Verb Prefixes in Russian Language

Nilufar Nuridinovna Kakharova

Teacher, Kokand State Pedagogical Institute named after Mukimi, Uzbekistan

E-mail: nilufar.qdpi@mail.ru

Abstract

The article deals with the problem of widespread polysemy of Russian verbal prefixes, especially when adding them to movement verbs. Different uses of the prefix have a common basic lexical meaning, but differ in their syntactic position. In this case, the value refers to the spatial domain. When the same prefix is added to a verb of non-directional movement, it behaves like a lexical prefix, i.e. it is generated in a syntactically higher position, above the aspect, and its meaning is related to the time domain.

Keywords: *Spatial Thinking; Verbs of Position In Space; Spatial Prefixes; Compositional Semantics*

Introduction

At first glance, the variety of possible meanings of this prefix in the Russian language may seem like a chaotic set of idiomatic meanings, for example, the prefix for- may refer to the beginning of an action, moving to a position behind an object, a short-term deviation from the path or the completion of an action. A unified analysis of Russian prefixes, where it is argued that differences in meaning arise due to different syntactic positions, and the lexical composition of the prefix remains the same. The main attention is paid to verbs of movement because of the consistent duality displayed by the prefix values when adding directional and non-directional movement to verbs. It turns out that prefixes change the path when adding directional movement to a verb and refer to movement in time with non-directional movement verbs. This semantic difference corresponds to different sets of syntactic properties characteristic of lexical and supra-lexical prefixes.In addition, in each set of prefixes, there is a three-membered division corresponding to the goals, sources and paths of movement (respectively до (to), от (from), через (through) for lexical prefixes and the beginning, completion and duration for supra-lexical prefixes. This leads to the assumption that the same prefix with a consistent conceptual meaning, shared with the corresponding preposition, receives part of its denotation from its position in the syntactic representation. The separation of conceptual meaning from structural meaning allows polysemy to arise from a position, and not from arbitrary homophony. Thus, the conceptual structure is unified with the syntax.

The main position of this study is related to the understanding of verbal prefixes as peculiar "agglutinating particles" (in M. Dokulil's terminology), which are easily distinguished by native speakers in the verb structure both structurally and semantically [5, 6]. Such a status of the prefix "allows it not to absolutely depend on the verb and to manifest its meaning relatively independently of the basis". The content behind the Russian prefix correlates with certain meanings (spatial, temporal, quantitative, etc.) that enrich the meaning of the verb. In addition, the Russian research tradition characterizes prefixes as "distinguishing signs" of a certain sphere of use: to force (dial.), to retrain (official.), to carry (colloquial.), to predict (book).

Let's consider which derivatives are formed from the rest of the positional verbs to lie, sit, stand, hang with the help of prefixes в- (in-), на- (on-), под- (under-), над- (over-), пред- (pre-), with primary spatial meaning.

In addition, prefixes in the spatial and temporal domains demonstrate an intriguing parallelism: in the spatial domain, prefixes can refer to the beginning, duration and end of the path (that is, to the source, route and goal), while in the temporal domain prefixes prefixes are associated with the beginning, duration and end of the event in time. For example, consider prefixes in the first case. In the first case, the про- refers to the length of the path in space, and in the second, the same prefix refers to the duration of the activity; in the third, the prefix пере- (re-) refers to crossing the border along the way in space, whereas in the fourth it refers to crossing the time boundary (for example, after which swimming is impractical).

1. Про-йти пять километров.	**1. Walk five kilometers.**
2. Про-ходить пять часов.	**2. Pass five hours.**
3. Пере-плыть реку.	**3. Swim across the river.**
4. Пере-плавать в бассейне	**4. Re-swim in the pool**

There are several logically possible directions of analysis. The least desirable alternative is homophony, when the prefix has several idiomatic meanings, and the fact that they sound the same is historically justified, but synchronically inappropriate. An exhaustive list of all applications is descriptively adequate, i.e. in the classical dictionary, as well as in the Swedish grammar, prefixes are listed in at least two meanings. However, these values are interrelated, and the relationship between them is predictable. The interpretation of polysemy as homophony does not allow us to grasp the synchronic generalizations of these relations [3].

Homophony can also pose a problem for language acquisition, since historical data may not be available to the language learner. A child, encountering two identical morphemes that have some overlap in meaning, should initially assume that they are the same lexeme and try to establish rules for its distribution, and not arbitrarily allow homophony. Thus, the preferred solution would be to combine prefixes so that each prefix has a single value that changes predictably depending on its function.

I assume that one part of the meaning comes from the vocabulary, and the other part of the meaning comes from the syntactic structure. The "neo-constructivist" point of view is that "the reason syntactic structures matter is that they are systematically constructed as part of a generative system (syntactic form) that has predictable correlates of values".

The position is that there is a structural component of the meaning of the prefix originating from the lexicon, and that each position in the syntactic representation has a specific, independently motivated

meaning. For example, the unique value "через" (through) will be combined with the value given by the position either in the path area or in the time area, which will lead to the reading of overcoming a certain distance (if "через" (through) is attached to the path level) or lasting a certain time (if "через" (through) is attached at the time level).

Lexical prefixes, as potential modifiers of the argument structure, are generated in the position inside. Super lexical prefixes modify the event itself and do not change the structure of the argument or the main meaning of the main verb and, therefore, syntactically higher, above the title of the form. According to Barykina, lexical prefixes are mainly attached to the bases of the perfect or telic form (if the verb is provided with an option), allow the verb to form secondary forms of the imperfect form, cannot be folded, are not measured over objects and can change the argument the structure of the verb [1]. This behavior corresponds to the low position of the prefix inside the " re, in, over" "пере, в, над".

Superlexic prefixes are attached to imperfect or grammatical bases, do not allow the verb to form secondary imperfect forms, can be formed (although this is not a common occurrence in Russian), can be measured by events or objects, do not change the argumentative structure of the verb. The examples below illustrate the superimposition of supra - lexical prefixes от, про, по on lexical prefixes.

The prefix за- is notoriously universal, and all the diversity of its meaning can hardly be discussed here in a limited space, but if we limit ourselves to verbs of movement, then the space-time parallel is obvious. With direction verbs, the prefix changes the path so that the figure enters some kind of enclosed space, for example:

зайти - Она встала, и проворно зайдя за ширмы, вывела оттуда Варвару Павловну; Зайти за угол, солнце зашло за тучи. зайти за угол, зайти за забор. (**go in** - She got up, and quickly went behind the screen, brought out Varvara Pavlovna; go around the corner, the sun went behind the clouds; go around the corner, go behind the fence).
заехать - свернуть за что-л., скрыться за чем-л.: Заехать за гору; Мы заехали за мост, заехать за остров. (**To stop by** - to turn behind something, to hide behind something-.: To go behind a mountain; We drove over the bridge, we drove over the island.

забежать - Он забежал за хату и поймал себя на том, что ему вовсе не хотелось выходить из укрытия. (**To run**- He ran behind the hut and caught himself that he did not want to come out of hiding at all).

залететь - Самолет залетел за тучу. (**Fly -** The plane flew over a cloud).

заплыть - Заплыть за буек. Заплыть за остров. (**Swim** - Swim behind the buoy; Swim over the island.

залезть – Залезть за шкаф. (**Get in** - Get behind the closet).

завести – Завести за угол. (**To start** - To start around the corner).

Thus, за- in the spatial domain introduces a limited path that ends at a certain place, i.e. at time 0 the figure is not in the specified place, and at time 1 it is inside a closed area.

Historians of the language agree that in the Indo-European language prefixes were independent words that played an auxiliary role in the sentence. While maintaining their independence, they gave other words a more precise meaning. In the future, "combining now with a noun, an adjective, a numeral,

then with a verb, prefixes naturally showed a tendency to approach the word, the meaning of which they clarified" [4]. As a result, proper prefixes and prepositions were formed. It is no accident that Volokhina G.A. often uses these terms undifferentiated [2].

The initial (or earliest) value of the prefix is recognized as spatial, which was later generalized to the value of the spatial limit in the course of desemantization, and then – effectiveness: "... The addition of a prefix to a verb not only spatially marked it, but also at the same time outlined the limit, the boundaries to which the action extends and at which it ceases".

Derivatives that arose by complicating static verbs with prefixes with spatial meaning are considered to be among the most ancient. They realized the functional and semantic potential of these affixes associated with belonging to proverbs. There is no contradiction here yet between the semantics of static verbs and the meaning of the effectiveness of the prefix, since the latter has not yet formed this meaning.

Thus, a clear distribution of lexical and non-lexical prefixes emerges, where lexical prefixes that occur with verbs of directional movement relate to the spatial domain, modifying the movement of a figure in space relative to a certain background. The supra-lexical prefixes encountered with non-directional verbs of movement shift the meaning of the central prefix to the time domain, describing the movement of the figure in time with respect to the event. Transferring the computational load to the structure allows you to save one common lexical entry for each prefix. Thus, even if the lexicon is responsible for some of the information, the proposed approach represents a significant progress compared to the enumeration of homophones and allows at least somehow to sort out the chaos of Russian prefixes.

References

1. Barykina A.N., Dobrovolskaya V.V., Merzon S.N. The study of verbal prefixes, M. 1981.

2. Volokhina G.A., Popova Z.D. Russian verbal prefixes: semantic structure, system relations, Voronej, 1993.

3. Ojegov S.I., Shvedova N.Yu. Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian language. M., 1992.

4. Trofimova A.V., Kosova V.A. Russian prefixal verbs with positional meaning as a means of verbalization of spatial thinking // Uchen. zap. Cauldron.un-ta. Ser. Humanit. science. – 2017. – Vol. 159, book 5. – p. 1231-1243.

5. Serysheva Yu. V., Filya Yu. V. Polyprefixal verbs with extenuating semantics in the linguistic consciousness of native speakers of the Russian language // Vestn. Tomsk State University. 2012. No. 357. - p. 29-36.

6. Serysheva Yu. V. Multi-prefixed verbs with cumulative semantics in the aspect of psycholinguistic experiment // Vestn. Tomsk State University. 2012. No. 364. pp. 18-21.

7. Vinogradov V.V. Problems of literary languages and patterns of their formation and development. - M., 1997.

8. Vinogradov V. V. About the language of fiction. - M., 1989.

9. Novikov L. A. Linguistic interpretation of a literary text. - M., 1989.

10. Novikov L. A. Artistic text and its analysis. - M., 1990.

11. Solodnikova L.G., Pleshakova S.V. Linguistic analysis of a literary text. Textbook for pedagogical universities. - T., 2007.

12. Elmslie L. New in linguistics, No. 1, 338 1960. - p. 388.

13. Gorbachevich K.S. Variability of speech and language norm, Leningrad: Nauka, 1978, - p.25.

14. Yartseva V.N. In process of the Languages of the world. The problem of language variability, Moscow, Nauka, 1990, - p.17.

15. Kapranov V.A. In process of Lexical synonymy, Moscow, Nauka, 1967, - p.139.

16. Rogozhnikova R.P. In process of Lexical synonymy, Moscow, Nauka, 1967, - p.157.

17. Moskalskaya O.I. In process of norm and social differentiation of the language, Moscow, Nauka, 1969, - p.57.

18. Rasuljanovna, I. N. (2019). The phenomenon of lacunarity as the linguacultural issue. *Prospects of world science-2019*, 226.