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Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 The structure of the thesis

The thesis comprises two main parts. Part I supplies the theoretical background behind creative prefixations. As prefixation is discussed (mainly) under derivation in word-formation studies, Chapter 2 looks at derivation from the point of view of creative prefixations, considering some inconsistencies and possibly borderline phenomena. The introduction of the traditional account of prefixation identifies different positions within formal morphology, reflecting upon classification problems in general and the notion of prefix in particular. In creative prefixation, the prefixes themselves fulfil a lexically more relevant function than it has been suggested by descriptive approaches; consequently prefix categorization is also investigated. Chapter 3 concentrates on two aspects closely related to prefixation: compositionality and analysability, where the different viewpoints on compositionality are discussed. The Building Block metaphor and its impact on how prefixation is still (largely) viewed leads to the discussion of problems concerning analysability and transparency. Chapter 4 introduces some major groups of models in the field of word-formation, proceeding to “unravelling the cognitive in word-formation” (OŃYSKO and MICHEL 2010), arriving at specifically cognitive viewpoints in word-formation and prefixation, respectively. Chapter 5 places the prefix un- in historical context and investigates it in the light of previous approaches, therefore, the morphological framework of its expected usage, the actual patterns are identified. Creative prefixations are discussed against this horizon of existing morphological patterns and rules.

In Part II (consisting of Chapter 6) the actual creative prefixations are investigated, analysed and put into context. Chapter 6 is divided into three main parts, focusing on un-nouns, un-verbs and un-adjectives, respectively.

In Appendix 1 all the creative examples of the thesis are listed with their sources. Appendix 2 gives the alphabetical list of possible meanings of the in Part II listed creative un-examples and – whenever possible – supplies context of usage.
1.2 The scope of the thesis

“Are you an Un?” asks us confrontatively a 1968 soft-drink marketing campaign. To be able to answer that question soft-drink consumer speakers of English need to reconsider several interpretational frames: why does Un stand alone in the question, and more importantly, what sort of a concept does a solitary Un refer to, in relation to which consumers are required to assume a standpoint?

A solitary un- reflects upon some basic notions of prefixes and prefixation, beginning with their status as bound derivational elements with a modifying function, to (highly debatable) approaches predicting the slow disappearance of prefixations as they “hinder perception” and “mask the beginnings of words” (Cutler-Hawkins-Gilligan 1985: 723-58). Prefixes, according to such a view, could in principle not attain an independent status, either formally or lexically. Although un- is indeed not often attested by itself, certain prefixations – to be termed creative prefixations, discussed in chapter 1.4) – also spectacularly defy the traditional, compositional interpretative framework of prefixation (discussed in chapter 2.1), and call for a different approach in their treatment. This theoretical framework could be supplied by cognitive linguistics.

Prefixation or prefixal derivation is not among the prominently researched areas of English word-formation, in comparison with e.g. suffixation or noun–noun compounding. The existing present-day literature is hugely influenced by the work of Marchand (1969). Applying a synchronic-diachronic, structuralist approach, he set the basic thematic guidelines to follow in a number of topics: concerning the origin of prefixes (native/non-native); the status of prefixes as bound, grammatical category, always dependent on the lexical stem–element; the category–preserving characteristics of prefixes; prefix meanings as clearly delineable units (based on historical reasons). Marchand is also highly influential in terms of the formation of prescriptive rules for prefixation, reverberations of which are attested with authors as recent as PLAG (2003). The forms which are breaking the set, descriptive rules are referred to as unacceptable, rule-bending or deviant, respectively, there even exist psycholinguistic studies (Ambridge-Freudenthal-Pine-Mills-Clark-Rowland 2009) investigating how children “unlearn un-prefixation errors” (where (1)
*unlearn* is meant to highlight one such erroneous *un*-prefixation, for a treatment of *unlearn* as a creative prefixation: chapter 6.2.2). Such a psycholinguistic approach traces back *un*-prefixation errors to overgeneralization by children, which they “produce, then subsequently retreat from” (p.1).

The well-rooted position of prefixation as a category in linguistic tradition is, however, questioned sometimes, especially with the cognitive approach advocating the view of a cline concerning morphological subcomponents. There exist certain lexical rules which crosscut the divide between inflection and derivation, and, with particular significance for creative prefixations, the clear borderline between compounding and derivation is also being questioned (BEHRENS 1996, BAUER 2003).

Frequency and distribution are two further decisive topics in the treatment of prefixation (COLEN 1981, LEHRER 1999, ADAMS 2001), just as the very notion of what a prefix is. At this point, category features and selection restrictions all play a part; ranging from the bound grammatical affix view to the identification of several English prefixes as having semantic properties as full lexemes.

The present thesis has twofold aims. First, it sets out to circumscribe and identify the category of creative prefixations, with special emphasis on the prefix *un*-.

Several aspects are taken into consideration here: their relation to compositionality; neologisms and nonce formations; the degree of their lexicalisation; their metonymic/metaphoric bases. Besides these factors, an all-pervading phenomenon behind all prefixations is their cultural embeddedness, with wide-ranging sociological, pragmatic and – at times – political frame of reference. Second, the thesis identifies those elements of the cognitive linguistic framework which play a part in their interpretational processes: prototype theory; the role of metaphor and metonymy in their meaning; frame-shifting and construal operations; conceptual integration. In addition, the discussion of creative prefixations fits into a general cognitive treatment of prefixation: a cline, a continuum is suggested, ranging from largely compositional cases of prefixation to increasingly creative ones. The investigation – by highlighting the sheer number of creative prefixations – is also meant to place creative prefixations themselves in the broader view of prefixation. Besides, by illustrating its manifold possible variants, prefixation is placed among creative linguistic processes.

In compiling the corpus, the work of the few authors who treat morphologically deviant prefixations as a noteworthy and relevant category (HORN 2002, 2005; CURETON 1979) is heavily relied on (especially Horn’s compilation of *un*-prefixations from newspapers and magazines), even if it is not morphological creativity in prefixations which is emphasized,
but mainly lexical rules and poetic devices are put forth. Besides these sources, the Internet search programs provide access to invaluable information. Moreover, there are Internet sites actually specializing in new(ish) formations in English, whose number has greatly increased with the advent of social networking sites. The examples are given predominantly in context, which helps in inferencing the dynamic relationship between the prefixes (mostly *un-*) and the bases.

In light of this background, the following research questions can be formulated:

**1.3 Research questions:**

1. How do creative prefixations – despite their morphologically deviant character in terms of traditional categories – fill in conceptual gaps (with conceptual structure related to phonetic structure), facilitating a “finer partition of the world” (HORN 2002)?

2. In a network-based interpretational system, which senses of *un-* are featured in creative prefixations? (cf. HAMAWAND 2009: 72)

3. What is the relation between productivity and creativity in processes of creative prefixation?

4. Where can creative prefixations be placed in terms of lexicalisation?

5. How can the specifically creative aspect of prefixation be identified?

6. What are the cognitive processes involved in the interpretation of creative prefixations?

7. What are the cultural aspects of creative prefixations, to what extent does cultural context motivate their meaning?

8. How to place negative prefixation in the context of negation?

9. Are there any patterns and identifiable conceptual processes behind creative prefixations?
10. To what extent is it possible to place creative prefixations within the wider context of English word-formation?
1.4 Creative prefixations

1.4.1 What are creative prefixations? The term “creative” and some introductory examples

The term “creative prefixations” designates a subcategory within prefixations. The specific term itself shows a clear parallel with the usage by Benczes (2006: 5-7), who introduced the term “creative compounds” to describe noun-noun compounds with a metonymical and/or metaphorical basis, highlighting the fact that the difference between endocentric compounds (e.g. apple tree) and metaphorical and/or metonymical compounds (e.g. land fishing) is not transparency of meaning, but creativity. Benczes also emphasizes that her use of the term “creative” is naturally different from that of the Chomskyan approach (having the ability to form an infinite number of sentences from a limited set of rules). On the contrary, metaphor- and metonymy-based compounds utilize creative associations existing between concepts, including associations of similarity, analogy or contiguity.

Nevertheless, everyday linguistic creativity does not stop with metaphorical and metonymical compounds; as there is a whole family of (interrelated) phenomena requiring elaborate meaning construction processes: understatement, hyperbole, suffixation, lexical blends (see Kemmer’s (2003) glitterati based examples). Negative prefixation is also an area with surprisingly flexible uses of both the prefixes and the stems, resulting in highly creative derivatives that cannot be accounted for within a purely compositional framework. What connects creative negative prefixations with other creative phenomena is their having “nonstandard meanings not computable by traditional parsers” (Coulson 2000: 2). It is along these basic lines that the term “creative” is used throughout this work with regard to its topic, emphasizing the relevance of cognitive operations such as metaphor and metonymy that take part in their formation.

Although this work concentrates on the prefix un-, both in terms of its general characteristics and its use in creative prefixations, the phenomenon of creative prefixation does not restrict itself to this single prefix, in fact, prefixes of both native and non-native origin facilitate creative usage, e.g. (2) antilibrary, where our knowledge of e.g. anti-American sentiments would only offer partial help in constructing the meaning ‘a person’s collection of unread books’:

I like the concept of the antilibrary, mostly because it justifies my habit of incessantly acquiring new books while lacking the time to read them all.
There’s something very comforting about owning stacks of books — particularly non-fiction — and having them immediately on hand, should you want to know something about (say) Hitler, inequality, cats or economics.\(^2\)

You will accumulate more knowledge and more books as you grow older, and the growing number of unread books on the shelves will look at you menacingly. Indeed, the more you know, the larger the rows of unread books. Let us call this collection of unread books an antilibrary.\(^3\)

**De-** is also a prefix exposing huge creative potential: if we take the compositionally clearly analysable case of (3) **de-friend,\(^4\)** for example, the extra interpretative effort to understand the derivate is obvious. The dictionary definitions of the prefix *de-* would still be of little help in the actual case: the prefix *de-* offers the following options: a, it shows the opposite of a process such as *deindustrialization*; b, that something is removed such as *debone the fish*; c, that something is reduced such as *devalue currency*.\(^5\) Although these entries do influence the meaning of the derivative, they do not have full predictive power when trying to decipher the actual meaning of **de-friend**, which is ‘to remove someone from one’s list of friends on social networking sites’.

> After Jerome Kerviel lost his employer, French investment bank Societe Generale, $7.2 billion, he also lost 7 of his 11 friends on Facebook. Smart move (MVE) by those ex-friends. You never know who's looking at your profile. Of course, at some point, you might be in a similar situation. Because this kind of thing happens all the time. So here's how to **defriend** that guy who just went into hiding after losing $7.2 billion.”\(^6\)

This example with the prefix *de-* has got further important implications: besides the cases which are clearly analysable from both structural and semantic aspects and where the meaning of the prefixation is clearly compositional (e.g. *dehydrate* or *defrost*), cases like *de-proliferate* or *de-emphasize* already entail a semantic twist. (4) **De-emphasize** means: ‘to restore something to its previous position in terms of importance’, with the inherent

---

\(^2\) Hazel Phillips, “The Importance of the Antilibrary — Converting Unknown Unknowns Into Known Unknowns,” Baldwin Boyle Group, January 12, 2015 (italics mine) [downloaded: 02.05.2016]

\(^3\) Nassim Nicholas Taleb, *The Black Swan*, Random House, April 17, 2007. Taleb is actually reflecting on Umberto Eco’s relationship with his library. [https://www.brainpickings.org/2015/03/24/umberto-eco-antilibrary/](https://www.brainpickings.org/2015/03/24/umberto-eco-antilibrary/) [downloaded 02.05.2016]

\(^4\) Orthography with respect to creative prefixations is by no means settled, it is very often the case that the same word can be attested with or without hyphen: *de-friend* or *defriend*. The present thesis uses hyphenated forms in the main text, which does not exclude the possibility of forms without hyphen in the contextual examples. (Hazel Philips, in her explanation of *anti-library* uses both the hyphenated and non-hyphenated form of the word within one and the same article.)

\(^5\) Longman Exams Dictionary

\(^6\) —“How to stop being Facebook friends with that guy who lost $7 billion,” *ValleyWag*, January 29, 2008 [downloaded 10.12.2015]
contradiction that something can only be *de-emphasized* if it has previously been (possibly over-) emphasized. In terms of mathematics education, it means

...education that *de-emphasizes* memorization and rote learning in favor of a cooperative approach to solving problems... "A method that disdains the notion of adults hierarchically imparting knowledge to kids, integrated math does not require students to memorize multiplication tables, compute fractions or learn other basic skills essential to algebraic success. It's often rightly derided as 'fuzzy math' because of its murky goals, which include, according to one popular integrated math program, 'linking past experience to new concepts, sharing ideas and developing concept readiness through hands-on explorations.'\(^7\)

(5) *De-proliferate* is somewhat similar to *de-emphasize*, with the meaning: ‘to reduce in number rapidly’\(^8\). The original semantic path paved by *de-* is twisted the same way, as *proliferate* and *de-* have contradictory semantic content, with the actual meaning of the phrase having important extra-linguistic elements as well. Both prefixations follow the pattern of *de-industrialization*. *De-proliferate* is usually used in connection with a country’s nuclear arsenal:

Tell North Korea, a danger to Asian stability, that you won’t come to its rescue as your grandfathers did if our bombers must *de-proliferate* its nukes.\(^8\)

An even more poignant case in point is (6) *de-policing*: ‘A law enforcement strategy in which police avoid accusations of racial profiling by ignoring traffic violations and other petty crimes committed by members of visible minorities’, where the prefixation’s semantic content is linked to the horizon of sociocultural context and where in fact precisely this sociocultural context played a part in the creation of the prefixation:

During a February, 2001 riot in Seattle, when police were accused of taking a hands-off approach, one officer was quoted as saying: ‘Parking under a shady tree to work on a crossword puzzle is a great alternative to being labelled a racist and being dragged through an inquest, a review board, an FBI and U.S. attorney investigation and lawsuit.'\(^9\)

---


These are the semantic gaps which become interpretable within a cognitive linguistic framework, and the aspects that structuralist and transformational approaches exclude from their fields of enquiry.

The prefix non- yields just as abundant examples of seemingly unexpected use as the prefix un-. In fact, non- seems to have an endless capacity for forming new, unconventional derivational patterns resulting in creative composite structures. ALGEO (1971) makes note of the “voguish” uses of the prefix non-. Besides Algeo, BAUER (1983) also deals with the different usage patterns of the prefix, which can be categorised according to types.

The prefix non- has been in use in the English language since the 14th century, in expressions referring to the institution of monarchy, power and authority (ALGEO 1971, ADAMS 2001). This was the semantic field that determined its usage during the 15th and 16th centuries, mostly used in the language of law: nonability, nontenure, and nonclaim. From the language of law it found its way into areas of the church, the army and politics. This was the point where the use of the prefix was extended into new semantic areas and new formations. Its incredible popularity, however, starts in the 20th century. ALGEO (1971, 1987) mentions a large number of examples in voguish usage, most of which fulfil our criteria of creative prefixations. One such example, which is also quoted by BAUER (1983: 279-285), is “It is a nonbook, so to speak, non-written by Andy Warhol”. (7) Non-book refers to publications in the format of a book, which – for possibly different reasons – do not fulfil the criteria of what a prototypical book is. They are usually glossy publications, with lots of pictures or photos; the text is at best a commentary. Therefore, it is because of their lack of textual information that they cannot be considered prototypical books. A (8) non-end means a clever postmodern phenomenon “in which things just kind of go on”. Even (9) non-ism exists (consisting of a prefix and a suffix, similarly to post-ness): ‘radical self-denial, usually as a reaction to extreme over-indulgence’:

A Boston psychiatrist has complained that his 24-year-old son is suffering from severe ‘non-ism’. A few years ago, the young man looked at the chaos around him and decided not to participate, his father reports. He gave up drinking, drugs and caffeine, meat, sugar, dairy and wheat products and sex. The father says his son is depressed and lethargic. ‘He’s a pleasure anorexic. He’s stuck’.10

---

Creativity as a basic language user ability is further testified by the fact that not only prefixes can be used in this way, but the structurally closely related combining forms as well. ALGEO (1987:348-349) and ALGEO – PORTER (1987:246) draw attention to the rather specific use (in the meaning of flexibility, therefore coinciding with the creative usage of prefixes) of the combining form Euro-. Its original use would be “pertaining to Europe”, as in Euro-summit; however, many of their combinations are clearly non-compositional, therefore they merit separate treatment. Such examples include (10) Euro-event, meaning “a collaboration of different nationalities on certain projects”:

French dance company, whose new work Waterproof will be performed in the Swiss cottage swimming pool...with music by cult Berlin group Einsturzende Neubaten, it will be a real Euro-event.

or (11) Euro-consciousness, referring to “a specific interest/involvement in European matters”:

Euro-consciousness is high among those under 30 and has a definite cut-off age. Older people are more interested in domestic issues.

These introductory examples shed some light on the problems to be tackled in this area of morphological creativity, as well as touch upon some borderline categories and notions in relation to which creative prefixations have to be considered. Two notable concepts against which a clarification of creative prefixations is needed are nonce formations and neologisms. These will be treated in the following section.

1.4.2. Creative prefixations versus nonce formations and neologisms

Based on the so far short, but from this aspect revelatory set of examples the question arises: to what extent are creative prefixations new? Creative prefixations often emerge as nonce-formations originally; however, the examples all show some sort of lexicalisation, as opposed to nonce formations. HÖHENDAUS (1996) defines nonce formations on the basis of four distinctive characteristics: they are unique, context dependent, non-lexicalised and rule-breaking. These aspects play an important role in the characterisation of creative prefixations as well. Uniqueness, which in case of nonce formations means that they have been attested only once and not repeatedly, usually in a specific context, offers some parallel with neologisms and creative prefixations; however, “new” remains a notion very difficult to handle. ALGEO (1987: 346) is also aware of the fact that there is certainly a subjective
element in considering a word “new”. He states: “…our criterion for newness is the nonappearance of a term in current British dictionaries” (p. 347), although “what is a new word in one of the national varieties may be old hat in another” (ALGEO – PORTER 1987: 242), besides, slang always represents a problematic area and new words might appear in any of the English-speaking countries. The examples of creative prefixations themselves attest to the approach advocated by Hohenhaus (1996: 31), who instead of a statistical approach prefers a psychological one when it comes to considering newness: the language user’s first encounter with the word. Creative prefixations are therefore often relatively new ((12) unfriend was chosen word of the year in 2009); Charlotte Brontë’s creative use of (13) unlove on the other hand can only be termed new in this psychological sense (first time encounter on the part of the reader):

I have told you… that I had learnt to love Mr. Rochester; I could not unlove him now.

It has been repeatedly noted concerning neologisms (and their creative aspects) that they do not as a rule enhance communicational efficiency (ALGEO 1971, HOHENHAUS 2007, LEHRER 2003), quite the contrary, and their interpretation requires extra cognitive effort. The statement is certainly true for creative prefixations as well or at least when we encounter them for the first time. Lehrer (2003) supposes perlocutionary force behind the extra cognitive work: it may be partly attention-seeking or partly the entrenchment process. If we are required to make the extra effort, we will probably remember and recall the expression more easily.

A second typical characteristic with reference to nonce-formations is context-dependence. This aspect is highly relevant for creative prefixations: in most, though not all cases, they are highly context-dependent. It can be the specific context which enables their creation, and still, even if we are acquainted with the immediate context, the extra cognitive effort cannot be spared. (14) Pre-forget for example has a clearly context-based source invoking a scenario: “in an attempt to forgo the future, a person wants to not remember the next few years and pretend they didn’t happen”:

Democrat: Isn’t it amazing that America elected Barack Obama?

Republican: I want to forget election night and pre-forget the next four years.11

11 http://hu.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=pre-forget [downloaded: 15.05.2016]
It is entirely in this context-based function that KASTOVSKY (1978: 358) finds (15) una\textit{murder} acceptable at all: although clearly a semantically deviant form, he states that in a science fiction context even this “unacceptable” use of the reversative prefix becomes facilitated.

From the point of view of rule-governed linguistic approaches, creative prefixations very often display rule-bending or rule-breaking aspects. In an attempt to analyse the phenomenon of creative prefixations the question arises whether it is possible to identify systematic rule-breaking or non-conforming patterns of connections on their part. This identification is on the one hand served by the structuralist-lexicalist-generative morphologist tradition (MARCHAND 1969, MATTHEWS 1974, ADAMS 1973, 2001, BAUER 1983), which formulates certain rules to be adhered to in prefixal derivation. The rule-breaking aspects of una\textit{prefixation} will be covered in Chapter 5, here the problem is only outlined with the help of some further examples to provide connections with the definition of creative prefixations.

KONIECZNA (2012), based on MARCHAND (1969), SZYMANEK (1998) and ADAMS (2001), identifies certain rule-breaking tendencies concerning the prefixes una- and de-.

The above-mentioned growing popularity of the prefix una- in online usage is also exemplified in (16) un\textit{follow}: ‘ceasing to follow somebody’s blog or webpage’; (17) unlike (as a verb): ‘to withdraw our support from something or somebody on a social networking site’. (18) Uncry is already on the side of poetic/stylistic usage: ‘to dry up one’s tears, to make the act of crying as if it had not happened’. (19) Un\textit{schooling} refers to 1, ‘a bulk of experience one attains outside of school’ 2, a learner-based approach to schooling, (20) un\textit{decorating} is actually ‘redecorating a home or room to give it a simpler, less cluttered look’. A further example is (21) un\textit{hotel}, which is 1, “a hotel very consciously designed to disguise its actual function” and 2, ‘somebody else’s flat where we stay as quasi hotel-guests’:

The success of peer-to-peer alternative housing marketplaces like Airbnb and HomeAway has opened up people’s eyes to a life beyond

\footnote{12 “I’m un\textit{following} Steve after all that pro-Apple spam.” With a further twist of linguistic creativity, the expression un\textit{followphobia} also exists: “a morbid, irrational fear of losing a follower on Twitter (as the number of followers you have is perpetually visible on your home page). 
\footnote{13} Un\textit{schooling} is a method of home-schooling that puts the desire, drive, motive and responsibility for life – this thing we call learning, or education – in the hands of the learner.
\footnote{www.thehippyhomemaker.com/homeschooling-the-nature-way-with-a-childs-world-nature-based-curriculum-hippyhomeschool-giveaway/[15.05.2016]}
minibars. They’ve made the travel feel more intimate while also opening up a grander world of hospitable possibilities.  

(22) Unturkey is a vegetarian dish in the shape of a turkey but containing no meat. It is commonly accepted and illustrated by our creative examples as well that the prefix un- can be attached to verbs, deverbal nouns and noun forms. In deriving verbs, it is most commonly associated with the reversative function, supposing a verbal base which is transitive and resultative. As a consequence, durative verbs like walk and play are as a rule not acceptable for combining with un-. MARCHAND (1969: 153-155) sets as a prerequisite for the verbal derivational use of the prefix that the possibility of reversing the action must exist. Reflecting on this condition, both unfollow and uncry display rule-breaking tendencies, the bases of both composite structures being durative. In both cases, the transitivity requirement is fulfilled, but the resultative aspect is missing. These aspects can be categorized as creative aspects compared with the descriptive taxonomic expectations concerning verbal bases. Rule-breaking composite structures as these have their effects on conceptualisation as well, because instead of a reversative action we have to conceptualise the finishing of an action, or to imagine as if the action had not happened at all.

Unschooling and undecorating as deverbal noun forms and the unhotel, unturkey noun forms also disregard the semantically expected derivational patterns. In composite structures created with nouns, the meaning of the prefix is ‘the lack of something’ (MARCHAND 1969, PLAG 2003). This sense is represented by examples like unease or untruth. The creative examples, however, display more of the sense characteristic of adjectives ‘not X’ (MATTHEWS 1979), with a new, conceptually extended meaning.

The creative usage of the prefix de- also represents non-canonical connection patterns. Let us consider (23) de-Scottishify: ‘rebranding the image of a product in order to deprive it from its Scottish connotations’:

A manufacturer of Harris Tweed has dropped the word “Scottish” from its US marketing campaign amid fears of a consumer backlash over the release of the Lockerbie bomber, a report said Monday. …“We have been getting a lot of feedback and we have had to de-Scottishify the image of the brand. If he had not been released we would not have altered anything,” he said.

---

15 “Scottish clothing manufacturer caught in Lockerbie bomber row,” Agence France Presse, September 13, 2009 [thehimalayantimes.com/.../clothing-manufacturer-caught-in-lockerbie] [15.06.2015]
Further examples include (24) *de-elect*, which means ‘the removal of an already elected official from his position’; the previously mentioned example of *de-policing*; (25) *de-shopping*, which refers to the act of ‘taking an already purchased article back to the shop for full refund’ (and possibly using the article in-between). In these cases, the prefix *de-* derives reversative and privative verbs (ADAMS 2001, PLAG 2003). Cases where nouns serve as bases for verbal composite structures are categorised by MARCHAND (1969) as marginal, in the sense of the lack, loss or removal of something. In the above-mentioned cases we have to observe an at least hugely flexible application of derivational rules. *De-Scottishify*, in its privative sense is a rarity in itself, with the base only existing as part of this composite structure (*Scottishify* has so far not been attested, KONIECZNA 2012). Along the same lines, *de-policing* and *de-shopping* can only partially be analysed as privative constructions, as the expressions are not about the total lack of policing or shopping or the negation of them, moreover, from a formal point of view, they stand in opposition to classic *de-* derivatives which typically contain one-syllable bases, instead of two- or three-syllable bases. Cases of creative prefixations therefore seem to have a strong tendency to display rule-bending or rule-breaking characteristics within the framework of the taxonomic/descriptive system, in comparison with typical derivational patterns.

The last decisive characteristic to cover is the lexicalised/non-lexicalised status of creative prefixations. First, however, the term lexicalisation needs to be clarified to an extent as this is also a concept with differing interpretations and usage (and, interestingly, the term is often used without definition in the literature). BOOIJ (2005: 14-20) represents the generally accepted (and somewhat simplified) view: “when a possible word has become an established word, we say that it has lexicalised”. BAUER (1983: 46-48) deems lexicalisation to be the third stage “in the history of a lexeme”: starting out from nonce formation the second stage being institutionalisation, when the lexeme starts to get accepted by speakers, and at the same time potential ambiguities are ignored in determining its meaning. (This is also true to the metaphorical extensions of lexemes.) Lexicalisation then is the third stage, when on account of certain changes in the language system the lexeme is formulated in such a way that “could not have arisen by the application of productive rules”. Lexicalisation, according to Bauer, can appear at every level of linguistic analysis, therefore it is possible to
talk about phonologically, morphologically or semantically lexicalised forms. Still, on the whole, he admits that the terminology concerning “lexicalised”, “established” and “institutionalised” is very confused. HÜDDLESTON and PULLUM (2008: 298) combine the views of Bauer and Algeo (see above): lexicalisation in their view refers to 1, words which cannot be formed by productive operation patterns validating their present meaning 2, “they absolutely have to be included in a dictionary”. In comparison, HÖHENHAUS (1996), in line with the German-language morphological literature in general, uses a simpler, narrower concept for lexicalisation: it only means that a lexeme forms part of the mental lexicon. SCHMID (2011) differentiates between three perspectives on the establishment of complex lexemes: the term “lexicalisation” is linked to the structural perspective, the terms “institutionalization/conventionalization” are linked to the sociopragmatic perspective, and “entrenchment” as a term can be linked to the cognitive perspective. There exists yet another term, “establishment”, functioning as a general term referring to the whole process of becoming established. Schmid emphasizes that the concepts are used rather differently in the literature, the above-mentioned partition agreeing with that of LIPKA (2002: 110), as opposed to the view of BAUER (1983: 45) and QUIRK et.al. (1985: 1515). Semantic lexicalisation is a phenomenon closely related to compositionality, a crucial topic from the point of view of creative prefixations (for a detailed treatment see Chapter 2). Schmid differentiates three possible reasons for lexicalisation taking place following the act of nonce formation (or ad-hoc formations, as the term is used by Schmid): cultural (as in the case of blackboard/whiteboard); linguistic (when the meaning of a lexeme changes, e.g. nice or holiday); and most importantly, cognitive: when words form concepts: that is “the cognitive tendency towards gestalt-formation”. (p. 80, based on LIPKA 1977: 161, 1981: 122). The majority of the creative examples mentioned previously belong to this category. Concerning the topic of creative prefixations, the term lexicalisation is used in the “entrenchment” sense, emphasizing the cognitive functions of creative prefixation as a process.

1.4.3. A matrix-approach to creative prefixations

In delineating the group of creative prefixations, it is important to emphasize that the cognitive view of categorization is clearly at work: we have fuzzy boundaries concerning this category. It means that the term “creative” in terms of prefixations refers to a scalar notion. There are a bunch of features loosely characterizing the group, which features – just
as with family resemblance – are not always present in each case. Those characteristics which are present in the respective cases are represented to differing degrees. What are then the typical characteristics of creative prefixations? There is one minimal criterion: all creative prefixations are 1, non-compositional,\(^{16}\) attaining cognitive salience (metonymic-metaphoric motivation, conceptual integration). This is true of all cases. Further possible characteristics are 2, their rule-breaking nature; 3, context-dependence; 4, nonceness/newness from a diachronic aspect. Using these characteristics, it is possible to create a matrix-like approach to describe creative prefixations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creative prefixation</th>
<th>non-compositionality/cognitive salience</th>
<th>rule-breaking</th>
<th>context-dependence</th>
<th>nonceness/new</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-geographic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unturkey</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonbook</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de-conflict</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Semantic matrix of creativity in prefixations

The matrix exemplifies two notions: first, that creativity in a cognitively based interpretation is a cline, a matter of degree, there are no clear-cut boundaries, stating what is included and what is not. Second, it exemplifies the notion of fuzzy boundary, leaving space for subjective differences in their evaluation. Among the characteristics, non-compositionality is a must; this is the strongest prerequisite, with nonceness/newness being the lightest prerequisite. On the basis of this matrix then it is possible to predict that among the four examples mentioned here, (26) \textit{de-conflict} will count as the most creative.

Creative prefixations therefore exemplify one segment in the large field of linguistic creativity, which is pointedly not equal with linguistic novelty. As DAVID CRYSTAL points out (2001: 22-3), inventiveness in language comprises much more than merely creating new words. He finds the possibility of creating new senses from existing words is just as

\(^{16}\) Non-compositional as a term is used here for practical reasons, designating one end of a scale, as compositionality is viewed as a matter of gradedness within cognitive linguistics. Compositionality and analysability are treated in Chapter III.
important, as his constant source of examples, none other as William Shakespeare, amply testifies. Shakespeare’s inventiveness with un-coinages (among many others) works both ways: 1, he created “fire-new items” like (27) unspeak or (28) unshout, (6.2), which “vividly express a dramatic point” (p.22) and 2, even commonplace coinages, like unlock or untie may acquire new meanings: unlock, for example, besides having the meaning ‘undo the lock of some physical entity’ also acquires the meanings a, ‘physically undo by using force’\(^{17}\) or b, ‘to bring to light’ or ‘display’\(^{18}\)

1.4.4 The productivity matrix

Formulating a framework for creative prefixations inevitably brings up questions of productivity as well. Although productivity here is pointedly not treated in the Chomskyan sense (cf. 1.4.1), it is still a contributing factor when placing creative prefixations in context. In terms of productivity, LADÁNYI (2007) represents the approach applied here. She points out that there exist qualitative and quantitative approaches to productivity, and a qualitative view places it into a context of frequency, regularity, creativity and analogy. Productivity is therefore seen as one element in (yet another) matrix, where frequency is only one of the components. Applying this to our topic, this type of matrix-like view with respect to creative prefixations, given the fact that creative un-prefixations do not display high frequency levels (in fact, although all of them are attested, many of them do not yield any matches in the COCA corpus), yet this fact in itself places them in a much more marginal light than what they deserve. Ladányi’s distinction of qualitative and quantitative productivity is related to morphological patterns of productivity-regularity-frequency and productivity-creativity-analogy respectively. In her extensive overview of possible productivity definitions (p. 40-46) she distinguishes between former definitions (anchoring productivity to free applicability in the formation of new linguistic forms) and current definitions which also take into consideration the notion of gradedness in productivity. For her own definition (based on the insights of natural morphology) she formulates productivity as a system-level notion, regarding the formation of the possible (potential) words of a language. Consequently, it does not equal either type or token frequencies. She accepts though the

\(^{17}\) Troilus and Cressida, 5.6.29: „unlock the rivets all”
\(^{18}\) Merchant of Venice, 2.9.52: „a key to unlock my fortunes here”
relevance of type-frequency in the building of productive patterns. Applying this to creative prefixations, the two decisive insights are 1, the four-element matrix structure of productivity and 2, the postulation of productivity in terms of a cline.19

1.4.5 What are creative prefixations used for?

Are there any specific functions of creative prefixations? The answer to the question is – not surprisingly – a definite yes. First of all, there is the specific naming/labelling function, hand in hand with a specific classifying and hypostatization function (Part 2). The most conspicuous usage concerns the Internet-based New Age technology, where names for new concepts are constantly needed. (29) Undownloading means ‘the deletion of an e-book or similar download by the original provider of that download’:

> Recently ebook vendors have introduced a new word entered our renter society: “undownloading.” Highlighted on Techdirt by Glyn Moody, undownloading happens when your ebook provider discovers that you’ve made the mistake of traveling where it has no legal right to sell you books, so it decides to rip the books off your device.20

The concept that the previously mentioned de-friend refers to exists exclusively online, namely on social networking sites. A (30) disconnectionist is a person ‘who advocates spending time away from online activities, particularly for mental or spiritual rejuvenation’:

> The disconnectionists see the Internet as having normalized, perhaps even enforced, an unprecedented repression of the authentic self in favor of calculated avatar performance. If we could only pull ourselves away from screens and stop trading the real for the simulated, we would reconnect with our deeper truth.”21

19 Productivity – naturally – is a many-sided topic and it could serve in itself as an area of research concerning (creative) prefixation. As KOVECES (1996: 246-248, 2000: 280-282) points out, some prefixes (notably semi-, de- and anti-) are more productive in American English than in British English. Demoralize is a famous example created by Webster, but other examples such as defeminize or derealization could even be termed creative coinages. He also draws attention to the so-called “prefix words”, as a word-formation mechanism that is falling between compounding and derivation, resulting in combinations like for real, for good, for sure; or no as a prefix word: no nonsense, no go, no-account, (meaning ‘worthless’, ‘good-for-nothing’), no fault (“form of insurance which covers certain losses of all persons injured”). Although such considerations are also relevant and interesting, they fall outside the scope of this thesis.

20 Matt Asay, “Rise Of The Renter Class: In A Spotify World, Need We Own Anything?,” ReadWrite, October 31, 2013 http://readwrite.com/2013/10/31/rise-of-the-renter-class-in-a-spotify-world-need-we-own-anything/ [downloaded: 02.05.2016]

21 Nathan Jurgenson, The Disconnectionists. The New Inquiry, November 13, 2013[downloaded: 02.05.2016]
Mechanisms of modern companies also require up-to-date and concise labelling. (31) *Unsourcing*, for example means ‘transferring company functions from paid employees to unpaid volunteers, particularly customers or social networks’.

Information condensation is another crucial factor in the creation of creative prefixations. From the above-mentioned examples *de-policing* might exemplify this notion possibly the best: a prefixal derivative refers to an extremely complicated situation, which can only be interpreted on the basis of an intricate cultural/socio-pragmatic context. The phenomenon is very similar to what noun-noun compounds also attest to: BREKLE’S (1978) Minimax Principle is at work: a minimalistic form is paired with a maximum of information content.\(^2^2\)

---

\(^{22}\) To exemplify the Minimax Principle, two of the examples analysed by Benczes might be mentioned here: *flame sandwich*, ‘a note that consists of a negative comment surrounded by two positive comments’ (p. 103) and *Hogwarts headache*, ‘migraine headache caused by the physical stress of reading the 870-page Harry Potter book, *The Order of the Phoenix*’ (p.149).
1.5 The cognitive linguistic theoretical framework


The two main or most developed branches within cognitive linguistics are cognitive semantics and cognitive grammar. Cognitive semantics investigates the relationship among several factors: our (bodily) experience, the conceptual system and the semantic structure, that is knowledge representation as conceptual structure and meaning construction as conceptualization are in focus. Cognitive grammar, on the other hand, aims at modelling the language system, for which results of cognitive semantics serve as a starting point. Cognitive semantics has four guiding principles as its basis. (EVANS-BERGEN-ZINKEN 2007)

1. In connection with the Embodiment thesis, conceptual structure is embodied (though the relation between embodied cognition and linguistic meaning is debated (DE VEGA-GLENBERG-GRAESSER 2008). The cognitive view of prefixation with the two basic pillars of the notion of contrast and schema theory (with the SCALE and CONTAINER schemas having prominent role, to be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5) also attest to the notion of embodied cognition.

2. Semantic structure is conceptual structure, as language does not refer directly to objective entities, but to concepts, through construal operations (as opposed to a denotational view of language representation in objectivist semantics). Creative prefixations also introduce lexical structures to encode concepts in the minds of language users. This function is especially relevant with new concepts and the naming function of some creative prefixations/prefix blends: undownloading, (32) unwich or (33) de-bachelorize are all examples of semantic structures naming/referring to conceptual structures. Still, this relation does not mean total equality: a word as a linguistic unit is only a conceptual substructure present in speakers’ mind.
3. The encyclopaedic view of meaning representation stands in sharp opposition with the dictionary view, according to which words encapsulate meaning in chunks or packages. Instead, lexical concepts are thought of as points of access (Langacker 1987), where each concept entails and interrelates with a huge amount of encyclopaedic, cultural knowledge. (The recurring example of the happy - unhappy pair highlights this problem from several aspects in chapter 2.) This view does deny the existence of a conventional or core meaning, but treats lexical elements as starting points for further meaning construction by placing them into the context of an utterance. This is exemplified by practically all creative prefixations, serving as the framework within which metonymic-metaphoric processes, construal operations and conceptual integration can be applied as interpretive tools in their meaning construction. Such an encyclopaedic view of meaning representation is linked to a number of further assumptions. As it denies the distinction between core meaning and culturally constructed meaning (be it the social, historical or pragmatic aspect of meaning), the distinction between semantics and pragmatics is also debated, consequently, there is only encyclopaedic knowledge (comprising what dictionary knowledge would entail, too). This encyclopaedic knowledge is well-structured, in a network-like system which is context- and usage-based, enabling us to differentiate between different meanings but also to identify prototypical and peripheral senses. It is contextual information which guides us in constructing meaning (hence the contextual background is almost always supplied with creative prefixations as well, cf. in 1.2 and Part II). It is in this sense that Langacker refers to lexical items as points of access, dynamically and selectively providing information instead of being conceptualized as containers with the same content. The encyclopaedic view of language knowledge culminates in two theories. Fillmore’s (1985, also Fillmore and Atkins 1992) frame semantics proposes that speakers dispose of semantic frames, represented at conceptual level, relating human experience to elements of a culturally embedded frame. It is this frame which facilitates our understanding of a word. The other important theory is Langacker’s (1987) theory of domains, with the similar proposition in terms of encyclopaedic meaning. The theory of domains also states that it is through larger knowledge structures that speakers understand lexical concepts. In his terminology, these larger structures are called domains. (A further related concept here is Lakoff’s (1987) Idealized Cognitive Model, which is also defined as background knowledge structure.)
4. The fourth tenet is closely linked to the cognitive view of meaning representation, stating that meaning is constructed at the conceptual level, as language in and by itself does not encode meaning. Meaning construction is thought of as a process, rather than a discreet, delineable entity.

There are some major and highly influential theories and approaches in cognitive semantics (connected to the above-mentioned principles). Image schema theory (JOHNSON 1987) proposes that it is in terms of image schemas that embodied experience manifests itself at the cognitive level. As human beings, we dispose of preconceptual experience resulting in certain rudimentary concepts like CONTAINER, CONTACT or BALANCE. LANGACKER (1999) mentions “conceptual archetypes” as distinct from a “salient prototype”: for Noun then the archetype would be a region in some domain, and the prototype would be thing. THING, as a concept develops in the first year of a child’s life. In the same vein, MANDLER (2004) suggests that gathering spatial experiences leads to abstractions enabling them to identify meaningful patterns, e.g. in case of the CONTAINER image schema. In the process “spatial structure is mapped into conceptual structure” (MANDLER 1992: 591), that is, embodiment-based experience forms the basis of fundamental human concepts. Applying this to our topic, METTINGER (1996) uses image schema theory in the treatment of prefixation.

Besides image schemas, another highly influential theory (or a set of systematic set of findings, if not a full-fledged theory) is ELEANOR ROSCH’S (1978) prototype theory, formulated in opposition with the classical theory of categorization. This experiment-based approach highlighted that instead of necessary and sufficient conditions, human categorization centers around prototypes, mental representations assembling the most decisive attributes based on interaction or features representing best any given category. This unavoidably leads to asymmetries among category members – the typicality effects – and fuzzy boundaries concerning the different categories. BARCELONA and VALENZUELA (2011: 21) actually refer to the prototype approach in terms of cognitive linguistic methodology based on basic general cognitive abilities. In terms of creative prefixations the prototypicality in linguistic categories in general and the notion of prototypical prefix in particular are of significance.

Conceptual metaphor theory was and has been a dominant theory within the cognitive semantic approach (LAKOFF and JOHNSON 1980, KÖVECSES 2002, 2005) supplying a basic premise in conceptualization: metaphor – instead of being simply a stylistic feature in language – is organizing conceptual structure: human thinking as such is metaphorical. This conceptual structure is organized on the basis of cross-domain mappings, some of which rely
on pre-conceptual bodily experience, some others, however, form more complex conceptual structures based on the former ones. The two basic tenets of conceptual metaphor theory are the embodied cognition thesis and the proposition that semantic structure reflects conceptual structure. In conceptual metaphors ontological submappings or ontological correspondences are at work: the source domain entities (states, actions, objects) are mapped onto their counterparts in the target domain. Besides ontological submappings there are also knowledge or epistemic submappings. As LAKOFF and TURNER (1989: 106-110) as well as BARCELONA (1997) suggest, one very important aspect of metaphor concerns its elaboration, namely, that it is open-ended and can therefore be creatively applied in language use. Two important properties of metaphors are 1, their unidirectionality, which is attributed to metaphorical mappings and 2, the fact that mappings can in no way violate the imageschematic structure of the target domain (with the isomorphism of participant roles being another factor in invariance).

Metonymy, besides metaphor, is another related basic cognitive mechanism, which similarly to metaphor has also been traditionally referred to as a trope. LAKOFF and JOHNSON (1980) argue that metonymy is the same way conceptual in nature as metaphor: in case of metonymy one conceptual domain is understood in terms of another experiential domain included in the main common experiential domain. As KÖVECSES and RADDEN (1999) define metonymy in terms of contiguity, the target domain is highlighted, that is mentally activated or accessed, which is often motivated by physical or causal associations (with the target remaining (linguistically) implicit.

Mental Spaces Theory (FAUCONNIER 1997), later extended into Conceptual Blending Theory (FAUCONNIER and TURNER 2002) is another cognitive theory of meaning construction. According to Fauconnier, meaning construction involves two processes. First, mental spaces are built, then mappings are established between the mental spaces. As meaning construction is always context-bound, mapping relations are determined by actual discourse contexts. Mental spaces are conceptual space regions containing specific kinds of information, based on general human strategies (linguistic and cultural) in gathering information. This background explains why mental space formation and the mappings between them have in principle unlimited meaning potential. It is exactly this sort of meaning potential which resides in linguistic expressions, as well as representing building instructions for the construction of mental spaces. In case of linguistic units, Mental Spaces Theory proposes space builders, prompting the construction of new mental spaces or shifting speakers’ attention between new and previously constructed ones. As EVANS-BERGEN-ZINKEN (2007:
18-19) summarize: “Space builders require the hearer to ‘set up’ a scenario beyond the ‘here and now’, whether this scenario reflects past or future reality, reality in some other location, a hypothetical situation, a situation that reflects ideas and beliefs, and so on.” Mental spaces are built on pre-existing knowledge structures, with the elements constructed online, creating an internal structuring with frames and idealized cognitive models. Blending Theory stands in close relation to Mental Spaces Theory, still, it is a distinct theory with its own theoretical tenets. Both emphasize the dynamic aspect of meaning construction and its dependence on mental spaces. The insight proposed by Blending Theory is that meaning construction involves the integration of structures originating from across mental spaces. Such integration results in emergent structures, which are always more than the sum of their parts. Blending Theory, besides accounting for linguistic structure, particularly targeted creative aspects of meaning construction, e.g. metaphors or counterfactuals, hence its importance for the creative aspects in prefixation as well: blends can integrate elements that are normally contradictory, therefore they are of great significance in creative prefixations (cf. blends for unarrest, unmarriage and unpink in Part II).

The cognitive approach has also made crucial contributions to the study of grammar, partly in RONALD LANGACKER’S (1991b, 1999) cognitive grammar, partly by construction grammars, characterizing and delineating linguistic units or constructions making up grammar. While being consistent with the tenets of cognitive semantics, it centres around two guiding principles: a, the symbolic thesis, holding that a symbolic unit has two poles: a semantic and a phonological one and that changes in the semantic pole are reflected symbolically in the phonological pole b, the usage-based thesis, holding that the mental grammar of a speaker is formed by making abstractions of symbolic units from situated instances of language use. In terms of placing grammar in a cognitive framework (and consequently, in opposition with a determinist, modular view of grammar) Langacker deems the relations governing grammar being ruled much more by indeterminacy/motivation than determinacy. He proposes vagueness/indeterminacy in two possible directions: on the one hand, regarding the elements that participate in grammatical relationships, on the other, concerning “the specific nature of their connection” (2009: 46). Based on these considerations, grammar in itself is metonymic: the exact relations are not self-evidently supplied by conventionally applied means. Linguistic coding serves more as a system of signposts, guiding language users in the larger field of meaning construction, where points of access serve as starting points for connections. His view of grammar is deeply rooted in the conceptualist view of semantics in cognitive linguistics: speakers are able to construe
any given situation in alternate ways; an expression’s meaning or even its role in grammar (cf. the subject as the clause level trajectory) cannot be reduced to objective properties; and – most importantly – the significance of various “imaginative capacities” (p.46) are of crucial importance for conception and linguistic semantics, including metaphor, metonymy, mental space construction and blending. The view that grammar is meaningful is embedded in the larger framework of a continuum of grammar with the lexicon. There are sets of symbolic structures which form assemblies/constructions, within which component symbolic structures form composite structures. In comparison with standard approaches to syntax and semantics, the cognitive view of grammar goes further: instead of unanalysed wholes put together, combination also entails the way they are combined, with regard to their conceptual integration as well. As the creative prefixations in Part II exemplify, metaphorisation and especially conceptual blending play a crucial role in their interpretive processes: they are also interrelated with their network-like meaning extensions in the conceptually more complex examples.
Part I  Prefixation: theory and past approaches

Chapter II

Introduction

The chapter aims to place the topic in a wider perspective through the discussion of a number of interconnected fields: the different positions within formal morphology (in connection with the subdivisions in the field of morphology); classification problems pertaining to the notion of prefix; the presence or rather the lack of semantic aspects in the treatment prefixations. As prefixation is a derivational process, this very process and its implications are considered. The main argument of the following treatment of the topic focuses on prefixes fulfilling a much wider and lexically more relevant function than the majority of descriptive approaches suppose. In connection with this, the problematic nature of prefix categorisation is necessarily investigated. From the point of view of creative prefixations, the argumentation aims at a more independent, lexically and not purely grammatically based view of prefixes, as prefixes (with respect to our topic: negative prefixes) in creative prefixations do fulfil such a role.

2.1  Prefixation within Formal Morphology

The majority of previous linguistic approaches (MARCHAND 1969, MATTHEWS 1974, ADAMS 1973, 2001, QUIRK et. al. 1985, BAUER 1983) have dealt with prefixes, the process of prefixation and prefixations as the results of derivational processes within derivation, where the context of affixation has provided the framework for prefixation: prefixes are affixes attached before a root (stem or base). The terminological inconsistencies and the resulting terminological variants reflect the – though slight, but existing – differences between the approaches. As descriptive/structuralist approaches emphasize the process of derivation, they refer to the end results of such processes as “prefixal derivatives”. MARCHAND (1969: 86-87) uses “prefixing” and “prefixation” for the process, MATTHEWS (1974: 63) uses the term “lexical formations”; in ADAMS (2001: 43-51) we find “prefixed verbs”, “prefixed adjectives” and “prefixed nouns”, respectively. As the present thesis advocates the cognitive linguistic approach, the terms used will be ‘prefix’ and ‘prefixation’. By prefix we mean linguistic elements such as un- or de- that function as affixes and are attached to stems which follow it. Prefixation is the derivational process of attaching such elements to stems; the results of derivational processes like unhappy or defriend are called prefixations in general, referring both to the process and the resulting formations, in accordance with the prevalent practice in the cognitive literature.
The fact that descriptively oriented, structuralist linguistic approaches (MARCHAND 1969, QUIRK 1985) dealt with the question of prefixation within clear-cut category boundaries can be accounted for by several reasons. One reason is that word-formation processes and morphology itself have long played a subordinate – at best intermediary – role within linguistics (especially in a generative orientation, see e.g. SELKIRK’S Word Syntax (1982), also LIEBER 1992, JENSEN 1990)\(^{23}\). Another reason is that lexically-based approaches were only very slowly taking ground; therefore any problematic (non-transparent) semantic aspects of prefixation were treated as borderline cases. The third, and possibly most decisive, reason is that system linguistics is not capable of handling fuzziness and non-compositionality at all. System grammars adhere to strict compositionality, where semantic or pragmatic factors are hardly considered (at any level of organization).

Before focusing on prefixation itself, as prefixation is a strictly derivational process in structuralist approaches, derivation and its position within morphology needs to be considered.

2.2 The place of derivation within morphology

As several authors point out (SCHMID 2011, KÖVECSES-BENCZES 2010, TOLCSVAI NAGY 2013, TAYLOR 2010) the main focus of the majority of linguistic theories concerning morphology/word formation has been from the point of view of linguistic structure. This basically means that the description and explanation of the internal structure of words is seen as rule-governed, where the rules are expected to be precise and allow for no exceptions or idiosyncrasies. SCHMID (2011: 16) states that apart from structuralism, most of the contributions of generative transformational grammar were structure-oriented as well, which had the – undoubtable – achievement of formulaic abstractions and taxonomies. Structuralist approaches provided an astonishingly detailed inventory of forms (it is sufficient here to mention the decisive contribution of MARCHAND (1969) to the field, to be discussed in the

\(^{23}\) In a wider context, word-formation and the study of morphology itself (as several authors point out: BAUER 1983, CARSTAIRS-MCCARTHY 1992, ARONOFF 1976) has been neglected within a generativist view. The “inherently messy nature of morphology” (Bauer (1983: 7) quoting HOOPER (1979: 113)) was avoided by transformationalist/generativist approaches, which concentrated largely on phonology and syntax.
Concerning the place of derivational morphology, Schmid identifies two basic positions: one of them is within the transformationalist approach, the other the lexicalist position. While a transformationalist position approaches derivational morphology on the basis of syntactic (formalizable transformation) rules, a lexicalist position on the other hand classifies its place as belonging to the lexicon, with the consequence that the processes of forming words cannot be described by rules. In his extensive coverage of prefixal negation, Hamawand (2009) finds one basic fault with morphological endeavours so far: the greatest part of their investigation concerns the semantic restrictions on the use of negative prefixes, instead of exploring the semantic possibilities in the use of negative prefixes. This basically rule based/rule-governed approach to (e.g.) negative prefixes results in an interesting and all-too-prevalent phenomenon: although numerous authors are ready to spot creative prefixations, the cases themselves are usually brushed aside as rule-breaking exceptions. Therefore, the semantic potentials of the prefixations and the respective prefixes are not investigated, as they seem to deviate from a structural norm. Another – fully justified – claim of Hamawand (2009: 5-6) is that negative prefixes are generally covered by lists and descriptions, but they are never treated in groups, and their counterparts are never cross-referenced. In doing so, morphological analyses fail to draw attention to the potentially distinctive roles prefixes might play. Even Booij (2005: 9-20, 56-57), who views morphology as morpheme syntax, meaning thereby a set of principles defining the ways in which free and bound morphemes can be combined to produce well-formed words, contrasts this syntagmatic approach with a primarily paradigmatic one, where the creation of new and complex forms means the extension of a pattern of form–meaning relationships. A paradigmatic approach facilitates the Hypothesis of Lexical Integrity (p. 20), according to which syntactic rules cannot operate upon complex words. This is the reason why he allows for the fact that “the meaning contribution of the affix, or more generally, the derivational process, might actually be pretty vague”. Concerning the problem of differentiating between compounds and derived words, while maintaining the general statement of compounding consisting of two lexemes, whereas derivation comprising affixes–non-lexemic morphemes and lexemes as stems, Booij allows for a flexible handling of such a distinction, as lexemes may develop into derivational morphemes.
2.3 Prefix – categories and boundaries

The term ‘prefix’ has to be placed within the wider context of morphological processes, as the definition itself questions boundaries between derivation and compounding. The term “derivation” is no exception to the terminological inconsistency characterizing English morphology. BAUER (1983: 22-29) states that derivation in a sense could be looked upon as the converse of inflection, as derivation is the morphological process resulting in the formation of new lexemes. He puts forward a simple test for derivation, accepted in the literature (MATTHEWS 1974: 49-50): if a form including affixes can be replaced in a number of occurrences in sentences by a simple root form, then the form shows derivation rather than inflection.24 Although it is far from being a universally applicable test, still – in English morphology at least – it does take one closer to derivation. As opposed to inflection, derivation seems to have numerous, often unpredictable gaps in the system (referred to as the semi-productivity of derivational processes, Bauer 1983: 27). This is partly the reason why the products of inflectional morphology show semantic regularities, whereas products of derivational processes display these regularities to a lesser extent.

Compounds are defined by BAUER (1983: 29) as lexemes containing two or more potential stems that have not subsequently been subjected to derivational processes, not as a form containing two lexemes, as compounds have been defined by most scholars, including himself in his earlier works (BAUER 1978). BENCZES (2006) also reflects upon the problem of different compound definitions being used in the literature. She, however, opts for a liberal view of the term: it is extended to the established categories, item-familiar compounds and the yet possibly not widely known constructions (nonce-formations) as well.

The subdivisions within morphology are presumed to be discrete, implying the possibility to make sharp distinctions between compounding and derivation, or derivation and compounding, respectively. BAUER (1983:35) questions the existence of such clear dividing lines: “[ ] morphology presents a cline from clear cases of inflection through to clear cases of compounding, with derivation providing an ill-defined centre part of the scale.” He illustrates this with the possible diachronic passage of an element from lexeme to

24 In the sentences “Frustration made him stop writing his book” and “The writer received a well-earned prize” frustration and writer could be replaced by pain and boy, respectively. In comparison in “He always kisses his mother goodnight” kisses cannot be replaced by a simple root form. BAUER (1983: 27)
suffix or from suffix to lexeme. He acknowledges though the transition from lexeme to suffix to be somewhat more common than from suffix to lexeme, but even in these processes there are borderline cases, notably the forms -ism and -ology. However, a decidedly common transition is the diachronic passage of a lexeme, when it is used as a second element of a compound, to a suffix. If we consider the case of postman, contradictory tendencies might be spotted: man as an “adult male human” seems on the one hand to be losing its connection with the lexeme man and becoming a suffix, on the other hand, policeman is contrasted with policewoman, which would serve as an argument against this transition (pp. 35-36). Further problems arise with examples like Anglophobe: Bauer states that we cannot speak of a lexeme like “Anglo” or “phobe”. As “Anglo” is not a stem either (as no inflectional affixation is possible), they cannot be viewed as bound roots, it is purely a question of definition whether we treat it as a compound or not.

Katamba (1993) is also aware of how the division of word formational processes into inflection and derivation belongs to the most contentious issues in morphological theory. On the one hand, there is no unanimity in the classification of processes as either inflectional or derivational. On the other, Katamba also makes note of words which seem to acquire a borderline position between compounding and affixation. His examples are the so-called “cranberry words” (Katamba 1993:322-3), where blueberry and blackberry would not pose any problems from the point of view of compounding, whereas the same is not true of huckleberry and cranberry, where neither huckle nor cran appear as independent words elsewhere. Gooseberry and strawberry would pose further semantic problems in the questionable motivation for goose and straw, which raises serious doubts whether they can be viewed as compounds. In line with Adams (1973) and Bauer (1983), Katamba also applies the category of neo-classical compounds, where part of a word is borrowed from Latin or Greek. He raises the question whether multi should be treated as a prefix or a base, and whether the words containing it should be viewed as compounds or derivatives. Ingo Plag (2003) approaches the problem of the above-mentioned terminological inconsistency from a structural point of view, focusing on which elements (and when) are central or non-central. This is especially relevant in cases of word formation where these so-called neo-classical elements are concerned. Plag states that these elements are lexemes of Latin or Greek sources, but – as unique cases – their combinations are all of modern origin. (2003: 74). To name but a few of his examples: biochemistry, photoanalysis, and geology. The terminological status of the elements italicized and in bold is highly questionable: are they affixes or bound roots? If we accept e.g. the prefix status of bio- and the suffix status of –
logy, we would face biology as consisting of a prefix and a suffix. If we hypothetically assume them to be bound roots, then we would be talking about cases of compounding instead of affixation. There are reasons and examples to validate this last assumption. Bio has the meaning of life and – as Plag convincingly argues – just as blackboard is a kind of board or a kitchen sink is a kind of sink, biochemistry is a kind of chemistry. The difference between neo-classical forms and native compounds would be the obligatorily bound position of the non-native elements. Such neo-classical elements are also called combining forms. Plag’s view concerning neo-classical formations, namely their treatment as compounds is relevant in supporting the more liberal prefix notions put forward here.

Concerning neo-classical compounds, BAUER (1998) – not surprisingly – advocates the fuzzy boundary category notion. He admits the general taxonomical problems as well as the fact that neo-classical compounding is not a well-defined category. The relevance of this reasoning from our point of view lies in his listing evidence for terming these neo-classical compounds “compounds” (1998:406). They have a linking element of a kind not found in native compounds (o-), they use stems from classical languages rather than from English, but, definitively, they are words formed in English by a combination of two (or more) stems. Bauer actually looks upon neo-classical compounding as some kind of prototype, with the actual formations diverging in different – possibly unpredictable – ways. A more lenient view of prefixes does not go against the assumption of such a prototype, in fact it can be well synchronized with the idea of a prototypical prefix notion, leaving the possibility of “higher” and “lower” cases of prototypical usage.

MATTHEWS (1974) in discussing lexical derivation, draws attention to the fact that the meaning of derived words is partly synthetic and partly analytic. “Synthetic” is used in the sense that a number of words have meanings that cannot be determined from their parts in their entirety. This has important implications for the handling of prefixes. The synthetic–analytic dichotomy seems to be justified if we refer to derivatives like invaluable, or to quote the examples of Matthews, the meaning of insubordinate, in “his insubordinate attitude” is more than a simple negation of subordinate (1974: 67). In examining borderline cases of derivation and compounding, he considers e.g. socio-economic as a compound.

From the point of view of the notion and placement of prefix – in close connection with it – the changing view of derivation (instead of the classification view of MATTHEWS (1974), JENSEN (1990), KATAMBA (1993), a more continuum-like view of word-formation of BYBEE (1985), ranging from inflection to compounds), BAUER’S work (2003) is of
definitive importance. He proposes a typological shift in process in English prefixation, with important consequences concerning both the categorization and the semantic role of prefixes. He postulates that this typological shift can partly be traced back to historical reasons: an originally largely compounding Germanic one was followed by a period of English language use when prefixation was the norm. In Bauer’s view, English is returning to such a more compound-oriented phase. This phase is reached by a “conspiracy” of changes resulting in originally prefixal elements turning into lexemes.

Referring to the current terminological opaqueness concerning prefixes he observes that the most productive prefix-like elements are phonologically independent (carry their own stress) and a lot of them are similar to lexemes from a semantic point of view. He accepts and uses the native/non-native distinction of prefixes, with the further classification of dividing native prefixes into two groups: those which are homophonous with a prepositional adverb, and those which can solely be interpreted as prefixes (calling this last category “true” prefixes). These true prefixes would be the ones greatly reduced in number to present day English (with the exception of un-, a whole class of native prefixes eroded in English). As a consequence, an increase can be traced in other kinds of left-adjoined obligatorily bound forms. It also explains the interest in such prefix-like elements as initial combining forms or in neo-classical compounding. Considering the presently active left-adjoined forms, Bauer makes three important remarks: most of them are non-native; the few remaining productive Romance prefixes (de-, dis-, re-) do not play a central role within the system anymore; the new prefixed elements contain full vowels. This last aspect is important from the developmental aspect, as their phonological structure resembles lexemes more than prefixes. In line with this argumentation, there arises again the semantic consideration: the productive elements have moved away from purely grammatical functions and even from the fundamental prepositional meaning to a direction where their meanings are on a par with the meanings of lexemes. Bauer’s (2003) examples are audio-, chloro-, kilo-, and petro-.

(The only possible problem with this statement lies in the fact that the bulk of the relevant literature does not consider these items to be prefixes. At this point the argumentation unfortunately runs the risk of circularity.) In his view, this process is validated by other aspects as well: some of these prefixal elements are starting to show a greater level of independence by becoming clippings or free words, like anti, mini or sub. He also makes note of the fact that while words like anti and pro are turning into free prepositional adverbs, other examples are becoming nouns, which process is mainly controlled by the semantics of the element concerned. Bauer therefore postulates a very important change concerning both
the productivity and future development form of the prefix-like elements: “What these things have in common is a move away from the obligatorily bound status of prefixes towards a situation where the elements which are added to the left-hand edge of English words are in themselves more wordlike. This can be seen as a movement away from prefixation and towards something more like compounding.” (Bauer 2003: 37, italics mine). Referring back to Marchand (1969), we seem to have come a full circle here, what originally was exclusively dealt with as compounding shows signs of returning to the very same category.

Taylor (1989: 176-179), as an illustration of the factors involved in the attribution of prototype structure to a linguistic category, compares the most basic, most salient but at the same time most controversial linguistic category, word, with the characteristics of affix. The word status of mother in This is Jane’s mother does not seem to pose problems. It is less clear in the case of mother-in-law or contractions like there’s (for there is). The so-called clear cases are mostly intuitively decided upon, suggesting that it is a prototype category we are dealing with. Consequently, it is possible to make a list of attributes shared by those linguistic forms which could without hesitation be characterized as words:

(a) Words are optionally preceded and followed by pauses as speech evolves. It is also possible for a word to stand alone as an independent utterance. Bloomfield (1933:178) characterized it as the “minimum free form”.

(b) In e.g. English, each word can be stressed.

(c) Words are supposed to possess a certain degree of phonological invariance, with many phonological rules operate preferentially in the word-domain rather than in sequence of words.

(d) Words are actually unselective concerning the kind of item they might be adjacent to. The standard example of adjectives preceding nouns turns out to be an overgeneralization, as in fact an adjective can stand next to practically any part of speech.

(e) In certain cases, words can be moved around in a sentence: I like John, John I like. These characteristics are enough to distinguish words from units which are larger than words. In comparison, affixes have the following (prototypical) characteristics:

(a) Affixes typically cannot occur independently of the stems they belong to, as it is also not possible to insert a pause between an affix and a stem.

(b) They generally do not carry stress.

(c) They are usually integrated into the phonological shape of the word-form they are part of.
(d) Affixes are selective as to the kind of stem they attach to.
(e) They cannot be moved around independently of their stems.

The above-listed characteristics are analogous to the attributes according to how the membership of a conceptual category is decided upon. With the entities having a more marginal status within a category, the tests based upon the listed characteristics might raise questions. For how should we characterize the category membership of pro- in an expression already referred to: to pro an idea? It does possess a certain degree of autonomy, in this case it can bear stress, but it is not unselective as to what it can be adjacent to. The example mentioned is especially interesting, because in its original usage like pro-life, it displays more affix-like characteristics: in this case it cannot be moved independently of its host. The example is yet another proof for the complications of categorisation.

2.4 The suffixing preference vs a comeback of prefixes

BAUER (1983, 2003) in line with MARCHAND (1969), puts emphasis on the suffixing preference present in English. Quoting CUTLER et.al. (1985), he observes that this tendency might have to do with the importance of word-beginnings for word-perception, as the above-mentioned true prefixes “mask the beginnings of words” (2003: 38) and, according to Cutler’s view, “hinder perception”. According to this assumption, a replacement of prefixes with words increases though the number of items to be perceived, but should facilitate that perception. Whether prefixes truly mask the beginning of words, or whether independent words (in our case then, e.g. compounds) facilitate perception are crucial questions from a cognitive semantic point of view as well. The conceptually and lexically more independent view of prefixes resonates with some historical–phonological arguments as well. Concerning the history of the English language, it has been generally accepted among scholars (BAUGH–CABLE 1992) that a substantial transition took place with the Norman Conquest: whereas Old English enlarged its vocabulary by using prefixes, suffixes and a liberal use of compounding, after the Norman Conquest prefixation as a method clearly declines. Marchand also emphasizes the utmost relevance of the Norman Conquest, as it “paved the way for the non-Germanic trend the language has since taken”, resulting in “wholesale borrowing, a method which meant an enormous cut-down on the traditional patterns of word-
formation out of native material” (p. 130). This, however, according to Lutz (1997) is not an entirely sufficient explanation, as it is still not clarified to what extent the Romance means of affixing were used instead of the Germanic ones and to what extent lexical borrowing was involved in this process. There are opinions (Koziol 1972, Kastovsky 1992) which postulate a semantic explanation for the decline of prefixing on Germanic patterns, stating that the process was present in Old English as well, with the prefix-verb combinations losing their transparency. Lutz finds the reason for the massive French influence on English vocabulary in their “filling lexical and morphological gaps that had been created by the effects of destructive sound change on the original morphological structures (p. 263, italics mine). Concerning un-, as a negative verbal prefix, she points out an exceptional development, which has relevance for creative prefixations as well. According to her findings, modern verbal prefixations with un- do not conform to the same accentual patterns as other verbal prefixations do, namely, the prefix un- regularly carries secondary stress: with undo or uncover, even frequent additional emphatic strengthening is possible. The Middle English and Modern English un- as verbal prefix then replaces the Old English synonymous but unstressed on-. Similarly to Lutz, Diemer (2014: 20-40) also outlines more complex interrelations concerning the disappearance of the English prefix. Moreover, on the basis of corpus-based studies, he postulates that the process is not irreversible, in fact, sees the reason for a potential revival of prefixation mainly in computer-mediated communication (a significant section of the discussed creative prefixations seem to underline this postulation). He, too, states that prefixes are not at all straightforward to distinguish, they have in fact “a rather elusive form” (p. 22). In a historical perspective, Old and Middle English prefixes could separate from their respective verbs irrespective of being lexemes or not. Three main hypotheses have been formed to explain the decline of the prefix. The first one, syntactical change postulates that the prefix went through three stages (Kennedy: 1920). First, the prefix separated from the verb (ingan > in(-)gan); afterwards the particle assumes additional prepositional and adverbial function (in(-)gan > (in)gan in), and finally the prefix is replaced by a phrasal verb with the stress shifting to the prepositional particle ((in)gan in > gan in). The second one, also termed the standard approach, puts the emphasis

25 Lutz (1997) identifies three interrelated problems with the previous treatments of such a transition: 1, it was not the wholesale French borrowing which induced the elimination of native prefixes, as several of them were given up before the Norman Conquest, 2, some of the native prefixes (notably un-, with a more detailed treatment cf. Chapter 5) did not cease to be productive even to this day, moreover, they are combined with native and borrowed stems alike, 3, Romance means of prefixing has been a productive process since the Middle Ages, with the Romance prefixes combining with native stems as well.

26 Cf. the findings of Hay (2007) concerning the phonetic characteristics of un-, Chapter 6.
on lexical reasons for the disappearance of the prefix, at the same time arguing for a more complex process of metonymic shift in meaning. According to this approach (BRINTON 1988, BRINTON and TRAUGOTT 2005: 129), parallel semantic processes of lexicalization and grammaticalization of particle and verb result in preference of prepositions, and for metaphorical meanings, phrasal verbs. The third factor is semantic change. SAPIR remarked as early as 1921: “Of the three types of affixing – the use of prefixes, suffixes and infixes – suffixing is much the commonest. Indeed, it is a fair guess that suffixes do more of the formative work of language than all other methods combined.” (p.67). Taking Sapir’s views as a starting point, MITHUN (2003:155-85) supplies several kinds of explanations for the suffixing preference. Some explanations have focused on cross-category harmony, stating that speakers prefer “consistent ordering of heads and dependents across syntax and morphology” (p. 155), and the head-final syntactic structure (OV) naturally draws with it a head-final morphological structure (Stem-suffix). Other explanations have focused on processing, stating that hearers prefer to process stems first, and affixes only afterwards. Production has also been focused on, fearing the erosion of morphemes occurring later in words. These explanations do not account for the numerous examples of prefixes in languages with head-final syntactic order, in Mithun’s estimation in each case the history of the individual prefix needs to be considered. DIEMER (2014) agrees with KURYLOWICZ (1964), who states that morphosyntactic language is not unilateral, but cyclical and dynamic, with positions and opportunities opening and closing, with restrictions strengthening then weakening as well as periods of fixed positioning alternating with relatively free positioning opportunities. For a revival of prefixation there has to be 1, a weakening in the position after the verb and 2, a newly available opening in the prefix position (p. 35). His corpus-based approach proves the interesting fact that in some forms of non-standard computer-mediated communications (mainly blogs), verb prefixations are modelled exactly after Old English templates in increasing numbers, forecasting a possible tendency. The positioning problems, possibly present with the adverbial particle might be overcome by using prefixes. Diemer’s examples of inbeing, inhove or intake, (though not un-prefixations) exemplify the characteristics of creative prefixations: they are precise, compact, special purpose terms. The following factors might play a role in a possible “return of the prefixes” (p.37):

- a weakening of prescriptive standard grammar
- the availability of the prefix position in non-standard online communication
- the increase of prefix use due to the need for facilitating syntax
• semantic reanalysis
• traditional forms (reduplication)
• influence of other languages and English as a world language
• the increase of prefixation in special purpose use
• humour and online innovation
• analogy formation

Just as BAUER (2003) postulates a possible typological shift, Diemer, too, finds the rumours of the death of the prefix somewhat premature, finding the possibility of a cyclical revival real.

The status of prefixes, therefore, seems relevant and debatable as well. In a wider context, LEHRER (1999) draws attention to two opposing views on the status of sub-lexemic units within morphology, emphasizing the controversial views concerning the nature of affixes: are they ordinary signs, similar to lexemes, or are they different from signs. Lehrer views this traditional dichotomy as one to be solved. She puts forward the continuum-based approach: the lexeme vs. full boundness notions of status representing only ends of a spectrum. Lehrer assumes –fully in line with the argumentation concerning creative prefix derivatives—that the semantic compatibility of an affix and a base requires semantic-pragmatic assessment, as well as substantial inferencing. Lehrer though does not go into details concerning the solution of this dichotomy, but rather concentrates on the analysis of certain prefixes used in English (mainly relying on dictionary classifications in deciding what is/ is not a prefix). Her examples are based on the assumption that they are “semantically interesting”27 illustrating problems like iterating and combinatorial possibilities. Her detailed examination of the prefix meta- brings up two topics – among others —with relevance for our topic: it illustrates constraints on the meaning of the base as well as ranges of meanings with semantic drift. Basically, two different senses of meta- can be distinguished: meta-X has a sense of foundational theory of X, as in metahistory or metasociology, with the word metatheorem already exemplifying a semantic drift, meaning a derived concept and not a foundational study. The other sense would be the “aboutness” with a wide range of creative possibilities. Therefore, “the semantics of meta- contains a variable, which is to be replaced by a copy of the base to which it is attached. (A

---

27 The innovative examples she gathered include metamental, metamovie, metaplanning, metaperformance, metapopulation, metagrumbles, metacriterion, metarule, metacommunication, metamessage, metacognition, metaweight, metasemantic, metajudgement, metacomparative, metacategory, and metalove. (LEHRER 1999:136)
metalanguage is a language about language. A metarule is a rule about rules.” (p.136) Lehrer extends the “aboutness” sense into an ABOUTNESS requirement: we can imagine a metamovie, but a metapotato might be more difficult to imagine, though there might be wide differences in the acceptance of such new words: “One requirement in accepting a new word is the possibility of imagining a possible referent.” (p.137, e.g. metamusic).

BYBEE (1985) was among the early advocates of a more continuum-based approach in morphology. Keenly aware of the classification problems typical of all morphological analyses, in her discussion on the distinction between derivational and inflectional morphology, there is only one criterion she finds useful and successful: that of the obligatory criterion. She makes insightful remarks concerning the two types of derivational morphemes, namely the (synthetic) category-changing and category-retaining morphemes. This type of differentiating between derivational morphemes also has its tradition; ADAMS (1973, 2001) and JENSEN (1990) are both applying it, among others. Jensen in his Morphology mentions as an example that the prefix counter- in English has no category features of its own (p.103). Therefore, when it is attached to a verb, the result is a verb (counterattack); when it is attached to a noun, the result is a noun (counterexample); when it is attached to an adjective, the result is an adjective (counterproductive). While this might be true for the prefix counter-, the case is definitely different with the prefix de-: if it is attached to a noun, the resulting compound might still be a verb, as in the case of de-friend. Though such category-changing prefixes are rare, still, a-, be-, or un- might be mentioned here as further examples. (KATAMBA 1993: 51)

The main difference between the two classes lies in the field of semantics: BYBEE (1985) postulates that it is category-retaining derivational processes which adhere to large meaning changes. In addition to the modification of meaning, a word’s syntactic category is crucial to its semantic representation, which serves as further reason in stating the relevance of the syntactic category of a word as an entity. The semantic change induced by category-changing derivations is of varying degrees, depending upon the semantic content they contribute to the derivational process. The importance of these remarks lies in the assumption that concerning the amount of effected semantic change, derivational morphemes show wide differences. This leads Bybee to the conclusion (resonating with the arguments of several quoted authors) that morphological categories themselves belong to a continuum, ranging from lexical to inflectional, with compounding involving the largest, open class of items and inflection being the most constrained.
Neither the scope, nor the size of the corpus of the present thesis allows for a statement concerning this topic. What creative prefixations do exemplify though is the presence of a productive, adaptable pattern, which does not allow for predictions for the future, but aims at highlighting a present tendency.
2.5 The category of prefix: definitions, functions and limitations

Concerning the traditional, structurally straightforward view of prefixes (presupposing the same semantic analysability and transparency), on the one hand, we are faced with the long-standing and widely discussed topic of what is / is not a prefix, that is: problems of categorisation (MARCHAND 1969, PRČIČ 2005, BAUER 1983), on the other hand, the definition of a prefix poses problems (BAUER 1983, 2003). Drawing on our findings concerning the creative aspects of prefixation, a cognitive linguistic notion of prefixes will be proposed, as descriptivist definitions (MARCHAND 1969, MATTHEWS 1974, KATAMBA 1993, ADAMS 1973) do not reflect upon the differing semantic roles prefixes might cover. Consequently, the coverage of structuralist, transformational and some alternative theories concerning prefixes/prefixation will mainly concentrate on certain topics which are crucial from the point of view of a more flexible approach to prefix as a category. The first problem to be investigated is how these approaches deal with the notion of prefixation itself: is it regarded as solely a structural category or is there any openness towards a more lexeme-like notion of prefixes. The second problem is how these approaches handle questions of compositionality and transparency.

Prefix definitions in a descriptive vein are schema-based and compositional concerning semantics: a prefix is a bound morpheme, attached before a stem (a head element), modifying the meaning of the derivate in predictable ways. However, besides being a grammatical category, a prefix is a lexical category as well: in cognitive theory the lexical and grammatical sides of meaning are viewed simultaneously. According to such a view, a prefix-like first element may range from bound morpheme to lexeme, with quasi-lexeme like cases in between. As a derivational process, prefixation can extend from derivates on the bound morpheme end to quasi-compounds on the lexeme-like end of the continuum. Such an extended notion entails a predominantly semantic affiliation: as prefixes have definite, paraphraseable meanings, we acknowledge a certain semantic cline as well, from modifying meaning to co-ordinating element in derivational processes. The semantic consequence of the cognitive linguistic prefix notion is the postulation of a semantic continuum, where at one end the meaning of a prefix derivative is the predictable sum of the meaning of the base plus the meaning of the prefix, at the other end meaning making has several other components besides the purely compositional factors.
There are several reasons for adopting this wider perspective, which will be dealt with later on within a cognitive linguistic framework. Certain arguments touched upon by descriptivist approaches also raise the possibility of opening towards such a perspective.

Marchand (1969) in his authoritative book on English word-formation applies a synchronic-diachronic approach. From a diachronic point of view, he acknowledges the fact that the term “prefix” was defined rather problematically, as older grammars unfamiliar with the term looked upon prefixing as part of compounding. As opposed to this view, Marchand (p. 85) insists on viewing prefixes as dependent morphemes as they cannot be treated in the same way as independent words. Prefixes therefore would be such particles as can be prefixed to full words, but which by themselves cannot be looked upon as independent words. In spite of this strict condition, he allows for the fact that native prefixes have developed out of independent words, while prefixes of foreign origin came into the language ready-made. Marchand fully endorses the widely used and accepted distinction between prefixes of native and foreign origin. The distinction has made its impact on practically every descriptivist author and – either explicitly or implicitly – other approaches rely on it as well. In fact, the distinction is taken so much for granted that it does not even get reflected upon. Native prefixes (a-, be-, un-, fore-, mid- and partly mis-) are very limited in number, but they developed out of independent words, whereas prefixes of foreign origin came into English ready-made, due to loans from different languages. Procedurally, when these foreign words of similar structure entered the English language, the pattern was extended on an analogical basis to new formations as well: the prefixes therefore became derivative morphemes.

Marchand gives historical reasons for the weakening or complete disappearance of native prefixes (with the notable exception of un-). He even acknowledges the fact that some prefixes developed secondary uses as independent words (e.g., counter, sub, and arch). This, however, would not invalidate the principle that prefixes were primarily particles with no independent existence. Apart from the fact that such independent word-like occurrences of prefixes are a major reason for validating the extended notion of prefix, it is also important to note that in treating prefixes

28 In fact, he finds Krusinga’s standpoint, namely that a prefix has basically the same function as a word in the position of the first element of a compound, hardly acceptable.
29 The Norman Conquest, the accompanying contact with French resulted on the one hand in a wholesale borrowing of words, with the decline of traditional, native material based word-formation, on the other hand, this Romanization transformed English vocabulary in such a way that the adoption of Latin words became much easier.
as solely dependent morphemes he disregards important semantic aspects and e.g. these secondary uses of prefixes as independent words are perhaps brushed aside too lightly.

It needs to be noted that Marchand (1969) gives a predominantly taxonomic overview of word-formation. Semantic considerations are limited to stating the meaning of each prefix to be dealt with (though he meticulously differentiates between possible denominal or deadjectival bases). Besides the above-mentioned strong structural “bound-morpheme” claim, the term “prefix” is an umbrella term, made up of different subgroups of present-day English morphology: 1) borrowings of particles on a neo-Latin basis; 2) elements which exist as preposition or particles with an independent word existence; and 3) even pronominal stems like *auto*-. It is not unusual to face terminological inconsistencies in morphological literature; the term “prefix” is no exception to this. Marchand makes important distinctions between particles, prefixes and the so-called combining forms. The borrowing of particles, later chiefly used in scientific terminology, begins in the 16th century, making progress with modern science (18th, especially 19th centuries). These particles may represent such elements as are prefixes in Latin or Greek (*a-, semi-*); such elements as exist as prepositions or particles with an independent word existence (*intra, circum*); such as are the stems of full words in Latin or Greek (*multi-, omni-*). This last group is termed “combining forms”, though the three groups represent a very similar process in terms of word formation: “they represent loan elements in English with no independent existence as words” (p. 87).

Valerie Adams (1973, 2001) takes a unique, comparative approach in putting emphasis on comparing prefixation with suffixation. She defines prefixes as bound forms initially attaching to bases, which can be verbal, adjec-
tival or nominal. For the term “prefix”, Adams (2001) provides a relatively short list (compared with that of Marchand, 1969), acknowledging the fact that prefixes are less heterogeneous than her simplified list would suggest, and that most of them are related to Latin or Greek particles or quantifiers. Adams classifies prefixes in four groups, which however are far from clear-cut and distinctive. Each of the “locative”, “quantitative”, “reversative” and “negative” group has items pointing to links with another group. An ‘unlocked door’ can refer to either the reversed result of an action (*unlock-ed*) or a negative state (*un-locked*). Similarly, *dis-* is reversative in verbs (*disconnect*) and negative in adjectives (*disloyal*) (pp. 41-42). There are numerous examples for such interrelated cases, which in a way question the usefulness of such groupings and make one reflect upon the semantic considerations in dealing with prefixes. Adams (2001), similarly to Marchand (1969), defines prefixes as semantically distinct from stems and initial
combining forms, but attains a degree of openness as far as semantic distinctions go, admitting that prefixes and stems cannot always be consistently differentiated (Greek stems might be very similar to certain locative prefixes). It is in line with this argumentation that she admits to prefixes having a certain degree of autonomy, therefore it is possible to find several of them as independent words: ‘pre the ceasefire’, ‘pro the idea’ (p. 42)

Although when listing the separate prefixes, MARCHAND’S (1969) taxonomic overview seems to have been formative, the last-quoted few insights are very forward-looking and on a different path than the one originally paved by Marchand and the bulk of structuralist literature. It is also important for the extended prefix notion under scrutiny. Her detailed analysis is not based on the above-mentioned four categories; rather, she examines prefixed verbs, adjectives and nouns. Her descriptive method raises questions concerning the nature of prefixes, which can only partly be answered by diachronic reasons. Interestingly, Adams has a tendency to spot unconventional prefix derivates (most of which could be termed creative prefixations in their own right): anti-matter, unbook, uncountry, non-answer, to name but a few of her examples.
2.6 Problems of categorisation: The classical approach to categorisation versus categories in Cognitive Linguistics

JOHN TAYLOR in his *Linguistic Categorization* (1989) – going back to as far as Aristotle himself – lists the basic assumptions of the classical approach to categorisation: categories are defined on the basis of necessary and sufficient properties. If any of a set of defining properties is not exhibited by a certain entity, then the entity is not a member of the category. The next assumption concerns the all or nothing binary nature of features, as a feature is either involved in the definition of a certain category or not, but a middle option does not exist; only one of two values can be applied. The clear category boundary as prerequisite follows from the two aforementioned assumptions: entities of the world can be divided into two, very distinct sets, an entity is either a member of a category or not, but there can be no ambiguous cases. The fourth basic assumption concerns the status of the members within the categories: all members have equal status within the category, there is no room for better or worse examples within a category, and there are no degrees of membership. Phonological theory has later also enriched the classical model of categories in that it introduced the feature not only as binary, but also as primitive, universal and abstract. As Taylor emphasizes, the principles worked out for phonology are often based on this feature approach, and in semantics, the structuralist, Saussurean and post-Saussurean notions still play an influential part in defining semantic categories.

It is WITTGENSTEIN’S (1953) Spiel example with the notion of family resemblance, and the investigations into colour terms (BERLIN and KAY 1969) that originally paved the way for theories of fuzzy categories. Colour terms were decisive from two aspects compared to classical approaches to categorisation: colour terms have a centre and a periphery, and they do not form a system in the Saussurean sense. Wittgenstein’s metaphor of family resemblance introduces two important aspects also important from the point of view of categorisation concerning prefix derivates/composites: the notion of fuzzy category boundaries and the exemplar-based acquisition of categories themselves. Prototype theory really presents an alternative to the classical theory. As TAYLOR (1989: 51) elaborates, ROSCH’S (1978) notion of basic level terms meshes in with the prototype structure of categories. Categories within the prototype theory have fuzzy edges and they can even merge into each other. Certain members of a category have attributes which are only shared by few
other members; moreover, there might even be categories without attributes shared by all their members. Taylor nevertheless emphasizes the importance of keeping the categories as distinct as possible (fully in line with the argumentation of Elsen 2009) as this is the prerequisite to maximal informativeness.

The most decisive difference between the classical approach to categorisation and the prototype theory of categorisation is fuzziness. Compared with the binary setup of the classical approach, where an entity is either a member or a non-member, in the prototype theory membership is a matter of gradience. In our line of reasoning, prefix, as it is to be illustrated, is a good candidate for the status of a fuzzy category. Prototypes can on the one hand be treated as central members, or as schematic representations. According to the latter view, one would not say that an entity is the prototype, but rather that it instantiates the prototype. Naturally, this last, more abstract approach will be applicable in our enquiries as well. Langacker (1987) describes cognitive structures more as holistic configurations than as attribute bundles.

The much-quoted bachelor example in the literature (Katz and Fodor 1963, Kempson 1977, Bierwisch 1970, Cruse 1986) focusing on the problem of semantic primitives proves that the conscious application of categorisation results in the differentiation of autonomous and encyclopaedic knowledge as well. The whole area of categorisation is therefore much wider than that of categorisation within linguistic terminology, as it leads to a view of word meaning which in its scope is encyclopaedic.

Taylor (1989) also notes that it is a frequent phenomenon when different uses of a word with complex semantic structure tend to highlight different components of frame-based knowledge (cf. Langacker’s active zones). Perspectivization might represent another explanatory cognitive process behind the process of prefixation, as it gradually turns into metonymy. Metonymic extension happens through the “perspectivization of an implication” (p.126). Though cognitive linguistics is generally opposed to formulating category-based rules for meaning extension, that is, predictions concerning which meaning extensions would or would not be possible in particular instances, certain preferred patterns of meaning extension can definitely be identified.

Kövecses–Benczes (2010) based on Lakoff (1987) and Taylor (1995) give an overview of how the notion of prototype can be extended to linguistic categories. As Taylor puts it, the things that linguists study, such as words, morphemes, syntactic structures, not only constitute categories in themselves, but they also stand for categories (1995:1). If we examine notions like noun, verb, adjective, sentence, we are faced with a similar case as in
the original Wittgensteinian (1953) Spiel example: are they categories defined on the basis of necessary and sufficient features, or are they organized around prototypes/conceptual archetypes? The answer to this question is of crucial importance from the point of view of a cognitively based notion of prefix as a category and prefixations with wider category boundaries than that of derivation proper. Recent research by TAYLOR (2010) supports the latter argument. The example of noun proves this prototypical view as well: bread or house are presumably better examples for the category of noun, than morality or constitution. (KÖVECSES-BENCZES 2010:30) Speakers therefore tend to have the assumption that water would be a better representative of the category noun, than the more marginal case of finance. This coincides with the method of the classical approach, which also defines nouns on the basis of the most typical examples referring to people, objects or places, instead of abstractions. To be able to account for these abstractions though, relations of family resemblance need to be investigated among prototypical and less prototypical members. On the level of linguistic categories again, overlaps are also possible: just as word might merge at its boundaries with categories like affix (TAYLOR 1989:175), prefix as a category might have fuzzy boundaries. In case of prefixes, on the basis of later analysis, a similar prototypical categorisation approach is advocated here. Un- or de- might be better examples for a prefix than para- or bio-. Besides offering a further chance of simplifying category boundaries, this will also help in analysing creative prefix derivatives.

30 TAYLOR (1989:177) quotes CARSTAIRS (1987:4) noting that the distinction between derivational, or word-forming affixes and inflectional affixes may be more of a continuum than a matter of discreetness: e.g. Is the adverb-forming –ly derivational or inflectional?
Chapter III

Introduction

Besides derivation, the notion of compositionality serves as the second axis in the traditional treatment of prefixation. Prefixation as a derivational process is treated as the compositional process par excellence; however, even the semantically relatively transparent cases of prefixation display semantic inconsistencies questioning the full compositionality view. In a continuum-like perspective on prefixations, where creative prefixations show differing levels of semantic complexity, they might serve as examples against the full compositionality view, exemplifying the need for a cognitively more plausible approach in their treatment.

3.1 Versions of compositionality in the light of negative prefixations

The principle of compositionality has always been a decisive – if not the most important – factor in the description of prefixation, as it was seen a basically concatenative operation (together with compounding). The originally syntax-oriented “Frege’s Principle” entails the supposition that it is possible to deduce a sentence’s meaning from the meaning of its constituents (KIEFER 2000: 17). This theory of compositionality was later extended to lower levels of syntax, including phrases and words, exercising a formative view on the handling of morphological structures. The “compositionality view” has two basic versions. According to the strict or strong principle of compositionality, as CRUSE (2010: 67-68) points out, the meaning of a grammatically complex form equals a compositional function of the meanings of the grammatical constituents making up the form and the structure. This would then include some consequent claims. First, the meaning of a complex expression is entirely determined by the meanings and the structure of its constituents. Second, by the help of general rules, the meaning of a complex expression is completely predictable from its constituents. Third, the meaning of the whole is a sum, to which every grammatical constituent contributes with its own meaning. There is, however, a modified view of compositionality as well, the partial or loose compositionality view, which only acknowledges a partial modification role for each constituent in the make-up of the meaning of the expression as a whole (similarly to cognitive motivation, consequently, loose compositionality is accepted within Cognitive Linguistics, cf. KÖVECSES-BENCZES 2010). According to Cruse, the problem lies in the fact that there are actually several ways of combining two meanings to make a third. He differentiates between additive and interactive modes of combination, where the additive mode entails simple syntactic coordination; the
interactive type of combination on the other hand means that the meaning of at least one constituent is decisively modified. This differentiation is reflected in the endocentric – exocentric type of distinction, compounding serving as possibly the best example for the two types.\textsuperscript{31}

In spite of the prevalence of the compositionality view, there has been a longstanding recognition concerning certain phenomena which strikingly fall out of the scope of this principle: beside idioms as the most obvious examples, indirect speech acts, figurative language in general, active zones and certain constructions (noun–noun, adjective–noun) are usually mentioned, as well as the pragmatic interpretations (the prime example being Pamela Downing’s deictic compound \textit{apple juice seat} (DOWNING 1977). Another much-quoted pair of example is the \textit{blackbird}/\textit{black bird} example (MATTHEWS 1974, CRUSE 2010, BENZES 2006: 70), as it is possible to predict the meaning of \textit{black bird} (a bird which is – predominantly – black in colour) whereas the meaning of \textit{blackbird} as a whole complex cannot be derived from \textit{black} and \textit{bird}, although it is true that the two forms differ structurally. BOOIJ (2005: 207-210) also identifies the compositionality principle as the most general principle regarding the semantic interpretation of morphological (as well as syntactic) structures in the sense that the meaning of a complex expression is a compositional function of its respective constituents “and the way they are combined”, adding an important factor to the discussion of compositionality. Booij nevertheless advises to distinguish between meaning and interpretation, acknowledging the fact that it is the high degree of abstractness/vagueness of the meaning contribution of compound structure which turns e.g. compounding into a very flexible device from a semantic point of view. Even though he maintains that the meaning of a complex word is in principle a compositional function of the base words and the morphological structure, he acknowledges that the meaning contribution of the derivational process in general and that of the affix in particular “might actually be pretty vague” (pp.56-57).

The cognitive linguistic view attains the notion of partial compositionality, or with a more fitting term, motivatedness, taking the existence of compositionality as “a self-evident fact” (TAYLOR 2010: 97). LANGACKER (1987) also emphasizes the necessity of compositional processes, the reasons for which he postulates that

“…linguistic convention cannot provide a fixed, unitary expression for every conceivable situation that a speaker might wish to describe. [] More often than not the

\textsuperscript{31} CRUSE (2011: 68) actually lists four types of endocentric combinations: Boolean combinations (\textit{red hats}), relative descriptors (\textit{large mouse}), negational descriptors (\textit{an ex-lover, an imitation fur-coat}) as well as certain indirect types (\textit{a beautiful dancer}) which have at least two possible interpretations.
speaker wishes to symbolize a coherent conceived situation that is relatively complex and for which no fixed expression is available. For purposes of linguistic coding, then, he is forced to dissociate his integrated conception into separate but overlapping ‘chunks’ for which conventional symbols are provided, and to invoke a number of compositional patterns sufficient to specify at least approximately the nature of their intended integration.” (p. 278)

In Taylor’s evaluation (reflecting upon the estimation of Langacker), two principal reasons can be identified in the failure of strict compositionality: 1, all the lexical, phrasal and constructional elements of language are abstractions based on usage events. Consequently, every ready-made expression needs to be applied to concrete situations, by detailing the specifics. 2, in any complex expression there exists the need for accommodation, a kind of value ordering for the sake of the intended conceptualization. A prime example for this is the active zone phenomenon: with any given entity, some parts of it might be more involved in the situation/conceptualization than others. 3, all concepts are context-based, where the speakers’ cultural knowledge is crucial.

The contribution of the different semantic elements to the meaning of the whole is not questioned; at debate is only the nature and extent of this contribution. What the cognitive viewpoint does question is the presuppositions behind the strict compositionality version. As CRUSE (2011: 67) summarizes, the strict compositionality principle claims that it is possible to completely determine the meaning of a complex expression based on the meanings of its constituents, the overall meaning is completely predictable by general rules (both aspects are fundamental in descriptive treatments of prefixations). A further factor in the strict compositionality view is that the constituents have meanings contributing to the meaning of the whole, by which fixed, stable meanings are meant, implying that their semantic properties are fully maintained in the complex expression and, perhaps even more importantly, no surplus meaning arises. The cognitive linguistic view disputes all three propositions, in fact Langacker claims strict compositionality to be the endpoint of a scale, with rare examples.

In case of prefixation, MATTHEWS (1974: 131-133) provides the basic schema: from happy we produce unhappy relying on the X→ un + X schema, where “the form which is derived consists of the base plus an added constant” (p. 133). The cognitive linguistic approach does not deny the existence of such a schema; however, it disputes the notion of meaning as fixed and rigid, objectified notion, conveyed in the above definition by the word “constant”. A recurring (as very handy) example the unsustainability of the strict compositionality view is SWEETSER’S red apple (1999: 129-131) example (red pen being another often used one). Sweetser in her investigation of adjective-noun compounds also
draws our attention to the fact that even cases of red apple simplicity demand employment of a rather broad range of cognitive mechanisms. She puts forward the evident question: what exactly happens when a simple pairing of elements like red apple is produced? The same question arises in case of prefixations as well, with creative prefixations as the most poignant examples. In adjective-noun compounds, even red apple poses problems to a strictly compositional view, a somewhat more sophisticated example of Sweetser, namely likely candidate, clearly defies a compositional interpretation. The likely candidate example shows considerable resemblance with a creative prefixation: (34) non-candidate (ALGEO 1971: 94-95). Non-candidate has at least two interpretations: with non- in the privative sense it refers to a person who is not a candidate, especially for political office, though many people wish him to run for office.

“If only he would run.”
How many times have we heard that line? There is never a shortage of candidates for any particular office, especially for president. But there’s always that one person, man or woman, who would be the perfect candidate, the sure winner. If only they’d run.
Right now the focus of that attention is on Joe Biden. The vice president is wrestling with a decision over whether to enter the 2016 contest for the White House. He wants to be president. His two previous attempts, in 1988 and 2008, went nowhere. Now, after seven years as the loyal vice president, he would like nothing more than to succeed the man who picked him as his running mate, Barack Obama.”

However, non- has also developed a pejorative sense: “one who is a declared candidate but whose selection is so unlikely that he can be set aside as a possible contender”. ALGEO (1971: 95) assumes yet another possible interpretative frame for non- in non-candidate is “one who is not a professed candidate and who may officially deny his candidacy but who is nevertheless regarded as a candidate by many newsmen, politicians and possibly himself”, for example, Edward Kennedy in 1972 and Ronald Reagan in 1968. (Algeo terms this third type of usage as dissimulative non-: “possessing the value but not the surface characteristics or acknowledged identity of”.

The parallel is important for our topic from two aspects. First, the prefix non- seems capable of fulfilling an adjective-like role in prefixations, second, the very existence of such

a parallel questions the traditional bound+ grammatical affix view of prefixes. The examples contrast with the “building block” view of semantic compositionality: the building blocks themselves are meant to represent the “same rigid and stable semantic chunk” (SWEETSER 1999: 136). Instead, we have to think of words as representing complex meaning structures in differing contexts, with possible flexible alternations depending on the immediate surroundings (e.g. metonymic usage, deictic usage). Building blocks are not supposed to overlap in physical structures, meanings of constituents however, often do. Sweetser’s insights lead us to a closer examination of the all-pervasive Building-block metaphor. In any survey of combination, a formal morphological view would, as LANGACKER (1987: 452-457) points out, conceive of a composite word as components stacked together in an appropriate fashion. Such a view has several consequences. First, the building blocks themselves and consequently the segmentation process acquires importance (see the above example of unhappy). The essence of morphological analysis lies in the identification of the components of a structure. Second, a composite word as an objectified entity is viewed as a construction and as such, its assembly is carried out without taking into consideration the language user. As LAKOFF and JOHNSON (1980: 204) elaborate, the metaphor’s components serve as building blocks in the physical sense of the word, as objects standing in fixed relationships to one another33. Langacker (1987: 452-3) actually deducts the notion of compositionality as originating from two metaphors. The first one is the CONTAINER metaphor: the conceptualisation of linguistic expressions as containers, filled with meaning as a substance. The CONTAINER metaphor is closely related to the CONDUIT metaphor, a basic metaphor for the conceptualization of human communication. As the second metaphor for compositionality, Langacker identifies the above-mentioned BUILDING-BLOCK metaphor, specifically its object-centred characteristics: objects are well defined entities, standing in fixed relations to one another (hence their compositionality and meaning predictability). To illustrate the problem of full compositionality in our field, our previous unhappy example might shed light on some of the questions. As a basic, textbook example, unhappy should exemplify compositionality per se; however, the exact meaning of unhappy is not so easy to define. If we turn to a dictionary (LED), the following meanings are listed: 1. not happy

33 BOOD in his tellingly titled Grammar of Words (2005) explicitly states morphemes to be “the morphological building blocks of words” which are defined as the minimal linguistic units with lexical or grammatical meaning. In the same lines he states that morphology might be seen as morpheme syntax, which would equal a set of principles defining how to combine free and bound morphemes into well-formed words. As opposed to this syntagmatic approach, stands a paradigmatic approach, where word-formation is seen as the extension of a systematic pattern of form-meaning relationships (p. 9).
→sad: *If you are so unhappy, why don’t you change jobs?* 2. feeling worried or annoyed because you do not like what is happening in a particular situation: *Dennis is unhappy about having to work on a Saturday. We were all unhappy with the quality of the service.* 3. an unhappy remark, situation etc. is not suitable, lucky or desirable: *an unhappy coincidence.*

It is important to point out that even the first example sentence conveys a meaning of *unhappy* closer to dissatisfied, rather than sad. As it will be discussed in Chapter V, the *un* - prefix of *unhappy* does not refer to a contradictory meaning, much rather to a deviation from a certain state.

The building-block conception is and has been a major driving force in the general view of morphology. In fact, JENSEN (1990: 21) sees the essence of morphology in the exclusive division of words into morphemes. LANGACKER (2009) terms this supposed property as determinacy, by which it is deemed possible to give a definite and precise specification of the elements connected to one another as well as to the way they are connected. Langacker views determinacy as an ever-present background assumption, a “canonical situation” (p. 45), from which departures or deviations are deemed problematic. In the end, it is connected to a wider conception of language, namely the separate mental “module” view, where on the one hand syntax is autonomous; on the other hand, the treatment of semantics is delimited and fully compositional. Langacker suggests indeterminacy instead as the canonical situation, which does not mean a total exclusion of precise and determinate connections, but these cases seem to be the exception, not the rule. Vagueness or indeterminacy are much more common, consequently, grammar should be viewed as basically metonymic, which means “that the information explicitly provided by conventional means does not itself establish the precise connections apprehended by the speaker and hearer in using an expression” (p. 46). Langacker identifies three consequences of the unsustainability of the determinacy principle: grammar is not autonomous from semantics; semantics is neither well-delimited nor fully compositional; language draws on more general cognitive systems and capacities: the language system is not autonomous. In terms of meaning construction, a very similar notion to Langacker’s contested determinacy is termed by EVANS (2009, following RECANATI 2004) as “literalism”. Literalism stands for on the one hand a “principled division of labour” (p. 5) between semantics and pragmatics; on the other hand it assumes words and rules to be “ingredients” of language, where rules serve to conjoin “atomic” meaning elements. Evans also identifies the problem that word meanings are taken as fixed, stable as well as context-independent as the hallmark of all componential accounts.
Literalism is basically additive in nature where grammatical principles ensure the behaviour of semantic units.

The biggest flaw is the separation of context-independent (sentence) meaning from context-dependent (speaker) meaning.\textsuperscript{34} Langacker maintains that linguistic phenomena show partial rather than full compositionality: “Rather than \textit{constituting} a composite structure, the component structures \textit{correspond} to certain facets of it, offering some degree of motivation for expressing the composite conception in the manner chosen” (1999: 16, italics in the original). Therefore, a schema for a composite expression should be expressed as $C= [AB]$.

Analysability, on the other hand, is a distinct matter from compositionality (Langacker 1987: 459-62), as analysability refers to the ability of the speaker to identify the elements in a composite term by the separate components. The speaker is aware of the elements making up a composite structure. In our case it means, when confronting a prefixation, the speaker specifically ascribes two elements in a structure, e.g. \textit{un} + \textit{happy}, and this recognition of two elements is particularly valid for creative prefixations. Hamawand (2009: 44) identifies this phase as recognition, where the components the speaker encounters contribute to the semantic make-up of the composite structure. As opposed to the formal semantic view, this recognition enriches the interpretation of the composite expression. In fact, even according to traditional accounts, the bimorphemic make-up of prefixations is a prerequisite for a construction to be termed prefixation. It is actually this semantic analysability which accounts for the semantic diversity in the application of two different negative prefixes within essentially the same composite structure such as \textit{dissatisfied} vs. \textit{unsatisfied} (Hamawand 2009: 44). It is through the analysability of the two expressions, by the contribution of the component structures that we are able to identify the two expressions as non-synonymous.

3.2 The cognitive approach: the SCAFFOLDING conception

What a cognitive approach to grammar offers as a solution for the explanation of the semantic behaviour of composite structures is the so-called SCAFFOLDING conception (Langacker 1987: 461). The SCAFFOLDING metaphor actually refers to the process whereby

\textsuperscript{34} Evans (2009), in line with Langacker, states that compositionality is in fact a hallmark of human symbolic activities; therefore we do need an account of it, but within a cognitively plausible framework. For this purpose, he introduces his LCCM theory, where lexical concept integration comprises two component processes: lexical concept selection and fusion, whereby any given word provides a unique activation of part of its semantic potential (p. 75).
component structures are seen as scaffolding, which is erected for the construction of a complex expression. This suggests a two-step approach: first the complex structure is put in place, through which it is established as a unit, and then the scaffolding as such is no longer needed, and gets therefore discarded. Taking into consideration the previously mentioned characteristics of formal morphological approaches, the novelty and viability of the cognitive linguistic approach has three characteristics (Hamawand 2009: 91):

First: a composite word is not viewed as a construction made up of smaller components (as opposed to the starting point of the Building-block hypothesis). Instead, the motivating function of the component parts is emphasized, highlighting selected facets of their meaning. LANGACKER (1987: 452) actually suggests a two-phase activation process: first the word as a whole is activated, reflecting certain aspects of the composite value. Any prefixation is first activated as a unit; secondarily its component parts are activated. In case of negative prefixations, the prefix highlights opposition while the base highlights action, with the composite structure asserting priority over its component structures.

Second: in accordance with the general usage-based, process-oriented base of a cognitive approach, it is the language user who produces the above-mentioned construction. It is in this sense that we might view the component parts of a composite expression as mere scaffolding, meaning is a process, morphology is seen as a way of conceptual composition. It also has the consequence that a composite word is a coherent structure in its own right, and its meaning is not derivable from the meanings of its components, as the additive view holds.

Third: derivation should be viewed in terms of cognitive processes, predominantly in terms of categorisation, configuration and conceptualisation, paving the way for the different levels of creativity.
Chapter IV: Word-formation theories and the cognitive view. Unravelling the cognitive in word formation

In the following, certain aspects of word-formation will be dealt with within the cognitive linguistic perspective, by making references and drawing parallels with different word-formation models (including formal approaches), and by exemplifying how general cognitive abilities influence and refine the understanding of the cognitive functions of word-formation processes, with the primary focus being on prefixation. The treatment of un-prefixation in the different models (generative-, schema- and exemplar-based) serves as a starting point and context for prefixation in a cognitive approach: the relevance of schemas, part-whole relations and similarity relations are identified as decisive factors. Importantly, formal and cognitive approaches are not treated as incompatible in the field of word-formation. The modifier-head dichotomy is reflected upon by applying the notions of dependence and constituency. Finally, the cognitive/conceptual functions of prefixation are investigated (schemas, types of contrast and steps in the lexicalisation process).

4.1 Word-formation – different models

Within the extensive word-formation literature, word-formation processes are interpreted within different models. According to Hockett’s (1954) classification, three types of models can be distinguished: 1, the item-and-arrangement model, where patterns of word-formation are based on listing morphemes and describing “the arrangements in which they occur relative to each other in utterances”; (p. 212) 2, the item-and-process model, where the procedural aspects (and especially roots) are emphasized; 3, word-and-paradigm models, with the main emphasis on inflection rather than derivation. Reflecting upon Hockett’s models, but with a view to current theories, Schmid (2015: 11) lists four types of approaches. The first group entails rule-based models, with the most prominent representatives being generative approaches. The focus of attention here is placed on word-formation types and type-specific rules (rule schemas). Following the different stages of development within generative grammar, the models started out with phrase-structure rules, to be followed by X-bar theoretical principles, government-and-binding and principles-and-parameters approaches. They concentrate on structure, rather than other aspects (semantic or formal), with the aim of maximal generalisation in terms of statements, rules and predictions.

To place these views in the context of un-prefixation, a concrete example is presented for adjectival un-prefixation in Aronoff (1976: 63) as follows:

“Rule of negative un#

a. \([X]_{\text{Adj}} \rightarrow [\text{un#}[X]_{\text{Adj}}]_{\text{Adj}}\)

semantics (roughly) un#X=not X
b. Forms of the base

1. $X \text{en}$ (where $en$ is the marker for past participle)
2. $X \text{#ing}$
3. $X \text{able}$
4. $X + y$ (worthy)
5. $X + ly$ (seemly)
6. $X \text{#ful}$ (mindful)
7. $X \text{#like}$ (warlike)”

In: Aronoff (1976: 33), italics in the original.

The second group of models, schema-based models, also aim at generalizations. Instead of rules, however, they formulate constructional schemas. These are “schematic form-meaning pairings representing lexical and phrasal knowledge and sanctioning concrete uses of complex lexemes. While rules are essentially variable procedural instructions, schemas are unit-like elements containing variable slots” (Schmid 2015: 12, based on Booij 2010: 41-43). Consequently, schema-based approaches not only try to account for productivity and analysability, but – to some extent – creativity as well. Schemas have subordinated sub-schemas, which inherit information from superordinate schemas. In a striking difference in comparison with rule-based models, schema-based models present a holistic, non-modular approach to language, as well as being more compatible with usage-based approaches, where concrete usage events and frequencies of occurrence of certain elements are emphasized. This might have consequences for the evaluation of creative prefixations like unfriend or unfollow (see Chapter 6.2), thanks to their wide usage on social networking sites, having effects on existing schemas for prefixations.
The top-level schema represents the most general schema: neither the form, nor the meaning of the base are specified. Moving downwards, the sub-schemas fill in more and more specific information: in case of *un*-prefixation the sub-schemas are applicable not only to adjectives, but to verbs and nouns as well, in the end, even individual words are sanctioned by the schemas. Although the network presented in Schmid 2015 does not include verbs or nouns, they could be included, reflecting on potentiality as well.

The third group of models are the exemplar-based models (with the last two groups being more closely connected than the first two. Exemplar-based models (EDDINGTON 2004: 71-98, BYBEE 2010: 14-33) attempt to determine lexical knowledge/knowledge about word-formation processes on the basis of associative networks. These networks are dynamic in nature, being usage- and context based. Some exemplar-based approaches, however, deny the existence of schemas as symbolic representations, only accepting the existence of individual exemplars in specific usage events. Instead of rules or schemas then, the key role for motivation is attributed to analogies based on similarities.

The fourth group of models originate in an attempt to reconcile the characteristics of schema-based and exemplar-based models, hence the name: exemplar-cum-schema based models
(Bybee 2010). They postulate the existence of schemas but also highlight the importance of exemplar-based knowledge, trying to reconcile the formation of new complex lexemes on the basis of schemas and analogical formations as well. An exemplar-cum-schema network model identifies form-based clusters of exemplars, which serve as candidates for schemas. The clusters are defined on the basis of frequency of occurrence (in the example below, the frequency of occurrence refers to the British National Corpus).

![Diagram of exemplar-cum-schema based representation of adjectival un-prefixation](image)

In the cognitive view of word formation, some elements of all these groups of models can be found. Tuggy (2005: 233-265) sees the relevance of a cognitive approach in accounting for morphology first and foremost in schemas for several reasons:

1. They imply a bottom-up, rather than top-down structuring: generalization is achieved on the basis of specific examples. Therefore, a coexistence of structures at different levels exists, constituting schematicity, ensuring its central function.

2. A huge advantage of schemas is that instead of repeating certain forms (testified in Chapter 5), they “embody the commonality of the established (good) patterns, and are automatically activated in the mind” (p. 260)

3. Schemas allow for variety in terms of how well-entrenched a structure is in a speaker’s mind, as well as their level of being established or conventionalized.
4. Schemas and schematic networks allow for complexity: one structure may elaborate a number of schemas.

TAYLOR (2015: 145-158) identifies three basic relations in a cognitive approach to word-formation: one of them – in accordance with TUGGY (2005) – is the schema-instance relation. He further points out that the possibility itself by which we can analyse a structure into its component parts is necessarily constrained by a schema, sanctioning the analysis. This, however, is a two-way dynamism: the act of the analysis further strengthens the schema. When it comes to creatively combining units, two factors play a part: the availability of the combining units on the one hand and the entrenchment of a schema sanctioning the very possibility of the combination on the other. The other two basic relations are part-whole relations (facilitating the analysis of linguistic structures into their component parts, the process in which speakers on the basis of motivatedness recruit already established units to create higher level structures not yet entrenched in their mental grammar) and the similarity relation (facilitating the emergence of schemas by speakers perception of similarity between forms like e.g. *urbane*/urbanity or *insane*/insanity. Before further overview of the cognitive approach to word-formation, some formative elements of MARCHAND’S (1969) work have to be mentioned, as present-day treatments still define themselves in relation to his categories.

4.2 Marchand’s thematization: the determinatum–determinant relationship

MARCHAND (1969) still exerts formative influence in matters of word-formation, in fact, KASTOVSKY (2005: 99-124) identifies a number of linguists (including himself) as “Marchandeans”. What connects these Marchandeans is the adoption of a synchronic-diachronic approach, with three cornerstone assumptions:

1. It is the synchronic description, which has to be granted priority, the history of a pattern should only be investigated when a synchronic description has been provided for the patterns characterising a given synchronic system.

2. The above-mentioned synchronic description of word-formation patterns should be based on notions of motivation, analysability, pattern and productivity, involving the notion of syntagma (the determinatum – determinant relationship).

3. Within such a synchronic description of word-formation, the synchronic functions of systematic morphophonemic alternations call for a two-level treatment of word-formation:
a native and a non-native one, pointedly in a structural-functional sense. Thus, cultivate – cultivatable and educate – educatable are based on a native pattern, however, navigate – navigable and communicate – communicable are based on a non-native pattern (p. 102). Marchand’s all-pervading impact is exercised chiefly by way of a cornerstone organizing principle characterizing his work: the determinatum–determinant relationship. In his own words: “…a derivative is a syntagma consisting of a determinant and a determinatum, whether we have a compound (e.g. head-ache), a suffixal derivative (e.g. father-hood), or a prefixal derivative (e.g. un-do). Both parts are morphemes, i.e. signs based on a significate/significant relation.” In terms of prefixation, two prerequisites of consequence are involved in this approach. The first is the distinction “the determinatum represents the element whose range of applicability is limited by the determinant” (p. 11). As an elaboration of this statement – more directly applying to prefixation – is the assumption that prefixed formations must meet the criterion of opposability to their unprefixed bases as well as to other composites containing the same prefix (p. 3). Marchand therefore outlines a two-way dependency structure, related to which several formative distinctions/subcategorizations are prevalent within morphological literature. The first such topic stemming from Marchand’s differentiation is the modifier–head/affix–stem dichotomy, which has particular relevance from the point of view of prefixation (concerning both the process of prefixation and the resulting composite structure).

4.2.1 The modifier–head/affix–stem dichotomy

The determinant-determinatum relationship, where word-formation syntagmas are viewed as shortened grammatical constructions (MARCHAND 1969: 1-10) entails a modification content: the first element modifies the second. The approach based on the determinant-determinatum relationship focuses on semantic structure, selects the base to be the head, dominating the modifier both grammatically and semantically. It is true, though, that the notion of headedness was much later introduced, namely by WILLIAMS (1981), but as KASTOVSKY (2005) points out, the notion has been present among notions of American structuralism, that is, the distinction between endocentric constructions (consisting of a head and a modifier) and exocentric constructions (not containing a head). Marchand even postulated an opposition between Germanic and Romance languages, with the former ones being characterised by modifier-head sequence of word-formation syntagmas, whereas the
latter ones might also contain head-modifier sequences. This standpoint facilitates the statement that “prefixes can only act as modifiers and not as heads, i.e. in formations such as *defrost, discourage, encage, unsaddle*, despite the change of word-class involved, the prefix cannot act as head” (p.103).35

In a more recent, but still fundamentally descriptive categorisation attempt, HUDLESTON and PULLUM (2008: 284) define affixation as a process where a base is expanded by the addition of a prefix or suffix, which definition still reflects a somewhat simplified approach, with the main emphasis laid on structural considerations. The semantic aspects in their treatment are narrowed down to the potentially category-changing effects of prefixation, where *be-friend* and *re-open* are classified as category-preserving ones. As opposed to this view, as TUGGY (1992: 237-300) insightfully points out, within cognitive grammar the difference between stems and affixes is perceived as “gradual rather than dichotomous” (p. 237). This can be traced back to two basic characteristics of cognitive grammar: its treatment of parameters along which linguistic structures diverge as scalar/gradual, instead of a binary, plus-or-minus set of qualities. The other characteristic is of course its view of categorization, in the particular case of affix–stem distinctions the main emphasis being laid on the relationship between schematic structures and their elaborations (where schematicity is also a gradual parameter). This does not mean that cognitive grammar denies the validity of the affix/stem distinction; on the contrary, the distinction is accepted as valid. What a cognitive approach does question though, is whether it is possible to exactly characterize the two categories36. Further questions concern how they can be separated and how the numerous borderline cases are to be treated. Cognitive grammar does not exclude the possibility of multiple cross-classifications: affixes and stems are and can be treated as different classes, but many affixes might be “classed with certain stems and vice versa”. (p. 240). The affix–stem dichotomy is solved within cognitive grammar by the application of dependence versus autonomy difference, acting as a primary parameter characterizing affixes as dependent both semantically and phonologically, whereas stems are relatively autonomous.

35 However, where derivation is associated with a zero-determinatum (KASTOVSKY 1986) the prefix is allowed to act as a determinant. Furthermore, the prefix as head is suggested by LIEBER (1981) and WILLIAMS (1981) as well, questioning the general typological structure of the Germanic languages.

36 TUGGY (1992: 238) lists the following cases where the “clearly stem-like stem plus zero or more clearly affixal affixes” differentiation does not seem to hold valid concerning the typical structure of a word: bound stems, compounds, derivational affixes (being partly affixal, but also displaying stem-like character), cases in which two affix-like elements join each other without a stem, particles, allomorphs of stems and affixes which historically were clearly stems. He also emphasizes the viability of a cognitive approach, in accommodating the problematic cases as well, reflecting on their relatedness in terms of more typical stems and typical affixes.
TAYLOR (2010: 225-242) refers as “a disposition to combine” (p. 225) to the function of the degree of autonomy vs. dependence of a unit, where a dependent unit is generally in need to combine with other units to create a relatively autonomous structure. Taylor’s examples are relevant in proving how the autonomy versus dependence differentiation is more feasible from a semantic point of view: although above can hardly be conceptualized as a relation in and of itself, needing trajector and landmark entities to fill it with conceptual substance. Uncle, which in itself fully justifies being categorized as stem, as the concept [UNCLE] cannot be imagined without nephews or nieces, is therefore conceptually dependent (as opposed to perhaps e.g. [TABLE]). TUGGY (1992: 242) also refers to the autonomy versus dependence difference as a basic parameter within cognitive grammar, referring to the extent to which it is possible to conceive of a structure as independent of its syntagmatically linked partner. He uses the metaphor where dependent structures have holes, with their autonomous partners having spikes, filling the holes. These “holes” (p. 242) are called elaboration sites (e-sites), where the autonomous structures are compatible with the e-sites, adding specifications, and “filling the holes”, to follow Tuggy’s hole-and-spike metaphor. In cognitive grammar, symbolic dependence is focused upon, where both poles of a symbolic structure display dependence on the two poles of another. LANGACKER (1987: 300) deems such dependence to be possibly the most characteristic parameter of differentiation concerning affixes and stems (actually turning affixation into a morphological, not just a phonological or semantic phenomenon). In Langacker’s actual phrasing, if one structure (D) is dependent on the other (A) to the extent that A constitutes an elaboration of a salient substructure of D, where the “degree of salience of the e-site is the measure of how big a part of D the whole is” (TUGGY 1992: 243). Langacker’s definition 1, applies to both the semantic and phonological poles 2, is itself a matter of degree, being based on two scalar notions, elaboration and salience respectively.

The modifier–head/affix–stem relation raises questions of integration, which LANGACKER (1987: 277-327) addresses by introducing valence relations. LANGACKER (1988: 102) postulates that valence relations may exist between two predications if these predications overlap, that is, “some substructure within one corresponds to a substructure within the other and is construed as identical to it”. Langacker’s valence metaphor, where the valence of a unit X determines the combinatorial possibilities of the unit emphasizes the schematic entities in the structure of X, these can then be elaborated by other units. The obvious question within morphology concerns the identification of such valence relations. TAYLOR (2010: 291) also notes that the valence relations of a morpheme may considerably
restrict its usage potential. In case of the prefix un-, it can only attach to ‘reversible’ verbs. In fact he goes even further in identifying the ongoing processes designated by the verbs as involving attachment, enclosure or ‘bringing together’ of entities, with the examples *unwrap, unfold, untie, unfasten, undo, unroll, unpack, unscrew*. He does not accept *unopen, unwrite, uncook, unsay or unmail*, although mentions *undelete, uninstall* and *unsubscribe* as potential verbs stemming from computer technology, as the reversal of these processes is possible. It is then the semantics of un- which restricts the number of verbs beginning with un-. In spite of allowing for the prefix to be “quite productive” (p. 291), he does not seem to notice (along with *PLAG* (2003) and *ADAMS* (2001)) that the prefix in creative usage in fact displays extreme flexibility (with the stems becoming accessible for combinations with un-).

Besides dependence, the modifier–head dichotomy is a basic starting point in the treatment of composite structures. This dichotomy has two further interrelated concepts: correspondence and constituency. In the unfortunately somewhat neglected area of negative prefixation, *HAMAWAND’S* (2009: 39-40) work (as practically the only cognitively based work on English prefixation) insightfully contrasts traditional approaches with the cognitive treatment. He, too, tackles dependence as a decisive parameter. Dependence is related to the formal distinction of modifier vs. head in his treatment as well, namely, a valid integration of substructures is only possible if there is asymmetry in terms of autonomy and dependence. The base counts as a fully autonomous entity (as syntactic head) and the prefix represents the dependent substructure, which semantically is not a fully acceptable unit. A cognitive linguistic view – though far from unanimous – approaches the question of modifier – head/head – complement differently. Langacker (1999: 21) defines a modifier as a “…component substructure a salient substructure of which is elaborated by the head.” This is an asymmetric relationship, where the syntactic head (functioning as profile determinant) is assigned a subordinate role, which means that the syntactic and the semantic relations are contradictory. He also states that a complement serves as an autonomous substructure, elaborating a salient part in the profile determinant’s semantic structure. As the profile determinant can be equated with what is traditionally known as the head, his component definition is “…a component structure that elaborates a salient substructure of the head” (p. 80). In this case, however, the syntactic and semantic aspects are in the same direction. Some structures, however, might present both relations, further complicating matters. One such example is the case of *of*, which Langacker deems and proves to be “a consistently meaningful element whose grammatical behavior reflects its semantic value” (p. 90) In general, these notions are defined by the extent to which “one component structure
elaborates a salient substructure of the other” (p.81). Therefore, the status of complement and modifier are matters of degree and they are not incompatible.  

Hamawand (2009: 40-41) identifies an elaboration site for the prefix, where the base fills the hole: “The prefix has a hole called an elaboration site, or more briefly an e-site, and the base fills that hole.” (p. 40, italics in the original). The difference between the formal and the cognitive approach is that the cognitive model is based on conceptual dependence, while the formal model concentrates on category selection. Hamawand points out that the terms used in the formal model to describe autonomy and dependence as relations are heads and dependents. Consequently, “head” as category is autonomous within its phrase: it selects all its dependents. In comparison, Hamawand’s cognitive model views this phenomenon differently: it is possible for the head to rely on its dependents if they elaborate some structural aspect of it (in which he follows Langacker’s views). The emphasis here is on the two-way dependency: the complement elaborates an essential part within the structure of the head and – in parallel – the head elaborates some schematic aspect of the modifier.

Hamawand’s (2009) views are, however, not fully shared by e.g. Taylor (2010: 230-231, 234-235). Using Langacker’s terminology, he accepts that in a phrase such as on the table, [on] is the profile determinant of [on the table]; therefore, it corresponds relatively closely with the traditional notion of head. In Taylor’s view the head and the expression it heads designate the same entity, even though with differing degrees of specificity: the complement [the table] elaborates (gives additional conceptual substance to) an entity already present schematically in the semantic structure of the head. “Modifier”, as a term, comes up in a construction like the book on the table, where the book is the profile determinant, and on the table is a modifier. The modifier then provides additional – and optional – conceptual substance to the head. Taylor clarifies this state of affairs by stating that Cognitive Grammar does not take the head-complement and the head-modifier relations to be mutually exclusive, as it is possible for an expression to exemplify both (father of twins).

Concerning prefixation, Taylor (2010: 274) holds the view that prefixation on the whole does not affect the semantic type of the base; for example, happy and unhappy both profile a relation between a Trajector and an emotional state. Therefore, in case of prefixation by un- we cannot speak of a change in the adjectival status of happy. As opposed to Hamawand (2009), Taylor states: “There are no grounds, therefore, to claim that unhappy

---

37 I especially thank Péter Pelyvás for highlighting this difference to me (in addition to all his helpful remarks).
is headed by the prefix. Rather, we should probably want to analyse the prefix as a modifier” (p. 274). He admits though that verbal prefixes are more complex in their semantic effects. In the example of eat and overeat, it is possible to suppose that the prefix – in an adverb-like manner – modifies the base verb. Yet eat and overeat display different valence properties: it is possible to eat a meal but not to overeat it. Over renders the base intransitive, and in this regard, Taylor accepts the prefix to be the head of the complex verb. A similar case is present with the prefix out-, but in reverse: in the examples outrun and outperform it imposes a transitive profile, thanks to the prefix. In Taylor’s argumentation, this is again a sufficient reason to regard the prefix as head.

4.2.2 Correspondence

“Correspondence” refers to the idea that one of the prerequisites of forming composite structures is that the respective substructures should have some elements in common at the semantic – and possibly – phonological poles as well. In Hamawand’s (2009) example, insecure is made up of two component substructures: in- and secure, where in- makes a schematic reference to a base, which secure then elaborates. From a semantic point of view, “in- evokes the relation of distinction which corresponds to the relation profiled by secure” (p. 39, italics in the original). A possibly even more decisive parameter in the treatment of modifier-head relations is “determinacy”. In this case a prerequisite in the formation of a composite structure is that the substructures have to display asymmetry in terms of profile determinacy. The profile determinant counts as central in a construction as it decides its character. To draw a parallel with formal descriptions, the profile determinant is (to some extent) an equivalent of the head of such constructions, determining core meaning as well as the grammatical category of the whole construction. As opposed to possible expectations, Hamawand (2009: 39-40) makes here an interesting claim. Referring back to the example of insecure, he states that in insecure it is the prefix in- which lends its profile to the whole structure. Secure is the base, whose profile is overridden by that of the prefix. This also means that it is actually the negative prefix in- which serves as profile determinant. The big leap for Hamawand then is that while in a formal model and the head – complement relationship the head heads the phrase and determines core meaning, in a cognitive semantic

38 To exemplify the productivity of the pattern on the one hand, and the presence of a schematic pattern on the other, Taylor (2010: 274) mentions outBlair, which example is mentioned in connection with creating verbs from a noun base, further reinforcing out- as profiling a schematic transitive verb. However, it can possibly be treated as a creative prefixation as well: a politician might be said to outBlair Tony Blair if they testify to certain Blairian characteristics to an even larger extent than Blair himself. The creativity lies in the fact that it is left open for interpretation which specific characteristic we associate it with (though verboseness seems to be a very likely candidate).
framework he starts out from the phenomenon of profiling and “the features of the profile determinant are defined in semantic terms and relate to its schematic meaning, e.g. process or thing” (p. 40. italics in the original). In comparison, the head is a structural category; its features decide on grammatical category.

4.2.3 Constituency

The third level of parameters, constituency and constituent structure are decisive in the integration of composite structures. Constituency in a formal model is related to the “words and rules” approach, a category-based selective process deciding upon which parts are combined and in what order. In a cognitive approach, processing means a multiple-level organisation where meaningful symbolic units are organised into structures whose complexity progressively increases both semantically and phonologically (LANGACKER 1987, 1991; HAMAWAND 2009: 41). A constituent here is a composite structure we arrive at by integrating two or more components. It is the notion of constituency which inevitably raises questions of interpretation: compositionality (see Chapter 2) and analysability. As Langacker (1987: 457-460) puts it, analysability pertains to “the extent to which speakers are cognizant (at some level of processing) of the contribution that individual component structures make to the composite whole”. This awareness proves to be essential in the interpretation of creative prefixations (especially as novel expressions).

At this point – although the bound-morpheme-free morpheme differentiation is used and accepted in the cognitive framework– a pivotal difference emerges: in a cognitive linguistic approach in case of word-formation we are dealing with semantic extension instead of a (possibly new) semantic structure. As UNGERER (2007: 652-653) elaborates, we can make parallels between the treatment of additional meanings of simplex lexical items and word-formation items. Both encode extensions which are based on category judgments, from the viewpoint of a profiled linguistic unit. The only difference lies then in the fact that in case of word-formation, we are dealing with additional meaningful components, whether they are lexical items or affixes. The parallels mentioned are not simply a matter of structure in the above-mentioned, conventional sense, but they also include “the semantic adjustment of the components and the addition of conceptual content in the composite item” (p. 653).

4.3. The cognitive and the structuralist views: coexistence and interdependence

The need to discuss the relationship between structuralist categories and their re-application/re-invention with a cognitive view is a second consequence of the all-pervading impact of MARCHAND’S (1969) work. As ONYSKO & MICHEL (2010: 5-12) clarify, treating the structuralist and the cognitive view of word-formation as two totally opposing systems
is a false approach. Generativist and structuralist linguistic terminology depicts language on the one hand in terms of rigid categories with discrete elements (on categorisation see chapter 2), on the other hand a basically rule-based approach is followed, clearly stating what is acceptable and what is not\(^{39}\). However, it is very important to stress that the structuralist and the cognitive views concerning the architecture of words “are not incompatible” (ONYSKO & MICHEL 2010: 5), as both perspectives focus on regularities in language, even though they differ in their vision of how the mind encapsulates them and – consequently – they describe the processes using different terminology. In order to facilitate interpretations of creative prefixations the aim of this thesis is to ground structuralist categories in cognitive processes, like schematicity and different types of conceptual combination. The difference of this new level of the cognitive approach is on the one hand the way it metaphorizes language (namely as holistic, non-modular and emergent); on the other, the constructionist position of the cognitive view holds as a decisive criterion that the end results of word-formation processes emerge as conceptual units.

Comparing and contrasting the cognitivist and structuralist analyses, METTINGER (1994) – in line with ONYSKO & MICHEL (2010), who do not deem a structural approach and a cognitive view incompatible concerning the internal structure of words – also finds certain results of the two approaches similar. The primary differences are in the field of expectations: where the structuralist and the descriptive word-formation perspective aims at establishing stable and possibly context-independent properties of the respective linguistic units relying on a bottom-up and paradigmatic approach, relying on (strict) compositionality, the cognitive viewpoint is concerned with the experiential nature of language, attaching prime importance to the role of the language-user, a top-down method and a syntagmatic aspect through the introduction of a trajector–landmark conceptual approach.

### 4.4 Unravelling the cognitive in word-formation – the cognitive functions of prefixation

As Cognitive Linguistics has proved to supply acceptable and valid accounts of language research in different areas, it can influence and “reform” word-formation analysis as well. UNGERER (2007) emphasizes the potential in cognitive linguistics to provide theoretical

\(^{39}\) A unifying basic principle connecting all these works is the presumption that word-formation is basically rule-governed. This is what BAUER (1983: 293) states as well, admitting though that these rules are rather complex and far from obvious. Within the same vein, PLAG (2003: 47-51) also emphasizes the inherent rule-governance within word-formation, yet implies a cognitive perspective on processes of word-formation in word storage and productivity.
background as well as the empirical tools for “the semanticization of word-formation analysis” (p. 651). The cornerstone aspect is the centrality of meaning (LANGACKER 1987: 12), therefore, all aspects of word-formation are treated as meaningful. This entails 1, the concepts which are expressed by word-formation items 2, their constituents 3, the underlying structural patterns (with the possible restrictions) and 4, the processual aspects of word-formation as well. From the point of view of a cognitive analysis of lexical concepts, different empirical tools have been developed: schemas, prototypes, and radial categories, metonymic and metaphorical extensions and blends. What is especially decisive for the treatment of creative prefixations is that linguistic processes have come to be described in terms of conceptual fusion. At this point, Ungerer seems to argue on a more positive note than LAMPERT and LAMPERT (2010), who agree with his ideas in deeming the framework of Cognitive Linguistics valid in and capable of investigating word-internal structuring, state, however, that “while using the well-known cognitive linguistic tool and concept repertoire, researchers must be aware of the fact that these were not specifically developed for studies in word-formation” (p. 31).

One of the specifics of a cognitive viewpoint is present in its view of the lexicalisation process: as a cognitive linguistic viewpoint focuses on how expressions acquire the status of a concept (or a cognitive category), SCHMID (2011: 70-83) connects the lexicalisation process to a “stored association in the memory of the individual speaker between one form and one conceptual complex” (p. 74, bold in the original). Such an associative link is formed and enhanced by the speaker’s encyclopaedic and cultural knowledge concerning objects, notions and states-of-affairs, resulting in the entrenchment of cognitive categories. To elucidate the processual aspects of concept formation, Schmid refers to a phrase originally used by the Russian psychologist VYGOTSKY (1962): the pseudo-concept, which describes a phrase in ontological development. Pseudo-concepts have two basic properties: on the one hand, the initial word-elements cannot yet be recalled as a whole, on the other, the hearer must somehow arrive at the content of the expression. Schmid refers to this process as computation (through the analysis of the individual word elements), which might be valid for some cases of prefixations (for example: bilingual) but in creative prefixations computation simply does not suffice for arriving at conceptual content: metonymy, metaphor and blending processes are also involved. Processwise, when a complex lexeme is consolidated in terms of its conceptual status, the components of the pseudo-concept merge into an integral concept, therefore 1, the associative link (arrived at through a number of
cognitive operations) is entrenched in language users’ minds, the individual conceptual contributions gradually fade. In this way a conceptual gestalt is formed, a unit whose meaning as a whole necessarily surpasses the sum of its constituting components. As opposed to this possible oversimplification of the issue by reducing processes to computation, Schmid is right to point out that the linguistic causes of lexicalization are the mirror image of the cultural ones, since changes in meaning might be facilitated by a number of processes: extension, narrowing, shift of meaning, processes which affect all words, not only complex lexemes (nice, for example, in Jane Austen’s time used to have the specific meaning ‘fine’ (LEISI 1985: 134); or holiday, stemming from Holy day, which underwent semantic extension and phonological lexicalisation parallelly).

In terms of a general cognitive perspective, three central features characterize cognitive approaches to the classification of word-formation processes (SCHMID 2011, UNGERER 2002, 2007; TUGGY 2005, ONYSKO and MICHEL 2010). The first feature is an interest in the effects of word-formation processes on conceptualization and concept formation (Schmid 2011: 93). This emphasis on conceptualization results in a distinction separating word-formation patterns combining several concepts (structured possibly to a higher or lesser degree), that is: compounding, prefixation and blending; and word-formation patterns whose main function is the re-categorization of conceptual content in terms of conceptual types: suffixation and conversion, respectively.

A second feature is that word-formation patterns are not treated as strictly separated categories based on categorical features and rules, but rather as a variable, flexible and dynamic continuum. Such a flexible view originates in schemas (recurrent as a formative notion in word-formation). Linguistic schemas are stored on different levels of abstraction, making a transition possible between e.g. prefixation and compounding.

A third feature concerns our acquisition of these schemas. Children learning language acquire schemas, which are cognitive representations “consisting of perceived similarities across many instances of usage... routinized, or cognitively entrenched patterns of experience” (KEMMER 2003: 78). Schema formation does not exclusively happen in childhood, in fact, creative prefixations, e.g. the group created for the needs of computer technology and social networking sites (undownloading, undelete, unfriend, unlike) are all

---

40 It is this respect, in which cognitive linguists (UNGERER 2002: 536, SCHMID 2011: 93) admittedly share a point of view with onomasiological approaches (ŠTEKAUER 1998, 2000), the latter proposing a comprehensive system of “onomasiological theory”, tackling word-formation processes on five levels: conceptual, semantic, onomasiological, onomatological and phonological.
very much evoking schema-forming abilities. Naturally, not only creative prefixations can be mentioned here: the very productive suffixation patterns with –\textit{aholic}, –\textit{gate} or –\textit{burger}; or the equally prolific first elements with –\textit{sexual} as second element (\textit{metro-}, \textit{retro-}, \textit{lumber-} and so on) are all exemplifying this point.

As discussed in Chapter 2, prefixation has largely been viewed as a word-formation process of relatively marginal importance (in comparison with noun-noun compounding or suffixation) and being much more representative of written (possibly formal/scientific) than of spoken language. It is indeed true that prefixation presently does not belong to the highest profile research areas even within a cognitive linguistic framework. Still, it is within this framework that the specific cognitive functions of prefixation came to be discussed at all. Together with \textsc{Schmid} (2011: 160-162) and \textsc{Ungerer} (2002: 554-556) the question has to be asked: what are the cognitive functions behind the existence of prefixation, and what use do speakers of English make of the existence of this word-formation pattern? On the basis of frequency of occurrence – importantly – one basic function of prefixation can be identified by all formal and semantic variants: the profiling of a contrast, namely to express the concept “different from X” (p. 160). The ability to perceive contrast and difference is described by \textsc{Langacker} (1987: 101) as a fundamental cognitive ability: conscious and unconscious allocation of attention is a central aspect of the human cognitive system (even babies direct their attention to changes of states, be it sound, movement or tactile perception). What it translates to in terms of prefixation is that its function is “to encode contrasts by lexical, rather than grammatical, means” (p. 160). Not surprisingly, Schmid’s corpus-based investigations identify negative prefixes as the strongest evidence for this function: \textit{un-} and \textit{in-} both have the “not X” meaning, this, however, does not only cover possible binary contrasts\footnote{\textsc{Schmid} (2010: 160) mentions \textit{even vs. uneven} numbers as primary examples of binary contrast. \textsc{Horn} (2002: 10), on the other hand, categorically rejects \textit{uneven numbers}, only accepting \textit{odd numbers} for the concept and allowing \textit{uneven} to be used with surfaces, \textit{odd} with numbers.} (which are very limited in number), but scalar ones as well, like the previously discussed \textit{happy–unhappy} pair. The scalar contrasts are paraphrased by \textsc{Mettinger} (1994: 21) as “other than X”. Profiling such contrasts expresses a specific interpretation of the basic figure/ground distinction, and the “different from X” notion of contrast takes different forms depending on the semantic specification of the prefix. As \textsc{Ungerer} (2007: 659, based on \textsc{Schmid} 2005: 162-65) summarizes, it is possible to list prefixes according to the type of contrast that they express:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{un-} and \textit{in-} both have the “not X” meaning, this, however, does not only cover possible binary contrasts\footnote{\textsc{Schmid} (2010: 160) mentions \textit{even vs. uneven} numbers as primary examples of binary contrast. \textsc{Horn} (2002: 10), on the other hand, categorically rejects \textit{uneven numbers}, only accepting \textit{odd numbers} for the concept and allowing \textit{uneven} to be used with surfaces, \textit{odd} with numbers.} (which are very limited in number), but scalar ones as well, like the previously discussed \textit{happy–unhappy} pair. The scalar contrasts are paraphrased by \textsc{Mettinger} (1994: 21) as “other than X”. Profiling such contrasts expresses a specific interpretation of the basic figure/ground distinction, and the “different from X” notion of contrast takes different forms depending on the semantic specification of the prefix. As \textsc{Ungerer} (2007: 659, based on \textsc{Schmid} 2005: 162-65) summarizes, it is possible to list prefixes according to the type of contrast that they express:
\end{itemize}
Prefixes and types of contrast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Type of contrast based on figure/ground distinction</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative prefixes</td>
<td>different from X</td>
<td>unhappy, uneven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un- in-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversative prefixes</td>
<td>different direction from</td>
<td>unwrap, disappear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un- dis-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative prefixes</td>
<td>not outside, but inside X</td>
<td>extracellular, intramural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extra- intra-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal prefixes</td>
<td>not during, but before or after X; X again, in contrast to expectation</td>
<td>pre-war, post-war, rebuild, reopen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre- post- re-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefixes of quantity</td>
<td>more than the norm for X</td>
<td>ultraright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(degree and number)</td>
<td>less than the norm for X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ultra- sub- super-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefixes of attitude</td>
<td>pro X, not anti X, etc.</td>
<td>pro-Palestinian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro- contra- counter-</td>
<td></td>
<td>counterproductive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4 Prefixes and types of contrast

The remaining prefixes (other than negative prefixes) which do not explicitly express an opposition or a contrast can still be classified according to four basic conceptual categories: SPACE for locative prefixes, TIME for temporal prefixes, QUANTITY (for prefixes denoting degree and number prefixes) and ATTITUDE. In Schmid’s argumentation, these categories

42 By comparison, ANDREOU (2015) in his investigation of lexical negation in the lexical semantics of in- and dis- differentiates between six basic types of negativity: privative (disanalogy), contrary (dishonest), contradictory (disengaged), standard negative (disagree), reversative (disconnect) and pejorative (dishear). This distinction is based on Lieber’s (2004) formal framework of lexical semantics, where affixes are proposed to have a skeleton and their semantic contribution can be accounted for by the same semantic features that are
have such decisive cognitive importance that they are all encoded by closed classes and grammatical categories as well.\textsuperscript{43} On this basis it is possible to identify the concept “different” being involved in the above-mentioned categories as well. The notion of contrast is further reinforced by the existence of semantic opposition, too: \textit{extra}- vs. \textit{intra}-; \textit{intra}- vs. \textit{inter}--; \textit{sub}- vs. \textit{super}--; \textit{pre}- vs. \textit{post}-. Even attitude is not an exception for creating some sort of contrast in terms of prefixation: \textit{pro-abortion} vs. \textit{anti-abortion}.

Further arguments to support the claim that the main function of prefixation is to profile contrast are pattern-specific gaps in productivity (also identified as rule-breaking/rule-bending characteristics). At this point, the examples of creative prefixations – even if they do not contradict argumentations concerning these pattern-specific gaps in productivity – certainly pose a counter-argument. SCHMID (2010) and UNGERER (2007) both agree that prefixed verbs mostly occur with verbs of the accomplishment type, consequently the reason why stative verbs (\textit{unlive}, \textit{unsit}) or nonconclusive durative verbs (\textit{unsleep}, \textit{unplay}) do not serve as basis for prefixation is that they do not have any “natural” contrasts.

What creative \textit{un}-verb prefixations exemplify is that by a shifting of frames, \textit{un}-verb prefixations surpass this type of natural–non-natural contrast. The statement that concrete objects are not suitable bases for prefixations is also a widely accepted view, since “they do not have any obvious opposites” (Schmid 2010: 161). As the conceptual structures of nouns are deemed more complex than for example adjectives (with one-dimensional conceptual structure, for a discussion of colour concepts with regard to creative \textit{un}-adjective prefixations: chapter 6.4). Schmid states that we find a question like “What is the opposite of \textit{big}?” easy to answer, whereas a question “What is the opposite of \textit{tree}?” would pose insurmountable difficulties. Schmid is not entirely right in this point: when he formulates the questions with “opposite”, the problem is narrowed down. In the original “contrast” sense, it is indeed possible to answer his question: the opposite of \textit{tree} is an \textit{untree}, in the meaning of 1, bonsai 2, Christmas \textit{untrees} are actually tree-shaped decorations of all kinds, either in three-dimensional form on metal spirals or in two-dimensional form, fitted into window-frames. In the same lines, stating that \textit{rich} immediately evokes \textit{poor}, but \textit{money} does not have a comparable counterpart is again a slight oversimplification, as \textit{money} as a

\textsuperscript{43}SPACE: by prepositions and the system of deixis; TIME: by prepositions and the category of tense; QUANTITY: by the singular/plural differentiation of the number system; ATTITUDE: by modal verbs.
noun might not have a negated counterpart, but as a concept it can have numerous counterparts in the oppositional sense: e.g. electronic payment, bartered items and so on. The same problem arises when gender-specific nouns are treated within the system of binary opposition, as the antonyms are already institutionalized as simplexes: man-woman, boy-girl, and father-mother. As in several other cases before, exceptions do exist, widening the binary conceptual setup: unwoman has been attested, just as unmotherly feelings.

SCHMID (2011: 162) on the other hand is perfectly right to point out that prefixation does have certain cognitive advantages compared with the very similar contrasts that can be expressed by means of adjectival, adverbial or prepositional phrases. The examples pre-war and before the war, unhappy and not happy, re-educate and educate again are distinctly different, hence the need for prefixations. Several factors play a part here, first of all the potential syntactic simplification as well as condensation. When pre-war years are mentioned (as distinct from the years before the war) we are able to formulate a concept, as Schmid puts it: “a state of affairs is moulded into a concept; an idea is entrenched and can be stored in the mental lexicon.” (p. 162). Pre-war years entails more than a specification of the concrete years preceding the war, it refers to an atmosphere, a continual change in the political climate: factors which make those years specific in relation to the war (and many other notions at the same time). With the much-quoted happy-unhappy pair, unhappy stands closer to the “opposite of happy”, importantly, leaving a wider range of options in language users’ determination of what opposite entails. Once entrenched, prefixations have the cognitive advantage of only having to be recalled from the mental lexicon where they are stored, as opposed to syntactic groups, even though prefixation on the whole might be typically less lexicalised than e.g. compounds, yet they are institutionalized as words and entrenched as concepts.

Creative prefixations make use of these potentials of prefixation to its fullest: by presenting a continuum, they have the common denominator of concept-formation, surpassing the simplified “conceptual specification” function traditionally associated with prefixation. What is true in the case of compounding, namely that most new conceptualizations add additional conceptual material to the source concept, is true for creative prefixations as well: in UNGERER’S (2002: 557) phrasing, it results in a so-called “floating concept”, where the conceptual substance is clarified through the context (and later possibly stabilized through lexicalisation).
Chapter V – The prefix *un*-

The chapter provides an overview concerning several aspects of the usage of *un*-. A short historical introduction is followed by some basic categorisation attempts, based on the work of Marchand (1969), Adams (2001), Katamba (1993) and Plag (2003), with special emphasis on previous research into the combinatorial possibilities of prefix and base, as well as rule-breaking/rule-bending characteristics of creative composites. The differing viewpoints with respect to combinatorial possibilities have raised the question within the literature whether there is one *un*- prefix or there are several *un*- prefixes, which problem can be convincingly solved within a cognitive linguistic framework. The semantic basis for prefix competition (composite structures with the same base but differing prefixes are explained with the concepts of domain and construal, resulting in further refining of conceptualization processes.

5.1 *Un*- prefixation: Background and past approaches

The prefix *un*- belongs to the most productive prefixes of present-day English. According to the Oxford English Dictionary (*OED*), it generally “expresses negation” or a “reversal or deprivation”. It has been very widely used in English (similarly to other Germanic languages); therefore it is a negative prefix that can be used with the greatest liberty in new formations (which might be a reason for the competition between the prefixes *un*- and *in-/la*- respectively, see Marchand (1969: 89); and their etymological relatedness, see Adams (2001: 42)). In Old English, the prefix was widely applied with a “purely negative force” (ibid.) to several parts of speech, yielding ca. 1250 recorded *un*- forms. Nevertheless, only an eighth of these survived beyond Old English. In spite of this drastic decrease, *un*- is still an exception, considering that a whole class of prefixes vanishes in English (Bauer 2003: 35). According to The Cambridge History of the English Language (1992), prefixation as a means of word-formation was already retreating during the Middle English period. However, some of those old English prefixes which remained productive were sometimes bound to change their significance and the rules by which they combined. *Un*-, for example, had three functions in Old English: it expressed the antithesis of the base morph with nouns and adjectives; it gave pejorative associations; or it simply added intensity. The latter two functions were nevertheless lost by the Middle English period. On the other hand,

---

44 As Diemer (2013: 24-39) elaborates, the disappearance of prefixes is usually accounted for by three different hypotheses: syntactical change: the ME transition to SVO word order; lexical change and competition: the early ME rise of the phrasal verb; and semantic change, where the parallel processes of lexicalization and grammaticalization of particle and verb result in preference for prepositional and phrasal verbs. However, he postulates further possible reasons behind the process, among others, an increasing competition of prefix position and postverbal position, decreasing prefix use due to changes in the morphosyntactic system, semantic reanalysis, reduplication and diglossia.
combinations with verbal bases became more common, and the prefix developed a reveresative sense, which was previously connected with the prefixes ond- and on- in Old English (pp. 446-47)

This fact in itself calls for its proper analysis; nevertheless, what makes the prefix even more intriguing is that it exemplifies and illustrates numerous categorisation problems, including combinatorial irregularities. MARCHAND (1969: 150–2) discusses the prefix under two headings: as in the type unfair and in the type unbind, partly because of historical reasons, partly because of the verb versus adjective differentiation. Besides stating that it is a nominal prefix with the basic meaning “not”, he also observes that it can combine with simple adjectives of a native basis (such as uneven or un-British), as well as with adjectives of a foreign origin (e.g., unable or uncertain). Besides simple adjectives, derived adjectives – including denominal derivatives and deverbal derivatives – can also take the prefix un- (e.g., unprecedented or unadvisable, respectively). Marchand makes note of the numerous synthetic formations that do not have unprefixed counterparts (e.g., unassuming, unbending or even untiring). Without dwelling on the specific semantic correlations, he states that tiring is not the opposite of untiring. There are also certain adjectives which do not take the un-prefix: good, bad, broad, narrow, strong, weak, deep, shallow.45 These adjectives stand for primary qualities which are not expressed by relational words. Consequently, ungood would imply that the speaker saw bad as the contradictory opposite of good, when in fact the words expressing the respective notions are coined as individual, non-relational words. In the case of adjectives which denote the absence of something (e.g., bad, naked, foolish), there are no contradictory opposites. As for the unbind type of un-prefix (corresponding with the German ent-prefix), it has the meaning of “opposite”, and it reverses the result of the action expressed by the simple verb. Consequently, ungood would imply that the speaker saw bad as the contradictory opposite of good, when in fact the words expressing the respective notions are coined as individual, non-relational words. In the case of adjectives which denote the absence of something (e.g., bad, naked, foolish), there are no contradictory opposites. As for the unbind type of un-prefix (corresponding with the German ent-prefix), it has the meaning of “opposite”, and it reverses the result of the action expressed by the simple verb. Consequently, almost all prefixed un- verbs are transitive or transitively used, although the grammatical object is not explicitly expressed, only implied: uncoil, undress and unmarry are his examples, unfortunately without commenting the semantic differences between undress and unmarry, other than they have a zero object. With denominal un- verbs (e.g., uncage or uncork), the implication is “to remove, release from, and deprive of the character or quality” (p. 154) and a third subcategory implies “deprive of the character or quality of…” (p.154): unvoice, unsin, unround. Linked to this category are

45 Adams (2001: 46–7) also makes note of the blockage of certain possible un-forms by simple forms, emphasizing the typical restrictions on the use of one or the other member of a pair. In this sense, unclean would be the antonym of clean only in a very limited sense. This is the point where nonce formations enter, as they are formed with “normally blocked bases: “An unyoung ‘youth’ leader” (Adams 2001: 47).
verbs with personal references, in privative meaning: *unking, unbrother, unchild*, referring to a deprivation in character, status or quality, even though they are not in common use anymore. In sum, Marchand treats *un* in the framework of two different types (based on historical reasons), but within a single category, without dealing with the possible implications of polysemy.

**Katamba** (1993: 78) also states that in case of two adjectives with opposite meanings, the negative prefix *un-* attaches to the positive adjective, as in the case of *unwell, unloved, unhappy, unwise, unclean* or *unoptimistic*. As it has been noted above, however, the extent to which these derivatives are antonyms of the original, positively evaluated stems is often questionable. Katamba’s point concerns markedness: if there are words representing the two poles of the same semantic dimension, there is a tendency to treat the positive end as the unmarked one, and to derive the marked and less favourable meaning by prefixing the negative prefix to a positive base. As **Anwar** (1996: 3–17) points out, Katamba’s (1993) reasoning postulates that pairs of adjectives may be characterized as either positive or negative, a statement Anwar deems to be an oversimplification of the issue.46 He considers markedness to be “more than binary” (p. 4), as in his opinion markedness as a semantic feature tends to be “accumulative” (ibid.) in nature and it also draws on features that appear at different levels of the grammar. As on several occasions previously, many of the questions raised by the authors are actually questions of rule governance: the effort to delineate “correct” and “deviant” usage. Investigating this approach, however, does make sense, as it redirects our attention to the possible differences in the treatment of concept formation. **Plag** (2003: 30-35) actually invites us to find the rule, the word-formation rule, with the aim to cover the possibilities of *un-* being attached to another morpheme. In the light of the examples in 1.3, it is interesting to observe which pairings are deemed unacceptable. He creates four categories, on each of which *un*-prefixation is attempted: 1, *table/car/pillow* → *untable/uncar/unpillow*; 2, *available/broken/aware* → *unavailable/unbroken/unaware*; 3, (to) *sing/ walk/ tell* → (to) *unsing/ unwalk/ untell*; 4, *post-mega-/izel-ness* → *unpost/ unmega/ unize/ unness*. He concludes that only the morphemes of the second group can take *un-* , while group 1, 3 and 4 cannot, on the basis of which it is possible to generalize the (rather exclusive) rule: *un-* attaches to adjectives, but not to nouns, verbs or

---

46 **Anwar** (1996: 3) cites Katamba as claiming *un-* to be attached to the negative member of the pair. This is, nevertheless, not true, as **Katamba** (1993: 79) pointedly states exactly the opposite (i.e., the negative prefix is attached to the positive base).
bound morphemes. Thus we arrive at a generalization rather similar to that of Matthews (1979), with the word-formation rule being:

Phonologically: \(/\text{an} / X\)
Semantically: ‘not X’
Base: X = adjective

While most un-derivatives follow this rule, Plag admits to the existence of a number of words going against it. As for nouns he mentions unbelief, unease and untruth (with the meaning “lack of”, slightly different from the rule’s “not”; as for verbs he lists undo, unfold, undress, unmask, unearth, unsaddle, unplug. He deems the number of such nouns to be quite small, so “it is hard to tell whether this group consists of really idiosyncratic exceptions or is systematic in nature” (p. 31). The examples listed are all abstract nouns; however, applying this hypothetical semantic leap to possible formations like unidea, unthought or uninformation are treated as minimally very questionable, therefore he does not accept these forms. Verbs, by their sheer number, cause understandably more of a headache: “the overall number of pertinent derivatives is quite large. It seems that it is even possible to create new forms” (p. 32). The OED examples only from the 20th century are unditch, unquote, unscramble, unspool, unstack, unzip, where the deviation from the rule is on the one hand in terms of part of speech of the base, on the other hand it is in terms of meaning. Similarly to the cases with nouns, instead of the meaning “not”, the characteristics of the verbs is that they denote reversal or deprivation. Taken these findings into consideration, Plag distinguishes between three un- prefixes, mainly to solve the problem of the semantically deviant cases: 1, de-adjectival “not”; 2, denominal “lack of”; 3, deverbal reversative or privative meaning. He also detects a fourth possible category, a meaning extension “not having the proper characteristics of X” (p. 101), (similarly to uses of anti- and non-): uncelebrated, unevent and un-Hollywood are mentioned, but not in the least elaborated. This leads us to a favoured topic concerning un-prefixation: how many un-prefixes does English actually have?
5.2. Un-prefix or un-prefixes?

The literature on the prefix un- (in particular MARCHAND 1969, PLAG 2003, MAYNOR 1979, and ANDREWS 1986) is rather divided concerning the question whether there is one un-prefix, or two un-prefixes, or possibly several homophonous prefixes. This distinction begins with Marchand’s above-mentioned unbind (v.) versus unfair (adj.) differentiation, and is further reinforced by the fact – as Maynor rightly points out – that in most dictionaries two headings are given for un-: one usually as a prefix meaning “not”, second, as a prefix to form verbs either as a reversal of some action or state, or removal/deprivation. Maynor, however, attaches the difference between unlikely and undress to the base of the words and not the prefix. In her view, in both uses of un- a reversal is involved, and whether it is a reversal of a condition (unlikely vs. likely) or an action (undress vs. dress) is of secondary importance. Un- is seen as a morpheme indicating oppositeness. She does concede though to a possible etymological difference: according to the OED, the Gothic forms were un- for negation and ana- for reversal, similarly with the respective un- and ant- or int- of Old High German. Maynor consequently argues for un- as a single morpheme, the potentially perceived differences in meaning being entirely a consequence of the different environments. The same un-as-a-single-morpheme view is represented by ANDREWS (1986), even though she concentrates on verbal un-forms (among which she only accepts verbs denoting reversible actions: untie, unbelt, unhook, unnerve are accepted, unread, unkill, unwork are pointedly not). She formulates a general, invariant meaning for un- as a verbal prefix in the following: it is a “cancellation of the original state such that minimal change occurs – a simple reversal” (p. 228).

The single-morpheme-view is, however, debated by THOMAS (1983: 80) based on a transformational test: a negative prefix combining with not to form a double negative in a statement should in principle be equivalent to the corresponding affirmation. According to Thomas, even if adjectives might pass this test (not unlikely being substitutable for likely: the event was not unlikely ≈ the event was likely47), verbs prefixed with un- fail this test: He did not untie the rope could never be substituted for He tied the rope (He did not undress himself ≠ He dressed himself). This leads Thomas to conclude that with untie or undress we

47 This type of substitution is highly problematic: not unlikely exists with a reason, expressing less probability than likely. THOMAS (1983) actually provides another example with another prefix, dis-, stating that according to the transformational test He did not disobey the order could be substituted for He obeyed the order. It is highly questionable though that someone who “did not disobey” a given order would actually obey it.
can only speak of a reversive un- (not a double negative with “not”), which is further reinforced by its use as an intensive prefix, as opposed to the negative un-.

Plank (1985: 55-57) also notes that the general view differentiates between a negative and a privative/reversative (e.g. unsaddle, unhead, unbishop and unlock, unlearn, unmake, respectively), but states that the “results” of the un-prefixations speak against the postulation of different word-formation rules and different but “accidentally” homophone prefixes.

5.3 Lexical network of prefix meanings

A cognitive linguistic approach to the semantics of negative prefixes bridges this homonymy/polysemy/antonymy problem, as proposed and elaborated by Hamawand (2009). By placing negative prefixes in the framework of prototype theory, he contrasts the concept of negative prefixation with 1, the classical theory of categorisation (clearly defined boundaries, clear-cut category membership), 2, the homonymy position, whose basic idea is that different meanings attached to a lexical item are entirely accidental (which view on the one hand denies systematicity in the relationship between the different meanings of an item, and on the other hand ignores the highly structured nature of lexical organisation, see Evans (2003: 87-8)) and 3, the monosemy position (Ruhl 1989; Pustejovsky 1995), according to which a lexical form pairs with a single sense. Hamawand’s treatment of negative prefixation extends Rosch’s (1978) prototype theory to morphology, stating that the concept of prototypes is formative for the analysis of any given negative prefix, as it is extremely useful “in resolving questions concerning the emergence of multiple senses, their extensions and the relatedness among them” (p.55). In this view he sides with Langacker (1987: 416, 1991: 35), who writes about a variety of interrelated senses concerning frequently used morphemes or lexical items. Based on these theoretical considerations, Hamawand offers a treatment of negative prefixation which helps solve the problems raised by the above-mentioned approaches concerning for example the prefix un-. He argues that a negative prefix “forms a category having a prototype, with the other senses gathering around it on the basis of semantic similarity” (p. 56). A negative prefix then is made up of distinct senses which are related to one another systematically, making up a network of senses. The different senses are gathered around a central, prototypical sense; this sense occurs most frequently and this sense has the most potential to clarify the other senses.48 The procedure which

48 In his assumptions Hamawand (2009) largely draws on cognitive linguistic insights, focusing on two basic views. His statement that the lexicon is not an arbitrary repository of unrelated lexemes, but the lexicon forms a network of form-meaning associations, consequently linguistic structure reflects semantic structure, he is relying on Langacker (1987, 1991), Fauconnier (1985), Heine (1997) and Lakoff (1987).
Hamawand applies to arrive at prefixal networks is a three-step approach. First, the central sense of a negative prefix has to be determined (standing out as the most salient among the category of senses, therefore serving as a reference point for the less salient senses). The second step includes the identification of the marginal senses of the negative prefix (displaying certain structural properties). These marginal senses are rated on the basis of their similarity to the prototype. The third step is to identify a certain itinerary which serves as a link among the different senses. Following this method, in the case of the un- prefix the following semantic variants can be identified prototypically and peripherally (Hamawand 2009: 70-72), where prototypical senses are identified with respect to adjectival bases and peripheral senses are identified concerning verbal and nominal bases (a relevant difference in itself, however, is not reflected upon: prototype and periphery playing crucial roles in the identification process). Based on salience of collocational frequency, in prototypical usage the un- prefix is tied to adjectival bases to express:

- “The antithesis of what is specified by the adjectival base” (p. 70). The adjectival bases usually describe humans, possibly traits. Unfair serves as the antithesis of fair, with e.g. unbiased, unfaithful, unkind covering the same “antithesis” route. Descriptions of nationality also belong here, where unBritish or unFrench would refer to the antithesis of a British or French national in characteristics.

- “Distinct from what is specified by the adjectival base” (p. 71). In these cases the un- prefix is tied to adjectives which mainly describe non-humans. Prefixations of this subcategory express contrariety: unofficial is distinct from official, or unsafe is distinct from safe. Some further examples include unintelligible, untidy or unusual.

- The third prototypical sense is described as “not subjected to what is specified by the adjectival base”, referring to complex adjectives as bases (participles ending in –ed or –ing). Uneducated means not educated in the sense that someone has not been subjected to education, and similar cases are valid for unbaked, unexamined, unchanging or undemanding.49

Peripherally the following senses are identified, resulting in semantic variants:

49 Although Hamawand’s layering of the prototypical senses is extremely useful and resolves many of the problematic categorisation questions concerning negative prefixation in general and the prefix un- in particular, some of his examples do not seem to fulfil entirely the prototypical subcategory descriptions. Among his examples in the third subcategory (“not subjected to what is specified by the adjectival base”) undemanding, unsmiling and unoffending are also mentioned, which could much rather be included in category B, instead of C, in spite of their complex adjectival base.
The first sense is “inverting what is specified by the verbal bases” (p. 71). This sense resonates with the much-debated reversative un-: here the object needs to have the physical ability to undergo change. Unpack would mean inverting the action of packing, unclose inverting the action of closing, together with some well-known examples like unbutton, unlock or unwrap. However, at this point Hamawand also lists some rather problematic examples: unlearn, unlive, unteach and unthink, respectively (p. 71). These examples clearly fulfil the expectations concerning creative prefixations, as neither the bases, nor the resulting prefixations can be treated according to the simplified reversative sense. Renaming the process to “inverting what is specified by the verbal bases” unfortunately does not help, as the conceptualization of such processes in cases of verbs where a reversative possibility is highly questionable, already belongs to rather creative usages of language. This aspect is not dealt with Hamawand, which in the light of his rather detailed subcategorization is all the more surprising.

The next identified peripheral sense is “taking away what is specified by the nominal base” (p.71). The relevant point about this meaning is that the prefix is “tied to concrete nouns, with the resulting formation denoting separation or release” (p.71) with unchain, unhook and unload serving as prime examples. Unchain indeed has the meaning of taking away a chain from something or somebody (to remove chains from something: the door was unchained), however, it also has the meaning to liberate something or somebody. Besides, the example the wind was unchained also exists, which latter meanings are not mentioned by Hamawand. The metaphorical extensions are avoided for the sake of creating a feasible subcategory, which avoidance is even more present with some further examples: unhand, unhorse or unman.

The last identified peripheral sense is “bereft of what is specified by the nominal base” (p.72). It is possibly the most relevant subcategory concerning the prefix un-, as it entails the meaning of privation with the negative prefix being tied to abstract nouns, or nouns implying non-action. Unease would then mean something that is bereft of ease, unrest a state bereft of rest and untruth something bereft of truth. It is at this point that Hamawand’s analysis lacks a further step: some of his examples are clearly in the realm of creative language use, with far more complicated meanings.
than “bereft of”: *unculture, unlaw, unpeace, unscience, unwisdom, unbelief* and above all *unsuccess* (which latter example is discussed among *un*-nouns).

Based on Hamawand’s (2009) semantic system of negative prefixes (relying upon prototype theory), we hypothesize that creative prefixations make more use of the peripheral senses of the separate prefixes than the prototypical ones, but e.g. in case of *un*-prefixations the “distinct from” prototypical sense also plays an important role. This is part of the explanation for having longer processing times and a higher salience of the individual components, especially when we encounter these expressions as novelties.

### 5.3. Rule-bending – rule breaking: aspects of regularity with creative prefixations

From the point of view of rule-governed linguistic approaches, creative prefixations very often display rule-bending or rule-breaking combinatorial characteristics. These specific aspects have cognitive consequences, (as well as a cognitive background, i.e. non-standard conceptualization behind them) therefore, the question necessarily arises whether it is possible to identify systematic violations or non-conforming patterns of connections on their part. This question has been tackled to varying degrees by a number of linguists, mainly in descriptive-taxonomic approaches.

The first group to examine here are *un*-verb constructions. As Adams (2001: 43) states, prefixed verbs are mostly “accomplishments”, denoting situations which can be brought to a conclusion. Plag (2003: 35) also postulates some sort of restriction, which only allows as bases for such constructions “verbs that denote an action which can be reversed or which involves a participant that can be removed.” It also means, that – given the part-of-speech specific restrictions – the unitary *un*- hypothesis (Andrews 1986) cannot be maintained. Szymanek (1989) – in line with Marchand (1969) – maintains the prefix *un-* with verbs is used to denote reversal, which requires a transitive and resultative base. As a consequence, durative verbs (*play, walk, sing*) are not allowed as bases for *un*-prefixation. As Marchand (1969: 205) explains: “...the condition for a verb to be formed depends on whether the physical possibility to undo the result of an action is conceivable. This explains why such verbs as *unbeat, unhit, unkill, unpoison* are not found.” On the basis of Marchand (1969) and Dowty (1979: 289–90), Horn (2002: 14) claims that there are constraints on the set of verbs that can undergo *un-* derivation, which is especially true of the verbal *un*:- the base of *un*-verbs is “normally an accomplishment, which crucially involves a change of state: this is why we have *unbend, uncurl or undress*...however, no *unsmoke, unswim, uneat* or
*ungo. In principle, then, un-verbs with a non-telic, stative or activity, base are ruled out.” Horn himself lists a number of counterexamples, from the O-ME unbe to the modern English unrecognize, and, indeed, examples of creative un-verb prefixations almost never abide by these taxonomic-descriptive rules. To mention a few examples, unfollow, in the meaning of “ceasing to follow somebody’s blog or webpage”; unlike (as a verb) “to withdraw our support from something or somebody on a social networking site”; or (35) uncry “to dry up one’s tears, as if the act of crying had never happened”. In all these examples (later to be elaborated in 6.3), the bases of the composite structures are durative. The transitivity requirement is fulfilled, but the resultative aspect is missing. Rule-breaking composite structures as these have their effects on conceptualisation as well. Instead of a reversative action, unfollow and unlike signify the finishing of an action. As for uncry and the previously mentioned (36) unhave, the frame is shifted into the realm of the impossible: we have to conceptualise a frame where backshifting in time would be possible. Horn’s (2002: 16) example with (37) uninvent, in connection with nuclear weapons, poignantly recalls the need for frame-shifting. Similarly, (38) unsay does not mean “to do the opposite of saying”, but “to make as if unsaid” (p. 16).

The second group of prefixations to consider from the point of view of rule-governance is that of un-adjectives. Un- with adjectives is predominantly classified as a negative sense; however, as we previously mentioned, the treatment of semantic anomalies concerning a potential oversimplification of this negative sense is elaborately detailed in the literature (Jespersen 1917, Zimmer 1964, Marchand 1969, Katamba 1993, Horn 2002).

Plag (2003: 30-36) aims to establish word formation rules/systematic restrictions concerning un-adjective formations. Based largely on introspection, he arrives at a number of impossible un-adjective examples, namely *ungreen, *unblack, *unred, *unbad, *unnaked, *unsilly51. This list is meant to signify that contradictory and complementary opposites are not expressed through un-prefixation. Based on Zimmer (1964) and Adams (2001), he also emphasizes that un-attachment results in derivatives expressing a contrary opposition “on a bi-dimensional scale of ‘more or less’, i.e. a contrast between gradable adjectives, and their respective opposites” (Plag 2003: 33-34), which would mean that contradictory and complementary opposites are not expressed through un-prefixation. From this follows the generalisation stating that un-prefixation is not applicable to form

51 Adams (2001: 51), reflecting on the use of simple positive stems with un-adjectives mentions, based on Zimmer (1964: 92) that unsilly was acceptable in the meaning ‘innocent’, however, it was not used anymore when silly came to mean only ‘foolish’.
complementaries (if something is green, it is not red, not blue, not brown, not white etc.), consequently, colour adjectives do not serve as legitimate bases for the prefix *un*-

Although this might generally be true, however, at this point (again) exceptions and creative prefixations enter. The first problem is that (39) *ungreen* does exist; moreover, it exists in different variants: *ungreen*, used of a plant or vegetable matter means “decaying”; but it also exists in the sense that something is harmful to the environment: “an ungreen enterprise”, or (of a person) not supporting the protection of the environment. (As it is to be elaborated in Chapter 6.3, in this latter case metonymy is at work (COLOUR FOR ATTITUDE), as the colour green in a metonymic chain stands for nature and environmental concerns.) In fact, there are quite a number of *un*-colour adjectives in use, based either on metonymy: COLOUR FOR NOTION, COLOUR FOR ATTITUDE, or the combination of metonymy and prototype effects. An (40) *unpink* baby girl is dressed in anything but pink, (41) *unblack* metal is actually Christian black metal (metal music with lyrics of a Christian message). There is (42) *unred* hair colour, from which unwanted red tones have been eliminated; (43) *unbrown* brownies are made with white chocolate; and by an idiomatic twist, we might feel (44) *unblue*, when getting over somebody after an affair.

As the prefix *un*- can be attached to adjectives, verbs as well as nouns/gerund forms, the third group to look into is *un*-nouns. Concerning *un*-nouns, Plag (2003: 31) states that their number is small; therefore, it is hard to tell whether formations like *unbelief*, *unease*, or *untruth* are idiosyncratic exceptions or “systematic in nature”. Nevertheless, forms like *untable*, *uncar* or *unpillow* are termed unacceptable by Plag. Adams (2001: 50) postulates backformation in case of nouns related to adjectives and prefixed by negative *un*-, e.g. *uneducation*, a state of *unrepair*, *unsucces* or *unsurprise*. Marchand (1969: 152) does mention a few diachronic examples, even *unfriend* (in the “non-Quaker”52 sense), but on the whole treats the examples as marginal. The number of *un*-nouns, however, is not as scarce and the phenomenon is by far not as peripheral as commonly accepted.

52 Quakers, or Friends are members of a group of religious movements, generally known as the Religious Society of Friends (also as Friends Church). https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quakers. *Unfriend* in this use designates non-church members, simply.
5.4 The un- prefix in the context of negation

Although the concept of negation, i.e., the different varieties of opposition, are only going to be discussed here from the aspects of (un-)prefixation, a short semantic/philosophical detour might prove useful to make, as it alights the whole of the following argumentation. LEECH (1974: 33), while acknowledging the necessity of categorization in language, resulting in “prepackaged experience”, also mentions the negative effect of such packages: they simplify things at the price of “disregarding many of the boundaries and gradations that could theoretically exist” (p. 33). One notable example for this phenomenon is with binary polar contrasts, like strong/weak, hard/soft, rich/poor, cases where actually there exists gradual transition, instead of clear-cut boundaries. Philosophers like KORZYBSKI (1933) or HAYAKAWA (1978) introduce the phrases “two-valued orientation” as opposed to “multi-valued orientation”, the latter facilitating a somewhat more accurate account of actual circumstances. This two-valued thinking is so predominant in language that binary contrasts seem to be more common than any other type of opposition (CRUSE (1986) talks about a predisposition to make binary distinctions). Negative prefixation in general, creative prefixations in particular reflect upon some of the finer distinctions such a bipolar orientation does not cover.

Looking for a finer layering concerning the topic of negation, a basic distinction goes back to Aristotle. As elaborated by HORN (2002: 1-64) there is a difference between contradictory and contrary opposites. Contradictory opposites as a rule are “mutually exhaustive as well as mutually exclusive” whereas contrary opposites “do not mutually exhaust their domain” (p. 1). According to this distinction, white/non-white, odd/even, male/female stand in contradictory opposition; white/black, poor/rich, happy/unhappy stand in contrary opposition, allowing for a grey area where neither mentioned characteristics are true. Contradictory opposition is therefore governed by the Law of Contradiction and the Law of Excluded Middle,\(^{53}\) contraries, however, do allow a middle. Privation, another mode of opposition, is treated by Aristotle as the absence of what could/should be expected by nature to be present: “we do not call that toothless which has no teeth, or that blind which has not sight” (The Categories, Chapter 12a28-33). In terms of privation, for example, the prefix a- has descriptive force, as a reanalysis of privation. Negative prefixation on the whole,

\(^{53}\) If F and G are contradictories, then: i, by LC, for any x in the relevant domain (Fx & Gx), ii, by LEM, for any x in the relevant domain (Fx v Gx). Contrary opposition is governed by LC but not LEM. HORN (2002: 2)
especially with the prefixes un- and in-, has a tendency to develop contrary, rather than contradictory interpretation; in fact, “few un-words of any category correspond to the contradictory opposition of the sentential negative” (Horn: 2002: 4). FUNK (1971: 361) also draws attention to opposites which are contrary to their stems in meaning, supplying numerous examples for the phenomenon. The meanings can mostly be described as depreciatory: inarticulate is close to dumb, inconvenient is troublesome, incurious is careless, indecent shows a tendency towards obscene, just as inglorious is close to shameful. JESPERSEN (1917: 144) also supposes a contrary term, or something that approaches a contrary term to the meaning of numerous negative prefixations: unwise means more than simply “not wise”, bordering more rather the meaning of foolish. Along the same lines, he finds the meaning of unhappy as not far from miserable.

On the basis of such examples, FUNK (1971: 361) observes that the majority of such derivatives cannot be said to have a truly negative meaning. Part of the problem lies in the difference of the negative content of simplex words which are – according to ZIMMER (1964: 38) – different from the negative content of forms derived on some synchronically productive and frequently encountered pattern. Another facet of the problem is the phenomenon of blocking itself. In the history of English, there is a tendency whereby a number of potentially occurring unX adjectives are not used, either because they are blocked (*unnice) or they are pre-empted (*unsad) by previously existing and more lexicalised simple contraries. (Note that this, however, has not always been the case: in the EMoE period, we do find undeep, ungood, unstrong or unwhole; see MARCHAND, 1969: 152, HORN 2002; as well as ZIMMER 1964: 92, who states that unsad was current in Middle English in the senses ‘unstable’, ‘unserious’). CRUSE (2004: 169-170) makes note of this phenomenon in the framework of privative polarity: the general tendency is that speakers associate one term with the presence of something, and the other with its absence. Alive is positive (as it possesses movement, consciousness etc.), dead is negative, married is positive and single negative, with the consequence that only unmarried exists: negative terms hardly ever take a negative prefix.

Applying this observation to the present topic, it is noteworthy that creative prefixations tend to disregard this linguistic tendency, freely producing forms which in theory should be blocked or pre-empted. One such example is (45) unyoung (“being of advanced years and especially past middle age”). In Horn’s contextual example, unyoung is used for a ballerina who turned forty and made a comeback to stage, in the meaning “not yet old”. In this particular case the usage of young or old would miss the point, as unyoung makes sense only
in relation to her profession (as relatively few dancers are still on stage past forty). The point here is, therefore, not so much the importance of the blocking effects ruling out descriptive or even evaluative terms, but rather the fact that creative prefixations, such as unyoung, often explore the murky area of lexical gaps.

Mettinger (1994: 22-23) also aims at a finer distinction concerning un-adjectives: in his evaluation, it is the focus on the synthetic aspect of word-formation which leads Marchand (1969) to assume ‘not’ as the basic meaning of un-. From Mettinger’s argumentation it clearly follows though that the assumption of a basic meaning as ‘not’ for un- is only justified for one group of un-Adj-formations. It is the group of scalar un-Adj-formations, which demands a finer semantic differentiation. Three types are distinguished in connection with scalar un-Adj-formations. The first type constituting scalar semantic dimensions involves pairs like important-unimportant, selfish-unselfish, where both members are gradable, but the semantic value of the unprefixed member (the X-value) moves towards infinity and the semantic value of the prefixed member (the y-value) moves towards zero. The case is rather different for the second type, exemplified by certain-uncertain, safe-unsafe. Even though they also constitute scalar semantic dimensions, as opposed to the previous type they represent uni-directionally open scales with an obligatory zero-value: the unprefixed member stands for the zero value with the feature y (in the case of the prefixed members) is applied for the rest of the scale. This distinction is based on collocational grounds: “the unprefixed member collocates with perfectly/completely/totally, whereas the prefixed member can be modified by a bit or slightly” (Mettinger 1994: 28, italics in the original).

As a further variant, pairs like happy-unhappy or wise-unwise are deemed by Mettinger to constitute bi-directionally open scales, where not only the aspect more/less, but also the evaluative terms positive/negative play a part. In case of intensification, the members of the pairs move in opposite directions with the unprefixed member covering the positive part of the scale and the prefixed member – correspondingly – the negative part.

Non-scalar adjective formations (true-untrue, able-unable, equal-unequal) represent a further category, based on the non-gradable attributes of both members of the pairs. Here one feature (the feature X) characterising the unprefixed member is negated by the prefixed member, hence this constitutes the only category where Marchand’s above-mentioned ‘not’ meaning for the prefix is applicable. Mettinger does not touch upon the problem exemplified by the very existence of untrue: if language users have false at their disposal, according to the general rule of blocking, untrue would seem to be a redundant formation, just as bad and small block the formation of *ungood and *unbig (Hamawand 2009: 30).
Marchand’s (1969) shadow looms large in Funk’s (1971) treatment of adjectives with negative prefixes; however, in his case, as opposed to Marchand, the problem of synonymy arises, together with several other semantic problems that a syntactic-derivative approach cannot handle. He points out that in certain cases (*not active - that is not active*) an adjective can be properly rewritten in the frame of a relative clause. On the contrary, “a person who is not happy” (italics in the original) is not identical in its meaning with “an unhappy person” (Funk 1971: 365). Therefore, we need to postulate a difference between syntactic and semantic derivatives, where a syntactic derivative is the lexical equivalent of a negated relative clause corresponding with it, a semantic derivative, however, would entail the addition of certain non-grammatical (semantic) features. At this point, Funk’s argumentation tries to appease two opposing views: while keeping the syntax-based approach, he is introducing a semantic viewpoint as well, possibly in the face of the large number of problematic cases encountered. His approach is halfway between a purely descriptive and a – partially – cognitive view: he does not go as far as to claim any derivational process entailing a change in meaning. His treatment of what he deems semantic derivatives focuses on defining the additional semantic features, leading him to the logical distinction between contrary and contradictory opposition. Based on Zimmer (1964: 95), inanimate and animate are contradictory opposites, whereby exhausting the possibilities along a given dimension (according to Funk, serving as a base for the very category of syntactic derivative). Although a contrary opposite can also be directly related to its affirmative pair, the case is here more about marking a positive counter pole within a negated field: *not happy* entails unhappy, unconcerned etc. In contrary opposition therefore it is somewhat blurred which areas of the extreme poles of a given dimension are covered. Introducing further semantic considerations he admits though that this seemingly helpful logical differentiation still does not cover certain words occupying intermediate position which are “ambiguous even in definite contexts” (p.367), like inadequate, uninteresting, unjust or unsatisfactory. Funk makes a very important statement: the exact meaning of such as the above-mentioned opposites is “open to individual interpretation”, supposing that we might assume some “space left” (p. 367) between adequate and inadequate, which is reflected in the possible use of modifiers: somewhat, extremely etc.

As even this short exemplary compilation testifies, negative prefixation in the context of negation calls for a more coherent account, with a number of finer distinctions where semantic considerations are concerned.
5.5 Competing prefixes

As generally accepted in cognitive linguistic literature (Langacker 1987, Taylor 2010, Hamawand 2009; for a treatment of synonymy in frame semantics: Fillmore 1985), lexemes do not exist as isolated chunks in the minds of speakers, but form structured domains, together with other conceptually related lexemes. Taylor (2010: 195-204) defines a domain as a more generalized background knowledge configuration, against which conceptualization is achieved. The examples [uncle] (Chapter 4) as well as [father] or [thumbnail] (p. 195) depict domain as the field for broader conceptualization: [father] and [uncle] with the idea of a kinship network, [thumbnail] with the conception of a hand, arm and ultimately, the human body. In Hamawand’s (2009: 96-99) formulation: “domains imply implicit conceptual fields” (p. 96), with different facets. Similarly to kinship terms (where “The intrinsic relationship profiled by the prepositional phrase is equated with the parent-offspring relationship evoked by father as part of its inherent characterization (Langacker 1999: 80-81)) negative prefixes cannot be treated as isolated, as they gather in domains of different kinds (possibly resulting in inter-domain construal). Possibly the most important argument Hamawand makes with respect to negative prefixation lies in stating that the meaning of a negative prefix can be understood 1, partly by how it stands for the particular facet of the domain and 2, partly by how it stands in a relation of contrast or affinity to the other prefixes in the domain. Prefixes are stored together; it is the domain which helps to clarify the existing differences. Within a domain, each prefix has its particular place, by which it is defined in contrast with the other domain members. Consequently, each prefix has a distinct meaning specification. As Fillmore and Atkins (1992: 76-7) point out, instead of being directly related to one another, they are only related by virtue of their links to the conceptual facets in their representation. Hamawand identifies the domains of distinction, opposition and privation concerning negative prefixation. Concentrating on the prefix un-, a closer look at the competing prefixes non- vs. un-; and de- vs. un- will be tackled in the next section,^54 with reference to the possible creative examples as well.

5.5.1 Non- vs un-: unbooks vs nonbooks

In Hamawand’s (2009: 132-33) domain-based system, non- and un- share the domain of distinction, symbolizing different facets, with non- meaning “different from the quality

^54 Prefixal competition is a detailed system, with relevance to prefix pairs like a- vs un- (atypical/untypical); in- vs un- (unrepairable vs irreparable); dis- vs un- (unbelief/disbelief, unqualified vs disqualified), for an in-depth discussion see Hamawand (2009).
described by the adjectival base” (p. 132). With the use of non-, one entity is described as different from another; its use is rather neutral and objective. By comparison, the prefix un-, meaning “the antithesis of what is specified by the adjectival base” (p. 132), is evaluative in nature (even used to criticize an entity). Corpus-based research shows that composite structures with non- describe people (with emphasis on the denial of the content which is signified by the base). Un-, on the other hand, is used in the description of people’s behaviour, where the evaluative aspect is emphasized about the content of the base. Non-professional and unprofessional are examples for this distinction (non-professional staff – unprofessional approach), where “each adjective imposes a different construal on the base, and so has its own meaning” (p. 33). Their respective use is clarified through their collocational environment: non-professional collocates mainly with words referring to personnel: actors, drivers or workers. The adjective unprofessional means not meeting certain standards, collocating with behaviour, conduct or practice. These highly insightful distinctions, however, do not cover the whole picture: non- and un- are also used with nouns, where the above-mentioned distinctions are valid, though, but with some further twists. Book, for example, can take both un- and non- in creative examples, retaining and at the same time refining the un-: pejorative meaning vs. non-: descriptive meaning differentiation. There are different meanings for the composite structure unbook, which on a closer look are related. Unbook (1), similarly to nonbook, is used in a privative sense: a book that does not have the merits of a book in the traditional sense of the word: although as for its form and outlook it reminds one of a book, but the inside content does not. Unbook (2) is a book bought not to be used, but to be given as a present. Unbook (3) is a relatively new phenomenon, as it is also used to describe content-free textbooks that anyone can edit (on a website). It moves away from the privative sense to a descriptive one: unbooks are fresh, continually updated products which are open to contribution. As one such unbook author/editor formulates: “An unbook is simply something that’s in between a blog and a book. It’s more thoughtful and organized than a blog, but hasn’t quite found its footing as a book yet. Like a blog, it’s a platform for conversation with a community of people that share an interest. Like a conversation, it’s fluid and shifting. The traditional book is a one-way affair: the author preaches at the pulpit and the readers listen. I wanted more – I wanted a conversation”.55 The prefix non- yields just as abundant examples of seemingly unexpected uses as the prefix un-. In fact, non- seems to have an endless capacity for forming new,

55 http://xplaner.com/theunbook/
unconventional derivational patterns resulting in creative composite structures. Algeo (1971) makes note of the “voguish” uses of the prefix non- (cf. Chapter 1.4). Besides Algeo, Bauer (1983) also deals with the different usage patterns of the prefix, which can be categorised according to types. One such example, which is also quoted by Bauer (1983: 279-285), is “It is a nonbook, so to speak, non-written by Andy Warhol”. Nonbook refers to publications in the format of a book which – for possibly different reasons – do not fulfil the criteria of what a prototypical book is. They are usually glossy publications, with lots of pictures or photos; the text is at best a commentary. It is then as a source of textual information that they cannot be considered prototypical books.

Another possible sense for non- formations is the “other than/different from” sense. In the case of the nonbook example, it is possible to talk about nonbook materials in a library, meaning all other types of material available: films, audio-materials and so on. In the expression nonbook materials, nonbook assumes a simply descriptive, adjectival function, without the previously mentioned possibly slightly pejorative use. In this case, non- indeed fills a conceptual void. In spite of the occasional evaluative overtone, non- in fact has a tendency toward an emotionally neutral sense, whereby it is possible to contrast it with other negative prefixes. As both Algeo (1971) and Horn (2002) point out, un-Christian is different from non-Christian, the latter being neutrally descriptive, denoting a person who is of a religion other than Christian. Un-Christian though can only be a Christian person who fails to act like one. The evaluative vs. descriptive parameter of un-/non- prefixation reveals some striking lexical gaps with respect to bases, too, as Horn (2002: 10) referring to the work of Zimmer (1964: 33) notices: unmaternal, nonmaternal and unmotherly exist, *nonmotherly does not. Therefore, the stem maternal might be construed in both descriptive or evaluative constructions, motherly, however, can only be evaluative. Similarly, non-male and unmanly exist, their possible counterparts un-male and non-manly in principle do not. Not surprisingly, (46) un-male – in societies conscious of gender construction theories – can be attested.56 It is possible that in the competing cases of unbook and nonbook, nonbook will remain in the descriptive, differentiating sense, whereas unbook –in one of its meanings—retains a somewhat evaluative character. The fact that non- offers mostly neutral associations reflects upon its significance in pragmatic matters as well, in cases of polite circumscriptions. When we talk about a failure at an election as (47) non-success, or when an illiterate person is referred to as (48) non-reader, we are transforming a binary contradiction into a contrary,

polar opposition; therefore we create a category solely induced by reasons of politeness or correctness.

The argumentation above serves as an extension to HAMAWAND’S (2009) insights: the claim that a negative prefix has a multiplicity of senses gathering around a core results in multiple definitions for each negative prefix. The choice of an alternative prefix is based on conceptual content; therefore, when two alternative prefixes attach to the same base, different facets of the base’s content are highlighted. In *unbook*, the base refers to a bundle of information, in *non-book*, the bookish format. Another important proposition put forward by Hamawand is that the meanings of negative prefixes are grasped in terms of a domain, a coherent area of conceptualisation relative to which linguistic structures can be characterized. Along the same lines prefixally negated expressions differ with respect to construal, the way a situation is perceived and conceived. Context and pragmatics influence the meaning of a negative prefix, changing relative to the element to which it is fixed.

5.5.2 De- vs un-: defriend vs unfriend

The prefixes *de-* and *un-* act as rivals in the domain of removal, according to HAMAWAND’S (2009: 140-41) domain-based system, where *de-* means “removing the thing described by the nominal base” (p. 141). In prototypical usage it refers to non-humans, for example *decouple*: when two things are decoupled, the relations are ended between them, mostly with objects like *earnings from revenues* or *revenues from sales*. The prefix *un-* within this domain stands for “taking away what is specified by the nominal base” (p.140), focusing on objects in the process of removal, separation. To *uncouple two things* is separating things joined together, like *hook from chain* or *carriage from train*. In terms of verbs, *defrock* and *unfrock* present the problem of metonymical-metaphorical extension: *unfrock* is neutral (*to unfrock a child or a doll*), meaning removing the frock from somebody (metonymical), *defrock*, however, means “removing somebody from a position of honour and privilege” (p. 141): *defrock a priest* (metaphorical). *De-* and *un-* also meet in the domain of reversal: *de-* means “reversing the action described by the nominal base” (*to be debarred from a club*); *un-* means “inverting what is specified by the nominal base” (p. 141) (*to unbar the door*). *De-* mostly refers to people, *un-* to nouns referring to objects.

Applied to the topic of creative prefixation, *unfriend* and *defriend* present another case of “competing” prefixations. Both verbs refer to the act of removing someone as a ‘friend’ on a social networking site; however, concerning which verb of the two should better describe the act, there seems to be considerable debate in different circles of Internet users.
(most of whom are not linguistically oriented by default). If there ever “was” a competition, then by the ruling of the New Oxford American Dictionary, unfriend is the winner. However, numerous users of social networking sites commented on the decision, stating that defriend describes the action much better. According to the commenters of the unfriend-camp, defriend “misses the whole point and is both boring and uncreative”57 as unfriend is “not befriending someone and making acquaintances in reverse, it’s just undoing a function-unhitting the friend button.” Reflecting exactly upon this aspect, the defriend-camp states: “Unfriend... implies a complete lack... that you are absolutely not friends... Defriend implies that you were once friends.” Also, commenters intuitively feel, that defriend applies more to the action, whereas unfriend seems to apply more to the state of being. The Dictionary’s research-based decision was unfriend, as being much more popular. However, when analysing unfriend, the editors acknowledge its difference from the norm followed by familiar un-verbs, as unfriend “assumes a sense of “friend” that is not really used (at least not since the 17th century). ZIMMER-CARLSON-HORN (2011) also comment on the phenomenon, stating that unfriending is also known as defriending, “in which the prefix de-can be understood not simply as a reversative but as a privative, formed from the noun friend” (p. 356, italics mine).58 Similarly, they note that there exists a difference between unschooling and deschooling: (49) unschooling refers to taking children out of school, and deschooling when we mean “changing the laws to make schools non-compulsory” (p. 366). Unschooling is actually treated among the creative examples, with a much wider range of meaning and conceptual complexity (cf. 6.1).59 What the two camps of commenters instinctively differentiate between actually reflects upon the cognitive linguistic approach “at work” concerning prefixes. As HAMAWAND (2009: 37) states, different prefixes highlight different facets of the base, moreover, the debate seems to underpin the idea of semantic relevance attached to prefixes in cognitive approaches. In fact, within a cognitive framework, Hamawand (2009: 39-40) places even more semantic importance on prefixes. He starts from the parameter of determinacy, according to which two substructures can be integrated to form a composite structure if they show asymmetry in terms of profile determinacy. The profile determinant is central in a construction, because

58 They also point out that e.g. boyfriend and girlfriend only lend themselves to prefixation by de- but not un-, quoting a New York Times article (07.01.2010): “You cannot deboyfriend yourself”.
59 ZIMMER (2009a) also notes that unliking is different from disliking: unliking someone simply returns you to a neutral state, accounting this to be a facet of our digitized life.
it is primarily responsible for the character of the construction. In negative prefixation – according to Hamawand—the prefix is the key substructure lending its profile to the entire composite structure. The profile of the base is “overridden” by that of the prefix. The prefix itself is a component substructure, although it is a dependent element. The prefix has a whole called an elaboration site, which is filled by the base.

As he points out, construal operations concern ways in which speakers—in our case, the different camps of commenters—conceptualise situations, as two negative prefixes that stand as rivals conceptualize a situation in different ways. Interwoven with these cognitive/concept-forming considerations, some descriptive arguments might also enlighten this debate. Andrews (1986: 228–9) observes that un- does not imply that the non-un-state ever existed in comparison with de- which always refers to the previous state as well, compare: the unarmed man, the unmarried teacher, the uncoded message with the defrocked priest or the decoded message. Therefore, the verbal processes by the prefixes de- and un- both make a reference to a prior event, with de- the previous situation is the most relevant, un- on the contrary, expresses only a minimal reference, identifying a previous result. Un- only names an opposite state and – in comparison with de- – lacks active force.
Part II A finer partition of the world - analyses of creative prefixations

Chapter 6 – Un-nouns, un-verbs and un-adjectives

Introduction

The chapter introduces the three main areas of examples of un-prefixations. The first section gives an overview of the three most important theoretical pillars in the analysis of un-prefixations: frame-external – frame-internal negation, categorisation based on prototype and conceptual blending. Frame-external and frame-internal negation (Fillmore 1985) is a principle underlying the negation/negativity aspect of un-prefixations; categorisation in terms of prototype is decisive in the classification of un-nouns; conceptual integration serves as the analytical basis for interpreting creative un-prefixations. The first subchapter investigates un-nouns (6.1), which in principle are the most “deviant”, yet – in terms of productivity – the most relevant as well. All three theoretical considerations play a crucial role in their treatment. Un-verbs (6.2) are also analysed in terms of frame-external – frame-internal negation, where the presence of “subjunctive contexts” calls for conceptual integration. Un-adjectives (6.3) – though the least prominent category in terms of productivity – also point out the relevance of frames in the interpretive processes.

6.1.1 Categories and analytic framework

The analyses of creative prefixations rest on three main theoretical pillars: semantic frames and frame-based models of negation; classification and considerations based on prototype theory; and conceptual integration. All three major analytical approaches are facilitated by the metaphorical-metonymical meaning extensions present in un-prefixations. Creative examples of un-nouns, un-verbs and un-adjectives are treated in three different subchapters, both for theoretical and practical reasons.

The first and most decisive theoretical background for the analyses is supplied by the concept of semantic frames and the treatment of negation within a frame-based theoretical approach (Fillmore 1985). In Fillmore’s phrasing frames refer to groups of words which are “motivated by, founded on, and co-structured with, specific unified frameworks of knowledge, or coherent schematizations of experience” (p. 223). Frames, however, not only identify existing relations among words, but also reflect upon how language use creates frames (with the notable example of the set of labels in German schools’ evaluating systems).60 For the analysis of creative prefixations frames are crucial as interpretive categories, where linguistic encoding presupposes “structured understandings of cultural

60 Based on WEISGERBER’S display (1962: 99), which identifies three different series of terms evaluating school work (A: sehr gut – gut – genügend – mangelhaft; B: sehr gut – gut – genügend – mangelhaft – ungenügend; C: sehr gut – gut – befriedigend – ausreichend – mangelhaft – ungenügend) FILLMORE (1985: 226) notes that students’ evaluation of gut or mangelhaft largely depended on the “full set of categories from which the word was chosen”, thus the actual frames within which the evaluation was performed.
institutions, beliefs about the world, shared experiences, standard or familiar ways of doing things or seeing things” (p. 231). The cultural basis of frames ally relevant for creative prefixations, as Fillmore’s semantic frames refer to e.g. (social) scenarios and social institutions: *unfriend* makes sense in the knowledge of social networking sites (both as scenario and social institution). Similarly, the differing but related interpretations of *unmarriage* (6.1), where marriage as a social institution supplies the frame against which *unmarriage* is conceptualised. Fillmore’s semantic frame theory differentiates between innate frames (acquired as part of the human cognitive development) and frames acquired through experience or training. It emphasizes the ubiquity of contextual variation (it is along these lines that frame theory plays a highly influential role in cognitive semantics as well) and points out the importance of background knowledge concerning expectations and inferences.

In terms of negation, Fillmore (1985: 241-44) makes two important distinctions. Firstly, he identifies between context sensitive and context free negation, secondly, and for our purposes more importantly, between ways in which negation and framing interact. Such a distinction results in within-frame negation and cross-frame negation (or frame accepting and frame rejecting negation). In line with the prevalent terminological practice, frame internal and frame external negation will be used in the analyses. As Kövecses (2006: 74) based on Fillmore (1985) explains, frame internal negation is illustrated by the example of the sentence: “He is not stingy”, meaning “It is not the case that he does not like to spend money”. The underlying assumption is that we accept the stingy frame, but negate what is inside it, the state of affairs in the world described by it. (In the end it comes to mean that he likes spending money.) As opposed to frame-internal negation, frame-external negation can be illustrated by “He is not stingy; he is thrifty,”, where it is the actual frame that is negated: we state that the stingy frame is not applicable. Frame-internal negation negates what is inside the frame (possibly sequentially), frame-external negation negates the applicability of the frame itself.

Cognitive Linguistics represents the view that the different sized lexical units are characterised by unit-like meaning representations, as a result of complementing grammatical and lexical meaning. Komlósi (2005: 92, 97) states that the meaning structures are composed by analysing hugely invariant compositional structures based on some typified mental processes: metaphoric and metonymic relations, conceptual blending and integration. These are mental processes turning the separate components into a composite structure of a higher conceptual level. Coulson (2000) points out that the theory of conceptual integration
offers a general model for construing meaning where a relatively few operations are applied in analogical, metaphoric and other semantic and pragmatic phenomena. The essence of conceptual integration lies in capturing spontaneous occurrences, resulting in possibly short-lived or new conceptualisations. Cases of creative prefixations range from simplex, analogical formations to complex cases of conceptual integration. Fauconnier-Turner (1998) and Coulson (2000) emphasize the non-compositional characteristics of the processes, where construing meaning results in emergent structures through imaginative and creative potentials. They can range from composite structures to elaborate systems of reasoning, with even poetic aspects included.

Conceptual integration works on two levels: it refers to non-compositional processes where meaning construction results in emergent structures, and from an analytical point of view refers to networks of mental spaces which are structured with frames (Coulson 2000: 115-118). For creative prefixations, two-sided blends also play a role in creative prefixations, where both input spaces contribute to the final blend’s frame-level structure.

The third aspect in the analysis and categorization of un-nouns starts from Rosch’s (1978) prototype theory. In Horn’s (2002, 2005) estimation, it is possible to distinguish between two types of category membership concerning unX nouns. The first type (Class A in Horn’s formulation) consists of members which lack “structure of category member but share function, evoking superset category of which X and unX are both members” (Horn 2002: 30). This describes then the category of (number) Un-Cola, (the first example to be discussed) where the actual soft drink is not structurally a member of the category of cola, but functionally it does share a status with it. The creative aspect of Un-Cola lies in the fact that “it invites the hearer to construct a category that contains both X and the referent of unX as subsets” (p. 30). In terms of negation, they represent frame-internal negation, as the function (e.g. SOFT DRINK frame) is shared, the “inside”, the actual structure is not. A prototype-based view and frame-based negation complement each other: supplying the answer to “why 7-Up is a better candidate for an uncola than tea or chocolate milk” (Horn 2005). This category will be referred to as “similar function – different structure” class.

Horn’s second type (Class B in his typology) contains examples where prototypicality is involved; however, as opposed to Class A examples, un-nouns here have the structure of a category member, but they are “bad” or peripheral members, in the sense that they lack a functionally significant property (that is to say an un X is a bona fide – but not a prototypical – member of the category X. This category will be referred to as “lack of function – similar structure” class.
Even though relatively small differences are involved, it is possible to postulate a third, category as well: its members are non-prototypical or peripheral in meaning in relation to the base; they, however, represent better examples compared to the base (the prototypical sense of the base is denied/modified), as opposed to the previously mentioned set of examples, which represent worse (or rather, insufficient) examples. This category will be referred to as “**proper function – similar structure**” class.
6.1.2 Un-nouns – a contradiction in itself

As covered in chapters 1.3 and 5.2, the prefix un- as a rule does not attach to nouns. In UNGERER’S (2007: 556) phrasing: “one major conceptual class, concrete object concepts, is hardly touched by prefixation at all…”61 Being mostly simplex words, they are “self-contained”, as opposed to members of other conceptual classes. Moreover, besides concrete object concepts, he extends this limitation in particular to person concepts, which have “a limited share in all major types of prefixation”. The same treatment is valid in case of MARCHAND (1969) with his two categories (unbind vs. unfair, see Chapter 5), or with BAUER’S “playful formations” (1983). ADAMS (2001: 49) treats prefixed nouns as “nominalizations of prefixed verbs”, like recirculation or disinflation, even allowing for the fact that prefixed deverbal nouns, such as cross-reference, misdiagnosis have a wider usage than the related verbs (which incidentally are often seen as cases of backformation). Another possibility is when prefixed nouns “correspond to prefixed adjectives” (p. 50), as in the case of non-Catholic and supersensitivity. Adams pointedly treats nouns related to adjectives and prefixed by the negative un- as backformations, as in (49) uneducation, quoting a 1936 OED example: “It is not their uneducation but their education that I scoff at”, with (50) unrepair, (51) unsuccess and (52) unsurprise as further examples of such backformations. At this point, however, Adams does not elaborate the phenomenon any further; possible creative prefixations are categorized as cases where the prefix acts as modifier: non-hero, unbook: “Reading experts always need tricky new gimmicks to put in their unbooks” (OED, 1982); (53) uncountry: “In this uncountry there was blue sky and light” (OED 1964); or (54) undeath: “There is, every now and then, a film that escapes this sort of un-death”(OED: 1974).

ADAMS (2001) is not the only author with whom the problem of creative prefixations is raised but remains without elaboration. PLAG (2003: 101) treats for example uneducation in exactly the same lines as Adams; namely, that it expresses the “absence of X” and being the result of analogy or backformation (based on uneducated, in this specific example). Plag talks about a “meaning extension”, “not having the proper characteristics of X”, as in the case of unevent (N), uncelebrate (V), and un-Hollywood (Adj/N). Unfortunately, there is neither context supplied for such examples nor further treatment of them, with the exception

---

61 The only exceptions UNGERER (2007: 556) allows for are some locative prefixed items like subway or underpath; these, however, represent borderline cases between object and locative domain concepts.
of drawing parallels with *anti-* and *non*-. Problems also arise when *anti-particle* is treated on exactly the same footing as *anti-hero*, *anti-professor* and *non-issue*, *non-answer*, respectively. The three examples: *anti-particle*, *anti-hero* and *anti-professor* are telling examples of the continuum view concerning prefixations: *anti-particle* is close to the compositional end of the scale (though even this example presupposes a certain knowledge of physics), *anti-hero* is already a more creative example (rooted partly in popular culture, partly in literary theory) and *anti-professor* opens up a number of interpretational possibilities (from an *anti-cause professor* such as *anti-gun professor* to professors of different attitudes or disposition).

6.1.3 “Similar function – different structure”. Ersatz items: *Un-Cola*

(55) *Un-Cola* is the par excellence *un*-noun example for HORN (2002), both in terms of prototype theory and meaning extension. This paragon of *un*-noun examples is also interesting from aspects of productivity and its diachronic aspects. *Un-Cola* as a term was first introduced as part of a marketing strategy: it was simply meant to define 7-Up, another soft-drink on the market. What originally started out just a few weeks before the 1929 stock market crash as “Bib-label Lithiated Lemon-Lime soda”, a citrusy drink known for its anti-acid qualities (mainly as a hangover remedy), had to find its niche in the market, with a new name and a corresponding image. According to the *Encyclopedia of Advertising* (2002), from the advertisers’ point of view, 7-Up was a relative latecomer to the non-cola category of soft drinks: at the time there were more than 600 lemon-lime beverages on the market.\(^62\) By that time, it became the third best-selling drink in the U.S.\(^63\) With the coming of the sixties, however, two trends became noticeable: 7-Up consumers represented an older section of society; teenagers considered the drink definitely “uncool”. All these factors played a part in brandishing 7-Up in the – in advertising terms phenomenally successful –

\(^62\) The “lithiated” bit in its name refers to lithium citrate, which affects the flow of sodium in the body’s nerve and muscle cells, working as a mood-stabilising ingredient. Although the actual 7-Up name has never been fully clarified, 7 possibly refers to the seven ingredients of the drink (with lithium being responsible for the “Up” effect). From 1948, lithium was banned in foodstuffs, and 7-Up stopped using it as well.

The *Un-Cola* campaign. It defined the drink as part of a counter-culture (an important asset in the sixties), even with a slight anti-establishment sentiment. In terms of imagery, reverberations of a slightly psychedelic nature are present (partly as a legacy of the one-time lithium content). The *Un-Cola* campaign defined itself as subversive in its television ads as well: the first person of colour was cast in its TV ad, with actor Geoffrey Holder playing a Caribbean planter explaining the difference between cola nuts and 7-Up’s “uncola nuts”: lemon and lime.

The *Un-Cola* campaign was transformed into a whole culture of *Un*: associations with a hippie “outsider” image, where it served as a key to identify as “different” from the rest of society. In fact, the *Un-Cola* associations have so much stuck with the 7-Up image that in order to handle its possible counter effects (the soft drink is mainly popular among the generation which was socialized in the *Un-Cola* campaign) nowadays a more general meaning is attempted, actually concentrating on the *un*- prefix itself in terms of defining their new campaign: *Uns* are unique and confident, people who think for themselves and make their own choices, who decide what to do instead of being told what to do… But while “Uncola” has been banished from the 7 Up lexicon, ‘un’ still has a major role in the brand’s future. In fact, a new $50 million ad/promo campaign, set to debut during the Super Bowl in January, centers almost exclusively on the leveraging of this lowly prefix, which will now refer not to 7 Up itself but rather to its consumers, portrayed in the upcoming ads as a group of stylish teens known as ‘Uns’, who intrepidly drink 7 Up despite the efforts of an evil collective called the Anti-Refreshment Syndicate. The campaign’s tag line is – get ready, now – ‘Are U an Un’? We’re trying to take that gene of equity – un – and establish it as a consumer descriptor rather than a product descriptor.

This treatment of *un*- as a concept for nonconformity and independence has been present in earlier 7-Up posters as well (besides playing word games with *un*-): “Un in the Sun” (Pat Dypold, 1969); “Un for the Good Old Summer Time” (Barry Zaid, 1971); “Un With The Show” (Ray Lyle, 1971); “Visit Un City” (Pat Dypold, 1971).

The campaign launched in 1968, “appealing to the nonconformist urges (or pretences) of the intended audience” (HORN 2002: 29) served as a highly productive

---

64 The success of the campaign also meant that besides *Un-Cola* (7-Up), *un-Cola* or even *un-cola* or *uncola* appeared, to be used in rather different areas of life, e.g. Bernie Sanders of the present U.S. Presidential campaign. As meaning extensions abound, so do orthographic variants as well: *un-cola* exists in all computational versions.
analogical basis for numerous creative examples, resulting in the *un-Cola (un-cola)* variants. As for example in the description of a new supplement as an (56) *un-magazine*: “It’s not like anything else we do. It’s an un-magazine, like an un-Cola”,67 or a company as (57) *Un-dot-com*. The ultimate *un-cola* was actually bottled water. Horn dates the 7-Up Un-Cola campaign as the starting point for “a sudden increase in productivity of these forms” (p. 29). It is all the more relevant as even unrelated concepts found analogy with the campaign: COLA stands for Cost of Living Adjustments, a federal benefit for the needy, resulting in titles like “It’s the year of the UnCOLA for social security”.68 Even this usage might serve as base for analogical meaning extension: “Some are calling it the year of the UnCOLA. Employers are trimming or eliminating cost-of-living allowances and taking hard-won wage gains back from their workers”.69 In terms of music, the 1970-79 period is often referred to as the *Un-Cola* period, and on music websites the phrase *uncola* is used with rock groups that had not given in to the corporate ethos, retaining integrity and individuality. The productivity of *un-cola* is best illustrated in the example of Bernie Sanders, Democratic presidential nominee in the 2016 U.S. election campaign, as he is also described as the “Uncola of American politics”:

Bernie is the Uncola of national politics. Remember 7-Up’s masterful marketing strategy to separate it from Coke and Pepsi? The lemon-lime soft drink became the “Uncola: tart, crisp, clear” and was branded as the exact opposite of the two sweet, brown colas. Call central casting for a presidential candidate and the last person they would send you is a rumpled, mad-as-hell, impatient Brooklyn native with the air of an absent-minded professor. But today the Bernie brand is hot. His issues resonate, his anger matches the nation’s mood, his no-nonsense approach to politics is seen as a breath of fresh air. In a time when politicians are on the outs, the unpolitician is in. The UnCola.70

The interpretation of the “Bernie brand” calls for conceptual integration: the “Bernie” characteristics are confronted with that of “prototypical” presidential candidates, resulting in the Bernie Sanders blend:

69 Business Week, 23. June 1986
As a further proof of the productive pattern introduced by *un-cola*, it is interesting to note that it is even present in Christianity discourse: *Uncola Christianity* is described as faith defined in terms of negativity instead of positive markers: “un is not the kind of person or Christian that you want to be”\(^\text{71}\); by avoiding the following traits: unspiritual, uninformed, undisciplined, unsettled, ungodly, uncaring or unloving. *Uncola Christianity* is described here as an example not to follow: acts and attitudes of faith should not be formulated in a negative sense. (In terms of negation, applying the Hamawandian prefixal network system is again constructive: *un-* is here again used either in the “antithesis” or the “distinct from” meaning).

*Un-Cola* and the dawn of dietary diversity opens up a whole range of *un*-variants:

• (58) Un-breakfast

It is used in at least two meanings. 1, to describe possible food combinations which are not characteristically included in a typical breakfast:

Among the “un-breakfasts” that the experts suggest, besides a bean burrito, are a ham or turkey sandwich ...and a bowl of soup. Sheryl Julian, “Which of the Above is a Nutritious Breakfast? A. All of Them. When It Comes to Kids, the Rules on Eating Right Are Changing.”

or 2, un-breakfast as a concept is called in for help to define a type of midmorning meal, known as brunch (especially) in English tradition, which is un-breakfast and un-lunch at the same time. Un-breakfast, as the first concept, was later extended to create (59) un-meal, for any non-prototypical food eaten at breakfast, lunch or dinner. The first meaning emphasizes the non-prototypical usage (lacking structure but sharing function, with the superset category being food eaten at specific times of the day), while the second meaning paves the way to the introduction of the concept of unmeal, where the main emphasis is on meaning-extension, referring to non-prototypical (e.g. vegan) food, fulfilling functional expectations, but lacking structure in terms of ingredients. Both meanings exemplify frame-internal negation: we remain within the BREAKFAST/MEAL frame, with the contents negated or modified.

• (60) un-martini

Un-martini is a ginger-citrus snap, with pomegranate seeds, served in martini glasses. Besides Un-Cola, possibly the best example for a “similar function – different structure” un-noun. It is non-alcoholic; therefore structurally it is not a martini. However, as a drink in a martini glass might be supposed to have the same or similar function. Similarly to un-martini, a whole set of “ersatz products” can be listed, with frame-internal negation: these

products are pointedly placed within the frame of the respective (usually food) products, but they differ in decisive characteristics.

- (61) \textit{un-milk}

In terms of drinks, \textit{un-milk} is defined as “a brand of organic fruit-flavoured rice milk for children”, and naturally, there exists a wheat-free, dairy-free, and sugar-free (62) \textit{un-bread} that assures us:

\begin{quote}
Just because you’re living gluten-free doesn’t mean you have to live a breadless life! It doesn’t mean you have to settle for hard, crunchy, or bland bread, either. Don’t fear the un-bread – embrace it with our delicious gluten free bread options.\textsuperscript{74}
\end{quote}

As concrete nouns, both \textsc{milk} and \textsc{bread} are rather simple concepts, however, with the contiguity of \textit{un} + noun, the extended form means extended conceptual unit: there can be many sorts of \textit{un-breads}, depending on how they differ from bread in structure (ingredient), displaying frame-internal negation.

- (63) \textit{unturkey}

It may be shaped as a turkey and meant to be served on occasions when turkey is traditionally consumed (at Thanksgiving, which is also referred to as Turkey Day, to refer to its somewhat commercialized nature), yet it is created entirely from vegetables:

\begin{quote}
One of Open Harvest Natural Foods Cooperative Grocery's biggest sellers for Thanksgiving this year is a turkey substitute called Unturkey. This bird-friendly holiday entree is a mixture of soy and wheat.\textsuperscript{75}
\end{quote}

\textit{Unturkey} is highly productive as a base for analogical patterns: \textit{unchicken} and \textit{unpork} also exist. (64) \textit{Unchicken} exists in usage very similar to \textit{unturkey}, however, it also exists in terms of synthetic, laboratory-made meat (as a possible future solution for feeding mankind). However, very interestingly, both cases present frame-internal negation. It seems more

\textsuperscript{74} \url{http://www.recipechatter.com/gluten-free-bread-recipes/}[12.12.2015]

\textsuperscript{75} Andrea Dukich, “Turkey Day creates other traditions for vegetarians,” Daily Nebraskan, November 25, 2003[12.12.2015]
obvious in the second case, as we are dealing with some sort of artificial meat substitution, grown from the animals’ own cells and presenting a more humane option for obtaining meat. The first, fully vegetarian option should in principle present frame-external negation, however, it does not: *unturkey*, *unchicken* and *unpork* as vegetarian meal options all define themselves within the MEAT frame. The reason for this – as vegetarians and vegans admit – is that real flavour is still associated with meat, even if it is not the case. It seems that tastes are indeed culturally constructed (e.g. *unpork* recipes for home cooking: promising the allure of pork from vegan ingredients). 76

Meaning extensions do not lag far behind: *Unturkey day* means half-priced cheeseburgers (actually containing meat) as part of a marketing campaign. Further analogies display an even more concentrated socio-cultural background. (65)*Unthanksgiving Day* (or *Un-Thanksgiving Day*), also known as The Indigenous Peoples Sunrise Ceremony, is an event held on Alcatraz Island in San Francisco Bay to honour the indigenous peoples of the Americas and promote their rights:

> Every year on the date of the United States Thanksgiving holiday in November, several thousand indigenous people and spectators travel to Alcatraz Island. Groups dance before sunrise, to honour their ancestors, while other groups demonstrate other aspects of their cultures and heritage and speak out for the rights of their people. The celebration is open to the public.

This latter example is partly a non-prototypical celebration on the one hand, on the other, *un-* is used in a partly privative sense: depriving the celebration from its American national symbolism, at the same time emphasizing indigenous culture, rights, as well as their willingness to express this type of opposition. *Un-Thanksgiving Day* sets a concept in historic setting, expressing their distance from a prototypically American celebration.

- (66) *Unpotato*

It refers to Jerusalem artichoke in Horn’s compilation; more recent searches identify it as either cauliflower or any other possible vegetable substitution for potato: “However roasted and served, a Jerusalem artichoke does not turn into a potato”,\textsuperscript{78} where non-prototypical conditions are fulfilled: the artichoke or cauliflower fulfils the function of potato as side-dish, but it is not the same. Ersatz items, however, where we have functional similarities but structural differences, are clearly cases of profiling as well. To refer back to the introductory paragon example, Cola invokes the domain of soft drinks, as it is presumably (still) the most salient example. In \textit{Un-Cola}, \textit{un-} profiles the actual soft drink, 7-up, against the horizon of Cola: to apply Langacker’s phrasing, the combination of \textit{un-} and \textit{cola} designates a specific entity identified and characterized by its position within a larger configuration (LANGACKER 1987). The same applies to \textit{un-breakfast}: breakfast serves as the domain (our mainly culturally based knowledge about what constitutes a typical breakfast) against which \textit{un-} profiles the differing ingredients. Of course, all this background knowledge is deeply rooted in cultural knowledge: even continental and English breakfasts show significant differences (let alone a breakfast in countries where even the concept of foodstuff is rather differently conceptualized, say, in India). \textit{Un-breakfast}, in this sense, exemplifies the notion of “floating concept” (UNGERER 2002: 557): it is continuously constructed, interpreted and conceptualized, against differing backgrounds. It also reflects upon the cognitive view of meaning-making, in terms of meaning representation and conceptualization as a network of encyclopaedic knowledge. As BARSALOU (1987) points out, instead of static categorical units, “concepts originate in a highly flexible process that retrieves generic and episodic information from long-term memory to construct temporary concepts in working memory” (p.101). In a similar vein, GEERARTS (1993: 259), too, warns against treating meanings as “prepackaged chunks of information”, when he draws attention to the tremendous flexibility

\textsuperscript{78} HORN (2002: 30), NYT, 14. March 2001
in the field of lexical semantics, where meanings should not be perceived as things, rather, as a process of sense creation (p.260). With *unpotato*, potato serves as a relatively fixed base, where *un-* introduces the “floating” aspect: it might introduce cauliflower, artichoke, even celery.

The listed examples in this subcategory present a productive pattern, partly because of the growing consciousness about food sensitivities and allergies, partly because of the presence and increasing awareness about “food-fashions”, i.e., long-or short-lived ideas about healthy diet. What connects the elements of ersatz items is their similarity in terms of the prefix-stem relations. Although *un-* always introduces meaning extensions based on metonymy, the stems in the ersatz items are concrete nouns; therefore, we always remain in the same **FOOD, DRINK** frame, elements of which are internally negated. In Hamawand’s system, *un-* takes the “distinct from” sense, which is also applicable to a different, more complex set of *un-*+stem prefixations, namely to composite structures where the stem elements are abstract nouns and metaphorically motivated.

### 6.1.4 “Similar function – different structure” – abstract stems

The prefix *un-* sheds light on the differing levels of creativity as well. *Unfriend*, although it requires a particular ICM, is a metonymy-based construction. *Unwoman* is an atypical/peripheral concept; the interpretation of *unmurder*, however, entails conceptual integration. The poet Cummings creates a whole *unworld* using *un-* and a nominal: *unanimal, unbeing, unday, undead, undream, ungod, unlife, unlove, unmeaning, unmind, unmiracle, unsleep, unsmile, unthing, unvoice* and *unwish* are all parts of this *unworld* universe. **CURETON** (1979) deems these forms deviant, because “in standard usage, *un-* only combines with nouns to produce “privative” verbs” (p. 221), he acknowledges though that Cummings uses these forms to exploit the gap that in English there are no nouns with *un-*.
In fact, he points out that Cummings uses these forms as a major thematic device, with the purpose of glorifying the “spiritual, unique, illimitable, fragile, timeless, beautiful and supra-physical over the merely physical materialistic, mundane, reproducible, scientific, prosaic and political.” (p.222). It is then the first group of entities which comprise a true world, the second set of entities create only an unworld filled with unthings. Cummings here – together with other users of English – turns un- into a noun-producing prefix. Normal reference is fragmented; therefore the number of nominal distinctions is increased.\textsuperscript{79}

Internet sources also offer such, from the point of view of creativity more complex examples.

- (67) unwedding

It is used in two senses: 1, a short, informal ceremony to celebrate the finalisation of a divorce, the newly acquired single status of the concerned parties. The celebration – the WEDDING frame – serves as the superset category, this being the function, yet structurally they could hardly be more different. 2, the second sense is closer to a non-wedding, meaning something original, unconventional in terms of the actual wedding ceremony. (It also stand in opposition to what is called a white wedding: the bride in a large, traditional wedding gown, lots of guests, conventional choice of ceremony venue. It is also attested as used for weddings of same-sex couples (cf. unmarriage). In this last sense we have a very exciting case of different values and attitudes: same-sex couples’ wedding is functionally similar, but structurally different than weddings of man-woman couples. This, so far, is frame-internal negation. Where values and beliefs are concerned, unwedding (and unmarriage) can also represent frame-external negation, where such a bond questions the whole frame of WEDDING/MARRIAGE. The un- of unwedding is more than a prefix: it is a discourse marker (similarly to un-verbs where it can act as a space-builder).

\textsuperscript{79} With Cummings, it is not only with nouns, verbs and adjectives that morphological deviance abounds. Some other examples are bys, flutterfly, ifs, ifed, ifing or a grief ago, displaying this overriding motif.
• (68) Un-kids

It refers to 1, a growing number of young people (almost a generation) in their twenties who cannot or do not want to live home/adopt an adult lifestyle. They represent an intermediary state between being kids and adults; college students tend to identify themselves as un-kids: as they are usually financially dependent on their parents, functionally (from their parents’ perspective) they are still kids. However, their actual age does not allow them into this structural category. It often refers to (childish) attitudes as well:

...young girls screaming for Latin teen idol Ricky Martin with the 20- and 30-somethings who ought to know better lining up for days at the Ziegfeld, duelling with plastic light sabers while waiting to buy tickets for The Phantom Menace. One woman, explaining ‘We are kids,’ admits to being 28.80

2. A different use for unkids reflects a similarly growing trend, where couples without children refer to their pets as unkids: again, the functional side is working, as pets need to be looked after somewhat similarly to kids, yet they are obviously not real kids (even if they are family members).

Figure 6. Unkids: pets
(69) **Undate**

*Undate* is a cautious concept, where the DATE frame is internally negated:

“What looks like a date from outward appearances, but takes place with no romantic intent’. Neither party gives anything away in terms of physical or emotional binding. Used as a fact-finding mission to determine if two people are interested in starting a relationship without the complications that often go hand-in-hand with a date.”

Even if *undate* as a concept seems to have limited relevance outside the teenager age-group (tempting us to ask the question: what does the DATE frame consist of?), the very existence of such an extensive definition highlights some of the factors characterizing creative prefixations: with the help of *un-*, not negation as such, but a conceptual asymmetry is expressed. *Undate* is a valid example of this category: all the functional circumstances of a date are given, yet the structure (the romantic intent, a difficult concept to grasp in itself) is missing.

- (70) **Undeath**

The example *undeath* is only briefly mentioned here, as the *un*-adjective *undead* receives a more detailed treatment in 6.3. *Undeath*, similarly to *undead* is used in two main contexts: 1, in the virtual reality of computer games 2, in “vampire literature”, where getting bitten by a vampire results in *undeath* instead of death, as such victims are perpetuated in a condition between life and death. Interestingly, in postmodern theologies we might even find parallels between the concept of undeath and readings of the body of Christ, as “Christ was a new type of being, an alien intruder into a world with which he had no ontological connection; he changed the conception of history and challenged categories of life and death… [raising] the same ontological issues as the vampire’s ‘undeath’ or Christ’s ‘being’.”

- (71) **Unfact**

[81](https://books.google.hu/books?id=8GuVCwAAQBAJ&pg=PT315&dq=vampire+undeath&source=books&hl=hu&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=vampire%20undeath&f=false)
The word means ‘deliberate falsehood made to pass as fact (as for partisan or propagandistic purpose)’; it is also used to refer to unfounded opinions or perceptions. In connection with the works of Joyce (notably *Finnegans Wake*), DAVID A. WHITE contemplates: “But what is precisely an ‘unfact’? A lie? A false assertion? An unfact need be neither – it could be an assertion, any assertion, which is *not* applicable within a given linguistic context.” He notes that negation is often represented as otherness in the *Wake*, serving as yet another example for creativity in the field of negation.

- (72) *unplace*

Though *unplace* is defined as ‘lack or absence of place’, this definition – suggesting frame-internal negation– is again sorely lacking: *unplace* is closer to a notion of placelessness (Heaven is associated with *unplace*), which invites us to conceptualize *unplace* in terms of frame-external negation. By the same token, *The Unplace Project* signifies “a museum without a place: intangible museography and virtual exhibitions. The project investigates ‘the tensions between real and virtual spaces.’”

---

82 https://books.google.hu/books?id=6_9Oy6pyPyQC&pg=PA69&lpg=PA69&dq=unfact&source=[downloaded 02.05.2016]
83 http://unplace.org/[02.06.2016]
• (73) Uncivilization

The composite structure *uncivilization* is used 1, to refer to an idyllic, prior-to-civilization, nature in its undisturbed essence state of affairs 2, it can be used to mark the beginning or end of a civilisational era:

This study in Grand Strategy, *Uncivilization: Urban Geopolitics in a Time of Chaos*, outlines how we are already entering an age in which global population levels will begin to decline substantially, even as urbanization and economically- and security-driven transnational migration gather pace. Population decline and movement patterns are also intersecting with economic, scientific, and power projection patterns, while urban social attitudes - the politics of urban societies - have created a revolutionary new political, social, and strategic reality. And *urban man* has also become *electrical man*, totally dependent on modern forms of energy. So the book looks at how energy dependency patterns are changing the opportunities and vulnerabilities of society.\(^8^4\)

*Uncivilization* is a popular science fiction term of course, and an *uncivilization* festival contemplates the Apocalypse, as its only fitting subject.

• (74) Unculture

The different senses of *unculture* also create a network: 1, in the most obvious sense, *unculture* means a lack of culture, by which ignorance or mediocrity is meant 2, it designates a culture that derives itself from the absorption of elements of other cultures, in which sense it is usually meant for U.S. culture 3, violence is an essential part of U.S. unculture and 4, unculture often designates pop-culture (as opposed to CULTURE culture of history, traditions etc.):

America's Christmas traditions are an amalgamation of holiday traditions from multiple different cultures and religious traditions. In this way, our "Holiday Culture" is really an Unculture.\(^8^5\)

\(^{8^4}\) UnCivilization-Urban-Geopolitics-Time-Chaos/dp/1892998181
\(^{8^5}\) http://hu.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Unculture [downloaded 02.06.2016]
(75) Unscience

The example – again – presents a network of senses: 1, an approach that uses the tools of science, but does not meet the standard of scientific research 2, a hands-on approach in teaching elementary school science. Unscience is also related to the so-called soft skills (as opposed to hard skills, which mean a degree, or computer skills, proficiency in another language): communicative skills, creative thinking, and assertivity. Un- here is used to introduce not so much a peripheral sense of science, much rather a different concept altogether.

(76) Uneducation

Even though uneducation does have the 1, “lack of education” meaning, especially in a gender discourse referring to countries where girls are denied an education, it can refer to much subtler differences, in fact within (American) university circles:

...unlike the radicalism of the 1960s, the political views dominating today’s universities are hardly distinguishable from the popular platitudes and truisms circulated by Fox News, MSNBC and other media outlets. Unsurprisingly, the moral and political deadlock long gripping American society has come to plague even the hallowed halls of higher education. [] Isolated within the confines of their disciplines, students look to mass culture to fill in the gaps where the university stands silent. Campus discourse merges with popular discourse until the two are nearly indistinguishable.86

Uneducation then takes place within higher education, but the frame introduced by education opens more possibilities in terms of conceptual integration than with the “lack of function – similar structure” examples.

6.1.5 Unmotherhood and conceptual integration

(76) unmother/unmotherhood

Unmotherhood is a yet more complicated example than unmarriage. In several senses of it (namely unmotherhood 1 and 2), it is possible to categorize them as “lack of function – similar structure” examples. This is exactly the point though, where prototype functions are being questioned. Motherhood is deemed a primary function and a key concept of culture: besides being a biological category, it is also conceptually heavily loaded. In fact, the “prototypical mother” serves as a prime example for prototype theory, reflecting exactly upon those categories (and the expectations elated to them) which create the function of mother/mothering. In our times though, mother even as a biological function is oscillating: we have surrogate mothers, who biologically terminate pregnancies for couples (mothers) who – for different reasons – are unable to terminate a pregnancy, we have egg donors, who do not take part in the process of pregnancy, yet genetically supply one half of creating a child. Could they be termed mothers? The problem is that the concept of motherhood, as such a complicated and ever-changing notion, has long surpassed and is constantly redrawing boundaries of prototypes (with dichotomies of stay-at-home mothers vs working mothers or married mothers vs unmarried or divorced mothers). MALINOWITZ (2002) based on MEAD (1999) rightly points out that questions about e.g. surrogate mothers or egg donor mothers highlight the fact that besides the biological side, motherhood is a conceptual category, where the defining characteristics of motherhood is that of intent, “the wish to be a mother”.87 (Mead even mentions the term “social parent”, prevalent in infertility business.) Unmotherhood directs our attention at both the biological and the cultural aspects of motherhood, in fact, identifies it as a “cultural standard” (INGALLS 2011).

87 Naturally, similar questions surround the concept of fatherhood as well, e.g. can a sperm donor be considered a father? However, at this point only the concept of (un)motherhood will be investigated, as it serves us with an even wider array of integrated concepts.
Among the possible meanings, six different senses of *unmotherhood* will be investigated, which meanings can be captured through conceptual integration. In the figures representing conceptual integration with respect to the different senses of unmotherhood, *un-* will be treated according to Hamawand’s (2009) system of prefixal networks. In this system, within prototype distinction he differentiates three senses: *un*-1 means ‘antithesis’, *un*-2 means ‘distinct from’, *un*-3 means ‘not subjected to’; peripherally another three senses exist: *un*-4 means ‘invert’, *un*-5 means ‘take away’, and *un*-6 means ‘bereft’.

*Unmotherhood* 1: the first sense of *unmotherhood* (Bushnell 1947) concerns the act of a woman who, although she has physically become a mother, but has undone herself from the societal role (in Bushnell’s phrasing it also means her failure at “Christian nurturing”). This sense could be identified as a “lack of function – similar structure” example of a category.
Figure 6. Blend: unmotherhood
Unmotherhood 2: This second sense is arrived at by terminating a pregnancy: physically negating/finishing the motherly condition.

Figure 7. Blend: unmotherhood2
Unmotherhood 3: This sense concerns motherhood as function or occupation. Unmotherhood in this sense is not a lack or conscious opposition to the idea of motherhood, on the contrary, this is motherhood without circumstances, without “subjects”. (This sense of unmotherhood is also present in the so-called empty-nest syndrome of mothers with their children “flown out”.)

![Diagram](image_url)

Figure 8. Blend: unmotherhood₃
Unmotherhood 4: it describes the physical inability to bear children.

Figure 9. Blend: unmotherhood4
Unmotherhood 5: this is the conceptually most complex variant of unmotherhood: referring to motherhood as a social/rhetorical concept. The blend shows the binary thinking prevalent in society: the adult female is conceptualized within the dichotomy of mother/unmother.
6.1.6 *Un*-Proper Names

HORN (2005: 350-352) supplies a whole list of metonymy-based prefixations in the form of *un*-Proper Names. Bob Dole, the one-time republican candidate represented such a stark contrast to the then-President that he was expected to prevail as the (77) *Un-Clinton* of the presidential race. (John McCain was also described as the archetypal *un-Clinton*.) In both cases, it was the striking difference between the modes of speaking on the part of the candidates and the “talkative” president. *Un-Clinton* has become rather fashionable, as it is also included in the *un-Clinton* and (78) *un-Yeltsin* description:

George W. Bush and Vladimir Putin have this in common: They got where they are by promising to be unlike their larger-than-life predecessors. Both say Russian-American relations will also be different, based on hard-boiled scrutiny of national interests, not on personal ties dressed up as grand strategy. So when the un-Clinton meets the un-Yeltsin tomorrow, post-cold-war diplomacy officially enters its post-heroic phase.  

The (79) *un-Arafat* was used for the Palestinian finance minister, an economist from the University of Texas, the (80) *un-Samaranch* for Dr. Jacques Rogge, the successor of the ethically suspect Samaranch. Gordon Brown has been dubbed by the British press as the (81) *un-Blair*, on the basis of his inability to connect; David Cameron, however, is never described as *un-Blair*, for exactly the same reasons: one of his fortes is his open manners of speaking and ability to listen. The (82) *un-Oscars* are used for the Golden Globes, (83) *un-Hong Kong* for Macao, which, as opposed to Hong Kong, could hardly wait for its takeover by the Chinese. The *un*-Proper Names could therefore be classified as “similar function – different structure” examples.

---

6.1.7 Un-blends

There are only two un-blends in the corpus (where blend is meant as morphological category): (84) unwich and (85) unsourcing. The process involved in these two formations is based on remotivation: as Benczes (2006: 84) explains (based on Taylor 2004: 60-1) remotivation can be illustrated by the example of hamburger. According to the OED, Hamburger steak was in use already around the turn of the century, originally meaning only a piece of meat made from minced beef. The steak was associated with the city of Hamburg and hamburger was arrived at by –er suffixation. With the passage of time speakers began to reanalyse the meaning of hamburger as ham and burger (Taylor accounts this to the phonological properties of the word). This reanalysis resulted in a number of variations containing burger (cheeseburger, chickenburger, vegetable burger, fishburger), therefore, burger acquired the status of an independent meaning bearing unit. The bases for the two un-blends are both well-known and often used expressions in English, namely sandwich and outsourcing. Creativity, humour and language play all play a part in their formation into a blend: sandwich is reanalysed as sand+wich; afterwards the second element (just as in case of hamburger) can be prefixed with un-. What we get is an unwich, a new type of sandwich (either to be interpreted as “similar function – different structure or “proper function – similar structure”, presumably): sandwich filling material wrapped in iceberg lettuce instead of bread. The expression unwich reflects upon the lack of bread, in fact, even an image metaphor is involved. Unsourcing reanalyses outsourcing and refers to a new method of handling customer complaints and problems. Outsourcing would involve paid personnel, unsourcing instead builds on creating online communities without payment (the way unwich is missing the bread):

‘Unsourcing’, as the new trend has been dubbed, involves companies setting up online communities to enable peer-to-peer support among users. Instead of speaking with a faceless person thousands of miles away, customers’ problems are answered by individuals in the same country who have bought
and used the same products. This happens either on the company’s own website or on social networks like Facebook and Twitter, and the helpers are generally not paid anything for their efforts.\textsuperscript{89}

\textsuperscript{89} Babbage (The Economist), May 11, 2012
6.1.8 “Lack of function – similar structure”: the “worse” examples

- (86) *Unwoman*

As with numerous *un*-nouns, conceptual asymmetry and metonymy pave the way for a number of interpretations. The term is used in literature by Margaret Atwood for women in *The Handmaid’s Tale* (1985), who because they are not fertile, are shipped to the colonies as slave labour. *Unwoman* as a conceptual construction laden with gender-constructional schemas points out the concept of woman being equal with her fertility (as function, cf. the blend analysis of *unmotherhood*). The infertility of these women renders them as “lack of structure – similar function” (bad) examples of the category, even though “structurally” they belong to it. Not surprisingly, *unwoman* found its way to other minority discourses as well:

But what is the ‘unwoman’ meme I talk about? It refers to the fact that in the way society is set up: the white woman is considered the paragon of virtue, fertility, beauty and femininity. Those cool points for white womanhood go up is she has blonde hair, blue eyes, a flat behind and a classic hourglass figure. She is held up by whiteness and white supremacy as the beauty standard by which all women no matter what their ethnicity should aspire to and that all men regardless of their ethnicity desire.90

As in this category the structural resemblance does exist, but the real function is lacking, the question might be raised whether there is a comparable “diagnostic” tool for this class. It is the construction which is referred to in different names, namely “the double” (DRAY 1987, HORN 1993), “contrastive focus reduplication” (GHOMESHI et. al. 2004), “the lexical clone” (HORN 2005). Instead of being simple cases of redundancy, clones actually pick out the prototype members of a category: a *salad* salad usually entails a green salad with lettuce and perhaps other (green) vegetables, perhaps tomato, but not a chicken or potato salad. A *dog* dog is a “functional” dog, maybe a German shepherd or possibly of uncertain breed, but capable of performing doggish tasks. It is in this sense that a small lapdog (e.g. a

Chihuahua) would not be termed a DOG dog. A DOCTOR doctor is a practicing physician with an M.D., and not an engineer or scientist holding a Ph.D. Their peripheral nature predicts that they represent the opposite extreme compared with the core members. Unwoman and the following examples underline this proposition.

- (87) unvegetarian

1, it is used of a person not entirely fulfilling the expectations of vegetarianism (while defining themselves as vegetarians); 2, it is also used in the sense of being an omnivore in a more socially and health-conscious way. Moreover, going unvegetarian might entail its own set of moral considerations:

Becoming un-vegetarian: When I was twenty years old, I watched PETA’s ‘Meet Your Meat’ in a rhetoric class and became a vegetarian. Seven years later, I decided to start eating meat again – for ethical reasons. And somewhere in between I decided to write a book, tentatively titled The Vegetarian’s Guide to Eating Meat, to try and explain that journey and all its complications, from the humane treatment of animals to labour rights and global poverty, from radical feminist cooking to local, sustainable, affordable recipes.”

Moreover, an unvegetarian might even be a proper vegetarian, who for some reasons does not wish to identify with the vegetarian title:

The Unvegetarian: The restaurant she started, Greens, and her two cookbooks have made meatless cooking chic. But don’t use the V-word around Deborah Madison; she thinks vegetarians are cranky.”

Non-prototypicality arises in two directions: besides having the “bad” example for a vegetarian (e.g. not eating meat, but disregarding other, closely related ideological notions connected to vegetarianism: fair trade issues, carbon footprint concerns); and being “good” examples for vegetarianism, but consciously not identifying with its prototypical indications.

- (88) Uncollege

The example refers to an institution of higher education; therefore it fulfils the structural expectations of higher education studies. The difference in its function refers partly to the specific array of subjects taught, partly to the emphasis on the spirit of the institution, rather than its scientific pre-eminence:

“Even though many Mids [Midshipmen = students at the U.S. Naval Academy] refer to their school with bemused affection as “the uncollege”, it remains one of the great bastions of “old college spirit” in its pristine form.”

• (89) Unelection

The 2000 Gore-Bush election is often referred to as an unelection, mainly because of the problematic nature of how the votes were counted and what votes counted. It also refers to the rather unconventional circumstances of the election night itself, with the prominent political figures not entirely acting according to public expectations:

The night was so wild, trussed up in such a mesmerizing cat's cradle of sibling rivalries and scalding feuds, that Tom Brokaw and Tim Russert actually fell into dead silence for several moments at 3:17 a.m., as they absorbed the fact that the man they had just declared president-elect was winning by only 568 votes in his brother's state. "It was as though we had crossed wires with 'Saturday Night Live,'" Mr. Brokaw recalls."93

An election-election has clearly set rules and a strict scenario, votes are not manipulated and purposefully recounted: the actual election did not fill its function.

• (90) Unfriend

The word does not exist only as a highly fashionable verb used in social media, but as a “lack of function – similar structure” type noun as well: unfriend describes a “bad” example of a friend, unreliable and disloyal. Cats are described as unfriends, referring to their somewhat selfish (or independent) attitude towards their owners. Lecturing on Shakespeare, David

92 Washington Post, 1977, 22 November
Crystal made note of his use of *un*-formations (among which *unfriend* has made such a spectacular comeback):

He told an audience Shakespeare was particularly fond of using the prefix "un", such as "unshout", "uncurse" and Lady Macbeth requesting: "Unsex me". "Leave it like that and it's a different language" said Prof Crystal. "But point out that 'friend' has now become 'unfriend' and the kids go 'oh yeah, that's right'. He added he had recently heard other examples in modern life, including "unChinese-y", "unpoliceman-life" and "unyoung".94

The noun *unfriend* also testifies a need for a conceptual category different from friend or enemy, meaning the person is not an advocate for an idea, but he does not put forth fierce opposition either:

Thus many unfriends and some friends of the Capital agree upon the same policy with diverse and contradictory motives []95

- (91) *Un-gallery*

The example is relatively simple in the sense that it is the actual venue and circumstances of the gallery and not the concept which is contrasted:

The night before he opened his gallery last April, Gavin Brown wasn’t even certain he could afford the traditional opening-night dinner. ...[Brown] put himself on the map a few years ago as an un-gallery of sorts when he began mounting shows in unexpected locations intended as alternatives to the depressed gallery scene."96

- (92) *Un-jungle*

The example actually stands for the city, being a “bad” example for a jungle. The comparison came into being by city residents becoming more and more lax in bringing ferocious animals to keep as domestic pets:

---

94 [http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/hay-festival/11640653/How-Shakespeare-invented-unfriend-400-years-before-Facebook.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/hay-festival/11640653/How-Shakespeare-invented-unfriend-400-years-before-Facebook.html) [downloaded: 4.3.2016]
95 William Edwin CHILTON, John Downey Works, Fiscal relation between the United States and the District of Columbia1916
96 NYT, 1994, 2 October
Faced with so many ferocious arguments about which creatures are fierce, the city recently banned 150 specific animals. Some of those named have not been a big problem historically in the city, but health officials decided not to let any more unwanted life forms slip, slither or fly through their loopholes. So they banned, among others, armadillos, polar bears, bees, iguanas, vultures, prairie dogs, black widow spiders, Tasmanian devils, kangaroos, pythons, whales – yes, whales – and all non-human primates.\textsuperscript{97}

\textit{Un-jungle} clearly calls for blend analysis: the jungle and the city have some common characteristics: large in size, difficult to orient oneself in it. Inhabitants are parallel with humans and animals, but instead of pets, the ferocious animals create the link and the source of opposition at the same time.

\begin{itemize}
\item (93) \textit{Unword}
\end{itemize}

There are several meanings of \textit{unword}, starting from the conceptually simpler ones to the more complex meanings. 1, \textit{Unword} can stand for words which are repeated so many times that they lose their meaning for the listener; 2, It can be an imaginary word that was made up to give meaning to something; 3, In the most complex sense, the example is actually based on the German “Unwort des Jahres”:

A German linguists' panel chooses one term that violates human rights or infringes upon Democratic principles, each year. The term may be one that discriminates against societal groups or may be euphemistic, disguising or misleading. The term is usually, but not always a German term.\textsuperscript{98}

\textit{Unwords} are inappropriate or offensive phrases which were actually in public use during the given year, possibly coming from many fields: politics, science, industry or the media. The first such word was \textit{ausländerfrei} (foreigner free) in 1991. Further examples are \textit{Überfremdung} (overforeignization) in 1993, with \textit{Lügenpresse} (lying press) for 2014.

The choice of a “word of the year” is also practiced by Oxford University Press, the reason why their most recent choice is deemed an \textit{unword} is that it is in fact not a word:

Oxford University Press has selected an emoji, ‘Face with Tears of Joy’, as the 2015 ‘word of the year’. For the first time ever, something that is not even a word has been given this accolade.99

This choice reflects on the one hand the fashions present in messaging (especially in the specifically message-based applications), on the other hand, emojis are interestingly meant to express concepts (HAPPINESS, FEAR, SADNESS) and they do it on different “levels”/to different extent. This shows parallels with some un-prefixations: complex meanings in concise forms.

6.1.9 Proper function – similar structure

These examples have been formulated to express a conceptual distance to the prototype, but not in a “worse”, but in a “better” sense, the concepts elaborated here are deemed as better versions of the original, prototypical sense.

• (94) Unbank

An unbank defines itself as a “check cashing store”, offering immediate service and short term loans, as opposed to traditional banks as institutions:

> Whether it is cashing a payroll or government check, sending or receiving money, buying a money order, paying bills or getting a short term loan, we are here to serve you. Our fees are low and are clearly displayed in the lobby so you know what it will cost before you even come up to the window. Quick and easy with no hidden fees or charges.100

The definition entails the drawbacks of a prototypical bank: expensive service, long waiting list and slightly ambiguous terms of transactions.

• (95) Un-candidate (un-candidacy)

100 www.unbankcompany.com [downloaded 5.1.2016]
It designates 1, either an unlikely candidate\textsuperscript{101} or 2, a very possible candidate, but one who does not consider running for office for various reasons\textsuperscript{102}. In the first case then, \textit{un-candidate} refers to an actual, running candidate, who defines himself as having different aspirations than the other competing candidates, the second case; however, is just the opposite: the person would make an ideal candidate, but chooses to stay away from the election race.

- (96) \textit{Undiet}

As with most previous examples, \textit{un-} triggers a network of interrelated senses for \textit{undiet}: 1, it may refer to unconventional diet regimes, usually with the application of some revolutionary method and/or ingredient involved 2, \textit{undiet} can also refer to the negation of the whole concept of dieting: one is required to accept his natural weight by way of eating right and being comfortable 3, an \textit{undiet} might also involve a psychological approach: by electronically altering photographs of oneself, psychological motivation is provided for losing weight. An \textit{undiet diet} (where diet would be the conventional type with rules and prohibitions) as an expression draws attention to the lexical clone phenomenon, not surprisingly \textit{un-diet books}, \textit{un-diet doctors} and \textit{un-diet delights} also exist. By yet another twist, the ever-present calorie-consciousness invited the phrase \textit{undiet Coke/Pepsi}, meaning the original sugary version.

- (97) \textit{Un-tourist}

The \textit{un-tourists} would probably consider themselves “proper function – similar structure” examples: by negating the classic \textit{TOURIST} frame, they tend to acquire a moral high ground: they do not use hotels, but live with the locals, they consider local cultures very important,

\textsuperscript{101} “Ralph Nader is a rarity among presidential candidates: he doesn’t just want to end up in the White House – he just wants people to listen.” Headline, Los Angeles Times, 31. January 1992

\textsuperscript{102} Massachusetts Senator Elizabeth Warren may not be running for the White House next year, but her influence in the Democratic Party appears only to be rising, thanks to the left-leaning side of the party which has embraced her unabashedly liberal point of view. http://recode.net/2015/05/26/the-un-candidate-elizabeth-warren-live-and-uncensored-liveblog/[12.12.2015]
besides, they identify as eco-tourists in being as green as possible. *Un-tourists* are seen, however, in a somewhat ironic light: instead of going on holiday, they “…go on things called “cultural experiences”, “expeditions”, “projects”, “mini-ventures” and, most tellingly, “missions.”*\(^{103}\)

- **Unschooling**

  Though a deverbal noun, *unschooling* belongs to the group of *un*-nouns, functionally, again, *un-* referring to an evaluatively more positive term than the base. It is attested in two senses:
  1. it refers to the bulk of experience gathered outside school during our lifetime (frame-external negation)
  2. it also refers to a very conscious education method (frame-internal negation):

    Unschooling is an educational method and philosophy that advocates learner-chosen activities as a primary means for learning. Unschooling students learn through their natural life experiences including play, household responsibilities, personal interests and curiosity, internships and work experience, travel, books, elective classes, family, mentors, and social interaction.\(^{104}\)

- **(98) unparenting**

  *Unparenting* is often mentioned together with *unschooling*, as parts of a larger ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION frame. *Unparenting* may take up different forms; in its most radical version it means “raising children without any rules whatsoever”, in which the biological parents refuse to act as parents, negating the whole PARENT frame. In its lighter version, it means ‘a mode of raising children that encourages us to take a step back in time, and away from the over-scheduled, hyper vigilant reality of modern-day parenting’, which is frame-internal


negation focusing on the parents’ point of view. The third possibility presents frame-internal negation from the child’s point of view: ‘the opposite of overparenting’.

- (99) Ungame

It is a question of alternative conceptualisation whether ungame is a “bad” or “good” example in comparison with a GAME game (with the problem of what a game is in the Wittgensteinian sense remaining unresolved):

The world’s most popular self-expression game is a cooperative adventure in communication. Two to six players, ages 5 through adult, progress along the playing board as they answer questions such as “What do you think life will be like in 100 years?” This non-competitive game can be a great icebreaker or a serious exchange of thoughts, feelings and ideas.

An ungame then has the structure of a category member with respect to being a board game and having certain rules; however, its non-competitive nature might turn it into a less good example for a (board)game.

- (100) Unmarriage

As with unbook or undiet, there exist abundant meaning extensions for unmarriage, too. As HORN (2005: 361) formulates: “When other polysemyse are factored in, the explosion of possible meanings for a given un-prefixed noun can be daunting indeed.” It might be daunting indeed in a way, yet at the same time also reflects the power of un-. From a prototype theoretical point of view – showing pointed analogies with unwedding – unmarriage can be classified as a “similar function – different structure” noun (as a committed same- or mixed-sex relationship where the partners do not attain legal wedlock); a “lack of function – similar structure” noun (with actually not one, but two possible senses: 1, a marriage in name only but not functioning properly, that is a deteriorated version 2, a marriage with the sole aim of getting the partner a green card); a deverbal reversative (in case of a divorce or annulment); or, side by side with unwedding, it can also be used for the “(un)ceremony resulting in any of the above” (p. 361). Unfortunately, even this does not
cover the whole picture: *unmarriage* is also present in feminist discourse, where *unmarriage* is the tool to avoid being tied to patriarchal institutions (which are not only patriarchal but authoritative as well).

- (101) *Unconference*:

It is again highly questionable, whether it is a “similar function – different structure” or a “lack of function – similar structure” example. Advocates of *unconferences* though certainly refer to it as a better version; however, it is more the function and less the structure that is emphasized:

An unconference is a conference organized, structured and led by the people attending it. Instead of passive listening, all attendees and organizers are encouraged to become participants, with discussion leaders providing moderation and structure for attendees. *“*105

The concept is fairly simple. At an unconference, no topics have been predetermined, no keynote speakers have been invited, no panels have been arranged. Instead, the event lives and dies by the participation of its attendees. They decide what topics will be discussed and they convene the individual breakout sessions. In other words, an unconference has no agenda until the participants create it.”106

### 6.1.10 Productivity – *un*-nouns

As for productivity, LADÁNYI’S (2007) approach will be applied: 1, productivity is seen as a cline and 2, it will be analysed in terms of four related notions, namely frequency, rule-governance, creativity and analogy.

Frequency in this approach is an influential but not decisive factor in determining the productivity of the respective schemas. In case of *un*-nouns, the already mentioned

“impossibility” and rule-breaking tendency of these forms can be described as type-blocking, that is lexical blocking on the level of the *un*-noun type. As foreseeable, in spite of the existing number of attested examples, a search in the COCA corpus yields very low frequency data for these forms. The majority of examples have no match in the corpus, however, there are some interesting and telling exceptions. *Un-Cola* yields six matches, *unwoman* 1, *un-diet* 2, *unschooling* 20, *ungame* 3, *undeath* 9, and *unperson* 3. Examining these token frequencies – in light of the present-day allergy– and health conscious trends in eating habits – it is surprising that no ersatz products (*un-milk*, *un-bread*, *unpotato*) were found in the corpus, while *un-diet* had two matches. The six matches for *un-Cola* (and *uncola*) reflect on a still present pattern-setting, analogical working of the phrase. *Unschooling* has a surprisingly high frequency, it seems to touch upon a commonly known and debated problem, present in every parent’s life who is raising school-age children. *Unperson* is used in specific contexts in the corpus as well: 1, in science fiction, where a person’s electronic trace is wiped out (bank account, credit cards and so on) 2, a person totally excluded by his colleagues and 3, a person excluded from financial circles because of an interview he has given. *Undeath* is present in the COCA corpus as 1, fantasy sci-fi expression (with respect to zombies, predominantly) 2, in one example a protagonist describes his life-quality at the age of a hundred years as undeath and 3, in a chase street-game, with survivors and fallen gamers, where the fallen ones “rise in undeath” and go on chasing the others. The corpus therefore lists some of the more creative *un*-noun examples and the expected simpler cases are not present.
6.2 Un-verbs

6.2.1 Reversativity and accomplishment – conceptual gaps

Resonating with the different approaches to the actual number of un- prefixes, where
the negative prefix un- attaches productively mostly to adjectives and only marginally to
nouns, it is the reversative un- which plays a crucial role in forming verbs (from verbs and
to a lesser extent, from nouns). The reversative aspect, however, hardly supplies a full
description of the actions taking place. As HORN (2002: 13) points out, what is generally
called a reversative un- “reverses not the ACTION denoted by the base verb, but rather the
RESULT of that action.” MARCHAND (1969: 205) states: “The reversative type untie has the
meaning ‘undo the result of a verbal action’, more precisely ‘cause the object of the verb to
be no longer –ed’. Tie a package means ‘cause the package to be tied’, untie a package means
‘cause the package to be tied no longer’. The ‘tiedness’ (passive state) of the package is
undone...At the level of the underlying syntactic structure, the analysis is ...cause to be un-
(=not)-tied.”

To what extent does the notion of reversativity help us understand creative un-verbs?
CRYSTAL (2001: 20-21), as part of a wider investigation into the language of Shakespeare –
especially aspects of linguistic novelty and creativity – draws attention to unshout
(Coriolanus 5.5.4): “Unshout the noise that banished Martius”. He admits to a previous
attempt at trying to supply a dictionary definition for unshout (by none other than Dr
Johnson): ‘to annihilate or retract a shout’. This definition clearly lacks true interpretive
force, as it solely refers to the reversative aspect. Still, Crystal’s reasoning is fully in line
with the views put forth in this thesis: “it doesn’t really capture the surreal dynamism of the
verbal action that the people are asked to perform... Unshout is literally nonsense... But it
is meaningful, powerful, dramatic nonsense. And it is all conveyed by un-.” (p. 20)107

Besides reversativity, accomplishment is one of the constraints concerning the set of verbs
that can undergo un- derivation. HORN (2002: 14-26) claims that there are constraints on the
set of verbs that can undergo un- derivation, which is especially true of the verbal un-: the

107 According to CRYSTAL’S (2001) queries, there are 314 instances in the OED, where Shakespeare is the first
citation for an un- usage. In 62 of the 314 instances the prefix has been added to an already existing verb.
Besides unshout, unspeak, uncurse, unswer and the especially interesting undeaf are further prominent
eamples: “My death’s sad tale may yet undeaf his ear” (Richard II, 2.1.16, John of Gaunt to York). Crystal
dubs these unique, innovative instances of Shakespearean language use Williamsisms. With respect to his un-
verbs, 30 % of them are found in just four plays: Richard II (uncurse, undeaf, undeck, unhappy – as a verb);
Macbeth (unbend, unfix, unmake, unprovoked, unspeak, unsex); Troilus and Cressida (unlock, untent, untie,
unveil); and Hamlet (uncharge, unhand, unmark, unpeg).
base of un-verbs is “normally an accomplishment, which crucially involves a change of state: this is why we have unbend, uncurl or undress….however, no *unsmoke, *unswim, *uneat or *ungo. In principle, then, un-verbs with a non-telic, stative or activity, base are ruled out.” Horn himself lists a number of counterexamples, from the O-ME unbe through unbelieve (16th-17th centuries) the modern English unrecognize, and, indeed, examples of creative un-verb prefixations almost never abide by these taxonomic-descriptive rules. Another restriction (Marchand 1969: 205) states that an un-verb will only occur only if “the physical possibility to undo the result of an action is conceivable”. In Marchand’s estimation this is the reason why unhit, unkill or unpoison cannot be found. Horn, however, rightly points out that (102) unkill is used, actually rather productively, e.g. with respect to departed characters in television series, just as unpoison became established in the phrase to unpoison the well, which refers to restoring civility. To forecast some already mentioned examples, unfollow, in the meaning of ‘ceasing to follow somebody’s blog or webpage’; unlike (as a verb) ‘to withdraw our support from something or somebody on a social networking site’; or uncry ‘to dry up one’s tears, as if the act of crying had never happened’. In all these examples, the bases of the composite structures are durative. The transitivity requirement is fulfilled, but the resultative aspect is missing. Rule-breaking composite structures as these have their effects on conceptualisation as well. Instead of a reversative action, unfollow and unlike signify the finishing of an action. As for uncry or (103) unhave, the frame is shifted into the realm of the impossible: we have to conceptualise a frame where backshifting in time would be possible. Horn’s (2002: 16) example with uninvent, in connection with nuclear weapons, is poignantly recalling the need for frame-shifting. Similarly, unsay does not mean “to do the opposite of saying”, but “to make as if unsaid” (p.16). The above-mentioned examples do not represent the same level of complexity; and according to their level of complexity and the frame-based negation involved, it is again possible to formulate groups of un-verbs. Naturally, the boundaries are not clear-cut, and a continuum exists from the conceptually simpler cases towards the conceptually highly complex ones.

The first group of un-verbs to investigate is a highly productive group, related to technology and characteristically linked to the widespread usage of computers, which facilitated and at the same time called for a number of expressions describing processes that

---

108 Horn (2002: 14-26) refers back to Marchand (1969) and Dowty (1979: 289-90) in stating that the verbal un- is “semantically choosy”, as both authors point out accomplishment characterizing the base of un-verbs, involving a change of state. It is non-telic (stative or activity) base which is definitely ruled out.
simply had not existed before. ZIMMER-CARSON-HORN (2011) treat these formations as back-formed un-verbs, and as such “rather unusual” (p. 356). What they emphasize though is the conscious play with the reversativity aspect, pointing out the first example (the locus classicus) to be the (104) undo command (dating back to 1976). Since the introduction of undo, hardly anything “undoable” remained in computer technology: it is known in all areas of editing and formatting. Such technological expressions are (105) unassociate: ‘to remove an established link, usually between a computer file type and the software program which has been assigned to open such files’; (106) unban: ‘remove the restriction that bars an individual, such as an interactive video game player’; (107) undestroy: ‘repair something that was significantly damaged, such as a computer file’ the metonymy-based (108) unflag: ‘remove a notation meant to attract one’s attention; (109) unfreeze: ‘make a computer or its display start working after it has remained inactive for an unreasonable time’ or (110) unprotect: ‘remove protection of a file’ present a continuum in terms of creativity and cognitive salience, where simple variants of the undo function represent one end of the scale: unerase, undelete, unbold, unitalicize, ununderline (Zimmer-Carson-Horn 2011: 356), the above-mentioned unban, undestroy, unflag, unfreeze, unprotect – given the more complex relations between the prefix and the stems – representing the other section of the scale. In terms of frames, these examples clearly represent frame-internal negation, where reversativity vs non-reversativity is also part of the frame: the in principle non-reversative actions like (111) unsubscribe ‘remove our data from a mailing list’ or (112) unsuspend ‘reactivate a user account’ remain within the SUBSCRIPTION and SUSPENSION frames, respectively.

The “Age of Undoing” (ZIMMER 2009), however, serves highly creative examples as well, where Crystal’s “surreal dynamism” is clearly felt. For the analysis of creative un-verbs the identification of frame-internal and frame-external negation is especially helpful, accordingly, the examples will be subsumed under two basic categories.

**6.2.2 Frame-internal un-verbs**

The frame-internal negation with un-verbs is in principle “doable”, as it is not the whole frame that is negated. However, in these cases, too, one type of action has been completed, so it is not a total negation, rather a sequential retraction of a state of affairs. Again, mostly telic activities are reversed; the creative aspect lies in discovering the void conceptual space.
• *unfriend*

The much-debated *unfriend* (also as the “winner” of the *defriend-unfriend* competition) displays analogical relations with the form *befriend*, together with *unlike* and *unfollow*. All of them express a change in attitude/opinion, where the virtual and actual relations are interconnected. Metonymy plays a part in the virtual aspects: *de-friend* and *unfriend* are both based on FUNCTION FOR PERSON metonymy from an aspect of illocution. The frame itself, which is being negated is not that of FRIENDSHIP, but rather that of VIRTUAL FRIENDSHIP, which narrows and extends the concept of friendship at the same time: online friends stand for acquaintances (classmates, colleagues) rather than friends. The productivity of the friending-unfriending pattern creates a highly flexible frame of friendship.

• (113) *unlearn*

*Unlearn* means ‘to make an effort to forget our usual way of doing something’, so that we can learn a new and sometimes better way. This can refer to different levels: we can *unlearn* bad driving habits or false/inaccurate information as well as a way of thinking or an attitude towards a given topic. As with all previous examples where *un-* opened up the way to a huge number of different senses (e.g. *unmarriage*), here again *un-* acts like a prism: with tiny shifts one sense after the other is being discovered.

My difficulty was that I had no one to advise me. I didn't know a soul who had written or who had ever tried to write. I didn't even know one reporter. Also, to succeed at the writing game, I found I had to unlearn about everything the teachers and professors of literature of the high school and university had taught me. I was very indignant about this at the time; though now I can understand it.109

---

109 [http://london.thefreelibrary.com/John-Barleycorn/26-1#unlearn](http://london.thefreelibrary.com/John-Barleycorn/26-1#unlearn) [downloaded: 02.05.2016]
Unlearning can refer to certain behavioural patterns, habits or even sophisticated mental constructs. At this point, even fields seemingly as far as spirituality literature and theories concerning adaptable and flexible knowledge management might be linked. Both areas emphasize the ability of emptying our assets to make way for something new. This process is on the one hand likened to removing old plants in a garden with the possibility of planting new ones, on the other, to stripping off the existing paint from a wall so that the new paint sticks.\textsuperscript{110}

To unlearn something still does not mean that we are leaving the LEARNING frame, in fact, unlearning is one step in a process. This is proven by the fact that unlearn is even chosen as the name of a social enterprise advocating “critical thinking by design …using clothing, posters and programs to provoke thought and discussion”.

- (114) unteach

Pairing up with unlearn, unteach also exists, however, its use is rather sporadic and with more archaic examples, compared with unlearn. Unteach means ‘to cause to forget or disbelieve something previously taught (possibly by contrary teaching)’. The attested examples link it to a frame of experience, like in the case of Sir Thomas Browne: “That Elder Berries are poison, as we are taught by tradition, experience will unteach us”. In CURETON’S (1979: 222-3) interpretation, in the poetry of Cummings, for example, unteach subsumes a whole poetic/philosophical disposition: the accumulation of knowledge in general, teaching in particular is seen as something negative, as opposed to the world of emotions. In his vision, capacities of the mind can only be enhanced at the expense of emotions; unteaching frees these shackles of the emotions: “Gladness unteaches what despair preaches” (1972: 764).

- (115) unconcede

The word *unconcede* – according to ZIMMER-CARSON-HORN 2009 – was much earlier present than *unfriend*, in fact, it was an ad-hoc formation which caught the eye of the American Dialect Society as well (nominated for Word of the Year in the Brand-Spanking New category). It refers to the 2000 presidential election, where during the rather chaotic election night Al Gore, the Democratic presidential candidate first conceded, then later *unconceeded* his defeat. It is a word which cannot be said to be productive in the sense of “sustained use” (p. 357), even if it has been present in American political slang ever since (with respect to John Kerry as well), but is still interesting for our purposes: it highlights the productivity of the creative un- + verb schema, just as it proved productive with un- + nouns (*unpolitician, uncandidate, uncampaign*; 6.1) With *unconcede*, we remain within the elaborate and also symbolic CONCESSION frame, the candidate unconceding not only negates the content of the frame, but also states something positive: his willingness to stay in the race.

- (116) *unvote*

To stay within the same political discourse, *unvote* presents an interesting example, as it can present frame-internal and frame external negation as well. *Unvote* meaning ‘reverse or annul a vote’ is clearly frame-internal negation: VOTING as a frame remains, but the actual vote is not valid. There is, however, another sense to unvote, ‘refraining from voting in protest’. In this case, the whole VOTING frame is rejected, as the potential voter finds either the candidates or the conditions of an election insufficient/unsuitable. (In this sense it shows analogies with the un-noun *unmarriage*, which also facilitated senses based on frame-internal and frame-external negation as well.)

- (117) *unelect*

One last example from the world of politics and governmental positions is *unelect*, in the meaning ‘to vote somebody out of office’ at the beginning of a new administrative term.111 The ELECTION frame is embedded in the GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS frame, which in turn,

---

111 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o2fE3RsnV1w
is part of the DEMOCRACY frame. To unelect somebody means negation within the ELECTION frame only, which possibility actually reinforces the validity of the larger frames.

- (118) unchoose

The word unchoose is another example where frame-internal negation is present, here again, though, there exists the possibility of an interpretation which involves frame-external negation as well. Unchoose means ‘deselect something’, for example a geographical destination. On a more sophisticated level of complexity, but still as frame-internal negation it can refer to conscious decisions made for our physical/mental well-being (hugely popular in e.g. popular self-help psychological literature):

…if the depression is a survival mechanism chosen by the woman when she was a child, then this is within her power to unchoose depression and to heal.\footnote{112}

We have coined a new word: "unchoosing." It has come to mean for us the opportunity to act on life's circumstances instead of reacting to them. It is the process of first discerning when past thought patterns are in play and then "unchoosing," stepping outside of old behaviors long enough to risk making a choice with a difference.\footnote{113}

The two examples fulfil the “doable” requirement, there is, however, a different sense to unchoose: “…you can’t unchoose your daddy’s hazel eyes”, which refers to a condition where the CHOICE frame is not valid.

6.2.3 Conceptual blending for frame-internal negation in un-verbs

A creative example like (119) unarrest is a more complex case of linguistic creativity in unverbs, therefore it allows the application of a four-spaced integration model.

- Unarrest is

1. Street tactic used by marchers and protesters who directly engage with police to assist in the escape of individuals who are in the process of being arrested. When a participant is apprehended by authorities, one or more people will rush the officer an attempt to either confuse them or pull the arrestee back into the crowd.

\footnote{113} http://www.amazon.com/Choosing-Unchoose-Conscious-Choice-Creating/dp/1432748483 [downloaded3.3.2016]
2. Process of on the street negotiations with authorities, often with the help of a legal observer, to get protesters who have been detained out of police custody.

3. Informal term for a legal process where persons who have been arrested can be released on the grounds of false arrest or insufficient evidence’.

One of the input spaces can be the space of *un-* (here heavily relying on the “semantically loaded” interpretation of prefixes). As a negative prefix, it entails in its space both the “not X”, and the reversative aspect as well, and all the cases of prefixation composed with *un-* by speakers of English, (possibly even other creative cases), that is the *un-*+X schema. The other input space would be that of the *arrest* lexeme, with its elaborate meaning extensions, including the cultural background concerning different aspects: the procedure of being arrested, the (legal) condition of being arrested, and the physical state of being arrested. The structure- and pattern giving generic space is an analogical schema containing the reversative aspect (as in *unchain* or *unlock*). The generic space also has a structural level, the schema of the derivational pattern of prefixation, the composite structure. This basic schema works as a starting point compared to which extra cognitive effort is needed to construe and integrate the meaning of *unarrest*. As a result, we have the integrated space of *unarrest*, as an emergent blend, the realisation of conceptual integration.
Figure 11. Blend: unarrest₁
6.2.4 Frame-external un-verbs — the subjunctive context

As opposed to the “doable” nature of un-verbs with frame-internal negation, un-verbs with frame-internal negation negate the whole frame, shifting into the realm of the impossible. What CRYSTAL (2001: 20-21) terms as “surreal dynamism”, COULSON (2000: 2-8) calls “semantic leaps”, with natural language constructions yielding nonobvious meanings.

- **Unsay**

  The word means: 1, retract 2, to not have said: by denying the frame the already uttered words “disappear”:

  …the witness tried to unsay the very testimony that he had given a few days earlier\textsuperscript{114}

\textsuperscript{114} http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/unsay
Although LIEBER (2004: 116) states that unlearn or unsay strike her as “slightly strange”, notes however, that they are comfortably used in negative or subjunctive contexts. Comparing You can’t unsay what you said (deemed acceptable) vs You can unsay what you said (deemed questionable), Lieber refers to (and agrees with) HORN (2002: 14-15), who argues that un- with activity verbs changes the lexical class of the base, with the effect of turning them into change of state verbs. Consequently, Lieber attempts to refine the “definition” for unsay. According to her, unsay means “something like cause to come into a state in which one takes back the saying of something”. Lieber is extremely insightful is supposing subjunctive contexts behind (e.g.) unsay, even if the attempted re-definition of unsay does not describe this subjunctive context: what the speaker aims at is a (hypothetical) return to a previous state, in which the action did not at all happen (therefore the aim is not reversing a chain of events). In fact, the subjunctive context could be a valid generalization for all creative un-verbs with frame-external negation.\footnote{What is implied by subjunctive context is the were- or past subjunctive, which is 1, hypothetical or unreal in meaning 2, refers to circumstances contrary to fact (QUIRK et.al. 1985: 158). LIEBER (2004) additionally notes that statements in the subjunctive mood exist outside time.} The examples not only negate the frame supplied by the stem, but also create a hypothetical condition of a subjunctive context.

- **Unlove**

The example violates the anti-stative restriction concerning verbs, with citations ranging from Chaucer’s Troilus to the previously already mentioned Brontë example:

I have told you, reader, that I had learnt to love Mr. Rochester: I could not unlove him now, merely because I found that he had ceased to notice me--because I might pass hours in his presence, and he would never once turn his eyes in my direction--because I saw all his attentions appropriated by a great lady, who scorned to touch me with the hem of her robes as she passed; who, if ever her dark and imperious eye fell on me by chance, would withdraw it instantly as from an object too mean to merit observation.
Unlove, however, is not a simple stative, in the sense of “not to love”, or a true reversative (to do the opposite of love, possibly hate), but “a verb with internal negation applying to an embedded state (to come to no longer love)” (HORN 2002: 14-15). In Horn’s evaluation, unlove is always a telic achievement. Although ZIMMER (2009c) also treats unlove as “no longer love”, this does not seem to cover the whole meaning of unlove. Following the previous reasoning, it does not only refer to a termination of a feeling but introduces the state of affairs within a different frame, hypothetically supposing a state of affairs when loving never happened. The essence of this frame-shifting lies in recalling a previous state by negating a frame, instead of simply reversing one. What happens is more than the transformation of a non-telic, anti-stative achievement into a telic one.

- (120) Unknow:

The example in HORN’S (2002: 15) summary has on the one hand 1, “an archaic, stative” use of “not to know, ignorant of”, but there is also 2, cease to know (to forget), an inchoative use:

She ... rather wished to unknowe what she knewe, then to burden her heart with more hopeless knowledge (Sidney: 1586)

There is no possibility... of the mind unknowing any thing it has come to know… (Paine: 1859)

In theology, unknowing exists as a concept through which the most divine knowledge of God can be attained (emphasizing a consciously chosen spiritual/emotional approach). In all mentioned examples the KNOWLEDGE frame is poignantly negated/denied and a hypothetical space is created which facilitates the possibility of returning to a previous condition.

• (121) Unabort

Even the dictionary definition for unabort, ‘to undo an abortion’ show the impossible, irreversible and final nature of this action, the hypothetical previous condition (being pregnant with the aborted baby) cannot be attained. Unabort, not surprisingly, is mostly present in theoretical discourses (pro-life vs pro-choice), as it directs attention to the finality of an abortion, this way the viability and possibility of the whole abortion frame is put to be questioned. Unabort in just one word concisely sums up one facet of the issues concerning abortion, focusing on the foetus (as opposed to the mother’s authority over her own body). Even if this one facet refers to the impossibility of such an action, it brings into play all the moral and ethical questions concerning abortion. The introduction of these questions and their handling is on the other hand is rooted in societal and legal conditions. By pointing out the irreversibility of the action, the abortion frame is negated. In terms of conceptual integration, unabort facilitates two parallel scenarios: one in which the foetus is aborted, side by side with one in which the foetus lives, developing into a human being.

• Uncry

It means ‘to make the act of crying as if it had not happened’. The term is rather well-known from pop songs, notably Toni Braxton’s song with the words “unbreak my heart, uncry these tears”. The word uncry in this song even caught the attention of Aronoff and Fudemam (2011) who – among others – use uncry to exemplify how neologisms work. When it comes to the actual explanation of the word, the authors get to somewhat slippery field. They state that although we have never seen anyone unbreak something and people generally can’t uncry tears, but speakers of English know what it means to unbreak somebody’s heart. The authors state: “If we asked somebody ‘unbreak my heart’, we would be asking them to reverse the process of having our heart broken” (Chapter 1.3.1, italics mine). In their
opinion, the fact that the particular actions mentioned cannot be reversed “only adds poignancy to the song”. This explanation is obviously somewhat lacking; at the same time sums up the way un-formations are generally treated in the literature.

Further un-verbs with frame-external negation include unhave, meaning ‘cancel retrospectively’, (especially of an embarrassing situation); (122) unhappen, meaning ‘to cease to have happened, to undo itself”; (123) uncurse, meaning ‘to remove a curse from somebody, to free somebody from a curse’ (which is usually achieved with special uncurse potions, or in computer games by rather elaborate operations). In a possibly humorous vein, unsee means ‘to undo the act of seeing something’: George Bernard Shaw states of a Shakespeare performance:

I have only seen the performance once; and I would not unsee it again if I could; but none the less I am a broken man after it.117

Two further examples deserve special treatment as depending on the different senses of the stems, they have meanings involving both frame-internal and frame-external negation variants. (124) Uncommit in the meaning ‘to release oneself from a previous obligation’ is in principle reversible, therefore it subsumes frame-internal negation. To uncommit a crime, however, belongs to the realm of the subjunctive context, involving frame-external negation. (125) Unchild, too, has two different variants (at least): ‘to bereave someone of children, to render childless’ (frame-external negation); while in the meaning ‘to deprive somebody of his childhood or the qualities associated with it’ depending on the possible contexts may represent frame-internal negation.

117 Shaw’s article Shakespeare in Manchester first appeared in 1897, and was later published in 1906, in Dramatic Opinions and Essays with an Apology by Bernard Shaw, Volume 2, p. 215.
6.2.5 Productivity – un-verbs

With respect to un-verbs, the corpus based research proves what our attested examples are suggestive of: the *undo* function of computer technology is represented in the corpus as well: *unfollow* yields 3 matches; *undo* 1856, partly from computer language, partly from political news programs of CBS, CNN, Fox, but also in more creative examples: “…it’s hard to watch her undo a life together we spent nearly forty years creating”; *unban* 5; *unfreeze* 73, where besides the computer language it is also used in the *defrost* sense; *unprotect* 1; *unerase* 4; *undelete* 17; *unsubscribe* 27; *unfriend* 24. *Unlearn*, with 134 matches also yields an outstandingly high frequency. The corpus lists examples ranging from the “mechanical” unlearning activities (e.g. pronunciation or handiwork mistakes) to unlearning “unconscious racism”, “violence”, “learned pain or learned paralysis”. *Unteach*, on the other hand, yields only 3 matches; *unelect* 4; *unarrest* 2 (of police and a sheriff’s department: “They don’t unarrest anyone”); *unlove* 3 (in entirely Brontëan sense: “how can you unlove your child?” or “I can’t unlove the thought of torching things to beauty”. *Unknow* yields 8 examples, but only four of them are actual verbs; *uninvent* 3; *unsay* 10. In the light of the relatively high frequency of *undo*, *unhave* interestingly yields only one match (“once you have AIDS, you can’t unhave it). *Unhappen* yields 7 matches, always in the subjunctive context (“make the tragedy unhappen”, “ unhappen slavery”). Surprisingly, even though science fiction and fantasy science contexts are well-represented in the corpus, no matches were found for *unkill*. 
6.3 Un-adjectives

Un-adjectives – prefixations with adjectival bases of un- – are by far the most frequent among un-prefixations, at the same time, they are the least productive category in terms of creative prefixations. Adjectives, due to their “one dimensional conceptual structure” (SCHMID 2011: 161) are deemed to be better suited to express contrast than nouns, which presumably have more complex conceptual structures. However, as the much-quoted happy – unhappy pair exemplified, derivation unavoidably shifts focus and changes perspective, paving the way for metonymic–metaphoric extensions. Even Schmid concludes that unhappy is not simply not happy, but “the opposite of happy” (p.162), although he does not go into elaborating what the opposite of happy would be then, only refers to this contrast.

In the analysis of creative un-adjectives, the overarching theoretical background is again supplied by frame internal – frame external negation. With respect to creative un-adjectives, some other aspects of negation also need to be discussed: problems of contrary and contradictory opposites, complementaries, antonymy and the relation between the negative prefix and its stem. Besides negation, schema theory (conceptualization of the presence or absence of boundaries) and construal operations will be discussed in the analyses of the examples. Here again, however, a point emphasized with un-nouns and un-verbs seems to resurface: speakers might want to aim at a finer partition of the state of affairs in the world, which means that the level of contradictory/complementary opposition is overridden by cognitive operations which can be interpreted through metaphor, metonymy, schemas and mental spaces. The involvement of such processes does not exclusively characterize creative prefixations: derivation as such creates extended conceptual units, preparing the way for metaphorical extensions. In fact, as GOATLY (1997: 93-102) points out, most prefixed forms have a tendency to incorporate metaphorical resemblance
compared to their unprefixed counterparts, so the extended form is already metaphorical. Among other prefixes (dis-, re- and en-) un- is a prime example for this metaphorisation process: in the cases of unclean, unclear, unbridled and unburden, where the unprefixed form “represents either a lexicalised metaphorical or literal meaning... but the prefixed form necessarily represents a metaphorical one” (p. 95) might optionally represent either a literal or a lexicalised metaphorical meaning: clear, bridled. However, the prefixed form necessarily represents a metaphorical extension.

FUNK (1971: 366-368) refers the problem of contradictory vs. contrary (also called diametrical) negation clearly in the field of logic. In line with ZIMMER (1964) and HORN (2002), he speaks of contradictory opposites when both constituents are (quoting Zimmer 1964: 95) “felt to exhaust the possibilities along a given dimension”:

![Diagram](image)

Figure 13. (based on Funk 1971)

By formal logic, such purely contradictory (binary) opposites can be expressed by the formula “that is not adj”, consequently, Funk treats them as syntactic derivatives, whose meaning can be fully captured by means of nexal negation. The denotatum of contrary opposites, on the other hand, though directly related to the corresponding affirmative “cannot be represented by formal grammatical means” (p. 366). Instead of being based upon negativity, it marks a counterpole within the negated field which could be termed positive:
In contrary (polar opposition) there are two extreme poles given on a dimension, with contrary opposites in transition from negation to position, the absence of a quality leading to a new quality. Related to this tendency, Funk also notes that the question of contradictory or contrary opposition is in most cases decided upon by the stem’s semantic qualities.

The link between the different approaches to negation (contrary vs contradictory, complementary negation and frame internal – frame external negation) is supplied by the relations between the negative prefixes and their respective stems. The suggestion that most adjectives with un- or in- have a depreciatory sense or negative evaluative content goes back to JESPERSEN (1917: 144): “we have unworthy, undue, imperfect, etc., but it is not possible to form similar adjectives from wicked, foolish, or terrible”. Along the lines of evaluative/emotive connotations of adjectives, the following generalization is accepted in the literature (CRUSE 1980, HORN 2002):

\[ \text{negative affix} + \text{e-pos base} \rightarrow \text{e-neg derived output} \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[un]} & \quad \text{[happy]} & \quad \text{[unhappy]} \\
\end{align*}
\]
In accordance with this generalization, HORN (2005: 332-3) produces a list of acceptable vs unacceptable examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(e-pos base)</th>
<th>(e-neg base)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>uncivilized</td>
<td>*unbarbarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unclean</td>
<td>*undirty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>*unfuzzy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfriendly</td>
<td>*unhostile, *unantagonistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unhealthy, unwell</td>
<td>*unsick, *unill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unintelligent</td>
<td>*unstupid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uninteresting</td>
<td>*unboring, *undull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unjust, unfair</td>
<td>*unwrongful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unkind, uncivil</td>
<td>*unrude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>untrue</td>
<td>*unfalse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infertile</td>
<td>*unbarren</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By strictly applying the generalizing principle, only e-pos or neutral stems could serve as bases,\textsuperscript{118} with the end-results being e-neg derived adjectives. This, however, is not entirely the case even from a historical point of view: according to the OED, it is true that considerable restrictions exist with the use of un- in cases of short simple adjectives of native origin, as their negative pairs are supplied by corresponding simple words. In the older

\textsuperscript{118} Concerning e-positivity, there exist some significant problems, though: 1, there are a number of “orphaned” un-adjecitves representing the productive un + participle pattern (HORN 2005: 333), where the possibility of finding a positive counterpart does not exist: unabashed, unassuming, unbending, unkempt, unparalleled, untouched etc.; 2, CRUSE (1980) points out that e-pos adjectives represent a semantically heterogeneous category: pairs of e-pos/e-neg adjectives constitute antonyms, that is gradable contraries, if a midinterval exists between the marked and unmarked qualities. Consequently, the positive attribute or property is present in possibly varying degrees. With gradable complementaries the unmarked term refers to negative or undesirable features: “All gradable complementaries denote degrees of some undesirable property, like dirtiness, or danger; antonyms always indicate degrees of either a neutral property, like length, or weight, or a desirable one, like beauty, merit, or intelligence” (p. 21).
language, though, *unbroad, undeep, unwide, unbold, unglad, ungood, unstrong* and *unwhole* freely occurred.

### 6.3.1 Blocked or pre-empted *un*-adjectives

Even HORN’S (2002: 332-3) above list of unacceptable *un*-adjectives includes some attested creative prefixations (where the creative aspect – among others – lies in finding the conceptual niche for the usage of “deviant” forms, relying on the metaphorically extended sense).

- (126) *undirty*

As *undirty* should in principle be blocked by *clean*, the analysis of this example should take on two directions: how is *undirty* different form *clean*, and what specific conceptual content is expressed by it? Interestingly, *undirty* is used in a physical sense as well (where the blocking effects of *clean* could be expected even more strongly present, with contradictory negation transformed into contrary negation): on an evaluative site for tourists, concerning hotel rooms *undirty* is used to imply that although some cleaning has been done, but the expected level of cleanliness has not been achieved, therefore the rooms are in an intermediary state:

> Very very undirty rooms; the housekeeping does not use any proper cleaning attributes.¹¹⁹

In terms of negation, *undirty* is frame-internal negation, we stay within the cleanliness frame, however, the content is negated. *Undirty*, however, is also used negating the frame implied by the metaphorical use of *dirty*, meaning obscene (songs, jokes, lyrics). *Undirty* words

actually substitute obscene ones, evoking the unmentionable words without speaking them. This, often intentionally, creates a humorous effect, as in the *undirty* song,\(^{120}\) where “your mind connects the dots, even if you don’t want to”; or as in one task of the Washington Post’s weekly wordplay game: “Talk undirty to us, in a poem with a ‘rude-sounding’ word”. (They provide a list of eligible rude-sounding words, e.g. *fuksheet*, which is an old term for the foremost sail on a ship; or *shittah*, which means a kind of tree, mentioned three times on the Bible, with *shittim* as its plural form.\(^ {121}\)

- (127) *unfuzzy*

*Unfuzzy* in its first usage simply means the lack of CO2 in drinks. *Fuzzy* exists in “fuzzy maths” (as mentioned in 1.2.1), meaning a new approach to teaching mathematics, relying on the integration of students’ past experience with their concept-forming abilities, instead of a predominantly algebra-based basic skills development. *Unfuzzy* maths means a definite distance from this conceptually integrated method, referring to problems where simple arithmetic means can/should be applied. A recent example comes from the 2016 U.S. election campaign, where candidates face problems of counting votes – and honing strategies – to win electorates:

> If Clinton loses Iowa and New Hampshire, her much touted firewall of minority voters in South Carolina and throughout the South will be tested. But even if you give Sanders every delegate in Iowa, plus the delegates from every caucus state and every state in New England, the most liberal part of the country, he’s still got only 36 percent of the delegates, says Cook. His path to the nomination is way, way too narrow. No chance he gets the nomination. Yet Cook says there’s a 15-20 percent chance, “and that might be high,” that Hillary doesn’t get it either. That’s if the FBI decides to take some action against her in the ongoing e-mail investigation, which would mean Joe Biden stepping in.\(^ {122}\)

\(^ {120}\) [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hcpxKK4NGe8](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hcpxKK4NGe8) [downloaded: 03.04.2016]


(128) unhostile

*Unhostile* is relevant partly in its distance from *amicable/benign*; and as frame-internal negation. As another example for finer partition, *unhostile* creates a category of its own, pointing out the necessity of a *hostile-unhostile* contrary negation (with *hostile-amicable* supposedly the contradictory one). *Unhostile* as a category stems from parallels with animal behaviour: in an encounter of two species, two basic behavioural patterns exist: *hostile*, when one animal serves as possible food source for the other; and *unhostile*, when this basic relation of the animal kingdom does not exist. The analogy of this behaviour is at work with corporate company structure: as global companies are often described as sharks or predators (based on the ABSTRACT COMPLEX SYSTEMS metaphor). In case of a *hostile takeover* between two companies, the acquisition of one company (called the target company, the metaphorical prey) by another (called the acquirer, the predator or shark) that is accomplished not by coming to an agreement with the target company’s management but by going directly to the company’s shareholders, or fighting to replace management in order to get the acquisition approved.\textsuperscript{123} In case of an *unhostile takeover* frame-internal negation takes place: as *hostile takeovers* are considered as standard, constituting the frame, in the special cases of *unhostile takeovers*, the contents of the invoked evaluative frame are negated. In fantasy fiction, creatures are also categorized according to their *hostile* or *unhostile* nature, and in ‘*The Life of Buddha*’, he is also described as having a “heart endued with abundant, exalted, measureless loving-kindness, unhostile and unaffected by ill will, extending to the entire world”.\textsuperscript{124}

(129) unboring

\textsuperscript{123} [http://www.investopedia.com/terms/h/hostiletakeover.asp](http://www.investopedia.com/terms/h/hostiletakeover.asp)

\textsuperscript{124} [https://www.google.hu/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&rrl=1C1CHWA_huHU679HU680&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=unhostile&start=10](https://www.google.hu/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&rrl=1C1CHWA_huHU679HU680&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=unhostile&start=10) [downloaded: 05.04.2016]
Unboring is listed among the examples HAY (2007: 39-57) is examining, with respect to the phonetic length of prefixes. As Hay convincingly proves, there exists a correlation between “highly compositional, highly creative” words containing phonetically longer un- prefixes, while less compositional, to a greater degree lexicalised words containing shorter, possibly even reduced un- forms. In accordance with HOHENHAUS (2007), she accepts a cline between lexical creativity and productivity (in which view productivity is highly rule-governed, whereas lexical creativity is not). Hay’s “cline” in terms of this correlation is constructed as follows: unfortunately (.06ms) → unsatisfactory (.0.9ms) → uncertain (0.11ms) → unboring (.17ms) → unmetalled (.22ms) → unbiased (.22ms). Unboring is actually mentioned as part of “to get an unboring job” (p.41). As Hay is mainly concerned with proving the above-mentioned correlation, she does not go into details concerning the rule-breaking aspect of unboring, as having an e-neg stem, however, it is relevant that even phonetic factors confirm the creative usage of un- in this example. An unboring job presupposes the existence of a frame where all jobs are boring (the possibility of an exciting job is not even included in the frame), so to find an unboring job (frame-internal negation) is already considered lucky. The same way, candidates may aim at “unboring job interview outfits”⁵ in the almost uniform-like world of business attires, where originality/individuality is not even part of the frame.

- (130) ungood

Ungood, an example originally blocked by bad is a literary example where exactly this blocking effect is called into question: George Orwell’s 1984 (with the equally well-known unperson example) uses this example, as applying un- is the general method to express negation. There are two reasons for this: 1, bad is considered superfluous, as un- + good is deemed the perfect antonym, 2, the Party in Orwell’s novel also aims at controlling people’s

⁵ [www.pinterest.com/pin/434878907738034791](http://www.pinterest.com/pin/434878907738034791) [downloaded 08.04.2016]
ability to think negatively. *Ungood* is actually often used in political journalism as referring to Orwell’s work, the context being almost exclusively state authorities claiming the right to interfere with citizens’ private lives.

As these blocked or pre-empted examples testify, antonymy and contradictory negation simply does not always cover the spectrum of negation speakers might want to cover: although *unstupid* is not widely attested, yet it exists in the senses 1, someone who cannot be easily taken in or 2, a person of average intellectual capacities: “Take the case of an ordinary unbrilliant, unstupid boy who is learning to read.”

### 6.3.2 Un-colour adjectives

Colour adjectives (as mentioned in Chapter 5) in principle cannot serve as bases for either contradictory or contrary opposition. The connotations of colour terms in general and of English colour terms in particular is an important field of investigation in cognitive linguistics (*Berlin and Kay 1969, Allan 2008, Steinwall 2002*). Colour adjectives do not stand for the colours in the classifying sense anymore; they comprise all kinds of non-lexical, encyclopaedic cultural knowledge, with which the respective colours are identified: their figurative uses are many-sided and culturally complex. The possibility of frame-internal and frame-external negation is conceptually facilitated by the fact that instead of (basic) colour terms, abstract colour expressions are used in creative prefixations.

As *Steinwall* (2002: 197-210) points out, metonymies play a crucial part in the figurative use of colours in two major classes: PART-WHOLE metonymies and PART-PART metonymies, with further possible subclasses: for PART-WHOLE metonymies further subcategories are SALIENT PROPERTY FOR THE CATEGORY (black people, white people, village green), SALIENT

[126](https://books.google.hu/books?id=0GKLAgAAQBAJ&pg=PT139&lpg=PT139&dq=unstupid&source=bl&ots=vAnFQUYcQ&sig=dSzS_WITxnFLJEr9dcFlE979G9o&hl=hu&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiz2v-M1YjMAhXCDpoKHSZFAVMy4MhDoAQgZMAA#v=onepage&q=unstupid&f=false[downloaded: 12.12.2015])
Creative *un*-adjective prefixations do not cover the whole colour spectrum, but they are inextricably linked to the metonymic-metaphorical use of the original colour terms.

- **unblack**

Black, as ALLAN (2008: 626-637) summarizes might be viewed positively in terms of the connotations of English colour terms, to be in the black means to be solvent, without debts. *Black-coat* for a clergyman is somewhat archaic and more in a descriptive/classifying sense. In all other senses, however, black is viewed negatively: as it is characterized by the absence of light, it denotes darkness; conceptually it is related to the dismal, the sombre, the sad and the gloomy. Black has had negative connotations since the ancient Romans, who marked inauspicious days in their calendar black; a black day has negative connotations ever since. For melancholy and depression the expression *black dog* is used (by Winston Churchill, for example, who used *black dog* for his lifelong obsession for suicide). In European cultures, black is predominantly associated with mourning and funeral clothes (although in a historic perspective, in the Middle Ages white was the colour of mourning and in some Hungarian communities living in Kalotaszeg and Torockó, it still is). Black is also associated with soil and dirt. There are only a few attested examples with *unblack*: 1, it exists in a somewhat specific sense, referring to a type of music: *unblack* metal music. This however entails an intricate web of the above-mentioned metonymic-metaphorical extensions and is condensed in terms of cultural content and construction. *Unblack* metal:

“...is a genre of music that is stylistically black metal, but whose artists either are either directly against Satanism, or promote Christianity in their lyrics and imagery. Unblack metal artists are controversial, mainly because black metal's pioneers, especially those of the Second Wave, were anti-Christian. It is also suggested that Christianity contradicts black metal's dark nature and the individualistic and misanthropic ideals of many bands.”

Unblack here refers to distancing themselves from traditional black metal, with possibly anti-Christian (even Satanist) messages. Unblack is created in the framework of all what black/blackness stands for: black for Satan, black for death/dying/mourning. As opposed to white/whiteness with many positive connotations, bad is black is an all-pervading metaphor, connected to evil things. It is this whole frame of black, which is negated by unblack in the example as frame-external negation. Although unblack metal musicians still define themselves as metal musicians, it is in a non-prototypical sense: their function is to play metal music, but in terms of structure/message, they could hardly be more different.

A second, culturally and sociologically loaded example for unblack is in terms of a sociological/ideological construction: the book entitled “Unyoung, unpoor, unblack: John Updike and the Construction of Middle American Masculinity” there is the ordinary Middle American white man in the centre, who realizes that he is not in the centre anymore:

“Whenever there is a major revolution or change in the power structure of some aspect of society, the outs, the insurgents, the underdogs always become the center of attention and receive the major share of publicity. Thus, in the United States, the activities of racial minorities and youthful rebels are given center stage, while their adversaries, the white, middle class, middle-age establishment, sink into the shadows.”

The underlying metaphor is middle american white man is silent majority, partly because the black minority has taken centre stage, partly because of the more and more outspoken feminist movement. Unblack in this context refers to their invisibility, unpoor to their middle-class status, unyoung to their “not yet old” status: the concept of this type of man is constructed on the pillars of three un-s, as they are conceptualized in three negatives and not a single affirmative.

- (130) ungrey

---

128 https://muse.jhu.edu/journals/modern_fiction_studies/summary/v044/44.2robinson.html[downloaded:13.12.2015]
Grey, as a colour can potentially be complimentary (ALLAN 2008: 629) in grey-beard, and the concept GREY is widely used for ageing populations: grey nomads are retired people travelling around the country, grey power and grey vote refer to the growing economic and political power of senior citizens. There is also classifying and negative sense attached to it, it may describe gloomy weather, unclear states of affairs (grey market), even dull people. Ungrey is attested in opposition to this concept of GREY: ungrey attitudes are less settled, less rigid and not from a position of power,

So young, so naive, so un-grey. It’s like looking back at the first few weeks of an outgoing president, except without the hyperaccelerated aging.129

- **ungreen**

Green is the colour of living leaves (hence the metonymical expressions green fingers or green thumb), and is associated with nature/ ecology in English (and many other European languages including Spanish, German and Hungarian). As part of a metonymical chain, it is also associated with political movements focusing on the preservation of natural environment. There are few negative connotations to green; however, white people might turn green from fear or jealousy. We therefore have Green Party, green revolution, green salad. In connection with the GREEN FOR NATURE metonymy, there also exists the GREEN FOR NON-PROCESSED FOOD metonymy in English. When ungreen is used for a plant or vegetable matter, it refers to decaying (UNGREEN FOR DECAY). Plants turn into ungreen colours in autumn (different shades of red, brown, possibly black). The UNGREEN FOR DECAY metonymy is extended into the DEATH IS AUTUMN metaphor. To further extend the GREEN FOR NATURE metonymy, as a person might be described as having green fingers in the meaning that they are gifted in raising vegetables/attending to plants, not surprisingly,

---

ungreen crops up here as well: specific plants are advertised to people with “an ungreen thumb”, being especially hard-wearing and enduring. An ungreen garden is

...a collection of species across the whole vegetal kingdom whose foliage grows in non-green hues. All climates, all conditions, plants or any origin whatsoever...Just not green!¹³⁰

An ungreen garden then stands in opposition to a real/traditional, prototypical green garden. However, it is again less of an opposition, more of a distance from a prototype, a distance from a GARDEN GARDEN (which is predominantly green), the GREEN GARDEN frame is internally negated.

An even larger section of ungreen expressions is based on an extension of the original GREEN FOR NATURE metonymy, namely GREEN FOR ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY or GREEN FOR ENVIRONMENTALLY CONSCIOUS, together with COLOUR FOR ATTITUDE and COLOUR FOR NOTION metonymies. When it comes to environmental concerns and activities, ungreen is an extremely compact expression to refer to behaviour, consumer attitude and business ideals as well: there are ungreen enterprises, ungreen corporate investments (relying for example on coal-fired power plants). Again, ungreen is identifying a set of interrelated phenomena. Persons can also be described as ungreen, they might even make “ungreen confessions using do-it-yourself weed killers”, and the question referring to a person’s carbon footstep is slowly evolving into “How ungreen are you?” (instead of “How green are you?” for which the possibility is deemed lower).

- unpink

Another high-profile un-colour adjective is unpink, which does not stand for “any other colour in the spectrum but pink”. If unpink is constructed in an opposition to anything, then it is not the colour pink, but the concept or frame of “pinkness”.¹³¹ Unpink then in a

¹³¹ The actual gender-conscious term for the phenomenon is pinkification (another remarkable piece of novel word-formation).
way does mean a lot of colours, referring to opportunities instead of some kind of gender-specific labelling. *Unpink* refers to a concept, a denial of the pink-and-pretty typecasting, as an involved mother points out:

I have decided to take a stand against the nonsense. I will not be a passive participant in this pink pandemonium. ...I’ll call my resolution Operation Unpink.\(^\text{132}\)

Another mother gives an even more exhausting description of the concept of *unpink*:

“I coined the term "the unpink ladies" shortly after my third daughter was born and always assumed to be a boy, simply because we didn't dress her- or any of the girls- in pink. Now, years (and another girl!) later, unpink is less about a wardrobe choice- in fact, all four often wear pink- and more about a way of life. Strong, sassy, creative and fun- unpink.”\(^\text{133}\)

![Figure 15. Blend: unpink](http://naturalparentsnetwork.com/operation-unpink/[downloaded 13.12.2015])  


Apart from these more frequently attested *un*-colour adjectives there are some less high-profile examples, which are used in either a descriptive sense (*unred* stands for hair colour from which unwanted red tones have been removed) or they refer to peripheral senses within a category (*unbrown* brownies are made without chocolate, therefore the same recipe is followed without adding the last ingredient).

6.3.3 Scalarity and concept formation via *un*-attachment

The following examples show that frames are not only involved in cases where their content is negated or where the frame as such is negated. Frame-related negation is involved in cases which point out the need for creating other, more elaborate frame structures.

- *unyoung*

  The example of *unyoung* (as above and previously in 6.1) has been mentioned meaning “being of advanced years and especially past middle age...but not yet old.” In this case, as neither the OLD, nor the YOUNG frame fits, both are negated by way of introducing another, that of UNYOUNG. In HORN’S (2002) example *unyoung* is used for a ballerina in an article entitled “*When Age 40 Doesn’t mean the End of Everything*” referring mostly to physical capacities. *Unyoung* in this (mostly) physical sense makes use of the prefix *un*- to express a more elaborate conceptualization: instead of a binary opposition, a three-tier system is aimed at:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>young</th>
<th>unyoung</th>
<th>old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

It can even be supposed that very concrete, embodied experiences are behind the need for such a partition: with the constant ageing of the population, *old* was shifted to describe a different category than people between 40 and 60. This accounts for the introduction of a
term originally pre-empted. *Unyoung*, however, might also refer to a certain status and a state of mind:

The curtain has lifted and there we are, in our all glory or our ordinariness, for the world to see. Our trajectories have pronounced themselves, our potentials have already actualized, and categorically, whatever points one gets from the enigma of simply being young are not available once we’ve become un-young.\(^\text{134}\)

With *unyoung*, Mettinger’s container schema can be applied: if we had one container for old and one for young as a polar contrast, unyoung comes in-between, not being contained by either of them. In terms of frame-based negation, *unyoung* presents frame internal negation with respect to the *YOUNG* frame, while rejecting the *OLD* frame at the same time.

The common denominator of all creative prefixations, the attempt at a finer partition of the world, a more distinctly layered conceptual system can be attested in some further examples. In Horn’s estimation (2002: 11): “Apparent non-scalar categories can be coerced into scalarity via un-attachment.” *Alive* and *dead* should in principle stand in binary/contradictory opposition; however, both *unalive* and *undead* exist.

- (131) **unbright**

Besides Cummings’ and Orwell’s extensive involvement with the usage of *un-* as a literary device, there exist further examples as well. Perkins (2013) makes note of the special usage of *un-* in Elizabeth Bowden’s novel, *The House in Paris*. In Perkins’ estimation, the prefix *un-* is used throughout the novel to express the narrator’s “definitional uncertainty” (p. 8-9) of *un-*words. This uncertainty goes hand in hand with the main character, Henrietta’s development of character, a process bound to question the “legitimacy of categorial definition” (p. 10-11), including her own self-definition. The *un-*formations of the novel serve as a tool to constantly undermine fixed definitions, which process also rings into play some creative *un*-formations. Such formations are e.g. *unbright* ‘neither wholly bright, nor

\(^{134}\) [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/peter-himmelman/lessons-for-from-the-unyo_b_8484490.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/peter-himmelman/lessons-for-from-the-unyo_b_8484490.html)
dark’, *unstrange*, as in “an unstrange place” said of a venue which was “never to lose for Karen a troubling strangeness, a disturbing repose” (p. 18, referring to p. 75 in the novel). Perkins identifies the role of *un*-words as means to destabilize meaning through unfamiliarity, indefinability, even irony. Just as with Cummings, *un* serves as a descriptor of a whole parallel world, where defining meaning is difficult. Even though Perkins handles Bowen’s *un*-formations in a literary context (where *un*- even plays a role in creating the text as fiction as well as a device for metalinguistic references) some of the analogues are strikingly similar in terms of the interpretation of creative *un*-forms.

- *(132)* **undead**

*Undead*, around since Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* (1897) and Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* – which are held to be the seminary texts about the *undead* – refer to all sorts of, presently very fashionable, creatures: vampires, zombies, awakening dead creatures etc. In their case, they are “not quite dead but not fully alive” (OED). The literature on this *undead* state is quite extensive, differentiating between different forms of *undead*, namely 1, living corpses (skeletons, vampires, and zombies) and 2, incorporated spirits (ghosts, poltergeists, the Grim Reaper):

An undead is a being in mythology, legend or fiction that is deceased but behaves as if alive. A common example is a corpse re-animated by supernatural forces by the application of the deceased's own life force or that of another being (such as a demon). Undead may be incorporeal like ghosts, or corporeal like vampires and zombies. The undead are featured in the belief systems of most cultures, and appear in many works of fantasy and horror fiction.\(^{135}\)

The state of being *undead*, therefore, plays an important role in many cultures, in fact it is indeed becoming a cross-cultural phenomenon (even in the commercial sense). It is a category placed between the two poles of binary opposition.

• (133) unalive

The picture is further detailed by the presence of unalive: “if something appears to be alive but does not quite fulfil that expectation...it is unalive”:

I wait for them [artificial flowers] to droop, as in a natural cycle. But they are stubbornly unalive and therefore unwilting.\(^\text{136}\)

Unalive stands for “lacking in vitality, not living or lively”. Interestingly, unalive is present even in medical terminology, concerning e.g. serious cases of Alzheimer’s disease, in possible treatment varieties (applying music, for example). The poet Cummings also uses a four-layer distinction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>alive</th>
<th>unalive</th>
<th>undead</th>
<th>dead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A continuum is formed both in his poetic world and in everyday usage alike. As Cureton (1979) points out, for Cummings, the use of un- redefines the normal reference of several adjectives. In his poetry, unalive refers to someone who is “merely physically alive but has denied the more spiritual aspects of his nature” (p. 224). This type of frame-internal negation is actually a productive pattern:

• (134) unasleep

Unasleep means 1, an intermediary state or condition between being awake and asleep, on the analogy of undead 2, it also refers to an attitude or state of mind: when an aspiring (coloured) student describes himself as “unashamed, unafraid, unasleep”,\(^\text{137}\) it describes his general lookout on life, an open-minded and pro-active attitude.

• unnuclear

Unnuclear is also an example where scalarity has been coerced: For example, nuclear is strictly binary in its original scientific sense (“of, relating to, or forming a nucleus”, Horn:

\(^{136}\) (Baxter 2000: 106)

Yet first with a metonymic extension to the original term *nuclear*, we have *nuclear families* in a metaphorically extended sense (father, mother and the child/children). The concept of a nuclear family has become so much rooted in common knowledge (as possibly the most prototypical family pattern), that through a process of frame-shifting it is possible to talk about *unnuclear* families, which deviate from this prototypical pattern in a number of ways, either as single parent families, same sex couples raising children, etc. (HORN 2002). Besides living in an *unnuclear* family, one might also have an *unbiological* family as well, meaning friends, roommates, or neighbours who are as close as family. In this case again, the family as frame is extended in the sense that the aspect of “living close together” acquires relevance instead of the actual biological bonds.

- (135) **unangry**

Some *un*-adjective formations raise the question adjectival opposites in a different light: as stated in chapter 4, with adjectives, it is relatively simple to define an antonym (even if allegedly not the whole spectrum is covered). Still, finding an antonym is not always a *big vs. small* matter for adjectives, either. If we take the example of *angry*, the following antonyms are supplied as possible variants: *calm, cheerful, cool, happy, peaceful*, and *pleased*. These adjectives certainly express some sort of contrast to *angry*, however, as with the previous cases of *unalive* or *unyoung*, a conceptual void exists, for which *unangry* is the answer: after a having a quarrel with somebody with heated emotions, the ensuing state of mind is better described by *unangry* than *cheerful, pleased*, let alone *happy*.

- (136) **unconservative**

An *unconservative* policy is not yet liberal; in fact, it is more of the “bad example”, “lack of function – similar structure” of non-prototypicality:

---

138 Horn’s example comes from the review of a novel (Sarah Dunant: *Mapping the Edge*), referring to a “strange unnuclear family” consisting of a protagonist, her 6-year-old daughter, her confidante, her best friend and his boyfriend. (New York Times Book Review, 18 February, 2001)
...modern Conservative economics produces very unconservative people. They are unlikely to be entrepreneurs and will regard the “role models” society holds up for them to admire as the beneficiaries of luck or fraud.\textsuperscript{139}

With \textit{unconservative}, some quintessential conservative ideas and attitudes are contrasted, defining a pole in a complementary opposition, serving to describe an attitude which is just as distinct from liberalism as from conservativism. However, it is conservative economics providing its frame, which means a case of frame-internal negation.

- (137) \textit{unacademic}

An \textit{unacademic} education is arrived at a route for schooling “different from other civil service coaching institutes as the courses are offered through YouTube for free”\textsuperscript{140}, in which case the whole frame of academic education is negated. However, negative connotations are also present:

Some unacademic enthusiastic upright soul called it a pear because it happened to remind him of a pear, though it is really a cactus-berry.\textsuperscript{141}

- (138) \textit{unfree}

Again a quintessentially binary case of contradictory negation is treated as frame internal negation in the meaning ‘bound’. \textit{Unfree} was used in case of tenants who were bound to a manor, therefore not physically enslaved, yet not free to move either. The expression \textit{unfree labour} refers to different types of forced labour, including slavery, with the whole frame being negated:

Unfree labour is a generic or collective term for those work relations, especially in modern or early modern history, in which people are employed against their will by the threat of destitution, detention, violence (including death), lawful compulsion, or other extreme hardship to themselves or to members of their families.\textsuperscript{142}

\textsuperscript{139} \url{http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/jul/12/osborne-britain-no-country-for-young-men-and-women} [downloaded: 3.12.2015]
\textsuperscript{140} \url{http://english.manoramaonline.com/lifestyle/society/an-ias-officers-unacademic-victory.html} [12.12.2015]
\textsuperscript{141} 1913, John Bertram Andrews, \textit{The American Labor Legislation Review}
\textsuperscript{142} \url{https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unfree_labour} [12.12.2015]
Unfree has extensive political and philosophical reverberations as well, the difference or borderline between freedom and the lack of it under debate for centuries, still presenting an ontological problem:

The majority of us are double-plus unfree: our “freedom to” is limited to approved and supervised activities, and our “freedom from” doesn’t keep us free from a great many things that can end up killing us, with our bathtubs being just the beginning. Freedom from toxic chemicals in the air and water? Freedom from floods, droughts and famines? Freedom from defective automobiles?143

The above Margaret Atwood quote makes a reference to Orwell with the double-plus unfree, as in Newspeak certain words with negative connotations are forbidden, thus a metalinguistic device is created by which the thinking of the citizens can further be influenced and controlled.

6.3.4 Pseudo un-nouns

There is still another significant category to be discussed among un-adjectives: these are termed by HORN (2002: 1-64) the pseudo un-nouns, which are actually adjectives in nominal clothing. This category goes back to an arch-example for creative prefixations: Lewis Carroll and his famous Looking Glass exchange, with Humpty Dumpty (on his cravat belt a gift from the White King and the Queen):

Humpty Dumpty: “They gave it me – for an un-birthday present...”
Alice: “What is an un-birthday present?”
Humpty Dumpty: “A present given when it isn’t your birthday, of course.”144

What happens in this case is that the prefix attaches to the first noun of a nominal compound, yet what is structurally an un-nominal is functionally “a prefixed quasi-adjectival modifier” (p.34), therefore such constructions do not count as un-nouns, much rather as un-adjectives.

- (139) undesert

144 LEWIS CARROL, Through the Looking Glass, Chapter 6, 1871
The example of **undesert** is again not an **un**-noun, but a zero-derived adjective that has undergone conventional affixal negativization:

“The estate had a lush green lawn in front, flowers blooming in neatly tended beds, huge weeping willows trailing ferny branches onto the grass, a pebbled circular drive with an offshoot that led to a three-car garage in front of which a Mercedes was parked. The house featured white stucco and ornate grillwork balconies. It was so beautiful. And so undesert.”

- **(140) un-Disney**:

  “For a show that is attracting family audiences, this one [The Producers] is about as un-Disney as you can get. It’s multicultural only in the sense that it makes fun of blacks and the Irish as well as Jews.”

- **(141) un-Florida**

  “So what does one wear to a place that looks like home? Your best. No T-shirts (which may seem un-Florida to some), sneakers, jerseys, shorts or baseball hats allowed.”

- **(142) un-Porsche**

  “Porsche blew everyone out of the water with its 558-horsepower Carrera GT – with a shape as dramatically un-Porsche as could possibly be – leaving Ferrari to ponder about the timing of the launch of its beautiful 550 Barchetta.”

- **(143) un-rock’n’roll**

  “One problem is that so many bona fide rock stars are beyond parody. How, for example, could you hope to better the magisterial buffoonery of Primal Scream, who failed to show up for a booking on Top of the Pops because it would have meant passing through Luton Airport, a prospect which the band’s leader Bobbie Gillespie declared was simply too un-rock’n’roll to contemplate?”

When standard adjectival testing is applied to these cases, their adjectival potential is proven: **so undesert, dramatically un-Porsche, too un-rock’n’roll, seem un-Florida.** As it has been mentioned in Chapter 1.3, creativity does not necessarily go hand in hand with novelty: un-cola was presumably contributed to by **unbirthday present** and the OED serves with (largely

---

145 Nancy HERNDON (1997: 202) *Time Bombs*
146 Frank RICH (2001) NYT, 12 May
147 Babita PERSEUD (2000) St. Petersburg Times, 12 October
148 Adrian Low (2000) Business Times (Singapore) 5 October
149 David Sinclair (2000) The Times (London) 13 October
nonce formations) from centuries before: *unquality Ladys* (“The reason of discontent by the unquality Ladys is that they were laugh’d at by the great Ladys.” 1771) *uncountry gentlemen* (“Alas, the country! how shall tongue or pen Bewail her now uncountry gentlemen?” BYRON 1823) or *unbusiness men* (Single women, widows, and unbusiness men, are those on whom the blow chiefly fell.” 1880)

This *un*-attributive nominal class involves a structurally rather heterogeneous set of examples in view of the previous sets of *un*-adjectives: “in these cases the innovation of the *unA B* presupposes the prior establishment of the A B in the common ground” (HORN 2002: 35) Consequently, it is the entire nominal compound is *un*-ned, similarly to the Class A examples with *un*-nouns: there is a superset category encompassing two kinds of concepts. An *undate movie* is based on the superset category of movies, of which there might be two types: the ones fit for a date, and those unfit for a date.

6.3.5 Productivity – *un*-adjectives

The analysed *un*-adjectives play a marginal role in terms of frequency, but they show rule-breaking tendencies and – especially the ones with which actual concept-formation takes place – tend to display high levels of creativity. The COCA corpus reveals some striking differences

in their frequencies: *undead* is by far the most frequent example, yielding 382 matches (from both literary and political contexts), which is outstanding in comparison with the other examples. *Unfree* with 55 matches is also highly represented, and in different senses as well: e.g. there are “unfree states” like Libya or China, but Ireland is an unfree state in another sense. Besides, there are “unfree markets”, and children can be described as *unfree*, as in a “culture of divorce”, they are subjected to court rulings. Elections are described as *unfree* in
many countries, there is of course *unfree* press, labour and society. *Unhostile* yields one match, (“to speak in an unhostile manner”); *unpregnant* 2; *unacademic* 9 and *unalive* 5.

*Un*-colour terms yield absolutely no matches, with *ungreen’s* 1 match being the exception.

Two further creative examples are represented in the COCA corpus: *ungood* with 4 matches (in context being used of a neighbourhood, and in an Orwellian analogy: “Big Brother is ungood”); and *unboring*, also with 4 matches.

**Chapter 7 Conclusions**

The thesis set out to investigate creative aspects of prefixations, focusing on *un-*-, one of the most productive of English prefixes. Although the compiled corpus of creative *un-*nouns, *un*-verbs and *un*-adjectives did not provide high token frequencies in the COCA corpus used for reference, still, the phenomenon explored is not marginal. Its importance lies in several aspects: it exemplifies cognitive processes of on-line language use, it reveals semantic meaning extensions and sheds light on the interplay of different concepts of negation.

The introduction of major theoretical problems concerning prefixation in general and the *un*-prefix in particular paved the way for investigating the research topics of the thesis. In the followings, I will provide a brief overview of the topics covered along the lines of the formulated research questions.

1. How do creative prefixations – despite their morphologically deviant character in terms of traditional categories – fill in conceptual gaps (with conceptual structure related to phonetic structure), facilitating a “finer partition of the world” (HORN 2002)?

Morphological descriptions in a formal vein tend to make note of the phenomenon of creative prefixations, however, almost exclusively in terms of their “rule-breaking”, “deviant” character. As a result, they are usually mentioned as questionable formations, with the authors (e.g. ADAMS 2001, PLAG 2003) admitting that they do make sense, yet they do not accept them as full-fledged morphological formations. What is usually overlooked in the literature is the fact that they actually fill in conceptual gaps. One important area where the
interplay of concept formation and the naming function is present comes from the language of computer technology (especially with *un*-verbs, created on the analogy of the *undo* function). Besides the naming function, conceptual recategorization is intertwined with meaning extensions: the paragon of un-nouns, namely Un-Cola originally served to express distance/otherness in terms of prototype categories (referring to 7-Up), yet in the form of un-cola it has come to mean very different, possibly even unrelated concepts. Creative prefixations are very concise, “handy” formations, where a minimalistic form is paired with a maximum of information content.

2. In a network-based interpretational system, which senses of *un*- are featured in creative prefixations? (cf. Hamawand 2009: 72)

Hamawand’s treatment of negative prefixations is crucial from several points of view. First, his work on negative prefixes is relevant for the cognitive linguistic approach in word-formation. Second, by supplying a detailed system, it also serves as a basis for investigating the prefix-stem relations in creative *un*-prefixations. In his treatment, each negative prefix forms a category having a prototype. All the other senses gather around this prototypical sense based on semantic similarity. Applying this to the case of *un*-, the following prototypical and peripheral senses were identified. Prototypically, we have the 1, “antithesis” 2, “distinct from” 3, “not subjected to” senses; peripherally 1, “inversion” 2, “taking away” 3, “bereft of”. Although Hamawand’s system is certainly useful to an extent in analysing creative prefixations, it does not/cannot cover the two-way relationship between prefixes and stems. Nevertheless, the analysed creative examples (Part II) make use of both the prototypical and the peripheral senses of the prefix, therefore, my original expectation that they focus more on peripheral senses were not proven.

3. What is the relation between productivity and creativity in processes of creative prefixation?

From the numerous existing productivity definitions this thesis accepts that of developed by Ladányi (2007). She differentiates between quantitative and qualitative approaches to productivity. In case of creative prefixations a qualitative approach is relevant (although the
results of a COCA search are used for reference at the end of the respective un-noun, un-verb and un-adjective sections of Part II). Such a qualitative approach is similar to the previous matrix-view in terms of creativity, as the productivity matrix is also built on the interplay of different aspects: frequency (based on the number of attested examples) 2, regularity 3, creativity and 4, analogy. Creative prefixations do not display high frequency levels, but the creativity aspect is present in them to a high extent. Their schema (un + X) validates the aspect of regularity, yet the elements of the schema do not produce regular composite structures. This view of creativity is based on morphological patterns of productivity-regularity-frequency parallel with productivity-creativity-analogy, which two patterns are not exclusive, but rather help the positioning of the different patterns. Creative prefixations also highlight the dynamic aspects of productivity, as both the prefixes and the stems open up a number of possibilities – as floating concepts – introducing more and more interpretational variants.

4. Where can creative prefixations be placed in terms of lexicalisation?

Lexicalisation is another term with a number of interpretations and definitions. Concerning the topic of creative prefixations, the term lexicalisation is used in the “entrenchment” sense, emphasizing the cognitive functions of creative prefixation as a process. Prefixation is viewed as a continuum, with the lexicalised prefixations at one end of the continuum, and the highly creative ones at the other end. However, creative prefixations also exemplify lexicalisation as a dynamic process. Some expressions (e.g. unfriend) used to be an absolute novelty at the dawn of social networking sites, but their widespread usage pushed it in the direction of relatively quick lexicalisation. Some specific creative composite structures never get lexicalised, some get entrenched and lexicalised.

5. How can the specifically creative aspect of prefixation be identified?

The research in creativity in prefixation has some predecessors in the literature (KEMMER 2003, Benczes 2006, 2010, Hohenhaus 2007), it is still a somewhat neglected area. The actual term “creative prefixation” has been coined on the analogy of “creative compound” as used by Benczes (2006: 7, 2010), who has applied it in reference to metaphorical and metonymical compounds, that is creative associations based on similarity, analogy and contiguity that exist between concepts and which language users routinely make use of when coining novel expressions. Creative prefixations are “creative” because their meaning cannot
be predicted from the lexicalised meanings of their components and they often involve similar processes as creative compounds. Creativity here is used in a pointedly different sense than in Chomskyan terminology (where it refers to the ability to form an infinite number of sentences from a limited set of rules). Beyond non-compositionality though, “creative” as a term refers to a scalar notion: there are several features loosely characterizing the group, but these features are not always present in each case. Such possible (but not obligatory features) are 1, rule-breaking/rule-bending characteristics, that is their irregular nature (the main reason for being termed “deviant”) 2, context-dependence 3, nonceness/neologism. This kind of matrix approach allows for the identification of forms as “creative” which are not at all new formations (e.g. Charlotte Brontë’s unlove, or Shakespeare’s inventive examples). The expression “creative prefixations” is therefore used as an umbrella term, where the examples are related to one another via the pattern of family resemblance, with differing levels of creativity.

6. What are the cognitive processes involved in the interpretation of creative prefixations?

Although in Part II the three most important processes (frame-internal – frame-external negation, patterns based on prototype theory and conceptual integration) are the driving force in interpreting the processes behind creative prefixations, there are several other cognitive processes involved in creative prefixations: profiling, metonymy, metaphor and schematicity.

7. What are the cultural aspects of creative prefixations, to what extent does cultural context motivate their meaning?

Cultural implications play a decisive role in the interpretation of creative un-prefixations: some examples reflect on changes in our technological environment, which brings along major cultural changes in our everyday lives, beginning from simple commands to a whole new set of expressions on social networking sites influencing and (especially for the younger generation) even defining interpersonal relationships (unfriend, unlike, unfollow etc.). Some other creative un-prefixations bring long-standing social institutions into play by questioning
and extending our prototypical concepts: the use of *un*- sheds light on different sort of family relations and their connection with the prototype. Forms like *unmarriage*, *unhusband*, *unmotherhood* point out questions of acceptance and tolerance within society by raising issues concerning the prototype itself. Even the playful formations (*unpink*) might raise serious questions about gender roles. Politics and the workings of democratic institutions also puts forth problems which may be indicated by the use of *un-*, making us reconsider notions of what a politician, a candidate or an election is (by introducing *un-politician*, *un-candidate* and *un-election*). *Un-* opens up the possibility of naming a whole range of dietary options as well as police activities. It is most powerful in its potential to create hypothetical conditions and parallel worlds, forming concepts and shaping culture.

8. How to place negative prefixation in the context of negation?

The somewhat simplified traditional/descriptive/formal view of affixes in general and the modifying role in particular is spectacularly reflected in the treatment of negative prefixes in the context of negation. The dichotomy of “two-valued orientation” and “multi-valued orientation” (KORZYBSKI 1933, HAYAKAWA 1978) in language has its reverberations in the treatment of prefixation: although CRUSE (1986) points out a general predisposition to make binary distinctions, the creative cases covered in this thesis reflect upon some of the finer distinctions a bipolar orientation does not cover. Concerning the distinction between contrary and contradictory opposition we can state that negative prefixation on the whole, especially with the prefixes *un-* and *in-*, has a tendency to develop contrary, rather than contradictory interpretation. Further aspects of the problem are presented by the negative content of simplex words that are different from the negative content of forms derived on synchronically productive pattern, such as negative prefixation. One aspect of the creativity of the examples lies exactly in the fact that they cover lexical gaps, often with blocked or pre-empted affix-stem combinations. The prefix *un-* has traditionally been identified with two main senses (reversative and privative: un + X → ‘not X’). This view has been debated in this thesis, on the ground of two basic considerations: 1. Hamawand’s (2009) prefixal network system, in which three prototypical and three peripheral senses of *un-* are identified, reflecting upon the different variants in which negation is implied by *un-*. 2. The very examples of creative *un-* prefixations highlight a much broader view of negation in terms of
un-; with even such cases involved where un- stands by itself, conveying a floating concept of opposition.

9. Are there any patterns and identifiable conceptual processes behind creative prefixations?

Part II concentrates on the different patterns and conceptual processes behind creative prefixations. The three most important factors in their evaluation are frame-internal – frame-external negation, patterns based on prototype theory and conceptual integration. The aim of the thesis was to make a contribution to cognitive linguistic theory of prefixation, exactly by identifying and elaborating these processes on the basis of a compiled corpus of creative examples.

10. To what extent is it possible to place creative prefixations within the wider context of English word-formation?

Creative prefixation highlight a slightly peripheral phenomenon in English word-formation, yet it is far from marginal. Its importance lies in providing highlight to another area of English word-formation which traditional/descriptive and especially generative frameworks do not associate with creativity. The size and character of the corpus does not allow for far-reaching hypotheses for the future of prefixation in diachronic perspectives, however, it does identify one area where the presence of the creative aspect facilitates productivity. The purpose of this thesis was to make a contribution to research in creativity in language use, by introducing the vast possibilities opened up by a tiny prefix, un-.
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## Appendix I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creative prefixations</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3) de-friend v.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wordspy.com">www.wordspy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) de-emphasize v.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wordspy.com">www.wordspy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) de-proliferate v.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wordspy.com">www.wordspy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) de-policing n.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wordspy.com">www.wordspy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) non-book n.</td>
<td>Algeo (1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) non-end n.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.thesaurus.com">www.thesaurus.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) non-ism n.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wordspy.com">www.wordspy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Euro-event n.</td>
<td>Algeo 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Euro-consciousness n.</td>
<td>Algeo 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) unfriend v.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.urbandictionary.com">www.urbandictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) unlove v.</td>
<td>Charlotte Brontë: Jane Eyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) pre-forget v.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.urbandictionary.com">www.urbandictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) unmurder v.</td>
<td>Kastovsky 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) unfollow v.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.urbandictionary.com">www.urbandictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) unlike v.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.urbandictionary.com">www.urbandictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) uncry v.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.urbandictionary.com">www.urbandictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) unschooling n.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.urbandictionary.com">www.urbandictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) undecorating n.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wordspy.com">www.wordspy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) unhotel n.</td>
<td>Horn 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) unturkey n.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wordspy.com">www.wordspy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) de-Scottishify</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wordspy.com">www.wordspy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) de-elect</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wordspy.com">www.wordspy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26) de-conflict</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiktionary.com">www.wiktionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27) unspeak</td>
<td>Shakespeare/Crystal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28) unshout</td>
<td>Shakespeare/Crystal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29) undownloading</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wordspy.com">www.wordspy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30) disconnectionist</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wordspy.com">www.wordspy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31) unsourcing</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wordspy.com">www.wordspy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32) unwich</td>
<td><a href="http://www.urbandictionary.com">www.urbandictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33) de-bachelorize</td>
<td>Konieczena 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34) non-candidate</td>
<td>Algeo 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35) uncry</td>
<td>Horn 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36) unhave</td>
<td>Horn 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37) uninvent</td>
<td>Horn 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38) unsay</td>
<td>Horn 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39) ungreen</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiktionary.com">www.wiktionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40) unpink</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiktionary.com">www.wiktionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41) unblack</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiktionary.com">www.wiktionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(42) unred</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiktionary.com">www.wiktionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(43) unbrown</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiktionary.com">www.wiktionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>unblue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>unyoung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>unmale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>non-success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>non-reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>uneducation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>unrepair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>unsuccess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>unsurprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>uncountry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>undeath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Un-Cola (un-Cola, un-cola)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>un-magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Un-dot-com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>un-breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>un-meal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>un-martini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>un-milk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>un-bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>un-turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>un-chicken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Un-Thanksgiving Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>unpotato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>unwedding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>unkids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>undate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>undeath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>unfact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>unplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>uncivilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>unculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>unscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>unmother/unmotherhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>un-Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>un-Yeltsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>un-Arafat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>un-Samaranch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>un-Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>un-Oscars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>un-Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>unwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>unsourcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>unwoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>unvegetarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>uncollege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>unelection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(90) unfriend (n.)</td>
<td><a href="https://en.wiktionary.org">https://en.wiktionary.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(91) un-gallery</td>
<td>Horn 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(92) un-jungle</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nytimes.com">www.nytimes.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(93) unword</td>
<td><a href="https://en.wikipedia.org">https://en.wikipedia.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(94) unbank</td>
<td><a href="http://www.unbankcompany.com">www.unbankcompany.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(95) un-candidate</td>
<td>Horn 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(96) un-diet</td>
<td>theundiet.info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(97) un-tourist</td>
<td><a href="https://www.bookdepository.com">https://www.bookdepository.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(98) un-parenting</td>
<td><a href="http://www.chicagonow.com">www.chicagonow.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(99) ungame</td>
<td><a href="https://en.wikipedia.org">https://en.wikipedia.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100) unmarriage</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wikipedia.com">www.wikipedia.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(101) unconference</td>
<td><a href="https://en.wikipedia.org">https://en.wikipedia.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(102) unkill</td>
<td>Horn 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(103) unhave</td>
<td><a href="http://www.urbandictionary.com">www.urbandictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(104) undo</td>
<td>Zimmer-Carson-Horn 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(105) unassociate</td>
<td>Zimmer-Carson-Horn 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(106) unban</td>
<td>Zimmer-Carson-Horn 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(107) undestroy</td>
<td>Zimmer-Carson-Horn 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(108) unflag</td>
<td>Zimmer-Carson-Horn 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(109) unfreeze</td>
<td>Zimmer-Carson-Horn 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(110) unprotest</td>
<td>Zimmer-Carson-Horn 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(111) unsubscribe</td>
<td>Zimmer-Carson-Horn 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(112) unsuspend</td>
<td>Zimmer-Carson-Horn 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(113) unlearn</td>
<td><a href="http://www.merriam-webster.com">www.merriam-webster.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(114) unteach</td>
<td><a href="http://www.merriam-webster.com">www.merriam-webster.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(115) unconcede</td>
<td><a href="https://en.wiktionary.org">https://en.wiktionary.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(116) unvote</td>
<td><a href="http://www.thefreedictionary.com">www.thefreedictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(117) unelect</td>
<td><a href="https://en.wiktionary.org">https://en.wiktionary.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(118) unchoose</td>
<td><a href="http://www.yourdictionary.com">www.yourdictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(119) unarrest</td>
<td><a href="http://www.urbandictionary.com">www.urbandictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(120) unknow</td>
<td>Horn 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(121) unabort</td>
<td><a href="https://en.wiktionary.org">https://en.wiktionary.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(122) unhappen</td>
<td><a href="https://en.wiktionary.org">https://en.wiktionary.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(123) uncure</td>
<td>Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(124) uncommit</td>
<td><a href="http://www.yourdictionary.com">www.yourdictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(125) unchild</td>
<td><a href="http://www.merriam-webster.com">www.merriam-webster.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(126) undirty</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tripadvisor.com">www.tripadvisor.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(127) unfuzzy</td>
<td><a href="https://en.wiktionary.org">https://en.wiktionary.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(128) unhostile</td>
<td><a href="http://www.collinsdictionary.com">www.collinsdictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(129) unboring</td>
<td><a href="https://en.wiktionary.org">https://en.wiktionary.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(130) ungrey</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiktionary.com">www.wiktionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(131) unbright</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiktionary.com">www.wiktionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(132) undead</td>
<td>Horn 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(133) unalive</td>
<td>Horn 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(134) unasleep</td>
<td><a href="http://www.urbandictionary.com">www.urbandictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(135) unangry</td>
<td><a href="https://www.vocabulary.com">https://www.vocabulary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(136) unconservative</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dictionary.com">www.dictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(137) unacademic</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oxforddictionaries.com">www.oxforddictionaries.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(138)</td>
<td>unfree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(139)</td>
<td>undesert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(140)</td>
<td>un-Disney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(141)</td>
<td>un-Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(142)</td>
<td>un-Porsche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(143)</td>
<td>un-rock-and-roll</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II

Alphabetical list of the meaning and context of the creative examples in Part II.

Date of downloads in the main text, if not otherwise indicated. Downloads double-checked on 15.5.2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creative un-prefixation</th>
<th>Meanings</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Un/Uns (n)</td>
<td>a type of non-conformist person</td>
<td>Uns are “unique and confident, people who think for themselves and make their own choices, who decide what to do instead of being told what to do... But while ‘Uncola’ has been banished from the 7 Up lexicon, ‘un’ still has a major role in the brand's future. In fact, a new $50 million ad/promo campaign, set to debut during the Super Bowl in January, centers almost exclusively on the leveraging of this lowly prefix, which will now refer not to 7 Up itself but rather to its consumers, portrayed in the upcoming ads as a group of stylish teens known as ‘Uns’, who intrepidly drink 7 Up despite the efforts of an evil collective called the Anti-Refreshment Syndicate. The campaign's tag line is – get ready, now – ‘Are U an Un’? We're trying to take that gene of equity – un – and establish it as a consumer descriptor rather than a product descriptor”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unabort (v)</td>
<td>hypothetical/subjunctive condition (of not having previously aborted)</td>
<td>Well, she can't unabort that baby. <a href="http://www.wordow.com/english/examples/?t=unabort">http://www.wordow.com/english/examples/?t=unabort</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unacademic (a)</td>
<td>education arrived at routes other than academic</td>
<td>Some unacademic enthusiastic upright soul called it a pear because it happened to remind him of a pear, though it is really a cactus-berry. <a href="http://english.manoramaonline.com/lifestyle/society/anjias-officers-unacademic-victory.html">http://english.manoramaonline.com/lifestyle/society/anjias-officers-unacademic-victory.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unalive (a)</td>
<td>of something that appears alive, yet does not fully fulfil the condition</td>
<td>I wait for them [artificial flowers] to droop, as in a natural cycle. But they are stubbornly unalive and therefore unwilting. (Baxter 2000: 106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unangry (a)</td>
<td>the state of mind after ceasing to be angry</td>
<td>I think he had some time to think, and no he's un-angry. <a href="http://www.urbandictionary.com">www.urbandictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-Arafat (n)</td>
<td>the Palestinian Finance minister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **unarrest (v)** | 1. Street tactic used by marchers and protesters who directly engage with police to assist in the escape of individuals who are in the process of being arrested. When a participant is apprehended by authorities, one or more people will rush the officer an attempt to either confuse them or pull the arrestee back into the crowd.  
2. Process of on the street negotiations with authorities, often with the help of a legal observer, to get protesters who have been detained out of police custody.  
3. Informal term for a legal process where persons who have been arrested can be released on the grounds of false arrest or insufficient evidence’.  

| **unasleep (a)** | 1, not fully asleep, yet not | 1. "They tackled Kate after she broke the window, but someone stole the cop's pepper spray while I unarrested her and pulled her back into the crowd."  
2. "The cops had a few kids in cuffs against the wall, but the legal observer managed to convince the sergeant to let them go before the paddy wagon showed up.”  
3. "They all got arrested at the march but we went down to the police station, and thanks to the legal aid, had them all unarrested because the charges wouldn't stick.” www.urbandictionary.com |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unassociate (v)</th>
<th>to remove an established link, usually between a computer file type and the software program which has been assigned to open such files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unban</td>
<td>remove the restriction that bars an individual, such as an interactive video game player’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unbank (n)</td>
<td>the better version of a bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unblack (a)</td>
<td>1, distinct from black as in black metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-Blair (n)</td>
<td>Gordon Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unbook (n)</td>
<td>online edited informational material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In computer terminology, "unassociate" is used specifically as a technical term in contrast to "disassociate" as a way of conveying the idea of reversing a previous action. www.quora.com/Is-there-a-word-called-unassociate.-If-no-why-do-they-use-this-term-in-IT-instead-of-disassociate

Our model is 100% transparent. Ffrees people pay for what they use as they use it. Unlike our competitors, who try to catch people out when they make mistakes and whack them with penalty charges. It’s an UNbanking approach that means people aren’t driven into debt. So you can choose how you pay to suit how you use your account. https://www.ffrees.co.uk/

unblack metal music: Christian metal music

For the past two years, I have been writing and publishing an unbook entitled Working Smarter. Six versions have been published in that time, the latest being The Working Smarter Fieldbook 2011. Unbooks are printed on demand; they change when the author has something new to say. By definition, unbooks are in perpetual beta.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unboring (a)</td>
<td>distinct from boring</td>
<td>to get an unboring job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-breakfast (n)</td>
<td>1, to describe possible food combinations which are not characteristicilly included in a typical breakfast: 2, un-breakfast as a concept is called in for help to define a type of midmorning meal, known as brunch (especially) in English tradition,</td>
<td>“Among the “un-breakfasts” that the experts suggest, besides a bean burrito, are a ham or turkey sandwich … and a bowl of soup.” Sheryl Julian, “Which of the Above is a Nutritious Breakfast? A. All of Them. When It Comes to Kids, the Rules on Eating Right Are Changing”. Boston Globe, 11. Oct. 2000. quoted in Horn 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-breakfast (n)</td>
<td>wheat-free, dairy-free, sugar-free bread variant</td>
<td>“Just because you’re living gluten-free doesn’t mean you have to live a breadless life! It doesn’t mean you have to settle for hard, crunchy, or bland bread, either. Don’t fear the un-bread – embrace it with our delicious gluten free bread options”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-bright (a)</td>
<td>neither dark, nor bright</td>
<td>Elizabeth Bowden: <em>The House in Paris</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-candidate (n)</td>
<td>1, unlikely candidate 2, a possible candidate not running for office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unchild (v)</td>
<td>to deprive of children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unchoose</td>
<td>deselect something</td>
<td>… if the depression is a survival mechanism chosen by the woman when she was a child, then this is within her power to unchoose depression and to heal Fern, Brad-Lutz, Tom. Ashes to Gold. 2011. <a href="https://books.google.hu/books?isbn=1590563077">https://books.google.hu/books?isbn=1590563077</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncivilization (n)</td>
<td>1, to refer to an idyllic, prior-to-civilization,</td>
<td>“It outlines how we are already entering an age in which global population levels will begin to decline substantially, even as urbanization and economically-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**un-Clinton (n)**

To describe a politician as being the quintessential not Mr. Clinton

“Mr Dole provides such a contrast to the talkatively gifted President that Republicans insist their man will finally prevail as “the un-Clinton”, the reassuring politician of oak-solid yeps and nopes. (Francis X. Clines, “It’s a War of Words (Say What?)”, Week in Review, NYT, June 30, 1996, p. 16, quoted by Horn (2002: 55-56)

**un-Cola (n)**

7-Up

“Even 7-Up (the Un-Cola) got into people’s minds by relating to colas”

**un-cola (n)**

something/so mebody defined as the antithesis of a phenomenon

**un-Cola of American politics (n)**

Bernie Sanders

Bernie is the Uncola of national politics. Remember 7-Up’s masterful marketing strategy to separate it from Coke and Pepsi? The lemon-lime soft drink became the “Uncola: tart, crisp, clear” and was branded as the exact opposite of the two sweet, brown colas. Call central casting for a presidential candidate and the last person they would send you is a rumpled, mad-as-hell, impatient Brooklyn native with the air of an absent-minded professor. But today the Bernie brand is hot. His issues resonate, his anger matches the nation’s mood, his no-nonsense approach to politics is seen as a breath of fresh air. In a time when politicians are on the outs, the unpolitician is in. The UnCola.


**un-COLA (n)**

lack of Cost of Living Adjustments

“Some are calling it the year of the UnCOLA. Employers are trimming or eliminating cost-of-living allowances and taking hard-won wage gains back from their workers”
| uncry (v)       | Take away the tears – Make someone happy
| uncry these tears.... (Toni Braxton: Un-break my heart) |
| uncollege (n)   | non-prototypical college |
| uncommit (v)    | hypothetically not having committed something |
| unconcede (v)   | to concede and then to go back on conceding |
| unconference (n)| better/non-prototypical versions of conference |
| unconference    | “An unconference is a conference organized, structured and led by the people attending it. Instead of passive listening, all attendees and organizers are encouraged to become participants, with discussion leaders providing moderation and structure for attendees.” http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/unconference |
| unconservative (a) | “bad” example of a conservative |
| unconservative  | …modern Conservative economics produces very unconservative people. They are unlikely to be entrepreneurs and will regard the “role models” society holds up for them to admire as the beneficiaries of luck or fraud. http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/jul/12/osborne-britain-no-country-for-young-men-and-women |
| un-country (n)  | atypical or characterless type of country |
| In this uncountry there was blue sky and light OED 1964 |
| unculture (n)   | 1, in the most obvious sense, unculture means a lack of culture, by which ignorance or mediocrity is meant 2, it designates a culture that derives itself from the absorption of elements of other cultures, in which sense it is usually meant for U.S. culture 3, violence is an |
| America’s Christmas traditions are an amalgamation of holiday traditions from multiple different cultures and religious traditions. In this way, our “Holiday Culture” is really an Unculture. www.urbandictionary.com |
| **uncurse** | to take back a curse |
| **un-date (n)** | a date without romantic intent |
| "What looks like a date from outward appearances, but takes place with no romantic intent. Neither party gives anything away in terms of physical or emotional binding. Used as a fact finding mission to determine if two people are interested in starting a relationship without the complications that often go hand-in-hand with a date.” www.urbandictionary.com |
| **un-dead (a)** | “not quite dead but not fully alive, dead-and-alive” OED |
| An undead is a being in mythology, legend or fiction that is deceased but behaves as if alive. A common example is a corpse re-animated by supernatural forces by the application of the deceased’s own life force or that of another being (such as a demon). Undead may be incorporeal like ghosts, or corporeal like vampires and zombies. The undead are featured in the belief systems of most cultures, and appear in many works of fantasy and horror fiction. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Undead |
| **un-death (n)** | It is used in 1, computer games 2, in “vampire literature” 3, in theological discourse |
| **undestroy (v)** | remove the restriction that bars an individual, such as an interactive video game player’ |
| **un-diet (n)** | 1, it may refer to unconventional diet regimes, usually with the application of some revolutionary method and/or ingredient involved 2, undiet can also UnDiet answers the question many people have when they realize it’s time for a change in their diets, a change in their health, and a change in their lives: Where do I start? Without being too far off the mainstream, UnDiet offers a simple, attainable, and most importantly, maintainable approach to living well. Through the book, readers are guided toward optimal gluten-free health by incorporating simple lifestyle modifications. Information is explained with refreshing clarity and vibrant passion, making it easy to follow ideas right off |
refer to the negation of the whole concept of dieting: one is required to accept his natural weight by way of eating right and being comfortable. An undiet might also involve a psychological approach: by electronically altering photographs of oneself, psychological motivation is provided for losing weight.

---

| undirty (a) | in an intermediary condition between clean and dirty |
| un-Disney (a) | to describe a show in comparison with one in the typical Disney tradition |
| Un-dot-com (n) | to describe a company in comparison with dot-com firms |
| uneducation (n) | gender based lack of education conveying false ideologies |

The book’s brightly designed pages and into everyday life. *UnDiet* offers a lifestyle based not on deprivation and painful restrictions, but vitality, mindfulness, and joy. [http://www.meghantelpner.com/books/undiet-meghan-telpner](http://www.meghantelpner.com/books/undiet-meghan-telpner)

For a show that is attracting family audiences, this one [“the Producers”] is about as un-Disney as you can get. (“Springtime for Adolf and Tony”, Frank Rich op-ed, NYT 12 May 2001; quoted in Horn 2002: 58)

John Hull, developing his SanFax Systems in Angels Camp, California, also alluded to 7-Ups ad campaign and proclaimed, “We are the “Un-dot-com’’”; quoted in Horn (2002: 29)

“...unlike the radicalism of the 1960s, the political views dominating today’s universities are hardly distinguishable from the popular platitudes and truisms circulated by Fox News, MSNBC and other media outlets. Unsurprisingly, the moral and political deadlock long gripping American society has come to plague even the hallowed halls of higher education. [...] Isolated within the confines of their disciplines, students look to mass culture to fill in the gaps where the university stands silent. Campus discourse merges with popular discourse until the two are nearly indistinguishable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>un-elect (v)</td>
<td>to vote somebody out of office</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-election (n)</td>
<td>2000, Gore-Bush election</td>
<td>“The night was so wild, trussed up in such a mesmerizing cat’s cradle of sibling rivalries and scalding feuds, that Tom Brokaw and Tim Russert actually fell into dead silence for several moments at 3:17 a.m., as they absorbed the fact that the man they had just declared president-elect was winning by only 568 votes in his brother’s state. ‘’It was as though we had crossed wires with ‘Saturday Night Live,’ ‘’ Mr. Brokaw recalls.” <a href="http://www.nytimes.com/2000/11/09/.../liberties-the-unelection-day.html">www.nytimes.com/2000/11/09/.../liberties-the-unelection-day.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-fact (n)</td>
<td>But what is precisely an ‘unfact’? A lie? A false assertion? An unfact need be neither – it could be an assertion, any assertion, which is not applicable within a given linguistic context. <a href="https://books.google.hu/books?id=6_9Oy6pyPyQC&amp;pg=PA69&amp;lpg=PA69&amp;dq=unfact&amp;source=">https://books.google.hu/books?id=6_9Oy6pyPyQC&amp;pg=PA69&amp;lpg=PA69&amp;dq=unfact&amp;source=</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-flag (v)</td>
<td>remove the restriction that bars an individual, such as an interactive video game player’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-follow (v)</td>
<td>unsubscribing from someone’s Twitter feed</td>
<td>“I’m unfollowing Steve after all that pro-Apple spam.” <a href="http://www.urbandictionary.com">www.urbandictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfree (a)</td>
<td>intermediary state between slavery and freedom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfreeze (v)</td>
<td>make a computer or its display start working after it has remained inactive for an unreasonable time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfriend (n)</td>
<td>bad example of a friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfriend (v)</td>
<td>the act of removing someone from your social networking site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfuzzy (a)</td>
<td>simple, clear, uncomplicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-gallery (n)</td>
<td>a gallery with non-prototypical circumstances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-game (n)</td>
<td>non-competitive board game</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ungood (a)</td>
<td>distinct from good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ungreen (a)</td>
<td>distinct form green/not environmentally friendly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ungrey (a)</td>
<td>distinct from grey/ageing attitudes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unhappen (v)</td>
<td>to create the hypothetical/subjunctive condition of sg. not happening previously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unhave (v)</td>
<td>Cancel retrospectively, especially an embarrassing conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-Hong Kong (n)</td>
<td>Macao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-hostile</td>
<td>neither friendly, nor hostile</td>
<td>unhostile takeover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-jungle (n)</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>“Faced with so many ferocious arguments about which creatures are fierce, the city recently banned 150 specific animals. Some of those named have not been a big problem historically in the city, but health officials decided not to let any more unwanted life forms slip, slither or fly through their loopholes. So they banned, among others, armadillos, polar bears, bees, iguanas, vultures, prairie dogs, black widow spiders, Tasmanian devils, kangaroos, pythons, whales – yes, whales – and all non-human primates.” <a href="http://www.nytimes.com/1999/08/28/opinion/the-urban-un-jungle.html">www.nytimes.com/1999/08/28/opinion/the-urban-un-jungle.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-kids (n)</td>
<td>people in their late twenties acting like kids or thirties</td>
<td>“...young girls screaming for Latin teen idol Ricky Martin with the 20- and 30-somethings who ought to know better lining up for days at the Ziegfeld, duelling with plastic light sabers while waiting to buy tickets for The Phantom Menace. One woman, explaining ‘We are kids,’ admits to being 28. Horn 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknow (v)</td>
<td>the hypothetical condition of not knowing something we already know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-learn (v)</td>
<td>to forget and stop doing something (such as a habit) in a deliberate way because it is bad or incorrect</td>
<td>unlearn bad driving habits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlike (v)</td>
<td>Taking back your approval of something that’s been said or done, or something posted online.</td>
<td>This term originates from Facebook, where you can publicly say you “like” something, and then have the option to take the “like” back. “Unlike” does not mean you dislike something. <a href="http://www.urbandictionary.com">www.urbandictionary.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlove (v)</td>
<td>to get back to the hypothetical/subjunctive state before loving someone</td>
<td>“I have told you… that I had learned to love Mr. Rochester; I could not unlove him now.” (Charlotte Brontë: Jane Eyre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-lunch (n)</td>
<td>lunch consisting of non-prototypical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Example/Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-magazine</td>
<td>non-prototypical magazine</td>
<td>“It’s not like anything else we do. It’s an un-magazine, like an un-Cola” Horn 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-male</td>
<td>a genetically male person not identifying with male roles or viewpoints</td>
<td>“the male characters usually act and speak in ways to which my only response is “oh God, they’re not like me at all, they’re some aliens from another planet”, <a href="http://www.gamasutra.com/blogs">www.gamasutra.com/blogs</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unmarriage</td>
<td>1, a marriage in name only but not functioning properly, that is a deteriorated version 2, a marriage with the sole aim of getting the partner a green card); a deverbal reversative (in case of a divorce or annulment)</td>
<td>The ‘Un-Marriage’ Trend: The Beginning Of The End Of An Institution? <a href="http://www.huffingtonpost.com/">http://www.huffingtonpost.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-martini</td>
<td>an alcohol-free citrus ginger snap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-meal</td>
<td>a non-prototypical meal/bad example of a meal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-milk</td>
<td>a milk substitute of non-dairy origin</td>
<td>Unmilk is a brand of organic fruit-flavored rice milk for childrenwww.behance.net/gallery/16362823/Unmilk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-motherhood</td>
<td>1, concerns the act of a woman who, although she has physically become a mother, but has undone herself from the societal role 2, physically negating/finishing the motherly condition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-nuclear (a)</td>
<td>of a family pattern not resembling the traditional nuclear family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-Oscars (n)</td>
<td>The Golden Globe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unparenting</td>
<td>parenting without any rules whatsoever</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpink (a)</td>
<td>distinct from pink/attitudes-values associated with the colour pink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unplace (n)</td>
<td>lack or absence of place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-politician (n)</td>
<td>a better version of a politician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpork (n)</td>
<td>pork substitute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpotato (n)</td>
<td>artichokes or other vegetables roasted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unprotect</td>
<td>remove protection of a file</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-Samaranch (n)</td>
<td>Dr. Jacques Rogge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsay (v)</td>
<td>refers to the wish to take back something, as if it had never been uttered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unscience (n)</td>
<td>an approach that uses the tools of science,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have decided to take a stand against the nonsense. I will not be a passive participant in this pink pandemonium. …I’ll call my resolution Operation Unpink. [http://naturalparentsnetwork.com/operation-unpink](http://naturalparentsnetwork.com/operation-unpink)

“The Unpotato: Jerusalem artichokes are roasted with thyme at Craft. (caption for illustration of Jerusalem artichokes, NYT, 14 March 2001; quoted in Horn 2002: 52)

“For thine own sake, unsay those dreadful words.” (Shelley)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>unschooling</strong></th>
<th>1, it refers to the bulk of experience gathered outside school during our lifetime 2, it also refers to a very conscious education method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>unsourcing</strong></td>
<td>‘Unsourcing’, as the new trend has been dubbed, involves companies setting up online communities to enable peer-to-peer support among users. Instead of speaking with a faceless person thousands of miles away, customers’ problems are answered by individuals in the same country who have bought and used the same products. This happens either on the company’s own website or on social networks like Facebook and Twitter, and the helpers are generally not paid anything for their efforts. Babbage (The Economist), May 11, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>unsubscribe</strong></td>
<td>remove our data from a mailing list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

but does not meet the standard of scientific research, a hands-on approach in teaching elementary school science. *Unscience* is also related to the so-called soft skills (as opposed to hard skills, which mean a degree, or computer skills, proficiency in another language): communicative skills, creative thinking, and assertivity. Unschooling is an educational method and philosophy that advocates learner-chosen activities as a primary means for learning. Unschooling students learn through their natural life experiences including play, household responsibilities, personal interests and curiosity, internships and work experience, travel, books, elective classes, family, mentors, and social interaction [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unschooling](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unschooling)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unsuspend</td>
<td>re-activate a user account</td>
<td>Gladness unteaches what despair preaches. e.e. cummings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unteach</td>
<td>to cause to forget or disbelieve something previously taught (possibly by contrary teaching)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-Thanksgiving Day (n)</td>
<td>The Indigenous Peoples Sunrise Ceremony</td>
<td>Every year on the date of the United States Thanksgiving holiday in November, several thousand indigenous people and spectators travel to Alcatraz Island. Groups dance before sunrise, to honour their ancestors, while other groups demonstrate other aspects of their cultures and heritage and speak out for the rights of their people. The celebration is open to the public. <a href="https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unthanksgiving_Day">https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unthanksgiving_Day</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-tourist</td>
<td>a better example of a tourist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-turkey (n)</td>
<td>A vegetarian substitute for turkey, particularly a turkey-shaped &quot;bird&quot; made with wheat gluten, soy, and other vegetarian ingredients</td>
<td>One of Open Harvest Natural Foods Cooperative Grocery's biggest sellers for Thanksgiving this year is a turkey substitute called Unturkey. This bird-friendly holiday entree is a mixture of soy and wheat. —Andrea Dukich, &quot;Turkey Day creates other traditions for vegetarians,&quot; Daily Nebraskan, November 25, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unvegetarian (n)</td>
<td>1, bad example of a vegetarian 2, an omnivore in a more socially and health-conscious way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unvote</td>
<td>reverse or annul a vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unwedding (n)</td>
<td>A formal ceremony held to celebrate a couple's divorce and to acknowledge their married life.</td>
<td>Now that divorce is an established cultural tradition, and no longer stigmatised as a shameful moral failing, increasing numbers of incompatible Americans are choosing to solemnise the break-up of their marriages with an &quot;unwedding ceremony&quot; — often in church with a reception afterwards — which acknowledges their shared life and marks their amicable separation as a couple. —Dermot Purgavie, &quot;More and more divorcing couples are opting to end their union with a formal ceremony,&quot; <em>Sunday Express</em>, June 17, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unwich (n)</td>
<td>a sandwich wrap made with lettuce instead of bread</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unwoman (n)</td>
<td>&quot;Unwoman&quot; comes from Margaret Atwood's dystopian novel The Handmaid's Tale, and refers to the label given to sterile, feminist, or politically deviant women. “But what is the ‘unwoman’ meme I talk about? It refers to the fact that in the way society is set up; the white woman is considered the paragon of virtue, fertility, beauty and femininity. Those cool points for white womanhood go up is she has blonde hair, blue eyes, a flat behind and a classic hourglass figure. She is held up by whiteness and white supremacy as the beauty standard by which all women no matter what their ethnicity should aspire to and that all men regardless of their ethnicity desire.” <a href="http://transgriot.blogspot.hu/2011/07/whats-black-unwoman-meme.html">http://transgriot.blogspot.hu/2011/07/whats-black-unwoman-meme.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unword (n)</td>
<td>1, unword can stand for words which are repeated so many times that they lose their meaning for the listener, it can be an imaginary word that was made up to give meaning to something in the most complex sense, the example is actually based on the German “Unwort des Jahres”: “A German linguists' panel chooses one term that violates human rights or infringes upon Democratic principles, each year. The term may be one that discriminate against societal groups or may be euphemistic, disguising or misleading. The term is usually, but not always a German term. The term is chosen from suggestions sent in by the public. The choice of the word does not depend on how many times it was suggested/ sent in, but reflects the judgement of the panel. The core of the panel consists of 4 linguists and one journalist. The un-word of the previous year is announced annually in January.” <a href="http://wikipedia_en_all_2015-05/A/Unword_of_the_year.html">wikipedia_en_all_2015-05/A/Unword_of_the_year.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unyoung (a)</td>
<td>neither young nor old, not young enough for a certain task “An unyoung youth leader” OED 1972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>