NEGATIVE MEANING OR MORE

Abstract: The aim of this paper is twofold: to bring to light some details about the process of affixation in the English language and to determine the equivalents for the three of English affixes in Serbian. Since the origin of affixes is important for either the structure or the meaning of newly-formed complex words, both diachrony and synchrony are taken into consideration. For this research different sources have been used, and its results have been tested in work with students of English as a foreign language.
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The main goal of the paper is to give more details about one of the most productive word-formation processes in the English language — affixation. Basically, this process represents a combination of two or more morphemes or, to be more precise, a combination of a base, stem or root and one or more affixes. An addition of a derivational affix to a base influences its meaning with a newly-formed complex word as the result. Depending on whether an affix is placed in front of (prefix) or after (suffix) the base, both the process of prefixation and the process of suffix-
ation can be applied. Prefixes represent a specific set of affixes regarding their origin or the meaning they express. A group of prefixes that basically expresses negative meaning, and possibly other related meanings, is called negative prefixes. Further description of these represents the main goal of this paper.

In order to reveal the problem, the research involves several stages. The first one, that is the consultation of a lot of reference books, leads to the conclusion that both diachrony and synchrony should be taken into consideration. The second stage focuses on the historical development of negative prefixes, having in mind the three main periods in the history of the English language. Trends in Modern English, also stated in a short review of this development given below, are taken from grammar books and dictionaries dating from the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century. The third stage considers the description of negative affixes regarding their origin, structure, function, productivity and meaning. The final stage points out some Serbian equivalents of the most frequent English affixes. For this research, different sources have been used, and its results have been tested in practice.

The purpose of this research is to help the process of foreign language acquisition (FLA) or teaching English to Serbian students. Even if affixation is rather simple from the point of view of structure, the function and the meaning of affixes or newly-formed words can represent a huge problem in learning English as a foreign language. If the process of language learning is seen, as some authors suggest, as a result of conscious creative act whereas the process of language acquisition is seen as a subconscious one (Krasher 1981), then it can explain why the problem of adopting the structure is not difficult while the problem of understanding different meanings is. On the other hand, if acquisition is the same process as learning, then the process of adopting a newly-formed word is rather a long one, starting from adopting a new structure to adopting the meaning and function of either an affix or a whole word.

**NEGATIVE AFFIXES IN OLD ENGLISH AND MIDDLE ENGLISH**

The presence of negative prefixation in OE (450–1150) is confirmed by one of the characteristics that words from other languages were rarely accepted in their original forms, but were modified according to English phonetics. The same was applied to prefixation. Old Nordic forms with the negative prefix *u-* had their English alternates with the *un-* prefix, as in *untime* (ModE unseasonableness), OE *ubain* and ON *uneinn* (ModE not ready), OE *unrad* and *unraed* (ModE bad counsel).

Apart from *un-* Old English used the following prefixes with similar meaning: negative *‘mis-* , as in *misician* and *misdeed*; reversible *on-* and *ond-* , as in *on-
bind and OE onlucan (ModE unlock); privative be-, as in beheadian, and or-, as in orsong and for- meaning “loss” and “destruction”, as in fordon and forweorpan.

The early stage of the English language was marked by changing accent of prefixes. The change was influenced by the distributional character of prefixes — as parts of nominals and adjectives, they were usually strong-stressed, as in ‘mis-doed’ and ‘un-spr’, and as parts of verbs, usually weak-stressed, as in for ‘gie-fan’.

The Old English privative suffix -less (devoid of), free form) had an independent form leas that was later abandoned. Its Scandinavian relative loose kept its independence in an altered form till nowadays. By losing its grammatical independence, the suffix -less got a very high linguistic hybridity. It can be seen in free combining with words, mostly of French origin (with stronger Norman influence in the Middle Ages), and later with words of other origins.

The oldest literal documents of the English language were written in Runes, a type of Latin minuscule. Runic literacy was used until Christianisation (6th century) and taking over of Alphabet. After Alphabet started being used, the English language kept the phonemic character of letters for a while (one phoneme – one grapheme), but it did not last. Certain graphemes of early English alphabet are no longer in use: Ae – ash, d – eth, p – thorn, oe – ethel, Z – yough, p – wynn.

The earliest preserved work of Old English literacy is the epic poem Beowulf of the unknown author dating from the 8th century. Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and AElfred of Wessex – Alfred the Great notes dates from the 9th century, and Exeter Book, Junius Manuscript and Vercelli Book from the 10th century. Only Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum, written in Latin by the Venerable Bede, is older dating from the beginning of the 8th century.

In the Middle English period, a language spoken by the first Germanic conquerors of the British Isles turned into Middle English in the 11th century. The Old English period lasted from 1150 till1500. It was initiated by the Norman Conquest by William the Conqueror in 1066. It was marked by a strong influence of the French language that came together with it. Detailed lists of all the valuables and estates in the Kingdom were made, and all of them are included in The Doomsday Book, one of the most comprehensive and most reliable land registration books ever. The famous literary works written in Middle English are The Canterbury Tales by Geoffrey Chaucer (14th century) and Sir Gawain and the Green Knight by the unknown author (15th century).

In the same way that the cohabitation with neighbouring Scandinavian caused a significant grammatical simplification, later a Norman rule led to the official use of the French language. It became the official language of the King’s court, judiciary system and Parliament. The actual lexical fund of the English language consisted of words of German origin (Old English and others), and Latin-
isms, extracted either directly from the Latin or through the Norman language. The Norman Conquest of the British Isles is thought to have opened the doors to a different system of word formation. The English language accepted the trend of use of prepositions in the prefix sense. The Greek preposition \textit{anti} entered the English language in the 15\textsuperscript{th} century, forming the prefix \textit{anti-} meaning “recall”, as in the \textit{anti-taxation movement}, \textit{anti-foreign party}, \textit{anti-slavery}; Latin preposition \textit{de} gave the prefix \textit{de-} of returned meaning, especially with verbs ending in -\textit{ize}: \textit{de-anglicize}, \textit{democratize}, \textit{deprovincialize}, \textit{denationalize}.

Foreign prefixes that became domestic during the middle phase of the English language development mostly came from Latin through French as a mediator-language. They are:

\textit{a-} (\textit{an-}) Grecism of negative/privative meaning, as in \textit{an-archy} (where its synonym is \textit{un-}) and in \textit{anhydrous} meaning “without water”

\textit{anti-} Grecism meaning “against”, as in \textit{anti-christ}, \textit{anti-pathy}, \textit{anti-pod}

\textit{in-} (\textit{im-, il-, ir-}) Latinism, synonym to domestic \textit{un-}

\textit{ne-} and \textit{non-} Latinisms meaning “no”, like in \textit{nefarious}, \textit{neutral} and \textit{nonsense}, \textit{nonentity}

\textit{ob-}, \textit{o(b)s-}, \textit{o-} Latinisms meaning “against”, as in \textit{obstacle}, \textit{obviate}, \textit{opposite}.

With influx of foreign prepositions into the English language, weakening of some domestic ones happened. The Old English reversible prefix \textit{on-} got identified and merged with \textit{un-}, turning the verb \textit{onbind} into \textit{unbind}, \textit{onlucan} into \textit{unlock} and so on.

The nominal-adjectival prefixes \textit{mis-} and \textit{un-} are still active in the original form.

Much later, with weakening of the Franco-Norman nobility and influence in England, there was economic and social rule of local middle class and the English language became dominant again.

**NEGATIVE AFFIXES IN MODERN ENGLISH**

The Modern English language has undergone significant changes through the 15\textsuperscript{th} century due to Great Vowel Shift. It appeared by spreading of standardized London dialect to Government and administration between 1450 and 1750, and the introduction of the press (1476) helped it as well. Word order in a sentence became stable (Subject-Verb-Object pattern), and writing was standardized, especially since the 19\textsuperscript{th} century on. Because of its turbulent past and contacts, the English language today looks like a big mosaic of lexical fund of different origins. English lexis is far more popular and bigger compared to lexis of other languages. Its development was a long and continuous, but also very productive process. To-
day it is *lingua franca*. It is the most frequently used language in the world, spoken by more than 500 million people on all the continents, as a consequence of the spread of the British Empire.

In his books *A Short Historical English Grammar* (1892) and *An Anglo-Saxon Primer* (1905), Henry Sweet, a British philologist and phonetician, tends to precisely distinguish what is used in language from what is outdated. He makes, for his times, a modern phonologic-dialectological-chronologic grammar of the English language. He makes a division to phonology and flexion with composition and derivation (accidence). He also gives a detailed overview of word classes, following its development from OE to modern times.

Derivation is processed in terms of origin of elements — domestic and foreign. Sweet makes locative subgroups in both groups — prefixation and suffixation.

Sweet does not group prefixes according to their meaning, but gives the following semantic remarks for each of them individually:

**Old English**

- *be-* privative in some cases  
- *for-* sense of loss or destruction  
- *mis-* still in use, unchanged meaning  
- *on-* “against; separation; change to the worse”  
- *or-* privative, “out of”  
- *un-* purely negative, sometimes “bad”

**Middle English**

- *mis-* still in use, unchanged meaning  
- *un-* still in use, unchanged meaning

**Foreign:**

- *an-* Greek, synonym of *un-*  
- *anti-* Greek, meaning “against”  
- *contra-, contro-, counter-* Latin, meaning “against”  
- *de-* Latin, stands for negation  
- *dis-, di-, dif-* Latin, stands for privation and negation  
- *in-, im-, il, i-* Latin, synonym of *un-*  
- *ne-* Latin, meaning “not”  
- *ob-, o(b)s-, o-* Latin, meaning “against”  
- *para-* Greek, meaning “against”.

Unlike prefixes, suffixes are more easily grouped based on the final derivational modification. He differs noun-forming, adjective-forming and verb-forming
suffixes. For this paper, the only domestic adjective-forming suffix is important, and that is -leas, later -less, meaning “deprived of; without”.

In *A Handbook of Present-Day English* (1932), Dutch linguist Etsko Kruisinga also uses the term accidence for word-formation. Prefixes are mentioned in the *Composition* chapter, subchapter *Composition with Prefixes*. He states that “it is usual to define compounds as consisting of two words; but it has already been observed that it is by no means a simple matter to decide what a word is. There are a number of words that are not simple in so far that each element expresses an independent meaning, although the first element, though called a prefix, not a word, really has the same function as a word used as the first element of a compound. For those reasons, the words formed with prefixes of this kind may be considered as a special kind of compounds.”

Also, it can be noted that almost all prefixes are of Roman origin (except mis- and un-), and are typical for ‘educated’ speakers. In such a type of compounds both parts are equally stressed, except for domestic prefixes (mis- and un-) that are somewhat weaker.

Some of the prefixes are:

- *anti-* meaning “against”
- *counter-* meaning “against”
- *dis-* no semantic comment, combined with words of local and foreign origin
- *mal-* meaning “ill; wrong; improper(ly)”
- *mis-* meaning “bad(ly); wrong(ly)”
- *non-* frequent in new formations in contradictory sense, whereas its meaning in the past was not clear
- *in-* (as un-) negative prefix
- *un-* negative prefix with adverbs and nouns and prefix expressing return action with verbs

Kruisinga sees derivation as a process of adding elements without independent meaning (and frequently no meaning at all), frequent in living language. In most of cases a derivational element is a suffix and the only derivational prefix is the verbal transitional prefix be-.

By the beginning of the 20th century, Hendrik Poutsma published *Grammar of Late Modern English* created for continental, especially Dutch, students. Together with Kruisinga and Sandwort, he continues the tradition that started in the 16th century — Dutchmen writing English grammars. However, he does not study affixes separately.

In the introductory part of *Handbuch der Englischen Wortbildungslehre* (1937), Herbert Koziol, a phonetician from Vienna, limits the term prefix to particles, i.e. forms creating compounds that do not have morphological independence as words do.
Koziol does not seem to make a precise difference between complex and derived words, so he places some temporal and locative prepositions and adverbs into prefixes (after-, back-, again-, down-). On the other hand, many prefixes are missing. Mentioned forms are grouped according to their origin into domestic and foreign.

Domestic forms in negative meaning are: gain-, mis-, un-, wan- (privative), wither-, -less, and foreign ones are: a-, ab-, anti-, contra-, counter-, de- (reversible), dis-, dys-, in-, mal-, non-, pseudo-, quasi-.

In *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles* (1942), Otto Jespersen, Danish linguist of descriptive orientation, admits that category of prefixes is sometimes difficult to define in a precise manner. If earlier prefixes and their use are studied, numerous irregularities in form, stress and pronunciation, and most of all meaning, can be noticed. The situation in prefixation nowadays is stable, confirmed by prefixes that have been “popular” in the past couple of hundred years, as their sound and stress are not varying and it is easy to determine the sense. Considering semantics, adverbial origin and creation for criteria, Jespersen divides prefixes into negative and related prefixes, prepositional prefixes and prefixes concluded.

According to Jespersen, there are only three negative prefixes in the English language: un-, in- (and its allomorphs il-, im- and ir-) and a- (and allomorph an-). The first one is of domestic origin, the second one came through French from Latin, and the third originates from Greek. All of them originate from the same old Indo-European form an- to which a negative particle non is similar. Apart from the mentioned, they can have a different semantic value: un- privative, and in- and a-as prepositional (treated within prepositional prefixes).

As “negative similar” in the same chapter, Jespersen studies 13 prefixes:

- n-, non-, mis-, dis-, gain- and with- negative meaning
- un- and de- privative meaning
- mal- pejorative meaning
- anti-, contra- and counter- in opposite meaning
- ex- locative-temporal meaning.

Apart from describing prefixes whose meaning is not completely negative, but “similar to negative”, in the *Conclusive Prefixes* chapter, Jespersen also mentions the prefix be-. It has a compositional-verbal function, and carries a privative sense with some verbs. In suffixation, suffix -less is mentioned, and its basic meaning is privative. Jespersen’s special contribution to linguistic research was the analysis of various types of words in the sentence in the sense of categories he himself set (naming them rank, junction and nexus). Word classes were established later, and they were used by Chomsky and Quirk.
In *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word Formation* (1960), German Philologist Hans Marchand treats all the affixes active in the English language. He makes a locative division into prefixes and suffixes. Prefixes are forms that are not independent on their own and that are added in front of complete words. His etymological remark is that domestic prefixes used to be words in the past, and that foreign entered the English language in the current form. Domestic, that are not so many, are only *a-, be-, un-* (negative and reversible), *fore-, mid-* and *(partially) mis-* . There are more foreign ones, mostly coming from Roman (Latin) and Greek. However, in both of these groups naturalization does not exclude phonetic variations according to the rules of domicile grammar. They are explained for each individual prefix.

In semantic sense, relation among prefixes is frequently a competitive one. Marchand illustrates it by couples: locative *over-/out-*; negative *un-/in-*; negative *un-*reversible *un-*; reversible *dis-/de-*; temporal *ante-/pre-* . That is why he avoids every semantic categorization of prefixes. Afraid of overlapping of their roles, he just lists them in an alphabetic order.

For Marchand, suffix is a final derivational element of word that carries semantic meaning, but does not appear as an independent unit in speech. Its character is adaptational (anglicising foreign words) and functional (constituting new word). Although distribution of suffixes is selective, Marchand does not make division at that level.

However, he presents a division of morphemes (and affixes are derivational morphemes) into principle sense groups:

- absence of: *-less, non-, un-, dis-
- deprivation: *de-, dis-, un-
- negation: *a-, dis-, in-, non-, un-
- opposition: *anti-, contra-, counter-
- reversal of result: *dis-, un-.*

Karl Ernest Zimmer’s *Affixal Negation in English* (1964) points out only five negative prefixes: *a-, dis-, in-, non-* and *un-.* The author processes them through adverbial derivation, in the sense of syntactic functions and internal structure. He frequently refers to Jespersen and Marchand, mentioning that the modern theory on antonymic couples derived through negative affixation started with Rudolph von Jhering in 1883. The issue of affixal negation is divided into complementary opposition (all possibilities along a given dimension) and contrary opposition (represent areas at the opposite pole of a given dimension and leave some room for other possibilities between given terms), and deals with the mentioned affixes through their productivity.

In *An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation* (1973), Valerie Adams states that, in the sense of grouping based on common elements and seman-
tics, development of suffixes was more interesting than development of prefixes. Most of English prefixes are of Latin or Greek origin and are frequently used for formation of scientific words. Suffixes are more frequently of domestic origin, or they came through French. Groups that prefixes are divided into are following a different formal pattern than suffixes. The largest group of prefixes is negative, privative and reversible group consisting of prefixes a-, de-, dis-, ex-, in-, non- and un-.

Then, there are groups of prefixes for number, time, size and place. These categories are well defined and do not show tendency for getting additional meanings as suffix groups like collectivity and agent.

Reinard William Zandvoort, Dutch linguist and grammarian of descriptive linguistic, originally made his *A Handbook of English Grammar* (1975) as a guidebook to Dutch students of English language, but it soon grew over the geographic limits and that kind of use. Derivational affixes are divided according to their position in respect to a stem into prefixes and suffixes. Depending on whether they are still active during word forming, they are further divided into living or productive and dead or unproductive. Stressing that he would deal only with the first group, he lists the unproductive prefixes as well. Our attention will be focused on with- that remained in verbs withdraw, withhold and such. It is completely merged with the stem (base?), so speakers do not feel it as a prefix anymore.

Other English prefixes are transparent according to stem (base?), but cannot be separated from it like in other German languages (Dutch, German).

In negative and similar meanings, Zandvoort mentions the following affixes with short comments on their productivity and types of words they are used with:

- Negative prefix denoting the mere absence of a quality, compares it with prefixes in-/un- and non-
  - anti- prefix having the meaning “rival, enemy of”, “opposed to”
  - counter- prefix meaning “against”
  - de- prefix meaning “to remove; to undo”
  - dis- negative prefix; may express deprivation or reversal of the action
  - mal- pejorative prefix “bad(ly)”,
  - mis- prefix meaning “bad(ly), wrong(ly)”,
  - non- prefix of the same idea as the negative a- but more widely used
  - un- the commonest negative prefix; with verbs denotes “an action contrary to or annulling that of the simple verb”
  - in- (with allomorphs) clearly negative in meaning

When considering suffixation, Zandvoort notes that it is rarely carrier of an independent meaning (apart from positional difference from prefixation). It has the role to modify the meaning of the main element or converting one type of words into another. Proportion of frequency of German elements in suffixation is
significantly higher, i.e. domestic prefixes are superior in number. As many other authors, Zandvoort classifies suffixes according to the type of words they form.

Suffixes important for this subject are -ite and -ster of pejorative and -less of privative meaning:

-ite denoting inhabitants with toponymes giving them a mild pejorative sound (Clamphamite, Durhamite); similar with derivatives from personal names such as Browningite, Ibsenite, and Wagnerite

-ster denoting a person given to the practice of gaming etc., as in gamester, gangster, punster; these pejorative connotations are not absolute, as in trickster, roadster, songster, speedster, tapster, teamster, youngster

-less with nouns carries the meaning “without”, as in endless, fearless, lifeless, penniless; with verbs that originate from conversion from nouns its meaning is “not to be”, as in restless, tireless, fadeless.

In Negative Prefixes can be Positively Confounding (2003), Jeff March et al. list 12 negative prefixes derived from Latin, Greek and other foreign languages. Some of them bring different connotation, and some are of identical meanings. The choice of corresponding prefix for each separate word is not easy, in fact it can be quite demanding. Rules determining their use are frequently not synchronized. March explains prefixes anti-, de-, dis-, dys-, in-, il-, im-, ir-, mal-, mis-, non- and un- in the following way:

anti- (ant-) with four meanings: “opposite” (antithesis, antonym), “opposing” (anti-aircraft, antagonist), “counteracting” (antigravity, antidote) and “curing; alleviating” (antipoverty, antianxiety).

de- with three meanings: “opposing; opposite of” (debate) “to remove from” (decarbonise, dehydrate) and “to diminish; to ruin” (depreciate, demolish)

dis- used with both nouns and verbs meaning “opposite of” (disappear), “deprive of a quality or object (disgrace, disarm), “exclude; expel from” (disbar) and “not; absence of” (discontent, disrespect)

dys- used with both nouns and verbs meaning “abnormal; impaired” (dyslexia), “difficult” (dysphagia) and “bad” (dyslogic)

in- (with variants il-, im- and ir-) meaning “not”

mal- named as a ‘combining form’, not a ‘prefix’; meaning “bad; badly” (malpractice, malodorous), “abnormal” (malfuction) and “inadequate” (mal-absorption)

mis- meaning “bad” (mismanage), “wrong; wrongly” (misconduct, misjudge) and “opposite; lack of” (mistrust)

non- used with nouns meaning “not” (noncomittal), “opposite of; reverse of” (nonfiction) and “absence of” (nonstop, non-violence)

un- used with adjectives (unusual), verbs (unfold), participles (undressed) and nouns (unrest), meaning “not” (unbeaten, unfinished), “opposite; contrary
to” (unfavourable, untrue), “to reverse” (unwind), “to deprive; to remove” (unnerve) and “to free from” (unburden, untangle).

March adds that some words can be paired with two or more negative prefixes. While some of the combinations are complementary (disfrock and unfrock “dismiss from the priesthood”), others have different meanings (disinterested and uninterested; non-military and unmilitary; disbelief and misbelief) and some can be misleading (flammable, inflammable and non-flammable).

Sometimes the forms im-, dis-, mis- and un- do not have a role of negative prefix, but represent an integral part of a stem (base) (impel, implore, discipline, distil, miscellaneous, undulate).

Slovak Professor Bozana Dzuganova in article Negative Affixes in Medical English (2006) observes only the prefixes a-, dis-, in- non- and un-, and the suffix -less. Others like anti-, counter-, contra-, de-, dys-, ex-, extra-, mal- and mis- are placed in the group of secondary prefixes. She even questions their ability of complete negating the words they are added to, as they are of limited negating ability. It is prominent just in some words they are combined with. That is why she calls them seemingly or partially negative, rather combining elements than prefixes.

Dictionaries also recognise affixes as morphologically and semantically independent forms. As far as significant monolingual dictionaries are concerned, several most popular in the English speaking area will be mentioned along with several bilingual. Regarding the British variant, The Oxford English Dictionary will be considered, as it is an absolute authority among the English dictionaries, together with The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. They, together with The Collins Cobuild Dictionary, are the most authoritative books in domain of the English language, and the history and development of both language and national culture can be seen in them. For the American variant, The Merriam-Webster Dictionary is chosen. All of the dictionaries have plenty of clear definitions of words and modern expressions, along with advice on grammar, pronunciation and writing. In the modern times they became available online as well.

**Negative Affixes a-, mal- and -less**

In linguistic literature, different authors often debate over the number and selection of affixes used for negation. The identification of a prefix is sometimes more difficult due to a large number of homophones, because many prefixes can have different value in derivatives. Deeper analysis makes it possible to notice their different semantics and also different origin. Suffixation is represented only by the -less form.

Dividing prefixes into semantic subcategories is also one of the topics that linguists disagree upon. Just a few grammarians actually make such a subcategorization (Quirk, Adams, and partially Marchand), which is not surprising as their
meanings are frequently overlapping. Within one meaning there are semantic sub-
groups that make division of prefixes into certain categories difficult. That is why
the authors are inclined to use the alphabetic lists of prefixes with comments on
meaning that each individual use of prefix is forming.

Negative affixes are a-/an-, dis-, in-/im-/il-/ir- and un-, but there are some
affixes that express similar meaning such as be-, anti-, contra-, mal-, mis-, de-, dis-
and -less. For each prefix, an etymological description is given first — general re-
marks on its origin and possible similar forms in dead and living European lan-
guages. In morphological processing, the structure and form of a prefix is regard-
ed, together with its allomorphs, distribution, productivity and accent, if it is not
stable. In semantic processing, differences in meaning achieved by the use of a
prefix are compared, and its synonym, homonym and antonym forms are listed.
The fourth part observes the state in the Serbian language and the existence of cor-
responding equivalents, with statistical processing. The last part of the chapter
consists of general remarks on the prefix couples n- and non-, and gain- and with-, which have not been mentioned so far due to their low frequency in language.

Prefix a- (an-)

Origin. The prefix a- and its pre-vocal allomorph an- are of Greek origin. The
prefix a- is derived from Greek alpha steretikon (Latin alpha privatum, nega-
tion alpha) that brings privative context in the Greek language, meaning “depriva-
tion; exclusion; giving up”.

The prefix a- is a very old one. It is of the same origin and meaning as San-
skrit an-, Latin in-, Gothic and Old English un-. Through reconstruction it was also
confirmed in the pre-Indo-European language. Most of coinages with the prefix a-
have been in the English language since the 19th century.

Structure

Allomorph. Apart from its basic form, the prefix a- appears in the phonetic
variation an-. It relates to initial vocal of the base (stem), whereas its meaning re-
mains unchanged. Bases (stems) starting with vowels or silent h (consonant exist-
ing in the graphic presentation of the word, but not the phonetic one) require the al-
ломorph of the basic form. The following examples illustrate the mentioned variation:

symmetric – asymmetric

but: aerobic – anaerobic

typical – atypical

hydrous – anhydrous

oxic – anoxic
In words of Greek root starting with consonant r-, the form an- assimilated into ar-, so there are arrhythmia, arrhina, arrosia. These words are rather rare in everyday language. They appear in scientific, especial medical terminology, following the lexical rules of Old Greek which the English language also respects. Many languages adjusted the initial arr- to their own transcription, including Serbian in which the abovementioned terms have the following form: aritmija, arinija and arozija.

**Use.** The prefix a- is most frequently used with adjectives derived from nouns. Newly-formed adjectives have meaning or simple negation – “not”, as in atheistic (disbelieving in the existence of God), acapsular (having no capsule), an-harmonic (not harmonic), “completely without something or to what is marked by the stem has no influence”, in as aacellular, agraphic, alexic, amoral, aplacental, arrhythmic, asexual, asymmetric.

Its use in verbs and adverbs is not as frequent, with the exception of the adverbs derived from adjectives by adding -ly (amoral+ly, apolitical+ly, asymmetrical+ly).

Analysis of the prefix distribution in the literal corpus proved almost identical use of prefixes with adjectives and nouns. The prefix is absolutely dominant in use with adjectives (32 cases or 48.5%) and nouns (31 cases or 47%). Only three uses with verbs have been identified, or 4.5% of the total number of words. These verbs are:

*anoxiate* “to take away, release oxygen” (prefix an- + oxygene)

*anaesthetize* “to apply anaesthesia, make smb insensitive to stimuli” (prefix an- + Greek term for conscious)

*atrophy* “to loose body mass due to malnutrition” (prefix a- + Greek term for feed).

Since words with the negative prefix a- are mostly used to describe condition caused by absence or loss of some property of occurrence, there are less cases when the prefix a- is used with words existing without prefixes. Some of these couples are:

theist/atheist
rhythmic/arrhythmic
chromatic/achromatic
symmetry/asymmetry

In the examples agranulocytosis, apnoea, amenorrhea, anaemia, apraxia, amitosis and others from medical terminology, an absence of certain occurrence is also marked. Those words have not been formed by adding the negative prefix on already existing word. They exist as independent units and most of people know
these words (with prefix) as such. They are not aware that the initial \( a- \) is a word with independent meaning.

**Productivity.** Productivity of the prefix \( a- \) is very limited, confirmed by a small number of entities with this prefix in the corpus. In most cases it is about the prefix lexemes borrowed *in toto* form the classical Greek (and sometimes Latin). Many of them do not even exist in English without prefix (*anomalous* through Latin *anomalus* from Greek \( an- + malos \) “irregular, incorrect”).

Zimmer (1964) talks about a dilemma caused by the productivity of the prefix \( a- \): on one hand, new formations are formed according to established pattern, and on the other hand, their number and/or semantical field are so marginal that assigning the same status as other prefixes (the productivity of which is less endangered) does not seem reasonable and justified.

The survival of the prefix \( a- \) in Modern English would be problematic if it wasn’t for the terms of specific fields (biology, medicine, physics).

**Meaning**

*The Oxford English Dictionary* presents the connection of the prefix with Greek \( an- \), as a prefix of privativity and negation. Its meaning in English is “without” and “not”. Good examples for this are words that came from Latin through French (*abysm, adamant, amethyst*) or directly from Latin (*acatalectic, adiaphorous, apetalous, acaulous, asexual*).

*The Merriam-Webster Dictionary* sees the prefix with the meaning “not” and “without”, as in *ahistorical, asexual, achromatic*.

*The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* presents the meaning of the prefix \( a- \) as “showing an opposite or the absence of something; not; without”, giving the following examples: *amoral* (“not moral”), *atypically* (“not typically”).

In the words of Greek origin, \( a- \) is a typical negation prefix, meaning similar to the prefixes *un- and non-* (*acotyledonous, achromatic, aphilanthropy*):

\[ \ldots \text{as a reminder that mid-Victorian agnosticism and atheism were related strictly to theological dogma}\ldots \]

According to the number in the corpus, privative meaning is right behind the negative one. It is important to mention that it is not always easy to set the clear border-line between these two properties, especially when it comes to adjectives.

For example, *rhythmic* operation is an operation performed in a certain *rhythm*. *Lacking* rhythm makes the operation *not rhythmic*. Since *rhythmicity* is a property without possibility of gradation, but only binary, *lacking* rhythm at the same time means *having no rhythm*, and the operation becomes *arrhythmic*.

In private meaning the prefix \( a- \) frequently has synonym relation with formations with suffix *-less*, as in *aplacental*. 
There are just a few examples of meanings “away”, “opposite” and “lack”.

**Synonymy.** The prefix *a*- can be considered a synonym of the domestic prefix *un*- . Both are used for negation as in:

- *amoral* “not moral”
- *arrhythmic* “not rhythmic”
- *atypically* “not typically”
- *asymmetrically* “not symmetrically”.

Similar meaning is sometimes achieved by the use of the domestic suffix *-less*, which will be regarded in details later. In short, the suffix *-less*, as well as the prefix *a*- , brings a private context to the notion. However, they are of different origins and they are used in different ways. This means that *a*- , being of Greek origin, requires a base of classic origin, as in *atemporal*, whereas OE *-less* requires a domestic base, as in *timeless*.

Medical vocabulary reveals cases when notions with the prefix *a*- exist in the form with *dys*- . However, these couples are not always synonyms. *Alexia* means “disability to read written or printed words”, while *dyslexia* denotes “problems or mistakes when reading”; *apepsia* means “sick condition due to gastric problems”, and *dyspepsia* denotes “the state of gastric problem”.

**Homonymy.** The negative prefix *a*- has a homonym in the prefix that is of either domestic – German, or Latin origin, but that is not related to negation.

The domestic prefix *a*- existed in the Old English period, forming adjectives and adverbs from nouns, as in *ago, asleep, abroad, aside, anew, abreast* or verbs intensifying the action and making movement – *arise, awake, ashamed*. Meaning of this OE prefix was prepositional and connected to prepositions *on* or *of*, as in *abed, alive, ashore, asleep*.

In the words of Roman origin, the prefix *a*- is related to the Latin prefix *ad*- that has the same meaning as the English prepositions *to* and *at*, as in *abandon, achieve, agree, alarm, amount, amuse*.

*The Oxford Dictionary* states: “It naturally happened that all these *a*- prefixes were at length confusedly lumped together in idea, and the resultant *a*- looked upon as vaguely intensive, rhetorical, euphonic, or even archaic, and wholly otiose”.

Comparative analysis of original and translation corpus shown that the prefix *a*- rarely has its corresponding Serbian equivalents. Out of seven examples from English literature, each was kept in its original form, slightly adjusted to Serbian lexic.

Since the prefix *a*- is rare in the literature corpus, an additional survey of the dictionary corpus has been performed. In Benson’s *English-Serbian Dictionary*, out of about 50,000 words, 55 examples with negative prefix *a*- were found (0.11%).
It is important here to compare the negative-private nature of the prefix a- that was discussed earlier and its corresponding forms in Serbian in which, with the ones that are not translated, the forms with the prefix bez- are dominating, followed by those with ne- and od-.

Through cumulative analysis of available corpus, it can be established that the English negative prefix a- is most frequently kept in Serbian in the identical form. In cases of translation the most frequent equivalents are:

- with prefix bez- – 17 cases or 27.5%
- with prefix ne- – 5 cases or 8%
- words and phrases indicating the lack or insufficient possession of a certain characteristic – 4 cases or 6.5%
- with prefix od- – 3 cases or 5%.

In the chapter on foreign prefixes in *Word-formation in the Modern Serbian Language*, Ivan Klajn notices that they prevailingly occur in scientific words of recent origin, with foreign base, which is the same as the findings of this paper on the private prefix a-. Klajn also notices that a- in nouns is more rare than in adjectives, whereas our corpus treats these two words in comparative relation.

The next equivalent of the prefix a-, the domestic prefix bez-, is derived from the corresponding preposition with usual private meaning that occurs in adjectives and nominalised forms derived from these adjectives (bezvlašće, bezinomenost, bespolan, bezbožnik). It is one of the most productive and most active prefixes that lately has been combined with foreign bases as well. At the same time, it is a prefix with the largest number of allomorphs (bes-, be-, beza-).

The prefix ne- has several meanings, but in the sense of equivalence with a-, its meanings are those of complete negation (nezanimljiv, netipičan) and opposites (nepismen, nenaglašen).

Od- is a prefix of prepositional origin, basically of ablative meaning – distance or separation, or separating from whole, which is related with its private role, as in otpadnički, otudjiti, odbiti. Allomorphs oda-, o- and ot- are caused by vocal changes.

**Suffix -less**

**Origin.** The suffix -less is of Old English origin and has always been very productive. It was also added to foreign words that entered the domestic vocabulary in the 12th century. In its original form leas, as it was used in Old English, it was an independent word, meaning “devoid of” and “free from”, although it also had a role of private prefix. It was also used as verb losian “to disappear, get lost”. Similar suffix is found in Modern Dutch (-loos) and German (-los), as well as in...
dead languages – Old Nordic *loose*, Middle Dutch *los*, Gothic *laus* and based on those in the reconstructed pre-German *lausaz*.

Jespersen lists the following adjectives that have been used since the OE period: *lifeless, lightless, mindless, restless* and *shameless*. The adjectives *breathless, faithless, fearless, fruitless, guideless, homeless, joyless, needless, reasonless, toungeless* etc. are somewhat younger, dating from the Middle English period. This form was a favourite one in the poetic language, frequently used by Lord Byron, John Keats, Percy Shelley and Robert Browning.

Independence of the *-less* form meaning was lost in the Middle English period, so from the 11th century only its other function became important.

**Structure**

**Use.** The suffix *-less* is, first of all, adjectival derivational suffix. In most cases it is used for deriving adjectives from nouns meaning “without something”, or to recall the meaning of adjectives derived in the form with *-ful*. Thus there are couples in correlation “full of” to “devoid of”:

- careful – careless
- colourful – colourless
- doubtful – doubtless
- hopeful – hopeless
- fearful – fearless
- helpful – helpless
- meaningful – meaningless
- useful – useless, and many others.

Quirk notices that the suffix is added to both abstract and concrete nouns, and that newly-formed formations do not have the option of gradation (comparison).

According to this, the suffix *-less* is in the same way added to verbs converted from nouns. Thus there are adjectives with passive meaning “not to be -ed” or “un -able” (*countless, timeless*). Intransitive verbs have meaning “un -ing” or “unable to be -ed” (*restless, tireless, fadeless, drainless, exhaustless*).

As far as distribution of the suffix *-less* in the corpus is concerned, situation is clearly defined. The suffix is used exclusively in formation of adjectives, out of nouns in the largest part (68%), and in a small part from verbs (32%). However, by further derivation it is possible to add nominal (*-ness*) or prepositional (*-ly*) suffix, so word categories with the mentioned suffix are frequently larger than adjectives. The form *-less* is used in 65 cases of adjectives (83%). Out of that number, 44 of them originate directly from nouns (68%), and 21 from verbs converted from nouns (32%). There are also prepositional in 7 cases (9%), and nominal in 6 cases (8%).
**Accent.** The suffix *-less* is phonologically neutral. Its influence on the accent of the base is not known.

**Meaning**

*The Oxford English Dictionary* describes *-less* as an adjectival-prepositional suffix. With nouns it has the following meanings:

- “destitute of, not having, free from”, as in *witless, childless* and *doubtless*
- “beyond the range of”, as in *countless*

and with verbs:

- “unable or lacking power to be acted on or to act”, as in *restless, quenchless* and *timeless.*

*The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* presents the suffix with three adjectival meanings:

- “without something”, as in a *childless couple* (who have no children)
- “never doing something”, as in a *tireless helper* (who never gets tired)
- “unable to be treated in a particular way”, as in *on countless occasions* (too many to be counted).

There were numerous examples of the *-less* suffix meaning in the observed corpus. Out of 78 examples, the majority has the most typical private meaning “not having” or “without something”. It is reflected upon Serbian in the pattern preposition *bez* + noun or prefix *bez* + noun.

*Mary was not faultless* (having no mistakes).

*…one may doubt the pinning as much as the heartless cruelty* (without/not feeling any pity)

*… on the poor motherless boy with the wicked father* (whose mother is dead)

*… a miserable and childless young husband* (having no children).

The following meaning is verbal “not -ed” or “not to be -ed”. It is provided through verbs converted from nouns:

*It was useless* (unable to be used properly)

*There were, too, countless reasons*… (too many to be counted).

The lowest, but not small, percentage belongs to the examples of converted verbs, the meaning of which is “not doing something”:

*…the old man’s endless days of supervising* (continues for a long time)

*There was (…) restless baa-ing* (unable to keep still)
Synonymy

Since -less has its negative couple in suffix -ful, there is also a substitution of the noun + less form with its semantical equivalent un+noun+ful where the prefix un-, depending on phonetic surrounding, can be replaced with the prefixes in- and ir-. Although both are semantically permitted, forms with -less are less usual. Thus, opposite to the mentioned adjectives careful, colourful, doubtful, fearful, helpful, meaningful and useful, there are also careless and uncareful, colourless and uncolourful, doubtless and doubtful, etc.

However, the relation of adjectives of these two types is not only correlational, and the form with -ful is not the requirement for the form with -less. On the contrary, there are a lot of cases where -less forms exist independently. These are: headless, motherless, childless, loveless, starless, numberless or awful, wonderful, skilful, masterful.

Marchand explains this by development, finding that etymologic character of derivations with -ful older than the 14\textsuperscript{th} century does not enable opposition with un-, and adjectives with -less derived after that period usually do not exist with the -ful form.

Opposite to this, in the couple unlawful and lawless there is no semantical unity, but the first form is used for “illegal” and the second one for “not respecting the law”.

Quirk notices that there are nouns which in the couple -less/-ful cannot establish antonymic relation. Such are pitiful and pitiless, as the first one is used for “poor, unhappy” and the second one for “ruthless, without mercy”.

Equivalents

The suffix -less is the third most frequent affix mentioned in this paper. It was detected in 78 examples (over 12%). Only the prefixes un- (31%) and in- (25.5%) are more frequent in contemporary spoken English. Out of 639 sentences regarded, 437 of them contain some of these three affixes, which is almost 70%. However, the meaning of this suffix is not in the first instance negative, but private. It is true that these two characteristics are sometimes difficult to separate precisely, so many grammarians observe privativity as a mere subtype of negativity. It enables placing suffixes in the group of the three most dominant English affixes of negative-private nature.

As far as individual translations are concerned, list of equivalents consists of the following:

- prefix ne- 8 15
- prefix bez- 20 12
- phrase bez+noun 8 6
Categories with the prefix *bez-* which are by type nouns, adjectives or adverbs (*bezosećajnost, beskućnik, bezgrešan*) and prepositional phrases consisting of the preposition *bez* and nouns (*bez daha, bez obzira, bez mesečine, bez mana*) have been treated separately when the equivalent forms is mentioned for the first time. However, since according to the morphological rules of the Serbian language these adjectival phrases can be converted into nouns, adjectives or adverbs with joining of preposition and noun and by adding certain nominal, adjectival or adverbial endings, all the above mentioned will be put together into one group. Negative phrases are the negative adjectival phrases in complex tenses (*nisu bili strašni, nije bilo svrhe*). For a certain number of Serbian translations (*ogoleo, izvan vremena, lišen energije, zanemeo*) the mutual morphological element could not be determined, even if they have a clearly prominent privative meaning. Thus the list of Serbian equivalents to the *-less* suffix was made:

* prefix *bez-* – 46 examples (59%)
* prefix *ne-* – 23 examples (29.5%)
* negative phrases – 3 examples (4%)
* other – 6 examples (8%).

Domination of the usual Serbian privative prefix *bez*- with almost 60% among the equivalents was expected and justified, since its basic meaning achieved by the suffix *-less* is privative. It is one of the most productive Serbian prefixes with meaning of corresponding preposition. It can be used to describe lack of numerous properties, meanings, impressions, matters and contents expressed by nouns of both domestic and foreign origin.

The prefix *bez-* is followed by translational equivalent in the negative prefix *ne-* in almost 30%, according to multiple feature of the suffix *-less* discussed in the chapter about meaning.

**Pejorative Affixes**

**Prefix *mal-***

**Origin.** The status of this prefix is not established. Some linguists (Jespersen, Marchand) considers it a prefix whereas according to *The Oxford English Dictionary* it is labelled as a ‘combining form’ since it is considered to have de-
veloped out of the Latin male (“ill; evil; wrong”), that has not been confirmed completely. The prefix mal- exists in French in the same form and meaning (“ill; evil; wrong; badly”). It existed in Old French, as well as in already mentioned Latin, where it had the form of a noun (malum, i) and adjective (malus, a, um). Probably the ancestor of all these forms is Avestinian prefix mairiia- meaning “traitor; ill”.

In English, coinages with mal- have been present since the 16th century, and most of them appeared in the 19th century.

Structure

Allomorph. In texts originating from the beginning of the 16th century it is possible to notice this prefix in the form male- that is considered to be the consequence of direct influence of Latinisms malefactor, malefaction, but that form became outdated in the 18th century.

Use. The prefix mal- is mostly used with verbs and abstract nouns, as well as adjectives derived from them. Due to the Roman origin of the prefix, complex words are also usually Romanisms.

The Oxford English Dictionary indicates that the prefix was not frequent in the past, and that since 16th century it has been present with many nouns derived for the needs of physiological terminology (malassimilation, malformation, malappropriate). Since the 17th century it has been possible to talk about higher productivity of the prefix, especially in fields of legislation and administration, each time meaning the improper and wrong behaviour, as in maladministration, malgovernment, malpractice, malfeasance, malconduct.

Analysis of the type of words the prefix mal- was used with confirms its prevailingly nominal use. It is established in more than half of examples (53%). With other examples, the prefix appears in the following ratio:

- with adjectives 11 – 29%
- with verbs 6 – 16%
- with adverbs 1 – 3%

Accent. As far as its accent is concerned, the prefix mal- always has a secondary stress:

malnu’trition, mal’formed, mal’treat, mal’odorous

Meaning

The Oxford English Dictionary presents the combinatory form mal- with the following semantics:

- “in an unpleasant degree”, as in malodourous
• “in a faulty or improper manner”, as in *malfuction*
• “bad”, as in *maladroit*.

*The Merriam-Webster Dictionary* also marks the form as ‘combinatory’, presenting the following meanings:

• “bad(ly), evil(ly)”, as in *malpractice, malodorous*
• “irregular(ly), abnormal(ly)”, as in *malformation, malformed*
• “poor(ly), inadequate(ly)”, as in *maladjustment, malnourished*.

*The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* presents the prefix in adjectival- adverbial meaning “bad or badly”, as in *a malformed limb* (wrongly shaped) / *She maltreats her children* (treats them cruelly).

Corpus shows that coinages with the prefix *mal-* appear in the following meanings in an almost equal proportion:

• “ill/evil/unpleasant”

*No more black horses to trash and maltreat* (treat cruelly)

• “done in the wrong or irregular way”

*malapropism* – a mistake by using a word
*malformed* – badly formed
*malnutrition* – not eating enough or good food

• “done with bad intentions”

*malcontent* – who causes trouble because he is dissatisfied
*malarkey* – informal talk meant to deceive
*malevolence* - a desire to harm other people.

As in its original forms, coinages with *mal-*, apart from meaning of negation, carry disqualifying character that has always been dominating in English, as in *maltalent, maladventure, malversation*.

Since the 18th century many medical and physiological terms have occurred with *mal-* meaning “existence of a defect, damage or poor quality”, as in *malformation, malposition, malnutrition, maladaptation*.

In French and Spanish today, *mal* exists in independent forms: noun *mal* “pain”, adjective *mal* “wrong” and adverb *mal* “badly”. Even *The Oxford English Dictionary* lists three cases in which *mal* is used independently, as a noun, but all of them are Romanisms:

*grand mal* – epileptic seizure
*petit mal* – milder form of epilepsy
*mal de mer* – sea sickness.
Equivalents

Out of 639 sentences containing the affixes mentioned in this paper, only three of them contain the *mal-* prefix.

As they represent less than 1% of the total (0.5%), the additional research material was obtained from 37 examples given in dictionaries. The list of equivalents is the following:

- words of negative qualification – 13 examples (35%)
- the prefix *ne-* – 10 examples (27%)
- words with the base *zlo* – 9 examples (24%)
- without translation – 3 examples (8%)
- the prefix *pod-* – 2 examples (5.5%).

A mutual morphological factor could not be identified for a significant number of Serbian forms (13) corresponding with material separated from the total corpus, but the fact is that all of them have a negative, disqualifying meaning (*prokletstvo, prekršaj, smrad, koještarija, oklevati, zarušavati, rdjavo, loše, bolesno, pogrešno, nakazno*, etc.), and they are categorized accordingly.

Based on the list of 41 samples from the corpus, several groups of Serbian equivalents are noticed:

- words of negative qualification – 14 examples (34%)
- words with the root *zlo* – 11 examples (27%)
- words with the prefix *ne-* – 10 examples (24%)
- words with the prefix *pod-* – 2 examples (5%).

Since it was impossible to determine a mutual morphological form to semantically compete with the prefix *mal-* , the conclusion is that for this English prefix there is no appropriate equivalent in the Serbian language. Desired meaning is achieved by words of different morphological structure the semantic value of which is equal to the original one.

A group of words derived from the root *zlo* is related to the meaning the prefix originally had in Latin. Since most of these words are actually Latinism, the forms of the group are literal translations of Latin originals:

*malefactor* (Latin) – *malefactor* (English)
*maleficium* (L) – *maleficence* (E)
*malevolentia* (L) – *malevolence* (E)
*malevolus* (L) – *malevolent* (E)
*malitia* (L) – *malice* (E)
*malitosus* (L) – *malicious* (E)
*malignus* (L) – *malignant* (E)
The prefix *ne-* is very productive and among several similar meanings, dominating meaning discussed in this paper is “bad, evil”. It is thus confirmed to be the first morphological equivalent of the prefix *mal-*, its frequency being 24%. Apart from this, it occurs in the usual negative meaning (*neumesan, nezadovoljan, neprilagodjen*), as well as opposites. It is sometimes difficult to draw the lines among all these meanings, because one comes out of the other frequently. Borders between them are vague. It is not easy to determine whether *nezadovoljan* (dissatisfied) means “a complete lack of satisfaction”, or denotes some completely other feeling.

A certain number of words (10%) was kept in the original form, adjusted to Serbian grammar rules – *malverzacija, maltretirati, malignost*, etc.

The next equivalent, the prefix *pod-*, is used in its literal space meaning. However, it can be more productive. Klajn states that the prefix stands for the notion or title that is “under” or “of lower degree” or “under the normal level, state”. It is thus used in forms *malnutrition* (*pothranjenost*) and *malnourished* (*pothranjen*) meaning “inadequate or insufficient nutrition, i.e. below the prescribed quality and amount”. Still, as both forms relate to only one notion, we believe that there are not enough reasons to consider the Serbian prefix *pod-* as the English prefix *mal-*.

As it can be seen, the process of affixation is a rather complex linguistic issue. It can be analysed from different aspects and with different linguistic characteristics in mind. This paper serves as an example of how to treat affixes. Different books, magazines, articles can be used as corpus. Determining equivalents represents the major goal of such investigations, because it can help in adopting English as a foreign language in an easy way.
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Драђана Спасић

ОДРИЧНО ЗНАЧЕЊЕ ИЛИ НЕШТО ВИШЕ ОД ТОГА

Резиме

Процеси који се користе за настајање нових речи или творба речи у енглеском језику привлаче пажњу лингвиста који се баве различитим нивоима описа језика зато што је поред структуре настанка нових речи којима се бави морфологија, битна и функција тих новонасталих речи као и значење које се добија. Стога је потребно, поред морфолошког и синтаксичког аспекта, имати у виду и лексиколошки и семан- тички аспект. То заправо значи бавити се узајамним односима речи и лексема. Процеси настанка нових речи управо због своје сложености играју важну улогу при усвајању енглеског језика као другог, или како неки лингвисти истичу, страног језика. Један од најпродуктивнијих процеса је афиксацija, и она је неисцрпни извор анализа енглеског језика. Овај рад се стога бави негативном афиксацijом и описом једног префикса и једног суфикса као моделом. Истраживање је вршено на корпусу и проверавано у раду са студентима енглеског језика. За анализу реципроцитета узето је у обзир неколико фактора као што су порекло, структура и употреба, значење и еквиваленти одређеног афикса у српском језику. Циљ истраживања је како анализи, тако и што лакше усвајање негативних афикса из језика извора ка језику циљу.

Кључне речи: Афиксацija, префиксацija, суфиксацija, дијахронија, синхронија, структура, значење, други језик, страни језик.