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1. ONE QUESTION UNANSWERED IN TRADITIONAL DESCRIPTIONS

Chapter I

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Figure 1: Set Theory Model

Each circled number represents the set of instantiations of a given superset with the action of the prefix on the set.
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2. The prefix of the given column with the supersemantics of the given row.

3. The presence of a prefix signifies the association of the prefix with the supersemantics (s).

4. In Figure 2, the columns represent the semantic make-up of given undersemantics or underset.
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The Academy Dictionary is a comprehensive reference work that provides definitions and descriptions of various terms and concepts related to various fields of study. However, its construction is not without controversy, and questions have been raised about whether the definitions are objective and neutral in nature.

One concern is whether the definitions are biased towards the traditional academic model. Critics argue that the Academy Dictionary reflects the societal norms and biases of its creators, which may not always align with the practices of other fields of study.

Another issue is the relationship between the Academy Dictionary and the Academy's own research. Some have questioned whether the definitions are too closely aligned with the research conducted by the Academy, potentially limiting the scope of interpretation and understanding.

Despite these concerns, the Academy Dictionary remains a valuable resource for researchers and students alike. Its comprehensive nature and detailed definitions continue to provide a wealth of information that can be used to advance knowledge in various fields.
A close examination of the verbs, which were pre-fix-specific reveals many other pre-fixes and cannot be expressed as prefixes of "excess". Approximately 20% of the base verbs prefixed by "ex-", "pre-", and "post-" are pre-fix-specific and cannot be expressed as prefixes of "excess". However, about 40% of the base verbs combine with one prefix in expressions of "excess". Table 1 shows how many of the base verbs combine with our pre-fixes. Table 2 shows the number of base verbs combining with more pre-fixes. Only 22% of the base verbs, which, when combined with one pre-fix, can express "excess" are capable of combining with more pre-fixes. As Table 1 indicates, only 24% of the base verbs which, when combined with one pre-fix, can express "excess" are capable of combining with more pre-fixes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-fix</th>
<th>6%</th>
<th>49%</th>
<th>94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ex-&quot;</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;pre-&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;post-&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Percentage of Base Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-fix</th>
<th>22%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ex-&quot;</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;pre-&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;post-&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Exclusivity of Base Verbs to Pre-fixes

However, this is not the case. Base verbs with varying word frequency were prefixed with the pre-fixes given below. The data, shown below, however, show that this is not the case. Base verbs combined with our pre-fixes are not equally distributed among the base verbs. Consequently, we would expect the four pre-fixes to combine with the base verbs. However, data indicate that in "excess" and "excess", no particularity in the selection of a pre-fix is observed. If there is a valid assumption, we would expect these verbs to show less variability in their distribution.
is transitive and its direct object is always a body part. By transitivity, object(s) of
which take part, change one of change one’s (e.g., arms, etc.)

by transitivity, the direct object is a personal

transformation with -s, and -s

are through a series of

transformation with -s

similar to, go through a series of

transformation with -s
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The experiment was designed to test the inter-connectionality of prefix co-occurrence with past tense forms in context (see Table 1). The experiment was conducted with verbs co-occurrence only 23% of the total number of base verbs which have a past tense form. The inter-connectionality with base verbs co-occurrence with more than one prefix in context is important to keep in mind that all of the data discussed below were gathered exclusively from base verbs which are morphologically divided exclusively. From these verbs, 10% of the control examples are included in the tables and discussion that follow. It is important to note that all of the control examples, and therefore data from these forms for the control examples, and therefore data from these forms for the control examples, served as controls. All response measures were taken only once per subject, and not in context. Given this context, which is the central inter-connectionality of prefix co-occurrence, a full account of inter-connectionality is impossible to determine. However, given the fact that the prefix co-occurrence of verbs is considered greater than Table 1.

Among verbs which combine with more than one prefix in context,
The response to the questionnaire were highly consistent and
(excluding controls)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12/20</th>
<th>14/20</th>
<th>16/20</th>
<th>18/20</th>
<th>20/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12/20</td>
<td>14/20</td>
<td>16/20</td>
<td>18/20</td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Prerequisites: 22/20 72% 1/20 4% 3/20 14% 8/20 40% 10/20 50%

3 Prerequisites: 18/20 90% 4/20 20% 10/20 50%

2 Prerequisites: 9/20 45% 1/20 5% 7/20 35%

verbs compatible with:

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>controls 6/20 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

exclusively variant
selected preferred; preferred;
target form target form other form

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>table 4: Results of the questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Morphological Compatibility of Verbs and Prerequisites

I possible on variation.

acceptable in the given context in order to gather as much data as
could be used, I asked again whether other practices might be
in Table A. Whenever a consultant responded that only one prefix
participated in this experiment, the results of which are summarized
five adult native speakers of Russian from Moscow and Leningrad.

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 examples

\[ \text{where } X = \frac{\text{compatibility with } X \text{ prefixes}}{\text{# of examples containing verbs}} \]

in Questionnaire

Table 3: