# Introduction

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

The aims and purposes of the work. The goal of the work is based on detailed study of affixation, which play important role in word – formation. According to this general aim the following particular tasks are put forward:

* 1. to classify affixes.
  2. to classify the affixes according to its structure and semantics.
  3. to show productive ways of word – building process of the English language.

The scientific novelty of the work. Novelty of the qualification work is determined by the necessity o the study of affixation which form a large layer of word – building process. And studying the productive ways of affixes in Modern English.

The practical value. The practical value of the research is that material and the results of the given qualification work can serve the material for theoretical course of lexicology, stylistics, typology as well as can be used for practical lessons in translation, home reading, conversational practice and current events.

Literature overview. While writing present qualification work I used the books written by great scholars such as: The English Word by Arnold I.V, A Course of Lexicology by Ginzburg R.S, A Course of lexicology by Buronov J.B. Besides above mentioned literatures I took information from Internet, Work Book Encyclopedia.

The structure of the work. Present qualification work consists of Introduction, main part, conclusion and the list of used literatures.

#### **1. Main part**

#### **1.1 Morphemes, free and bound forms**

If we describe a word as an autonomous unit of language in which a particular meaning is associated with a particular sound complex and which is capable of a particular grammatical employment and able to form a sentence by itself we have the possibility to distinguish it from the other fundamental language unit, namely, the morpheme.

A morpheme is also an association of a given meaning with a given sound pattern. But unlike a word it is not autonomous. Morphemes occur in speech only as constituent parts of words, not independently, although a word may consist of a single morpheme. Nor are they divisible into smaller meaningful units. That is why the morpheme may be defined as the minimum meaningful language unit.

The term morpheme is derived from Gr morphe 'form'+ eme. Linguists to denote the smallest unit or the minimum distinctive feature have adopted the Greek suffix – eme. (Cf. phoneme, sememe). The morpheme is the smallest meaningful unit of form. A form in these cases is a recurring discrete unit of speech.

A form is said to be free if it may stand alone without changing its meaning; if not, it is a bound form, so called because it is always bound to something else. For example, if we compare the words sportive and elegant and their parts, we see that sport, sportive, elegant may occur alone as utterances, whereas eleg – – ive, – ant are bound forms because they never occur alone. A word is, by L. Bloomfield's definition, a minimum free form. A morpheme is said to be either bound or free. This statement' should be taken with caution. It means that some morphemes are capable of forming words without adding other morphemes: that is, they are homonymous to free forms.

According to the role they play in constructing words, morphemes are subdivided into roots and affixes. The latter are further subdivided, according to their position, into prefixes, suffixes and infixes, and according to their function and meaning, into derivational and functional affixes, the latter also called endings or outer formatives.

When a derivational or functional affix is stripped from the word, what remains is a stem (or a stem base). The stem expresses the lexical and the part of speech meaning.[[1]](#footnote-1) For the word hearty and for the paradigm heart (Sing.) – hearts (Pl.)[[2]](#footnote-2) the stem may be represented as heart– This stem is a single morpheme, it contains nothing but the root, so it is a simple stem. It is also a free stem because it is homonymous to the word heart.

A stem may also be defined as the part of the word that remains unchanged throughout its paradigm. The stem of the paradigm hearty – heartier – (the) heartiest is hearty– It is a free stem, but as it consists of a root morpheme and an affix, it is not simple but derived. Thus, a stem containing one or more affixes is a derived stem. If after deducing the affix the remaining stem is not homonymous to a separate word of the same root, we call it a bound stem. Thus, in the word cordial 'proceeding as if from the heart', the adjective-forming suffix can be separated on the analogy with such words as bronchia/, radial, social. The remaining stem, however, cannot form a separate' word by itself: it is bound. In cordially and cordiality, on the other hand, the stems are free.

Bound stems are especially characteristic of loan words. The point may be illustrated by the following French borrowings: arrogance, charity, courage, coward, distort, involve, notion, legible and tolerable, to give but a few.[[3]](#footnote-3) After the suffixes of these words are taken away the remaining elements are: arrog-, char-, cour-, cow-, – tort, – voIve, nat-, leg-, toler-, which do not coincide with any semantically related independent words.

Roots-are main morphemic vehicles of a given idea in a given language at a given stage of its development. A root may be also regarded as the ultimate constituent element which remains after the removal of all functional and derivational affixes and does not admit any further analysis. It is the common element of words within a word-family. Thus, – heart – is the common root of the following series of words: heart, hearten, dishearten, heartily, heartless, hearty, heartiness, sweetheart, heart-broken, kind-hearted, whole-heartedly, etc. In some of these, as, for example, in hearten, there is only one root; in others the root – heart is combined with some other root, thus forming a compound like sweetheart.

It will at once be noticed that the root in English is very often homonymous with the word. This fact is of fundamental importance as it is one of the most specific features of the English language arising from its general grammatical system on the one hand, and from its phonemic system on the other. The influence of the analytical structure of the language is obvious. The second point, however, calls for some explanation. Actually the usual phonemic shape most favoured in English is one single stressed syllable: bear, find, jump, land, man, sing, etc. This does not give much space for a second morpheme to add classifying Lexico-grammatical meaning to the lexical meaning already present in the root-stem, so the Lexico-grammatical meaning must be signaled by distribution. In the phrases a morning's drive, a morning's ride, a morning's walk the words drive, ride and walk receive the Lexico-grammatical meaning of. a noun not due to the structure of their stems, but because they are preceded by a noun in the Possessive case.

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

The above treatment of the root is purely synchronic, as we have taken into consideration only the facts of present-day English. But the same problem of the morpheme serving as the main signal of a given lexical meaning is studied in etymology, i.e. in that branch of linguistics which deals with the origin and development of words tracing them back to their earliest determinable source. When approached thus historically or diachronically the word heart will be classified as Common Germanic. One will look for cognates, i.e. words descended from a common ancestor. The cognates of heart are the Latin cor, whence cordial 'hearty', 'sincere', and so cordially and cordiality; also the Greek kardia, whence English cardiac condition. The cognates outside the English vocabulary are the Russian сердце, the German Herzt the Spanish corazon and somе other words.

To emphasize the difference between the synchronic and the diachronic treatment, we shall call the common element of cognate words in different languages not their root but their radical element. An interesting example of historical treatment may be found in Potter's book.[[4]](#footnote-4)1 Potter shows that the same radical element s-d is to be recognized in the English monosyllables sit, seat, soot and nest. The radical element is s-d, the vowels may be different. Potter distinguishes five grades: (1) – sed – as in Latin sedere, whence the English sedentary 'requiring much sitting', 'physically inactive' (sedentary work, sedentary person) and sediment 'the part that settles to the bottom of a liquid'. From sedare, sedat (the causative of sedere) the English vocabulary has sedate 'quiet', 'calm' and its derivatives: sedately, sedateness, sedative; supersede is 'to sit above', hence 'to replace'. This meaning developed, as Potter explains, at the time when seats at schools were assigned by quality of work, so if a pupil surpassed another he superseded him. The verb sit belongs to this group also, being developed from Common Germanic setjan. (2) The variant – – sod – is represented by the Past Tense sat, (3) [-se:d] – is observed in Mode seat<old Norse sǽti<; Common Germanic sǽt. (4) [-so:d-l as in English soot with its Northern pronunciation [su:t]<OE and ON sot 'that which sits or settles in the chimney’. (5) From the vanishing grade E-sad‑1 combined with the adverb ni-'down' which is cognate with the German nieder, the Indo-European noun ni-sd-os 'place where the bird sits down' is formed, whence both the English nest and the Russian гнездо. The Latin cognate is nidus, which is used in English as a scientific term 'place in which insects deposit eggs'; nidiflcation means 'nest building’.

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

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

A suffix is a derivational morpheme following the stem and forming a new derivative in a different part of speech or a different word class, cf. – en, – y, – less in hearten, hearty, heartless. When both the underlying and the resultant forms belong to the same part of speech, the suffix serves to differentiate between Lexico-grammatical classes by rendering some very general lexico-grammatical meaning. For instance, both – ify and – er are verb suffixes, but the first characterizes causative verbs, such as horrify, purify, whereas the second is mostly typical of frequentative verbs: flicker, shimmer, twitter and the like.

If we realize that suffixes render the most general semantic component of the word's lexical meaning by marking the general class of phenomena to which the referent of the word belongs, the reason why suffixes are as a rule semantically fused with the stem stands explained.

A prefix is a derivational morpheme standing before the root and modifying meaning, cf. to hearten – to dishearten. It is only with verbs and statives that a prefix may serve to distinguish one part of speech from another, like in earth n–unearth v, sleep n – asleep (stative).

Preceding a verb stem, some prefixes express the difference between a transitive and an intransitive verb: stay v and outstay (smb) v t. With a few exceptions prefixes modify the stem for time (pre-t post-), place (in-, ad-), negation (un-, dis-) and remain semantically rather independent of the stem.

An infix is an affix placed with in the word, like – n – in stand. The type is not productive.

An affix should not be confused with a combining form. A combining form is also a bound form but it can be distinguished from an affix historically by the fact that it is always borrowed from another language, namely, from Latin or Greek, in which it existed as a free form, i.e. a separate word, or also as a combining form. Thus, the combining form cyclo – and its variant cycl – are derived from the Greek word kuklos 'circle', giving the English word cyclic. The French adjective mat 'bad' gives the English combining form mat-, as in malnutrition. The same mean ing we observe in the Greek combining form kako – derived homkakos 'bad' (cacophony 'ill sound', cacoepy 'bad pronunciation’). They differ from all other borrowings in that they occur in compounds and derivatives that did not exist in their original language but were formed only in modern times in English, Russian, French, etc. Cf. polyclinic, polymer; stereophonic, stereoscopic, telemechanics, television. Combining forms are mostly international. Descriptively a combining form differs from an affix because it can occur as one constituent of a form whose only other constituent is an affix, as in cyclic[[5]](#footnote-5)1.

1.2 Aims and principles of morphemic and word-formation analysis

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

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

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

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

A correlation is a set of binary oppositions. It is composed of two subsets formed by the first and the second elements of each couple, i.e. opposition. Each element of the first set is coupled with exactly one element of the second set and vice versa. Each second element may be derived from the corresponding first element by a general rule valid for all members of the relation.[[6]](#footnote-6)1

Observing the proportional opposition:

child = woman = monkey = spinster = book

childish womanish monkeyish spinsterish bookish

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

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

impatience n = patience n = corpulence n

impatient a patient a corpulent a

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

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

inconvenience n pain n disgust n anger n delight n

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

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

*Analysis into immediate constitute*

A synchronic morphological analysis is most effectively accomplished by the procedure known as the analysis into immediate constituents[[7]](#footnote-7)1 (IC's). First suggested by L. Bloomfield[[8]](#footnote-8)2 it was later developed by many linguists.[[9]](#footnote-9)3 The main opposition dealt with is the opposition of stem and affix. It is a kind of segmentation revealing not the history of the word but its motivation, i.e. the data the listener has to go by in understanding it. It goes without saying that unmotivated words and words with faded motivation have to be remembered and understood as separate signs, not as combinations of other signs.

The method is based on the fact that a word characterized by morphological divisibility (analysable into morphemes) is involved in certain structural correlations. This means that, as Z. Harris puts it, «the morpheme boundaries in an utterance are determined not on the basis of considerations interior to the utterance, but on the basis of comparison with other utterances. The comparisons are controlled, i.e. we do not merely scan various random utterances but seek utterances which differ from our original one only in stated portions. The final test is in utterances which are only minimally different from ours. «[[10]](#footnote-10)1

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

If, however, we compare the adjective gentle with such adjectives as brittle, fertile, fickle, juvenile, little, noble, subtle and some more containing the suffix – le-ile added to a bound stem, they form a pattern for our case. The bound stem that remains is present in the following group: gentle, gently, gentleness, genteel, gentile, gentry, etc.

One might observe that our procedure of looking for similar utterances has shown that the English vocabulary contains the vulgar word gent that has been mentioned above, meaning 'a person pretending to the status of a gentleman' or simply 'man', but then there is no such structure as noun stem + – le, so the word gent should be interpreted as a homonym of the bound stem in question.

To sum up: as we break the word we obtain at any level only two IC's, one of which is the stem of the given word. All the time the analysis is based on the patterns characteristic of the English vocabulary. As a pattern showing the interdependence of all the constituents segregated at various stages we obtain the following formula:

Un – + {[(gent -+ – le) + – man] + – ly-}

Breaking a word into its immediate constituents we observe in each cut the structural order of the constituents (which may differ from their actual sequence). Furthermore we shall obtain only two constituents at each cut, the ultimate constituents, however, can be arranged according to their sequence in the word: un-un – + gent-+ – le +-man +-ly.

We can repeat the analysis on the word-formation level showing not only the morphemic constituents of the word but also the structural pattern on which it is built, this may be carried out in terms of proportional oppositions. The main requirements are essentially the same: the analysis must reveal patterns observed in other words of the same language, the stems obtained after the affix is taken away should correspond to a separate word, the segregation of the derivational affix is based on proportional oppositions of words having the same affix with the same lexical and lexico-grammatical meaning. Ungentlemanly, then, is opposed not to ungentleman (such a word does not exist), but to gentlemanly, Other pairs similarly connected are correlated with this opposition. Examples are:

ungentlemanly = unfair = unkind = unselfish

gentlemanly fair kind selfish

This correlation reveals the pattern un-+adjective stem.

The word-formation type is defined as derivation. The sense of un-as used in this pattern is either simply 'not', or more commonly 'the reverse of, with the implication of blame or praise.

The next step is similar, only this time it is the suffix that is taken away:

gentlemanly = womanly = scholarly

gentleman woman scholar

The series shows that these adjectives are derived according to the pattern noun stem-Mi/. The common meaning of the numerator term is 'characteristic of (a gentleman, a woman, a scholar).

The analysis into immediate constituents as suggested in American linguistics has been further developed in the above treatment by combining a purely formal procedure with semantic analysis. A semantic check means, for instance, that we can distinguish the type gentlemanly from the type monthly, although both follow the structural pattern noun stem+-ly. The semantic relationship is different, as – ly is qualitative in the first case and frequentative in the second, i.e. monthly means 'occurring every month'.

This point is confirmed by the following correlations: any adjective built on the pattern personal noun stem+-ly is equivalent to 'characteristic of or 'having the quality of the person denoted by the stem'.

gentlemanly→ having the qualities of a gentleman

masterly→ having the qualities of a master

soldierly → having the qualities of a soldier

womanly→ having the qualities of a woman

Monthly does not fit into this series, so we write:

monthly ↔ having the qualities of a month

On the other hand, adjectives of this group, i.e. words built on the pattern stem of a noun denoting a period of time +-ly are all equivalent to the formula 'occurring every period of time denoted by the stem':

monthly→ occurring every month

hourly → occurring every hour

yearly → occurring every year

Gentlemanly does not show this sort of equivalence, the transform is obviously impossible, so we write:

gentlemanly ↔\*occurring every gentleman

The above procedure of showing the process of word-formation is an elementary case of the transformational analysis, in which the semantic similarity or difference of words is revealed by the possibility or impossibility of transforming them according to a prescribed model and following certain rules into a different form, called their 'transform. The conditions of equivalence between the original form and the transform are prefixed. In our case the conditions to be fulfilled are the sameness of meaning and of the kernel morpheme. Transformational analysis will be discussed in the chapter on Methods of Linguistic Study. E.O. Nida[[11]](#footnote-11)1 discusses another complicated case: untruly might, it seems, be divided both ways, the IC's being either un-+truly or untrue-^–ly. – Yet observing other utterances we notice that the prefix un~ is but rarely combined with adverb stems and very freely with adjective stems; examples have already been given above. So we are justified in thinking that the IC's are untrue+-ly. Other examples of the same pattern are: uncommonly, unlikely.

There are, of course, cases, especially among borrowed words, that defy analysis altogether; such are, for instance, calendar, nasturtium or chrysanthemum. The analysis of other words may remain open or unresolved. Some linguists, for example, hold the view that words like pocket cannot be subjected to morphological analysis. Their argument is that though we are justified in singling out the element – et, because the correlation may be considered regular (hog: hogget, lock: locket), the meaning of the suffix being in both cases distinctly diminutive, the remaining part pock – cannot be regarded as a stem as it does not occur anywhere else. Others, like Prof. A, I. Smirnitsky, think that the stem is morphologically divisible if at least one of its elements can be shown to belong to a regular correlation.[[12]](#footnote-12)2

Controversial issues of this nature do not invalidate the principle of analysis into immediate constituents. The second point of view seems more convincing. To illustrate it, let us take the word hamlet 'a small village'. No words with this stem occur in present-day English, but it is clearly divisible diachronically, as it is derived from OFr hamelet of Germanic origin, a diminutive of hamel, and a cognate of the English noun home. We must not forget that hundreds of English place names end in – ham, like Shoreham, Wyndham, etc. Nevertheless, making a mixture of historical and structural approach will never do. If we keep to the second, and look for recurring identities according to structural procedures, we shall find the words booklet, cloudlet, flatlet, leaflet, ringlet, tоwnlet etc. In all these – let is a clearly diminutive suffix which does not contradict the meaning of hamlet. Smirnitsky's approach is, therefore, supported by the evidence afforded by the language material.and also permits us to keep within strictly synchronic limits.

Another example of the same nature discussed by a number of authors is the word ceiling. Does it contain one morpheme or two? It may, be argued that ceiling should at present be considered a root word, because the root ceil – is no longer current, and the speaker no longer understands it as a covering or lining of the roof, although the existence of the words covering and lining is, as we have seen, sufficient in itself to consider the word divisible. There are, however, other words in which the same suffix performs a similar function. Thus, in flooring, decking, piping, paving, etc, – ing is equivalent to the semi-affix – work, so that framing is synonymous with frame-work.

There is also one more procedure that helps differentiation and can be offered as a test. This is substitution within similar or identical contexts. This testifies in favour of taking ceiling as consisting of two morphemes, since one may contrast ceiling and flooring. S. Potter quotes the following example: Every apartment is floored with sandal and ceiled with nacre.

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

###### **2. Second part**

**2.1 Derivation and functional affixes**

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

Language being a system in which the elements of vocabulary and grammar are closely interrelated, our study of affixes cannot be complete without some discussion of the similarity and difference between derivational and functional morphemes.

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

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

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

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

Cowards die many times before their deaths;

The valiant never taste of death but once.

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

**2.2 Semi-Affixes and Boundary cases between derivation and inflection**

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

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

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

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

**2.3 Allomorphs**

The combining from allo-from Greek allo «other» is used in linguistic terminology to denote elements of a group whose members together constitute a structural unit of the language (allophones, allomorphs). Thus, for example, – ion / – tion / – sion / – ation are the positional variants of the same suffix. To show this they are taken together and separated by the sign/. They do not differ in meaning or function but shav a slight difference in sound from depending on the final phoneme of the preceding stem. They are considered as variants of one and the same morpheme and called its allomorphs. Descriptive linguistics deals with the regularities in the distributional relations among the features and elements of speech, i. e. their occurrence restively to each other within utterances. The approach to the problem is consequently based on the principles of distributional analysis.

An allomorph is defined as a positional variant of a morpheme occurring in a specific environment and so characterized by complementary distribution. Complementary distribution is said to take place hen two linguistic variants cannot appear in the same environment. Thus, stems ending in consonants take as a rule – ation (liberation); stems ending in pt, however, take – tion (corruption) and the final t becomes fused with the suffix.

Different morphemes are characterized by, contrastive distribution, i.e. if they occur in the same environment they signal different meanings. The suffixes – able and – ed, for instance are different morphemes, not allomorphs, because adjectives in – able mean «capable of being»: measurable «capable of being measured», whereas – ed as a suffix of adjectives has a resultant force: measured «marked by due proportion», as the measured beauty of classical Greek art; hence also «rhythmical» and «regular in movement», as in the measured from of verse, the measured tread.

In same cases the difference is not very clear-cut – ic and – ical, for example, are two different affixes, the first a simple one, the second a group affix; they are characterized by contrastive, distribution. That is, many adjectives have both the – ic and – ical form, often without a distinction in meaning COD points out, that the suffix – ical shows a vaguer connection with what is indicated by the stem: comic paper but comical story. However, the distinction between them is not very sharp.

Allomorphs will also occur among prefixes. Their form then depends on the initials of the stem with which the will assimilate. A prefix such as im-occurs before bilabials (impossible), its allomorph ir-before r (irregular), il-before l (illegal). It is in – before all other consonants and vowels (indirect, inability).

Two or more sound forms of a stem existing under conditions of complementary distribution may also be regarded as allomorphs, as, for instance, in long a: length n, excite y: excitation, n.

In American descriptive linguistics allomorphs are treated on a purely semantic basis, so that not only [iz] in dishes, [z] in dreams and [s] in dreams and [s] in books, which are allomorphs in the sense given above, but also formally unrelated [in] in oxen, the vowed modification in tooth: teeth and zero suffix in many sheep, are considered to be allomorphs of the same morpheme on the strength of the sameness of their grammatical meaning. This surely needs some serious re-thinking, as within that kind of approach morphemes cease to be linguistic units combining the two fundamental aspects of form and meaning and become pure abstractions. The very term morpheme (from the 6 reek morphe «form») turns in to a misnomer because all connection with form is lost. Allomorphs there sore are phonetically conditioned positional variants of the same derivational or functional morpheme (suffix, root or suffix) identical in meaning and function and differing in sound only insomuch, as their complementary distribution produces various phonetic assimilation effects.

**2.4 Suffixation**

**2.4.1 Classification of suffixes**

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

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

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

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

Noun-forming suffixes:

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

Adjective-forming suffixes:

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

Numeral-forming suffixes:

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

Verb-forming suffixes:

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

Adverb-forming suffixes:

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

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

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

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

Abstract nouns are signaled by the following suffixes:

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

See examples above.

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

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

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

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

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

The connotation of same diminutive suffixes is not one or endearment but of some outlandish elegance and novelty, particularly in the case of the borrowed suffix – ette (kitchenette, launderette, lecturette, maisonette, etc). The diminutive suffixes being not very productive, there is a tendency to express the same meaning by the semiaffix mini– : mini-bus, mini-car, mini-crisis, mini-skirt, etc. Which may be added to words denoting both objects situations.

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

**2.4.2 Suffixes and endings**

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

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

**2.4.3 The origin of suffixes**

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

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

The contact of English with various foreign languages has led to the adoption of countless foreign words. In the process, many derivative morphemes have also been introduced, suffixes as well as prefixes. As a consequence, we have many hybrid types of composites. We have to distinguish between two basing groups. A foreign word is combined with a native affix, as in dear-ness, un-button. Just as the in production of a foreign word is an essentially uncomplicated matter, so is its combination with a native derivative element. As no structural problem is involved in the use of a foreign lexical unit, it can be treated like native words. This is the reason why native prefixes and suffixes were added to French words almost immediately after the words had been introduced. Suffixes such as – ful, – less, ness were early used with French words so we find faithful, faithless, clearness and others recorded by 1300. The case is different with foreign affixes added to native words. Here, the assimilation of a structural pattern is involved, not merely the adoption of a lexical unit. Before the foreign affix can be used, a foreign syntagma must have come to be familiar with speakers so that the pattern of analysis may be imitated and the dependent morpheme be used with native words. This is much more complicated. When it does happen, such formations are found much later than those of the first type. This is to be regarded as a general linguistic phenomenon. It explains why combinations of the types break-age, hindr-ance, yeoman-ry crop up much later and the less numerous. The early assimilation of – able is exceptional. Some foreign affixes, as – ance, – al (type arrival), ity have never become productive with native words.

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

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

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

Another AE suffix is-eteria with meaning «shop, store, establishment». The starting-point is prob. Mexican Spanish cafeteria which passed into American English (first used about 1898). As it was immediately analyzable in American English, with the first element interpreted as an allomorph of [kafi] it attected a good number of words (chiefly since 1930). Mencken has about 50 words, such as basketeria, caketeria, candyteria, cleaneteria, luncheteria, drygoodsteria, drugteria, fruiteria, shoeteria, chccolateria, furnitureteria. The original implication was «place where articles are sold on the self-service plant» (so in the recent coinage gas-a-teria, Life International). The only common word, however, is cafeteria, stressed as indicated.

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is yet a third way in which suffixes may arise. Words of apparently only one constituent element may develop derivative morphemes. If we take such a word as hamburger, we observe that it has attracted other coining like cheeseburger, bufburger, fishburger. The analysis of the word cannot be, as one may feel tempted to assume, that of ham and burger as there is no ham in the humburger. So the word cheeseburger has not arisen from re-interpretation. What has taken place is a shortening of the morpheme hamburger into a fore-clipped – burger, this part being taken as representative of the semantic elements contained in hamburger. The suffix cheeseburger there fore is a clipped word for non-existent cheese hamburger. Parallel to – burger words are such in – furture, as shrimpfurder, krautfurter, chicenfurter. In election campaign words such as Hoovercrat, Willkiecrat, – crat was short for democrat. The word telegram 1852 gave rise to cablegram, radiogram, pidgeongram, lettergram where – gram is short for telegram/ Tnr diminutive suffix – ling prginated in the same way. Wolfling «young wolf» is a blend pf wol fand, young-ling «young animal»

**2.4.4 Nominal and verbal suffixes**

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

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

A new words are needed with regard to adverbal derivatives. Adeverbal derivative is not fundamentally different from a cpd whose first member is a verb stem, so as in the case of denominal suffixes, a great number of meanings are possible. In practice, however, the possibilities are much restricted. Deverbal suffixes express grammatical functions than semantic concepts, and the usual implications are «act, fact, instance of…» (arrival, quidanse, warning), sometimes «state of…» (starvation, bewilderment), «agent» (personal or impersonal: baker, eraser, disinfectant), «personal object» (direct or indirect, only with – ee, transferee, draftee), «object of result» (breakade, savings), «plase» (settlement, brewery, lodgings). Similar considerations apply to derivation by a zero morpheme (pickpocket, blackaut, look).

**2.5 The valency of affixes and stems**

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

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

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

Their structural significance is clear if we realize that to describe the system of a given vocabulary one must know the typical patterns on which its words are coined. To achieve this it is necessary not only to know the morphemes of which they consist but also to reveal their recurrent+ regular combinations and the relationship existing between them. This approach ensures a rigorously linguistic basis for the identification of lexico-grammatical classes within each part of speech. In the English language these classes are so far little studied, although inquiry info this problem seems very promising and begins to affect attention.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A good example is furnished by the suffix – ish, as a suffix of adjectives. The combining possibilities of the suffix – ish are vast but not unlimited. Boyish and waspish are used, where as enmesh and aspish are not. The constraints here are of semantic nature. It is regularly present in the names of nationalities as for example: British, Irish, Spanish. When added to noun stems, it formes adjectives of the type «having the nature of with a moderately derogatory colouring» bookish, churlish, monkeyish, sheepish, swinish. Chidish has a derogatory twist of meaning, the adjective with a good sense is childlike. A man may be said to behave with a childish petulance, but with a childlike simplicity. Compare also womanly having the qualities befitting a woman, as in womanly compassion, womanly grace, womanly tact, with the derogatory womanish effeminate as in: Womanish tears, traitors to love and duty. (Cole ridge).

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

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

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

The suffixes – ion (and its allomorphs) and – or are noun-forming suffixes combined with verbal stems. The opposition between them serves to distinguish between two subclasses of noun abstract noun and agent nouns, e.g. accumulation: accumulator; action:actor; election:elector; liberation:liberator, oppressor; vibration:vibrator, etc. The abstract noun in this case may mean action, state or result of action remaining within the same subclass. Thus, cultivation denotes the process of cultivating (most often of cultivating the soil) and the state of being cultivated. Things may be somewhat different, with the suffix – or because a cultivator is a person who cultivates and a machine for breaking up ground, loosening the earth round growing plants and destroying weeds. Thus two different subclasses are involved: one of animate beings, the other of inanimate things. They differ not only semantically but grammatically too: there exists a regular opposition between animate and inanimate nouns in English: the first group is substituted by he or she, and the second by the pronoun it. In derivation this opposition of animate personal noun to all other noun is in some cases sustained by such suffixes as – ard/ – art (braggart), – ist (novelist) and a few others, but most often neutralized. The term neutralization may be defined as c temporary suspension of an otherwise functioning opposition. Neutralization as in the word Cultivator, is also observed with such suffixes as – ant, – er that also occur in agent nouns, both animate and inanimate. CF. accountant a person who keeps accounts and coolant a cooling substance; fitter mechanic who fits up all kinds of metalwork and shutter (in photography) device regulating the exposure to light of a plate of film: runner a messenger and a millstone.

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

**2.6 Prefixation**

**2.6.1 Prefixes of native and foreign origin**

We call prefixes such particle s as can be prefixed to full words but are them selves not words with an independent existence. Native prefixes have developed out of independent words. Their number is small: a-, be-, un-, (negative and reversative), fore-, mid-and (partly) mis-, Prefixes of foreign origin came into the language ready made, so to speak. Tey are due to syntagmatic loans from other languages: when a number of analyzable foreign words of the same strucure had been introduced into the language, the pattern could be extended to new formations. i. e. the prefix then became a derivative morpheme. Some prefixes have second le-rely developed uses as independent words, as counter, sub, arch which does not invalidate the principle that primarily they were particles with no independent existence. The same phenomenon occurs with suffixes also.

**2.6.2 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 there particles begins in the 16th century, but really develops with the progress of modern science only, i.e. in the 18th and esp the 19th century. With these particles there is a practical difficulty. They may represent 1) such elements as are prefixes (in the above meaning) in Latin or 6 reek, as a – (acaudal etc.), semi – (semi-annual), 2) such elements as exist as prepositions or particles with an independent word existence, as intra, circum / hyper, para, 3) such as are the stems of full words in Latin or 6 reek, as multi-, omni-/ astro-, hydro.

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

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

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

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

**2.6.3 The conceptual relations underlying prefixed words**

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

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

**2.6.4 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 emplace, encage) all prefixes have stress. To illustrate this important point a comparison with non-composite words of similar phonetic structure will be useful. If we compare the words re-full and repeat, morphemic re- / ri / in refill 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-full, though basically a middle stress, can take the form of heavy stress where as phonemic absence of stress can never rise to presence of stress. They refilled the tank may become they refilled the tank (for the sake of contrast) or they 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.

**2.7 Productive and non-productive affixes**

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

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

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

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

**Conclusion**

Affixation is the formation of words with the help of derivational affixes. Affixation is subdivided into prefixation and suffixation. Ex. if a prefix «dis» is added to the stem «like» (dislike) or suffix «ful» to «law» (lawful) we say a word is built by an affixation. Derivational morphemes added before the stem of a word are called prefixes (Ex. un+ like) and the derivational morphemes added after the stem of the word are called suffixes (hand+ ful). Prefixes modify the lexical meaning of the stem meaning i. e. the prefixed derivative mostly belongs to the same part of speech. Ex. like (v.) – dislike (v.).kind (adj.) – unkind (adj.) but suffixes transfer words to a different part of speech, ex. teach (v.) – teacher (n.). But new investigations into the problem of prefixation in English showed interesting results. It appears that the traditional opinion, current among linguists that prefixes modify only the lexical meaning of words without changing the part of speech is not quite correct. In English there are about 25 prefixes which can transfer words to a different part of speech. Ex. – head (n) – behead (v), bus(n) – debus(v), brown (adj) – embrown(u), title(n) – entitle(v), large (adj). – enlarge (v), camp(n). – encamp(u), war(n). – prewar (adj). If it is so we can say that there is no functional difference between suffixes and prefixes. Besides there are linguists1 who treat prefixes as a part of word-composition. They think that a prefix has.he same function as the first component of a compound word. Other linguists2 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 suffixes-ness, – ish, – dom, – ful, – less, – ship and prefixes be-, mis-, un-, fore-, etc are of native origin. But the affixes – able, – ment, – ation, – ism, – ist, re-, anti-, dis-, etc are of borrowed origin. They came from the Greek, Latin and French languages. Many of the suffixes and prefixes of native origin were independent words. In the course of time they have lost their independence and turned into derivational affixes. Ex. – dom, – hood. /O.E. had – state, rank, – dom (dom condemn, – ship has developed from noun «scipe» (meaning: state); the adjective forming suffix «-ly» has developed from the noun «lic» (body, shape). The prefixes out-, under-, over etc also have developed out of independent words.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2) characterized by (rainy, cloudy)

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

Thus, affixes have different characteristic features.

The Comparative analysis of the English language with other languages showed that English is not so rich in suffixes as, for example, the Uzbek language. The total number of suffixes is 67 in English but the Uzbek suffixes are 171 and, vice versa, prefixation is more typical to the English language than Uzbek (Compare: 79:8)

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Diminutive | Suffixes |
| In English | In Uzbek |
| -ie (birdie), – let (cloudlet), – ting (wolf ling), – ette (mountainette), – ock (hillock), – y (Jony), – et (whippet), – kin (tigerkin), | -akay (yol-yolakay), alak(do’ngalak), – gina(qizgina), jon(dadajon) |

As compared with the Uzbek language the negative affixes are more widely used in English.

In Uzbek: – siz (qo’lsiz), be – (berahm), no – (noxush)

In English: – less – (handless), a-, an – (anomalous); – un – (unkind) dis – (dislike), anti – (antibiotic), de – (decode), in – (innocent) ir – (irregular), im – (impossible), non – (nondeductive)

Though the number of Uzbek prefixes is very few (they are – 8) they are capable of changing words from one part of speech into another. Ex. adab. (n.)» – boadab(adj), hosil (n) – serhosil(adj)

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

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

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

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

But recent investigations prove that there are no productive and non-productive affixes because each affix plays a certain role in wordformation. There are only affixes with different degrees of productivity, besides that productivity of affixes should not be mixed up with their frequency of occurence in speech. Frequency of affixes is characterised by the occurence of an affix in a great number of words. But productivity is the ability of a given suffix or prefix to make new words. An affix may be frequent but not productive, ex, the suffix «-ive» is very frequent but non-productive.

Some linguists distinguish between two types of prefixes:

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

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

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

Prefixes and suffixes may be classified according to their meaning.

1) prefixes of negative meaning such as; de-, non-, un – in-, ir-, il-, im-, dis – (ex. defeat, decentralize, disappear, impossible, discomfort etc); 2) prefixes, denoting space and time relations: after, under-, for-, pre-, post-, over-, super – (ex, prehistory, postposition, superstructure, overspread, after¬noon, forefather); 3) prefixes denoting relation of an action such as: re – (ex. reread, remake).

Like prefixes the suffixes are also classified according to their meaning:

1) the agent suffixes: – er, – or, – ist, – ee etc. (baker, sailor, typist, employee); 2) appurtenance: – an, – ian, – ese (Arabian, Russian, Chinese, Japanese); 3) collectivity: – age, – dom, – hood, – ery (peasantry, marriage, kingdom, childhood); 4) dimi-nutiveness: – let, – ock, – ie etc (birdie, cloudlet, hillock); 5) quan-titativeness1: – ful, – ous, – y, – ive, – ly, – some.

Suffixes may be divided into different groups according to what part of speech they form:

1) noun – forming, i. e. those which are form nouns: – er, – dom, – ness, – ation, – ity, – age, – ance. – ence, – ist, – hood, – ship, – ment etc; 2) adjective-forming: – able/, – ible/. – uble, – al, – ian, – ese, – ate, – ed, – ful, – ive, – ous, – y etc; 3) numeral-forming: – teen, – th, – ty etc; 4) verb-forming: – ate, – en, – ify, – ize etc.; 5) adverb-forming: – ly, – ward, – wise etc.

Suffixes may be added to the stem of different parts of speech. According to this point of view they may be:

1) those added to verbs: – er, – ing, – ment, – able; 2) those added to nouns: – less, – ish, – ful, – ist, some etc; 3) those added to adjectives: – en, – ly, – ish, – ness etc.

Suffixes are also classified according to their stylistic reference: 1) suffixes, which characterize neutral stylistic reference: – able, – er, – ing (ex. dancer, understandable (helping); 2) suffixes which characterize a certain stylistic reference:

– oid, – form, – tron etc (astroid, rhomboid, cruciform, cyclo¬tron etc).
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