AN INVESTIGATION ON ADJECTIVAL NEGATED PREFIXES: CORPUS-BASED APPROACH

Doung Dara[1] & Sun Ny[2]

1. Mr. Doung Dara: Bachelor of English, Master' degree of Law and Applied Linguistics
2. Mr. Sun Ny: Bachelor of English, Master' degree of TESOL

~~~~~~

Abstract:

The concerns with English negative prefixation for learners of ESL or EFL have been noticed; meanwhile, very fewer guidelines have been so far released for deeper understandings or generalizations. Over-generalized rates have been found and the under-generalization has still inherited in learners' perceptions. These would impede the learners' creativeness by means of word formations and uses. The present research's aim is to fill this gap, finding out the specificities of each negated prefix and to streamline for practical generalizations. Corpus-based method was considered as the rationale approach to this implementation with several advantages. The famous data bank , BNC corpus , was placed to access for exploring new findings. The results were found that some negative prefixes tended to take some certain starting consonants while some were not and some adjectives were able to attach with more than one negative prefixes. Moreover, it suggested that the spirits or the conveying meanings of those preceding negators had inherited their own uniqueness and origins and the matter of borrowing left skeptic.

Key-words: Corpus Approach, Negation, Adjectives, Prefixes

1. Introduction

The prefixing processes for negation of English adjectives have hit by many different disciplinary scholars. However, very fewer studies on negative prefixes via corpus have been recorded: negating the modernization of English by negative pre-post- adders Kjellmer (2005). Surveys of English grammar (Quirt et al, 1985; Greenaum , 1996; Biber et al,1999; Huddleston and Pullum, 2002), aspects of the question dealt (Zimmer , 1964 ; Funk ,1971; Warren, 1984; Dierickx , 1991; Kwon, 1997and Gleby , 2002), studies on coining-words and morphology (Jespersen ,1942; Marchand , 1969 and Bauer , 1983) and so on. The methods of some research listed are old and document-based which several limitations can still be found such as much conveyance of writers' intuitions, scarcities of sources for discussions or small collection of data etc.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:	RESEARCH ARTICLE
Doung Dara Bachelor of English, Master' degree of Law and Applied Linguistics Email: doung1dara@gmail.com	

67

Vol-4, Issue-05, May 2023   ISSN (E): 2583-1348
AGPE The Royal Gondwana Research Journal of History, Science, Economic, Political and Social science

As written, very few of them are used by corpus-based method to administer their studies. Nonetheless, some can be found like (Kwon, 1997) and H. Baayen and Lieber (1991) etc.Therefore, this study purposely extended from the previous research in this issue in order to clarify the ambiguities, particulary for both atterance and writing. To be logical and well focused, the hypothetical questions are what the rules for adjectival negations prefixally and what the characteristics of those negative prefixes are.

2.Theoretical background
2.1.Some views on morpheme , lexicon and word

The prefix study is relevant to some areas such as morphology, lexicology and wordology. The perspectives from these studies form an ideal ground to critical analysis. In linguistics, a morpheme is defined slightly different such as Komárek (1978) and Crystal (1997) meanwhile from Wikipedia, a morpheme is the meaningful tiniest part grammatically where its independent stances were notices. It is the major difference between morphemes and words. On the opposite corner, words are both meaningful and and freestanding[1]. Moreover, some scholars focused on morphological theory of whose productive and unproductive rules are carefully analyzed (R. H. Baayen, 2009; Dressler & Barbaresi, 1994). A larger part of morpheme is lexicon or a so-called lexical-based morpheme. Scholars from divergent fields may provide heterogeneous standpoints over this term. Richards (1976) discussed it from potential dimensions. In linguistics, a lexicon is a language's inventory of lexemes (Orwig, 1999, p.1; COUNCIL, 2001). Hence, some scholars provide perceptible definitions to this technical term.

Words are the independent grammar-based units. There are a lot of studies on words: identifying classifications of words (Nation ,1990), the four dimensions of words (Qian, 2002), the beyond - focused studies on these two aspects (Shen, 2008, p. 136 cited in (Aşık, Vural, & Akpınar, 2015). According to Sproat and Shih (2002), words had a plenty of areas to attract the researchers' interest to investigate over what have been mentioned up to the disciplines. Thus, there is a joint image that vocabulary familiarization has two portions compulsorily: sizes and depths.

2.2. Word-formation

Word – formation is so complex and troubles the language learners. It has many ways to produce a new words terminologically and grammatically. Among them, prefixation is one of them which, its creation mechanism is by adding pre-elements to give birth to new words. Upon changed, the worlds would reflect new concepts and new things. Semantically-related question is always raised about what the word is (Lyons, 1980 & 1995; Cruse, 2004; Hoey, 2005; Almela, 2006). Semantic features were generally directed to the lexical particles or words based on terminology (Rizzo & Pérez, 2010). Language users had to have abilities to create, produce, and comprehend new complex words and the explicit descriptions depending on their multiple definitions and properties (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992; Almela, Sánchez & Cantos, 2004; Sánchez & Almela, 2004; Sánchez, 2005). Lefer (2010) argued that word-making options such as derivational particles were so crucial, particularly for the complicity of interpretational and translational works.

Recently, corpus-approached linguistic studies have hit many scholars around the word both native and non-native researchers and scholars. Baayen 1992, 1993, Baayen and Lieber 1991 , Baayen and Renouf 1996, Baayen and Neijt 1997, Plag 1999 concluded from large computational corporal studies and they claimed there was no significance because of results couldn't prove anything about the productivity in some contextual discourses. Presently, there were uncertain and reliable conclusions, wonders were still raised and further studies were also

---

[1] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lexicon

68

Vol-4, Issue-05, May 2023 ISSN (E): 2583-1348
AGPE The Royal Gondwana Research Journal of History, Science, Economic, Political and Social science

purported at once (Plag, Dalton-Puffer, & Baayen, 1999), while data from bilingual dictionaries were barely proposed in lexicographic studies(Lefer, 2010). Some academicians, scholars, researchers and lexicographers raised that English is not a very morphologically rich language and hasn't virtual inflection. Most of the derivation is based on using suffixes or prefixes with lexical meaning etc (Cvrček, 2009).

2.3.Negative Prefixes

In the light of advancement, the role of technology, especially with computerized mediations, has come into sights. The emergence of corpus has been found in almost fields -- both the scientific and non-scientific. So has the linguistics which continuously changing lying in documentary paper -based , writer's intuition-based to a collective data storage- based which is so called " corpus". The advent of corporal approach has been placed in utilizations. For illustrations, there were new English adjectival negations in corpus (Kjellmer,2005)and prefixes and morphemes (Paradis and Willners,2007). They both showed so interesting results and suggestions like the wonder of uncertainty for combining prefixes and adjectives. Moreover, borrowing was one of the unsolvable issues but some benefits were taken by them as key concepts for further research by Cvrček (2009) and Kjellmer, (2005); the elaboration of the negating prefixes(Kwon , 2005) and perspectives of adjectival negations by Lefer and Cartoni (2011), Warr,1990; Lehrer, 1998; Fradin, 2000; Bauer, 2005. However, countless documentations on this subject matter such as books, papers, course books etc were published and downloadable, etc corporal studies.

3. Methodology

This present study was administered by using the domain existing corpus -BNC which is constituted 100 million words. BNC was opted for this project depending to its fundamental function as general data bank, considerable largeness and the representativeness of a variety.

The first part of this current observation was completely relied on the list of prefixes which have been suggested from the previous scholars as the prefixal negators. The list of those negative pre-morphemes or pre-adders was appended. The second part was operated by using the mentioned corpus and the cautious examinations over frequencies and post-prefix starting characters were deployed with extensiveness. The conclusion was drawn after generalizations were claimed based on the found results from the corpus.

The third, dictionaries or online dictionaries were reasonably used for profound introspection in the purposes that the possibilities of adjectives to take more than one negative prefixes were closely scrutinized to find out their essential characteristics, natures , or differences of indications of multi-prefixes.

4. Result and discussion

From the online BNC corpus searching, a very long list of adjective with (negated prefix im, un, in , ir, il, non, dis) was obtained, but unfortunately, in each list of those prefixes contained some unwanted words, especially non -adjectival words. Those words had to be removed from the list manually.

Table 1. The contribution of negated adjectives with negative prefixes

No	Neg. prefixes	Number of adjectives
1	Adjectives with UN-	1648
2.	Adjectives with IN-	240
3.	Adjectives with IM-	85
4.	Adjectives with IR-	66

69

Vol-4, Issue-05, May 2023   ISSN (E)**: 2583-1348**
AGPE The Royal Gondwana Research Journal of History, Science, Economic, Political and Social science

5.	Adjectives with IL-	8
6.	Adjectives with NON-	2483
7.	Adjectives with DIS-	229

Some of negated adjectives were counted only once but some of them were more than once because those were constructed differently or with other words ; moreover, some of them have divergent establishments to form negative meanings as in non-academic and unacademic. So these words have to be placed into their own categories.

The results have indicated that some negative prefixes which are very commonly used are such as non-, un, in, which are fairly used are dis and im- , and which are rarely found are il- and ir-. From the table 1. there are thousands of adjectives with prefix un and non (1684 and 2483) , the counted tolls of them as mentioned are two-folded or multi-folded. The moderate used prefixes are IM, IN , DIS and IR, whose totalization are 85, 240 , 228 an 66 respectively. As more, IL are seen used with a few adjectives, only eight adjectives (the number is in exclusion from ILL constructs due to its nonnegative meanings.

Having been discernible, the results uncover that IL- prefix is addable to only L- initiated adjectives (illogical, illogic, illiterate, illegal, illegible etc) but this doesn't mean that L-beginning adjectives need just IL to create their own negativeship. This remarkable way is also done on IR-negator , whose usability is sayably low and not found numerously in Corpus. From the traceable corporal indication, prefix IR- is tendable to work with only R as the first letter of adjectival words (i.e irresponsible, irrevocable, irrational, irrotational etc) but there are still considerable proportions of derivative and deverbal adjectives embedded with other prefixes. IM is likely to take only M and P initiating adjectives (immortal, immoral, immobile , impatient , impending, imperceptive etc) This may be concerning with diachronic development or changes over time , especially from the old to modern English with widespread bursting usages in which the varieties may come to present. Dis (229 adjectives) is found more functional than IR or IL. To answer question 1, DIS, NON, UN and IN are ungeneralizable in the virtue that these prefixes are applicable to all alphabet starters. So the sense of the first letter noting may presumably unreasonable.

Another investigable result, a list of prefixally negated adjectives contains a host of deverbal and derivative adjectives which refer to unoriginal adjectives. Most of them are from participle adjectives and suffixed adjectives which ending in ed, ing, able, ible and so on. This result is well consistent with Kjellmer (2005), whose study reported deverbal (47%) of the negated adjectives was found , whereas deverbal of non-negated ones was only 14%. When the participial forms were excluded, differences were in of the same magnitude (44% as against 10%). There are several reasons why the adjectives are incapable to be negated (Kjellmer, 2005).

To respond to hypothesis 2, the comparison had to be made and differentiation might be addressed. There were a couple of saliently concludable suggestions. In the following subparts, the analogy was performed on just un, in and non based on their high frequent uses bestowed from corpus. This would clear the learners' doubts pertaining to their uncertainty in use but contrarily to upgrade their digestibility which hints them to use unmistakably both in written and non-written provinces

A. Prefix Un vs In

Even though some grammarians have purported that there is a rule for prefixation, the serious augmentation among **in- and un-** has been on the table for centuries and one side-coin-game-like winning has casted severe problem for English speakers for long century. Lots of such adjectives were detected from the corpus like inable and unable, inalienable and unalienable, unhuman and inhuman, unartistic and inartistic, inarguable and unarguable and so forth. The

70

Vol-4, Issue-05, May 2023 ISSN (E): 2583-1348
AGPE The Royal Gondwana Research Journal of History, Science, Economic, Political and Social science

corpus studies don't provide any explanatory basics rather a quantitative data. However, the short rememberable annotation were delivered from some researchers. One of these assertions comes from the power of borrowing or neighboring languages. Truly testimonial, words take un- when they are of English (Germanic) origin and in- if they come from Latin, while the forms (im-, il-, and ir-) are variations on IN. Secondly, Kwon (1997) claims that there was a general propensity to use the negative prefix un instead of the foreign negative prefix in- in the derivational processes of word-formation, especially in the 16th century. Nonetheless, the present tendency is UN instead of IN for almost all cases.

Another, morphologically, un- usually take participle adjectives, ending with –**ing, -ed,** or the like. The examples of them are **uninteresting, unflattering, uneducated, or uncivilized**, whereas in- were used to pre-anchor with adjectives ending in -ant, -ent, or –ate etc, while synchronically the studies didn't provide this origin. The words (illegitimate, insufficient, or inappropriate etc) do were their examples and they did work with verbs in common (stephneies, 2006 Kjellmer, 2005 and Kwon, 1997).

B. Prefix non vs un

Not only do some adjectives admit in and **un**, but also some take both **non** and **un**. This is also an inspiring finding from which learners can benefit. This case may perplex ESL learners to judge either non or un is more rational to a certain adjective or even both of them are viable. Kjellmer (2005) and Ferris (2014) who claim that there are two notions to differentiate them: classifying and characterizing. An inference is made that most of non- adjectives are classifying while other negated ones such as dis-, in- and un- are all primarily characterizing writing that un or in has to do with "ascriptive adjectives", whereas non- has more to do with "associative adjectives".

The word nonchristian is unfindable in dictionaries but only unchristian which referring to "not showing the qualities you expect as the Christian, not kind or thinking about other's feelings"2. This definition is intended to improper manner, quality or characteristics of people while the antonym is christian defined as good and generous. Despite unshowability of non-christian in the dictionary, this negated term is likely to defamiliarize between Christian and not Christian groups. Judgeably in general, christian and non-christian are associative in meanings; unlike them, Christian and unchristian are ascriptive in meaning. Though this claim is assumed, the absolute supposition on this matter in general is still unasserted thanks to exceptions.

5. Conclusion and implication

In spite of that prefixation is impenetrable, ungernneralizable, and problematic, the curious scholarships which is sharply aimed to break the obscurity and to reveal some perceptible indications via intuition-based and corpus-based. From this study, some important extrapolations are raised:

- The most used negated prefixes are non, un and in the moderate ones are dis, im and ir ; the less extractable one is il.
- Prefix NON is used for classification-determinant or orientation of adjectives; UN is from Germanic family prefixes denoting characteristics or quality in some cases. This prefix gets much along with adjectives ending in ed, ing , able and ible while IN is from Latin and found with adjectives finishing with ant, ent , ous and so on.
- Moreover about IN, it has some variations like il , ir , and im. One more unignorable natures of adjectival negation is antonym which is innately opposite or negative.

---

[2] Advanced learner dictionary

71

Vol-4, Issue-05, May 2023 ISSN (E): 2583-1348
AGPE The Royal Gondwana Research Journal of History, Science, Economic, Political and Social science

This fresh study has several limitation: the corpus-drawn adjective list contains unneeded words due to encoding awareness, the corpus in use, though large enough and representative to a type of English, is of British English only. It would be more acceptable if corpora of divergent varieties were utilized.

6. Acknowledgment

We, hereby, would like to show our highest gratefulness to ours parents, professors, deans, friends- in profession, subsidizers, who always support, encourage and advise us until we accomplish following our dreams.

7. Declaration of originality

We, the author and coauthor, would like to assert that this piece-work is in our possessions which we have paid our best both bodies and souls to write this paper. Therefore, we clarify all parts of this writing are under copyrights.

References

1. Aşık, A., Vural, A. Ş., & Akpınar, K. D. (2015). Lexical awareness and development through data driven learning: Attitudes and beliefs of EFL learners. *Journal of Education and Training Studies, 4*(3), 87-96.
2. Baayen, H., & Lieber, R. (1991). Productivity and English derivation: a corpus-based study. *Linguistics, 29*(5), 801-844.
3. Baayen, R. H. (2009). 43. Corpus linguistics in morphology: morphological productivity. *Corpus linguistics. An international handbook*, 900-919.
4. Baayen, R. H., & Renouf, A. (1996). Chronicling the Times: Productive lexical innovations in an English newspaper. *Language*, 69-96.
5. Cvrček, V. (2009). *Corpus-driven morphematic analysis.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Corpus linguistics conference. Liverpool: University od Liverpool.
6. Dressler, W. U., & Barbaresi, L. M. (1994). *Morphopragmatics: Diminutives and intensifiers in Italian, German, and other languages* (Vol. 76): Walter de Gruyter.
7. Ferris, C. (2014). *Meaning of Syntax: A Study in the Adjectives of English*: Routledge.
8. Kjellmer, G. (2005). Negated Adjectives in Modern English: A corpus-based study. *Studia Neophilologica, 77*(2), 156-170.
9. Kwon, H.-S. (1997). Negative prefixation from 1300 to 1800: A case study in in-/un-variation. *ICAME journal, 21*, 21-42.
10. Lefer, M.-A. (2010). *Word-formation in English-French bilingual dictionaries: the contribution of bilingual corpora.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the XIV Euralex International Congress. Fryske Academy: Leeuwarden.
11. Lefer, M.-A., & Cartoni, B. (2011). Prefixes in contrast: Towards a meaning-based contrastive methodology for lexical morphology. *Languages in contrast, 11*(1), 87-105.
12. Plag, I., Dalton-Puffer, C., & Baayen, H. (1999). Morphological productivity across speech and writing. *English Language & Linguistics, 3*(2), 209-228.
13. Richards, J. C. (1976). The role of vocabulary teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 77-89.
14. Rizzo, C. R., & Pérez, A. S. (2010). Building new meanings in technical English from the perspective of the lexical constellation model. *Ibérica*(20), 107-125.
15. Sproat, R., & Shih, C. (2002). Corpus-based methods in Chinese morphology. *Tutorial at the 19th COLING.*

■ ■ ■

72

Vol-4, Issue-05, May 2023 **ISSN (E): 2583-1348**
AGPE The Royal Gondwana Research Journal of History, Science, Economic, Political and Social science