.W. The English Language. Lnd. 1985 pp. 45–47.

9. Canon G. Historical Changes and English Word formation: New Vocabulary items. N.Y., 1986. p.284.

10. Dubenets E.M. Modern English Lexicology (Course of Lectures) M., Moscow State Teacher Training University Publishers 2004 pp.17–31.

11. Ginsburg R.S. et al. A Course in Modern English Lexicology. M., 1979. pp.72–82.

12. Howard Ph. New words for Old. L., 1980. p.311

13. Maurer D.W., High F.C. New Words – Where do they come from and where do they go. American Speech. 1982.p.171.

14. Pilch H.Comparative Constructions in English, "Language", vol. 41, No1, Jan.-March 1965, p.40.

15. Sheard John. The Words we Use. N.Y., 1954.p. 3

16. Smirnitsky A.I. Homonyms in English M.1977 pp.57–59, 89–90

17. Алефиренко Н.Ф. Спорные вопросы семантики.– М.:Гнозис,2005.– С. 5-6.

18. Амосова Н.Н. Основы английской фразеологии.–Л.:ЛГУ,1963-208с.

19. Анипкина Л.Н. Оценочные высказывания в прагматическом аспекте // Филологические науки. – М., 2000. - №2. – С.58-65.

20. Арнольд И.В. Семантика. Стилистика. Интертекстуальность. –СПб.: Изд-во С. Петербург ун-та, 1999. -444с.

21. Арнольд И.В. Семантическая структура слова в современном английском языке и методика её исследования. – Л.: ЛГУ, 1966.-186с.

22. Арнольд И.В. Стилистика современного английского языка. – Л.: ЛГУ, 1981.-324с.

23. Ахманова О.С. Очерки по общей и русской лексикологии.-М.: Учпедгиз, 1957.- 296с.

24. Ахманова О.С. О стилистической дифференциации слов // Сборник статей по языкознанию.-М.,1984.- С.184-195.

25. Бабушкин А.П. Типы концептов в лексико-фразеологической семантике языка. – Воронеж: ВГУ, 1996. – 212с.

26. Беляевская Е.Г. Понятие «Когнитивная модель» в современной лингвистике (Научно-аналит. обзор) // Реферативный журнал ИНИОН РАИ.- Серия 6. Вып. 2. –М., 1996. – С. 10-28.

27. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика. – М.: Прогресс, 1974. – 447с.

28. Блумфильд Л. Язык. – М.: Прогресс, 1986. – 608с.

29. Бодуэн де Куртенэ И.А. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию. – М.: Изд-во АН, 1963, т. 1. – 384с.; т. 2. – 391с.

30. Бушуй Т., Сафаров Ш. Тил қурилиши: таҳлил методлари ва методологияси. – Тошкент: Фан, 2007.– 274б.

31. Колпакова Г.В. Семантика языковой единицы.–Казань: Изд-во Казанск. ун-та, 2004. – 216с.

32.Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка. – М.: Высшая школа, 1986. – 336с.

33. Ройзензон Л.И. Лекции по общей и русской фразеологии. Самарканд: Изд-во Самарканд. ун-та, 1973. – 223с.

34. Савицкий В. М. Проблема моделирования во фразеологической системе языка (на материале английских глагольных фразеологических единиц): Автореф. дисс. …д-ра филол. наук. – Самара, 1996. – 36с.

35. Смирницкий А.И. Лексикология английского языка.– М.: ИИЛ, 1956. - 260 с.

36. Смит Л.П. Фразеология английского языка / Перевод с англ. – М.: Учпедгиз, 1959. – 208с.

37. Умархўжаев М.Э. Олмон тили лексикологияси ва фразеологияси.-Андижон: АДТПИ, 2010.-150б.

Internet resources

1. www.dialog-21.ru/achieve-article.asp?param=6255

2. http:// www.1september.ru/ru/rus/2004/05/1/htm

3. http:// kogni.narod.ru/ concept.htm

4. http:// www.rusnauka.com /Article//Filology/7-10/59.html

5. http:// gazeta.ksu.ru / f10 / publications/2004/rsf_conf_8.php

6. http:// www. vspu.ru / ~axiology/ vik/ vikart 2 htm

7. http:// www. prpc.ru / reshr/lib_59. shtml

8. http:// www. philology. Ru

http://www.wikipedia.com/English/articles/homonymy.htm

http://www mpsttu.ru/works/english philology