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1. Introduction

Literature seems to be full of discussion on negation in general. However, since negation is mainly focused on clause negation (see section 2.1.2), I became curious about the ‘underdog’ that was named ‘negative affixes’. In order to better understand this way of negation, I chose it as the topic for my thesis. For this, I intend to look at three aspects of negative affixes: (i) their distribution, (ii) their competition in present-day English and (iii) their historical development.

Since the term 'negative' has many different meanings, I will deal with the concept of ‘negation’ first and define what is understood by ‘negative’ in my thesis. For this, I will point out the differences between clause negation and so-called local negation. The latter will, then, be of more interest as negative affixes negate one word only, rather than an entire clause. Further, I will differentiate between contrary and contradictory opposition, the distinction of which will be crucial when discussing the affixes’ competition in present-day English. In addition to this, I will deal with the process of affixation which is one of many ways to form new words. For sake of completeness, other word-formation processes will be described very briefly. This section should also show how small the sphere of negative affixes is in the great field of word-formation, even though there is a lot to say about them. Finally, I will discuss the matter of productivity which implies the ability to coin and understand new words.

The first aspect of negative affixes involves their distribution in present-day English. In this part of my thesis I will describe the affixes which are considered to be 'negative'. We shall see that the English language has several negative affixes, but not all of them will be discussed in the following chapters.

The second aspect involves the competition of the negative affixes in present-day English. Since there are so many negative affixes, the question that arises is: which affix can be applied to which word? Since negative affixes may be difficult for learners of English, it is relevant whether there are any fixed rules or, at least, some general patterns, which make it easier to find the ‘right’ affix? This discussion will consider morpho-syntactic, semantic and etymological criteria. Further, I shall discuss whether this distinction is enough to opt for the ‘correct’ negative affix.
In addition to this, I will deal with the question of what difficulties may arise when using (non-) affixal negation. If all negative prefixes have (more or less) the same meaning, does it matter which one a speaker is using? This is where the distinction between contrary and contradictory opposition plays an important role. As we shall see, the utterance *I am not happy* has a slightly different meaning than *I am unhappy*. Further, I will discuss constraints that lead to obligatory use of either affixal or non-affixal negation.

As the final part of my thesis, I will examine the historical development of the negative affixes. Since a detailed history of all negative affixes would go beyond the scope of this thesis, this section will focus on the debate between the use of negative *un-* and negative *in*-. As will be mentioned in the Competition section (and also partly in the Distribution section), the prefix *un-* is considered to be the biggest rival of *in*-. With the aid of linguistic corpora, I will investigate this rivalry and describe how the use of *un-* and *in-*prefixation has developed over the years.

I am aware that the three aspects mentioned above may overlap to a certain degree and that there are no clear-cut boundaries between them. Nevertheless, I decided to structure my thesis in this way to allow a clear picture of negative affixes.
2. Theoretical framework

In this chapter, I want to introduce three concepts which are directly linked to ‘negative affixes’ and which will occur frequently in this thesis, namely (i) negation, (ii) affixation, and (iii) productivity. I will discuss each concept in turn. The aim of this chapter is to not only provide the basis for my thesis, but also to help mapping ‘negative affixes’ in the expansive landscape of linguistics.

2.1. What is negation?

2.1.1. Negative

In order to discuss ‘negative affixes’, it is of importance to know what is understood by the term ‘negative’. According to the OED (s.v. negative adj., adv.2, and int.), ‘negative’ first appeared as a noun and, then, developed to a verb and adjective respectively. As a noun, ‘negative’ expresses two senses: (a) those relating to denial or negation, and (b) those relating to an opposite or inverse form (OED: s.v. negative n.). ‘Negative’ as a verb seems to have limited use in the English language. The most recent entries of it occurred as late as the 1980s (OED: s.v. negative, v.). The use of ‘negative’ as an adjective forms the largest group. As an adjective, the OED (s.v. negative adj., adv.2, and int.) lists no less than thirteen meanings of ‘negative’, such as denial, negation, refusal, unsuccessful results, etc.

In linguistics, ‘negative’ is “[a] grammatical form usually implying negation”. (Hartmann 1972:150). Trask (1993:179) elaborates on this by saying that “a grammatical element which, when added to a sentence expressing a proposition, reverses the truth value of a proposition.” For Matthews (1997:240), ‘negative’ is a “(sentence, construction, form) whose basic role is in asserting that something is not the case”. In general, it can be said that ‘negative’ functions as the opposite of ‘positive’ or ‘affirmative’ (Crystal 2008:324).

According to Crystal (2008:15; 2008:323-4; 2008:376), ‘positive’ and ‘affirmative’ both indicate a proposition without any markers of negation and, thus, express an 'assertion', such as in She is happy as opposed to the negative She is not happy (also Matthews 1997:10; 1997:287). This then means that “the process or the result of making a negative statement” (Hartmann 1972:150) is called
'negation'. Based on these entries, we can now say that, at least for my purposes, the term ‘negative’ will be used to imply negation and will be treated as the opposite to the terms ‘positive’ and ‘affirmative’.

Having established what ‘negative’ means, there is one more question that needs to be dealt with: what is a ‘negative’ proposition and how can we tell (cf. Horn 1989 [2001]:30)? In his book, Horn (ibid.) does not provide an explicit answer as the discussion between negation and affirmation has been ongoing for many centuries and scholars are still in disagreement today. However, he points out that “the difference between affirmative and negative statements [can] be reduced to one approach” (Horn 1989 [2001]:34), namely that to Ayer’s (1952) notion of negativity. Ayer (1952:813) describes it as follows:

[a] statement is negative if it states that an object lacks a certain property rather than stating that it possesses the complementary property: a statement is negative if it states that a certain property is not instantiated, rather than stating that the complementary property is universally instantiated.

From all this, we are able to infer that the presence of a negative, i.e. some grammatical element, indicates that the statement or proposition uttered may be regarded as ‘negative’. If such an element is absent, i.e. the utterance does not carry a negative marker, it may be considered as an assertion or affirmative (cf. Mazzon 2004:1). In the following section, I will discuss the traditional criteria which signal negation in the English language.

2.1.2. Negation

The term ‘negation’ derives from the Latin verb *negare* which means 'to say that...not, deny’ (Bußmann 1996:322) and accordingly from the Latin noun *negātiō*, which translates to ‘denial, refusal, act of making negative’ (OED: s.v. *negation n.*). The concept of negation can traditionally be found in philosophy, logic, computing, mathematics and linguistics (cf. OED: s.v. *negation n.*; Bußmann 1996:323). Thanks to Aristotle, negation has moved from the “realm of pure ontology [i.e. study of being] and enter[ed] the domains of language and logic” (Horn 1989 [2001]:6). In his original theories, Aristotle focused on a “system of oppositions between pairs of terms” (Horn ibid.) and built the foundations of negation in linguistics as we know it today. Asher (1994:2769) points out that “negation in
natural languages is very different from, and much more complicated than, negation in logic or mathematics”. Logical negation basically functions like linguistic sentence negation where “the truth value of a proposition p [is converted] into its opposite truth value” (Bußmann 1996:322). However, in linguistics, as opposed to logic, negation is quite manifold and can be divided into more than one category. Generally speaking, negation in linguistics is “[a] process or construction in grammatical and semantic analysis which typically expresses the contradiction of some or all of a sentence’s meaning” (Crystal 2008:323). Ayer (1952:799) argues that “[denying] some previous suggestion […] may even be [negation’s] most common use”.

As already mentioned, negation in linguistics is rather complex and has been an issue of debate for many years (cf. Horn 1989 [2001], Asher 1994, Ayer 1952). Therefore, it comes as no surprise that there are some differences in categorisation.

For this thesis, I shall go with Quirk et al.’s (1985) categorisation. The reason why I settle for Quirk et al.’s (1985) solution is, to put it frankly, because their categorisation is simple and straightforward. Their classification is kept at a very general level. Other scholars (see below) have very detailed differentiations in regard to negation. Huddleston and Pullum (2002), for example, differentiate between four types of negation, namely (i) verbal vs non-verbal, (ii) analytic vs synthetic, (iii) clausal vs subclausal, and (iv) ordinary vs metalinguistics. Another scholar, Klima (1964), defines instances of sentence and word negation which is similar to Quirk et al. (1985), but he additionally differentiates between strong and weak negation. Jespersen (1924 [1977]:322ff) has a different approach with his distinction between indirect, incomplete, special and nexal negation as well as his tripartition positive-questionable-negative. Another scholar, namely Bußmann (1996:323), distinguishes between internal, external, weak and strong negation, and, thus, uses yet another means of categorisation. Even though it is important to know the different approaches on negation by different scholars, these categorisations are much too detailed for my purposes. Moreover, my thesis will be concerned with affixal negation, rather than negation in general. Therefore, a very detailed discussion on negation would go beyond the scope of my thesis.

According to Quirk et al. (1985:775), there are three types of negation: (a) clause negation, (b) local negation, and (c) predication negation. Since the third
kind, predication negation, is a “minor type applying only after certain auxiliaries, in which the predication is negated” (Quirk et al. ibid.), I shall omit this type entirely. An example of predication negation would be they may not go swimming which implies ‘they are allowed not to go swimming’ (Quirk et al. 1985:797). I will, however, discuss clause and local negation in detail, whereupon my focus will lie on local negation.

In the English language, there are many different ways of indicating negation. Bußmann (1996:323) states that negation may be expressed lexically, morphologically, intonationally, and idiomatically. In lexis, it is typically signalled by the particle (often referred to as ‘negative particle’) not or its contracted form n’t as in examples (1a), (1b), (2a) and (2b) below (cf. also Crystal 2008:323; Hartmann 1972:150; Bußmann 1996:323; Leech 2006:64-5). Jespersen (1924 [1977]:325) explains that not generally “means 'less than', or in other words 'between the term qualified and nothing'.

(1) He is happy. (1a) He is not happy. (1b) He isn’t happy.
(2) I have finished. (2a) I have not finished. (2b) I haven’t finished.

Other lexical means include “adverbs and adverbial expressions (not, never, by no means), indefinite pronouns (nobody, nothing, none), co-ordinating conjunctions (neither...nor), sentence equivalents (no), or prepositions (without, besides)” (Bußmann 1996:323). In terms of morphology, negative prefixes such as un- in unhappy or negative suffixes such as –less in helpless are used (Bußmann ibid.; cf. also Crystal 2008:323). As far as intonation is concerned, Bußmann (1996:323) argues that negation depends on the stress expressed in an utterance. He (Bußmann ibid.), for example, states that in the sentence Jacob is not flying to New York tomorrow, the negation can refer either to 'Jacob', 'flying', 'New York', or 'tomorrow' (cf. also Quirk et al. 1985:787). Negation may also be expressed by means of idioms such as in For all I care (Bußmann 1996:323). For Crystal (2008:323) and Jespersen (1924 [1977]:329), the use of lexemes with negative meaning, such as deny or lack, is another way of expressing negation.

Before I turn to clausal and local negation, I shall first refer to the so-called 'scope' and 'focus of negation'. The scope of negation is “the stretch of the language over which the negative item has a semantic influence” (Quirk et al.
In other words, the scope is the part in an utterance which is being negated (cf. also Huddleston and Pullum 2002:790). Usually, the scope of negation begins at the negative element and terminates at the end of the clause, whereupon intonation marks the difference of two or more meanings (Quirk et al. 1985:787-8). For example, the sentence *For the whole time I wasn't listening* either expresses the meaning 'the whole time I wasn't listening, instead I scribbled over my notebook' or 'I was listening but not the entire time' (ibid.). As far as focus of negation is concerned, it indicates the "special or contrastive nuclear stress falling on a particular part of the clause" (Quirk et al. 1985:789). This means that negation is prominently or explicitly indicated in one particular spot of the utterance (Quirk et al. ibid., cf. also Huddleston and Pullum 2002:790). However, since it is of no relevance to the discussion of affixal negation, I shall not go into more detail with this.

In **clause negation**, a whole sentence or finite clause is regarded as a negative statement. Clause negation can be achieved “by inserting the negative particle *not* between the operator and the predication” (Quirk et al. 1985:776). The operator may be defined as “the first or only auxiliary” (Quirk et al 1985:79) which usually follows the subject directly. The predication “consists of the non-finite part of the verb-phrase plus any other elements relating to it” (Leech 2006:89). For example the sentence (2) above has been negated by inserting the negative particle *not* between ‘have’ (operator) and ‘finished’ (predication) to become *I have not finished* as seen in (2a). Often, there may be no predication given, e.g. in sentence (1), then, the negative particle immediately follows the operator, as can be seen in (1a). In cases where the operator is not present, the so-called 'dummy' auxiliary *do* will be used to support the negation (ibid.), for example *She works hard* is negated to *She does not work hard*.

Other means of expressing clause negation include the use of “words negative in form and meaning” (Quirk et al. 1985:778) such as *no, none* or *never*, and “words negative in meaning but not in form” (Quirk et al. 1985:780) such as *seldom, rarely, scarcely, hardly, barely, little* and *few* as illustrated below.

(3a) That was no accident.
(3b) None of them were prepared.
(3c) I will never make this mistake again.
(4a) I **seldom** go to church.

(4b) The author **rarely** accepts suggestions from others.

(4c) They **barely** know him.

(4d) Little did I know.

(4e) **Few** people were invited to join the discussion.

It needs to be pointed out that negative clauses are syntactically different from positive clauses. According to Quirk et al. (1985:777ff), there are five distinct features. Clauses are considered to be negative if they are (i) followed by positive checking tag questions, (ii) followed by negative tag clauses, (iii) followed by negative agreement responses, (iv) followed by non-assertive items such as *any*, or (v) do not co-occur with items that have positive orientation. Examples of these features can be seen in (5) below. Quirk et al. (1985:778) state that the features (i) to (iii) mentioned above, are only applicable to independent declarative clauses. In contrast to this, the features (iv) and (v) may also apply to subordinate finite and non-finite clauses.

(5a) She does not work hard, **does she?**

(5b) She does not work and **neither do you**. OR: She does not work, **nor do you**.

(5c) She does not know him – **No, she does not**.

(5d) There was not **any** parking space left.

(5e) *It is not **pretty** late. (cf. It's pretty late)*

In addition to this, Huddleston and Pullum (2002:786) argue that clause negation can also be identified by the addition of a *not even* construct. They claim that “[w]hen a clause is negative, the following *even* is commonly preceded by *not* [...] but *not* is inadmissible after a positive clause” (Huddleston and Pullum ibid.). For example, *She does not work hard* may be extended to *She does not work hard, not even when a pay raise is offered*. Consequently, this sentence contains clause negation. In contrast to this, a positive clause, e.g. *She works hard*, could not be extended by *not even*, e.g. *She works hard, not even when a pay raise is offered*. Instead, positive clauses are followed by *so*, as in *She works hard, so a pay raise has been offered* (Huddleston and Pullum 2002:787).
In local negation, only one constituent is negated and, thus, leaves the entire clause positive (Quirk et al. 1985:776). Huddleston and Pullum (2002:789) refer to this kind of negation as 'subclausal negation'. A constituent, i.e. a word or phrase, is usually negated by the preceding negative element, for instance not as shown in example (6) below (Quirk et al. 1985:790).

(6) She is a not unattractive woman.

In this example, we can see that the negative particle not only negates unattractive and not the entire clause. Since the syntactic features for negative clauses cannot be applied, the negation cannot be of clausal kind. In addition, we could see that the test by Huddleston and Pullum (2002:786), i.e. adding a not even construct would not apply either. If, however, the sentence was She is not an attractive woman, the syntactic features would apply and, thus, make it a clause negation.

At this point, I shall note that attractive and not unattractive do not express the same meaning (Huddleston and Pullum 2002:810). Huddleston and Pullum (2002:809) state that “attributive adjectives cannot be negated directly by not”, for example *a not large house. This means that an adjective can only be preceded by not, if it has a productive and transparently negative prefix, such as un-, and if it is gradable (ibid.). Therefore, a sentence like *She is a not attractive woman would have been impossible. The notion of (un-) gradable lexemes (cf. contrary and contradictory opposition) will be discussed in section 2.1.3.

The negative element in local negation not only modifies adjectives but also (i) degree adverbs as in I visit them not very often, (ii) adverbs expressing distance or time, for instance in They live not far from us, (iii) the quantifiers a few and a little, e.g. I sensed not a little hostility, (iv) the comparatives more, less, fewer for example We need to collect no fewer than 100 signatures for the petition, or (v) prepositional phrases such as We cleared the table in no time (Quirk et al. 1985:791-2).

Local negation may also be achieved morphologically by adding so-called 'negative affixes' such as the prefix un- in uncertain or the suffix -less in helpless. Since these are considered to be a 'special kind' of local negation, they will be discussed separately below.
The question that now arises is, why is it essential to distinguish between clause and local negation? In many cases, there may be a difference in meaning depending on “whether the negative belongs to one special word or is placed with the verb as belonging to the sentence as a whole” (Jespersen 1933 [1950]:298). In order to illustrate this, let me compare the sentences (7a) and (7b) below:

(7a) They own not very fierce dogs.  
(7b) They do not own very fierce dogs.

The example above shows that sentence (7a) consists of local negation, where the degree adverb very is negated. This sentence, thus, implies that 'they have dogs, which happen to be not very fierce'. Sentence (8b), on the other hand, comprises clause negation, where own very fierce dogs is negated. Consequently, the utterance implies that 'they do not have dogs at all' (cf. Quirk et al. 1985:791).

In other cases, however, clause negation may correspond to local negation and basically imply the same message, but the 'main idea' of an utterance may be different (Quirk et al. 1985:791-2). Take, for example, the sentences in (8) below. Sentence (8a) consists of clause negation, where like the film is being negated, and basically indicates that 'the majority of us did not like the film'. In contrast to this, sentence (8b) involves local negation, which negates not many of us, and implies that 'the minority liked the film'. It can, thus, be said that (8b) is essentially what (8a) indicates, but the focus is different, i.e. in (8a) focus lies on the general dislike of the film, but in (8b) the fact that only 'few people' liked it is stressed.

(8a) Many of us did not like the film.  
(8b) Not many of us liked the film.

The general tendency in negation is to “place the negative first, or at any rate as soon as possible” (Jespersen 1966:5) in order to avoid misunderstandings of any kind. As we have seen above, it is often a matter of style whether clause or local negation is being chosen, e.g. it is not possible to do this versus it is impossible to do this. However, Jespersen (1966:43) claims that local negation such as in it is impossible is “somewhat stronger”.
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A special kind of local negation is that of **affixal negation** because it is “purely morphological” (Huddleston and Pullum 2002:790). Generally speaking, affixal negation is a type of negation where a lexeme with positive meaning is not negated with a negative particle *not* but is instead negated with an affix (Crystal 2008:232). Klima (1964:291) points out that negative affixes are “not instances of sentence negation” and Huddleston and Pullum (2002:789) insist that “[a]ffixal negation is *always* subclausal” (my emphasis, CL), i.e. a matter of local negation rather than clause negation. The reason for this is quite simple: the negative affix only negates the lexeme to which it is attached (cf. Klima 1964:292). Jespersen (1924 [1977]:329) even considers affixal negation to be a 'special negation' because negation, then, only belongs to “one single idea” (ibid.).

Negative affixes in the English language include the prefixes *un-*, *in-*, *de-*, *dis-*, *mis-*, and *non-* and the suffix *-less* (Cruse 2006:117). In addition to this, Jespersen (1966:147) also considers the prefixes *(a)n-*, such as *asexual* or *amoral*, and *no-*, e.g. *no-settlement*, to be negative. According to Tottie (1991), the suffix *-out*, as in *without*, should also be included in the list of negative affixes. I should note, however, that the affixes *no-* and *-out* will not be considered in this thesis. The reason being that there is hardly any information on these two affixes which makes a detailed discussion impossible. The characteristics and behaviours of negative affixes will be the focus of attention in chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis.

### 2.1.3. Contrary and contradictory opposition

An issue that needs to be tackled when discussing negative affixes is the difference between contrary and contradictory opposition. Knowing the difference is crucial not only because it influences the choice between affixal and non-affixal negation, but also because some negative affixes can only express one or the other kind of opposition. The latter will be dealt with in greater detail in chapter 4 of this thesis.

The notions ‘contrary opposition’ and ‘contradictory opposition’ go as far back as Aristotle (Horn 1989 [2001]:6-7). Generally speaking, lexemes with positive meaning usually have a negative counterpart and vice versa; for example *succeed* (positive) with the counterpart *fail* (negative) (Lyons 1977 [1978]:270). For Lyons (ibid.), the “standard technical term for oppositeness of meaning between
lexemes is antonymy”. It should be noted, however, that for Lyons (1977 [1978]) the term ‘antonymy’ is not a general one to define oppositeness, as for instance used in dictionary entries, but it is reserved for a particular kind of oppositeness (Crystal 2008:28).

Lyons (1977 [1978]:271) insists that a distinction between so-called ‘gradable’ and ‘ungradable’ opposites must be made. Examples of ‘gradable’ opposites include long – short, hot – cold, happy – sad, whereas ‘ungradable’ opposites include single – married; female – male; dog – cat; alive – dead (Cruse 2006:14-15 and 2006:35-36). Gradable opposites are listed in example sentences (9a) to (9d). How do they differ from the ungradable opposites in (10a) to (10d)?

(9a) The Golden Gate Bridge is long.
(9b) The Golden Gate Bridge is longer than the Tower Bridge.
(9c) The Tower Bridge is short.
(9d) The Tower Bridge is shorter than the Golden Gate Bridge.

(10a) Susan is married.
(10b) *Susan is more married than Carol.
(10c) Carol is single.
(10d) *Carol is more single than Susan.

Sentences (9b) and (9d) show that ‘gradable’ opposites can be used to represent similarities or differences, i.e. they are used for comparison. In contrast to this, the adjectives in (10b) and (10d) respectively are not subject to comparison. It is semantically impossible for someone to be ‘more married’ or ‘more single’ as these two lexemes represent absolute states. This leads to the result that the most crucial factor for gradability is comparison (Lyons 1977 [1978]:271). Because of comparison it is possible to set “one or more middle terms” (Jespersen 1924 [1977]:322). For example, if I were to describe the size of a tablet computer I could say that it is smaller than an average PC but bigger than a mobile phone. In this case, I did not choose either one of the extremes (small – big), instead I opted for the middle and say it is medium-sized.

Gradable opposites are referred to as either antonymy or as contrary opposition (Lyons 1977 [1978]:272; Crystal 2008:112). Cruse (2006:36) defines it
as follows, “[t]wo propositions stand in a contrary relation to one another if truth of one entails the falsity of the other, but the falsity of one does not entail the truth of the other”. This means that both lexemes cannot be true at the same time but they both may be false at the same time (Lyons 1977 [1978]:272; Cruse 2006:36). For example, if the coffee is hot, it automatically implies that the coffee is not cold – and of course vice versa, if the coffee is cold, then the coffee is not hot. However, if one of the opposites is negated, e.g. the coffee is not hot, it does not necessarily imply the truth of the other, i.e. the coffee is cold. The reason for this is that in contraries both may be false, so the coffee is neither hot nor cold, but lukewarm. Ayer (1952:208) refers to this as follows, “[o]f any two statements which are not mutually exclusive it may be said that each is a partner in the range of the other.” Essentially, lukewarm is ‘a little bit of hot’ and ‘a little bit of cold’ simultaneously.

In contrast to this, two ungradable opposites do not possess these qualities, hence the term ungradable. They are often referred to as complementary or contradictory opposites (Lyons 1977 [1978]:271; Cruse 2006:35). Cruse (2006:35) explains that “[t]wo propositions are contradictory if the truth of one entails the falsity of the other, and the falsity of one entails the truth of the other”. In other words, both cannot be true at the same time and both cannot be false at the same time (Lyons 1977 [1978]:271-2; Cruse 2006:35). For instance, if Jamie is alive it definitely implies that Jamie is not dead. However, if Jamie is not alive it automatically means that Jamie is dead. In order words, it is impossible for Jamie to be neither alive nor dead, but it is also out of question for him/her to be both alive and dead at the same time. In addition to this, any middle terms are excluded (Jespersen 1924 [1977]:322).

The distinction between contrary and contradictory opposition should be kept in mind as it will be crucial when discussing the issue of negative affixes’ competition in chapter 4 of this thesis. We shall, then, see that semantic difficulties arise when a decision between affixal, e.g. unhappy, and non-affixal negation, e.g. not happy, has to be made.

2.2. What is affixation?
The second concept which I want to discuss is that of affixes, or rather the process of affixation. Affixation is part of the linguistic branch of morphology, which “studies
the structure or forms of words” (Crystal 2008:314). Morphology stands in contrast to the branch of syntax as it “deals with the internal structure of words” (Lyons 1968:194). In addition to this, Matthews (1974:154) argues that morphology is also about the words’ “relationship to other words within the paradigm”. Syntax, on the other hand, deals with “[the] ‘putting together’ or ‘arranging’ of elements” (Matthews 1974:2) and “the rules governing [the words’] combination in sentences” (Lyons 1968 [1969]:194). In this section, I will at first briefly explain word-formation, which is a sub-category of morphology, then I will discuss its most basic principles and will, finally, go into depth about the affixation process.

2.2.1. Word-formation

Morphology can be divided into two sections, namely inflection and word-formation (Lyons 1968 [1969]:195, Matthews 1974:38, Bauer 1983 [2002]:33). The former is, briefly said, the study of endings which mark grammatical elements such as tense, person, case, etc. (Bauer 1983 [2002]:10, Plag 2003:14). For example the ending –s, as in he sings, marks the third-person singular indicative present of the verb. Consequently, these inflections obey grammatical rules, e.g. subject-verb agreement, with which sentences are built (Plag 2003:14-15). Word-formation, on the other hand, examines the processes with which new words are formed (Lyons 1968 [1969]:195, Kastovsky 1982:71, Bauer 1983 [2002]:33).

Word-formation can be further categorized into derivation and compounding (Matthews 1974:38, Bauer 1983 [2002]:30 and 1983:33). According to Lyons (1968 [1969]:195), derivation is the formation of new words based on already existing ones (cf. also Lyons 1977:522). For example the noun nation can be extended to nationhood (‘state of being a nation’), it can become an adjective by adding the suffix –al (national, ‘of or relating to nation’), which can, then, be used as verb with –ise (nationalise, ‘to bring under state control’) (cf. Bauer 1983 [2002]:11). In contrast to this, inflection does not result in new words, as can be seen in nation > nations, i.e. plural form of ‘political state’.\(^1\) Thus, derivation is said to encode lexical meaning, whereas inflection expresses grammatical properties (Plag 2003:17). As far as compounding (or composition) is concerned, it may loosely be defined as

\(^1\) All definitions according to OED (s.v. nationhood, n.; national, adj. and n.; nationalise, v.; nation, n.1).
“the process of putting two words together to form a third” (Bauer 1983 [2002]:11). For instance, the noun girlfriend is considered to be a compound as it consists of the two lexemes girl and friend (cf. Plag 2003:5).

2.2.1.1. The term ‘word’

When discussing ‘word-formation’, it is of importance to clarify the term ‘word’. The word is without a doubt the most essential unit in both syntax and morphology (cf. Lyons 1968 [1969]:194). However, there is one question that arises: what is a ‘word’? Despite the disagreement on the definition of ‘word’, Bauer (1983 [2002]:8) points out that “speakers of a language, even illiterate speakers, have a feeling for what is, or is not, a word”. But what exactly is understood by ‘word’? According to Marchand (1969:1), a ‘word’ is something which “denote[s] the smallest independent, indivisible, and meaningful unit of speech, susceptible of transposition in sentences.” Lyons (1968 [1969]:69 and 196) divides the term ‘word’ into three senses: (i) phonological or orthographic, (ii) grammatical, and (iii) the ‘abstract’ entity.

As Lyons (1968 [1969]:196) points out, the phonological and orthographic senses of ‘word’ are based on realisation. Thus, the phonological word can simply be defined as the combination of sounds to form a meaningful entity (Lyons 1968 [1969]:69). The orthographic word, on the other hand, represents this entity “as a unit of the writing system” (Plag 2003:4). For instance phonological /kæt/ represents orthographic cat. At this point, it is important to note that one phonological word may represent two or more different orthographic words (Lyons 1968 [1969]:69), for instance /sʌn/ may stand for sun or son. This is, then, referred to as homophony (Plag 2003:9, Matthews 1974:23).

Different word-forms which have different grammatical properties may be subject to one paradigm. This paradigm is, then, referred to as lexeme (Lyons 1968 [1969]:197, Kastovsky 1982:74, Bauer 1983 [2002]:12-13, Plag 2003:9). For example, the different word-forms sing, sings, singing, sang, sung, and singer all underlie the paradigm or lexeme sing (Lyons 1968:197). A lexeme, thus, may be regarded as the abstract entity where a “set of forms” constitute for one paradigm (ibid.). For Matthews (1974:22), the lexeme is “the fundamental unit […] of the lexicon of the language” as it implies “all the possible shapes that [a] word can
have” (Bauer 1983 [2002]:11). It can also be said that a lexeme is the item which can be found in the dictionary.

Lyons (1968 [1969]:197) argues that “[i]t is up to us to decide which way we wish to define the term ‘word’. The important thing is to keep the three senses apart”. Therefore, Bauer (1983 [2002]:13) argues to reserve the term ‘word’ for entities that are “vague between word-form and lexeme”.

2.2.1.2. Basic elements in word-formation

In discussions of word-formation it is, unfortunately, not sufficient to distinguish between word, word-form and lexeme. For proper analysis, smaller units, i.e. ‘parts of words’ (Matthews 1974:77), need to be established. Lyons (1968 [1969]:183) argues that “when the word can be segmented into parts, these segments are referred to as morphs”; for example, the word *untouchables* can be divided into the morphs *un*, *touch*, *able*, and *s* (cf. Bauer 1983 [2002]:13-15). According to Bauer (1983 [2002]:15) a morph is “a segment of a word-form which represents a particular morpheme” (cf. also Lyons 1968 [1969]:184; Matthews 1974:83). This is to say that morphemes are abstract elements made of morphs which are essentially “phonetic (or orthographic) strings” (Bauer 1983 [2002]:15) with “its own form (or set of forms), its own meanings, and its own distribution” (Bauer 1983 [2002]:13). Generally speaking, a morpheme can be defined as “the minimal unit of grammatical analysis” (Lyons 1968 [1969]:181, Matthews 1974:11-12, Bauer 1983 [2002]:14, Plag 2003:10).

Kastovsky (1982:71) differentiates between “lexikalische Morpheme” and “grammatische Morpheme”. The former are units which are used to combine with one another within a syntactic-semantic framework. The latter includes markers of grammatical properties such as tense, person, case, etc. (see also discussion on inflection above). In addition to these morphemes, Kastovsky (1982:72) further differentiates between “freie, gebundene und blockierte Morpheme”. Free morphemes are entities “which may occur alone as utterances” (Lyons 1968 [1969]:201). This is to say that free morphemes function as independent units, which “can occur in isolation” (Bauer 1983 [2002]:17), and do not have to be combined with anything else, for example *the*, *go*, *alone*, *man*, *in* (cf. Kastovsky 1982:72).
Whenever entities cannot stand alone as whole utterances and need to be “in conjunction with at least one other morph" (Bauer 1983 [2002]:17), they are called 'bound morphemes' (Lyons 1968 [1969]:201, Kastovsky 1982:72, Bauer 1983 [2002]:17). Let me illustrate this with the morphemes commit and ment in the lexeme commitment. While commit can occur independently, it is impossible for ment to be unattached. Hence commit is regarded as a free morpheme, whereas ment must be bound. Such bound morphemes are generally referred to as 'affixes' (Kastovsky 1982:72). Depending on their position in a word, affixes are divided into three categories, namely (i) prefixes, (ii) suffixes, and (iii) infixes (Kastovsky 1982:72, Bauer 1983 [2002]:18, Plag 2003:10-11, Crystal 2008:16). Affixes are discussed in-depth in the following section.

For Kastovsky (1982:72), blocked morphemes constitute a special case as they only occur in certain, closed paradigms; for example the morphemes cran-, as in cranberry, or Mon-, as in Monday, do not occur elsewhere. However, in the paradigm of berry, cran- is used to differentiate between raspberry, strawberry or such and, thus, its existence makes sense. The same applies to Mon-: within the paradigm of day, Mon- can clearly be separated from Tuesday or Friday. Another kind of morpheme, which is not relevant in terms of negative affixes, but which I will discuss for completeness’ sake, is the allomorph. An allomorph is a morph which represents variant forms of one morpheme (Plag 2003:27, Crystal 2008:20). For example, the indefinite article has three distinct realizations: [ə] as in a question, [en] as in an answer, or ['eɪ ] when it is isolated (cf. Plag 2003:27).

Apart from morphemes, there is another element which we will come across on a frequent basis, namely ‘base’, sometimes also referred to as ‘root’ or ‘stem’. Generally speaking, these three terms “designate that part of a word that remains when all affixes have been removed” (Bauer 1983 [2002]:20). A distinction between these three terms has been established to not only avoid confusion but also to clearly separate from inflectional and derivational operations (Bauer 1983 [2002]:20, Plag 2003:10-11).

The ‘base’ is essentially that part of a word to which any affixes can be attached (Bauer 1983 [2002]:21, Plag 2003:11). For instance, touch functions as the base when the prefix un- and the suffix -able are added to form untouchable (cf. Bauer 1983 [2002]:21). A base, thus, represents the “central meaningful
element of the word” (Plag 2003:10). In addition to this, the term ‘root’ is used for “bases that cannot be analyzed further into morphemes” (Plag 2003:11) neither by means of derivation nor in terms of inflection (Bauer 1983 [2002]:20). In the example untouchable above, the base touch also functions as the root because it is not further analysable. The third term, ‘stem’, is exclusively used in discussions of inflectional morphology (Bauer 1983 [2002]:20, Plag 2003:11). When all inflections have been removed, the part that is left is referred to as ‘stem’ (Bauer 1983 [2002]:20). For instance, in (he is) singing the stem is sing, in books the stem is book. It should be noted that in a word like untouchable, touchable can never be considered a stem as it is not a matter of inflection (Bauer 1983 [2002]:20).

2.2.1.3. Word-formation processes

For the sake of completeness, I will very briefly describe word-formation processes other than affixation in this section. Scholars, such as Kastovsky (1982), Bauer (1983 [2002]), Plag (2003), Adams (1973), Marchand (1969), Jespersen (1942), etc. have identified many methods to enhance the English language’s lexicon. The ‘major’ word-formation processes include compounding, zero-derivation, back-formation, and affixation. The ‘minors’, which Bauer (1983 [2002]:232) termed the ‘unpredictable formations’ because “it is by no means clear that the forms of these words can be predicted by rules without appealing to such ill-understood notions as euphony” (ibid.), include clipping, blends, acronyms, and word manufacture. I will briefly discuss each process in turn. Since the process of affixation is of more interest for my purposes, it will be dealt with in detail in the following section.

Compounding, or composition, is “the most productive type of word-formation” (Plag 2003:132). It is, roughly said, the combination of two or more words to form a new one (Bauer 1983 [2002]:11, Plag 2003:133). Kastovsky (1982:152) states that compounds are built on the basis of something “schon Bekanntem” and, thus, argues that “Wortbildungen sind [...] als Syntagmen zu definieren, denen eine Determinatum/Determinans-Beziehung zugrundeliegt”. Since the notions ‘Determinatum’ and ‘Determinans’ will recur in section 2.2.2., I will briefly discuss them here. The Determinatum serves as ‘head’ or ‘nucleus’ (Marchand 1969:13) which not only expresses the most important unit (Plag 2003:152), but also constitutes the known element in a compound (Kastovsky
The Determinans (E determinant), on the other hand, represents the element to be modified (Kastovsky ibid.).

Another word-formation process is that of **zero-derivation**, which is often also referred to as **conversion** (cf. Jespersen 1942, Adams 1973, Bauer 1983 [2002], Plag 2003). Since this issue will return in chapter 4.1.1., where I will discuss the negative affixes' competition based on morpho-syntactic criteria, I will treat this a little longer than the other word-formation processes. Generally speaking, zero-derivation implies “the derivation of a new word without any overt marking” (Plag 2003:107). Kastovsky (1982:172) defines it as follows:

Es handelt sich hierbei um Konstrukte, die zur Charakterisierung von Beziehungen auf der Ebene des Sprachsystems dienen und eine Leerstelle bezeichnen, die normalerweise durch ein explizites Suffix gefüllt wird.

For Bauer (1983 [2002]:226-227) conversion is an “extremely productive” process where a lexeme of one word-class is treated as if it belongs to a different class. Examples of zero-derivation are listed in (11a) to (11d) below (from Plag 2003:107, Kastovsky 1982:172-173).

(11a) the bottle to bottle (‘to put something into a bottle’)  
the father to father (‘someone who acts as father’)  
the water to water (‘to provide something with water’)  
(11b) poor the poor (‘people who are poor’)  
rich the rich (‘people who are rich’)  
English the English (‘people from England’)  
(11c) to cheat the cheat (‘someone who cheats’)  
to guess the guess (‘the act of guessing’)  
(11d) empty to empty (‘to make empty’)  
open to open (‘to make open’)

Kastovsky (1982:173) insists that the lexeme, which serves as base, and its derived form must be semantically connected. That is to say that the verb to bottle presupposes the concept of bottle (Kastovsky ibid., cf. also Plag 2003:109). Bauer (1983 [2002]:226) states that because “all form classes seem to be able to undergo
conversion, and conversion seems to be able to produce words of almost any form class”, there appears to be no specific ruling for this process.

According to Bauer (1983 [2002]:32), some scholars, especially Marchand (1969) and later also Kastovsky (1982), prefer the term zero-derivation to conversion. A reason for this, Bauer (1983 [2002]:32) continues, is that the term zero-derivation implies the operation of a “zero affix” (cf. also Adams 1973:37), a “zero-form” (cf. also Plag 2003:111) or a “zero-morpheme” (cf. also Marchand 1969:359). This zero element, thus, is an “affix with many functions” (Adams 1973:37) as this affix expresses numerous different actions, roles, etc. (see examples in (11) above). Lyons (1977:523) states that the term 'zero-derivation' implies affixation of an “identity-element” (i.e. zero element), whereby the new lexeme is being considered as an 'extension' in their new word-class; for instance to bottle is an 'extension' (i.e. belongs to a subclass) of verbs. The term 'conversion', on the other hand, merely expresses “the syntactic transposition of a word” (Marchand 1969:360). For Marchand (ibid.) conversion is a notion which should be used in discussions of grammar.

Another means of forming new words is the process of back-formation or back-derivation. In this process, a suffix (or supposed suffix) is deleted in order to form a new, somewhat shorter lexeme (Kastovsky 1982:174, Bauer 1983 [2002]:232, Plag 2003:37). The probably most cited example is that of the verb edit (e.g. Bauer 1983 [2002]:231). This verb was derived from the noun editor, but the suffix –or was deleted because it was perceived as an analogy to actor (> to act) or director (> to direct). Bauer (1983 [2002]:232) argues that in regards to more recent examples, such as transcript (from transcription), back-formation could even be treated as “a special case of clipping” (see below).

One of what Bauer (1983 [2002]:232) calls the ‘unpredictable formations’ is the process of clipping. It refers to the “deletion of material” (Plag 2003:13) while “still retaining the same meaning” (Bauer 1983 [2002]:233). In contrast to back-derivation, clipping does not change word-class (Bauer 1983 [2002]:233). Examples of clipping include ad (from advertisement), bi (from bisexual), deli (from delicatessen), lab (from laboratory), etc. (cf. Bauer 1983 [2002]:233, Plag 2003:121). Clippings, so Adams (1973:135) suggests, are “generally used in less formal situations than their full-length equivalents”. 
Another word-formation process is called **blends**. A blend constitutes two (rarely more) words which are combined into one, whereby material from one (or both) are deleted (Plag 2003:121-122). Such a combination, however, no longer allows any transparent analysis into morphs (Bauer 1983 [2002]:234). Most frequently used blends include **smog** which derives from *smoke + fog*, **Spanglish** (*Spanish + English*), or **brunch** (*breakfast + lunch*).

A new lexeme is defined as an **acronym** when “the initial letters of the words in a title or phrase” (Bauer (1983 [2002]:237) are used to form this lexeme. It should be noted that acronyms clearly differ from abbreviations. Even though abbreviations are also “formed by taking initial letters of multi-word sequences” (Plag 2003:126) for instance **BA** for *Bachelor of Arts*, acronyms are pronounced like regular words. This is to say that acronyms “must conform to the phonological patterns of English” (Plag 2003:128). On this note, NATO is treated as an acronym because it is pronounced as /'neɪtou/ rather than /en eɪ tiː ou/, and BBC is considered to be an abbreviation because /bbk/ (or /bbs/) is an impossible combination of sounds in the English language (cf. Plag 2003:128).

For Bauer (1983 [2002]:239), the “purest cases” of creating a new lexeme are without any morphological, phonological or orthographic motivation. However, such cases are pretty rare. The probably most famous example of **word manufacture** is the brand name **Kodak** (Bauer ibid.).

### 2.2.2. Affixation

Affixation is a very common and productive method to create new words (cf. Lyons 1977:521, Plag 2003:104). It stands in clear contrast to compounding as it involves at least one bound morpheme, it differs from back-derivation because an affix is added (rather than removed), and there are hardly any material deletions involved. This section will go into detail about the affixation process and discuss its main characteristics in the English language.

As mentioned earlier, an ‘affix’ is generally described as a bound morpheme which cannot stand alone and, therefore, must be attached to another morpheme. Depending on their function, affixes are referred to as inflectional affixes, when they mark grammatical properties like tense, or as derivational affixes, when they contribute to the creation of new words (cf. Plag 2003:14-15, Crystal 2008:138).
According to Matthews (1974:124), the process of affixation consists of two characteristics:

Firstly, the derivand (the form which results when process or operation is applied) will consist of the operand (the form that it is applied to) plus a new formative which has been added or ‘affixed’ to it. [...] Secondly, this additional formative (the affix) will be a constant; it will be the same whatever particular operand is in question.

This is to say that in affixation a base, which Matthews (1974:124) termed ‘operand’, is the central meaningful element to which an affix (or more) must attach (cf. Plag 2003:10). Furthermore, a particular affix always operates in the same way, no matter what the base is, hence Matthews’ notion of ‘constant’. This means that prefixes can never become suffixes and vice versa. These processes are illustrated in (12a) to (12c) below.

(12a) general rule: base + affix = derivative
    suffixation:   base + suffix = derivative
    prefixation:   prefix + base = derivative
(12b) base + -ed = derivative expressing past tense, e.g. played, watched
    base + -ish = derivative expressing vagueness ('somewhat...'), e.g. greyish
(12c) trans- + base = derivative expressing location ('across'), e.g. transatlantic
      re- + base = derivative expressing repetition of an action, e.g. re-entry, retry

Affixes are, then, divided into three categories, i.e. (i) prefixes, (ii) suffixes, and (iii) infixes (Kastovsky 1982:72, Plag 2003:10-11, Crystal 2008:16). As the Latin-influenced names suggest, prefixes include all affixes which are attached before the base, suffixes are placed after the base and infixes are situated between two bases (ibid.). Even though prefixes and suffixes are very common in the English language, it needs to be pointed out that the third kind of affixation has no occurrences in English at all (Plag 2003:11). Infixation can, however, be found in Asian, American Indian and African languages (Crystal 2008:243). Plag (2003:11) claims that speakers of English have used infixation in connection with swear words, such as in abso-bloody-lutely (cf. absolutely). However, it goes without saying that this is restricted to the informal spoken genre.

This, then, leads to the question of the origins of affixes in the English language. According to Marchand (1969:129), the handful of native prefixes, which
include *a-*, *be-*, *fore-*, *mis-*, *mid-*, *un-*, came into being thanks to independent words. Most of the foreign prefixes, on the other hand, “came into language ready-made, so to speak”, so Marchand (ibid.) claims. During the Norman Conquest, the English language experienced a “rise of prefixes and suffixes” (Marchand 1969:130), where many French and Latin loan words entered the language. Since a number of these French and Latin loans (and, of course, from other languages as well) had the same or similar structure to English, it was possible for patterns to extend and to form new affixes over time (Marchand 1969:129-130). As far as suffixes are concerned, Marchand (1969:210) states that there are two ways in which a suffix may come into existence: 1) the suffix was once an independent word but is no longer one; 2) the suffix has originated as such, usually as a result of secretion.

Regarding the former, Marchand (1969:210) points out that the suffixes *-dom* and *-hood* were still independent words in Old English. Consequently, their development can be observed. In terms of the latter, the suffix *-ing* is merely an extended form of *-ing*. Furthermore, other suffixes came into being because they were used as “second parts of combinations” (Marchand ibid.). Even though they were still regarded as words, they were no longer used as independent words, such as *-wise* or *-wright*. In contrast to this, there are some second elements of combination, which have been treated as suffixes, but are, according to Marchand (ibid.), “not suffixes”, such as *-craft* (*witchcraft*), *-fiend* (*cigarette-fiend*), or *-proof* (*fireproof*).

It is with cases like the latter where difficulties “in discerning affixed words and the pertinent affixes” (Plag 2003:85) could arise. Therefore, it needs to be pointed out that the boundaries between prefixation, suffixation, and infixation are not always as clear-cut as the theory suggests (Matthews 1974:125). As a result, the exact number of affixes in the English language cannot be established, “but it is clear that there are dozens” (Plag 2003:85). According to Matthews (1974:124), the most common process in the English language is suffixation. In his major work on word-formation, Marchand (1969) lists 65 prefixes, 78 suffixes, and six ‘semi-suffixes’.²

Other than their position in a word, affixes have distinct characteristics which clearly separate prefixes from suffixes. In the following, I will describe general

---
² These numbers include affixes which are listed twice (or more) due to their different types.
properties which “are mostly of a phonological nature, but they have serious consequences for the properties of derived words and the combinability of affixes with roots and other affixes” (Plag 2003:79). The list below shows some examples of prefixes and suffixes and with it, it is possible to determine some dissimilarities.

(13a) Prefixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefixes</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hero</td>
<td>anti-hero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organise</td>
<td>reorganise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modern</td>
<td>postmodern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>president</td>
<td>vice-president</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(13b) Suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffixes</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hero</td>
<td>heroic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evolution</td>
<td>evolutionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selective</td>
<td>selectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offense</td>
<td>offensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first striking difference between prefixes and suffixes is the change of base-form in suffixation (cf. also Plag 2003:79). As seen in the list above, suffixes have caused the deletion of some material at the end of the base (Plag ibid.). For instance, both selective and offense lose the orthographic <e> respectively. In contrast to this, the base-form remains unaltered in prefixation. However, there are some suffixes, such as –less or –ness, which do not result in deletion of material (Plag ibid.), e.g. hope > hopeless, open-minded > open-mindedness.

The second difference concerns parts of speech. The list above clearly shows that suffixation results in change of word-class (cf. also Kastovsky 1982:171, Plag 2003:15): for example, the noun hero becomes an adjective in heroic. With prefixation, on the other hand, the word-class does not change, e.g. verb organise stays a verb in reorganise. According to Kastovsky (1982:171), the reason for this is that the suffix acts as determinatum, which then modifies the base. In other words, the determinatum (suffix), i.e. the head or dominant element, is able to move the determinant (base), i.e. the ‘weak’ element, into a different word-class (Kastovsky 1982:153 and 1982:171). Let me illustrate this with an example of to employ > employer. In the case of employer, the suffix -er denotes “the performer of an action, occasional or habitual” (Marchand 1969:273). Thus, suffix acts as agent substantive, ergo employ is nominalised to employer. According to Bauer (1983 [2002]:216) the “vast majority of prefixes” in the English
languages does not change word-class. Those prefixes that do change word-class include *a-* (e.g. asleep), *be-* (e.g. befriend), *en-* (e.g. enslave) and many more (Bauer ibid.).

Finally, another difference between prefixes and suffixes affects phonology. Some suffixes trigger change in the stress pattern, such as –*ise*, –*ate*, or –*ity*, while others do not, e.g. –*less*, –*hood*, or –*ly* (Plag 2003:80). As a ‘rule of thumb’, Plag (ibid.) states that suffixes, which trigger phonological changes are vowel-initial, whereas those that do not are consonant-initial.3 Prefixes, on the other hand, have “no effect on the stress patterns of their base words” (Plag 2003:79).

As seen above, affixes are generally categorised according to their position in a word, i.e. prefixes, suffixes and infixes. Nevertheless, there have been numerous different ways of categorisation including alphabetical order, or classification according to syntactic or semantic properties (Plag 2003:85-86). However, most of these have turned out to be quite problematic or even impractical. Therefore, affixes are often listed in terms of the syntactic properties of the derived form (Plag ibid.). Such categories include suffixes forming nouns (e.g. Bauer 1983 [2002]:220), forming verbs (e.g. Bauer 1983 [2002]:222), forming adjectives (e.g. Bauer 1983 [2002]:223), forming adverbs (e.g. Bauer 1983 [2002]:224). In terms of prefixes, the categorisation is somewhat more problematic as they often derive different categories, such as *un-* which derives an adjective in *unhappy* but a verb in *untie* (Plag 2003:86). Bauer (1983 [2002]:217ff), thus, differentiates between class-changing and class-maintaining prefixes.

At this point, I shall note that even though the amount of affixes is vast and would lead to numerous possibilities to create new words, there are some affixes which are used more often than others – and others which are hardly or not used at all (Plag 2003:44). This property is called ‘productivity’ and will be discussed in the following section.

### 2.3. What is productivity?

When talking about word-formation, sooner or later one stumbles upon the term ‘productivity’. As previously mentioned, there are some affixes which are used

---

3 According to Plag (2003:80), –*ish* is the only vowel-initial suffix which does not result in change of stress pattern.
more often to create new words, while other affixes are used rarely or not at all (e.g. Plag 2003:44). This is, then, referred to as the ‘productivity’ of affixes. In this chapter, I will discuss the concept of ‘productivity’ in morphological terms (as opposed to productivity in syntax), which has been a matter of discussion among linguists for many years (e.g. Bauer 1983 [2002]:62).

2.3.1. Possible and actual words

Aronoff (1976:19) claims that “the task of a morphology [is] to tell us what sort of new words a speaker can form”. However, this then leads to the question of how speakers (or rather listeners) are able to understand new words, if they are unknown (Plag 2003:54). For example, Kastovsky (1982:152) mentions the lexeme *mud-bather*. Given that a speaker is familiar with the concept of *sun-bather*, i.e. a person who takes a sun-bath, it is easy to infer that a *mud-bather* is someone who takes a mud-bath. According to Plag (2003:54), the main reason for this deduction is that speakers/listeners are able to “decompose the word into its constituent morphemes and compute the meaning on the basis of the meaning of the parts”. Therefore, speakers are not only well aware of which words are possible and which are not (Plag 2003:44), but also have “intuitions about [the new word’s] meaning and structure” (Aronoff 1976:19). Nevertheless, in morphology many things are possible, but “some are more possible than others” (Aronoff 1976:35). This potential of coining new words is, then, referred to as ‘productivity’ (cf. Bauer 2001:41, Plag 2003:68). However, Kastovsky (1982:156) raises the issue that

This leads to the question what words are possible and what words have been established? Van Santen (1992:63-74 quoted in Bauer 2001:34) insists on the distinction between ‘possible’ (‘potential’) and ‘actual’ (‘existing’) words because “[p]roductivity is manifested in the space between the existing and the impossible” (Van Santen 1992:63-74 quoted in Bauer 2001:34). As Bauer (2001:34) puts it,
only in accepting the category of ‘existing’ words, the notion of ‘productivity’ is possible.

A possible word is understood as an entity whose “semantic, morphological or phonological structure is in accordance with the rules and regularities of the language” (Plag 2003:46). Consequently, these rules and regularities should be clearly stated (Plag ibid.). Furthermore, this means that words can be coined but may not be used, for whatever reason (Bauer 2001:40). Plag (2003:46) lists *cannibalisable* as an example of a possible word, i.e. it follows word-formation patterns where the suffix –*able* can attach to verbs (cf. *readable*, *manageable*), but is not an actual word. On this note, it shall be pointed out that not all possible words are, or will eventually become, actual words (Plag 2003:46). In fact, Bauer (1983 [2002]:81) states that actual words are always only “a small proportion” of the possible words.

Actual words can loosely be defined as those entities which have already been coined and used by speakers of English, i.e. actual words are known entities, which are in use (Plag 2003:46). Of course, this then raises the debate about what is ‘known’ and what is ‘in use’. On this note, Bauer (2001:36) uses the terms ‘existing’ and ‘established’ words. The former implies that a word exists “from the moment it is first coined” (Bauer ibid.). The latter expresses that a word has been established when it has become part of the norm. This, consequently, leads to the problematic issue of an individual speaker’s mental lexicon (cf. Plag 2003:47). How can a speaker know that a given word has already been coined, let alone established (Plag 1999:8)? By and large, it can be said that there is “a large overlap” (Plag ibid.) of speakers’ mental lexicons whereby “the common core of vocabulary” (Bauer 2001:35) is shared and, thus, meaning is generally understood.

In addition to this, Plag (1999:8-9) points out that the boundaries between possible and actual words are very fuzzy. For instance *knowledgeable* (from Plag 2003:47) does not accord to the word-formation rules of the suffix –*able*, where the derivate gains the meaning ‘capable of doing’ (Marchand 1969:230-231), cf. *affordable* ‘can be afforded’, whereas *knowledgeable* means ‘having knowledge’. Furthermore, Plag (1999:8) claims that “the class of actual words contains both morphologically regular and morphologically idiosyncratic forms”. He (1999:8, 2003:47), thus, concludes that only actual words may be idiosyncratic, but possible words are never idiosyncratic. Nevertheless, such an actual/possible word
distinction is certainly “useful and often necessary” (Plag 1999:9) when describing morphological processes. After all, possible words are determined “by studying large amounts of actual words” (Plag 1999:9).

In summary, it can be said that speakers and listeners not only have the ability to understand new coinages but are also able to distinguish between possible and impossible words. But what does this potential for coining new words, i.e. ‘productivity’, mean?

2.3.2. Subsets of productivity

The ‘essence’ of productivity is rather hard to grasp and, thus, the definition (or an attempt of definition) of the notion productivity has been subject of debate for many years (Bauer 2001:12). For Aronoff (1976:35), productivity is even “one of the central mysteries of derivational morphology”. From the literature I have read (Aronoff 1976, Bauer 2001), I came to the conclusion that the main idea behind productivity is the ability to create new forms based on already stored elements. This can be argued as follows:

According to Bauer (2001:20), there are three prerequisites for productivity, namely (i) frequency, (ii) semantic coherence, and (iii) the ability to make new forms. Even though many scholars claim that frequency equals productivity, for Bauer (2001:48) this is not the case (cf. also Aronoff 1976:36). The sheer number of occurrences with a certain morphological process cannot be the crucial factor of productivity (Aronoff 1976:36, Plag 2003:52). On the one hand, some morphological processes seem to be productive, but then generate a low frequency of new words. According to Bauer (2001:48), the prefix a-, which means “in a state or position of” (Marchand 1969:139) as in ablaze, is an example for this. Bauer (2001:48) laments that “given the number of potential verbal bases for such formations, [about ninety listings in Marchand (1969:139-140)] is not a large number”. On the other hand, seemingly unproductive processes have lead to a high frequency of new words, for instance suffix –ment (Bauer 2001:48). However, Plag (2003:53) points out that frequency is a useful indicator for productivity because the higher the frequency of a word, the more likely it is to be established and, thus, it becomes an actual word (see 2.3.1. above).
In terms of **semantic coherence**, Aronoff (1976:39) suggests that it is directly linked to productivity. Aronoff (1976:38) claims that meaning is “assigned to [coinages] by the semantic function of the rule”. This is to say that the meaning of the newly coined word can be predicted based on the rule carried out (Aronoff ibid.), for example in the lexeme *Anglicism*. The meaning of it can be easily retrieved because the suffix –*ism* denotes ‘a peculiarity or characteristic of what the base states’ (OED: s.v. –*ism*, suffix, sense 2b). Hence, *Anglicism* implies ‘being of English quality’ (OED: s.v. *Anglicism*, n., sense 2). In this regard, Aronoff (1976:39) states that “the correlation [semantic coherence and productivity] is perfectly reasonable: the surer one is of what a word will mean, the more likely one is to use it”.

For Bauer (2001:21), it seems redundant to list ‘**ability to form new words**' as a prerequisite for productivity. However, he (ibid.) points out that there are two things worth mentioning. First, “the actual production of new words is not necessary to productivity” (Bauer 2001:21). That is to say that the potential or possibility for it plays the central role (Bauer 2001:41) (see section 2.3.1.). Second, coinages may be a result from unproductive morphological processes (Bauer 2001:22). Bauer (2001:56) remarks that it is possible for individual speakers to coin new words from morphological patterns, which are not productive. This may be done consciously or unconsciously (Bauer ibid.). In conclusion, it is the “potential to lead to new coinages, or to the extent to which it does lead to new coinages” (Bauer 2001:41) that makes processes productive.

Word-formation presents, as Bauer (2001:41), puts it, “methods for filling [lexical gaps], by exploiting the potential which the system provides”. This exploiting is, however, not unlimited. Thus, productivity also has its limitations (Bauer 1983 [2002]:84ff., Plag 2003:60ff.). Since this is not relevant for my purposes, I will omit the discussion on productivity restrictions.

### 2.3.3. My understanding of productivity

Generally speaking, productivity can be regarded as the “potential for repetitive non-creative morphological coining” (Bauer 2001:98). By distinguishing between what is a possible and an actual word, speakers are able to form new coinages. It can, thus, be said that productivity serves as scaffold for producing new forms.
Frequency is a prerequisite for productivity because it is more likely for a new affix to be stored, the more it is used (Plag 2003:53). In addition to this, productivity constitutes “the statistical readiness with which an element enters into new combinations” (Bolinger 1948:18 quoted in Plag 1999:22). With semantic coherence as another subset for productivity, one is more likely to use new coinages when the speaker is certain of its meaning (Aronoff 1976:39). In conclusion it can be said that morphological patterns are productive, if they are readily available to coin new words. Therefore, “productivity is all about potential” (Bauer 2001:41).

2.3.4. Productivity and negative affixes

Putting the notions mentioned above into the scope of negative affixes, it is possible to deduce the following things. First of all, negative affixes are part of word-formation, which in turn is, as briefly mentioned above, a method of naming new items, actions and the like (cf. Bauer 2001:41). Using negative affixes is a means of exploiting the potential which the English language provides.

Second, this potential of forming new words, i.e. productivity, has contributing factors: semantic coherence, frequency, and the ability to form new words. It is clear that negative affixes are semantically coherent (e.g. Aronoff 1976:39). Therefore, it not only makes it easy for a person to understand the meaning, but it also allows a speaker to form new words using a negative affix. It is this ability of coining new words by means of affixation, which plays an important role. That is to say that even if the newly coined words are only possible words and may never become actual words, this potential makes affixal negation productive. As we shall see in the following chapter, some negative affixes are more productive than others.

---

4 Bauer (2001:12ff) describes the disagreement about what is actually considered to be productive in word-formation. He (ibid.) states that, depending on the scholar, productivity applies to particular affixes, morphological processes, groups of processes, rules, or even individual words. Due to space constraints, I will not go into detail about this disagreement and will, following Bauer (2001:13), assign productivity to morphological processes.
2.4. Summary

In this chapter I have introduced three concepts which are essential when discussing negative affixes. First, I have discussed the notion of ‘negative’, whose basic function in linguistic usages is to reverse the truth value of a proposition. This operation is, then, referred to as ‘negation’. Negation can be divided into clause negation, local negation, and predication negation. For my purposes, local negation is of greater interest as only one word (or phrase) is beingnegated, rather than an entire clause. A means of expressing local negation includes the addition of negative affixes. In addition to this, I have explained the difference between contrary and contradictory opposition which will be crucial when discussing the negative affixes’ competition. This, then, leads to the second concept, namely that of affixation.

Affixation is part of word-formation which is one of the two branches of morphology; the other being inflection. Word-formation is, generally speaking, concerned with the formation of new words, or ‘coinages’. Apart from affixation, word-formation processes include compounding, zero-derivation, back-formation, clipping, blends, acronyms, and word manufacture. Affixation, however, is probably the most common method for coinages. There are three kinds of affixes, i.e. prefixes, suffixes, and infixes, which are further categorised according to syntactic or semantic properties, such as affixes forming verbs, or affixes denoting negation. Even though the number of affixes is large, there are some affixes which are used more often than others. This brought me to the third concept, productivity.

Productivity has been subject of debate for many years and there is no final definition of this term. My interpretation of productivity is that it is the potential to form new words. Since speakers are able to distinguish between words which are possible and which are actual (existing), they are capable of decomposing new coinages and of inferring their meanings. The factors which are contributing to productivity are frequency, semantic coherence, and the ability to form new words. Since negative affixes are semantically coherent and occur frequently, the process of affixal negation is likely to be productive.

Keeping these notions in mind, it is now possible to dive into the discussions of negative affixes. A schematic representation of how these concepts are linked to each other can be seen in Figure 1 below. In the following chapter, I will discuss
which affixes are considered to be negative and I will introduce three concepts of meaning: ‘negative’, ‘reversative’, and ‘privative’.

Figure 1. Negative Affixes.
3. Distribution

Having established the notions which go hand in hand with ‘negative affixes’, I will now discuss the negative affixes themselves. In this chapter, I will at first describe all affixes which are considered to be negative in the English language. I shall briefly describe their origins, historical development and their semantics respectively. At last, I will introduce three concepts of meaning which are essential when discussing the affixes’ competition to each other, namely ‘negative’, ‘reversative’, and ‘privative’.

3.1. Which affixes are negative?

Even though negative affixes are limited in number, they differ considerably from other prefixes. As we shall see, the discussion of negative affixes will be very interesting as they seem more complex than meets the eye (cf. Plag 2003:99).

Affixes, which are regarded as ‘negative’, include the prefixes \textit{un-}, \textit{in-}, \textit{de-}, \textit{dis-}, \textit{mis-}, and \textit{non-} as well as the suffix \textit{–less} (Cruse 2006:117). Welte (1978:186) and Jespersen (1966:147) add \textit{a(n)}- to the list of negative prefixes. For Jespersen (ibid.), the prefix \textit{no-} is also a negative affix. Furthermore, Plag (2003:99) claims that the prefix \textit{anti-} should also be included because it is a ‘relative’. In her studies on negation in spoken and written texts, Tottie (1991:8) also included the suffix \textit{–out}. For sake of simplicity, I have categorised these affixes into prefixes and suffixes, and, further, sorted them alphabetically. It should be noted that this is a tentative categorisation and should not be given any interpretation of significance for each affix. At the end of this chapter, I will enclose a list of the affixes which will be discussed further in chapter 4 of this thesis. It needs to be pointed out that the definitions of all example words are taken from the online version of the OED.

3.1.1. Negative prefixes

3.1.1.1. \textit{a(n)}-

Even though Marchand (1969:139ff) divides the prefix \textit{a}- into two types, namely (i) “in a state or position of” such as \textit{asleep} (i.e. ‘in a state of sleep’) and (ii) ‘not’ as in \textit{asymmetric} (i.e. ‘not symmetric’), it should be noted that the prefix \textit{a-} is in these
cases only the same in terms of orthography. In terms of phonology they should be treated separately because *asleep* is pronounced with /æl/, while *asymmetric* has /æəl/.

Negative *a*- [æ] expresses the meaning ‘not’ (see above), but could also imply “without, devoid of, not affected or characterized by what is denoted by the root” (Marchand 1969:140) as in *asexual* ‘without sex’ (Plag 2003:99). This prefix originates in Greek (Zimmer 1964:26, Marchand 1969:140) and is usually combined with Greek bases, but can also be found with Latin bases (OED: s.v. *a-, prefix6*). This prefix, however, is “of very limited occurrences in English” (Zimmer 1964:26). As Zimmer (ibid.) continues, the majority of terms starting with negative *a*- “belong to highly specialized areas of vocabulary”, such as *acardiac* ‘lacking heart’, *amnemonic* ‘characterised by loss of memory’ or *anhydrous* ‘having no water in its composition’ (examples from Marchand 1969:140). Non-scientific lexemes with *a*- include for instance *asymmetric* ‘not symmetric’, *amoral* ‘not in sphere of moral sense’, *apolitical* ‘detached from political issues’ (examples from Marchand ibid.).

The prefix *a(n)*- usually derives adjectives from substantival bases (Marchand 1969:140, Plag 2003:99). Marchand (1969:140), however, states that “in practice they are often analysed as opposites of unprefixed adjectives”.

Words with this prefix usually express contradictory opposition (Zimmer 1964:27). This means that lexemes negated with *a(n)*- are not subject of degree and, hence, are not eligible for comparison. Zimmer (ibid.) claims that it is “more or less equivalent to the suffix –*less*”, which stands in clear contrast to the suffix –*ful*.

In terms of phonology, the prefix *a*- changes to *an*-., when it is attached to a base beginning with a vowel (Jespersen 1966:147, Marchand 1969:140).

### 3.1.1.2. *anti-*

Plag (2003:99) added this prefix to the group of negative affixes because it seems to be related. This prefix originates in Greek and is usually found in “compounds already formed in Greek” (OED: s.v. *anti-, prefix1*). New formations with this prefix are based on Greek models (OED ibid.).

In Old Greek, this prefix attached to verbs and deverbal nouns; the latter, however, has not been implemented into the English language (Marchand 1969:142). According to Stein (2007:11), *anti-* attaches to nouns and adjectives.
The first *anti*-word in English, namely *antichrist* meaning ‘enemy of Christ’, was recorded in 1300 and served as “the archetype for a whole group” (Marchand 1969:142).

Originally, the meaning of this prefix was ‘counter, opposite, instead’ but has extended over the centuries (Marchand 1969:142-143). During the 17th century, the prefix also implied ‘against, opposing’ (Marchand 1969:142, Plag 2003:99) such as in *anti-Calvinist* to mean ‘to be against Calvin’. Further, *anti-* was “used in chemicomedical terms with the meaning ‘counteractive, neutralizing, preventive of’” (Marchand 1969:143), such as *anti-bacterial*, *anti-catarrhal*, or *anti-diphtheritic*. According to Marchand (1969:143), a sense of ‘defense’ was added to this prefix in the 20th century, giving way to formations like *antiaircraft gun*, *anti-tank gun*, or *anti-missile protection*. Plag (2003:99) claims that nowadays the prefix *anti-* also expresses ‘not having the characteristics of what the base denotes’, examples include *anti-hero* ‘unlike a hero’, or *anti-matter* ‘matter composed of anti-particles’.

In terms of orthography, I have found *anti*-words sometimes written with a hyphen and sometimes without. Neither Marchand (1969:142ff) nor any other literature I consulted, explained when, or if, a hyphen should be used.

At this point, I want to stress that not every *anti-* seems to be the negative prefix *anti*-. In some cases *anti-* is a variant of the prefix *ante-* meaning ‘before’ (OED: s.v. *anti-* prefix2). Thus, *anticipate* meaning ‘to observe, practice in advance’ or *anticamera* ‘antechamber’ (obs.) are not matters of local negation.

3.1.1.3. de-
The prefix *de-* originally developed from the Old French prefix *des-* (OED: s.v. *dis-* prefix). In French speech, *des-* became *de-* before a consonant and when the letter <s> was eventually omitted in writing as well, the prefix *de-* emerged (OED: s.v. *de-* prefix, sense 1f; cf. also OED: s.v. *dis-* prefix). *De-* was first introduced to the English language when some *de-*words were taken over from French, such as *decrease*, *defend*, or *desire* (OED: s.v. *de-* prefix). According to the OED (ibid.), *de-*words which entered English at a later stage “have been adapted directly from Latin, or formed from Latin elements, without the intervention of French”.

General meanings of the prefix *de-* are (i) ‘down from / to’ as in *depend* ‘to hang down’ (this meaning is predominately used in literature), (ii) ‘away, off’ as in *defend* ‘to ward off’, and (iii) ‘down to the bottom’ such as *deplore* ‘to weep, to
lament, to regret’. It may refer to ‘something bad’ as in 
\textit{deceive} ‘to mislead’ and 
\textit{detest} ‘to hate intensely’, or it may imply that something is made of two or more 
elements as in 
\textit{decompose} ‘to separate into constituent parts’ (OED: s.v. \textit{de-}, 
\textit{prefix}, senses 1a-e).

In terms of negation, \textit{de-} refers to two distinguishable types: one, which 
Marchand (1969:153) refers to as the ‘demilitarise-type’, and the other, which he 
(ibid.) labelled the ‘delouse-type’. Even though both types denote some kind of 
removal, they differ in quality (Marchand ibid.). The demilitarise-type expresses 
reversativity because it implies the ‘undoing of an action’ (Marchand ibid.). The 
delouse-type, on the other hand, expresses privativity because it denotes the 
‘removal of what the base denotes’ (Marchand 1969:155). Consequently, 
\textit{demilitarise} implies ‘sending military organisation which is then taken away again’, 
whereas \textit{delouse} means ‘to clear of lice’. The notions of reversativity and privativity 
will be dealt with in greater detail in section 3.2.

This prefix can attach to nouns, verbs, and adjectives (Stein 2007:33) and is 
predominately used to derive verbs (cf. OED: s.v. \textit{de-}, \textit{prefix}, sense 2a). According 
to Marchand (1969:153-154), \textit{de-} is most frequent with verbs ending in \textit{–ise}, for 
example \textit{decentralise}, \textit{demagnetise}, \textit{demilitarise}, \textit{denaturalise}, followed by verbs 
ending in \textit{–ate}, such as \textit{decolorate}, \textit{defecate}, or \textit{defoliate}. The prefix seems to be 
very limited in numbers with the verbal suffix \textit{–ify} as in \textit{defortify}, \textit{deossify}, 
\textit{declassify}. \textit{De}-verbs ending in \textit{–ify} are commonly found in the scientific field 

In terms of orthography, a hyphen is usually used when \textit{de-} comes before a 
vowel, as in \textit{de-acidify} ‘to remove acid’. In other instances, \textit{de-} is hyphenated to 
emphasise the composition as in \textit{de-Christianise} ‘to make no longer Christian’ 
(Jespersen 1942:483). Generally, however, the hyphen is not required (OED: s.v. 
\textit{de-}, \textit{prefix}, sense 2a).

\textbf{3.1.1.4. dis-}

Similar to \textit{de-}, \textit{dis-} developed from the Old French prefix \textit{des-} (OED: s.v. \textit{dis-}, 
language, the Romanic version \textit{des-} was preferred and coinages were usually 
formed with \textit{des-} (OED: s.v. \textit{dis-}, \textit{prefix}). As mentioned earlier, French \textit{des-} 
became \textit{de-} in speech and was, eventually, also established as \textit{de-} in writing
(OED: s.v. de-, prefix, sense 1f; cf. also OED: s.v. dis-, prefix). However, in some cases Latin dis- was retained and "was often substituted for, or used alongside of, des-" (OED: s.v. dis-, prefix), leading to the co-existence of e.g. F descorder and F discorder (E to be discordant) (OED ibid.). In the later stages of the Middle English period, dis- "was uniformly substituted, and des- became entirely obsolete" (OED ibid.). Marchand (1969:159) claims that the prefix dis- was "definitely established by the 15th century".

The meaning of dis- is manifold. First, it was considered as the clear opposite of L com- / con- which, in a nutshell, expresses a sense of combination or togetherness (OED: s.v. com-, prefix). Thus, giving for instance concolor (E of the same colour) > discolor (E of different colours), or concordia (E concord) > discordia (E discord), etc. (OED ibid.). Further, the prefix dis- also implied senses of separation as in L dividēre (E divide), L dijūdicāre (E dijudicate), L dīnumerāre (E dinumerate) and such (OED: s.v. dis-, prefix, senses 1a-c).

In terms of negation, this prefix expresses the meaning "refuse to, fail to, not" (Marchand 1969:159). Examples include disagree 'to differ in agreement', dislike 'to not like', disregard 'to pay no regard'. When dis- is used with a noun, it usually conveys the meaning 'absence' or 'lack of' (Marchand 1969:161), for instance discomfort 'lack of comfort', or disease, which literally means 'lack of ease', but it is generally used to describe the condition of 'being out of health', i.e. illness. In addition to this, Marchand (1969:159) states that in some instances dis- implies "cease to" such as in discontinue ('to stop') or disused ('no longer used').

The prefix dis- is able to attach to nouns, verbs, and adjectives (Stein 2007:36), whereupon elements of Romance origin are preferred (Marchand 1969:159, 1969:161-162). It seems as though the number of derived verbs is higher than those of adjectives or nouns (Marchand 1969:159-162). Marchand (1969:159) points out that dis- can attach to "many verbs beginning with en- (em-, in-, im-)", such as disengage, disembark, disinter, disimprison. Marchand (1969:159) also suggests that the reason for this is the "very productive" type désenchanter in French (cf. also Kastovsky 2000:107).

Dis- is one of two prefixes, the other being un-, which has negative, reversative, as well as privative meaning (see section 3.2.). Marchand (1969:161) claims that nouns and adjectives with dis- express negativity, whereas verbs most often imply reversativity or privativity.
Reversative meaning of the prefix dis- has been established around 1500 (Marchand 1969:159) and expresses the undoing or the reversal of the action denoted by the base (OED: s.v. dis-, prefix, sense 2a). Examples of reversative dis- include lexemes like disappear ‘to vanish from sight’, or disconnect ‘to sever a connection’ (examples from Marchand ibid.). Privative meaning, i.e. to remove from or deprive of what is denoted by the base, has been established in English by the second half of the 15th century (Marchand 1969:160). Examples of dis- with privative meaning are to disarm ‘to remove arms or weapons’, to discharge ‘to release, free, rid from something’, to disqualify ‘to deprive of the qualifications necessary for a purpose’. A detailed discussion about the differences between negative, reversative, and privative can be found in section 3.2.

Lexemes coined with the prefix dis- usually imply contrary oppositions (Jespersen 1966:146, Marchand 1969:159). This is to say that to dislike, for example, does not immediately convey ‘to hate’ and is, thus, similar to the example of unhappy – not happy which will be discussed in section 4.1.1. Marchand (1969:161), however, points out that “[a] strict line between [contrary and contradictory opposition] cannot be drawn”, for example in a lexeme like dissimilar it is not quite clear whether ‘somewhat different’ (contrary opposition) or ‘completely different’ (contradictory opposition) is implied.

3.1.1.5. in-
A distinctive characteristic of the prefix in- is that it has always followed the Latin rules of phonology (Jespersen 1966:139, Marchand 1969:169, OED: s.v. in-, prefix\(^2\)). In other words, this prefix has il-, ir- and im- as its alternate forms, which can be explained by assimilation: the prefix changes to il- before [l] as in illiterate, to im- before [m, b, p] as in immoral or impossible, and to ir- before [r] as in irreplaceable (Jespersen 1966:139, Marchand 1969:169). In contrast to this, the prefix un-, which is the biggest rival to in- (see section 3.1.1.9. below), does not assimilate: unlit, unmitigated, unbreakable, unreliable, etc.

In etymological terms, the prefix in- goes back “to the same Arian form, n-(syllabic), reduced from the negative word ne” (Jespersen 1966:139). It is cognate with Greek α- and αv- and conveys the meaning ‘not’, as in infinite ‘not finite’ (Jespersen ibid., Marchand 1969:168, OED: s.v. in-, prefix\(^3\)). In Old French, many words with in- became em- / en- (OED: s.v. in-, prefix\(^2\)), such as L inimicus > OF
enemi > E enemy (OED: s.v. in-, prefix²). In the 14th century, many French loans to the English language, however, had retained the Latin prefix in- because Latin was “predominant” (Marchand 1969:168). According to Marchand (ibid.), in- has been established as “an independent formative by about 1500”.

Commonly used with nouns and adjectives (Stein 2007:83), the prefix in- conveys ‘not’ (especially with adjectives) or ‘want, lack, absence of’ (predominantly with nouns) (Marchand 1969:168), for example innumerable meaning ‘not capable of being numbered or not countable’, inanimate ‘without motion of life’, injustice ‘want of equity’, intolerance ‘absence of tolerance’, etc.

The number of verbs with in- seems to be very low. Neither Marchand (1969:169) nor Jespersen (1966:142) discusses verbs beginning with in-; they only mention illegalise, immortalise, and inhabit. However, it should be noted that inhabit cannot be treated as local negation because this in- prefix is the Latin preposition in, expressing ‘into, in’ (Jespersen 1966:142, OED: s.v. in-, prefix¹ and in-, prefix²). Thus, inhabit conveys the meaning ‘to reside permanently in, live habitually in’.

In contrast to the previously mentioned prefixes de- or dis-, in- cannot take reversative and/or privative meaning. It is purely negative in meaning, i.e. it expresses negation only (Marchand 1969:168). In regards to this, in- implies contradictory opposition, e.g. illegal definitely means ‘not legal’ (Jespersen 1966:144). In some cases, the prefix in- is often changed to a-, for instance immoral > amoral, or to un- as in inhuman > unhuman (Jespersen 1942:470, Jespersen 1966:144-145). Jespersen (1942:470) explains the difference between immoral and amoral as follows: while immoral conveys the opposite of moral, amoral indicates having no moral quality at all. The subtle difference between inhuman and unhuman is described in section 4.2.2 when discussing rivalry between in- and un-.

As briefly hinted above, there is direct rivalry between in- and the prefix un-. Jespersen (1966:140), for example, states that many words with in- may be created with un- as well. Over the centuries, especially from the 14th century onwards (OED: s.v. un-, prefix¹, sense 5b), there were some instances which had “by-forms with the prefix un-“ (Marchand 1969:170), such as impractical – unpractical, inexact – unexact, irreplaceable – unreplaceable, incorrupt – uncrypt, perfection – unperfection (examples from Marchand 1969:170; OED:
s.v. un-, prefix\textsuperscript{1}, sense 5b). Only from the 17\textsuperscript{th} century onwards, there was a tendency to differentiate between the two prefixes (OED: un-, prefix\textsuperscript{1}, sense 5b). The reason for this was “to discard one or other of the doublets” (OED ibid.). During that time, preference was given to the prefix in-, especially when the base was of Latin origin, e.g. inadequate (OED ibid., also OED: s.v. in-, prefix\textsuperscript{3}). Marchand (1969:169), however, points out that nowadays the prefix un- “is ousting in- more and more”, especially in regard to adjectives. In this respect, the OED (s.v. in-, prefix\textsuperscript{3}) states that “words obviously answering to Latin types” keep the in-prefixation, while all others take un-. The rivalry between in- and un- will be further discussed in chapters 4 and 5 of this thesis.

Marchand (1969:169) states that “[f]or reasons of euphony”, in- does not attach to lexemes that already begin with in-, hence, *ininhabitable or *inintelligible do not exist (cf. also Jespersen 1966:142). Such words are, therefore, negated with un- to form uninhabitable and unintelligible respectively.

3.1.1.6. mis-

The prefix mis- is often referred to as a negative affix because it implies negation, such as misfortune, i.e. ‘bad luck’ or simply the opposite of luck. During the Old English period, mis- was actually “use[d] as a mere negative prefix” (OED: s.v. mis-, prefix\textsuperscript{1}, senses 4 and 5). In Modern English, however, mis- is semantically speaking not a ‘real’ negative affix because this prefix expresses the meaning “badly, wrongly, improperly, amiss” (Marchand 1969:176), rather than ‘not’. Examples with mis- include mishap ‘unfortunate event’, mistrust ‘lack of trust’, mischief ‘harm, injury’ (now obsolete: ‘bad luck’), to misunderstand ‘to understand wrongly’, to misrepresent ‘to give false or misleading representation’.

The origins of mis- can be traced back to the Old English period, but the prefix has not been exploited until the Middle English period (OED: s.v. mis-, prefix\textsuperscript{1}). Marchand (1969:176) describes that many French words with mes- were introduced into English during the Middle English period. The French prefix mes- was essentially synonymous with the prefix mis- (Onions 1966:580), and both prefixes later “naturally fused into one” (Marchand 1969:176).

Many lexemes with mis- date back to the Middle English period, where it had been used extensively (Marchand 1969:177). During the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, mis- was highly productive (OED: s.v. mis-, prefix\textsuperscript{1}). Francis Bacon, John Donne, and
Bishop Joseph Hall are among the scholars who have used this prefix frequently in their respective works (OED ibid.; cf. also Marchand 1969:1977).

According to the OED (s.v. mis-, prefix\(^1\)), the prefix mis- attached freely to bases of native or foreign origin. It seems as though this prefix is most frequent with nouns and verbs (Marchand 1969:176-177, Stein 2007:110): misbelieve, misconception, to mislead, to miscall. This prefix is, however, less frequent in adjectives (Marchand 1969:177). Adjectival examples include misproud, miscontent, misminded from the Middle English period. In this respect, it needs to be pointed out that in some instances mis- has given way to the prefixes ill- and mal- as in misminded > ill-minded (OED: s.v. mis-, prefix\(^1\)).

In terms of orthography, in Old and Middle English lexemes with mis- were usually written as two words (OED: s.v. mis-, prefix\(^1\)). Hyphenated mis-words have been occasionally found in Middle English texts. The custom of writing two words has ceased during the 16th century, where mis-words were then recorded as one word, either with or without the hyphen. Today, hyphenation with mis- has stopped, except in “new or rarely used formations” (OED ibid.), especially when the base word begins with the letter <s>.

3.1.1.7 no-

Jespersen (1966:147) includes the pronoun no to the group of negative affixes because it can often be used as “a kind of prefix” such as in no-education, or no-settlement. Unfortunately, Marchand (1969) does not mention no- in his work and there are no entries for no- as a prefix in the online version of the OED. Due to the lack of sources and information, I will not include this prefix in further discussions.

3.1.1.8. non-

The prefix non- has its origin in Latin and was specifically used in special or technical fields such as Law (OED: s.v. non-, prefix, Jespersen 1966:147, Marchand 1969:179, Mazzon 2004:111). Examples with non- include non-payment meaning ‘failure or refusal to pay’, or non-regardance (obs.) expressing ‘failure or refusal to regard something’ (all examples from Jespersen 1966:147). From the 17th century onwards, this prefix was no longer restricted to certain areas of expertise and began to attach freely to any bases (OED: s.v. non-, prefix). Newer
formations include non-resistance, non-obedience, nonconformist, etc. (examples from OED ibid., Marchand 1969:179)

Non-, like the prefix in-, can only be used in a negative meaning, i.e. to express negation (OED: s.v. non-, prefix). Generally, it conveys the meaning ‘absence or lack of’ (OED ibid.). Often, the meaning can be extended to ‘not doing, failure to do’ and to ‘not being, failure to be’ (OED ibid.), as shown in the examples above.

This prefix is predominantly attached to nouns giving non-appearance, non-communicant, etc. but can also be found in numerous adjectives such as non-active, non-breakable, non-irritating and such (Marchand 1969:179-180, Stein 2007:116). According to Marchand (1969:180) non- cannot be found in verbs. However, he (ibid.) mentions that from the 15th to the 17th century, “non- was frequently prefixed to verbs” (Marchand 1969:180) but this usage has ceased.

Words prefixed with non- generally express contradictory opposition (Zimmer 1964:33). That is to say that non-words are never matters of comparison, for instance non-smoker is the direct opposite to smoker and any middle terms are excluded.

As far as orthography is concerned, non-words are usually hyphenated (OED: s.v. non-, prefix). However, the hyphen may be omitted, as seen in words such as nonsense, or nonchalant.

3.1.1.9. un-
Unlike in- or non-, the prefix un- can convey either negative, reversative or privative meaning (see section 3.2). For sake of clarity, I will begin with un- as a negative and will, then, turn to the reversative and privative meanings of this prefix.

Negative un- shares the same root as the prefix in-, i.e. it is a variant of the negative word ne (OED: s.v. un-, prefix1), and can be traced back to the Old English period (OED: s.v. un-, prefix1, sense 2). Like in-, the prefix un- conveys the meaning ‘not’, such as in unhappy ‘not happy’ (Marchand 1969:201).

According to the OED (s.v. un-, prefix1, sense 2), there were about 1250 words with un- recorded in the Old English period. Unfortunately, only an eighth of this number survived beyond that period (OED ibid.), though most of these ‘survivors’ “had passed out of use by 1250” (OED: s.v. un-, prefix1, sense 3). Due to this incredible loss, un-words were categorised into four groups in the early
Middle English period: (i) survivals of Old English, (ii) new formations from native elements, (iii) adoptions from Scandinavian forms, and (iv) new formations on French bases (OED: s.v. *un-* prefix¹, sense 4a). The usage of this prefix was, then, predominantly based on “the traditional stock” (OED: s.v. *un-* prefix¹, sense 4a) and new forms were hardly coined. During the 14th century, however, the English language experienced a revival of the present and past participles and the suffix – *able* was introduced (OED ibid.). By the 1400s, the prefix *un-* was used more frequently and new formations started to emerge (OED ibid.). From the 15th century onwards, the prefix *un-* experienced a steady increase in its usage and by the time of the 17th century, the English language has become “extremely rich in words beginning with *un-*” (OED: s.v. *un-* prefix¹, sense 6a). Despite the disappearance of older formations and the restrictions of newer ones during the 1900s, the prefix *un-* was nevertheless very popular in use, up to the point where “its employment has become almost unrestricted” (OED ibid.).

Generally speaking, *un-* can attach to adjectives, nouns, and verbs (Stein 2007:170). As discussed above, negative *un-* hardly seems to have any limitations. However, one limitation concerns the affixation to verbs: negative *un-* can only be attached to present or past participles, where it becomes “adjectival in character” (OED: s.v. *un-* prefix¹, sense 5d), for instance in *unchanging*, *unbecoming*. According to Marchand (1969:204), some *un*-verbs in the 16th and 17th century were back-derivations giving *to unbecome*, *to unknow* and such. Nevertheless, similar instances were coined in Middle English too, but did not survive, such as *untrust* ‘distrust’ or *unbetide* ‘not happen’ (Marchand ibid.).

Furthermore, the OED (s.v. *un-* prefix¹, sense 11b) states that negative *un-* is able to attach to simple adverbs, yet this is hardly the case. Even though such formations have existed in Old English, they were quite rare even then. Some instances remained during the Middle English period, but the general tendency was to get rid of such forms. Other than this, *un-* seems to have no greater limitations when attaching to bases.

Adjectives and nouns prefixed with negative *un-* can express contrary as well as contradictory opposition (Kastovsky 2006:261). Examples for contradictory opposition include *unfit* ‘not suitable’, *unworthy* ‘not worthy’, *unemployed* ‘not employed’ (examples from Kastovsky ibid., and Jespersen 1942:465-466). Contrary opposition, on the other hand, can be found in lexemes like *unwise* which
“means more than not wise” (Jespersen 1942:465) or unhappy which “is not far from miserable” (Jespersen ibid.).

In terms of reversative meaning, the prefix un- has its origin in the Old English prefix and- / ond- (OED: s.v. un-, prefix2, sense 1, Marchand 1969:204). According to the OED (s.v. un-, prefix2, sense 2a), reversative un- and its alternate form on- were recorded from Old English onwards, although most formations were made in the 16th and 17th century (OED s.v. un-, prefix2, sense 2b). The basic meaning of this prefix is ‘the reversal of what the base denotes’ (OED: s.v. un-, prefix2, sense 3) or, as Marchand (1969:205) describes it, to “cause the object of the verb to be no longer -ed”. Examples of modern uses of reversative un- include undo ‘to reverse an action’, untie ‘to unfasten cord, knot, etc.’, unbutton ‘to undo the buttons of a garment’ and such.

With regard to the privative meaning of un-, this type has already been recorded in Old and Middle English (OED: s.v. un-, prefix2, sense 4a). However, the respective numbers were quite small (OED ibid.). It seems as though privative un- became more frequent from the 16th century onwards (Marchand 1969:206), where lexemes like unsaddle ‘to dislodge from a saddle’, unhorse ‘to dismount from a horse’, unbody ‘to remove from body’ (cf. disembodv) entered the English language. Privative un- generally conveys ‘remove, release from’ or ‘deprive of (character or quality)’ (Marchand 1969:206).

3.1.2. Negative suffixes
3.1.2.1. –less
This suffix originates in the Old English lexeme léas and is used to convey the meaning ‘devoid of’, ‘free from’ (OED: s.v. –less, suffix) or ‘without’ (Plag 2003:73). In Old English, léas was written as either a separate word or was attached to a lexeme (OED: s.v. –less, suffix). During the Middle English period, the separate word disappeared and léas became a suffix (OED ibid., Marchand 1969:324). Today, this suffix is attached to nouns and verbs to derive adjectives (OED: s.v. –less, suffix), e.g. numberless, paperless, helpless, countless, etc.

The suffix –less is usually used to negate words ending in –ful (Jespersen 1942:467, Marchand 1969:324-325). Thus, they “are often semantically correlative”
(Marchand 1969:325), as in careful – careless, harmful – harmless, and so on. However, Marchand (ibid.) adds that, in the 15th century,

the suffix -ful had lost of its original meaning ‘full’ to such an extent that its correlation with -less practically no longer existed. This does not mean that their semantic opposition had altogether ceased to be felt (in many words it is felt to the present day), but the distance between the suffixes was no longer the one that had existed between the words full and less.

As a consequence, many adjectives which end in the suffix –ful, are nowadays often negated by prefixing negative un- (Marchand 1969:325). Therefore forming, for example, unfruitful, uncareful, uneventful, unfaithful, ungrateful, unlawful, unsuccessful, untactful, unthoughtful, etc. (examples from Marchand 1969:291-292).

3.1.2.2. –out
In her work, Tottie (1991:8) included the suffix –out in the list of negative affixes. However, this suffix only occurs in the word without and can, thus, be considered as unproductive. Unfortunately, the OED does not have an entry for –out as a suffix and, further, Marchand (1969) does not mention it in his work. Hence, I am unable to give any information on this suffix and, thus, will not include this suffix in further discussions.

3.2. Negative, reversative, and privative

In his work Categories and Types, Marchand (1969:156) introduces three semantic values, which are present in negative affixes: (i) negativity, (ii) reversativity, and (iii) privativity. Even though their meanings are easily inferred from example words (see words with de-, dis- and un- above), I decided to discuss these semantic patterns separately. This will not only give a better overview of the negative affixes, but also demonstrate how important they are in terms of competition.

The notion of ‘negativity’, on the one hand, has already been discussed in section 2.1. In a nutshell, an affix is negative when it expresses opposition and negation. As seen in the examples above, negativity generally expresses the meaning ‘not’. Ironically, not all negative affixes convey negativity. The prefix de-
and the suffix –less are the only negative affixes without negative meaning (see discussion on this further below).

As far as ‘reversativity’ is concerned, Welte (1978:186) describes it as the reverse order of an action. In other words, ‘reversative’ meaning implies to return to the state before the action occurred (Kastovsky 2000:101). Kastovsky (ibid.) formally describes the semantic structure as follows:

(14) cause theme (T) to come to be not in location (L) or status (S)

This means that the focus is set on location (L) or status (S), which serves as the basis of the derived word, whereas the theme (T) is the external object (Kastovsky 2000:100-101). Therefore, the action unpacking a suitcase, for example, implies the pre-action of packing (i.e. status S) a suitcase (i.e. theme T), which is then emptied (cf. to unpack) and, thus, results in an empty suitcase again (i.e. T no longer in S).

The term ‘privativity’, on the other hand, expresses some kind of removal (Marchand 1969:153, Welte 1978:186). In contrast to reversativity, the focus in privativity lies on theme (T), which then serves as the basis of derivation, and the location (L) becomes the external object (Kastovsky 2000:100-101). Let me illustrate this with an example: to defrost a steak means to cause the frost (T) to be removed from the steak (L). Therefore, privativity can be described as follows (cf. Kastovsky ibid.):

(15) cause location (L) not to have theme (T)

Based on these three semantic patterns in negative affixes, Welte (1978:186-187) concludes that negative prefixes can be organised in three categories: (i) those negative prefixes, which only have negative meaning, namely a-, non-, and in-, (ii) those, which have two meanings, namely reversative and privative, i.e. de-, and (iii) those, which can convey all three meanings, namely un- and dis-. This is illustrated in Table 1 below. As far as (ii) is concerned, Welte (ibid.) insists that if negative prefixes express two meanings only, these meanings must be

---

5 Welte (1978) does not discuss any negative suffixes in his work.
reversativity and privativity. Any other combination, so Welte (ibid.) states, does not occur in negative prefixes.

Even though negativity is clearly distinguishable from reversativity and privativity, it needs to be pointed out that the borderline between reversative and privative meaning is “somewhat fuzzy” (Kastovsky 2000:100). In many cases, it is quite unclear whether a pre-action is on hand. Kastovsky (ibid.) gives the example of the verb disarm: in terms of privativity, to disarm implies that someone removed someone else’s arms, assuming no pre-action of providing arms occurred because one is already born with arms. In terms of reversativity, however, to disarm implies that someone was previously provided with arms because one was born without them which are then taken away (cf. Kastovsky ibid.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Reversative</th>
<th>Privative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a(n)-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dis-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mis-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-less</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Reversative</th>
<th>Privative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a(n)-</td>
<td>asymmetric</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>deactivate</td>
<td>defrost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dis-</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disjoin</td>
<td>disarm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-</td>
<td>impolite</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mis-</td>
<td>misunderstand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-</td>
<td>non-smoker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-</td>
<td>unhappy</td>
<td>untie</td>
<td>unnerves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-less</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>useless</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distinction between negativity, reversativity, and privativity is crucial when discussing the negative affixes’ competition to each other. As Table 1 above shows, not every affix is in direct competition with the others. The prefixes de-, dis- and un-, for example, are the only ones with reversative and privative meaning. That is to say that, in this respect, the others cannot compete with them. The
reverse also holds: the prefix *in*- , for instance, only has negative meaning, which in turn means that it is in competition with every other affix that has negative meaning. Keeping the differences between negativity, reversativity, and privativity in mind will be helpful when deciding which affix to take. This is discussed in detail in the following chapter.

3.3. Summary

In this section, I have discussed nine prefixes and two suffixes which are considered to be ‘negative’ in the literature consulted. I have elaborated on the historical development, specifically with the prefixes *de*- , *dis*- , *in*- , *mis*- , *un*- , and the suffix –*less*. Further, I have described to what kind of bases each affix usually attaches to. Doing so, I have discovered that only four negative affixes are able to freely attach to either verbs, nouns, or adjectives, namely the prefixes *de*- , *dis*- , *un*- , and, to a certain degree, *mis*- . In two cases, i.e. prefixes *a*- and *non*- , I have described that they are found in specialised vocabulary. All the others seem to be found in everyday language. In addition, I have distinguished between affixes which express contrary opposition and those which imply contradictory opposition. Contrary opposition can be indicated by the prefixes *un*- and *dis*- . Contradictory opposition, on the other hand, can be expressed by *a*- , *anti*- , *dis*- , *non*- , and the suffix -*less*. In this respect, the prefix *dis*- seems to be the only negative affix that is eligible to express contrary as well as contradictory opposition. Furthermore, the prefix *de*- is the only negative affix without negative meaning. And, of course, I have also pointed out each affix’ meaning.

In regard to this, Table 3 below gives an overview of all meanings, which the negative affixes can obtain. With the help of Table 4, I will omit some affixes from further discussion in this thesis, namely the prefixes *anti*- and *no*- , as well as the suffix –*out*. The reasons for this are stated as follows.

Even though the prefix *anti*- is related to negative affixes, I have the impression that it is different in quality. This prefix implies ‘against, opposing’ and is, thus, not entirely negative in meaning. In my opinion, *anti*- is very similar to the prefix *contra*- , which is used to “indicate a thing made or acting against” (OED: s.v. *contra*- , *prefix, sense 3*) and does not quite fit the profile of negative affixes. In terms of the prefix *no*- and the suffix –*out*, there is hardly any information available
in the literature. Due to this lack of information, it is impossible to discuss these affixes in detail.

Even though the prefix *de*- does not have negative meaning, I decided to keep it in the list of negative affixes. The reason for this is twofold. First, *de-* complies with Welte’s (1978:186-187) classification for negative prefixes discussed in section 3.2. Second, the prefix *de-* differs from the prefix *anti-* in the sense that *de-* implies the opposite state or action of what is denoted by the base. In terms of the suffix *-less*, it does not have negative meaning either, but historically speaking it can be regarded as the antonym of the suffix *-ful*.

Consequently, the affixes which will be further discussed in chapter 4 of this thesis are *a(n)-*, *de-*?, *dis-*, *in-*, *mis-*, *non-*, *un-*, and *-less* because they are all in accordance with the term ‘negative’ as discussed in section 2.1.1. This means that these affixes comply with the definition of ‘negative’, i.e. to express opposition. However, I would like to point out that Modern English *mis-* is actually no longer a ‘real’ negative. Due to its historical development, i.e. it had negative meaning in the Middle English period, it will remain among the negative affixes in my thesis. In the following chapter, we shall see it does not compete with the other negatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>affix</th>
<th>meaning(s) in terms of negation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a(n)-</td>
<td>‘not’, ‘without, devoid of’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti-</td>
<td>‘against, opposing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de-</td>
<td>‘undoing an action’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dis-</td>
<td>‘not’, ‘refuse to, fail to’, ‘absence or lack of’, ‘cease to’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-</td>
<td>‘not’, ‘absence or lack of’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mis-</td>
<td>‘badly, wrongly, improperly, amiss’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-</td>
<td>‘absence or lack of’, ‘not doing’, ‘failure to do/be’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-</td>
<td>‘not’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Competition

In Old English, there was only one negative prefix, namely \textit{un-} (OED: s.v. \textit{un-, prefix}). However, due to (or thanks to) foreign languages’ influences and borrowings over the centuries (e.g. Fisiak 2005), many other negative affixes have been introduced to the English language, “which now [compete] with \textit{un-} and among themselves” (Kastovsky 2006:260). Given that speakers of English are aware of the semantic coherence between the prefixes \textit{dis-}, \textit{in-}, \textit{non-}, \textit{un-}, etc. and are, thus, able to form possible words (see section 2.3.1), how are they able to find the ‘correct’ negative affix? For example, if the noun \textit{comfort} is negated to \textit{discomfort}, why is the negated adjective called \textit{uncomfortable} and not \textit{*discomfortable}? Further, why is it possible to say \textit{intolerance} but not \textit{*non-tolerance}, when both prefixes supposedly convey the same meaning, i.e. ‘absence or lack of’? After all, \textit{discomfortable} and \textit{non-tolerance} are both possible words. In addition to this, negative affixes can be particularly difficult for learners of English. Therefore, I want to ask if it is possible to establish rules, or at least rough guidelines which dictate when which affix is used?

The aim of this chapter is to detect patterns which make it easier to find the correct negative affix. This section is divided into three groups of criteria, namely (i) morpho-syntax, (ii) semantics, and (iii) etymology, with which (hopefully) some patterns emerge and the ‘jumble’ behind negative affixation is disentangled. At first, however, I will deal with the question whether speakers are able to choose freely between affixal and non-affixal negation.

4.1. Is there a choice between affixal and non-affixal negation?

In section 2.1.2., I have described that affixal negation belongs to local negation, where only one constituent is negated. In contrast to this, non-affixal negation equals clause negation, where a whole sentence or finite clause is negated. As a consequence, these kinds of negation are syntactically different from each other. Therefore, it could be argued that affixal and non-affixal negation cannot be compared. However, Tottie (1991:49) points out that “sentences with affixal and
nonaffixal negation may be semantically equivalent” – and it is this semantic equivalence that “is crucial” (Tottie ibid.). This brings me to the following question: if affixal as well as non-affixal negation is possible, which one will – or should – be used? Further, how will a speaker know that s/he chose the ‘right’ kind of negation? Tottie (1998:233) explains that constraints determine the choice and, thus, “[v]ariation between affixal and non-affixal negation is not free”.

In this section, I will discuss these constraints in detail, which Tottie investigated in her extensive study (1991) on the usage of affixal negation in speech and writing. I will only highlight the most striking issues when comparing affixal to non-affixal negation. It should be noted that the discussion is limited to the use of negative meaning only. That is to say that discussions on reversative and privative uses have been omitted. The reason for this is that reversative and privative uses do not have non-affixal counterparts which are semantically equivalent. For instance please deactivate the alarm cannot be rephrased to please do not activate the alarm (or vice versa) because its meaning would change entirely. I shall begin with instances where both affixal and non-affixal negation is possible, and will then turn to obligatory affixal and non-affixal negation respectively.

4.1.1. Affixal and non-affixal negation possible

In most cases it is possible to use both affixal and non-affixal negation. It is more or less the speaker’s choice which one s/he uses – presupposing both sentences are semantically equivalent, as shown in the examples (16) to (19) below.

(16a) The patterns on this carpet are not symmetric.
(16b) The patterns on this carpet are asymmetric.

(17a) It is not legal to sell the chocolate “Kinder Egg” in the U.S.
(17b) It is illegal to sell the chocolate “Kinder Egg” in the U.S.

(18a) The old sofa was not comfortable.
(18b) The old sofa was uncomfortable.
(19a) I do not agree with you.
(19b) I disagree with you.

In such cases, it does not matter whether affixal or non-affixal negation is used. However, there are two constraints. First, great attention must be paid when ‘gradable’ adjectives are to be negated. This is where the distinction between contrary and contradictory opposition plays a major role. As already discussed in section 2.1.3., contrary (or gradable) opposites are not mutually exclusive and allow middle terms between two extremes. Consequently, contrary opposites “create nonsynonymy between pairs with affixal and nonaffixal negation” (Tottie 1991:50), which is given in example (20) below.

(20a) He is not happy about losing the game.
(20b) He is unhappy about losing the game.

This non-synonymy of gradable adjectives is illustrated in Figure 2 and Figure 3 below. The expression not happy excludes some part of the happy-area because it implies ‘definitely not pleased’. Therefore, one end of the scale, i.e. happy, can be omitted. At the same time, however, it does not exclude the meaning ‘completely sad’. In other words, the interpretation of not happy begins somewhere in the middle of the happy-area and may go as far as the unhappy-area, including the other end of the scale, i.e. unhappy. In contrast to this, the expression unhappy presupposes ‘no happiness’ at all and, thus, excludes the happy-area entirely. Interpretation of unhappy, therefore, begins at unhappy and may stop at the middle term, which in this example I will name content. Based on this, it can be said that unhappy equals not happy in the sense that there is ‘no happiness’ whatsoever. However, not happy does not equal unhappy because not happy still permits ‘some happiness’. Therefore, it can be said that he may be not happy, but he is not unhappy either.
Second, when adverbial modifiers are involved, there is the possibility that meaning will change (Tottie 1991:64). As shown in the example below, sentence (21a) may be rephrased to either (21b) or (21c).

(21a) This is totally untrue. (cf. Tottie 1991:64)
(21b) This is totally not true.
(21c) This is not totally true.

In how far is sentence (21b) different from sentence (21c)? In (21b), the negative element *not* has been placed after the adverb *totally*. As a consequence, the adjective *true* is the only element within the scope of negation. In (21c), on the other hand, negative *not* has been placed before the adverb and, therefore, both adverb and adjective fall within the scope of negation. Hence, (21b) conveys that ‘everything that has been said is false’, whereas (21c) expresses that ‘some of what has been said is false’.

Even though there is a slight difference in meaning between affixal and non-affixal negation, it is ultimately the speaker’s decision to choose one or the other. There are various factors, which establish affixal or non-affixal negation: spoken or written discourse, style (formal or informal), matter of hedging (in the sense of mitigating), or even the speaker’s preference – just to name a few. Nevertheless, both forms are acceptable. There are, of course, some cases where constraints “absolutely determine the choice of either affixal or nonaffixal negation” (Tottie
In the following section, I will examine those which lead to obligatory affixal negation.

### 4.1.2. Obligatory affixal negation

Generally speaking, the constraints, which induce affixal negation, can be divided into two categories, namely (i) scope of negation and (ii) lexis.

One of the constraints, where scope of negation is at issue, is the **premodifying function** (Tottie 1991:63; Tottie 1998:243). In such cases, the adjective premodifies the noun and, thus, falls within scope of negation because of its negative prefix as shown in example (22a) below. Non-affixal negation as shown in (22b) would not be possible because an attributive adjective cannot be negated by *not*, unless it is already prefixed with a negative as demonstrated in (22c) (Huddleston and Pullum 2002:809) (see also section 2.1.). Even though acceptable, sentence (22c) changes meaning because the negated adjective falls within the scope of negation. Thus, sentence (22c) can be regarded as a negation to (22a), but certainly not as a paraphrase.

(22a) The unpleasant woman left. (from Tottie 1991:51)
(22b) *The not pleasant woman left.
(22c) The not unpleasant woman left.

For Tottie (1991:64), “[a]nother important constraint” is that of **adverbial modification**. Since this matter has already been discussed in the previous section, I shall now turn to lexical constraints.

According to Tottie (1991:66), it is a “well-known fact” that some negatively prefixed adjectives do not have a simplex⁶ counterpart and, thus, **lexical gaps** occur. Examples of lexical gaps include *unflagging*, *ineffable*, or *intact* (examples from Tottie ibid.). It goes without saying that, in such cases, affixal negation is mandatory because non-affixal negation is simply not possible: *not flagging*, *not effable*, *not tact.*

---

⁶ The term ‘simplex’ refers to lexemes, which are not derived from word-formation processes (Bauer 1983 [2002]:30), for instance *comfort* would be regarded as a simplex word, whereas *discomfort* and *uncomfortable* are regarded as complex words.
In other cases, both affixed and simplex forms are at hand, but there is no semantic equivalence (Tottie 1991:66). In other words, affixal negation is obligatory because non-affixal negation would not make any sense, as illustrated in the examples (23)-(25) below.

(23a) The political party was indifferent to the rejection of their proposal.
(23b) *The political party was not different to the rejection of their proposal.

(24a) After hearing what had happened, she felt uneasy.
(24b) *After hearing what had happened, she felt not easy.

(25a) Everybody noticed that she is unusual. (from Tottie 1991:66)
(25b) *Everybody noticed that she is not usual.

In the examples above, it can clearly be seen that both affixal and non-affixal negation are possible, yet in each case the latter does not make sense. In the example (23a) indifferent expresses the meaning ‘to have no interest or feeling in regard to something’, whereas not different suggests ‘to be alike’. In the next example (24a), uneasy refers to a state of discomfort, while not easy expresses the opposite of difficult. As for the third example (25a), unusual conveys the meaning ‘not common’ in the sense of ‘remarkable, exceptional’, whereas not usual implies ‘not common’ in the sense of ‘out of ordinary use’.

Unfortunately, I was unable to determine why the negatively affixed words differ semantically from the negated non-affixal form. Neither the OED nor Marchand (1969) discuss this phenomenon. A possible explanation, however, could be lexicalisation.

4.1.3. Obligatory non-affixal negation

Similar to obligatory affixal negation, constraints that lead to obligatory non-affixal negation can also be categorised into matters of (i) scope of negation and (ii) lexis. I shall discuss them in turn.

The first constraint in regards to scope of negation has already been discussed in the previous section, namely adverbial modifiers (Tottie 1991:64,
For Tottie (1991:73-74) a subcategory to adverbial modification is what Welte (1978:209) refers to as **presupposition**. This is illustrated in the example (26) below.

(26a) She was *not fortunate* enough to lose her husband
(26b) She was *unfortunate* enough to lose her husband.

(both examples from Welte 1978:209)

Tottie (1991:73) remarks that the “correct presupposition” influences the choice between affixal and non-affixal negation. After all, (26a) implies that ‘she would have been lucky, if she had lost her husband’, while (26b) suggests that ‘she was unhappy that her husband passed away’ (Welte 1978:209).

Another constraint is where “the **scope of negation is restricted on the main verb**” (Tottie 1991:74) In such instances, it is impossible to move the negative element to the adjective “without a concomitant change of meaning” (Tottie 1991:75).

Example sentence (27a) below conveys the meaning that ‘the people in question do not have any clear intentions’ and is, hence, equal to sentence (27c). Sentence (27b), on the other hand, expresses that ‘intentions are at hand, but they are not clear’ and is, thus, not synonymous to (27a).

(27a) ...they had *no clear* intentions...
(27b) ...they had *unclear* intentions...
(27c) ...they *do not have* clear intentions....

(examples from Tottie 1991:74)

Another example is listed in (28), where (28a) implies that ‘a person does not have a legal right’ and is, thus, equal to sentence (28c). However, in sentence (28b), the adjective is negated and expresses that the ‘right is illegal’.

(28a) ... *has no legal* right to...
(28b) ... *has an illegal* right to...
(28c) ... *does not have* a legal right to...

(examples from Tottie 1991:74)
In terms of lexical constraints, there are two important factors. First, there is often no semantic equivalence between affixal and non-affixal negation (Tottie 1991:71). This is shown in the following examples:

(29a) The story is not credible.
(29b) The story is incredible.

(30a) She is not famous for her acting.
(30b) She is infamous for her acting.

Even though both negatively affixed and negated simplex forms are possible, the meaning changes. Affixal negation in (29b) and (30b) is doubtlessly acceptable, but it no longer conveys the same as indicated in (29a) and (30a) respectively. In sentence (29a), not credible refers to a ‘story that cannot be believed in’, whereas incredible expresses ‘something exceedingly great’. Further, not famous simply states ‘to be little known’, while infamous indicates ‘to be well known for some bad quality or deed’. Similar to the examples (23) to (25) above, the speaker is obliged to choose either affixal or non-affixal negation in order to convey the correct message.

Second, what Tottie (1991:71) calls “an extremely common case” of lexical constraints, is that of lexical gaps, where many adjectives do not have an affixal counterpart. Examples include not tiny - *untiny, not bad - *unbad, not poor - *unpoor, not great - *ungreat, and such. In this respect, Zimmer (1964:15) proposes that “negative affixes are not used with adjectival stems that have a ‘negative’ value”. This value is based on “evaluative scales” (Zimmer ibid.) of the types good – bad or desirable – undesirable. Therefore, it is possible to attach negative prefixes to ‘positive valued’ adjectives such as well, healthy, comfortable, competent to create unwell, unhealthy, uncomfortable, incompetent respectively. On the other hand, ‘negative valued’ words such as bad, ugly, cruel, lazy, rude cannot be negated locally: *unbad, *unugly, *uncruel, *unlazy, *unrude.

There are, however, two difficulties with this proposal. First of all, how can the ‘positive’ or the ‘negative’ value of a word be established? For Zimmer (1964:16), ‘positive’ is something that “express[es] a favourable judgment, or describ[es] a state generally considered desirable”. ‘Negative value’, then,
expresses the opposite of ‘positive value’, i.e. something unfavourable. Unfortunately, dictionaries, encyclopaedia and such do not list ‘positive’ or ‘negative’ value of entries. Thus, the difference between the two has to be based on intuition (Zimmer ibid.). This, however, may lead to disagreements, for instance with an adjective like quiet – some people may think of it as something ‘negative’, others may not. Since it can be locally negated to unquiet to mean ‘restless’, does this, then, mean it is ‘positive’? In addition to this, what if words cannot be categorised into either of the two, but are treated as ‘neutral’ such as neutral, regular, existent, conventional, or even quiet? Affixal negation is possible in some of these ‘neutral’ words (e.g. non-existent, unconventional, irregular, unquiet), yet it is impossible in others (e.g. *unneutral).

Second, there are many cases where the base is of ‘negative’ value and may still be negated with a negative prefix (Zimmer 1964:30-31). Examples include incorrupt, inoffensive, unpainful, unguilty, unfaulty, unbroken, uninterrupted (Zimmer 1964:30, 1964:35). In conclusion, it can be said that Zimmer’s proposal is quite helpful, yet it does not hold for all adjectives.

4.1.4. Summary

Even though affixal and non-affixal negation are semantically equivalent, there are some limitations to them. In this section, I have discussed instances where it is possible to use both affixal and non-affixal negation without changing the utterance’s meaning. Since both kinds of negation are possible and acceptable, it is the speaker’s decision which one s/he uses. The speaker must be particularly careful when s/he is negating gradable adjectives because contrary opposition creates non-synonymy between affixal and no-affixal negation. In an example, I have shown that unhappy means not happy, but not happy does not necessarily indicate unhappy.

Further, I have discussed constraints that ultimately lead to either affixal or non-affixal negation. They can be categorised into constraints concerning scope of negation and concerning lexis. As far as scope of negation is concerned, the most important factor is adverbial modification. Even though both affixal and non-affixal negation are possible, the scope of negation may be shifted when using non-affixal
negation. It is, therefore, the speaker’s choice which type of negation s/he uses as it depends on what s/he intents to convey.

In regard to lexical constraints, there is sometimes no semantic equivalence and in other times lexical gaps may occur. As a consequence, either affixal or non-affixal negation must be chosen to get the right message across. In these cases, the speaker has no free choice.

4.2. Which affix should be used?

In case of affixal negation, there are many different affixes to choose from. In this section, I will take a look at three different criteria which will hopefully help to determine the ‘correct’ affix.

4.2.1. Based on morpho-syntactic criteria

The first criterion I want to discuss is that relating to syntax. Syntactic categories are probably the most easily detectable elements. Therefore, the question arises: can certain syntactic categories be negated by certain negative affixes only? It seems as though some affixes are predominantly used with one syntactic category, for instance non- appears to be attached to nouns only as in non-smoker, non-conductor, non-conformist, nonsense, etc., while the prefix in- seems to prefer adjectives, e.g. illegal, impolite, important, inadequate, intolerant, irresponsible, etc. Would it, thus, be possible to say that all nouns can be negated by adding non- and all adjectives by attaching in-? In Table 4 below I have listed which syntactic category can take which affix. With that table in mind, the answer to the previous question is (un)fortunately ‘no’. At this point, I would like to stress that the word-class of the outcome, i.e. the word-class of the derived word is not of interest at present.
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Table 4. Syntactic categories and negative affixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Verbs (finite or infinite)</th>
<th>Verbs (participle)</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>Nouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a(n)-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dis-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mis-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Syntactic categories and negative affixes - examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Verbs (finite or infinite)</th>
<th>Verbs (participle)</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>Nouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a(n)-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>asymmetric</td>
<td>asymmetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de-</td>
<td>demilitarise</td>
<td>demilitarising</td>
<td>dehydrated</td>
<td>debus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dis-</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagreeing</td>
<td>disloyal</td>
<td>disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>inconvenient</td>
<td>intolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mis-</td>
<td>misunderstand</td>
<td>misrepresenting</td>
<td>misminded (ME)</td>
<td>misfortune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>non-active</td>
<td>non-smoker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-</td>
<td>undo</td>
<td>unchanging</td>
<td>unhappy</td>
<td>unhorse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-less</td>
<td>help/less</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>speechless</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most striking feature shown in Table 4 is that nouns seem to be able to take all negative affixes, whereas verbs are limited to de-, dis-, mis-, and, to some extent, un- and –less (see discussion on this below). In terms of adjectives, they appear to function with all negative prefixes, but not with the negative suffix –less. At this point, it shall be noted that the prefix mis- is a somewhat special case. Even though there are no adjectives which can take mis- in Modern English, there are some instances recorded in Middle English (Marchand 1969:177; see also section 3.1.1.6).

Based on the table above, it is not possible to infer striking patterns, let alone establish rules of any kind. Therefore, I decided to change the point of view and rephrase the question to: can certain affixes be attached to certain syntactic categories only?

Unfortunately, even from the affixes’ point of view there are no distinctive patterns. However, the negative affixes’ attachments to word-classes seem to be less random from this viewpoint. The prefixes de-, dis-, mis-, un- appear to be able to attach freely to any word-classes. A(n)-, in- and non- are the only prefixes which cannot attach to verbs, neither (in)finite nor participles. And it seems as though –less is the only odd one out. This suffix attaches to nouns and, to some extent, to verbs, but definitely not to adjectives.
Even though the tables above give a nice overview, there are some difficulties that arise when discussing negative affixes in terms of morpho-syntactic categorisation. The problems mostly concern the prefix *un*- and the suffix *less*. Welte (1978:187) argues that *un*- never attaches to (in)finite verbs and only appears with participles, e.g. *unexpected*, but not *to unexpect*. However, there are instances like *to untie*, *to unbutton*, or *to undo*. Should these examples be treated as substantival bases, i.e. *the tie*, *the button*, as Welte (ibid.) suggests, or is it legitimate to treat them as verbal bases, i.e. *to tie* ‘to bind, to fasten’, *to button* ‘to fasten with button’?

A similar problem occurs with the suffix *less*: at first, it seems as though this suffix is only able to attach to nouns, e.g. in *helpless*, *countless*, *hopeless*. However, at closer inspection, it is clear that most of these nouns may also function as verbs: *the help* > *to help*, *the count* > *to count*, *the hope* > *to hope*. I was not able to find an ‘explicit’ verb that can take the suffix *less*, for instance *to write* (n. *writer*) > *writeless* is impossible. The question I wish to raise is whether zero-derivation (see section 2.2.1.3) plays a role in this? If it is a matter of zero-derivation, I may conclude that categorising negative affixes according to syntactic criteria is a dead-end because zero-derivation makes lexemes permissible to all syntactic categories. Thus, it is nearly impossible to even find any useful patterns.

In summary, it can be said that on the basis of morpho-syntactic criteria no rules are inferable and I shall continue with the discussion of negative affixes based on semantic criteria.

4.2.2. Based on semantic criteria

For a better overview, I decided to separate this section into four parts: (i) competition of affixes with all three meanings, (ii) competition of affixes with negative meaning, (iii) competition of affixes with reversative meaning, and (iv) competition of affixes with privative meaning. I will address each part in turn.

As already discussed in the previous chapter, one possibility to categorise negative affixes is based on negative, reversative, and privative meaning. From Table 1 in section 3.2., the most striking feature is that the prefixes *dis-* and *un-* are the only ones, which can take all three meanings. Thus, the question arises whether *dis-* and *un-* are rivals or not? Interestingly, this can be answered with a
'not really'. Even though they have a lot in common (as shown in Table 7 below), they do not seem to interfere with each other. It appears as though words that can take the prefix un- are unable to join dis-; for example the adjective happy is unambiguously negated to unhappy rather than *dishappy. This also works in the other direction: the adjective honest is being negated to dishonest, not *unhonest. This cannot be explained by the different meanings of the respective prefixes because un- and dis- share one meaning, i.e. ‘not’ (see Table 6 below). However, etymology may be the influencing factor in the examples above. This will be discussed in section 4.3.

I could think of two cases, where there is direct rivalry between dis- and un-. First, instances where nouns are formed with dis-, but their respective adjectives are coined with un-, for instance discomfort – uncomfortable, or disability\(^7\) – unable. It should be pointed out that *discomfortable did exist in the Middle English period (OED: s.v. discomfortable, adj.), and furthermore, the lexeme disable, meaning ‘unable, incapable’, still exists but is now hardly used (OED: s.v. disable, adj.). So, why did the adjectives change to uncomfortable and unable, respectively? Second, those instances where both dis- and un-prefixation is possible, but the derivations differ (slightly) in meaning, such as dissatisfied ‘deprived of satisfaction’ – unsatisfied ‘not satisfied’, disease ‘out of health’ – unease ‘lack of ease’. As far as the former case is concerned, the literature I consulted did not mention the phenomenon of dis-nouns with un-adjectives. Only the OED (s.v. un-, prefix\(^1\), sense 7b) states that attaching un- to words ending in –able was very common in the 14\(^{th}\) century. This would, to some extent, explain why discomfort has the adjective uncomfortable. In terms of the latter case, I was unable to find an answer, but I assume that it may be the same case as with words beginning with in- and un-: during the Middle English period, many in-words had by-forms with the prefix un- (OED: s.v. un-, prefix sense 5b). It may be possible that many dis-words had by-forms with un- as well, which survived in Modern English but are different in meaning.

\(^7\) In the sense of ‘lack of ability’ (OED, s.v. disability, n., sense 1a), rather than ‘a physical or mental condition that limits a person’s movements, senses, or activities’ (OED, s.v. disability, n., sense 2).
Table 6. Rivalry between dis- and un-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>negative un-</th>
<th>negative dis-</th>
<th>reversative un-</th>
<th>reversative dis-</th>
<th>privative un-</th>
<th>privative dis-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘not’</td>
<td>‘not’, ‘refuse to, fail to’, ‘absence or lack of’</td>
<td>‘undoing of an action’</td>
<td>‘undoing of an action’</td>
<td>‘deprive of’, ‘release from’</td>
<td>‘deprive of’, ‘remove from’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>untie</td>
<td>disconnect</td>
<td>unnerve</td>
<td>disarm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>unhappy</td>
<td>dissimilar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unlimited</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>untruth</td>
<td>discomfort</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unease</td>
<td>unease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When looking at Table 1 in section 3.2., it is evident that six out of eight affixes have negative meaning. This, then, leads to the question: to what extent are the prefixes a(n)-, dis-, in-, mis-, non-, and un- rivals? With the prefixes a(n)- and non- we can safely assume that they are no ‘threats’ to the other negative prefixes. Since both prefixes are very limited in use and are often found in specialised lexicons, they seem to not interfere with the others (see sections 3.1.1.1. and 3.1.1.8.). Furthermore, it seems as though the number of words with a(n)- is finite. This is to say that most words with the prefix a(n)- have been borrowed and new formations are hardly found (Zimmer 1964:26). Based on this, it could be said that a(n)- is no longer productive as it is not readily available for new coinages (see section 2.3.).

As far as the prefix non- is concerned, it is regarded as productive (Zimmer 1964:32) as it attaches freely to any substantival and adjectival bases. However, it appears to be used slightly differently (Zimmer 1964:33) and is, thus, no direct rival to the others. According to Zimmer (1964:33), non- has a descriptive force, rather than an evaluative one (cf. also Plag 2003:100). That is to say that words with non- seem to be ‘neutral’, while other negative prefixes convey a bias. For example non-Christian implies that someone is not of Christian belief, whereas un-Christian refers to a Christian who does not follow Christian conventions (example from Zimmer 1964:33).

In terms of the prefix mis-, I believe it not to be in direct competition with any other negative affix. The reason for this is its meaning. Of all negative affixes, mis- is the only one to express “badly, wrongly, improperly, amiss” (Marchand

63
1969:176). As a result, mis- is not treated as a ‘true’ negative affix and cannot compete directly with the other negative affixes. This prefix has only been included to the category of negative affixes because it expressed negativity during the Old English period (see also section 3.1.1.6.).

Consequently, this leaves us with only three negative prefixes namely dis-, in-, and un-. Since the rivalry between dis- and un- has already been discussed above, I shall turn to in- and its competition to dis- and un- respectively. As far as the competition between in- and dis- is concerned, it can be said that there is no direct competition. The reasons for this are twofold. First, negative in- cannot be attached to verbs, thus, making a prefixation with dis- very likely. Second, with nouns both prefixes express ‘absence or lack of’ but it seems as though they do not interfere with each other. Nouns with in- appear to be unable to attach to dis- and vice versa, for instance justice is undoubtedly negated to injustice (not *disjustice), and belief is negated to disbelief rather than *inbelief. However, there is one instance that came to my mind, where both prefixes are acceptable: inability – disability. The former conveys the meaning ‘state of being unable to do something’, whereas the latter expresses ‘a physical or mental condition causing a person to be unable to do something’.

In terms of adjectives, however, there seems to be some competition. Even though their meanings vary, i.e. adjectives with in- only convey ‘not’, whereas adjectives with dis- express either ‘not’ or ‘refuse to or fail to’ (see examples in Table 7 below), it is (in theory) possible to exchange the negative prefixes. If, for instance, honest is negated to dishonest to convey ‘not honest’, it could as well be negated to *inhonest expressing ‘fail to be honest’ ⁸. However, the ‘incompatibility’ of in- and honest may be explained by etymology. The prefix in- is of Latin origin, whereas the lexeme honest is French (OED: s.v. honest, adj.). The matter of etymology will be further discussed in section 4.1.3 below. Thus, based on what I have observed, it could be said that the prefixes in- and dis- are no real rivals.

### Table 7. Rivalry between dis- and in-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>negative in-</th>
<th>negative dis-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘not’ (adj)</td>
<td>‘not’, ‘refuse to, fail to’ (v, adj)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁸ According to Marchand (1969:203), unhonest was among those words, which were used with the prefix in- instead. However, alleged *inhonest was the only one to be replaced by a dis-word, i.e. dishonest. Unfortunately, Marchand (ibid.) does not state why.
In contrast to the competition between *dis*- and *in*-, there is strong rivalry between *un*- and *in*-. I have briefly mentioned this rivalry in section 3.1.1.5., where I discussed that during the 14th century some words with the prefix *in*- had “by-forms with the prefix *un*” (Marchand 1969:170). From the 17th century onwards, speakers began to differentiate between the *un*- and *in*- prefixes and exclusively used one prefix or the other (OED: s.v. *un*-, *prefix1*, sense 5b). As a result, words formerly used with the prefix *un*- where now used with *in*-, for instance un*active* became *inactive*, un*capable* > *incapable*, un*perfect* > *imperfect* (Jespersen 1966:140-141). Of course, it also worked the other way around: words, where *in*- was formerly used, are now formed with *un*-, e.g. *incertain* > *uncertain*, *ingrateful* > *ungrateful* (from Jespersen ibid.) This trend, however, does not mark the end of the *un*-/ *in*- rivalry. Jespersen (1942:469) remarks that

> [i]t should be noted that while most of the *in*-words are settled once and for all, and have to be learned by children as wholes, there is always the possibility of forming new words on the spur of the moment with the prefix *un*-.

Marchand (1969:170) states that even today the prefix *un-* “is ousting” the prefix *in*- because it “has proved [to be] the stronger prefix” (Marchand 1969:203). However, so Marchand (ibid.) continues, “there are also cases where the *un*- words have passed out of use”. As a guidance, Jespersen (1942:468) states that “[p]retty often *un*- is preferred before the shorter word, and *in*- before the longer word derived from it, which is generally also of a more learned nature”, thus giving *unable – inability, unjust – injustice, unequal – inequality*, and the like. Similar to the 14th century, there are some instances in Modern English, where still both *in*- and *un*- prefixation is possible. The difference lies subtly in meaning: *inhuman*, for example, means ‘brutal, cruel’, whereas *unhuman* implies something ‘not pertaining to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘absence or lack of’ (n)</th>
<th>‘absence or lack of’ (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbs</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dislike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dismiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjectives</strong></td>
<td>invisible</td>
<td>dishonest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intolerant</td>
<td>disgraceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inevitable</td>
<td>dissimilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nouns</strong></td>
<td>injustice</td>
<td>disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inability</td>
<td>disbelief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inequality</td>
<td>discomfort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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mankind’, or even ‘superhuman’ (example from Marchand 1969:170). The probably most cited example is that of immoral – unmoral (e.g. Zimmer 1964:29). While the former expresses the opposite of moral, i.e. ‘not conforming to moral’, the latter conveys ‘not influenced by, or connected with, moral considerations’\(^9\). Generally speaking, it is extremely difficult to determine why in- was preferred in some instances and un- in others.

Competitors in regard to **reversative meaning** are the prefixes *de-*, *dis-*, and *un-*. Since prefixes with reversative meaning are only attachable to verbs and can only express one idea, i.e. the reversal of an action, there is, unfortunately, not more differentiation between the prefixes *de-*, *dis-* and *un-* (as shown in Table 8 below). As a consequence, it is impossible to determine any guidelines for the use of either reversative *de-*, or reversative *dis-* or reversative *un-*. Perhaps etymology may be of help (see section 4.3.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>reversative de-</th>
<th>reversative dis-</th>
<th>reversative un-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>demilitarise</td>
<td>disarm</td>
<td>untie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deactivate</td>
<td>disjoin</td>
<td>unbutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decentralise</td>
<td>disentangle</td>
<td>unpack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as **privativity** is concerned, there are only four affixes which can convey such a meaning, namely *de-*, *dis-*, *un-* and –*less*. Among these, the suffix –*less* is the only one to derive adjectives. In contrast, the prefixes *de-*, *dis-* and *un-* derive verbs (see Table 9 below). Similar to the category of reversative meaning, it seems as though there are no real patterns to distinguish between *de-*, *dis-* or *un-* prefixation. With privative *de-*, however, it seems as though it often attaches to verbs ending in –*ise*, –*ate* or –*ify* (OED: s.v. *de-, prefix senses* 1f-2a).

---

\(^9\) In section 3.1.1.5 (about the negative prefix *in-*), I have mentioned the difference between immoral and amoral. The main difference between immoral, unmoral, and amoral is where they are located in the sphere of moral sense. Immoral indicates the opposite of moral (OED: s.v. immoral, adj. and n.), unmoral suggests that it was not influenced by moral (OED: s.v. unmoral, adj.), and amoral conveys the overall lack of moral quality (OED: s.v. amoral, adj.).
In conclusion, it can be said that keeping negative, reversative, and privative meaning apart is useful when determining which affix can be used for negation. By doing so, it is possible to eliminate those affixes that are unable to attach. However, there is still more than one option left. For instance, if I were to negate the adjective legible, I can eliminate the prefix de- and the suffix –less as they do not express negative meaning. Further, I could also rule out a(n) because legible does not belong to a specialised vocabulary. The prefix mis- could be put aside as I would be trying to express the opposite of legible. In the end, I would be left with three prefixes, namely dis-, in-, and un-. With the help of etymology, which will be discussed in the following section, I may be able to identify the correct negative prefix to legible.

4.2.3. Based on etymology

The English language consists of a number of borrowings most notably from Latin, French, Greek as well as Scandinavian languages. The general tendency, therefore, is that Latin affixes are usually attached to Latin bases, French affixes are usually combined with Romance bases, and so on (Plag 2003:84ff., Marchand 1969:160). Applying this to the example legible mentioned above, it is possible to say that its negation is formed with in- to coin illegible. The reason is that legible is of Latin origin, and so is the prefix in-. Even though this appears to be a simple and a very elegant method of finding the ‘correct’ negative affix, some difficulties arise.

First of all, this method may be extremely helpful for linguists, but what should laypeople do, first and foremost young(er) learners of English? It is very likely that they do not know the origins of the words they use. Further, I believe that most native speakers of English do not know word history either.
Second, there are many cases where foreign and native elements are mixed. That is to say that “either a foreign base is combined with a native affix or a native base is combined with a foreign affix” (Lutzky 2004:35); for instance in *disbelief*, where the prefix is foreign (French), whereas the base is native. This is, then, referred to as a ‘hybrid formation’ (Crystal 2008:232). Table 10 below shows which negative affixes can attach to bases of native, French, Greek, and Latin origin respectively.

### Table 10. Negative affixes with native and/or foreign bases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Native base</th>
<th>French base</th>
<th>Latin base</th>
<th>Greek base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a(n) - (Greek)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de - (French)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dis - (French)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in - (Latin)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mis - (French)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non - (Latin)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un - (native)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-less (native)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11. Negative affixes with native and/or foreign bases – examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Native base</th>
<th>French base</th>
<th>Latin base</th>
<th>Greek base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a(n) - (Greek)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>amoral</td>
<td>acardiac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de - (French)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>decaffeinate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dis - (French)</td>
<td>disbelief</td>
<td>disenchant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in - (Latin)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>intolerant</td>
<td>illegal</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mis - (French)</td>
<td>misunderstand</td>
<td>misdemeanour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non - (Latin)</td>
<td>non-smoker</td>
<td>non-profit</td>
<td>non-scientific</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un - (native)</td>
<td>unafraid</td>
<td>unsafe</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-less (native)</td>
<td>hopeless</td>
<td>faithless</td>
<td>senseless</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What strikes most is that the prefix *a(n)*- appears to be the only one to combine with Greek bases. The reason for this may be that it is the only negative affix of Greek origin. Further, it seems to be the only one to be unable to attach to French bases. The French prefixes *de-* , *dis-* and *mis-* definitely take Romance bases, whereby *dis-* and *mis-* may also combine with native bases. Mazzon (2004:74), however, states that *de-* is actually not restricted to Romance bases and has also combined with Germanic and Latin roots during the Late Middle English period. In general, bases with French roots can combine with any negative affix, except *a(n)*-. As far as Latin is concerned, the prefix *non-* is attachable to either native, French or Latin bases, whereas *in-* is not ‘compatible’ with native words. The native prefix
un- can more or less attach freely to bases of any origin, with the exception of Greek. However, it should be pointed out that the prefix in- is a strong rival to un- when it comes to bases of Latin or French roots. This brings me to my third and final point: even though Jespersen (1942:469) has already said that many words with in- “are settled once and for all”, there is still the possibility to use un- instead. In addition to this, the reverse also holds: many words with un- may be replaced with in- (see discussion in 3.1.1.5 and 4.2.2.). In such cases, it seems as though etymology does not matter at all and the negative prefix can be chosen at random. This, in turn, results in less (or even no) transparent patterns and may cause more confusion.

In conclusion it can be said that negative affixes prefer to attach to bases that share their origin. However, it should be kept in mind that hybrid formations are possible. Unfortunately, this makes establishing rules which dictate what affix should be used quite hard, if not impossible. I, therefore, believe that many, if not most, of the negated words are learned, while others may be formed by analogy.

4.2.4. Summary

Unfortunately, it is not possible to establish rules with which the use of negative affixation can be specified. It is not easy to give a reason why (or why not) a base can take a particular negative affix. Fortunately, I have found a few rough guidelines, or ‘rules of thumb’, with which the choice of negative affix can be simplified.

In terms of morpho-syntax, it seemed quite helpful to know which affix can be attached to which word-class. However, at closer inspection, it turns out to be somewhat useless as too many negative prefixes coincide. In addition to this, zero-derivation makes lexemes permissible to any syntactic category, which in turn makes it impossible to find any readily identifiable patterns.

As far as semantics is concerned, it proved to be very valuable. If the distinction between negative, reversative, and privative meaning is kept in mind, it is possible to eliminate some negative affixes. With regard to negative meaning, it should be noted that the prefix a(n)- is rarely used, and if it is used, it usually occurs in specialised lexis only. Further, non- has, according to Zimmer (1964:33), a descriptive value rather than an evaluative one. In terms of the prefix mis-, it is
historically speaking a negative affix, yet it is not in direct competition with the others as it conveys different meaning, i.e. ‘wrongly, badly’.

Attention must be paid when one needs to reach a decision between the prefixes *un-* and *in*-. In such cases, I would recall Jespersen’s ‘rule of thumb’ where *un-* is usually reserved for ‘shorter’ words, while *in-* is usually attached to ‘longer’ ones (cf. *unequal* – *inequality*). Unfortunately, there are no real guidelines in terms of reversative and privative meaning.

I believe that the combination of semantics and etymology is extremely helpful when discussing the competition of the negative affixes. However, one needs to be aware of at least two pitfalls: possible hybrid formations and the seemingly endless rivalry between *un-* and *in*-. 
5. Historical development of the competition between the prefixes un- and in-

In this section I will further examine the development of the prefixes un- and in- because they have been regarded as rivals (e.g. Jespersen 1966:140, Marchand 1969:169, Kwon 1996 quoted in Mazzon 2004:74). The basis of my investigation lies in Marchand’s statement (1969:170) in which he claims that words with in- had alternate forms with un- during the Middle English period. According to the OED (s.v. un-, prefix ¹, sense 5b) one of the two forms had to be eliminated from the 17th century onwards. Preference was given to the prefix in- (OED ibid.). However, Marchand (1969:169) claims that nowadays the prefix un- is “ousting in- more and more”. In addition to this, Jespersen (1942:469) stated that in the “spur of the moment” in- may be replaced with un- (see also sections 3.1.1.5. and 4.2.2.).

According to Marchand (1969:170), the OED (s.v. un-, prefix ¹, sense 5b) and Mazzon (2004:74), there are many cases, in which both un- and in-prefixation was possible during the Middle English period. Eleven words were directly mentioned in the literature above, and they are listed in Table 12 below. Out of these eleven, eight are used with the prefix in- in Modern English, two take un- and only one still allows for both un- and in-prefixation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Middle English negation</th>
<th>Modern English negation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>alienable</td>
<td>unalienable = inalienable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>unactive – inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>capable</td>
<td>incapable – incapable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>unperfect – imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>practical</td>
<td>unpractical – impractical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>exact</td>
<td>unexact – inexact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>replaceable</td>
<td>unreplaceable – irreplaceable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>corrupt</td>
<td>uncrupt – incrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>possible</td>
<td>unpossible – impossible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>certain</td>
<td>uncertain – incertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>just</td>
<td>unjust – injust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1. Research Methodology

The first objective of my investigation is to see **how the frequency of un-prefixation has declined in favour of the Latin prefix in-**. For this, two Early Modern English corpora, namely Parsed Corpus of Early English Correspondence (PCEEC) and the Lampeter Corpus of Early Modern English Tracts (Lampeter) will be used. The PCEEC consists of approximately 2.2 million words and covers the period from 1410 to 1695. The Lampeter, on the other hand, has texts recorded from 1640 to 1740 and consists of approximately 1.1 million words. This time period was chosen because with the desire to refine the English language during the 17th and 18th century (Fisiak 2005:117ff.) either the un- or the in-form had to be eliminated. The aim of this query was to observe, if un- or in-prefixation was favoured. As we shall see, the results from PCEEC and Lampeter are not representative enough to say whether the prefix un- has given way to the prefix in- (or vice versa).

As a result, two larger corpora, namely Corpus of Historical American English (COHA) and TIME Magazine Corpus of American English (TIME), will be consulted. The COHA corpus stretches over a period of 200 years (1810-2009) and includes 400 million words of text. On the other hand, the TIME corpus ‘only’ covers approximately 70 years (1920-2006), but consists of 100 million words. The main aim of this query was to observe the rivalry between un- and in- during Jespersen’s and Marchand’s lifetime. Even though the competition between un- and in- is not clearly visible with all words listed in Table 12 above, we shall see that the overall tendency is that in- was the preferred prefix.

The second objective of my investigation is to find out whether Jespersen’s (1942:469) and Marchand’s (1969:169) statements, in which they claim that in-prefixation is being ousted by un-prefixation, can be ‘validated’. For this, the corpora COHA and TIME will be used once more as they both cover the beginning of the 20th century. Surprisingly, the query with COHA and TIME did not indicate any change from in- to un-prefixation in the first half of the 20th century.

5.2. Results

In terms of the PCEEC and Lampeter corpora, I expect to see a clear difference between the number of un-words and the number of in-words. Since the PCEEC
includes a little bit of the Middle English period, I presume that both un- and in-
prefixation will occur but the number of in-words will be higher. As far as the
Lampeter corpus is concerned, I expect to see a proportionally high number of in-
prefixation and very few by-forms of un-. In both corpora, however, I presume the
negated words certain and just to be more frequent with un- (see Table 12 above).
At this point, I would like to stress that I will discuss the most significant numbers in
the main text; detailed tables of all search queries can be found in the Appendix.

Unfortunately, the results from PCEEC and Lampeter were not quite what I had
anticipated (see Table 13 below). Let me elaborate on this by looking at the
outcome from PCEEC first.

It is clear that only five of the originally eleven words targeted were negated
with a prefix, namely capable, perfect, possible, certain, and just. Only the last two
words, however, were negated with un-. On the one hand, this is to be expected as
their Modern English form takes the un-prefix only. On the other hand, it would
have been interesting to know whether the alternate form with in-, that is incertain
and injust respectively, actually existed. The word capable is the only one where
the prefix un- is neck and neck with the prefix in-. At this point, it is not clear which
prefix would eventually ‘win’. In terms of the other two words, i.e. perfect and
possible, they both occur with both un- and in-prefixation, whereby a tendency for
in- is noticeable. The negation of possible should, however, be regarded with a
pinch of salt. Since unpossible is a hapax legomenon\(^\text{10}\), there is not enough
‘evidence’ that possible actually prefers the negative prefix in-.

In regard to the Lampeter corpus, it is evident that the words are negated
with only one of the two prefixes. The only exception to this is the word capable,
which was negated with both un- and in-. Against my expectation, it is obvious that
preference was given to the prefix un-. The word capable, for instance, was used
with un- one third more often than with in-. In terms of certain and just, they
occurred 39 and 59 respectively with the prefix un-, which was to be expected.
However, I was surprised to see that active, practical, and corrupt were negated
with un-, whereby no alternate form with in- occurred. However, they need to be
treated with caution as each one of them is a hapax legomenon. Consequently, no

\(^{10}\) A word, which can be found only once in a text or corpus, is referred to as ‘hapax legomenon’
(Crystal 2008:224).
‘real’ conclusion can be drawn. In terms of the prefix *in-* only *perfect* and *possible* clearly prefer it with nine and 108 occurrences respectively. Yet, this does not allow us to conclude that *un-* was giving way to *in-* because *perfect* and *possible* only constitute two out of the eight Modern English *in-*words (see Table 12 above).

When comparing the outcome from the PCEEC corpus to the Lampeter, there is unfortunately only one pair worth mentioning, namely *uncapable* – *in*capable. Negation of this word with *un-* has risen from 0.227 occurrences per 100,000 words (PCEEC) to 0.818 occurrences per 100,000 words (Lampeter), which gives reason to believe that *un-* has become the preferred prefix. However, *in*capable also experienced a rise from 0.273 instances (PCEEC) to 0.545 instances (Lampeter) per 100,000 words. With this result, it is unfortunately not possible to draw a ‘real’ conclusion because it is uncertain whether the prefix *un-* or the prefix *in-* is in favour. This may be partly because of the low number of occurrences, even though PCEEC and Lampeter are fairly large for historic corpora.

Table 13. Results PCEEC and Lampeter (incl. normalisation per 100,000 words)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PCEEC</th>
<th>Lampeter</th>
<th>PCEEC normalised</th>
<th>Lampeter normalised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>unalienable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inalienable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>unactive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>uncapable</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>in</em>capable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>unperfect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imperfect</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>unpractical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impractical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>unexact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inexact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>unreplaceable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>irreplaceable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>uncorrupt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incorrupt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>unpossible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impossible</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incertain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>unjust</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>injust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As one can imagine I was dissatisfied with this outcome and so I decided to turn to corpora with bigger collections of texts and a larger time-span, namely COHA and the TIME corpus.

The objective of this query is twofold. First, I would like to establish whether the negated forms from Table 12 are attested. That is to say that I would like to examine if both un- and in-negation have actually been used. The results from the COHA corpus, with its 400 million words of text, and the TIME corpus, with roughly 100 million words, will hopefully provide further insight into my question.

Second, I assume that Jespersen (1942:469) and Marchand (1969:169) based their propositions on the rivalry between un- and in- from what they have ‘witnessed’ during their lifetime, which is the beginning of 20th century. For this, the COHA and TIME are suited for this examination as they consist of texts ranging from the time period 1810-2009 and 1923-2006, respectively. From these corpora, I expect to see that (i) there is a high number of in-prefixation and that there will be some by-forms with un- and that (ii) especially in later years, in-prefixation has an overall declining trend, whereas un-prefixation will rise. Similar to the PCEEC-Lampeter-examination, I will only mention the most significant results in this thesis. For detailed tables on search results for COHA and TIME, I kindly refer to the Appendix.

In terms of attestation of the eleven words from Table 12, I will look at the results from COHA first. As can be seen from Table 14 below, every search term occurs at least once in this corpus. However, two words, namely unperfect and unexact, are somewhat problematic as they are both hapax legomena in a 400 million word corpus. The question that arises is whether they are typos or formed on purpose. In this respect, I have checked in which kinds of text they appear. The word unperfect was used in an article from 1913 in The Atlantic Monthly, a US-American magazine. Since publications are usually revised, I do not believe it to be a typo. The word unexact, on the other hand, was used in a fictional text called Philo Gubb, Correspondence-School Detective (1918) by Ellis Parker Butler. According to the source text, the main character, Philo Gubb, uses this word in direct speech. Therefore, I assume that unexact is formed on purpose, maybe indicating that the character did not know how to negate exact.
Returning to the results as shown in Table 14, it is clear that there is a tendency towards the prefix in-. The words active, capable, practical, replaceable and possible all are negated with this prefix, which is expected. On the other hand, the words certain and just clearly take the prefix un-, which does not come as a surprise either. What is surprising, however, is that the word corrupt seems to prefer un- as it occurs 22 times, whereas negation with in- appears sixteen times in the corpus. According to the COHA source texts, the word uncorrupt was used eleven times in fiction, three times in non-fiction and eight times in magazines. From these entries, twenty were recorded before or in the 1900s, while only two appear in or after the 1960s. In terms of the word incorrupt, it was used five times in fiction, three times in non-fiction, seven times in magazine, and one occurred in a newspaper article. Similar to the word uncorrupt, the majority of incorrupt can be found before the 1870s (twelve instances), while the rest was used only after the 1900s (four instances).

When looking at the results in TIME, it can be seen that some negations have no instances at all. This is not surprising as this corpus covers a slightly later period than COHA. This, in turn, corresponds to the statements of OED (s.v. un-, prefix1, sense 5b) where one form was dropped in favour of the other. Similar to COHA, the prefix in- is clearly the preferred choice with all words from Table 12 above, with the exception of the word certain. It is interesting to see that only three words, namely alienable, perfect and practical, occur with both un- and in- in this corpus. Astonishingly, the word just is negated with the prefix in- only and has absolutely no occurrences with un-, whatsoever.

Comparing the COHA corpus to the TIME corpus, it is obvious that the prefix in- is clearly preferred. All un-prefixations which occurred in COHA, except for the words certain and just, hardly occur or no longer appear in TIME. This corresponds to the statement by the OED (s.v. un-, prefix1, sense 5b) in which the Latin based in- was the preferred prefix. This can especially be seen in the development of the negated words practical and alienable, respectively. The negation of practical with un- occurs 0.045 instances per 100,000 words (COHA) and declines to 0.033 instances per 100,000 words (TIME). On the other hand, practical negated with in- rose from 0.193 instances per 100,000 words (COHA) to 0.327 instances per 100,000 words (TIME). As far as the word alienable is concerned, both un- and in-negation occur in COHA as well as in TIME. In general it can be said that the
tendency in both corpora is towards the *in*-prefixation with the two exceptions mentioned above.

Table 14. *Results COHA and TIME*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COHA</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>unalienable</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inalienable</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>unactive</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>uncapable</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incapable</td>
<td>4792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>unperfect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imperfect</td>
<td>3758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>unpractical</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impractical</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>unexact</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inexact</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>unreplaceable</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>irrereplaceable</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>uncorrupt</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incorrupt</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>unpossible</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impossible</td>
<td>39618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>8688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incertain</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>unjust</td>
<td>4392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>injust</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though there is ‘proof’ that words with the negative prefix *in*- co-occurred with forms using *un*- , I wonder whether it is accurate to speak of a ‘rivalry’? From this query, I have shown that the bottom line is that the prefix *in*- was the preferred choice. However, in how far did they influence each other? Was it a neck and neck race? Looking at the timeline (rather than the overall outcome) of each of the eleven pairs, I noticed something very interesting. From the eleven words listed in Table 12, only two pairs seem to fluctuate strongly, namely *un- / inalienable* and *un- / impractical*.

From Figure 4 below it is visible that up until the end of the 19th century, the word *practical* was negated with either *un-* or *in-*, whereby *un-* was favoured with up to six times more instances, e.g. in the 1890s. The negation with *un-* reached its peak in the 1900s where 28 instances are recorded. From this point onwards, however, the word *unpractical* suffers a slow yet steady decline which leads to no
attestations in the 1990s and 2000s. The word’s negation with the prefix in-, on the other hand, shows a slow increase beginning in the 1890s. It skyrocketed from four to 24 occurrences in the 1900s and was almost even with unpractical. While negation with un- decreases, negation with in- continued to fluctuate until the 2000s, reaching its peak in the 1950s with 99 instances. Suffering a decline in the following three decades, impractical levelled at 81 occurrences in the 1990s and 2000s.

Figure 4. Unpractical vs. impractical in COHA – raw results

It could be argued, however, that the figure above is not quite accurate because the number of occurrences are not normalised. Each decade in the COHA has a different amount of texts and, hence, a different amount of words. I have, thus, added Figure 5 below\(^\text{11}\) which shows the normalised results from COHA. It is evident that the outcome is more marked. From the normalised perspective, it can be seen that the use of impractical in the 1990s and 2000s dropped slightly from 0.290 to 0.274 occurrences per 100,000 words. Whether the use of impractical will decline in the future is not yet known. However, we can assume that the negation with un- has lost.

\(^\text{11}\) Please note that Figure 5, Figure 7, and Figure 9 were created in the German version of MS Excel 2007. Therefore, the punctuation is German. The numbers with a comma (,) should, thus, be read as decimals (\).
The results from the TIME corpus (Figure 6 below) illustrate a similar picture. Even though negation with *un*- increased from three to seventeen occurrences at the beginning of the 20th century, it plummeted in the 1950s to only one instance. From this point onwards, *unpractical* has not been recorded at all, except for one time in the 1970s. As a result, negation of *practical* with *un*- is no longer productive. This would mean that the negation with *in*- has clearly won. However, it should be noted that in this corpus the word *impractical* has continued to decline since the 1950s. Does this mean that writers for the TIME magazine use *impractical* less often? Or may it indicate that *unpractical* could revive in the future? These are questions which I am unable to answer, though I believe that *unpractical* has given way to *impractical* permanently as it has not been used since the 1980s.

Similar to the discussion of *un*- / *impractical* in COHA above, the numbers from the TIME corpus shown in Figure 6 are not normalised. The normalised results, i.e. the number of occurrences per 100,000 words, are illustrated in Figure 7 below.
In regard to the word *alienable*, the OED (s.v. *un-, prefix¹, sense 5b*) claims that nowadays it may be negated with both *un-* and *in-*.

Figure 8 below shows that both prefixes were indeed used, but the prefix *in-* is more prevalent. There is only one period where *unalienable* and *inalienable* seem to be direct rivals, namely in the 1820s when eleven occurrences with *in-* and seventeen occurrences with *un-* were recorded. Other than that *in-* seemed to be the preferred choice.
Negation with *in-* reached its peak in the 1850s with a total of 61 occurrences. From this point onwards, the use with *in-* fluctuates greatly over the next 150 years. At first it dropped drastically to only 39 occurrences in the 1860s, but increased again over the following three decades. From the 1900s to the 1950s, it settles down around the 35-mark. However, in the following decade the use with *in-* sloped steeply to fifteen occurrences. After a slight increase until the 1990s, *inalienable* drops once again and reaches thirteen occurrences only in the 2000s, giving it an all-time low.

The use of the prefix *un-* with *alienable*, interestingly, shows a completely different picture. While the amount of the prefix *in-* changes drastically over the years, the use of *un-* seems to be rather stable. There is only a handful of records of *unalienable* in each decade, where its peak was in the 1820s with seventeen occurrences followed by the 1850s (eleven occurrences), the 1860s (ten occurrences), and the 1890s (nine occurrences). What I found most interesting, however, is the decline of *inalienable* and the increase of *unalienable* at the end of the 20th century. Given the results from the 1970s to the 1990s, the numbers of *inalienable* continued to rise (from 21 to 28), while the number of *unalienable* kept falling (from six to one). This would indicate that negation with *un-* is on the verge of becoming unproductive. However, the numbers of the 2000s suggest that *unalienable* may be ousting *inalienable* in the future.
Once again the discussion above is based on the raw results of the TIME query. In Figure 9 below the normalised numbers, i.e. average occurrences per 100,000 words, are shown. The overall trend is similar to Figure 8, but there is one visible difference. In the normalised figure, it is evident that the decline in the use of *inalienable* is much steeper.

Figure 9. *Unalienable vs. inalienable in COHA – normalised*

As already mentioned above, I believe that *impractical* has replaced *unpractical* once and for all. In terms of the negation of *alienable*, however, I believe that nothing is decided yet. Even though both *un-* and *in-* may still be used (OED: s.v. *un-*, *prefix*¹, *sense* 5b) it is so far not quite clear which one will triumph. Taken into account the claim by the OED (s.v. *in-*, *prefix*³), where “the modern tendency is to restrict *in-* to words obviously answering to Latin types, and to prefer *un-* in other cases”, *alienable* is predetermined to take negative *in-*.

Then again, *practical* is nowadays negated with *in-*, even though it is of Greek¹² origin.

¹² According to the OED (s.v. *practic*, *adj. and n*²), the word *practical* derives from ancient Greek *praktikos* and denotes “concerned with action, practical, active, effective”. In English, the suffix –*al* was attached “freely to nouns ultimately of Greek origin” (OED s.v. –*al*, *suffix*).
Generally speaking, the results this query has given me so far are quite satisfying. However, it needs to be noted that COHA and TIME both consist of texts written in American English. In regard to this, I also consulted a corpus with British English texts, namely the Freiburg-LOB corpus, also referred to as F-LOB. This corpus is, with approximately 1.1 million words, much smaller than COHA or the TIME corpus. In Table 15 below, the results from F-LOB are compared to the Frown corpus, i.e. the Freiburg-Brown corpus, which is the American English equivalent to F-LOB.

The reason why I included Frown is twofold. First, F-LOB and Frown have the same timeframe, i.e. they both consist of texts from the 1990s. And second, they have roughly the same number of words. From this query I hope to see that the results in British English texts do not differ (much) from the American English texts.

Table 15. Results F-LOB and Frown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F-LOB (BrE)</th>
<th>Frown (AmE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>unalienable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inalienable</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>unactive</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>incapable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incapable</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>unperfect</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imperfect</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>unpractical</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impractical</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>unexact</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inexact</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>unreplaceable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>irreplaceable</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>uncorrupt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incorrupt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>unpossible</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impossible</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incertain</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>unjust</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>injust</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The outcome in F-LOB is similar to the one in the COHA-TIME-query: the negative prefix *in*- is clearly favoured. Exceptions to this are, once again, the words *certain* and *just*, which are both negated with *un*-.

In terms of rivalry between *un*- and *in*- forms, there is only one pair worth mentioning, namely *corrupt*. Surprisingly, *uncorrupt* appears twice as much than *incorrupt*. The question that arises here is whether negation with *un*- was intended or not as *incorrupt* only appears once.

Other than that, this query did not illustrate any rivalry between *un*- and *in*-, not even between *unalienable* and *inalienable*.

Up to this point, I have been able to show two things in regard to the words listed in Table 12. First of all, some words which were negated with *un*- did have an alternate form with *in*-. And second, that – when it was time to eliminate one of the two – the preferred choice was the prefix *in*-, except in the two cases mentioned above.

The question that I now want to address is whether I am able to ‘validate’ Jespersen’s (1942:469) and Marchand’s (1969:169) statements in which they propose that the trend nowadays is to replace the negative prefix *in*- with *un*-.

The discussion about the negation of *alienable* above has shown that, at least in this case, *un*- seems to be pressing upon *in*-. However, this development is still ongoing and I wonder, if there are other cases where the prefix *in*- has definitely been replaced by *un*-.

In his work, Jespersen (1942) does not mention any specific words that changed from *in*- to *un*-negation. Marchand (1969:169), however, does provide a list:

[...] words such as *inceremonious, incertain, inchangeable, incharitable, inchaste, incomfortable, inconscionable, ingrateful, inimaginable, inorganical, impleasing, impopular, improfitable, intenable, inutterable, etc. have given way to un- adjectives.

Having this list in mind, I turned to the COHA and the TIME corpus to see if these words have been used at the beginning of the 19th century and, as Marchand (1969:169) suggests, have later been negated with *un*-.

The reasons why I chose the COHA and the TIME corpora again are threefold. Even though they consist of texts written in American English, (i) they are very large corpora (400 hundred million and hundred million words respectively), (ii) they include a great time-span.
(twenty decades and nine decades respectively), and (iii) because of the great
time-span, it is easier to see their developments.

Unfortunately, I was not very successful. In the COHA corpus, only four of the 15
words mentioned above were found, namely *incertain* and *ingrateful* with five
occurrences respectively, and *intenable* and *inutterable* with one occurrence each.
The frequency of the word *incertain* in COHA is somewhat problematic. Three out
five occurrences appear in French passages within English written texts. As a
consequence, there are only two ‘real’ instances of *incertain* in COHA. They are
both recorded in a scientific text from 1904. In terms of the word *ingrateful*, it
appears in three fictional texts all of which written in the 1820s, another one was
recorded in a magazine article from 1880, which recites a prayer, and the last
instance can be found in a newspaper article from 1965 with a ecclesiastic topic.
Even though this shows that *incertain* and *ingrateful* were used, there is no
possible way of determining some kind of development.

With regard to the TIME corpus, the results were even worse: there were no
hits with any word from above. Then again this could indicate that the transition
from *in*- to *un*-prefixation was completed by the 1920s. As a result, I turned to the
PCEEC and Lampeter corpora. In the PCEEC corpus only one word listed above
was mentioned, namely *ingrateful*. The Lampeter, on the other hand, did not have
any hits with any of the words mentioned above. As a last resort, I consulted the
online version of the OED. The OED lists all these words as “obs. rare”, which does
not come as a big surprise, yet it does not reveal when these *in*-words ceased to
be.

I am in no position to disprove Jespersen’s (1942:469) and Marchand’s
(1969:169) propositions. However, I am also unable to find any indications for the
change of *in*- to *un*-prefixation. So, what did they base their statements on? This
conundrum made me develop two hypotheses.

First, the corpora, that I looked at, consisted of written sources only. This
leads me to the question, if Jespersen (1942) and Marchand (1969) based their
observations on spoken discourse. It is easier to (either accidentally or
intentionally) use a different negative prefix in spoken discourse, especially when
the listener is not correcting the speaker – for whatever reason. In this respect,
Tottie (1991:57) points out that “[s]peech is normally unprepared, i.e., thought and
speech occur more or less simultaneously, or at least with very little lapsing between thought and utterance.” As far as written texts are concerned, they are usually prepared and undergo some kind of revision, especially in cases of publication. This, in turn, means that it is less likely to use a different prefix. In addition to this, Jespersen (1942:469) spoke of a “spur of the moment” when changing in-prefixation to un-. This indicates some sort of spontaneity. In written discourse, spontaneity is not really given (except maybe in letters or emails) as they need to be drafted and well-structured in order to be effective and to get the message across.

And second, I wonder whether the mother tongue played a role in their propositions. As far as I know, neither Otto Jespersen, a Dane, nor Hans Marchand, a German, was an English native speaker. Could it be that, when they interacted with people in English or when they observed other people talking in English, there was a tendency to use negative un-? It may be possible that, at one point or other, a (non-) native English speaker was unsure about which negative prefix to use and used negative prefix un- by default. After all, un- is an English negative prefix. Furthermore, I know from my own experience that German-speaking people have the tendency to use the negative prefix in English that is also used in German. I work at the British Council Austria, where mostly German-speaking staff is employed but our working language is English. At some occasions, I caught my colleagues saying unpolite. Since unhöflich is used in German to refer to someone who is ‘not polite’, it is perfectly understandable why my colleagues turned to un-. Therefore, could it be that our mother tongues might influence the choice in negative prefixes?

Unfortunately, the latter hypothesis does not explain why the OED lists the in-words above as obsolete. After all, the OED would not change words because some foreigners ‘decided’ to use the prefix un- instead of in-. Clearly, the in-words have been used by native English speakers and, further, it was native English speakers, who have discarded them in favour of un-prefixation. I may have found a reason why the use of un- has risen: the expansion of the British Empire and, thus, the spread of the English language (Fisiak 2005:137ff.). According to Fisiak (2005:149-150), the English language became more prestigious at the beginning of the 20th century. Could it be that the native English prefix un- has been regarded as more appropriate than its Latin opponent in-? And that, as a consequence, words
that were formerly negated with *in-* were then formed with *un-*.
This would certainly explain Jespersen’s and Marchand’s propositions.
In this respect, one could also ask in how far productivity, more precisely its subset frequency, is involved?
Did a higher frequency in the use of negative *un-* influence the change from *in-* to *un-* prefixation?

Based on this, I wonder if the change of *in-* to *un-* prefixation is a fairly recent phenomenon.
Could it be that the process is still going on? Nevertheless, at this stage it is not quite possible to determine when *in-* prefixation became *un-* and it is impossible to tell for sure what had been the influences for that change.

5.3. Summary
In this section, I have examined the rivalry between the prefixes *un-* and *in-* by means of a list with eleven words, which were allegedly used with both *in-* and *un-* prefixation in the Middle English period. At first, I used the two corpora which included the Early Modern English period, i.e. PCEEC and Lampeter. Unfortunately, the results from this query were quite disappointing because there were hardly any occurrences. With a new search using the COHA and the TIME corpora, I was able to show that the words in question were attested. Further, it has shown that the negative prefix *in-* was preferred to negative prefix *un-*.

Real rivalry between the prefixes *un-* and *in-* was clearly visible with the words *practical* and *alienable*. While *un-* seems to be no longer used with *practical*, the favoured negative affix for the word *alienable* seems to be *in-*.
However, it needs to be pointed out that usage of *inalienable* has declined and *un-* is now on the rise. Based on these results, only the future will tell us, if *alienable* will remain to be used with both *un-* and *in-* or if one of the two prefixes will be ousted.

In terms of the *un-* words that were formerly negated by *in-* the OED has labelled them as ‘obs. rare’. Unfortunately, the corpora I have used for this thesis hardly showed any indication that these words had been in use. In conclusion it can be said that I am in no position to disprove Jespersen’s or Marchand’s propositions. However, I have taken the liberty to draw up two hypotheses: first, maybe the change from *in-* to *un-* prefixation is more prominent in spoken data. And second, maybe Jespersen and Marchand observed non-native English people in their times.
The latter, however, does not explain why the OED lists former *in*-words as obsolete. Did the English prefix *un*- experience a rise because the English language became more prestigious during 20th century? Unfortunately, I was not able to give a definite answer.
6. Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to discuss the properties and distinctive features of negative affixes. In a nutshell, it can be said that negative affixes are more complex than meets the eye.

In the theory part of my thesis, I discussed some notions, which go hand in hand with negative affixes. I have shown that ‘negative’ refers to the reversal of the value of a proposition, and its operation is called ‘negation’. In this respect, one type of negation, namely local negation, includes the use of negative affixes. It stands in clear contrast to clause negation as only one element is negated, rather than an entire clause. With the chapter about affixation, I intended to clarify that the group of negative affixes only constitutes a small part in the field of word-formation. However, as seen in the following chapters, negative affixes are quite multifaceted. The discussion on productivity completes the theory chapter. Productivity is the space between possible and actual words. It can be regarded as the potential for coining new words on the basis of already existing ones.

With the background information on negative affixes in mind, I was able to discuss them in detail. The Distribution section (chapter 3) lists all negative affixes known in the English language. I have briefly discussed their etymologies, their meanings, their abilities to attach to words of all syntactic categories and their ability to express contradictory or contrary opposition. Some of these affixes had to be dropped from further discussion because they either did not meet the requirements to be considered ‘negative’ or because lack of information made it impossible to talk about them. From this, we were left with seven negative prefixes, namely a(n)-, de-, dis-, mis-, non-, in-, and un-, and one negative suffix, namely -less. The prefix mis-, however, must be treated with caution as this is technically no longer a ‘negative’.

Having established that there are so many negative affixes in the English language, it was then time to examine their competition. Chapter 4, has dealt with constraints that lead to either affixal or non-affixal negation. In some cases, the speaker is obliged to choose one or the other, otherwise the message will change in meaning. In other cases, it does not matter whether affixal or non-affixal
negation is used, it is basically the speaker’s choice. However, when gradable adjectives or adverbial modifiers are involved, the speaker’s choice is limited.

I, then, tried to establish rules with which it would become easier to find the ‘correct’ negative affix. An investigation based on morpho-syntactic criteria turned out to be a dead-end because the affixes seem to be able to attach to almost any syntactic category.

In terms of semantic analysis, the notions negativity, reversativity, and privativity became matters of discussion. We have seen that only the prefixes dis- and un- can convey all three meanings. Those with only negative meaning are the prefixes a(n)-, in-, mis-, and non-. The prefix de- and the suffix –less, on the other hand, do not have negative meaning at all. Those with reversative and privative meaning are the prefixes de-, dis-, and un-. Based on this, it was possible to determine that no single negative affix is in direct competition with all the others. Rather negative affixes, which share meaning, are competing directly, for instance all negative affixes with reversative meaning are rivals.

In the end, I was unable to determine definite rules – this may be especially disappointing for learners of English. However, the distinction between negative, reversative, and privative meaning can be regarded as rough guidelines. Since there are no established rules on the ‘correct’ choice of negative affixes, I assume that the majority of words with affixal negation is learned, e.g. from usage guides, grammar books, dictionaries or other readings, from hearsay, or simply because someone corrects the speaker. The others are formed by analogy, e.g. coining affixal negation on the basis of what has already been learned and stored in the lexicon or – in cases of speakers of other languages – maybe even on the basis of the mother tongue.

Having discussed the negative affixes’ competition with one another, one thing was most striking: the alleged rivalry between negative un- and in-. For the chapter on historical development, I then decided to focus on this negative pair in the hopes to see a development on the uses with un- and in- over the centuries. Even though both affixal negations were possible, the prefix in- was said to be in favour. I was, therefore, intrigued by Jespersen’s and Marchand’s propositions in which they claim that un- is being favoured in recent years.

Taking these statements as well as a list of words, which were negated with un- and in- in the Middle English period, as a starting point, I began researching
with linguistic corpora. At first, I made a query with the PCEEC and Lampeter, but
the results were disappointing as there were hardly any occurrences. From a
second query with COHA and TIME, I was able to see that both un- and in-
prefixation was indeed used. However, there was hardly any rivalry between the
two affixes. In fact, in many cases in- was clearly preferred. There were only two
cases where rivalry between un- and in- was evident, namely with the words
practical and alienable.

With Marchand’s list of former in-words, which became un-words, I was
hoping to see a development of how un- was pushing on in- over the years. I
based my query on Marchand’s list because these words had definitely changed
from in- to un-prefixation. Therefore, I assumed that a development should be
possible to see. Further, such a development would have indicated a period of time
where in- was replaced by un-. Unfortunately, a query with corpora could not
generate any useful results. So, I am wondering what grounds Jespersen and
Marchand based their propositions on?

As already discussed in the previous section, I am in no position to falsify
Jespersen or Marchand. I, therefore, began to wonder why the results from my
queries were not in agreement with the scholars. Would a change from in- to un-
prefixation be more evident in spoken data? Or did the scholars observe speakers
with mother tongues other than English? If the latter was true, why did the OED list
former in-words as obsolete?

With my queries I have shown two things. First, in-prefixation was preferred,
and second, the un- / in- rivalry was evident in, at least, two cases (practical and
alienable). However, I was unable to show that un- is ousting in- as both Jespersen
and Marchand suggested. Since change from in- to un- seems to be a fairly recent
phenomenon, I hope that future research with native and non-native English
speakers may shed some light on the rivalry between the two prefixes.

I set out to write this thesis in a way that it not only introduces the topic of
negative affixes, but also establishes ground on which future research may build.
For instance, in terms of the negative affixes’ competition it would be interesting to
find out in how far the mother tongue influences the choice of negative affix when a
non-native English speaker uses affixal negation in English? Another possible
research topic could be further investigation on the pair unalienable and
inalienable. Based on my query with COHA both un- and in-prefixation is used with
the word *alienable*. It would be interesting to look at the geographical distribution of the pair, for instance if *unalienable* is predominantly used in British English or American English?

Although I do not claim completeness I hope to have fulfilled both of these objectives to the degree possible in the format of a Master thesis.
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8.2. PCEEC and Lampeter

The Parsed Corpus of Early English Correspondence (PCEEC) consists of approximately 2.2 million words, while the Lampeter Corpus of Early Modern English Tracts consists of approximately 1.1 million words. Normalisation was calculated as follows: (number of instances / total number of words) x 100,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PCEEC raw results</th>
<th>Lampeter raw results</th>
<th>PCEEC normalised*</th>
<th>Lampeter normalised*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>unalienable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inalienable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>unactive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>uncapable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incapable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>unperfect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imperfect</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>unpractical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impractical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>unexact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inexact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>unreplaceable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>irreplaceable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>uncorrupt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incorrupt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>unpossible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impossible</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2,409</td>
<td>9,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>3,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incertain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>unjust</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>5,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>injust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Normalisation per 100,000 words

8.3. COHA and TIME

The Corpus of Historical American English (COHA) consists of approximately 400 million words, and the TIME Magazine Corpus consists of approximately 100 million words.
million words. Normalisation was calculated as follows: (number of instances / total number of words) x 100,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COHA raw results</th>
<th>TIME raw results</th>
<th>COHA normalised*</th>
<th>TIME normalised*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>unalienable</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inalienable</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>unactive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>0,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>uncapable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incapable</td>
<td>4,792</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>1,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imperfect</td>
<td>3,758</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>0,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>unperfect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imperfect</td>
<td>4,758</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>0,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>unpractical</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impractical</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>0,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>unexact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inexact</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>unreplaceable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>irreplaceable</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>uncorrupt</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incorrupt</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>unpossible</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impossible</td>
<td>39,618</td>
<td>5,885</td>
<td>9,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>8,688</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>2,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incertain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>unjust</td>
<td>4,392</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>injust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Normalisation per 100,000 words
COHA: Timeline (raw results)

|     | 1810s | 1820s | 1830s | 1840s | 1850s | 1860s | 1870s | 1880s | 1890s | 1900s | 1910s | 1920s | 1930s | 1940s | 1950s | 1960s | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s | total |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1   | 1     | 17    | 8     | 5     | 11    | 10    | 2     | 3     | 9     | 1     | 1     | 1     | 2     | 6     | 7     | 0     | 6     | 3     | 1     | 5     | 99    |
| 2   | 1     | 11    | 24    | 53    | 61    | 39    | 45    | 48    | 51    | 35    | 39    | 31    | 30    | 35    | 34    | 15    | 21    | 23    | 28    | 13    | 637   |
| 3   | 0     | 1     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 2     | 1     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 4     |
| 4   | 6     | 44    | 61    | 80    | 41    | 27    | 65    | 30    | 32    | 24    | 34    | 47    | 70    | 70    | 64    | 34    | 51    | 32    | 47    | 53    | 912   |
| 5   | 34    | 165   | 299   | 321   | 359   | 337   | 333   | 308   | 281   | 242   | 269   | 258   | 205   | 198   | 219   | 208   | 216   | 179   | 194   | 167   | 4792  |
| 6   | 25    | 261   | 336   | 463   | 321   | 310   | 279   | 249   | 258   | 183   | 192   | 138   | 120   | 94    | 94    | 99    | 81    | 78    | 98    | 3758  |
| 7   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 2     | 2     | 0     | 1     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 6     |
| 8   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 2     | 6     | 9     | 25    | 21    | 15    | 40    | 21    | 41    | 30    | 211   |
| 9   | 1     | 4     | 2     | 5     | 2     | 3     | 0     | 1     | 1     | 1     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 1     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 1     |
|10   | 0     | 0     | 3     | 6     | 2     | 1     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 1     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 1     | 0     | 1     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 16    |
|11   | 2     | 1     | 6     | 3     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 2     |
|12   | 157   | 980   | 1437  | 1487  | 1796  | 1884  | 2630  | 2561  | 2514  | 2752  | 2708  | 2757  | 2461  | 2214  | 2102  | 1933  | 1769  | 1898  | 1781  | 1797  | 39618 |
|13   | 36    | 163   | 343   | 390   | 367   | 434   | 465   | 500   | 508   | 564   | 492   | 560   | 579   | 506   | 429   | 477   | 531   | 461   | 456   | 427   | 8688  |
|14   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     |
|15   | 39    | 196   | 380   | 340   | 403   | 338   | 360   | 383   | 303   | 291   | 243   | 238   | 196   | 126   | 117   | 115   | 94    | 77    | 63    | 90    | 4392  |

COHA: Timeline (normalised results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1810s</th>
<th>1820s</th>
<th>1830s</th>
<th>1840s</th>
<th>1850s</th>
<th>1860s</th>
<th>1870s</th>
<th>1880s</th>
<th>1890s</th>
<th>1900s</th>
<th>1910s</th>
<th>1920s</th>
<th>1930s</th>
<th>1940s</th>
<th>1950s</th>
<th>1960s</th>
<th>1970s</th>
<th>1980s</th>
<th>1990s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TIME: Timeline (raw results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>1920s</th>
<th>1930s</th>
<th>1940s</th>
<th>1950s</th>
<th>1960s</th>
<th>1970s</th>
<th>1980s</th>
<th>1990s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unalienable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inalienable</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unactive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incapable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incapable</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unperfect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperfect</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpractical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impractical</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unexact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inexact</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unreplaceable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irreplaceable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncorrupt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incorrupt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpossible</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impossible</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>5885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incertain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unjust</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unjust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIME: Timeline (normalised results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>1920s</th>
<th>1930s</th>
<th>1940s</th>
<th>1950s</th>
<th>1960s</th>
<th>1970s</th>
<th>1980s</th>
<th>1990s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unpractical</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impractical</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unalienable</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inalienable</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.4. F-LOB and Frown

Both the Freiburg-LOB Corpus (FLOB) and the Freiburg-Brown Corpus (FROWN) consist of approximately 1.1 million words, respectively. Normalisation was, thus, not necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F-LOB</th>
<th>Frown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unalienable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inalienable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unactive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incapable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incapable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unperfect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperfect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impractical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unexact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inexact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unreplaceable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irreplaceable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncorrupt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incorrupt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpossible</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impossible</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incertain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unjust</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unjust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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