

Chapter IX: Latin Prefixes

- Rules transform roots when suffixes are added.
- Latin prefixes add meaning.
- To understand a word, must understand the meaning of the prefix.
- Recognizing prefixes is part of the process of recognizing the root of a word.
- The Latin prefixes that have been borrowed into English.
- Already seen: negative *in-* , locative *in-*, collective *con-*.
- Some others are already familiar, those that have become naturalized and are productive in English. Ex. *re-*.

Latin Prefixes

- The morphological rule:
 - $\text{Lex} \Rightarrow \text{prefix} + \text{Lex}$
- In Latin, prefixes are category preserving.
 - $\text{Lex}_N \Rightarrow \text{prefix} + \text{Lex}_N$
 - $\text{Lex}_V \Rightarrow \text{prefix} + \text{Lex}_V$
 - $\text{Lex}_A \Rightarrow \text{prefix} + \text{Lex}_A$
- The general rule will look like this:
 - $\text{Lex}_X \Rightarrow \text{prefix} + \text{Lex}_X$
- Difficult to determine whether you add prefixes or suffixes first.
- However, appear that when added to lexemes derived from the past participle, they are added before the nominalizer *-ion*.

Latin Prefixes con't

- Evidence:
 - *correct*
 - *correction*
 - *çrection*
- For many Latin verbal roots, it is necessary to attach a prefix to a stem in order to create a lexeme that can be inflected.

The prefix *ad-* (*to*)

- Susceptible to assimilation to the following consonant.
- Assimilation to [l], [r], [n], [f], [p], [b], [g], and [k].
- Rules:
 - [d + l → l + l]_{Latin}
 - [d + r → r + r]_{Latin}
 - [d + n → n + n]_{Latin}
 - [d + f → f + f]_{Latin}
 - [d + s → s + s]_{Latin}
- General Rule:
 - [Voicing Assimilation]_{Latin}

The prefix *ad-* (*to*) con't

- Roots that begin with a dental.
- Consider the assibilation rule: t + t going to s + s.
- Assibilation does not apply to the prefix *ad-*.
- The explanation lies with the distinction between new and old words.
 - The set of morphological rules that add prefixes are relatively new in the history of Latin.
 - They were originally prepositions.
 - The past participle is an ancient structure.
 - Probably IE.

The prefix *ad-* (*to*) con't

- The assibilation rule that is found in the past participle is also probably ancient.
 - Since assibilation is an old rule it only applies to old structures.
 - It applies to the past participle but not to prefixes.
- Voicing Assimilation is one rule that persists through all stages of Latin.
- Roots that begin with [s].
 - [d] assimilates to [s].
 - The [d] has disappeared.
- Cluster Simplification Rule:
 - [s + s consonant → + s consonant]_{Latin}

The prefix *dis-* (*off, away, opposite*)

- Originates with PIE **dwis* (Grimm's Law- a cognate of English *two*).
- Changes that result for the adding of the prefix *dis-*:
 - When added to roots that begin with [f], the [s] assimilates to the following [f]. This is an assimilation rule.
 - [s + f → f + f]_{Latin}
 - The loss of [s] in certain words.
 - [s] deletes before voiced consonants:
 - [s + voiced consonant → voiced consonant]_{Latin}

The prefix *dis-* (*off, away, opposite*) con't

- Why does [s] remain before voiceless consonants but deletes before voiced consonants?
- The voicing assimilation rule predicts that [s] should convert to [z] before voiced consonants.
- This event predicts that it is not [s] which deletes but [z].
- Thus the rule would be:
 - $[zC \rightarrow C]_{\text{Latin}}$
 - This distinguishes between [s] and [z] and suggests that voicing is the difference between deleting and maintaining a consonant.
- Why Latin removed Z *zeta* from the alphabet. If all instances of [z] deleted then Latin had no need of this character.

Naturalization and the Age of Words

- The prefix *dis-* has been naturalized to some extent in English.
 - It appears in hybrids (attached to roots that are not Latin).
 - Its behaviour no longer corresponds to the Latin rules that we have proposed for it.
 - In *disband*, *disbar*, and *disbelief*, the [s] appears before a voiced consonant.
 - The naturalized words are processed by the English phonology.
 - Since the rule to delete [s] is a Latin rule, it will not apply to the naturalized use of *dis-*.

The prefix *ex-* (out)

- When the prefix *ex-* [ks] is added to a root that begins with *s*:
 - *eks* + *spec* + *e* + *t*
 - [s + s consonant → + s consonant]_{Latin}
- The prefix *ex-* is reduced to *e-*:
 - The *e-* variant appears when the root begins with a voiced consonant.
 - General Rule:
[stops and fricatives assimilate in voicing to a following consonant]_{Latin}
 - Note: This rule holds only across morpheme boundaries. When a sequence of consonants is part of a single morpheme, there is no assimilation.

The prefix *abs-* (away) con't

- This prefix appears as:
 - *abs-* before *c* (originally [k]) and *t*.
 - These consonants are voiceless.
 - *ab-* before *d, n, j, l, r,* and *s*.
 - These consonants are voiced.
 - [Voicing Assimilation]_{Latin}
 - [zC + C]_{Latin}
- *abs + solu*
 - [Cs + s → Cs +]_{Latin}

The prefix *re-* (back, again)

- This is a clear example of a naturalized morpheme.
- It can be added to virtually any verb to indicate that the action indicated by the verb is repeated.
- Further evidence for naturalization is the fact that it can be reanalyzed: its etymological form is not *re-* but *red-*.
- In Latin, a rule such as:
 - $[d + C \rightarrow + C]_{\text{Latin}}$
- Since more roots begin with consonants than vowels, there will be more instances of *re-* than *red-*.
- As a consequence, English speakers reanalyzed the prefix as *re-* and use this form everywhere, including before vowels as in *reopen*.

The prefix *re-* (back, again) con't

- The rule is not exactly correct:
 - $[d + C \rightarrow + C]_{\text{Latin}}$
- We have contradictory rules:
 - $[d + t \rightarrow tt]_{\text{Latin}}$
- Restrict the deletion rule to situations where the preceding vowel is *e* and apply it first:
 - $[e d + C \rightarrow e + C]_{\text{Latin}}$
- Deletes [d] when it appears after [e] but after [a].
- The [d] in *ad-* will not delete and can assimilate to other consonants.

The prefix *prod-* (before, forth)

- Similar to the analysis of *red-* is that of *prod-*.
- It has been reanalyzed in English as *pro-* (before).
- All the examples of original Latin *pro-* appear before consonants.
- The examples with *prod-* appear before vowels.
- The argument here is the same as that for *red-*.
- The rule:
 - $[\text{od} + \text{C} \rightarrow \text{o} + \text{C}]_{\text{Latin}}$

The prefix *sed-* (apart)

- This prefix is no longer productive in any form.
- It shows the same pattern as *red-* and *prod-*.

Prefixes ending in [d]

- The [d] of *ad-* will assimilate to a following consonant but the [d] of *red-* deletes before a consonant.
- The rules can be summarized as follows:
 - {e/o} d + C → C (Deletion)
 - ad + C₁ → aC₁C₁ (Assimilation)

Prefix *sub-* (*under*)

- The prefix is still productive in English.
- New lexemes are created: *subfloor* and *subheading*.
- These are hybrids.
- The *b* of the prefix will assimilate completely to a following *c* [*k*], *p*, *f*, and *g*.
- It does not assimilate to dentals *s*, *t*, *d*.

Prefix *trans-* (*across*)

- This prefix exhibits an alternation between *trans-* and *tra-* in Latin.
- In English the prefix is now productively *trans-*.
- When the root begins with a vowel or voiceless consonant, the prefix appears as *trans-*.
- If the root begins with a voiced consonant, the prefix is transformed to *tra-*.
 - [Voicing Assimilation]_{Latin}
 - [nz → z]_{Latin}
 - [zC → C]_{Latin}
 - The ordering of these rules is important.

Prefix *trans-* (*across*) con't

- Note: forms such as *traverse* and *tramontane* are borrowed from French and Italian respectively and show reduction or *trans-* by Romance rules.
- Words such as *translate*, *transduce*, and *transliterate* appear to be later creations and so escaped reduction.

Extensions

- Latin prefixes are derived from what were once independent prepositions.
- Some prepositions can inflect like adjectives.
- Some Latin prepositions could inflect like adjectives.
- When converted to a prefix these inflections would be retained.
- We will simply consider these to be extensions to the original prefix, indicating a prefix with a slightly different meaning than the original.

Extensions con't

- The prefixes that we are interested in are:
 - *in-* locative
 - *con-* collective
 - *ex-* egressive
 - *sub-* subordinate
- There are 3 extensions that can be added to these, although not all are added to each prefix.
 - *-ter-*; *-tra-* ; *-tro-*
- The comparative of the Latin *in* was *inter*
- From *inter-*, the other possible prefixes *intra-* and *intro-* were created.