

THE MORPHOLOGICAL PRODUCTIVITY OF THE AFFIXES IN MODERN ENGLISH

Liudmyla Chumak (Zhytomyr, Ukraine)

By productivity, that has always been one of the most debating topics in derivational morphology, we understand the link between competence and morphological rules work. Morphological productivity is one of the key issues in the study of derivational morphology, as it depends on such factors the user of the language possesses as: the individual language experience with the words of the language, extraordinary memory capacities, conversational skills and communicative needs, the stylistic registers available in the language community, personal language habits and the possibility to interact with others.

Morphological productivity is essential to the study of word formation. There are many different ways a word can be formed. Words formed by productive processes are often the new complex words that are coined by using affixes. According to Bauer [1], an affix is productive if it can be used to create new words, as a productive affix should be able to form new words in today's language. Productive elements in a language compete with each other for productivity. There are several quantitative measures that are used for determining the degree to which an affix is productive. An obvious measure is the size of the set of words containing the affix. The more words an affix attaches to, the more productive that affix is.

In English, of the 20,000 most commonly used words, 20% are formed with prefixes and among these words 15 prefixes comprise 82% of the prefixes used [2]. The most frequent prefixes in the corpus are: *un-*, *re-*, *de-*, *pre-* and *dis-* while for suffixes, the most frequent occurrence are *-able/ible*, *-al/ial*, *-er/or*, *-ion*, *-ly*, *-ness*, *-y*. For prefixes used to form new words in academic English, *co-*, *dia-*, *fore-*, *hydro-*, *inter-*, *iso-*, *poly-*, *sub-*, *trans-*, *thermo-*, *under-*, are found to be the most frequently used.

The scientists [3] proved that the productivity of a written form suffix may vary from formal spoken, and informal spoken language. Suffixes tended to be most productive in written language, and least productive in informal spoken language. The linguists consider that among functions of derivational morphology the so-called reference (syntactic recategorisation, lexical innovation) function and the labeling (transposition) function are the most important ones [4: 596; 1: 24]. It means that new words must have the capacity of labeling a new concept or referent (i.e. to create a (new) name for a thing or an event) and be able to condensate the information for the purposes of making reference easier to things mentioned in the previous discourse. The referential function, i.e. the creation of lexical innovations is typical of certain kind of abstract nouns, for example the derivatives in *-ness* ("*live*"-*ness*, "*married*"-*ness*, *excessive* -*ness*, "*mad*"-*ness*, "*with-it*"-*ness*, "*awesome*"-*ness*, "*spongy*"-*ness*); *-ity*

(*abnormality*); -like (“*V*”-**like**, “*candide*”-**like**, “*lost*”-**like**, “*chapel*”-**like**, “*I Spy*”-**like**, “*Twin Peaks*”-**like**, “*survivor*”-**like**, “*Titanic*”-**like**); -ment (*appeasement*, *advancement*, *adornment*, *thecee-ment*); -(t)ion (*completion*, *indentation*, *dehydration*).

So, the following examples prove that morphological productivity provides mechanisms for generating new words that are unintentional, unlimited and regular [5] and how the broad notion of creativity is realized in language.

References

1. Bauer, Laurie 2001. Morphological productivity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. xiii + 245.
2. Roe, Betty D., Barbara D. Stoodt, and Paul C. Burns. Secondary School Reading Instruction: The Content Areas. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1987. – 512 p.
3. Plag I., Dalton-Puffer C., Baayen R.H. (1999). Productivity and register. Journal of English Language and Linguistics vol.(3). Pp. 209–228.
4. Kastovsky D. 1986. The problem of productivity in word formation. In: Linguistics 24. pp. 585-600.
5. Evert S., Lüdeling A. Measuring morphological productivity: Is automatic preprocessing sufficient. In Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics 2001 conference, Lancaster, pp. 167 – 175.