

## A national cultural peculiarity of suffix word formation

Aliya Anipina – Raya Orazova – Alikhankyzy Guliya – Zhylykybay Gulimzhan –  
Sholpan Karsybekova

DOI: 10.18355/XL.2023.16.01.18

### Abstract

Language is constantly developing, and the study of changes in the language's vocabulary is an important task of linguistics. The modern English language is characterized by the constant formation of new words. The suffix system of modern English has been actively and fruitfully studied by both domestic and foreign linguists; a significant number of works have been written considering certain aspects of the suffix system of the English language.

However, the language changes over time, and its structure partially changes. The existing theoretical knowledge becomes insufficient. Therefore, it is necessary to identify new, modern trends that have been observed in recent decades.

The article is devoted to the patterns of the use of noun suffixes in modern English. Also, in this article, the concept and types of word formation as one of the ways of enriching the language are studied. Thanks to the use of live suffixes, it will be easier to enrich your vocabulary. Suffixes are easily distinguished as word-forming elements. They are suffixes. They are used to form new words. The productivity of the suffix depends on how many formations they give. The article provides examples of suffixes of the actor and ways of formation from different parts of speech. Most often, nouns and verbs with the addition of suffixes are used for word formation at the base of the word.

In addition, this article examines the definitions and approaches to defining the concepts of new words. New words formed by the suffix method are investigated. The most productive ways of forming new words are analyzed and identified.

The principles of morphemic analysis of the basics are considered. Semantic and grammatical functions of the suffix morpheme are defined. The productivity of suffixes of modern English is studied. The process of distribution of suffixes by parts of speech is revealed.

**Key words:** suffix, suffix word formation, suffix-homonym, agentive meaning, instrumental meaning

---

### Introduction

Word formation is the formation of new words using prefixes, suffixes, the addition of bases and other methods. If you know how word formation works in English, understand the meaning of the main prefixes and suffixes, it will be much easier for you to replenish your vocabulary, read, understand English, because you will guess the meaning of a huge number of words without a dictionary.

The vocabulary of a language is known to be in a state of continuous change. Modern English vocabulary is a product of a number of epochs. In view of the fact that the language's vocabulary development is gradual, at the moment, in modern English, we can meet words that have developed in different historical epochs and with the help of various word-forming means.

Word-formation techniques, the effect of which can be noted in the history of English vocabulary, are affixal word formation (derivation), word composition, conversion, word reduction (abbreviation), and vowel alternation (ablaut).

Word formation, and in particular suffixes and prefixes, is one of the most difficult topics in learning English. Knowledge of this topic and the competent use of these word-forming parts is necessary in all types of speech activity: both orally and in writing (Marchand, 2017).

Currently, either there is no distinction between the terms "model" and "type", or something is understood that does not match. For example, E.A. Zemskaya considers the model as a morphological variety within the same word-formation type, which qualifies as a formula for the structure of derived words characterized by the commonality of three elements: the semantic relationship between the derivative and the producing word, the formal relationship, as well as the part of speech producing the basis.

The main problem in the study of neoplasms of the English language is that most dictionaries do not keep up with dynamic changes in the structure of vocabulary. Therefore, a number of neoplasms are permanently present that are not represented in dictionaries (both electronic and printed).

The word-formation activity of various literary languages and their territorial varieties is the object of close attention of modern domestic and foreign linguists (E.M. Dubenets, V. Adams, L. Bauer, etc.). Such scientific interest is due to the fact that living languages are capable of regular reproduction and renewal, which requires systematic research and versatile interpretation of new language formations. The tradition of studying the growth of dictionary systems of literary languages has taken shape, to date, into an independent branch of synchronous linguistics, designated by neology and neography and studying the theoretical aspects of neologization and the practice of describing neologisms in lexicographic works. The traditional aspects of studying new units of the lexical system of the language are lexicological, word-formation, onomasiological and functional-stylistic, which can be generalized as structural-systemic and functional aspects (Arnold, 2016).

Neoplasms are one of the most rapidly and dynamically emerging phenomena of language. Therefore, constant study of this phenomenon is required in order to understand the peculiarities of language change.

Suffixation is a word-formation process that is quite viable and productive in modern English. To determine the meaning of a derived word, it is necessary to understand what meaning suffixes have and what they contribute to the meaning of the lexical meaning of the derived word. As is known, the suffix, joining the base, is able to modify its meaning and determine whether the derivative belongs to a particular lexico-grammatical class of words. Suffixes are involved in the formation of significant parts of speech. It should be noted that they are especially numerous among nouns and are productive with the meaning of a figure, a tool, a place of action, abstract names and words. In classical Latin, the well-known masculine suffix *-arius* with the meaning of a figure and the neuter suffix *-apitso* with the meaning of a place or receptacle differed, but in folk Latin they coincided, and their homonymy is preserved in the modern language: *ouvrier/grenier*. The question arises, what is the difference between a prefix and a suffix? The prefix changes only the meaning of the word, while the suffix creates a new word, forms it as a specific part of speech.

A derived word determines the independence of its constituent affixes. Suffixes are usually more closely related to the base, since they form a word as part of speech, and prefixes are less closely related, since they change the semantic meaning of a word.

As a rule, the suffix occupies the position of the middle or end of the word. The limiting feature is the impossibility of the initial position. The suffix occupies a position in the middle of the base if it is followed by another derivational morpheme (one or more suffixes, such as constitutional, where *-ion* occupies a position in the middle of the base.) The suffix occupies the final position in the word if the end of the base coincides with the end of the word (Ginzburg, 2015).

A restrictive feature here is the impossibility of delivery before the root morpheme, or after the formant.

Functional criterion - the suffix system has two functions – semantic and grammatical.

The semantic function appears more clearly in the position of the suffix at the end of the base. As a rule, the suffix is a carrier of a more generalized meaning than the root morpheme and the word as a whole. This is the main difference in semantic function between the suffix morpheme and the root morpheme.

The grammatical function is inherent in the suffix or its allomorph in the final position in the word, and therefore is not a constant. And the suffix located between the root and the final suffix has no grammatical function.

The semantic function of the suffix morpheme is an integral part of the content of the suffix morpheme. It persists regardless of distribution.

Most suffix morphemes do not change the amount of information (or meaning) of the topic. This, first of all, belongs to the category of so-called adjectivating, substantiating, verbalizing and adverbializing suffixes.

Suffixes that do not change the scope of the meaning of the topic:

- a) verbalizing
- b) adverbializing
- c) adjectivating
- d) substantive (Dubenet, 2014)

The extension of the meaning takes place if the topic has a substantive meaning, and the suffix is abstract.

The narrowing of the meaning is suffixes with a clarifying role, there are also suffixes with a diminutive value. There are also two types of semantic relations between the suffix and the base – this is the expansion and narrowing of the meaning.

From the point of view of the uniformity of the semantic function, suffixes are divided into polysemous and monosemous. The same refers to the fullness (function) of the suffix in the position after the topic. There are groups of suffixes belonging to any one family.

Suffix morphemes form specific linear structures. Linear suffixal structures make up the membership of multi-morphed suffixal bases. (Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary, 2016)

## Results

Quantitative analysis of the means of translation of the discursive marker 'like' made it possible to identify a noticeable trend toward its reduction in subtitles and dubbing. In subtitles, the formal-discursive marker *like* is omitted in 52% of cases, and pragmatic - in 72.4% of cases; in this case, most often, the reduction exposed to *like*, which performs a formal-discursive search function expressions (80%) and pragmatic easing (100%) and emphases (77.8%). With regard to dubbing, formal-discursive markers are omitted in 44% of cases and pragmatic - in 62% of cases. In Russian dubbing and subtitles, the reduction is most often subjected to *like* in the formally discursive expression search function (70%) and the pragmatic function emphases (66.7%). Further analysis showed that the omission of the discursive marker *like* in subtitles and dubbing sometimes leads to functional losses. Subtitled functional losses occur mainly in the pragmatic reduction markers, namely the emphases marker (the share of losses is 57%) and uncertainty (50%).

In contrast, when formally discursive markers are omitted, the share of losses is insignificant (33.3% in the case of the marker explanation). In dubbing, a functional loss is rare and observed only when the pragmatic marker of uncertainty is omitted (16.7%) (Table 15). We also found that there often are functional equivalents in subtitles and dubbing for discursive Like markers. Yes, in subtitles, it is possible to find equivalents for approximately half of the formally discursive (48%) and 18% of the pragmatic markers. In turn, in dubbed by functional equivalents, more than half of formal-discursive (56%) and 26% of pragmatic markers are translated. To pass pragmatic functions like in subtitles and dubbing, compensation is used at the lexical or syntactic level. Using this technique, 9.5% of pragmatic markers are translated into

subtitles and 12% into dubbing. Cases of translating *like* by adding *not* were revealed neither in subtitles nor in dubbing.

Thus, the discourse marker *like*, like other markers, is more often reduced in subtitles than in dubbing. Functional loss at *like* reductions also occurs more often in subtitles; a significant share of functional losses are due to the decrease in pragmatic markers 172 emphases and uncertainty. In dubbing, functional losses when the discursive marker is omitted are minimal and fall on the marker *like*, which performs the pragmatic function of uncertainty. In subtitles and dubbing, the discursive marker is often translated as a functional equivalent; most often, functional equivalents can be chosen for the marker *like*, which performs formal-discursive features in subtitles. The compensation technique is also used for passing pragmatic *like* functions as in subtitles and dubbing. According to our observations, *append* is not used for transferring functions discourse marker *like* neither in subtitles nor in dubbing.

### **Another example of analyses**

A quantitative analysis of the means of translation *I mean* allowed us to establish that the discursive marker is often reduced in subtitles and dubbing. In subtitles, *I mean*, which performs formal discursive functions, is omitted in 39% of cases, and *I mean*, which serves 185 pragmatic functions - in 70% of cases. Among the formal discursive markers in subtitles, the communicative step marker is most often omitted (66.7%). As for pragmatic markers, a large proportion of the reduction was observed both in the case of the emphases marker (71.4%) and the case of the marker easing (66.7%). In dubbing, formal-discursive markers are omitted in 30.4% of cases and pragmatic - in 50% of cases. As in subtitles, most often, the formal-discursive marker of the communicative step is omitted (66.7%) and pragmatic markers of emphases (50%) and mitigation (50%). Further analysis showed that in the subtitles, the reduction of the marker, *I mean*, performing the pragmatic functions of emphases and mitigation, often leads to functional losses: the proportion of losses when the marker is lowered Emphasis is 70%, and Ease Marker is 75%. The share of losses at the omission of formal discursive markers is insignificant (about 22%); functional losses are due to correction markers and clarifications. A small amount of functional loss was observed in dubbing when formal discursive markers were omitted (14.3%). When reducing pragmatic markers to dubbing, functional losses were not detected.

When transferring the functions of the discursive marker *I mean* in subtitles and dubbing; in addition to the omission technique, translation is used by functional equivalent. Functional equivalents are especially common matches for formal-discursive markers: in 61% of cases in subtitles and 69.6% of cases in dubbing. To pass pragmatic marker functions, compensation is also used at the lexical or syntactic level: in 12% of cases in subtitles and 24% of cases in dubbing. The technique of adding is used to pass the *I mean* marker in neither subtitles nor dubbing. Thus, as the other markers considered earlier, the discursive marker *I mean*, in general, is reduced more often in subtitles than in dubbing. Functional loss during marker reduction is also more commonly seen in subtitles; the main share of functional losses is accounted for in the reduction of pragmatic markers of emphasis and mitigation. In dubbing, in your turn, the functional loss, when I omitted, *I mean* is minimized and falls on the formal-discursive marker of explanation. Both in subtitles and in dubbing for the discursive marker *I mean* often a functional equivalent is selected; often functional equivalents translate formal-discursive markers in subtitles. For passing pragmatic functions, *I mean* as in 187 subtitles, and in dubbing, a compensation technique is used. In our observations, it is not used to transfer the functions of the marker, *I mean* in subtitles, nor in dubbing.

## Discussion

The paper considers linear suffixal structures (suffixal sequences) as part of the basis characterized by certain types of functional connections that find expression in the nature of morphemic units. Seams on morphemic borders are defined as free, semi-free and non-free. All three types of seams can take place both at the junction between the non-derivative theme and the first-order suffix with which the suffix sequence begins and between suffixes in the sequence itself. In accordance with the nature of the seams, suffix sequences are defined as follows:

- a) ordinary (sequences with free seams), which make up the most numerous group;
- b) semi-fused (sequences with one semi-free seam);
- c) fused (sequences with one or two non-free seams).

In the practical part of the work, most of the known suffixes are given in accordance with the classification described in the theoretical part, and the suffixes identifying the noun are considered in more detail as the most extensive class of suffixes.

Morphemic status of the suffix

A suffix is a linear unit allocated at the word level. As a morpheme, it is advisable to consider it in the following aspects:

- 1) in the light of the correspondence of the suffix to the general definitions of morpheme currently accepted in linguistics and
- 2) from the point of view of the place of the suffix in the existing classifications of morphemes and their structural and functional characteristics (Espersen, 2017).

This approach is due to the ambiguity of the definition of morphemes, and the classes subsumed under this unit. It is necessary to find out which definition of the morpheme corresponds to the status of the suffix and what formal, functional and other properties determine the place of the suffix on the scale of different morphemes.

In search of an adequate definition of a morpheme that would cover all categories of morphological level units, including the suffix, let us turn to more capacious and generalizing formulations. These conditions are met by the definition of morpheme, which we find in Baudouin de Courtenay. Morpheme, in his opinion, is “further indivisible, further indecomposable element of linguistic thinking. This term is a generic unifying term for frequent specific concepts like root, prefix, suffix, ending, etc.” (Sweet, 2018)

V.N. Yartseva qualifies the morpheme as “the shortest structural and semantic unit distinguished in the structure of the word”, emphasizes the functional differences between root and suffix morphemes.

The place of the suffix morpheme in the system of other morphemes should be determined by a set of formal and functional features. In the classifications of morphemes available in the linguistic literature, the suffix finds far from the same interpretation. In most cases, the discrepancy in the qualification of the suffix is explained by differences in the choice of criteria for its evaluation (purely formal, functional, mixed).

The specificity of the suffix morpheme as an intermediate between the lexeme, morpheme and grammatical formant creates difficulties for its classification (Sweet, 2018).

Classifications of morphemes based only on formal features are of much less interest. One of the most complete classifications of morphemes by formal features (by type of phonemes, by the positional relationship between phonemes). Where suffixes are distributed into several groups:

- 1) a group of morphemes consisting exclusively of segmental morphemes
- 2) a group of morphemes consisting of segmental and suprasegmental phonemes (accents),
- 3) a group of continuous “continuous” morphemes in contrast to the discontinuous morphemes “discontinuous”,

4) a group of “complementary” and “replacing” morphemes (“additive” and “substitute”, for example, the suffix – ity in banality, consisting of a segmental morpheme with adjacent stress and a change in root vocalism).

The study of the suffix morpheme in modern English from the point of view of distribution, morphology and functionality allows us to draw some conclusions relating both directly to the structure of the English suffix system and affecting certain issues of the general theory of morpheme and the technique of morphemic (as well as morphological) analysis (Bloch, 2015).

The obtained distributive, morphological and functional characteristics of the suffix morpheme give the basis for its description as follows: a suffix is a related poly— or monomorphic morpheme with linearly coincident segmental and suprasegmental composition, occupying a position in the word between the root morpheme and the grammatical formant, the content of which is expressed by its functionality.

The suffix in the morpheme system of modern English is a separate, special type of morpheme. The specific distributional and functional features of this unit, which distinguish it from such units of the same level as the root morpheme, prefix and grammatical formant, are identified using several criteria: distributional, functional, criterion of “connectivity” and criterion of limited inventory.

The suffix morpheme has a set of features of a formal, distributive and functional nature, in the context of which it seems most appropriate to classify it: by phonemic composition, by grammatical function, by belonging to a functional subclass and by semantic function.

## **Discussion and results**

Suffix morphemes form specific linear structures. Linear suffixal structures make up the membership of multi-morphed suffixal bases (Jukka Pennanen, 2019).

Linear suffixal structures (suffixal sequences), as part of the basis, are characterized by certain types of functional connections that find expression in the nature of morphemic units. Seams on morphemic borders are defined as free, semi-free and non-free. All three types of seams can take place both at the junction between the non-derivative theme and the first-order suffix with which the suffix sequence begins, and between suffixes in the sequence itself. According to the nature of the seams, suffix sequences are defined as follows:

- a) ordinary (sequences with free seams), which make up the most numerous group;
- b) semi-fused (sequences with one semi-free seam);
- c) fused (sequences with one or two non-free seams).

Some suffixes have a phonemic invariant, i.e. a similar spelling and sounding of the same suffix. So, to isolate a single suffix, it is necessary to find all its phonemic invariants, study the phonemic composition, trace its functions (functional characteristics). The criterion of the suffix position in a word (distributive criterion) can be used as an additional one. (Ross, 2015)

Suffixation as a way of word- and form-formation is the attachment of suffixes to roots and bases. There are many criteria for describing and classifying suffixes and prefixes in the linguistic literature. Both are usually classified on different grounds:

- 1) by origin: native English (-ly, -ful, -er, -ness, for-, mis-, out-, over-, semi) and borrowed. (-tion, -fy, -ize, -able, co-, dis-, ex-, extra-);
- 2) by productivity: highly productive (-ize, -er, -ism, -ist, anti-, co-, cross-, non-, pre-, re-), productive (-era, -ation, -ic, bi-, dis-, inter-, para-), unproductive (-her, -nik, homo-, post-, semi-, poly-), unproductive (-ard, -fold, -kin, -ling, be-, en-, epi-, vice-);
- 3) by semantics: agentive (-er, -ess, -ant), collective meaning (-dom), negation (un-, non-, in-), temporal sequence and precedence (fore-, pre-, post-), etc.;
- 4) by stylistic affiliation: neutral (-er, -able, out-, re-, under-) and stylistically colored (-eer, -ard, epi-, hemi-);

5) in the part of speech to which the derived word belongs.

The number of suffixes that are used in the formation of new words and their distribution are currently very large and diverse. A characteristic feature of modern suffixes is that they are strictly terminologized and assigned to a certain sphere (e.g., muson – elementary particle, grading – sorting, receptionist – registrar, employability – ability to work, durability – service life, accounting – accounting) (Kucera, 2017).

There are currently unproductive affixes, productive affixes that have the so-called "absolute productivity", i.e. such a word production ability, in which the affix has minimal limitations in its use as a word-forming element.

To describe the suffix system of the English language, A. Rosse identifies suffix schemes and models. The suffix scheme shows which parts of speech are used in the word-formation act, which of them is producing, which is derivative. So, for example, V + Suf = N is a suffix scheme. This scheme represents a noun formed from the verb base using a suffix, for example, remove + al = removal. At the same time, suffixal models are distinguished within suffixal schemes. They describe the generating base, a specific suffix, and a derived word. So, in the above scheme there are different models: for example, V + ion = N, communicate – communication; V + er + N, speak-speaker (Rey, 2015).

Regarding the part of the river affiliation of words formed by the suffix method, we can say that most of the terms are nouns and make up 49% of the total number of words formed by this method, i.e. the most productive way of suffixation is for the formation of nouns in the economic terminology of the English language. A wide variety of suffixes, both native and borrowed, are used for their formation: -er (-or), -ness, -sion (-tion, -cion), -ence (-ance), -ist, -ism, -ment, -ity (-ty), -ant, -dom, -ship, etc. For example, calculator, pension, payment, clerkship, heredity, officialdom.

Also, this method of word formation is quite productive for adverbs, verbal nouns and adjectives. In the formation of adverbs, the most productive is the suffix -ly, with which 27.4% of the lexical units analyzed by us are formed. A large number of different suffixes are also used to form adjectives (10%), such as -able (-ible), -al, -ic, -ar, -ive, -full, etc. Examples include the following adjectives: valuable, convertible, marginal, legal, powerful (Aitchison, 2017).

Analyzing directly the suffixes with which economic terms are formed in English and their lexical meanings, we came to the conclusion that the most productive in the formation of economic terminology of the English language are the suffixes -ion, -tion, -cion, -sion, -ty, -ity, which form nouns denoting abstract concepts. With their help, 27.6% of the words we considered were formed. The suffixes -ion, -tion, -cion, -sion came to English from Romance languages in the 18th and 19th centuries and began to serve as a model for the production of abstract nouns from those Romance verbs that did not have corresponding nouns with this suffix in English. For example: restriction – restriction, organization – organization, participation – participation. The suffix -ity, -ty is also borrowed and when combined with the basics of adjectives, the place of stress often changes. For example: 'acid – a'cidity, 'acid – a'cridity. There are cases when joining -ity entails some changes at the root. For example: clear – clarity. This suffix corresponds to the Russian analog -awn and also forms abstract nouns, but already from the basis of the adjective. With the help of this suffix, 8.7% of words were formed, such as activity – activity, convertibility – reversibility, property – property, etc. (Mattiello, 2017).

One of the most productive suffixes in the formation of nouns is the native English suffix -er and its analog -or, borrowed in the Middle Ages. With the help of these suffixes, nouns were derived from nouns and verbs, denoting persons engaged in the type of activity indicated by the generating basis, and nouns whose -er and -or indicate belonging to a certain locality.

Among the economic terms considered by us, the words formed with the help of this suffix make up 19.7%, for example, innovator – innovator, buyer – buyer, borrower – borrower.

For the formation of adjectives, the suffix –al is very productive, which forms adjectives with the meaning of a feature or property related to an object, phenomenon, action, place, time or number named by the original word. With the help of the suffix -al, 6.3% of adjectives are formed from the base of the noun. High productivity is also shown by the suffix -ing, which is used to form verbal nouns (gerund) with the meaning of action (Pounder, 2018).

Also, the following noun suffixes show a fairly high productivity in the formation of economic terminology: -ment (5.8%), which gives the meaning of an action, process or set of actions, forming nouns with the meaning of a state or property from verbs or nouns, suffixes -ant and -ist (1-8%).

Among the suffixes that form adjectives, suffixes -ible, -able are also quite active in productivity with the meaning of a constant property, quality, propensity for something, possession of some quality to a large extent of a sign or property related to an object, phenomenon, action, place, time or number, called the original in a word (Corbett, 2016).

Having considered and analyzed word-formation models using the example of economic terminology, we drew attention to the fact that the most productive model is  $V + \text{Suf} = N$ . This scheme represents a noun formed from the verb base using a suffix, for example:  $\text{pay} + \text{ment} = \text{payment}$ ,  $\text{calculate} + \text{or} = \text{calculator}$ . With its help, 69.4% of words are formed. The  $\text{Adj} + \text{Suf} = N$  (9.8 %) model is also quite often used:  $\text{active} + \text{ity} = \text{activity}$ ,  $\text{competitive} + \text{ness} = \text{competitiveness}$ . For the formation of adjectives, the models  $N + \text{Suf} = \text{Adj}$  (6.3%) and  $V + \text{Suf} = \text{Adj}$  (6.3%) are most often used:  $\text{finance} + \text{ial} = \text{financial}$ . The following word-formation models are the least productive for this group of words:  $N + \text{Suf} = N$  (4.4%) and  $\text{Adj}, N + \text{Suf} = \text{Adj}$  (3.8%).

That is, the analysis of word-formation models once again confirms that the most productive are models for the formation of nouns by the method of suffixation in the economic terminology of the English language (Kroft, 2013).

So, after analyzing all the data we have, we came to the following conclusions:

1. Suffixation is indeed one of the most productive ways of word formation in the formation of economic terms of the English language. With the help of suffixation, 17% of the words from the terms we analyzed were formed. All other methods of word formation account for 83% of words.
2. The largest number of economic terms formed using suffixation are nouns, verbal nouns (gerunds), adjectives and adverbs.
3. The most productive suffixes are -ion, -tion, -cion, -sion, -ty, -ity, which form abstract nouns, suffixes -er and -or, with the help of which nouns were produced denoting persons engaged in the type of activity indicated by the producing basis, and nouns, in which -er and -or indicate belonging to a certain locality.
4. The most productive models for the formation of economic terms in English are  $V + \text{Suf} = N$  and  $\text{Adj} + \text{Suf} = N$  (Quirk, 2014).

## Conclusion

English is a very dynamically developing language and requires constant study. Like any other language, it is a reflection of the specifics of people's lives at this historical stage. One of the most unstable and in need of constant study of phenomena is the updating of the vocabulary of the language by the appearance of new words. The appearance of new words in the English language is due to various factors, the main of which is the emergence of new realities that require a dictionary designation, the

change and modification of already existing cultural and everyday objects, the changing cultural and linguistic borders of states due to population migration.

The study of the suffix morpheme in modern English from the point of view of distribution, morphology and functionality allows us to draw some conclusions relating both directly to the structure of the English suffix system and affecting certain issues of the general theory of morpheme and the technique of morphemic (as well as morphological) analysis (Durst-Andersen, 2019).

The obtained distributive, morphological and functional characteristics of the suffix morpheme give the basis for its description as follows: a suffix is a related poly— or monomorphemic morpheme with linearly coincident segmental and suprasegmental composition, occupying a position in the word between the root morpheme and the grammatical formant, the content of which is expressed by its functionality.

The suffix in the morpheme system of modern English is a separate, special type of morpheme. The specific distributional and functional features of this unit, which distinguish it from such units of the same level as the root morpheme, prefix and grammatical formant, are identified using several criteria: distributional, functional, criterion of "connectivity" and criterion of limited inventory (Baddeley, 2015).

Thus, we see quite a large variety of suffixes of nouns in the English language. They are quite productive because, with their help, new nouns can be formed from various parts of speech: verbs, adjectives, and nouns. Knowledge of suffixes and the ability to apply them correctly will greatly facilitate students to study the English language vocabulary since having a certain vocabulary and knowing the laws of the formation of English words with the help of suffixes. You can save time on learning new words and vocabulary replenishment.

Having studied the origin of suffixes, examined some of their types and meanings, and got acquainted with a larger classification of suffixes in the English language, we achieved our work's goal, revealing theoretical and practical knowledge in the field of the suffix method of forming English words.

### **Bibliographic references**

- Aitchison, J. (2017). *Words in Consciousness: An Introduction to the Mental Lexicon*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell. 328 p.
- Arnold, I.V.(2015) *Lexicology of the modern English language*. Textbook for students of in-tov and fac. in. Languages I. V. Arnold. Moscow: Higher School. 186 p.
- Baddeley, A. (2015). *Memory*. London: New York: Psychology Press. Taylor and Francis Group; 2nd Edition. 546 p.
- Bloch, M. Ya. (2015). *Theoretical grammar of the English language*. Times Books.
- Corbett, G.G. (2016). *Canonical Derivational Morphology*. The structure of the word, 3 (2), 141-155.
- Dubenets, E. M. (2014). *Modern English Lexicology*. Textbook for students of humanities universities]. Moscow: Gloss-press; KARO.
- Durst-Andersen, P. (2019). *For language. Culture of the mental universe of language and communication*. Copenhagen: International Publishers.
- Espersen, O. (2017). *Modern grammar of the English language on historical principles*. Part VI, Morphology. Copenhagen.
- Ginzburg, R. (2015). *Lexicology of the English language*. Sage publishing. 260 p.
- Kroft, U. (2013). *Typology and universals*. Cambridge University Press. 368.
- Kucera, H. & Francis, W. N. (2017). *Computational analysis of present-day American English*. University Press of New England.
- Marchand, H. (2017). *Studies in Syntax and Word-Formation*. Munich: Wolter de Gruyter. 224 p.
- Mattielo, E. (2017). *Analogy in word formation. The study of English neologisms and occasionalisms*. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH. 247 p.

Pennanen, J. (2019). History and theory of literature. Pohjoinen.  
Pounder, A. (2018). Process and paradigms in word-formation morphology. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 131. Berlin: New York: De Gruyter Mouton. 735 p.  
Rey, A. (2015). Essays of terminology. Translated and edited by Juan S. Sager. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 223 p.  
Ross, A. (2015). Grammatical systems in the English language. Chisinau.  
Sweet, H. A. (2018). New grammar of the English language. Logical and historical, 2, Oxford.  
Quirk, R. (2014). From the sensual framework of the word to the social stereotypes of consciousness. Life Science Magazine, 11(10), 634-637.  
Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language. Random House Value Pub. (2016).

*Words: 5612*

*Characters: 35 075 (19,5 standard pages)*

Anipina Aliya  
Al Farabi Kazakh national university  
Temiryazeva street, 71, Almaty city  
Kazakhstan

Orazova Raya  
Department of Oriental Philology and Translation  
Kazakh National University named after Abay.  
Dostyk avenue, 13, Almaty, 050050  
Kazakhstan

Assoc. prof. Alikhankyzy Guliya  
Department of Oriental Philology and Translation.  
Kazakh National University named after Abay  
Dostyk avenue, 13, Almaty , 050050  
Kazakhstan

Zhylkybay Gulimzhan  
Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University  
B. Sattarkhanov avenue 29, 161200, Turkistan  
Kazakstan

Sholpan Karsybekova  
Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University  
B. Sattarkhanov avenue 29, 161200, Turkistan  
Kazakstan