

## AFFIXATION. THE CLASSIFICATION OF AFFIXES

Nosirova Shakhloxon Yokubjon qizi

**Annotation:** *This article provides information about the different ways of affixation and the views of scientists on this matter. Some information about learning and knowing affixation as an independent network is presented.*

**Key words:** *techniques, prefixes, phonetic, definition, affixes, reflects, exical, grammatical.*

It is obvious that every language system has their own ways of forming words. Some techniques of producing words in modern English can be used to create new words whenever the need arises-these are known as productive ways of forming words-while others can no longer produce new words and are known as non-productive or unproductive ways of forming words. Affixation, for example, has been a productive technique of constructing words since the Old English period; on the other hand, sound-interchange must have been a word-building means at one time, but in Modern English it serves merely to distinguish between distinct classes and forms of words and gives a certain type of meaning.

The four most frequent prefixes account for 97 percent of prefixed words in printed school English divided prefixes into two groups:<sup>20</sup>

- 1) prefixes with negative meaning:
- 2) prefixes expressing relation to place, time, degree.

To the first group of prefixes belong *un-, in-, il-, im-, ir-, dis-, mis-, non-, de-, anti-* and *counter-* unfamiliar, unseen, incapable, immoral, dislike, disapprove, to misunderstand, to misprint, non-religious, non-stop, nongovernmental, degasify, devalue, deforest, anticolonial, anti-tank, counterblow, counter-revolution etc.

Prefixes belonging to the second group, are divided into 5 subgroups by P.V. Tsaryeva and she calls them:

1) prefixes expressing existence out of something, excess, superiority, redundancy of something. To this subgroup belong words with such prefixes as *out-, extra-, ultra- and trans-: outdoor, outsider, extrahuman, extraformal, ultracomplex, ultra-English, transmarine.*

- 2) prefixes expressing situation over(upon) something, excessiveness of something;

For example; *overproduce, oversadly, overdeepen, superpower, supernatural, superprofit;*

- 3) prefixes expressing situation;

Under something, lower something, subordination to someone: *underbuy, undertime, underground, subfloor, subway, subtractive, subtype* etc.

4) prefixes expressing presence of something between some things, relation with something: *inter-* for example: *interlibrary* (Кутубхоналараро (алоқа, алмашинув), *interurban* (икки шаҳар ўртасида турувчи), *interdependent* (ўзаро бир бирига боғлиқ, тобе) *interactive* (интерфаол), *intercontinental rockets* (қитъалараро ракеталар);<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Turniyozov NK “Introduction to the derivation syntax of the Uzbek language Samarkand- 1990. –P 5.

<sup>21</sup> Butayev Sh. English-Uzbek, Uzbek-English dictionary “O’qituvchi”, Toshkent. 2013. –B 23.

5) prefixes expressing fore going, posteriority in time; pre-, post-: prearrange, preborn, preseason, post-war, post-graduate, post-roman.

From the point of view of etymology, affixes can be subdivided into two main groups: the native affixes and the borrowed affixes. The term affix refers both to suffixes and prefixes. By native affixes we mean original suffixes and prefixes that existed in English in the old English period and formed from old English words. We know that affixes are bound forms but some of them developed from free forms once upon a time. To such kind of affixes belong “-dom”, “-hood”, “-lock”, “-ful”, “-less”, “-like”, “-ship”. Suffixes “-dom” and “-hood” developed from the word “state”. They were the second elements of compound words. Later on they lost their status of being a stem and became suffixes. The same can be said about the following suffixes and prefixes: “-dom”, “-hood”, “-d”, “-ed”, “-en”, “-fold”, “-ful”, “-ing”, “-ish”, “un-”, “over-”, “under-”, “in-”, “de-”, “ex-”, “re-” are Romanic, “sym-”, “hyper-” are Greek prefixes<sup>22</sup>.

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 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 of 5 prefixes may be referred to exclusively verb-forming (*en-*, *be-*, *un-*, etc.).

2) As to the type of lexical-grammatical character of the base they are added to into: (a) deverbal, e.g. rewrite, outstay, overdo, etc.; (b) denominal, e.g. unbutton, detrain, ex-president, etc. and (c) deadjectival, e.g. uneasy, biannual, etc. It is interesting 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, untold, 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-*, *in-*, *dis-*, *a-*, *im-/in-/ir-* (e.g. employment (unemployment), politician (non-politician), correct (incorrect), advantage (disadvantage), moral (amoral), legal (illegal), etc.); (b) reversative of privative prefixes, such as *un-*, *de-*, *dis-*, *dis-* (e.g. tie (untie), centralize (decentralize), connect (disconnect), etc.); (c) pejorative prefixes, such as *mis-*, *mal-*, *pseudo-* (e.g. calculate (miscalculate), function (malfunction), scientific (pseudo-scientific), etc.); (d) prefixes of time and order, such as *fore-*, *pre-*, *post-*, *ex-* (e.g. see (foresee), war (pre-war), Soviet (post-Soviet), wife (ex-wife), etc.); (e) prefix of repetition *re-* (e.g. do (redo), type (retype), etc.); (f) locative prefixes such as *super-*, *sub-*, *inter-*, *trans-* (e.g. market (supermarket), culture (subculture), national (international), Atlantic (trans-Atlantic), etc.).<sup>23</sup>

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

<sup>22</sup> Arnold I. The English word: Moscow-Leningrad, 1966.

<sup>23</sup> Guinzburg R.S. and others. A course in Modern English lexicology. Moscow, 1979.

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 (e. g. unnatural, unlace, outgrow, override, redo, 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, ultra-violence, 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 *over-* occurs 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.

However, not all living derivational affixes of Modern English possess the ability to coin new words. Some of them may be employed to coin new words on the spur of the moment, others cannot, so that they are different from the point of view of their productivity. Accordingly they fall into two basic classes — productive and non-productive word-building affixes.

#### REFERENCE:

1. Butayev Sh. English-Uzbek, Uzbek-English dictionary “O’qituvchi”, Toshkent. 2013. –B 23.
2. Guinzburg R.S. and others. A course in Modern English lexicology. Moscow, 1979.
3. Turniyozov NK “Introduction to the derivation syntax of the Uzbek language Samarkand- 1990. –P 5.
4. Arnold I. The English word: Moscow-Leningrad, 1966.