PREFIXES AND PREFIXED WORDS ARE ONE OF THE WAYS TO ENRICH THE VOCABULARY BASE OF THE LANGUAGE

Khojiyeva Mekhrangiz Gayrat kizi,
Master's student,
Uzbekistan state world languages university.
Supervisor: ***Khujaniyazova Khilola Turayevna,***
Independent researcher, UZSWLU

Abstract

In order to provide prefixed words' morphological representations structure, this article introduces prefix transparency and phonological consistency. Despite the fact that various research have examined the significance of root semantics in the encoding of morphological information, none have examined the semantic transparency of affixes and their contribution to the overall representation of the word. Although the degree of phonological overlap between morphologically related words has been evaluated in earlier studies, the effect of a phonological alternation on the identification of morphemes with a task that does not present both forms of the root has not yet been investigated.

Key words: pronunciation, stress, prefix, suffix, affixation, types of prefixes, prefixed words;

Prefixes in English differ from suffixes in a number of ways, which makes research on them intriguing. These variations imply that representational assertions based on research on suffixed words may not necessarily apply to prefixed terms. Prefixes and suffixes vary from each other in that they come before the base whereas suffixes come after. Therefore, prefixes may acoustically or visually conceal the word's root meaning at the beginning of the term. Having a prefix that hides the start of the base might make it very difficult to recognize words. To get to the root, the fundamental building block of words, all prefixes must be removed. The impact of prefixes and suffixes on the base is another distinction between the two.

In contrast to prefixed bound root words, bound roots that undergo suffixation typically retain more consistent semantic substance throughout their occurrences. For instance, compare the instances of the suffix "aggress-" (aggression, aggressive, aggressor) to those of the suffix "-ceive" (receive, conceive, mislead). Suffixes are connected to a number of formal characteristics, such as a change in the base's phonological shape or grammatical category. Some suffixes routinely cause phonological changes or shifts in emphasis, while others consistently modify the root's part of speech. Prefixes, however, serve no use in English; shape and meaning were

thought to be the two most important components of a morpheme. Bound roots, however, presented an issue for this theory.

The assertion that receive and deceive are not ostensibly related to one another implies that a complex analysis of these words is at odds with definitions of the morpheme that depend on meaning, but a complex analysis of these words is not at odds with morphological theories that do not consider meaning to be a necessary component of a morpheme. However, with prefixed bound root words, the root is not the sole source of meaning; the prefix can also provide a recognisable meaning element that can help distinguish the word as polymorphemic. For instance, the verb recede, which means "to move back or away," does appear to include a semantic component that is compatible with the prefix "re-'"s meaning.

The psychological literature has typically ignored the prefix, which is a source of meaning. To determine if the prefix's transparency affects the morphological information provided in words with prefixes, we compare bound root and free stem words with both semantically transparent and opaque prefixes. Bound root words frequently lack a phonologically consistent root, just as they frequently lack a semantically transparent root. When they are suffixed, root morphemes like "-ceive" alternate with "-cept." If a morpheme is regarded as a unit of both form and meaning, then peculiar phonological changes, such as those between the words receive and reception, may hide the fact that these words have a common ancestor. On the other hand, the fact that numerous words alternate in this manner, such as mislead and conceive, may help identify a common root morpheme in these terms. In order to determine whether the presence or absence of an alternation affects the representation of morphological structure, prefixed words with alternating bound roots, like receive, are contrasted with prefixed words with non-alternating bound roots, like resist.

Dislike is formed up of the prefix "dis" and the root "like," for example. Prefixes like de-, dis-, il-, re-, and un- are typical ones. Some roots, like like, may be used as a standalone word, whereas others, like renounce and condemn, cannot be used as a standalone word. Some words don't highlight the prefix and only emphasise it when there is a clear contrast. Compare:

A: Do you enjoy eating an ice-cream?

B: No, I really dis**LIKE** it.

A: I thought you LIKED eating it.

B: No, I really **DIS**like it.

Words like these are typically represented in phonetic transcriptions as having just one (main) stressed syllable, such as dislike (/dslak/). Un'easy, un'pack, re'place, de'grade, de'flect, and de'fraud are other words that sound like hate. Decompose, Consider, and Unaffection are some more words with these prefixes that place secondary accent on the prefix. Prefixes like de- and re- are typically pronounced as

/d/ and /r/ if they are unstressed and as /di:/ and /ri:/ if they are stressed. Compare the following terms: degrade (/d/), decompose (/di:), reclaim (/r/), and consider (/ri:). When de- and re- prefixes are used as verbs and nouns, respectively, they are often pronounced with an unstressed // in the prefix when the word is a verb. Compare this with the statement: Interest is anticipated to decline, yet interest has already declined. Depending on whether the prefix re- denotes 'again' or not, several words beginning with the letter re have the same spelling but a distinct emphasis and meaning. Compare []:

recover /riːˈkʌvə / (= cover again); – /rɪˈkʌvə/ (= get well)
recount /riːˈkaʊnt/(= count again); – /rɪˈkaʊnt/ (= describe)
reform /riːˈfɔːm / (= form again); – /rɪˈfɔːm/ (= improve)
remark /riː ˈm ɑː k / (= mark again); – /rɪˈmɑːk/ (=comment)
resort /ˌr iː ˈz ɔː t/(= sort again); – /rɪˈzɔːt/ (= turn to)
resign /ˌr iː ˈs aɪ n/ (= sign again); – /rɪˈzaɪn/ (= give up a job)

Re-cover and Re-count are examples of words spelled with a hyphen where the prefix re- denotes "again." Prefixes that are native, non-native, and nativized can all be distinguished. Native and nativized prefixes also attach to native base words, but non-native prefixes only attach to non-native base words and non-native roots []. Although prefixes typically syllabify separately, some non-native prefixes can be read as creating a single word with their parent word. Prefixes often do not receive main stress, although if they do contain a complete vowel, they frequently receive secondary stress.

Non-native prefixes never carry primary word stress. Yet they can carry secondary stress if there is at least one intervening syllable between the first syllable of the prefix and the primary stress of the word. In that way, non-native prefixes behave like mono-morphemic words; such words have a predictable initial secondary stress – with the exception of cases in which the second syllable carries primary stress, as adjacent stresses within a prosodic word are disallowed and always have to be split by at least one unstressed syllable. This predicts that monosyllabic prefixes should receive secondary stress if their base word does not have initial stress, while polysyllabic prefixes with a stressable first syllable should always receive initially stress on that syllable. This is indeed the case. Consider first the prefix re-. For instance, the primary stressed syllable of the word follows the prefix in the term reductie [redk.si] reduction. The vowel in the prefix re- can potentially be changed to schwa [rdk.si], indicating that the major stress follows the prefix immediately. As a result, the prefix remains unstressed. The initial syllable of representeer [re.pre.zn.ter] represent, however, cannot be reduced since the main stress is not next to the prefix. Instead, secondary stress can be allocated to the syllable because there won't be a stress conflict. It is sometimes debatable whether these prefixed forms still qualify as prefixes or whether they instead combine with their base word to produce a single word since

their phonological makeup typically matches that of monomorphemic words and because their meaning is opaque.

The capacity of non-native and nativized prefixes to combine with native base words is the key difference between them. Nativized prefixes can mix with native base words, but non-native prefixes never do; some of them can even appear as separate words, as for instance anti-, co-, contra-, des-, ex-, inter-, meta-, non-, para, pro-, semi-, sub-, super-, ultra- []. Notably, these prefixes always receive primary stress when combined with nouns, and they never syllabify together with a noun; this indicates that, unlike non-native prefixes, they are independent prosodic words and form compounds with their base words. Note that in adjectival compounds, nativized prefixes do not attract primary compound stress – in such cases, primary compound stress falls on the adjective in predicative position, while it shifts leftwards in attributive position.

As mentionaed in sources of linguistics native prefixes are divided into three main classes with respect to their stress behavior. Because they get primary compound stress at least when paired with nouns, which exhibit the vast majority of important words, some native prefixes behave like independent prosodic words when they are joined with nouns. On the other hand, there are native prefixes that don't have stress; they form verbs and can even be prepositions or particles. The word "intermediate" refers to a tiny subset of prefixes that, when combined with base verbs, fall somewhere between those that tend to avoid stress and those that tend to draw it. These prefixes frequently join nouns and draw primary focus [].They behave as noun compounds as a result, and they experience early compound stress. Prefixes that never cause stress fall into one of two categories. The first one consists of prefixes with a schwa as their only vowel; as schwas never convey stress, neither do these prefixes. Prefixes that independently appear as prepositions make up the second category of native prefixes with lower levels of stress. They all have a whole vowel, therefore they may all be used to create independent prosodic words. We may infer that they do not behave like most nominal compounds since they do not experience primary compound stress. Their stress pattern is similar to the weak-strong pattern that is seen in many adjectival compounds. However, unlike adjective compounds, which frequently exhibit stress changes in the attributive position, prefixed verbal forms do not.

When the verbal prefixes her-, over- and onder- combined with verbal bases, the prefixes her-, over- and onder- sometimes carry stress and sometimes they do not: they attract stress if the first syllable of the following base verb does not carry main stress but in cases in which the base verb shows initial stress, stress is realized on the base verb [].

In conclusion, prefixes and suffixes are sometimes referred to as affixation. By modifying or altering a base word's meaning, affixation produces new English words.

Learning vocabulary is a crucial component of studying a second language, something that students, teachers, material authors, and academics can all agree on. The ideal way to acquire language effectively, however, is still unknown, in part because it relies on so many different variables. The degree to which the target language is comparable to the learner's native tongue determines how easy or difficult it will be to acquire that language. As a result, it would appear that learning vocabulary with affix systems or patterns would be considerably more successful for language learners than simply memorization. Another advantage of employing affixation procedures is that they enable students to organically broaden their understanding of grammatical or semantic categories. As a result, affixation-based education and vocabulary development should be seriously considered by English language teachers and students.

REFERENCES:

1. Anderson, S. R. (1992). A-morphous morphology. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
2. Anglin, J. M. (1993). Vocabulary development: A morphological analysis. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 58(10), 1–166.
3. Carlisle, J. F. (2000). Awareness of the structure and meaning of morphologically complex words: Impact on reading. Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 12, 169–190.
4. Carlisle, J. F., & Stone, C. A. (2003). The effect of morphological structure on children's reading derived words in English. In E. M. Assink & D. Sandra (Eds), Reading complex words: Cross-language studies (pp. 27–52). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
5. Chall, J. S., Jacobs, V., & Baldwin, L. E. (1990). The reading crisis: Why poor children fall behind. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
6. Hudson, T. (2007). Teaching second language reading. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. Ku, Y. M., & Anderson, R. C. (2003). Development of morphological awareness in Chinese and English. Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 16, 399–422.
8. Ku, Y. M., & Anderson, R. C. (2006). Morphological awareness and learning to read: A crosslanguage perspective. Educational Psychologist, 41, 161–180.
9. Laufer, B., & Nation, P. (1999). A vocabulary-size test of controlled productive ability. Language Testing, 16(1), 33–51.