THE MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL
EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN
KARSHI STATE UNIVERSITY
ROMAN-GERMAN PHILOLOGY FACULTY
ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

Written by the student of
the 4th course group 402
Mukhiddinova Makhliyo

FINAL QUALIFICATION PAPER

on

" **Comparative study of Prefixation as a means of word formation
in English and in Uzbek**"

Scientific supervisor: J.Tursunov

Reviewer: O. Hamraeva

"This qualification paper is admitted to defense "

by the dean of the Roman-German philology

faculty:_____D. Juraev

Department protocol № ___ of _____ 2014

Contents

2014

Introduction

To notice that within the limits of realization of the Law of Republic Uzbekistan «About education» and the National program on a professional training in the country the complex system of training to the foreign languages, directed on formation harmoniously developed, высокообразованного is created, is modern conceiving rising generation, the further integration of republic into the world community. For years of independence it is prepared over 51,7 thousand teachers of foreign languages, multimedia textbooks on English, German and French languages for 5-9 classes of comprehensive schools, electronic resources on studying of English language in initial classes are created, is equipped over 5 thousand language laboratories at comprehensive schools, professional colleges and the academic lyceums.At the same time the analysis of operating system of the organization of learning of foreign languages shows that educational standards, curriculums and textbooks not to the full correspond to modern requirements, especially regarding use of front lines information and media technologies. Training is conducted basically by traditional methods. Demand the further perfection the organization of a continuity of learning of foreign languages at all levels of an education system, and also work on improvement of professional skill of teachers and their maintenance with modern scientific-methodical materials.

With a view of cardinal perfection of system of training of rising generation to foreign languages, preparations of the experts freely owning them, by introduction of the advanced methods of teaching with use of modern pedagogical and information-communication technologies and on this basis of creation of conditions and possibilities for their wide access to achievements of a world civilization and world information resources, developments of the international cooperation and dialogue:

Present qualification paper deals with one of the most actual problems of present day lexicology – that is the problem of prefixes as a means of word formation and their comparative study in translation from English into Uzbek.

Word-formation is that branch of the science of language which studies the patterns on which a language for new lexical units, i.e. words.[1] Word-formation can only treat of composites which are analysable both formally and semantically. The study of the simple word, therefore, insofar as it is an unanalysable, unmotivated sign has no place in it. It is a lexical matter. A composite rests on a relationship between morphemes through which it is motivated. By this token, *do-er, un-do, rainbow* are relevant to word-formation, but *do, rain, bow* are not.

Actuality of the qualification paper is important, because the solution of the problems of prefixes and translation will make it possible to find nearly all question of word formation in the present-day lexicology.

The theoretical significance of the present qualification paper is seen in the fact that it will give the language learners and translators to work out recommendations on how to work with English prefixes in the process of translation and what ways are applicable in the process of translation.

The practical value of the qualification paper. The material, methods, results and conclusion of the work can be helpful for the teachers and students of the translation faculty in learning theoretical courses of translation theory and lexicology, also the practical courses, learned at the faculty. [1]

The aim of the qualification paper is to carry out a detailed investigation of prefixation as a means of word formation in English and their translation into Uzbek.

The tasks of the paper have been worked out on the basis of the aim of the work:

1. to define prefixation as word formation
2. to analyze the types of prefixes
3. to analyze the existing theories about word formation and prefixation in present day lexicology
4. to analyze the classification of prefixes
5. to analyze the affection of prefixes on lexical meaning

---

[1] H.Marchand. A practical course in English lexicology. J. Buronov. A. Muminov.28p

6. to analyze the ways of translating the English prefixes into Uzbek with a special attention paid.

The structure of the work. In accordance with the aim and the tasks of the paper the work consists of an introduction, 2 chapters, conclusion and bibliography.

CHAPTER I

1.1. WORD-FORMATION

Word-formation is the process of creating new words from the material available in the language after certain structural and semantic formulas and patterns. [2]For instance, the noun *driver* is formed after the pattern *v + -er,* i.e. *a verb-stem + the noun-forming suffix -er.* The meaning of the noun *driver* is related to the meanings of the stem *drive-* and the suffix *–er;* "a driver is one who drives (a carriage, motorcar, railway engine, etc.)". Likewise compounds resulting from two or more stems joined together to form a new word are also built on quite definite structural and semantic patterns and formulas, cf., for instance, adjectives of the *snow-white* type built according to the formula *n + adj.,* i.e. a noun-stem + an adjective stem: *coal-black, age-long, carefree,* etc. It can easily be observed that the meaning of the whole compound is also related to the meanings of the component parts.

It should be noted that the understanding of word-formation as expounded here excludes semantic word-building. By semantic word-building some linguists understand any change in word-meaning, e.g. *stock* - 'the lower part of the trunk of a tree'; 'something lifeless or stupid'; 'the part of an instrument that serves as a base', et c.; *bench* **-** **'**a long seat of wood or stone'; 'a carpenter's table', etc. The majority of linguists, however, understand this process only as a change in the meaning of a word that may result in the appearance of homonyms, as is the case with *flower-*'a blossom' and *flour* -'the fine meal', 'powder, made from wheat and used for making bread'; *magazine* – 'a publication' and *magazine* **-** 'the chamber for cartridges in a gun or rifle', etc. The application of the term *word-formation* to the process of semantic change and to the appearance of homonyms due to the development of polysemy seems to be debatable for the following reasons:

As semantic change does not, as a rule, lead to the introduction of a new word into the vocabulary, it can scarcely be regarded as a word-building means. Neither can we consider the process a word-building means even when an actual

---

[2] Ginzburg. Practical course in English lexicology. J.Buronov. A. Muminov. 28p.

enlargement of the vocabulary does come about through the appearance of a pair of homonyms. Actually, the appearance of homonyms is not a means of creating new words; it is the final result of a long and laborious process of sense-development. Furthermore, there are no patterns after which homonyms can be made in the language. Finally, diverging sense- development results in a semantic isolation of two or more meanings of award, whereas the process of word-formation proper is characterized by a certain semantic connection between the new word and its component parts. For these reasons diverging sense-development leading to the appearance of two or more homonyms should be regarded as a specific channel through which the vocabulary of a language is replenished with new words and should not be treated on a par with the processes of word-formation, such as affixation, conversion and composition.

As a subject of study, word-formation is that branch of Lexicology which studies the patterns on which a language In this case the English language, builds new words. It is self-evident that word-formation can deal only with words which are analyzable both structurally and semantically. The study of the simple word has no place in it. Therefore, *writer, displease, atom-free,* etc, are relevant to word-formation, but *to write, to please, atom, free* are not. Like any other linguistic phenomenon word-formation may be studied from two angles-synchronically and diachronically. It is necessary to distinguish between these two approaches, for synchronically the linguist investigates the present-day system of the types of word-formation while diachronically he is concerned with the history of word-building. To illustrate the difference of approach we shall consider affixation. Synchronically a derived word is structurally and semantically more complex than a simple one, while diachronically it was formed from some other word. On the synchronic plane a derived word is regarded as having a more complex structure than its correlated simple word, regardless of the fact whether it was derived from a simple stem or not. There are cases in the history of the English language when a word structurally more complex served as the original element from which a simpler word was derived. Those are cases of the process called backformation (or

back-derivation), cf. *beggar – to beg; editor – to edit; chauffeur – to chauff,* and some others. The fact that historically the verbs *to beg, to edit,* etc, were derived from the corresponding agent-nouns is of no synchronous relevance. For the present-day speaker no such relationship exists, therefore they are all simple words in Modern English.

While analyzing and describing word-formation synchronically it is not enough to extract the relevant structural elements from a word, describe its structure in terms of morphemes and allomorphs and determines the type of word-formation; it is absolutely necessary to determine the position of the constituents within the structural system of the language as a whole. Productivity of a derivative type therefore cannot be overlooked in this description.

Some of the ways of forming words in present-day English can be resorted to for the creation of new words whenever occasion demands-these are called productive ways of forming words; other ways of forming words cannot now produce new words, and these are commonly termed non-productive or unproductive. For instance, affixation has been a productive way of forming words ever since the Old English period, cf. old English fiscere and modern English striker and steamer. On the other hand, sound-interchange must have been at one time a word-building means but in Modern English it cannot be used to coin new words. Actually, its function in Modern English is only to distinguish one word from another, e.g., a verb from a noun, as is the case with *food – to feed, bloody - to bleed, full - to fill,* etc.

The delimitation between productive and non-productive ways and means of word-formation as stated above is not, however, accepted by all linguists without reserve. Some linguists consider it necessary to define the term "productivity of a word-building means" more accurately. They hold the view that productive ways and means of word-formation are only those that can be used for the formation of an unlimited number of new words in the modern language, i.e. such means that "know no bounds" and easily form occasional words. This divergence of opinion is responsible, in particular, for the difference in the lists of derivational affixes

considered productive in various books on English Lexicology. The available linguistic literature on the subject cites various types and ways of forming words. Books dealing with the problems of word-formation in the Russian and the Uzbek languages, as well as some books on English Lexicology usually mention morphological, syntactic and semantic types of word-formation.

In conformity with the basic structural types of stems and words described above the following two types of word-formation may be distinguished: word-derivation and word-composition (or compounding). Words created by word-derivation have only one primary stem and one derivational affix in terms of word-formation analysis, e.g. *cleanness* (from *clean*), *to overestimate* (from *to estimate),* *chairmanship* (from *chairman*), *waterproofness* (from *waterproof*), *openhandedness* (from *open-handed*), etc. Some derived words have no affixes, because derivation is achieved through conversion, e.g. *to paper* (from *paper*), *a fall* (from *to fall*), etc. Words created by word-composition have at least two primary stems, e.g. *coal-black, ice-cold, looking-glass, daydream, hotbed, speed-ometer,* etc. Besides, there are words built by a simultaneous application of composition and derivation (suffixation or conversion)-derivational compounds, e.g. *long-legged, open-minded, a breakdown,* etc. The shortening of words stands apart from the above two-fold division of word-formation. It cannot be regarded as part of either word-derivation or word-composition for the simple reason that neither the root-morpheme nor the derivational affix can be singled out from the shortened word (cf. *lab, exam, Euratom, V-day,* etc.). Consequently, the shortening of words should be treated separately as a specific type of word-formation.Within the types, further distinction may be made between ways of forming words. The basic ways of forming words in word-derivation, for instance, are affixation and conversion. The lexicalization of grammatical forms, sound and stress- interchange and some others are usually referred to as minor ways of forming words. In describing the technique of word-formation it is important to point out the means by which word-formation is effected. For instance, affixation is characterized by

the use of suffixes and prefixes, some cases of compounding by the use of connecting elements, etc.

Another classification of the types of word-formation worked out by H. Marchand is also of interest. Proceeding from the distinction between complete motivation as found in such composites as *rain-bow, do- er, un-do,* etc, and partial motivation as exemplified by phonetic symbolism (cf. *pish, pooh, crack*) he considers two major groups: (1) words formed as grammatical syntagmas, i.e. combinations of full linguistic signs, and (2) words which are not grammatical syntagmas, i.e. which are composites not made up of full linguistic signs. To the first group belong Compounding, Prefixation, Derivation by a Zero Morphemes and Backderivation, to the second Expressive Symbolism, Blending, Clipping, Rime and Ablaut Gemination, Word-manufacturing. It is characteristic of both groups that a new coining is based on a synchronic relationship between morphemes. The choice of allomorphs depends on three types of conditioning: phonetic (determined by the following or preceding sound), lexical (dependent on the particular word), and grammatical (dependent on the word class). Some allomorphic variation may be ascribed to stylistic conditioning, and some to free variation. A portmanteau morph represents more than one morpheme but cannot be divided into morphs. An empty morph (e.g. *to* in *to say)* has no meaning.

A suppletive morph is a form from a different root used in the paradigm of a particular word (e.g. *go, went). A* zero morph signifies the absence of a morph to represent a morpheme expected in the grammatical system.A free morph can occur by itself as a word. A bound morph is alwayscombined with another morph. A paradigm is a set of grammatically related forms of verbs. Paradigms for verbs are conjugations, and those for nouns are declensions. We find contrasting pairs of words with *pre-* and *post-: pre-war/post-war, pre-tax/post-tax, predate/post-date.* Of the three prefixes meaning 'before', *pre-* is the one most used to form new words. It also competes with the others in a few words: the words in the pairs *antenatal/prenatal, forejudge/prejudge, foreordain/pre-ordain* are synonyms. *Re-* appears as an English prefix in words that contrast with borrowings

from French or Latin. In such contrast, the English prefix *re-* is pronounced /ri:/ whereas the initial syllable of the loanwords may begin /n/ or /re/ or /ra/, and the English prefix is differentiated by being spelled with a hyphen: *re-cover* ('provide with a new cover')/*recover, re-form/reform, re-creation/recreation, re-fuse/refuse, re-lay/relay, re-mark/remark, re-present/represent, re-serve/ reserve, re-signj resign.*

Two prefixes that are less common (in non-scientific language) are *proto-* ('first', 'original'), as in *prototype,* and *retro-* ('back in time'), as in *retroactive. Retro-* has had some recent popularity in the sense 'fondness for past style or fashion', both as a word on its own, and (with the same sense) as a prefix in words such as *retro-culture* and *retro-rock.*

1. 2. Prefixation

Prefixation is the formation of words with the help of prefixes. Although the terms "Prefix" and "prefixation" are now firmly rooted in linguistic terminology, they are treated differently in linguistic literature. There are linguists, for instance, who treat prefixation as part of word-composition (or compounding); they believe that a prefix has the same function as the first component of a compound word. The majority of linguists, however, treat prefixation as an integral part of word-derivation regarding prefixes as derivational affixes which differ essentially from root-morphemes and stems.

Some linguists think it necessary to distinguish between two types of prefixes: (1) those not correlated with any independent word (either notional or functional), e.g. *un -, dis-, re-,* etc.; and (2) those correlated with functional words (prepositions or preposition-like adverbs), e.g. *out-, over-, up-,* etc. Prefixes of the second type are qualified as semi-bound morphemes, which implies that they occur in the language both as independent words and as derivational affixes, e.g. *over one's head, over the river* (cf. *overhead, overbalance; to run out, to take out (cf. to outgrow, to outline); to look up, hands up! (cf. upstairs, to upset),* etc. It seems correct to distinguish between the two types of prefixes here mentioned and the distinction should be observed in linguistic literature on the subject. However, the qualification of Type II prefixes as semi-bound morphemes is open to criticism, for English prefixes of this type essentially differ from the functional words they are correlated with:

1) these prefixes are characterized by a high frequency of occurrence, as a glance at the corresponding pages in a comprehensive dictionary will prove beyond doubt;

2) like any other derivational affixes they have a more generalized meaning in comparison with the more concrete meanings of the correlated words (see the examples given above);

3) they are deprived of all grammatical features peculiar to the independent words they are correlated with.

Therefore it seems to be more adequate to qualify such prefixes, at least in the English language, as bound morphemes and regard them as homonyms of the corresponding independent words, e.g. the prefix *out-* is homonymous with the preposition and the adverb *out,* the prefix *over-* with the preposition and the adverb *over,* etc.

Of late some new investigations into the problem of prefixation in English have yielded 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 with regard to the English language. In English there are about 25 prefixes which can transfer words to a different part of speech in comparison with their original stems. Such prefixes should perhaps be called convertive prefixes, e.g. *to debus* (cf. *bus* n), *to embronze (cf. bronze n), pre-war adj. (cf. war n),* etc. If further investigation of English prefixation gives more proofs of the convertive ability of prefixes, it will then be possible to draw the conclusion that in this respect there is no functional difference between suffixes and prefixes, for suffixes in English are also both *convertive* (cf. *hand-handless)* and *non-convertive* (cf. *father - fatherhood, horseman - horsemanship,* etc.).

Derivational morphemes affixed before the stem are called prefixes. Prefixes modify the lexical meaning of the stem, but in so doing they seldom affect its basic lexico-grammatical component. Therefore both the simple word and its prefixed derivative mostly belong to the same part of speech. The prefix *mis-,* for instance, when added to verbs, conveys the meaning 'wrongly', 'badly', 'unfavorably'; it does not suggest any other part of speech but the verb. Compare the following oppositions: *behave - misbehave, calculate - miscalculate, inform - misinform, lead - mislead, pronounce - mispronounce.* The above oppositions are strictly proportionaI semantically, i.e. the same relationship between elements holds throughout the series. There may be other cases where the semantic relationship is slightly different but the general lexico-grammatical meaning remains, cf. *giving – misgiving -* 'foreboding' or 'suspicion'; *take - mistake* and *trust - mistrust.*

The semantic effect of a prefix may be termed adverbial because it modifies the idea suggested by the stem for manner, time, place, degree and so on. A few examples will prove the point. It has been already shown that the prefix *mis-* is equivalent to the adverbs *wrongly* and *badly,* therefore by expressing evaluation it modifies the corresponding verbs for manner. The prefixes *pre-* and *post-* refer to time E.g. *historic - prehistoric, pay - prepay, view - preview.* The last word means to view a film or a play before it is submitted to the general public. Compare also: *graduate - postgraduate* (about the course of study carried on after graduation), *Impressionism - Post-impressionism.* The latter is so called because it came after Impressionism as a reaction against it. The prefixes *in-, a-, ab-* modify the root for place: e.g. *income, abduct.* Several prefixes serve to modify the meaning of the stem for degree. The examples are *out-, over-* and *under-*. The prefix *out-* means 'in a manner that surpasses': *outlive* 'to live longer', *outnumber* 'to exceed in number', *outrun* 'to surpass in running'. Cf. in "Hamlet": *It out-herods Herod,* where *out-herod* means 'to surpass in violence or extravagance of Herod' (the ruler of Judea at the time of Christ's birth, who was noted for his despotic nature). Compare also the modification for degree in such verbs as *overfeed* and *under-nourish.*

The group of negative prefixes is so numerous that some scholars even find it convenient to classify prefixes into negative and non-negative ones. They are: *de-, dis-, in-/im-/il-/ir-, un-*. This group has been also more accurately classified as prefixes giving negative, reverse or opposite meaning.

The prefix *de-* occurs in many neologisms, such as *decentralize, deconta-minate* 'remove contamination from the area or the clothes', *denazify,* etc.

The general idea of negation is expressed by *dis-;* it may mean 'not', 'the reverse of', 'asunder', 'away', 'apart'. Cf.: *agree - disagree* 'not to agree', *appear - disappear (disappear* is the reverse of *appear), disgorge* 'eject as from the throat', *dishouse* 'throw out, evict'. *ln-/im-/ir-/il-* have already been discussed, so there is no necessity to dwell upon them. *Non-* is often used in abstract verbal nouns such as *noninterference, nonsense* or *nonresistance,* and participles or former

participles like *non-commissioned* (about an officer in the army below the rank of a commissioned officer), *non-combatant* (about any one who is connected with the army but is there for some purpose other than fighting, as, for instance, an army surgeon).

The most frequent by far is the prefix *un-;* it should be noted that it may convey two different meanings, namely:

1) Simple negation, when attached to adjective stems or to participles: *happy - unhappy; kind - unkind; even - uneven.* It is immaterial whether the stem is native or borrowed, as the suffix *un-* readily combines with both groups. For instance, *uncommon, unimportant,* etc, are hybrids.

2) The meaning is different when *un-* is used with verbal stems. In that case it shows action contrary to that of the simple word: *bind - unbind, do - undo, mask - unmask, pack - unpack.*

A very frequent prefix with a great combining power is re- denoting repetition of the action expressed by the stem. It may be prefixed to almost any verb or verbal noun: *rearrange* v, *recast* v 'put into new shape', *reinstated* 'to place again in a former position', *refitment* n 'repairs and 'renewal', *remarriage,* n, etc. There are, it must be remembered, some constraints. Thus, while *reassembled* or *revisited* are usual, *rereceived* or *reseen* do not occur at all.

The meaning of a prefix is not so completely fused with the meaning of the primary stem as is the case with suffixes, but retains a certain degree of semantic independence.

It will be noted that among the above examples verbs predominate. This is accounted for by the fact that prefixation in English is chiefly characteristic of verbs and words with deverbal stems.

According to H. Marchand[3] who treats prefixes as a part of word composition, he thinks that a prefix has the same function as the first component of a compound word.

---

[3] *H. Marchand - «The Categories and Types of Present English Word-Formation»* 1960.

Prefixes are called such particles as can be prefixed to full words but are themselves, 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-*. Prefix of foreign origin came into the language ready made, so to speak. They are due to syntagmatic loans from other languages: when a number of analyzable foreign words of the same structure 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 secondarily 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. ..

Е.С. Куберкова[4] distinguishes between two types of prefixes:

a)   Those which are functional words (such as prepositions or adverbs) *Ex:* but-, over-, up-.

b)   Those which are not correlated with any independent words. *Ex:* un-, dis-, re-, mis-.

Prefixes <u>out-</u>, <u>over-</u>, <u>up-</u>, <u>under-</u>, etc. are considered as semi bound morphemes. However this view is doubtful because this prefixes are quite frequent in speech and live other derivational affixes have a generalized meaning.

They have no grammatical meaning live 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 *<u>outdoor, outcome, outbreak,</u>* etc. is homonymous to the preposition «out» in «<u>out of door</u>» and the adverb «out» in «<u>he went out</u>».

Prefixation is the formation of words with the help of prefixes. The interpretation of the terms prefix and prefixation now firmly rooted in linguistic literature has undergone a certain evolution. For instance, some time ago there were linguists who treated prefixation as part of word composition (or compounding). The greater semantic independence of prefixes as compared with

---

[4] *Е. С. Кубрекова - « Что такое словообразование?»* М. 1964

suffixes led the linguists to identify prefixes with the first component part of a compound word.

At present the majority of scholars treat prefixation as an integral part of word derivation regarding prefixes as derivational affixes which differ essentially both from root-morphemes and non-derivational pre-positive morphemes. Opinions sometimes differs concerning the interpretation of the functional status of certain individual groups of morphemes, which commonly occur as first component parts of words. H. Marchand, for instance, analysis words like *to overdo, to underestimate* as compound verbs, the first components of which are locative particles, not prefixes. In a similar way he interprets words like *income, onlooker, outhouse* qualifying them as compounds with locative particles as first elements.

There are about *51 prefixes* in the system of Modern English word formation.

According to the available word counts of prefixal derivatives the greatest number are verbs - 42.4 %, adjectives comprise 33.5 % and nouns make up 22.4 %. To give some examples.

Prefixal verbs: to enrich, to disagree, to undergo, etc.;

Prefixal adjectives: anti-war, biannual, uneasy, superhuman, etc.;

Prefixal nouns: ex-champion, co-author, disharmony, subcommittee, etc.

It is of interest to mention that the number of prefixal derivatives within a certain part of speech is in inverse proportion to the actual number of prefixes: 22 form verbs, 41 prefixes make adjectives and 42 nouns.

Proceeding from the three types of morphemes that the structural classification involves two types of prefixes ate to be distinguished:

1)   those not correlated with any independent word (either notional or functional) e.g. *no-, dis-, re-, pre-, post-,* etc.; and

2)   those correlated with functional words (prepositions or prepositions-like adverbs), e.g. *out-, over-, up-, under-,* etc.

Prefixes of the second type are qualified as semi bound morphemes, which

implies that they occur in speech in various utterances both as independent words and as derivational affixes, e.g. «*over* one's head», «*over* the river» (cf. to *overlap,* to *overpass),* «to run *out»,* «to take somebody *out»* (cf. to *outvote;,* to *outline);* «to look *up»,* «hands *up»* (cf. *upstairs,* to *upset);* «*under* the same roof»; «to go *under»* (cf. to *underestimate, undercurrent),* etc.

I should be mentioned that English prefixes of the second type essentially differ from the functional words, they are correlated with:

a) like any other derivational affixes they have a more generalized meaning in comparison with the more concrete meanings of the correlated words they are characterized by a unity of different denotational components of meaning – a generalized component common to a set of prefixes and individual semantic component distinguishing the given prefix within the set.

b) They are deprived of all grammatical features peculiar to the independent words they are correlated with;

c) They tend to develop a meaning not found in the correlated words;

d) They form regular sets of words of the same semantic type.

Of late some new investigations into the problem of prefixation in English have yielded 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 with regard to the English language. In English there are about 25 prefixes which can transfer words to a different part of speech in comparison with their original stems. Such prefixes should perhaps be called convertive prefixes, e.g. *to debus* (cf. bus n); *to embronze* (cf. bronze n), etc. If further investigation of English prefixation gives more proofs of the convertive ability of prefixes, it will then be possible to draw the conclusion that in this respect there is no functional difference between suffixes and prefixes, for suffixes in English are also both convertive (cf. *hand - handless*) and non-convertive (cf. *father - fatherhood, horseman - horsemanship,* etc).

Some recent investigations in the field of English affixation have revealed a close interdependence between the meanings of a polysemantic affix and the

lexico-semantic group to which belongs the base it is affixed to, which results in the difference between structural and structural-semantic derivational patterns the prefix forms. A good illustration in point is the prefix *en-*.

When within the same structural pattern *en-* + n - *V,* the prefix is combined with noun bases denoting articles of clothing, thinks of luxury, etc. it forms derived verbs expressing an action of putting or placing on, e.g. *enrobe* (cf. robe), *enjewel* (cf. jewel), *enlace* (cf. lace), etc.

When added to noun bases referring to various land forms, means of transportation, containers and notions of geometry it builds derived verbs denoting an action of putting or placing in.

At present the majority of scholars treat prefixation as an integral part of word derivation regarding prefixes as derivational affixes which differ essentially both from root-morphemes and non-derivational pre-positive morphemes. Opinions sometimes differs concerning the interpretation of the functional status of certain individual groups of morphemes, which commonly occur as first component parts of words.

Prefixation is the formation of words by means of adding a prefix to the stem. In English it is characteristic for forming verbs. Prefixes are more independent than suffixes. Prefixes can be classified according to the nature of words in which they are used : prefixes used in notional words and prefixes used in functional words. Prefixes used in notional words are proper prefixes which are bound morphemes, e.g. un- (unhappy). Prefixes used in functional words are semi-bound morphemes because they are met in the language as words, e.g. over- (overhead) (cf over the table).

The main function of prefixes in English is to change the lexical meaning of the same part of speech. But the recent research showed that about twenty-five prefixes in Modern English form one part of speech from another (bebutton, interfamily, postcollege etc).

 Prefixes can be classified according to different principles :

1. Semantic classification :

a) prefixes of negative meaning, such as : in- (invaluable), non- (nonformals), un- (unfree) etc,

b) prefixes denoting repetition or reversal actions, such as: de- (decolonize), re- (revegetation), dis- (disconnect),

c) prefixes denoting time, space, degree relations, such as : inter- (interplanetary) , hyper- (hypertension), ex- (ex-student), pre- (pre-election), over- (overdrugging) etc.

2. Origin of prefixes:

a) native (Germanic), such as: un-, over-, under- etc.

b) Romanic, such as : in-, de-, ex-, re- etc.

c) Greek, such as : sym-, hyper- etc.

When we analyze such words as : adverb, accompany where we can find the root of the word (verb, company) we may treat ad-, ac- as prefixes though they were never used as prefixes to form new words in English and were borrowed from Romanic languages together with words. In such cases we can treat them as derived words. But some scientists treat them as simple words. Another group of words with a disputable structure are such as : contain, retain, detain and conceive, receive, deceive where we can see that re-, de-, con- act as prefixes and -tain, -ceive can be understood as roots. But in English these combinations of sounds have no lexical meaning and are called pseudo-morphemes. Some scientists treat such words as simple words, others as derived ones.

There are some prefixes which can be treated as root morphemes by some scientists, e.g. after- in the word afternoon. American lexicographers working on Webster dictionaries treat such words as compound words. British lexicographers treat such words as derived ones.

1. 3. Classification of prefixes.

Unlike suffixation, which is usually bound up with the paradigm of a certain part of speech, prefixation is considered to be neutral in this respect. It is significant that in linguistic literature derivational suffixes are always divided into noun-forming, adjective-forming, etc. Prefixes, however, are treated differently. They are described either in alphabetical order or subdivided into several classes in accordance with their origin, meaning or function and never according to the part of speech formed. Some linguists even hold the view that one and the same prefix may be added to different parts of speech, cf. *un-kind and un-tie.* All this testifies to the fact that the problem of prefixation wants further investigation. It is hardly possible, for instance, to regard *un-* in *unkind and un-* in *untie* as the same prefix, for these two morphemes differ in meaning: in the first case *un-* has a negative meaning, and in the second it indicates reversal of an action. Therefore it would be more correct to consider them as being two homonyrnous prefixes: *un-*added to adjectival stems and *an-* affixed to verbal stems.

Prefixes may be classified on different principles. Diachronically distinction is made between prefixes of native and foreign origin. Synchronically, prefixes are classified according to the meaning they convey to the derived word. This is of great practical value in classroom teaching. The following groups of prefixes may be distinguished:

1) prefixes of negative meaning such as: *un-, in-, dis-* and some others, e.g. *ungrateful (cf. grateful); unemployment (cf. employment); incorrect (cf. correct); disadvantage (cf. advantage), etc.*

It may be mentioned in passing that the prefix *in-* occurs in different phonemic shapes depending on the initial sound of the stem it is affixed to; in other words, the prefixal morpheme in question has several allomorphs, namely **il-** (before [l]), *im-* (before [p, m]), *ir-* (before [r]), *in-* in all other cases, e.g. *illegal, improbable, immaterial, irreligious, inactive,* etc.

2) prefixes denoting reversal or repetition of an action such as *un-*, *dis-*, *re-* and some others, e.g. *to unfasten* (cf. *to fasten*), *to disconnect* (cf. *to connect), to re-write (cf. to write), etc.*

3) prefixes denoting space and time relations such as *fore-, pre-, post-, over-, super- and some others, e.g. to foresee (cf. to see), pre-historic (cf. historic), post-position (cf. position), to overspread (cf. to spread), superstructure (cf. structure), etc.*

As is the case with suffixes there are prefixes which are characterized by neutral stylistic reference and those possessing quite a definite stylistic value. To give but one example: the prefix *over-* occurs in all styles of speech, whereas the prefix *super-* is peculiar to the style of scientific prose. Like suffixes, prefixes may also be classified as productive or non-productive. Two examples will suffice here: the prefix *re-* is highly productive in Modern English, the prefix *ill-* is not.

The majority of prefixes affect only the lexical meaning of words but there are some important cases where prefixes serve to form words belonging to different parts of speech as compared with the original word.

These are in the first place the verb-forming prefixes *be-* and *en-,* which combine functional meaning with a certain variety of lexical meanings. *Be-* forms transitive verbs with adjective and noun stems and changes intransitive verbs into transitive ones. Examples are*: belittle* v 'to make little'; *benumb* v 'to make numb'; *befriend* v 'to treat like a friend'; *becloud* v *(bedew)* v, *befoam* v) 'to cover with clouds (with dew or with foam)'; *bemadam* v 'to call madam'; *besiege* v 'to lay siege on'. Sometimes the lexical meanings are very different; compare, for instance, *bejewel* v 'to deck with jewels' and *behead* v which has the meaning of 'to cut the toad from'. There are on the whole about six semantic verb-forming varieties and one that makes adjectives from noun stems following the pattern *be- + noun stem + -ed,* as in *benighted, bespectacled,* etc. The pattern is often connected with a contemptuous emotional colouring.

The prefix *en-/em-* is now used to form verbs from noun stems with the meaning 'put (the object) into, or on, something', as in *embed, engulf, encamp,* and also to form verbs with adjective and noun stems with the meaning 'to bring into such condition or state', as in *enable* v, *enslave* v, *encash* v. Sometimes the prefix *en-/em-* has an intensifying function, cf. *enclasp.*

The prefix *a-* is the characteristic feature of the words belonging to statives: *aboard, afraid, asleep, awake,* etc.

This prefix has several homonymous morphemes which modify only the lexical meaning of the stem. Cf. *arise* v, *amoral* adj.

The prefixes *pre-, post-, non-, anti-* and some other Romanic and Greek prefixes very productive in present-day English serve to form adjectives retaining at the same time a very clear-cut lexical meaning, e.g. *anti-war, pre-war, post-war, non-party,* etc.

The borderline cases present considerable difficulties for classification. It is indeed not easy to draw the line between derivatives and compound words or between derivatives and root words. Such morphemes expressing relationships in space and time as *after-, in-, off-, on-, out-, over-, under-, with-* and the like which may occur as free forms have a combining power at least equal and sometimes even superior to that of the affixes. Their function and meaning as well as their position are exactly similar to those characteristic of prefixes. They modify the respective stems for time, place or manner exactly as prefixes do. They also are similar to prefixes in their statistical properties of frequency. And yet prefixes are bound forms by definition, whereas these forms are free. This accounts for the different treatment they receive in different dictionaries. Thus Hornby's Dictionary considers *aftergrowth* a derivation with the prefix *after-,* while similar formations like *afternoon, afterglow or afterthought* are classified as compound nouns. Webster's Dictionary does not consider *after-* as a prefix at all. The Concise Oxford Dictionary alongside with the preposition and the adverb *on* gives a prefix *on-* with the examples: *oncoming, onflow, onlooker,* whereas in Chambers's Dictionary *oncome* v is treated as a compound.

The other difficulty concerns borrowed morphemes that were never active as prefixes in English but are recognized as such on the analogy with other words also borrowed from the same source. A strong protest against this interpretation was expressed by N. N. Amosova. In her opinion there is a very considerable confusion in English linguistic literature concerning the problem of the part played by foreign affixes in English word-building. This author lays particular stress on the distinction between morphemes that can be separated from the rest of the stem and those that cannot. Among the latter she mentions the following prefixes listed by H. Sweet: *amphi-, ana-, apo-, cato-, exo-, en-, hypo-, meta-, sina-* (Greek) and *ab-, ad-, amb-* (Latin). The list is rather a mixed one. Thus, *amphi-* is productive in terminology and is with good reason considered by dictionaries a combining form *(amphitheatre, amphibiotic* 'terrestrial in adult state but aquatic as a larva'). *Ana-* in such words as *anachronism, anagram, anaphora* is easily distinguished, because the words readily lend themselves for analysis into immediate constituents. The prefix *ad-* derived from Latin differs very much from these two, being in fact quite a cluster of allomorphs assimilated with the first sound of the stem: *ad-/ac-/af-/ag-/al-/ap-/as-/at-*. E.g. *adverbial, accumulation, affirm, aggravation,* etc.

On the synchronic level the differentiation suggested by N. N. Amosova is irrelevant and the principle of analysis into immediate constituents depends only on the existence of other similar cases.

Prefixes may be classified on different principles. Diachronically distinction is made between prefixes of native and foreign origin. Synchronically prefixes may be classified:

1) according to the class of words they preferably form. Recent investigations, as has been mentioned above, allow one to classify prefixes according to this principle. It must be noted that most of the 51 prefixes of Modern English function in more than one part of speech forming different structural and structural-semantic patterns.

A small group 5 prefixes may be referred to exclusively verb-forming *(en-, be-, on-,* etc.).

The majority of prefixes (in their various denotational meanings) tend to function either in nominal parts of speech (41 patterns in adjectives, 42 in nouns) or in verbs (22 patterns);

2) as to the type of lexical-grammatical character of the base they are added to into; deverbal, e.g. *rewrite, outstay, overdo,* etc.; denominal, e.g. *unbutton, detrain, ex-president,* etc.; deadjectival, e.g. *uneasy, biannual,* etc.;

It is of interest to note that the most productive prefixal pattern for adjectives is the one made up of the prefix *un-,* and the base built either on adjectival stems or present and past participle, e.g. *unknown, unsmiling, unseen,* etc.;

3) semantically prefixes fall into mono and polysemantic;

4) as to the generic denotational meaning there are different groups that are distinguished in linguistic literature:

a) Negative prefixes, such as: *un-, non-, dis-, a-* e.g. *ungrateful* (cf. grateful), *non-politician* (cf. politician) *unemployment* (cf. employment), *non-scientific* (cf. scientific), *incorrect* (cf. correct), *disloyal* (cf. loyal), *disadvantage* (cf. advantage), *amoral* (cf. morale), *asymmetry* (cf. symmetry), etc. It may be mentioned in passing that the prefix *in-* occurs in different phonetic shapes depending on the initial sound of the base it is affixed to; in other words, the prefixal morpheme in question has several allomorphs, namely *il-* (before **[1]**)**,** *im-* (before *[p,m]*)*,* in**-** (before *[r]*)*,* in**-** in all other cases, e.g. *illegal, improbably, immaterial, irreligious, inactive,* etc.;

b) Reversative or privative prefixes, such as *un-, de-, dis-,* e.g. *untie* (cf. tie), *unleash* (cf. leash), *decentralize* (cf. centralize), *disconnect* (cf. connect), etc.;

c) Pejorative prefixes, such as *mis-, mal-, pseudo-, e.g. miscalculate,* (cf. calculate), *misinform* (cf. inform), *maltreat* (cf. treat), *pseudo-classicism* (cf. classicism), *pseudo-scientific* (cf. scientific), etc;

d) Prefixes of time and order, such as *fore-, pre-, post-, ex-,* e.g. *foretell* (cf. tell), *foreknowledge* (cf. knowledge), *pre-war* (cf. war), *postwar* (cf. war), *post-classical* (cf. classical), *ex-president* (cf. president);

e) Prefix of repetition *re-,* e.g. *rebuild* (cf. build), *re-write* (cf. write), etc;

f) Locative prefixes, such as *super-, sub-, inter-, trans-, e.g. superstructure* (cf. structure), *subway* (cf. way), *inter-continental* (cf. continental), *trans-atlantic* (cf. atlantic), etc. and some other groups;

5) when viewed from the angle of their stylistic reference English prefixes fall into those characterized by *neutral stylistic reference* and those *possessing quite* a *definite stylistic value.* As no exhaustive lexico-stylistic classification of English prefixes has yet been suggested, a few examples can only be adduced here. There is no doubt, for instance, that prefixes like *un-, out-, over-, re-, under-* and some others can be qualified as neutral prefixes, e.g. *unnatural, unknown, unlace, outnumber, oversee, resell, underestimate,* etc. on the other hand, one can hardly fail to perceive the literary-bookish, character of such prefixes as *pseudo-, super-, ultra-, uni-, bi-* and some others, e.g. *pseudo-classical, superstructure, ultraviolet, unilateral, bifocal,* etc.

Sometimes one comes across pairs of prefixes, one of which is neutral, the other is stylistically coloured. One example will suffice here: the prefix overoccurs in all functional styles, the prefix *super-* is peculiar to the style of scientific prose.

6)   prefixes may be also classified as to the degree of productivity into highly productive, productive and non-productive.

Suffixation is the formation of words with the help of suffixes. Suffixes usually modify the lexical meaning of the base and transfer words to a different part of speech. There are suffixes however, which do not shift words from one part of speech into another; a suffix of this kind usually transfer a word into a different semantic group, e.g. a concrete noun becomes an abstract one, as is the case with

child - childhood, friend - friendship, etc.

Chains of suffixes occurring in derived words having two and more suffixal morphemes are sometimes refereed to in lexicography as compound suffixes:

-ably = -able + -ly (e.g. profitable, unreasonable); *-ical - ly = -ic + -al + -ly* (e.g. musically, critically); *-ation = -ate + -ion* (e.g. fascination, isolation) and some others. Compound suffixes do not always present a mere succession of two or more suffixes arising out of several consecutive stages of derivation. Some of

them acquire a new quality operating as a whole unit.

Let us examine from this point of view the suffixation in words like *fascination, translation, adaptation* and the like. *Adaptation* looks at first sight like a parallel to *fascination, translation*. The latter however are first-degree derivatives built with the suffix *-ion* on the bases *fascinate-, translate-*. But there is no base *adaptate-,* only the shorter base *adapt-.* Likewise *damnation, condemnation, formation, information* and many others are not matched by shorter bases ending in *-ate,* but only by still shorter ones *damn-, condemn-, form-, inform-.* Thus, the suffix *-ation* is a specific suffix of a composite nature. It consists of two suffixes *-ate* and *-ion,* but in many cases functions as a single unit in first-degree derivatives. It is referred to in linguistic literature as a coalescent suffix or a group suffix. *Adaptation* is then a derivative of the first-degree of derivation built with the coalescent suffix on the base *adapt-.*

Of interest is also the group suffix *-manship* consisting of the suffixes *-man* and *-ship.* It denotes a superior quality, ability of doing something to perfection, e.g. *authormanship, quotemanship, Upmanship,* etc. (cf. statesmanship or chairmanship built by adding the suffix *-ship* to the compound base *statesman-* and *chairman-* respectively).

It also seems appropriate to make several remarks about the morphological changes that sometimes accompany the process of combining derivational morphemes with bases. Although this problem has been so far insufficiently investigated, some observations have been made and some data collected. For instance, the noun-forming suffix **-ess** for names of female beings brings about a certain change in the phonetic shape of the correlative male noun provided the latter ends in *er-, -or,* e.g. *actress* (cf. actor), *sculptress* (cf. sculpter), *tigress* (cf. tiger), etc. It may be easily observed that in such cases the sound **[3]** is contracted in the feminine nouns.

The main function of suffixes 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. (e.g. "educate" is a verb, "educatee" is a noun, and "music" is a noun, "musicdom" is also a noun) .

There are different classifications of suffixes :

1. Part-of-speech classification. Suffixes which can form different parts of speech are given here :

a) noun-forming suffixes, such as : -er (criticizer), -dom (officialdom), -ism (ageism),

b) adjective-forming suffixes, such as : -able (breathable), less (symptomless), -ous (prestigious),

c) verb-forming suffixes, such as -ize (computerize) , -ify (micrify),

d) adverb-forming suffixes , such as : -ly (singly), -ward (tableward),

e) numeral-forming suffixes, such as -teen (sixteen), -ty (seventy).

2. Semantic classification . Suffixes changing the lexical meaning of the stem can be subdivided into groups, e.g. noun-forming suffixes can denote:

a) the agent of the action, e.g. -er (experimenter), -ist (taxist), -ent (student),

b) nationality, e.g. -ian (Russian), -ese (Japanese), -ish (English),

c) collectivity, e.g. -dom (moviedom), -ry (peasantry, -ship (readership), -ati (literati),

d) diminutiveness, e.g. -ie (horsie), -let (booklet), -ling (gooseling), -ette (kitchenette),

e) quality, e.g. -ness (copelessness), -ity (answerability).

3. Lexico-grammatical character of the stem. Suffixes which can be added to certain groups of stems are subdivided into:

a) suffixes added to verbal stems, such as : -er (commuter), -ing (suffering), - able (flyable), -ment (involvement), -ation (computerization),

b) suffixes added to noun stems, such as : -less (smogless), ful (roomful), -ism (adventurism), -ster (pollster), -nik (filmnik), -ish (childish),

c) suffixes added to adjective stems, such as : -en (weaken), -ly (pinkly), -ish (longish), -ness (clannishness).

4. Origin of suffixes. Here we can point out the following groups:

a) native (Germanic), such as -er,-ful, -less, -ly.

b) Romanic, such as : -tion, -ment, -able, -eer.

c) Greek, such as : -ist, -ism, -ize.

d) Russian, such as -nik.

5. Productivity. Here we can point out the following groups:

a) productive, such as : -er, -ize, --ly, -ness.

b) semi-productive, such as : -eer, -ette, -ward.

c) non-productive , such as : -ard (drunkard), -th (length).

Suffixes can be polysemantic, such as : -er can form nouns with the following meanings : agent,doer of the action expressed by the stem (speaker), profession, occupation (teacher), a device, a tool (transmitter). While speaking about suffixes we should also mention compound suffixes which are added to the stem at the same time, such as -ably, -ibly, (terribly, reasonably), -ation (adaptation from adapt).

There are also disputable cases whether we have a suffix or a root morpheme in the structure of a word, in such cases we call such morphemes semi-suffixes, and words with such suffixes can be classified either as derived words or as compound words, e.g. -gate (Irangate), -burger (cheeseburger), -aholic (workaholic) etc.

Further, there are suffixes due to which the primary stress is shifted to the syllable immediately preceding them, e.g. *courageous* (cf. courage), *stability (*cf. stable*), investigation* (cf. investigate), *peculiarity* (cf. peculiar), etc. When added to a base having the suffix **-able/-ible** as its component, the suffix **-ity** brings about a change in its phonetic shape, namely the vowel [i] is inserted between [b] and [1], e.g. *possible - possibility, changeable - changeability***,** etc. Some suffixes attract the primary stress on to themselves, there is a secondary stress on the first syllable in words with such suffixes, e.g. *employ'ee* (cf. em'ploy), *govern'mental* (cf. govern), *picturesque* (cf. picture).

There are different classifications of suffix in linguistic literature, as suffixes may be divided into several groups according to different principles:

1)	The first principle of classification that, one might say, suggests itself is the part of speech formed. Within the scope of the part-of-speech classification suffixes naturally fall into several groups such as:

a) noun-affixes, i.e. those forming or occurring in nouns, e.g. *-er, -dom, -ness, -ation, etc. (teacher, Londoner, freedom, brightness, justification,* etc.);

b) adjective-suffixes, i.e. those forming or occurring in adjectives, e.g. *-able, - less, -ful, -ic, -ous, etc. (agreeable, careless, doubtful, poetic, courageous,* etc.);

c) verb-suffixes, i.e. those forming or occurring in verbs, e.g. *-en, -fy, -ize (darken, satisfy, harmonize,* etc.);

d) adverb-suffixes, i.e. those forming or occurring in adverbs, e.g. *-ly, -ward, (quickly, eastward, etc.).*

2)	Suffixes may also be classified into various groups according to the lexico- grammatical character of the-base the affix is usually added to. Proceeding from this principle one may divide suffixes into:

a) deverbal suffixes (those added to the verbal base), e.g. *-er, -ing, -ment, -able, etc. (speaker, reading, agreement, suitable,* etc.);

b) denominal suffixes (those added to the noun base), e.g. *-less, -ish, -ful, -ist,- some, etc. (handless, childish, mouthful, violinist, troublesome,* etc.);

c) de-adjectival suffixes (those affixed to the adjective base), e.g. *-en, -ly, -ish, -ness, etc. (blacken, slowly, reddish, brightness, etc.).*

3)	A classification of suffixes amt also be based on the criterion of sense expressed by a set of suffixes. Proceeding from this principle suffixes are classified into various groups within the bounds of a certain part of speech. For instance, noun-suffixes fall into those denoting:

a)	the agent of an action, e.g. *-er, -ant (baker, dancer, defendant,* etc.);

b)	appurtenance, e.g. *-an, -ian, -ese,* etc. *(Arabian, Elizabethan, Russian, Chinese, Japanese,* etc.);

c)	c) collective, e.g. *-age, -dom, -ery (-ry),* etc. *(freightage, officialdom, peasantry,* etc.);

d) diminutiveness, e.g. **-ie, -let, -ling, etc. (birdie, girlie, cloudlet,** *squirreling, wolfling,* etc).,

4)   Still another classification of suffixes may be worked out if one examines them from the angle of stylistic reference. Just like prefixes, suffixes are also characterized by quite a definite stylistic reference falling into two basic classes: those characterized by neutral stylistic reference such as *-able, -er, -ing,* etc.; those having a certain stylistic value such as *-old, -i/form, -aceous, -tron, etc.*

5)   Suffixes are also classified as to the degree of their productivity.

As is known, language is never stable: sounds, constructions, grammatical elements, word - forms and word - meaning are all exposed to alteration. Derivational affixes are no exception in this respect, they also undergo semantic change.

Consequently many commonly used derivational affixes are polysemantic in Modern English. The following two may well serve as illustrations. The noun suffix **-er** is used to coin words denoting persons following some special trade or profession, e.g. *baker, driver, hunter,* etc.; persons doing a certain action at the moment in question, e.g. *packer, chooser, giver,* etc.; a device, tool, implement, e.g. *blotter, atomizer, boiler, crasser, transmitter, trailer,* etc. The adjective suffixes also have several meanings, such as: Composed of, full of, e.g. *bony, story,* characterized by, e.g. *rainy, cloudy;* having the character of, resembling what the base denotes, e.g. *inky, busily.*

CHAPTER II

2. 1. Prefixes of native and foreign origin

We call prefixes such particles as can be prefixed to full words but are themselves 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) m*is-*. Prefixes of foreign origin came into the language ready made, so to speak. They are due to syntagmatic loans from other languages: when a number of analysable foreign words of the same structure 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 secondarily 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.

Prefixing on a Neo-Latin basis of coining

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 these particles begins in the 16th c., but really develops with the progress of modern science only, i.e. in the 18th and esp. the 19th c. With these particles there is a practical difficulty. They may represent:

1) such elements as are prefixes (in the above meaning) in Latin or Greek, 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 Greek, 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 word formation, as they represent loan elements in English with no independent existence as words. That *macro-, micro-* and others should be termed

combining forms while *hyper-, hypro-, intro-, intra-* and others are called prefixes by the OED, is by no means justified.

Only such patterns as are prefixed to full English words of general, learned, scientific or technical character can be termed prefixes. *Hyper-* in *hypersensitive* is a prefix, but h*yper-* in *hypertrophy* is not, as *-trophy* is no word. We cannot, however, undertake 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 have been considered that fall under the above groups I) and 2). But we have also included a few prefixes which lie outside this scope, as prefixes 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 independent words: *over-* and *out-* sometimes overlap, there is overlapping between *un-* (neg.) and *in-, un-* (reversative), *dis-* and *de-,* between *ante-* and *pre-, super-* and *trims-, super-* and *supra-*.

A pre-particle or prefix combination may be based on three different conceptual patterns and accordingly present the prefix in three functional aspects: I) the prefix has adjectival force (with substantives, as in *anteroom, archbishop, co-hostess, ex-king)',* 2) the prefix has adverbial force (with adjectives and verbs, as in *unconscious, hypersensitive, informal, overanxious unroll, rewrite, mislay)* 3) the prefix has prepositional force (as in *prewar years, postgraduate studies, antiaircraft gun/afire, aflutter / anti-Nazi , afternoon / encage-:* substantives and verbs must be considered syntagmas with a zero determinatum, the combinations *anti-Nazi, afternoon, encage* being the respective determinants).

The preceding conceptual patterns are important in the determination of the stress: while a combination based on an adjunct / primary relation tends to have two heavy stresses (as in *arch-enemy)* or may even have the main stress on the

prefix (as in subway), the prefix has not more than a full middle stress in the other types.

The phonemic status of prefixes

The semi-independent, word-like status of prefixes also appears from their treatment in regard to stress. With the exception of regularly unstressed *a-* (as in *afire, aflutter), be-* (as in *befriend),* and *em-, en-* (as in *emplane, encage)* all prefixes have stress. To illustrate this important point a comparison with non-composite words of similar phonetic structure win be useful. If we compare the words re-*fill* and *repeat,* morphemic *re-* /ri/ in *re-fill* is basically characterized by presence of stress whereas non- morphemic *re-* [ri] is basically characterized by absence of stress. This is proved by the fact that under certain phonetically unpredictable circumstances, the phonemic stress of *re-* in *re-fill,* though basically a middle stress, can take the form of heavy stress whereas phonemic absence of stress can never rise to presence of stress.

They refilled the tank - may become - Th*ey refilled the tank* (for the sake of contrast) or Th*ey refilled the tank* (for emphasis), but no such shift is conceivable for mono-morphemic *repeat, incite, prefer* etc. which invariably maintain the pattern no stress/heavy stress.

2.2. The use of negatives affixes

Word formation appears to occupy a rather special place in grammatical description. In many cases the application of apparently productive rules leads to the generation of compounds or derivatives that are, for one reason or another, felt to be unacceptable or at least very odd by native speakers, and the grammarian must decide what status he is to give to such rules and their output in his grammar. The decision is by no means easy, and can lie anywhere between the setting up of maximally general rules of a generative type, with little concern for the fact that much of their output may in some sense be questionable, and the simple listing and classifying, in terms of syntactic function and internal structure, of attested forms. The latter procedure is of course safer, but it is the former which raises the more interesting problems. Are e.g. *unbad* and p*uppycat* "grammatical but non-occurring" in the same sense as a sentence such as *Colorless green ideas sleep furiously?* It can certainly be argued that they are; but if we are justified in asserting that the sentence status of the last example is clearer than the word status of the first two, then we are still faced with the question why this should be the case if they are all three grammatical. It would seem that the role of formal criteria in decisions about sentence status is likely to be much greater than it is in decisions about word status (it is, for one thing, probably generally true that there are, in the case of sentences, more formal criteria available on which a decision can be based). Processes of word formation often seem to belong to a somewhat vague intermediary area between grammar and lexicon, and while this need not prevent us from giving formal statements of these processes, it may often be necessary to state restrictions on their output in primarily semantic terms (i.e. to insure that their output is not "unsemantical") if we want to hold on to the criterion of native speaker acceptance as an essential measure of the adequacy of our description. Thus in the area of English nominal compounds it would seem that actually occurring compounds are not as a rule created like new sentences in order to refer to momentary conditions. Leaving aside the possible difficulties of stating such semantic considerations in a reasonably rigorous way in any given case, the

problem is to determine, for the various word-formative processes in which they appear to play a part, how they can most reasonably be accommodated within an over-all framework of grammatical and semantic description.

In our investigation of restrictions on the use of negative affixes with evaluatively negative stems we shall attempt to deal with the question of how such restrictions are to be treated descriptively, and particularly whether rules for such restrictions should be incorporated into a "generative" morphology. In this connection we shall be concerned with the notion of productivity as it is applied to morphological processes. The term "productive" is often used rather indiscriminately to refer both to certain aspects of the behavior of the speakers of a language and to certain diachronic trends; while there is presumably in many cases a connection between these two aspects of productivity, it is necessary to keep the distinction in mind. Moreover, and more importantly, the concept of what we might term "synchronic productivity" is itself often used in a rather ill-defined way in the area of word formation, and it is in many cases difficult to decide just what is being implied when a morphological process is said to be synchronically productive.

We shall confine ourselves to the derivation of adjectives from other adjectives, we shall be especially concerned to discover whether it is true that in English negative affixes are not used with adjectival bases that have a negative value on such evaluative scales as "good - bad", "desirable - undesirable".

The derivational affixes that must be considered are the prefixes a-, *dis-, in-, non-,* and *un-.*

1.*a-/an-*

This prefix, which goes back to a borrowing of the Greek *alpha privativum,* is clearly of very limited occurrence in English. Many of the adjectives in which it is etymologically present have been borrowed in the derived form from Greek (sometimes through Latin), and frequently have no positive counterpart in English (e. g. *anomalous,* through Late Latin *anomalus* from the Greek *anomalos,* literally 'uneven', 'irregular', from *an-* 'not' + *homalos* 'even', 'lever). A large proportion of

adjectives containing the prefix belong to highly specialized areas of the vocabulary, and new formations in English are scarcely frequent enough to justify the inclusion of adjective derivation *by* means of *a-/an-* in the repertory of productive morphological processes. In this and similar cases one is faced with a dilemma: on the one hand new formations that gain currency follow an established pattern of composition, on the other hand the number and/or semantic field of these new formations is so margined that it would seem neither reasonable nor accurate to assign to this pattern a status similar to others of less questionable productivity. One might perhaps relegate such marginal processes to a kind of "recognition morphology" which would assign an interpretation to new formations that become established, and treat the process of formation itself as an unpredictable accident that lies outside the scope of productive grammatical rules.

As for the semantic function of the prefix, it is either negative - apparently generally contradictory - or privative, more or less equivalent to the suffix *-less,* as for instance in *aplacental.* The semantic relationships between the non-prefixed adjectives and the prefixed forms are not always predictable. An interesting set of forms is constituted by *amoral, immoral, nonmoral* and un*moral,* where *immoral* is the contrary opposite of *moral* on the dimension of morality, but where the precise differences, if any, between *amoral, nonmoral* and *unmoral* are not very clear.

When we come to examine the forms in *a-/an-* in which the prefix has a purely negative rather than a privative function from the point of view of the "positive" or "negative" value of the underlying bases, it must be said that our second hypothesis is borne out quite well. We have not found a single form which could be said to be derived from a negatively evaluated base (this applies, incidentally, both to negatively prefixed forms borrowed *in toto* and to English new formations). On the other hand it would certainly be wrong to claim, as Jespersen did for the forms in *an-,* that most of the derived adjectives have a depreciatory sense; most of them are rather clearly neutral on an evaluative scale. This is hardly surprising in view of the high proportion of scientific terms among them.

2. *non-* There can be little doubt that *non-* is more productive than the prefixes we have examined so far. The N*CD (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary)* lists only 26 adjectives in *non-* with definitions (including such "non-derived" ones as *nonchalant, nondescript),* but includes a list of about 850 others with the note that "the meanings of the words in the list can be understood from the definitions of the terms with which non- is combined". The listing is rather arbitrary (it includes *non-Turkish* but not *non-Bulgarian, nonintuitive* but not *nondeductive),* and it is in fact hard to see what usefulness it has. The same can be said of the listing of non-forms in the *NlD3 (Webster's New International Dictionary)* (all of them with definitions, a good many of these of the type non-x: not x); *nonwhite* is listed, *noncolored* is not, *nonpsychiatric* is, *nonpsychological* is not, etc. Where one is dealing with a clearly productive morphological process, a simple statement of the semantic content of the process in question, which would enable one to interpret new formations, seems to be as much as can or should be expected of a dictionary (together, of course, with a list of attested forms that are semantically specialized or irregular). A listing of semantically transparent attested forms (which in any case in practice is bound to be incomplete) is hardly less futile than an attempt to count the drops in a pool during a rainstorm. Moreover, it has to some extent the effect of obscuring the fact that the process *is* synchronically productive.

It is interesting to note that the great majority of *non-* forms in the dictionary' listings have underlying forms which are themselves morphologically complex; most of them end in *-al, -ible, -ic, -ous,* etc. This may be connected with the fact that many simple adjectives (such as *small, long)* have obvious simple antonyms; n*onred* is probably more acceptable than *nonlong. - The* listing in the NCD also includes some double negatives: *nondisfranchised, noninfinite,* and the noun *nondiscontinuance.*

As for the semantic function of *non-,* the definition of it given by the *NCD* seems quite satisfactory: A prefix in common use in the sense of *not-, un-, in.-, non-* is generally less emphatic than *in-* or u*n-,* being merely negative, while *in-* and un- are positive, often implying an opposite thing or quality.

Cf. nonreligious, irreligious; nonmoral, immoral; non-Christian, unchristian.

In our terms, *non-* generally expresses contradictory opposition, while in- and u*n-* often express contrary opposition. The fact that most derivatives in *non-* are not compared and are not modified *by very,* etc., also supports the interpretation of *non-* as a contradictory negative.

There is a considerable number of cases where the u*n-* derivative of a given base seems to imply the absence of a desirable or expected quality, while the non-derivative of the same base does not have this implication (e.g. u*nremunerative* vs. *nonremunerative).* And often the contrast between x and *non-x* lies as it were along a different dimension from that between x and un-x (or in-x). Thus the contrast *Christian* vs. *non-Christian* appears to be primarily one between 'related to, pertaining to, characteristic of certain religious doctrines' and 'not related to, etc., these doctrines', while that between *Christian* and *unchristian* rather involves a scale of conformity or opposition to certain norms. ' Comparable contrasts are quite frequent (cf. *non- American* vs. *un-American, non-grammatical* vs. *ungrammatical).* We might say in general that in such cases *non-* selects the descriptive aspect of the stem for negation, while u*n-* selects the evaluative one. Moreover, the evaluative aspect thus selected appears to be in general a positive one; in u*n-Cartesian* for instance it would seem that certain praiseworthy features of the meaning of Cartesian are negated, so that u*n-Cartesian* sounds evaluatively negative (as opposed to *non-Cartesian).* The selection of an evaluatively positive sense is of course contingent upon the existence of one; it would be interesting to determine whether un-derivatives of certain terms which have, for most speakers of English, no such "positive" aspect available (e. g. *fascist, totalitarian)* would generally be considered as to some extent peculiar. We might further note in this connection that for terms such as *maternal,* which have both an evaluative and a descriptive aspect, we have two acceptable derivatives (e. g. to take the stem just cited, *unmaternal and nonmaternal),* while for related terms with a primarily evaluative-and "positive"-aspect such as m*otherly* the u*n-* derivative is often well-

established, while a derivative in *non-* seems quite odd (cf. *unmotherly* and *nonmotherly).*

As we might expect in view of the foregoing remarks, the great majority of the нон-derivatives listed in the NCD have "neutral" underlying stems. A few do have "negative" stems (e.g. *nonculpable, nonmalicious, nonreprehensible),* and an approximately equal number have "positive" stems (e. g. *nonadvantageous, nonbenevolent, noncommendable).* It would seem that we are justified in assuming that the use of non- is primarily confined to descriptive, i.e. "neutral" terms, or at least to terms which have a possible interpretation under which they are evaluatively neutral, and that its use with both "positive" and "negative" terms is rather marginal.

As for a generative account of derivation by means of non-, this could perhaps best be handled in terms of a "degrees of grammaticalness" approach (or in terms of degrees of acceptability, if we want to avoid the thorny question of what is more grammatical or less grammatical). We would then have a class of derivatives in non- for which the underlying stems would have to be specified only so as to insure a minimum degree of acceptability'; let us say that we require merely that the stem be an adjective (we are not concerned with non-derivatives of nouns here). There would further be two subclasses of this class of minimally acceptable forms, the members of both of which would all have a higher degree of acceptability; one would be composed of the non-derivatives of stems without simplex antonyms, the other one of the non-derivatives of evaluatively neutral stems. The highest degree of acceptability could then be specified in terms of membership in both of these two subclasses, i.e. of belonging to their intersection. To give some examples, the class of minimally acceptable forms would contain no derivatives less acceptable than *nondelicious* and nonlong, respectively; and their intersection would contain only fully acceptable forms such as nonelon*gated.* It might be considered whether morphological complexity as such should be specified as a desirable condition for derivatives in non-.

It need hardly be added that our remarks here are only meant as a suggestion for a possible scheme of description. It would be necessary to investigate in much more detail the importance of the two factors we have discussed, and the possible role of other ones, before we could decide whether this outline should be adopted. In any case it is clear that such an approach, if feasible, would constitute a semantic specification of the acceptability of the output of a formal morphological process, for the two subclasses of adjectives that we have suggested above are defined in semantic rather than in grammatical terms.

2. 3. Some ways of translation of prefixes from English into Uzbek.

Now we would like to show some ways of translation of prefixes from English into Uzbek. In this connection we found some prefixes from Muller's dictionary and translated into Uzbek.

As we mentioned before prefixes have broad general meanings like *not*, *under*, and *against* and a particular one of them may appear in hundreds of different words. Often their meanings are hard to interpret, since many prefixes have more than one meaning. In general, a knowledge of prefixes will help every student, or everybody who learns English to know when to double consonants in such words as *misspell*, *overrun*, *interrupt*, *irregular, irrelevant, irregularity, irrational, irreparable, irreconcilable, irritating, irrespective, irresponsible, irresistible, irrevocable, illiterate, illogical, illegal, immoral, immobile.* For instance, *It was irresponsible of you to leave her alone. It's illegal for employers to discriminate on the grounds of race.* In- and dis- are generally found in words of Latin or French origin. Un- and non- the two regular negative prefix for new words. Irregardless has two negative affixes, the prefix *ir-* and the suffix –less. Since *regardless* is well- established in the language, objections have been voiced against a regardless, which is intended to have the same meaning but has the redundant prefix.Many of the prefixes in the following list have several different spellings in order to fit with various roots:

Prefix	Meaning	Examples
Old English a- for- fore- mis- un-	in, on, of, up, to away, off, from before, previous bad, poorly, not not, opposing	Abed - afoot – Forget -forswear – Foretell – forefather – Misspell - misfire – Unfold – untrue -

Prefix	Meaning	Examples
Latin		
ab-	From, away, off	Abdicate –Abjure –
ante-	Before, previous	Antecedent –Antedate –
bi-	Two, twice	Bisect –Biennial –
circum-	Around	Circumspect –circumference –
com-	With, together, very	Commotion – complicate –
contra-	Against, opposing	Contradict – contravene –
dis-	Away, off, down, not	dissent- disappear –
ex-	Out	extract –
in-	Not, opposing	incapable –ineligible –
inter-	Among, between	intercede –interrupt –
post-	After, following	postpone – postscript –
pre-	Before	prevent – preclude –
re-	Back, backward, again	revoke –recur –
retro-	Back, backward	retrospect – retrograde –
sub-	Under, beneath	subjugate – substitute –
trans-	Across, beyond, over	transact – transport –
Prefix	Meaning	Example
Greek		
a –	Without, lacking	Atheist –Agnostic –
anti –	Against, opposing	Antipathy – Antitoxin-
apo-	From, away	Apology –Apostate –
cata-	Down, away, thoroughly	Catastrophe –Cataclysm –
dia-	Through, across, apart	Diameter – Diagnose –
hyper-	Excessive, over	Hypercritical – Hypertension –

hypo-	Under, beneath	Hypodermic –Hypothesis –
pro-	Before	Prognosis – Program –
sym-	With, together	Sympathy –Symphony -

Some examples of translations:

Ante- She was sent immediately to an *antenatal* clinic

Uni darxol xomilador ayollar klinikasiga junatishdi.

Anti – We don't go out much. I suppose we're rather *antisocial*.

Bas kilaylik endi. Menimcha, biz odamgarchilikdan chikib ketayapmiz.

Bi- There are lots of *bilingual* dictionary in the library.

Kutubxonada ikki tillik lugatlar ko'p.

Co- There is mutual *cooperation* between Japan and China.

Xitoy va Yaponiya O'rtasida o'zaro hamkorlik mavjud.

Contra- You behavior *contradicts* against the rules of our organization.

Sizning hulqingiz bizning tashkilotimiz qoidalariga ziddir.

Ex- *Ex*-presidnte of the US made a speech in the Congress yesterday.

Kecha kongresda AQShning sobiq prezidenti nutq so'zladi.

Inter – Our government tries to take a good place and reputation in *international* arena. Hukumatimiz xalqaro maydonda yaxshi o'rin egallashga va yaxshi obro' orttirishga harakat qilayapti.

Mini- Samarkand car plant produces *minibuses* for our republic.

Samarqand mashina ishlab chiqarish zavodi respublikamiz uchun miniavtobuslarni ishlab chiqaradi.

Mis – Mr. Morris *misunderstood* Mr. Nagasaki when he negotiated with the delegation of Japan. Yaponiya delegatsiyasi bilan olib borilgan muzokarada janob Morris janob Nagasakini noto'gri tushundi.

Ex- Is she still in touch with her ex? U hali ham sobiq xotini bilan aloqadami? We have gone ex-directory because we were receiving so many unwanted calls. Biz o'zimiz xoxlamagan ko'pgina qo'ng'iroqlarni qabul qilganimiz uchun sobiq direktorimizdan voz kechdik.

Inter- Many of the soldiers were intered in unmarked graves. Ko'pgina soldatlar belgisiz qabrlarga qo'yildi. Dominique's teacher says that they interacts well with the other children. Dominik o'qituvchilari bolalar bilan yahshi aloqada bo'lishlarini aytishdi.

Trans- Kate has transformed that house since she moved in. Katya ko'chib o'tgan uyini mutloqo o'zgartirdi. The sale was transacted in conditions of the greatest secrecy. Savdo juda sirli ravishda olib borildi.

All these comparative analysis of the English language showed that English is not so rich in suffixes as the Uzbek language. Uzbek suffixes are more than English suffixes. And Prefixation is more typical to the English language than Uzbek prefixes. As I studied in my Qualification Paper prefixes in Uzbek and English languages, I want to give some examples with the prefix in English and Uzbek languages.

Prefixes modify the lexical meaning of the stem, but in so doing they seldom affect its basic lexico-grammatical component. Therefore both the simple word and its prefixed derivative mostly belong to the same part of speech.

Ex:	mis;	behave	(v)	-	misbehave	(v)
calculate	(v)	-		miscalculate		(v)
inform	(v)	-		misinform		(v)
lead	(v)	-		mislead		(v)

pronounce (v) - mispronounce (v)

There may be other cases where semantic relationship is slightly different but the General lexico-grammatical meaning remain.

Ex: giving – misgiving

take – mistake trust - mistrust

The prefix *pre-, post-* refer to time

Ex: historic – prehistoric

pay – prepay

view - preview

The group of negative prefixes is so numerous that some scholars even find it convenient to classify prefixes into negative and non-negative ones. They are: *de-, dis-, in-, im-, H-, ir-.*[5]

Ex: de-; decentralize, decontaminate, denasify

dis-; disagree, disappear, disgorge, dishouse,non-; noninterference, nonsense, si, stance, noncommissioned,noncombatant,un-; unload, unreal, unhappy, unkind, unfriendly,uneven,uncommon, unimportant, unbind, undo, unmask, unpack.

There are no hard distinctions between what is real and what is unreal nor between what is true what is untrue. A thing isn't necessarily either true or untrue it can be both true and untrue.[6]

Apart from the known and the unknown what else is there?[7]

re-; rearrange recast reinstate remarriage reassembled rerecieved reseen

a-; aboard asleep awake

The prefixes *pre-, post-, non-, anti-* and some other Romanic and Greek prefixes very productive in present day English serve to form adjectives retaining at the same time a very clear cut lexical meaning;

,*Ex:* antiwar

prewar

postwar

nonparty

Now we shall compare some examples in Uzbek language.

Ex: be-; bebosh, benamoz, behayo, beraxm, befaxm, befarosat, bekami kust, benasib, beo'xshov, bepul, benomus, betamiz

no-; nojuya, nohush, noma'lum, noo'rin, noqulay, noiloj

---

[5] *Амосова Н.Н. - «Этимологические основы словарного состава современного английского языка»* М. 1956

[6] Harold P.'s 2005 Nobel Prise Acceptance Speech.

ser-;   serhosil,   serdaromad,   sermazmun,   sergap,
serunum, serurug'

ba-;   bama'ni,   bamaslahat,   baxamjixat,   bamaylixotir,
badavlat, basavlat,

nim-;   nimjon, nimrang, nimhol, nimtatir

By their origin the Uzbek affixes like English one are divided into native and borrowed. Some Uzbek prefixes бо-, но-, ба- are borrowed origin.

As compared with the Uzbek language the negative affixes are more widely used in English. Though the number of Uzbek prefixes are few they are capable of changing words from one part of speech into another.

Ex adab (n) - boadab (adj)

xosil (n) - serhosil (adj)

iloj (n) - noiloj (adj)

baxt (n) - bebaxt (adj)

rang (n) - nimrang (adj)

So in conclusion we can say that in Uzbek language in many cases, mostly prefixes form adjectives from noun. In the English language from verb is formed

verb;   *to do (v) - undo (v)*

to trust (v) - mistrust (v)

from noun is formed verb

house (n) - dishouse (v)

from noun is formed noun

sense (n) - nonsense (n)

from adjective is formed adjective

historic (adj) - prehistoric (adj)

from verb is formed noun

take (v) - mistake (n)   and so on.

---

[7] H.P.Quotation.

Conclusion

As we looked through everything concerning with prefixes as a means of word formation and it essential for lexicology to determine the place and the role of prefixes in English. As our investigation showed prefixation is one of the most necessary ways of word formation.

Unlike suffixation, which is usually bound up with the paradigm of a certain part of speech, prefixation is considered to be neutral in this respect. It is significant that in linguistic literature derivational suffixes are always divided into noun-forming, adjective-forming, etc. Prefixes, however, are treated differently. They are described either in alphabetical order or subdivided into several classes in accordance with their origin, meaning or function and never according to the part of speech formed. Thus we came to conclusion that:

1. Word-formation is the process of creating words from the material available in the language after certain structural and semantic formulas and patterns.

2. As a subject of study, word-formation is that branch of Lexicology which studies the patterns on which the English language builds words. Like any other linguistic phenomenon, word-formation may be studied synchronically and diachronically.

3. There are two principal types of word-formation in Modern English: word-derivation and word-composition. Within the types further distinction is made between various ways and means of word-formation.

4. Distinction is made between productive and non-productive ways of word-formation.

5. Prefixation plays an important role in translating form English into Uzbek.

6. Prefixes can affect on lexical meaning and we could show in examples given.

So, 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 twenty five prefixes which can transfer words to a different part of speech.

There are some linguists' who treat prefixes as a part of word composition. They think that a prefix has the same function as the first component of a compound word. Other linguists consider prefixes as derivational affixes which differ essentially from root morphemes and stems. From the point of view of their origin affixes may be native and borrowed.

The Comparative analyses of the English language with other languages showed that English language is not so rich in suffixes as, for example, the Uzbek language. As compared with the Uzbek language the negative affixes are more widely used in English.

So my task was to study thoroughly affixation in English.

1.   Affixation (prefixation and suffixation) is the formation of the words by adding derivational affixes (prefixes and suffixes) to bases.

2.   There are quite a number of polysemantic, homonymous and synonymous derivational affixes in Modern English.

3.   Classification of derivational affixes are based on different principles such as:

a)   the part of speech formed;

b)   the lexico-grammatical character of the stem the affix is added to;

c)   its meaning;

d)   the degree of productivity;

e)   the origin of the affix (native or borrowed) etc.

4.   The productivity of derivational affixes is relative and conditioned by various factors.

5.   Many of the Modern English derivational affixes were at one time independent words. Others have always been known as suffixes or prefixes within the history of the English vocabulary. Some of them are of international currency.

In comparative analyses of the English language with other language showed that the English language is not so rich in suffixes as, for example, the Uzbek language. But prefixation is more typical to the English language. In Uzbek

prefixes are so few, but they are capable of changing words from one part of speech into another and so on.

Affixation is the formation of words with the help of derivational affixes. Affixation is subdivided into prefixation and suffixation.

If derivational morphemes *added* before *the* stem of a word are *called prefixes.Ex:* un-like *dis*-like

If derivational morphemes *added* after the stem of the word are called *suffixes. Ex:* law-*ful, hand-ful*

So, in conformity with the division of derivational affixes into suffixes and prefixes affixation is subdivided into suffixation and prefixation. Word like reappearance, unreasonable are generally qualified as prefixal-suffixal derivatives.

In Modern English suffixation is characteristic of noun and adjective formation (suffiks bilan odatda Ingliz tilida ot va sifat yasaladi). While prefixation is typical of verb formation (prefikslar bilan odatda fe'l yasaladi).

As a rule, prefixes *modify the lexical meaning of stems to which they are added.* A prefixal derivative usually joins the part of speech the unprefixed word belongs to. *Ex:* un-usual from *usual*

in-definite from *definite dis-comfort* from *comfort*

As we told above that derivational suffixes are always divided into *noun forming, adjective forming,* etc.

Prefixes, however, are treated differently. *They are subdivided into several classes in accordance with their origin, meaning or function and never accordance to the part of speech formed.*

Prefixes may be classified on different principles. *Diachronically distinction is made between prefixes of native and foreign origin. Synchronically prefixes are classified according to the meaning they convey to be derived word.*

The following groups of prefixes may be distinguished:

a) Prefixes of negative meaning, such as: *un-, in-, dis-* and some others,

Ex: *ungrateful* (grateful) *incorrect* (correct) *disadvantage* (advantage), etc.

b) Prefixes denoting reversal repetition of an action, such as *un-, dis-, re-,* and some others, *Ex:* *to unfasten* (to fasten) *disconnect* (to connect) *to rewrite* (to write), etc.;

c) Prefixes denoting space and time relations, such as *fore-, pre-, over-, super-*and some others, *Ex:* to <u>fore</u>see (to see) <u>pre</u>-historic (historic) <u>post</u>-position (position), etc.

Within the scope of the part of speech classification prefixes naturally may fall into several groups, such as:

1)Prefixal Verbs: to enrich

2)Prefixal Adjectives: uneasy

3)Prefixal Noun ex-champion, co-author.

Affixes may be divided into <u>dead</u> and <u>living</u>. 1) 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 analyses. (Bunday affikslar bilan so'z yasab bo'lmaydi, ular o'lik affikslar hisoblanishadi.)

Ex: -d in deed, seed -t in fight, gift

2) Living affixes may be easily singled out from a word:

Ex: good-ness free-dom child-hood

Living affixes are traditionally divided into *productive* and *nonproductive*.

1) Productive affixes are those which are characterized by their ability to make new words. *Ex:* **-**er, -ism, -ish, -ing, -ness, -ation, -ry, and etc.

2) Non productive are those which are not used to form new words in Modern English. The following prefixes are non-productive ones.

Ex: in-, *ir-, mis-, dis***-** and so on. indiscreet, irregular.

There are not so many prefixes in Uzbek (about 8-9**)** but they are capable changing words from one part of speech into another.

Ex: ser-, be-, ba-, no-, nim- and so on.

serhosil (adj) (from hosil - noun)

behayo (adj) (from hayo - noun)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Karimov I.A   O'zbekiston buyuk kelajak sari. Toshkent, 1998

2. Karimov I.A Tarixiy xotirasiz kelajak yo'q. Toshkent. Sharq, 1998

3. Chet-tillarini o'rganish tizimini yanada takomilashtirish chora tadbirlari to'g'risidagi O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidentining Qarori 2012/10/12

4. Jalolov J. Chet til o'qitish metodikasi. Toshkent 1996

5. Амосова Н.Н. Этимологические основи словарного состава современного английского языка. М. 1956

6. Арнолд И.V. Лексикология современного английского языка. М. 1959

7. Ворно Е.Ф., Кашеева М.А. и др. Лексикология английского языка. М. 1955

8. Илиш Б.А. История английского языка. М. 1968

9. Илиш Б.А. Современний английский язык. М. 1948

10. Кубрякова Е.С. Что такое словообразование. М. 1965

11. Паул Г. Принципи истории языка. М.1960

12. Швейтсер А.Д. Очерк современного английского языка в США. М. 1963

13. Akhmanova J. Lexicology: theory and method. M. 1972

14. Barantsev C/T/ English Lexicology in practice. Kiev. 1954

15. Bloomfield L. Language. NY. 1933

16. Carrol J.B. The study of language. Cambridge Harvard university press. 1955

17. Koonin A. English lexicology. M. 1940

18. Muminov A. M. and others A course in modern English lexicology.T. 19

19. Serjeantson M.S. A history of foreign words in English. London. 1935

Web page.

http://iteslj.org/
http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Yang-Writing.html
http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Ross-ListeningComprehension.html
http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/think/articles/listening
http://www.inspiringteachers.com/
http://www.education.gouv.fr/
http://www.educnet.education.fr/
http://www.educationprioritaire.education.fr/
http://www.edufle.net

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishi hozirgi kundagi leksikologiyaning dolzarb muammolaridan biri bo'lgan so'z yasalishidagi prefixlarning Ingliz va O'zbek tillari tarjimasida qiyosiy o'rganishga bag'ishlangan.

So'z yasalishi tildagi yangi leksik qism, ya'ni so'zlarni o'rgatadigan til ilmining bir qismidir. So'z yasalishi ham semantik ham tuzilish jihatdan tahlil qilsa bo'ladigan tarkiblargagina munosabat bildiradi. Oddiy so'zlarni, shuningdek tahlil qilib bo'lmaydigan, turtki bermaydigan belgilarni o'rganishga unda o'rin yo'q. Bu leksik masala. Tarkibiy qism motivatsiyalangan morfemalar o'rtasidagi aloqalarga asoslangan. Keltirilgan quyidagi misolarda *do-er, un-do, rainbow* so'z yasalishiga aloqador, lekin *do, rain,bow* yakka holda so'z yasalishiga aloqador emas.

Ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishni dolzarbligi shundaki tarjima va prefikslar muammosi yechimi hozirgi kun leksikologiyasidagi so'z yasalishining deyarli barcha savollariga javob topa oladi.

Ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishining nazariy ahamiyati shundaki u til o'rganuvchilar va tarjimonlarga tarjima jarayonida qanday usular maqulligi va bu jarayonda Ingliz tili prefikslari bilan qanday ishlash mumkinligi bo'yicha tavsiyalar beradi.

Bitiruv malakaviy ishining amaliy ahamiyati. Materiallar, metodlar natija va yutuqlari hamda xulosasi tarjimonlik va filologiya yo'nalishidagi talaba va professor -o'qituvchilar uchun leksikologiya hamda tarjima nazariyasining nazariy o'rganish kurslarida shu bilan birga fakultetda o'rganiladigan amaliy kurslarni o'qitishda ko'makchi bo'la oladi.

Ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishining maqsadi. Prefiksatsiyani Ingliz-tilida so'z yasalish darajasida va ularning O'zbek tiliga tarjiomasini batafsil izlanish olib borish.

Bitiruv malakaviy ishining vazifalari ushbu ishning maqsadiga asoslanib ishlab chiqilgan : so'z yasalishida prefiksatsiyani aniqlab olish ; prefikslarning turlarini tahlil qilish ; hozirgi kundagi so'z yasalishi va prefiksatsiya haqida mavjud nazariyalarni tahlil qilish ; prefikslarning klassifikatsiyasining tahlili ;

prefikslarning leksik ma'noga ta'siri ; Ingliz prefikslarini O'zbek tiliga tarjima usullariga e'tibor berish.

Ishning strukturasi. Maqsad va vazifaga ko'ra ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishi kirish, ikkta bo'lim, xulosa va foydalanilgan adabiyotlardan tashkil topgan.