

SYNTACTIC FUNCTION OF NEGATIVE PREFIXES IN ENGLISH AND POLISH PARTICIPIAL ADJECTIVES

BARBARA FEDOROWICZ-BACZ

The Jagellonian University of Cracow

The commonest and the most productive negative prefix in English is undoubtedly the particle *un-*. Jespersen (1965: VI. 26. 16) observes that "while most of the *in-* words are settled once for all, and have to be learned by children as wholes, there is always a possibility of forming new words on the spur of the moment with the prefix *un-*".¹ Other negative prefixes such as *a-* (*amoral, asymmetric, atrophied, asexual*), *non-* (*non-existent, non-flammable, non-commissioned, non-nucleated*), *dis-* (*dishonest, discourteous, discoloured, disinterested*) and *in-* (*inauspicious, impossible, irrelevant, indebted*)² are considerably less frequent and by far less productive in Modern English. Their application is limited to small groups of words of restricted semantic spheres. Whereas the native, Germanic *un-* "is the regular prefix with adjectives belonging to the common vocabulary of the language" (Marchand 1960:21), the Greek *a-* is basically reserved for terms belonging to science (Cygan 1974:317), Romance *in-* forms negatives with "learned words of Latin and French origin" (Quirk 1972:982),³ *dis-* occurs mainly in verbs and words with some inherent verbal idea (Jespersen 1930:126.53; Zandvoort 1966:294), and *non-* prefixes chiefly in nouns of action (Zandvoort: 1966:295; Cygan 1974:317). Since *un-* is the most important of English negative prefixes, and, what is of significance for

¹ Ample evidence supporting this observation can be found in the specific idiolect of a modern American poet E. E. Cummings whose well known language coinages expressing negative concepts are all prefixed by *un-*, e. g. *unpeople, manunkind*, etc.

² Negative *in-* should not be confused with intensifying *in-* of words such as e. g. *inflammable* (easily set on fire).

³ In some words of Latin or French origin negative *un-*prefixed adjectives constitute derivational sources of *in-*prefixed nouns, as in *unable* — *inability, unjust* — *injustice, unequal* — *inequality*. Zandvoort (1966: 298) suggests that this disparity of prefixes on the nouns here (*-ty, -ice*) shows the Latin origin of the word more clearly.

the purposes of this paper, seems to be the most frequent English negative prefix added to adjectives, the discussion here will center around adjectives prefixed by negative *un-*.

It has to be made clear at the beginning that there are two *un-* prefixes in English which differ in their semantic function and syntactic distribution: a) negative *un-* and b) privative *un-*. Profixation by negative *un-* produces the semantic effect of simple negation of the meaning expressed by the stem to which the prefix attaches (*unjust, unforgettable, unreported*) whereas derivatives with privative *un-* denote actions which are reversals of the actions designated by the stems of the words in question (*unbutton, undress, unlock*). As to the distribution of the two *un-* prefixes it can be observed that negative *un-* shows up surfacedly on lexical adjectives (*unhappy, unthinkable*), nouns (*untruth, unkindness*), adverbs (*ungracefully, unfortunately*) and participial forms such as *uninhabited, unbroken*, whereas privative *un-* occurs in verbs (*undo, unsaddle, unleash*).

In an unpublished 1971 paper Dorothy Siegel suggests that all words prefixed by negative *un-* have to contain an adjective somewhere in their derivation. Indeed, it can be observed that negative *un-* prefixed nouns and adverbs are all derived from the corresponding *un-* adjectives, cf. *unkindness* (n) — *unkind* (adj), *unfortunately* (adv) — *unfortunate* (adj). That explains why in the lexicon of English we do not find items such as **unyoung, *ungoodness, *ungaily*, etc., which would have had to be derived from non-existent adjectives **unyoung, *ungood*, and **ungay*, respectively.

Since both negative *un-* and privative *un-* can appear on participial forms in *-ed*, ambiguity between the two kinds of *un-* participles can be expected, especially that both can occur as attributive modifiers in NP's, cf., *an unpublished paper* (negative *un-*) versus *an unbuttoned shirt* (privative *un-*). In spite of their surface structure similarity participial forms prefixed by negative *un-* differ syntactically from participial forms prefixed by privative *un-*. It can be shown that the former belong to the class of adjectives and the latter to the class of verbs. In this paper I will try to offer syntactic arguments in order to prove that negatively *un-* prefixed participial forms such as *uninhabited, unpublished*, etc. are not verbal participles but adjectives.

Words which have the morphological structure such as verbal participles ended in *-ed* and *-ing* and at the same time manifest syntactic properties typical of lexical adjectives are, in linguistic literature, sometimes referred to as "participial adjectives", and this is the term I am going to adopt in the present discussion.⁴ Participial adjectives, which are derivatives from verbs,

⁴ This term is used by Dorothy Siegel (1971) to denote items such as *uncollected, uninhabited*, etc. For a discussion of English participial adjectives see Quirk (1972 : 242 - 246).

should be distinguished from adjectives in *-ed* derived from nouns, such as e. g. *(un)cultured, talented, old-fashioned, blue-eyed, (un)skilled* etc., which obviously cannot be treated as verbal participles as they have no corresponding verbs such as **(un)culture, *talent, *old-fashion*, etc. Participial adjectives exhibit adjective characteristics to the extent that: 1) they occur in attributive and/or predicative position, e. g. *the diseased lung — the lung is diseased, an interesting book — the book is interesting*, 2) they may be premodified by *very*, e. g. *his very diseased lung, a very interesting book*, 3) they may occur in *more ... than* structures of comparison, e. g. *she is more offended than heart-broken, the result was more surprising than predicted*.

The formal criteria given above cannot be treated as absolute and unailing tests indicating the adjective status of the words in question. Very often, especially when they appear in predicative position, and no disambiguating factors are present in the sentence, ambiguity may result since particular *-ed* or *-ing* items can be interpreted as either participial adjectives or verbal participles, the meaning of the sentence depending on the presupposition in the mind of the speaker or his intended meaning which has not been expressed verbally in a clear-enough way. Cf. the following examples,⁵

1. a. She is (very) calculating (but her husband is frank) — adj.
b. She is calculating (now). (Don't disturb her) — participle
2. a. They were (very) relieved (to find her at home) — adj.
b. They were relieved (by the next group of sentries) — part.
3. a. It is (absolutely) freezing (i.e. very cold) — adj.
b. It is freezing (i.e. becoming frozen) — part.
4. a. It is (absolutely) boiling (i.e. very hot) — adj.
b. It is boiling (i.e. becoming gaseous) — part.
5. a. The man was offended. (He looked very cross) — adj.
b. The man was offended (by her behaviour) — part.

It may be said that the interpretation of ambiguous sentences like these above depends on their verbal or adjectival focus, which is determined in the mind of the speaker. Some grammarians explain the difference between the two interpretations solely in semantic terms, maintaining that adjective interpretation should be given when the state resulting from the process is meant, and participle interpretation, when the process is emphasized.

Quirk (1972) proposes a *seem*-test for discovering the adjective status of a lexical item in predicative position. He observes that in ambiguous sentences like these above, *be* can be replaced by *seem* only in examples a), i.e. the ones with adjectives. The *seem*-test, however, is not very helpful when an interpretation of *-ed* or *-ing* words occurring in attributive position is needed, for e. g. the attributive modifier *faded* in NP *faded curtains* can have two

⁵ These examples are taken from Quirk (1972 : 244) and Horn (1973).

derivational sources: participial *the curtains have faded* or adjectival *the curtains are/seem faded*. L. Horn in his 1973 dissertation introduces an *absolutely*-test to distinguish adjectives from participles. The intensifier *absolutely* can be inserted only in front of adjectives. This test, which seems to be another version of the well known *very*-premodification test, is successful when applied to ambiguous attributive items, cf. *those absolutely faded curtains* — *those curtains are absolutely faded*, **those curtains have absolutely faded*.

Some of the attributive forms in *-ed* have no corresponding verbs and this feature clearly excludes them from the class of verbal participles. The lack of the corresponding infinitival form is an unfailing signal of the category of adjective in the case of morphological participles which are derivatives from nouns such as (*un*) *skilled, talented*, and of *un*-prefixed deverbal participial forms such as *uncollected, unassuming* for neither of them have underlying infinitives, cf., *(*un*)*skill, *talent, *uncollect, *unassume*.

Another unfailing feature defining participial adjectives in *-ed* (including these which have corresponding infinitive forms) is the impossibility of a passive interpretation. Participial adjectives cannot or may not be interpreted as passive counterparts of well formed active sentences because they either (1) do not have the corresponding verb, e. g. in *his talented friend* — **his friend was talented by someone* — **to talent*, or (2) the corresponding verb is typically intransitive as in *the escaped prisoner* — **the prisoner is escaped by someone*, or (3) the passive interpretation is semantically impossible or not obligatory, e. g. *a grown boy* — **a boy who is/has been grown up by someone, a boy who has grown up* (Quirk 1972: 243).

Negative *un*-prefixed participial forms in *-ed* which are under scrutiny in this paper have to be included in the class of participial adjectives since their formal characteristic complies with the list of features outlined above. Specifically, 1) they have no corresponding infinitive forms, e. g. *unexpected guests* — **unexpect*, 2) they cannot be interpreted as passives since there are no well-formed active sentences from which they could have been derived, cf., *unexpected guests* — **these guests were unexpected by John, *John unexpected these guests; uninhabited area* — **this area is uninhabited by man, *man uninhabits this area*, 3) some of them can be premodified by an intensifier such as *very* or *absolutely*, e. g. *those absolutely unexpected guests* (but not **this very unwritten letter*), 4) they occur in attributive and/or predicative position, e. g., *uninhabited area* — *this area is uninhabited*.

A few observations can be made concerning the relation between the *un*-prefixed participial forms and their possible positive counterparts. In the cases when negative *un*-prefixed participial modifiers are participial adjectives, their positive counterparts are verbal participles occurring in unprefixed *-ed* forms, e. g. *the (very) unexpected guests* (adj.) but *the (*very) expected guests* (verb); *the (absolutely) uninhabited area* (adj.) but *the (*absolutely) inhabited area*

(verb). One could generalize this observation by saying that in the case of *-ed* participles, prefixation by negative *un*-, which is a morphological operation, causes a change of the syntactic category of the item in question by shifting the word from the lexical class of verbs to that of adjectives. There are, however, instances of *un*-prefixed participial adjectives which have no corresponding positive counterparts that would occur in unprefixed *-ed* forms, cf., *an unheeded problem* but **a heeded problem, an unheard-of demonstration* but **a heard-of demonstration*. In such cases the function of negative prefixation by *un*- can be described as that of conferring acceptability on a participial form in question.⁶

On the level of semantics prefixation by negative *un*- results in simple negation of the meaning of the stem in question. In terms of logic this process would be described as $p \rightarrow \sim p$.

It is intuitively felt that semantically, participial adjectives like *unexpected* correspond to negated participles like *not expected* but differences in syntactic properties between the two imply that there must be a difference in meaning introduced by the morphological operation of prefixation by *un*-. The differences in syntactic properties between negated participial adjectives and the corresponding participles will be brought to light when premodification by *very* and Klima's (1964) question tag test for negation are applied, cf., (a) *very unexpected* but not **not very expected, *very not expected*; (b) *these guests were unexpected, weren't they?* but not **these guests were not expected, weren't they?* Semantic differences between these two forms of negation (*un*-negation and *not*-negation) require a close scrutiny. D. Siegel (1971) suggests that when *un*- and *not* appear immediately before non-gradable participial adjectives (i. e. adjectives which cannot be premodified by *very*) both forms are practically synonymous, whereas when *un*- and *not* precede participial adjectives which can be graded, a difference in meaning between the two forms can be observed. Indeed, ungradable *unhated* seems to be semantically identical to *not hated, unafraid* to *not afraid, unmoved* to *not moved*, while gradable *not complicated* seems to assume a greater degree of complication than *uncomplicated* and *not satisfied* is necessarily *unsatisfied* (c. g. the demand

⁶ It is assumed that the derivation of negative *un*-prefixed participial adjectives starts from the positive infinitival form and develops through *-ed*-suffixation to prefixation by *un*- which is the final operation, e. g. *unexpected* = *expect* → *expected* → *unexpected*, *not expect* = **unexpect* → *unexpected*. Examples such as *unheeded* may constitute a problem for this line of derivation of negated participial adjectives as the lexicon of English does not contain positive *-ed* participles such as **heeded*. Since there is no infinitival form **to unheed* neither of the two possible derivations of this item can be preferred, cf. *unheeded* = **heed* → **heeded* → *unheeded* or *unheeded* = **heed* → **unheed* → *unheeded*. Thus, *unheeded* does not constitute a valid counterexample to the derivation of participial adjectives proposed here.

not satisfied is necessarily unsatisfied), but the converse is not true. It seems that in forms negated by *not* the presence of an agent is presupposed, i.e. *not complicated* is in fact understood as *not complicated by someone* whereas in *un-*negated forms the agent is not important, the state being exposed. The semantic difference between the *not* and *un-*negated members of relevant pairs of participial adjectives will be seen more clearly when an intensifier such as *very* or *completely* is inserted, cf., *not very complicated* does not mean *very uncomplicated*, *not completely satisfied* is not *completely unsatisfied*, etc.

These semantic observations and comments have been made here only in order to enlarge on the syntactic characteristics of English *un-*negated participial adjectives given before. I believe that syntactic arguments given here are sufficient to maintain that *un-*prefixed English *-ed* participial forms are adjectives.

In the following part of this paper I will examine negated participial adjectives in Polish and discuss the relation between English *un-*negated participial adjectives and negated participial adjectives in Polish.

There are two major negative prefixes in Polish that attach to adjectives, *nie-* (*nieładny*, *nieprzejrzany*, *niespodziewany*) and *bez-* (*beładny*, *bezbronny*; *bezbrzeżny*). Since *bez-* does not appear on participial forms (there are no examples such as **bezmyślący* or **bezspodziewany*) and has no corresponding prefix in English, *bez-*prefixed lexical items being rendered by means of adjectives with the suffix *-less* or by prepositional phrases with the preposition *without* (cf., *beznadziejny* — *hopeless*, *bezbronny* — *without weapon*) *bez-* negation will be disregarded in the present study.

The negative prefix *nie-* is the only Polish equivalent of the English negative prefix *un-* (as well as of the negative *in-*). In his contrastive classification of Polish negative exponents J. Cygan (1974:299, 314) includes this *nie-* into the group of exponents of what he calls "special (lexical) negation". As a morphological unit Polish *nie* is much more universal than English *un-*, for besides functioning as a negative prefix equivalent of the English *un-* as in *nieszczęśliwy* — *unhappy*, *nieoczekiwany* — *unexpected* it serves as an exponent of sentence negation, equivalent of the English *not* (*n't*) as in *człowiek nie mówiący po angielsku* — *a man who does not (doesn't) speak English*; *Nie pal.* — *Don't smoke.*, or as the lexical substitute for a negative answer (absolute negation), an equivalent of English *no*, as in: *Czy idziesz ze mną? Nie!* — *Are you coming with me? No!* Discussing Polish *nie-* Cygan (1974:314) states that "the negative particle and the word it negatives are felt strongly to belong to each other, and can in fact as a whole always be replaced by another word of synonymous meaning but positive in form". This fact is reflected in Polish orthography for according to the general orthographic rule in Polish *nie-* has to be spelt jointly with adjectives (*niełatwy*, *nieładny* with positive synonyms *trudny* and *brzydki*, respectively), nouns (*nieprzyjaciół*, *niepokój*

with synonyms *wróg*, *podniecenie*), deadjectival adverbs (*niełatwo* — *trudno*, *nieładnie* — *brzydko*) and adjectival participles (*nieokreślony* — *szary*, *bezbarwny*, *nieoczekiwany* — *nagły*, *niespodziewany* — *zaskakujący*) but not with verbs (**niepisać*, **nietaćzyć*). (For the formulation of the rule and discussion see Jodłowski and Taszycki 1974:50-53).⁷ This generalization about the surface distribution of *nie-* in Polish, when compared with the generalization concerning the possibilities of prefixation by *un-* in English will bring out certain differences and similarities between the two languages. Whereas in English negative *un-* can attach to nouns only if they are derived from *un-*prefixed adjectives, Polish nouns prefixed by *nie-* do not need to have corresponding *nie-*adjectives since *nie-* can be freely prefixed to underived nouns, cf. *nieśmiałość* — *nieśmiały*, *nieprzyjaciół* — *nieprzyjacielski* but *niedolę* — **niedolny*, *niewola* — **niewolny*, etc. In the case of negated adverbs the same generalization applies to both languages for Polish *nie-*, just as English *un-*, appears only on adverbs derived from negated adjectives, cf., *nieudolny* — *nieudolnie*, *nieładny* — *nieładnie*, but **niesprytny* — **niesprytnie*, **nieziemny* — **nieziemno*. Like in English, problems arise in the case of negated items which have the morphological form of the so-called participles in *-ny*, *-na*, *-ne*, *-ty*, *-ta*, *-te*, *-ący*, *-ące*, *-ąca*, "imiesłowy przymiotne czynne i bierne"). In the grammar of Polish an a priori functional distinction is made between negated adjectival participles functioning as verbs ("imiesłowy przymiotne w funkcji czasownika") and negated adjectival participles functioning as adjectives ("imiesłowy przymiotne w funkcji przymiotnika") (see e.g. Jodłowski and Taszycki 1974:51). The difference between the two kinds of negated participial forms is reflected in Polish orthography where a much troublesome rule prescribes a joint spelling of the particle *nie-* with adjectival participles functioning as adjectives and disjoint spelling of *nie-* with adjectival participles functioning as verbs, cf.,

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| <i>nie+ustający</i> | — a) Lał deszcz, <i>nie ustający</i> od godziny. |
| | b) Rada <i>Nieustającej</i> Pomocy |
| <i>nie+nasycony</i> | a) Gąbka, <i>nie nasycona</i> wodą, zeschnęła na kość. |
| | b) <i>nienasycony</i> apetyt |
| <i>nie+palący</i> | a) Osobom, <i>nie palącym</i> w tej chwili, podano ciasto. |
| | b) W przedziale było trzech <i>niepalących</i> . |

Polish negated adjectival participles in the function of verbs (examples a) correspond to English negated verbal participles, and negated adjectival

⁷ There are a few exceptions to this rule in the case of such verbs as *niepokoić* (disturb), (*z*)*niewolić* (enslave), *niedomagac* (be unfit), *niedowidzieć* (not to see well), *nienawidzić* (hate) but they do not constitute counter-evidence to the generalization as formulated for there are historical and/or semantic reasons accounting for the joint spelling with *nie-* in each case (see Jodłowski and Taszycki 1974:50).

participles in the function of adjectives (examples b) to English participial adjectives. From now on the uniform terms "verbal participle" and "participial adjective" will be used in reference to relevant participial forms in both languages. Whereas in English negated participial adjectives differ from the corresponding verbal participles structurally, the former being negated by *un-* and the latter by *not*, in Polish negated participial forms are ambiguous, for *nie* is the negator in both cases. In fact, the formal difference between negated participial adjectives and homonymous verbal participles is seen only in spelling for on the level of phonology both *nie-* and *nie* are treated alike, as unstressed proclitics of the following word. In spite of the fact that the distinction between participial adjectives and homonymous verbal participles in Polish is made in semantic terms (the function of a given negated participial form has to be "felt" as adjectival or verbal) it is possible to construct some formal tests to distinguish the two categories. The task, however, is more difficult than in English.

In English NP's *un-*negated participial adjectives can occur prenominaly, e. g. *the unexpected guests*, whereas negated verbal participles have to follow the head noun, cf., *the visitor, not expected today* but not **the not expected today visitor*. In Polish, unlike in English, both the *nie-*negated participial adjectives and the *nie* negated verbal participles can appear as attributive prenominal modifiers, cf.,

6. a. *nieoceniona pomoc* — invaluable help
 b. *nie oceniona przez komisję praca* — the work, not evaluated by the committee
7. a. *nieznany pisarz* — an unknown writer
 b. *nikomu nie znany pisarz* — the writer not known to anybody
8. a. *nieoczekiwany gość* — the unexpected guest
 b. *przez nikogo nie oczekiwane zakończenie* — the end, not expected by anybody

In predicative position, however, Polish verbal participles are always separated from the negator *nie* by means of the copulative verb *być, zostać, zdawać się* whereas *nie-*negated participial adjectives, if they appear in predicative position at all, have to follow the copulative verb and the negator *nie-* cannot be detached from the participial adjective it prefixes without a change in meaning, cf.,

Verbal participles:

9. *nie oceniona praca* — *praca, która nie została oceniona*
 **która została nie oceniona*
10. *nie wykształcona (w pełni) kończyzna* — *kończyna, która nie została wykształcona*
 **która została nie wykształcona*

11. *nie znane jej otoczenie* — *otoczenie, które nie było jej znane*
 **które było jej nie znane*
12. *nie zbadany pacjent* — *pacjent, który nie został zbadany*
 **który został nie zbadany*

Participial adjectives:

13. *nieoceniony wysiłek* — *jego wysiłek zdaje się nieoceniony (bardzo cenny)*
 ≠ *jego wysiłek nie jest oceniony*
14. *nieznany autor* — *autor, który jest nieznany (anonimowy)*
 ≠ *autor, który nie jest/nie wydaje się znany*
15. *nienasycony apetyt* — *jego apetyt wydaje się nienasycony (bez dna)*
 ≠ *apetyt nie wydaje się (jeszcze) nasycony*
16. *niezatarte ślady* — *te ślady są niezatarte (trwale)*
 ≠ *ślady nie są zatarte*

As can be seen in examples above *nie-*negated participial adjectives can be substituted by synonymous words (predominantly lexical adjectives) positive in their morphological form which have been indicated in brackets. Such substitution is not possible in the case of negated verbs and verbal participles.

Similarly to English participial adjectives, negated participial adjectives in Polish have no corresponding infinitive forms, e. g. *niezdobyta twierdza* — **niezdobyć* (cf. *uninhabited house* — **uninhabit*) and cannot be interpreted as passives since they do not co-occur with *przez*-agents and have no underlying active sentence sources, e. g. *nieokreślony wyraz twarzy* — **wyraz jej twarzy był nieokreślony przez kogoś* — **ktoś nieokreślił wyraz(u) jej twarzy* (cf. *the unwritten letter* — **the letter was unwritten by John* — **John unwrote the letter*). Negated verbal participles have corresponding infinitives, e. g. *nie palący w tej chwili mężczyzna to mój wujek* — *(nie) palić*, and can be interpreted as passive counterparts of underlying active sentences, cf., *ten, nie przzerwany przez Jasia sznurek* — *sznurek nie został przzerwany przez Jasia* — *Jaś nie przerwał sznurka*. Polish participial adjectives can be and often are premodified by intensifiers such as: *absolutnie, kompletnie, zupełnie, całkiem* but they do not co-occur with the word *wcale*, e. g.

absolutnie nieoceniona pomoc (bezcenna)

**wcale* „ „ „
zupełnie niesłychane wydarzenie

**wcale* „ „ „

Negated verbal participles can easily co-occur with *wcale* but on the whole they do not admit of intensifiers such as *absolutnie* and *całkiem*, cf., *myśl wcale/zupełnie nie wypowiedziana, artykuł zupełnie/wcale nie napisany* but **absolutnie niewypowiedziane bogactwa, *całkiem niezgłębiona tajemnica*.

I believe that the above discussion has shown that Polish negated participial forms in *-ny-, -na-, -ne-, -ty-, -ta-, -te* should be treated as adjectives not only because of their adjectival meaning but also because of their syntactic

properties which distinguish them from the category of verbal participles.

A few semantic comments concerning Polish negated participial adjectives will now be made. It can be observed that through prefixation by *nie*-Polish adjectival participles (imiesłowy przymiotne bierne) often acquire a completely new meaning, different from the meaning of the underlying verbal stem and the corresponding verbal participle negated by *nie*. They can have the meaning of a morphologically unrelated adjective, positive in connotation, which can be used as a semantic substitute for a given negated participial adjective, or they carry the meaning which can be expressed by the *impossible-to-V* structure where V stands for the underlying verbal stem. Cf. some examples of these two semantic groups of participial adjectives in Polish:

I. <i>Negated participial adj.</i>	<i>Negated participle</i>	<i>Underlying verb</i>
nieskomplikowany (simple)	nie skomplikowany (not complicated)	skomplikować (complicate)
nieopisany (unusual, extraordinary)	nie opisany (not described)	opisać (describe)
nieprzejrzany (vast)	nie przejrzany (not surveyed)	przejrzeć (survey)
nieprzerwany (continuous, unbroken)	nie przerwany (unbroken)	przerwać (break)
nieoczekiwany (sudden, unexpected)	nie oczekiwany (not expected)	oczekiwać (expect)
II.		
nieoceniony (invaluable, impossible to evaluate)	nie oceniony (not evaluated)	ocenić (evaluate)
niewypowiedziany (impossible to express)	nie wypowiedziany (not voiced)	wypowiedzieć (say)
niezapomniany (unforgettable)	nie zapomniany (not forgotten)	zapominać (forget)
niezbadany (impossible to examine)	nie zbadany (not examined)	zbadać (examine)
niepokonany (impossible to defeat)	nie pokonany (not defeated)	pokonać (defeat)

The semantic difference between negated participial adjectives of group I and the corresponding negated participles will be better seen if intensifiers such as *bardzo/wcale* and *zupełnie* can be inserted, e. g. *zupełnie/wcale nieoczekiwany* does not mean *niezupełnie/niebardzo oczekiwany*, *zupełnie nieskomplikowany* is not *niezupełnie skomplikowany*, etc. It can be observed at this point that D. Siegel's generalization that a semantic difference between English *un-*

and *not* negated participial adjectives is found only if a given adjective can be premodified by an intensifier such as *very* does not apply to Polish for Polish participial adjectives of group I do not have to be gradable, cf. **bardzo/zupełnie nieopisany, *bardzo/zupełnie nieprzejrzany* but *zupełnie nieskomplikowany, zupełnie nieoczekiwany*.

As to participial adjectives of group II (impossible-to-V) it may be noticed that they correspond to English lexical adjectives in *-able* which are derivatives from verbs (for a discussion of *un-V-able*-adjective see Chapin (1970:58).

To sum up the most important points and observations made in this paper about negatively prefixed participial adjectives which occur in English and Polish NP's the following statements can be made by way of conclusion:⁸

a) English *un-*negated *-ed* participial forms and Polish *nie-* negated adjectival participles in *-ny, -na, -ne, -ty, -ta, -te* appearing in attributive position should be treated as participial adjectives and not verbal participles not only because of their semantic function but also because of their syntactic properties which distinguish them from verbal participles and tie them up with the category of adjectives.

b) In the process of negation by means of negative prefixes *un-* and *nie-*, in English and Polish respectively, verbal participles (whether actually occurring in language or merely hypothetical) change their syntactic category and become adjectives. This consequence is the syntactic function of the morphological operation of negative prefixation.

⁸ The discussion and conclusions of this paper are consciously limited to negatively prefixed participial adjectives appearing in attributive position for English *un-*prefixed participial forms used non-attributively do not have to be adjectival in their function. Examining English equivalents of negated adverbial participles in Polish, Grala (1974 : 287) distinguishes as a special type of equivalents English "past participles and adjectives with negative prefix *un-*" by which she means the same morphological forms as those considered in the present paper but occurring in non-attributive function being used as the traditional free adjuncts. In her Polish-to-English approach items such as *unmoved, unafraid* (see her examples 25, 26 in Grala (1974 : 287) are treated as negative past participles equivalent of Polish "adverbial particles" (imiesłowy przysłówkowe) *nie wzruszyszy się, nie obawiając się*. Cf. her example 25: *Nie wzruszyszy się jej sytuacją odmówił pomocy* — *Unmoved by her situation, he refused to help*. If English-to-Polish direction of contrastive analysis were applied here, the *un-*prefixed participial forms in question could be treated as ambiguous, for the English example quoted here can equally well be interpreted as a translation equivalent of the Polish sentence: *Nie poruszony (nie wzruszony) jej sytuacją, odmówił pomocy* with the negated item *unmoved* rendering Polish adjectival participle (imiesłów przymiotnikowy) *nie poruszony* used in the function of a verb (in the terminology of this paper, a negated participle). This possibility of a double (adjectival and adverbial) translation of English *un-*prefixed participial forms into Polish does not show that non-attributive participial forms in English are not adjectives. It may be taken to suggest, however, that English negated participial adjectives can be ambiguous as to their perfective or non-perfective aspect, which should be taken into consideration in a more detailed study (e. g. *unmoved* here can be interpreted as a) *is not moved* or b) *has not been moved*).

c) English negatively prefixed participial adjectives and the corresponding negated participles differ in their surface structure distribution, for *un-* participial adjectives can occur in prenominal position in NP's whereas *not-* negated verbal participles cannot. Negatively prefixed participial adjectives in Polish and the homonymous verbal participles negated by *nie* can both appear as prenominal modifiers in NP's.

REFERENCES

- Bierwisch, M. and Hoidolph, K. E. (eds). 1970. *Progress in linguistics*. The Hague; Mouton.
- Chapin, P. G. 1970. "On affixation in English". In Bierwisch, M. and Heidolph, K. E. (eds). 1970. 51 - 63.
- Cygan, J. 1974. "Negation in English and Polish". *PSiCL* 2. 295 - 329.
- Grala, M. 1974. "Negated adverbial participles in Polish and their corresponding forms in English". *PSiCL* 2. 281 - 294.
- Fodor, J. J. and Katz, J. A. (eds). 1964. *The structure of language*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.
- Horn, L. 1972. *On the semantic properties of logical operators in English*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Jespersen, O. 1965. *Modern English grammar on historical principles*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Jodłowski, Z. and Taszycki, W. 1974. *Słownik ortograficzny i prawidła pisowni polskiej*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Klima, E. 1964. "Negation in English". In Fodor, J. J. and Katz, J. A. (eds.). 1964. 246 - 323.
- Marchand, H. 1960. *The categories and types of present-day English word-formation*. München: Verlag C. H. Beck.
- Quirk, R. et al. 1972. *A grammar of contemporary English*. New York and London: Seminar Press.
- Siegel, D. 1971. "Non-sources of un-passives". Unpublished manuscript.
- Zandvoort, R. W. 1966. *A handbook of English grammar*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.