SYNTAX ANALYSIS OF TERMS WITH NEGATIVE AFFIXES

**Kosimova Dilobar Tursunalievna,
Xodjayeva Naima Sharafitdinova**
*Academic Lyceum of Tashkent State
University of Economics, teachers of
English*
E-mail: nanihon@inbox.ru

Abstract. Paraphrasing or "reading" of an affixal negation derivative may help in indicating the group into which the derivative can be accommodated, as shown by the two readings of the French verb déconseiller. The distribution of the subtypes of these two groups needs to be explored further, which might give insights as to the role of various affixes in the distribution of their derivatives. The observations of Sapir (cited by Cysouw 2006) regarding the imbalance of affixation seem to be challenged in the domain of negation. They have observed that in the domain of affixation, the number of suffixes is higher than the number of prefixes, which amounts to the imbalance in affixation. In the case of negative affixes, however, prefixes seem to outnumber suffixes. This phenomenon could be examined further to see whether it is linked to the distribution of affixal negation into the groups "direct" and "indirect".

Key words: negativity in linguistics, negative affixes, prefix, suffix, inflection, derivation, types of negative affixes, metallurgical terms,syntaxeme analysis.

1. Introduction

Much literature on negation (Jespersen 1917, Horn 2001, Zeijlstra 2007, Hintikka 2002, Geurts 1998) primarily deals with sentential negation and pays comparatively lesser attention to lexical negation in general, and to affixal negation in particular. Antonymy, which is a part of lexical negation [2][2]The term "lexical negation" is used to indicate the negation of…, is treated in the domain of lexicology and to some extent in semantics (Lehrer 1985, Ljung 1974), but affixal negation receives lesser attention even in the domain of morphology.

After examining the affixal derivatives, it can be observed that affixal negation is not a homogenous set in its own. The various subtypes of negation (as expressed through the meanings of the derivatives) – diminution, lack, absence, inferiority (physical, hierarchical), falsehood, reversal (of action, of direction), deprivation, removal, etc., to cite a few – can be included in this set.

In this article, an attempt is made to group these various types of affixal negation into two main groups – direct and indirect. The example *infamous* (English, henceforth "en") when put in contrast with *unhappy* (en) helps us in distinguishing between these two types of negation. An *unhappy* person is a person who is *not happy*, which is in direct opposition

with *happy*. An *infamous* person, on the other hand, is not someone who is not famous, but it is someone who is famous for the wrong reasons. The word *infamous* is thus not in direct opposition with *famous*, but still maintains a negative connotation. The first type of negation (*happy* / *unhappy*) is that of direct negation, whereas the latter example (*famous* / *infamous*) is that of indirect negation.

These types of affixal negation (direct negation and indirect negation) are examined with examples in English, French (henceforth "fr"), Sanskrit (henceforth "sk") and Marathi (henceforth "mr"). Although all these languages belong to the Indo-European family, they come from different sub-families – French has Latin origins, English belongs to the Germanic sub-family, Sanskrit is a classical language, as Latin and Greek. Marathi, which is an Indo-European language spoken by about 70 million people, mainly in the region of Maharashtra in India, has its roots in Sanskrit and some other languages. All these languages exhibit a rich morphology, especially with regard to affixation.

Negative affixes, as is the case with any other affix, may exhibit multiple shades of meaning (which is evident in the meaning of the respective derivative). This polysemy renders these affixes flexible in terms of the positioning of their derivatives in the two types of negation described above. The prefix *mis-* (en) produces some indirect negations (*mislead*, *misplace*, *misconstrue*), as well as some direct negations (*misfire* (= to not go off, in case of a gun), *misfit* (= not to fit, in case of clothes)). Similar is the case of the prefix *a-* (sk, mr) (= not) with some direct negations (*ayogya* (= what is not correct), *abalā* (= who does not have strength)) and some indirect negations, like *adoha:* (= inappropriate time for milking a cow), *adwāram* (= wrong way).

2. Affixal negation

The term "affixal negation", simply put, means "negation carried out by or with the help of an affix" [3][3]It must be specified that the term "affix" is used here to…. It results from a process of affixation that creates a new form through derivation (and negation thereby) and creates a new word form (which is called derivative), making such an affixation part of derivational affixation.

Affixal negation provides an efficient way of formulating semantically negative notions, while still allowing the construction of "affirmative" sentences. The sentence "He is *not happy*" can be rewritten as "He is *unhappy*" [4][4]Discussed in detail in Horn 2001, § 1.1.4..

2.1. Why affixal negation?

There is a possibility to negate almost all the elements with a sentential negative, as shown by the examples below.

I gave you a pen.
- I did not give you a pen. / It's not I that gave you a pen. / John gave you a pen. (= I didn't)
- I did not give you a pen. / It's not you that I gave a pen to. / I gave him a pen. (= not you)
- I did not give you a pen. / I lent you a pen. (= not given)
- I did not give you a pen, I gave you the pen. (= not any pen, but a particular pen)
- I did not give you a pen, I gave you a pencil. (= not a pen)

Such focus is indicated by various means, like using the negation of the verb, restructuring the phrase, varying the stress, using altogether different lexemes, etc. The phenomenon is examined in detail by Horn 1985.

No such flexibility extends to affixal negation. It can only negate certain elements. The elements belonging to the grammatical categories "pronoun", "proper nouns" (even some of the nouns), "prepositions" (or "postpositions" in the case of languages like Marathi and Sanskrit) and "conjunctions" cannot be negated using affixation. One can negate, using affixation, some of the nouns, adjectives, adverbs and some of the verbs.

This is illustrated by the very frequent English affixes *non-* and *un-*. They seem to possess the ability of negating almost any element belonging to most of the grammatical categories (except for the prepositions and the conjunctions). This is probably due to the fact that these affixes negate the very nature or character (denotative or connotative) of the referent of a word. As Horn (2001) [5][5]Horn 2001, 280. mentions, the affix *non-* negates the "observable" (or denotative) meaning and the affix *un-* negates the "underlying" (or connotative) meaning of a word. Pronouns, prepositions and conjunctions are excluded, probably because the nature of the meaning they carry is "instructional" and not "referential" or "descriptive".

2.2. Advantages of affixal negation

There are, however, some distinct advantages of affixal negation.

2.2.1. Construction of "affirmative" sentences

A "negative" sentence typically uses verbal negation. The sentence "Christ is not mortal" is termed as a "negative" sentence. The reformulation of this sentence "Christ is immortal", however, is more often than not termed as "affirmative" and not "negative". Psychologically, the speaker is assured that he / she is not making a "negative" statement [6][6]Ibid., § 1.1.4..

2.2.2. Economy

Affixal negation allows one to achieve economy in terms of the number of "words" used. Saying that something is "non-white" is much easier than specifying that it is "not white, but not black nor red either".

2.2.3. Approximation

Providing the information of something being just "non-white" and not specifying its true colour may appear as "approximation". But this power of approximation or generalization helps in facilitating conversations at times, if the exact details are not the need at that moment.

2.2.4. Shades of negation

Affixal negation helps in capturing the various "grey" shades of negation like diminution, badness, inferiority, reversal of action, etc., as opposed to the black and white nature of the NOT type of negation, usually found with sentential or verbal negation. In this NOT type of negation in sentential negation, the finer adjustments of information might be lost.

3. Affixal negation – direct and indirect

The laws of negation as defined in the Aristotelian approach (as cited by Horn 2001) are based on two criteria: Law of Contrarity (LC) and Law of Excluded Middle (LEM).

The type of negation that obeys both of these laws is termed as "contradictory" (for example, *alive* / *dead*) and the one that obeys only the LC but not the LEM, is termed as "contrary" (for example, *hot* / *cold*).

In the realm of affixal negation, we do find examples for both these types of negation. *Obéir* / *désobéir* (fr), *bhadra* (= good) / *abhadra* (= bad) (sk), *mortal* / *immortal* (en) are examples of contradictory negation, whereas *happy* / *unhappy* (en), *utsuk* (= eager) / *anutsuk* (= not eager) (mr) are examples of contrary negation. The grouping of affixal negation into "direct" and

"indirect" [7][7]One can find allusions to this term "indirect negation"… encompasses these two types of negation.

3.1. Direct negation

Direct negation is characterized by the NOT element in the derivative with respect to its base. An *unhappy* person is a person who is "NOT happy". Similarly a *non-white* box is a box that is "NOT white" (whether the box is black or red or even colourless is inconsequential here). Direct negation thus encompasses both types of negation as described above – contrary as well as contradictory negation. Similar is the case of indirect negation. To *mislead* someone is not to "NOT lead" someone, but "to lead someone in a direction that is not desired". An *infamous* person is not someone who is "NOT famous", but it is someone who is "famous for undesired reasons".

The groups direct and indirect, however, may not be mutually exclusive from the point of view of some affixes. One may find derivatives formed by the same affix belonging to both groups, although the affinities (in terms of the number of derivatives and productivity) of that particular affix towards either of the groups may vary.

A large portion of negations carried out by the prefix *mis-* (en) are indirect in nature (*mislead*, *misplace*, *misconstrue*), but some examples of direct negation with *mis-* (*misfire* (= to not go off, in the case of a gun) [8][8]Example given in Haïk 1998, 35-36., *misfit* (= not to fit, in the case of clothes)) can still be found. On the other hand, while a lot of negations carried out by the prefix *a-* (sk, mr) (= not) in Sanskrit are direct in nature (*ayogya* (= what is not correct), *abala* (= he, who does not have strength)), some examples of indirect negation can also be found, like *adoha:* (= inappropriate time for milking a cow), *adwāram* (= wrong way).

As seen above, direct negation is of the type "NOT X", i.e., it negates the base logically, by negating its existence. The negations like *unhappy* (en) (as opposed to *happy*), *incontournable* (fr) (as opposed to *contournable*), *non-Christian* (en) (as opposed to *Christian*), *apragat* (sk, mr) (= not advanced / backward) (as opposed to *pragat* (= advanced)), *niswārthi* (mr) (= one who thinks of gains for others) (as opposed to *swārthi* (= one who thinks of gains only for himself)), etc., fall under this category. This direct negation is brought about by the negative affix acting upon the subject, the object or the predicator of the base. In *pragat* / *apragat* (sk, mr), we have the negation of the subject (= what is not advanced) using the affix *a-*. In *contournable* / *incontournable* (fr), we have the

negation of the object using *in-*. In *like / dislike* (en), we have the negation of the predicator using *dis-*. Some more subtypes can be added to this category of direct negation, like the negations of the type "privative" (*couronner / découronner* (fr)), "reversal of action" (*motiver / démotiver* (fr)), etc.

Amongst the types of negation described by Horn 2001 and Lieber 2004, "contrary negation" (*happy / unhappy* (en)), as well as "contradictory negation" (*finite / infinite* (en)) can be said to belong to this category of direct negation.

3.2. Indirect negation

Indirect negation on the other hand is a bit more peculiar than this. Indirect negation is that type of negation which may not look like a logical negation (P − ~P) but is still a negation in terms of its connotation.

Negations of the following types can be said to belong to the category of indirect negation:

Reversal of direction: *purogāmi* (= who / which moves forward) / *pratigāmi* (sk, mr) (= who / which moves backwards). Here negation is carried out without negating the concept of movement indicated by the base *gāmi*.

Reversal of action: *tie / untie* (en), negation by indicating an action performed to reverse another previous action.

Inferiority: *tension / hypotension* (fr), negation without negating the existence of tension.

Insufficiency: *normal / subnormal* (en), only giving a precision about the level, taken as negative in some contexts (as discussed elsewhere in this article).

Badness / wrong: *conduite / méconduite* (fr), negation in the form of only giving a precise description of someone's behaviour (in a negative way).

Over-abundance: *active / hyperactive* (en), negation in the form of existence in excessive and undesired quantity of activity, typically in the case of a child (medically taken to be a disorder).

Pejorative: *drunk / drunkard* (en), negation by pejorative indication of excessive drinking.

Opposition: *matter / antimatter* (en), *terrorist / anti-terrorist* (en), negation by indication of opposition in notion, action, ideology, etc.

Removal: *bug / debug* (en), negation indicating the removal of something.

Some more interesting cases of indirect negation are discussed below in section 3.3.

3.3. Some interesting cases of indirect negation

In French, the word *déconseiller* is a good example of indirect negation. The negative affix *dé-* is used for direct negation as we have seen in some examples, like *découronner*, where it negates the action of crowning somebody. In *déconseiller*, however, one does not negate the action indicated by the base *conseiller*, i.e., the action of giving advice. The negation instead acts on the nature of advice. When one does the action of *déconseiller* on somebody, one is still giving an advice but that of not doing something. (for example, "*les frites sont déconseillées pendant le régime*" = one is advised not to eat fries when on a diet).

Similar is the case of *infamous* in English. The affix *in-* does not negate the state of being famous; it negates, instead, the reason for this fame. An infamous person is still famous, but for the wrong reasons.

In Marathi and Sanskrit, the prefix *a-* usually carries out direct negation. In some contexts, however, this prefix carries meanings other than the direct NOT. In *akāli* (= mr) (= inappropriate time; *kāl* = time), it carries the meaning "inappropriate". Similar is the case of *adoha:* in Sanskrit. The word comes from the verbal root *duh* which means "to milk a cow"; *adoha:* means "inappropriate for milking", which is usually used for indicating time. Hence, *adoha:* means "inappropriate time for milking a cow", and the prefix *a-* carries the meaning of "inappropriate". Another example of the prefix *a-* carrying out indirect negation is *adwāram* (sk) which means "wrong way", with *a-* taking up the meaning "wrong".

Some more examples of indirect negation are *déparler* (fr) (= to talk inconsiderately), *décrier* (fr) (= to bad-mouth someone), *déraisonner* (fr) (= to make wrong judgments), *infâme* (fr) (same as *infamous* in English), *non-événement* (fr) (= an event that is given undue or undeserved importance esp. by the media), *non-issue* (en) (= an issue that is given undue or undeserved importance), *anti-hero* (en) (= a central character or a protagonist in a film or a work of fiction, who lacks the characteristics of a conventional hero), *misuse* (en) (= use but not in the desired way), *ageless* (en) (= whose age cannot be estimated or who does not get old), *kugrām* (mr) (= a very small, almost remote and inaccessible, village; *grām* = village).

4. Negation by non-negative affixes

Some affixes by themselves are not considered as "negative affixes". Out of context, they indicate just a different state of things from what is usually considered as "normal". A *subspecies* is a hierarchically inferior species to some

other more "general" species in a particular classification system – but it is still a species of some kind. A *hypermart* or *hypermarket* is a store bigger in size than a *supermarket*, which in turn is bigger than a *market*, which in this case is taken as the normal term for a shop or a place where commodities are sold. In other words, the words *market* or *species* can be considered as unmarked whereas the words *supermarket*, *hypermarket*, *subspecies* are marked words.

Consider the following examples:

This child is hyperactive.
The athlete put in a subnormal performance.

If these utterances are put in context, they convey different meanings of the affixes *hyper-* and *sub-* from the ones indicated above. In the case of a child being examined medically / psychologically, the state of being *hyperactive* is considered a "negative" attribute. For an athlete, who has set high expectations of himself, not performing as well as he usually would is not desirable. Thus the adjective *subnormal* in this case would be a negative attribute of his performance. This does not imply that all the derivatives of these affixes are negative, but one should note that such negation by non-negative affixes may occur.

As illustrated by Lehrer (1985), Ljung (1974), Givón (1970), it is usually the marked member of a pair of adjectives that carries the "negative" value. The elements *hyperactive* and *subnormal* in the examples are thus the "negative" elements of the pairs *active / hyperactive* and *normal / subnormal*. As far as grouping these adjectives – in terms of the type of negation that they carry – is concerned, they can be grouped as being part of indirect negation.

One can observe similar phenomena in the case of some other non-negative affixes too, like *hypo-*, *micro-*, *mini-*, *semi-*, etc.

5. Role of "reading" or paraphrasing

Paraphrasing plays an important role in determining whether a particular derivative could be considered as negative or not. Additionally, it could also help in grouping a negative derivative as being of the direct or indirect type.

As seen above, an affix can negate a base by acting upon the subject, the object or the predicator of the "reading". The Sanskrit and Marathi derivatives *apragat* (of *pragat*) shows the negation of the subject using the affixe *a-*, the French derivative *incontournable* (which cannot be surpassed /

bypassed) shows the negation of the object and the English derivative *dislike* shows the negation of the predicator using *dis-*.

We identify the affixal negation of the type "direct" as the one that is brought about by a logical negation of the base (P - ~P). We identify "indirect" negation as the one where the derivative is not in logical opposition with the base, but still maintains a negative connotation.

The French word *déconseiller* presents an important and interesting example. Dictionaries like *Le Larousse de poche* (2003), *TLFi*, Littré en ligne define this word as "*conseiller de ne pas faire*" (= to advise not to do something). One may also come across it being paraphrased as "*ne pas conseiller de faire*" (= not to advise to do something). The former deconstruction of the derivative would classify it as being indirect as discussed above in 3.2. The latter way of paraphrasing, however, would make it fall into the category of direct negation, since in this case it appears as if the existence of the base (i.e., *conseiller* or to advise) itself is negated.

The difference made by paraphrasing can be illustrated with an interesting case in English (and it is possible to find some more in English as well as in other languages) – it is the case of *invaluable*.

There appears to be a negation at the formal level, brought about by the attachment of a normally or predominantly negative prefix *in-* to the adjectival base *valuable*. A deeper examination beyond the surface level is what makes it problematic. A possible paraphrasing of *invaluable* is "the value of which cannot be estimated, or what is above valuation". This in turn has a very much positive connotation and usage. Still, there is a negation taking place (of a value, in that it cannot be estimated). So the question here is, are such cases to be considered to be of negation or not? On the surface level, there is definitely a negation, which can be categorized as direct negation. Does the paraphrasing still keep it in the domain of negation or does its connotation take it out of negation?

6. Polysemy of negative affixes

It is the polysemy of the affixes (as discussed by Corbin 2001, Lieber 2004, Lehrer 2000 and others cited by them) that gives rise to derivatives of diverse types from the same or different bases. This polysemy is in turn responsible for the placement of the derivatives in different subsets of the set of derivatives in general. Further, the polysemy of negative affixation gives rise to the various shades of negation. These negative derivatives can be then classified as belonging to the

direct negation or indirect negation type.

Take the case of the prefix *in-* in French. It forms derivatives like *inanimé* (NOT X), *indécision* (lack), *indépendance* (absence), *inconduite* (badness). In addition to the predominant NOT meaning, it conveys various other meanings like lack, absence, badness. As discussed earlier, an examination of the nature of negation in these derivatives would be helpful in classifying them as belonging to the direct or indirect type of negation. In the case of the derivatives *inanimé* (NOT X), *indécision* (lack) and *indépendance* (absence), it can be observed that the derivative contains a logical negation of the base.

inanimé = NOT *animé*

indécision = NO *décision*

indépendance = NO *dépendance*

As for *inconduite*, however, the nature of negation is different from the previous cases. The derivative *inconduite* does not mean "NO behaviour", but "BAD behaviour". So in this case, the existence of the base (*conduite*) is not negated, but a negative connotation is attached to it.

Hence, the first three derivatives (*inanimé*, *indécision* and *indépendance*) would be classified as belonging to the direct negation type, whereas the derivative *inconduite* would be classified as a case of indirect negation.

It is thus not possible to predict *a priori* the distribution of the derivatives of a particular affix under the categories of direct and indirect negation.

At times, ZERO meaning is also one of the meanings acquired by an affix as a result of its polysemy. In Marathi, for example, the base *čapaḷ* (= stealthy, speedy) in combination with the prefix *a-* forms *ačapaḷ*, which has the same meaning as *čapaḷ*. In this case, the otherwise negative affix *a-* possesses a ZERO meaning. A similar phenomenon is observed in French in the case of the negative prefix *dé-* (*doublement* / *dédoublement*) where it acquires a ZERO meaning. Such ZERO meanings would not be included in the negative meanings of the affix.

7. Synonymy of negative affixes

In Marathi, one finds the derivatives *aniččhā* as well as *niriččhā* – the first one is formed with the prefix *an-* attached to the nominal base *iččhā* and the second one is formed through the combination of the prefix *ni(r)-* and the same base *iččhā*. This is a case where there are multiple affixes being attached to the same base. Both the affixes bring about negation, so at a macro level they are

synonymous. At a micro level, however, their meanings are not exactly identical. Not only are the meanings of the affixes different, but the meaning of the base is the same in both cases. So this rules out the possibility of the polysemy or the homonymy of the base creating two negative derivatives with two different affixes. How then could these two derivatives be classified? The nominal base *iččhā* means "a desire" or "a wish". The prefix *an-* occurs in utterances like "*tyāne he kām kahishyā aniččhene kele*" (= he did this job without really wanting to do it). So *aniččhā* indicates the state of "not having a desire" or "not wanting". One finds the derivative *niriččha* in utterances like "*tyāne niriččhapane he kām kele*" (= he did this job without any desire). Even if on the surface both of these derivatives appear to indicate the lack of desire, there is still a subtle difference. When one performs a task with *aniččha*, it means that the person does not want to perform that particular task but probably wants to do something else. On the other hand, doing something with *niriččha* means carrying out the job with no expectations of any gains out of it and with no particular desire of doing anything else either.

A similar behaviour of these two prefixes is also observed in the case of other derivatives like *ni:pakṣ* (= not taking any sides (e.g. in a dispute)) and *apakṣ* (= who does not belong to any party (esp. political), an independent candidate), *nirapekṣ* (= without having any expectations of returns) and *anapekṣit* (= unexpected).

One can observe, thus, that the prefix *a(n)-* is more of a simple negation (NOT), whereas the prefix *ni:(ṣ/r)-* indicates a voluntary rejection. But this meaning of the prefix *ni:(ṣ/r)-* is observed only when it competes with *a(n)-*. Normally it indicates a simple negation or a lack, for example *niṣkrīy* (= doing no action), *nirvikār* (= lacking emotions), *nirbuddh* (= lacking intelligence), etc. The point to note here is that both these types belong to the group of direct negation.

Similar competition of synonymy between negative affixes can also be observed in English. The negative affixes *a-*, *iN-* and *non-* compete with each other over the formation of derivatives with the base *moral*. All the derivatives, viz. *amoral*, *immoral* and *non-moral* indicate the state of "not being in conformance with established moral values" [9][9]The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English 1990.. But it is revealed on a more detailed examination that *amoral* indicates a non-relatedness with morality, *immoral* indicates a direct opposition to morality and *non-moral* carries a relatively neutral meaning, while still indicating an opposition to moral values. Another example of such a

competition of synonyms is that of the derivative pair *illogical* and *non-logical*, where *illogical* indicates a direct negation of the notion of being logical and *non-logical* carries a more neutral meaning [10][10]Ibid..

The prefixes *dis-* and *mis-* produce the derivatives *displace* and *misplace* in combination with the base *(to) place*. In both these derivatives, the underlying meaning is "to not have something in its intended place", the difference, however, being that of voluntary control over the action.

It is interesting to compare such competition of synonymy between negative affixes with a similar competition observed between the affixes *non-* and *un-* in English. These affixes produce derivatives like *unclear* and *nonclear* (although *nonclear* is not attested by the British National Corpus, its occurrences can be observed on the Internet by simply googling it).

One may have an *unclear* idea but not a *nonclear* one. On the other hand, the bodily fluids that are not clear in appearance are described as *nonclear*, but not as *unclear*. This is in line with Horn (2001) [11][11]Horn 2001, 280. – the affix *non-* negates the "observable" (or denotative) meaning and the affix *un-* negates the "underlying" (or connotative) meaning of a word. Hence, a fluid cannot be *unclear* and an idea cannot be *nonclear*. The same can be observed in the case of the pairs *non-American* / *un-American* or *non-Christian* / *unchristian*, etc.

Although these two competitions between affixes appear similar on the surface, and both of these can be grouped under the direct type of negation, examining them together brings out some interesting differences. In the first case, that of *ni:(ṣ/r)-* vs. *a(n)-*, the meaning of the base remains the same in both the derivatives, thereby leaving it to the affixes to sort out the distribution with the help of the context. In the second case (*un-* vs. *non-*), however, the polysemy of the base lends a hand by giving out a denotative meaning in one derivative and a connotative meaning in another. This helps in resolving the conflict between the affixes and ensures their distribution.

8. Conclusion

The groups "direct" and "indirect" of affixal negation encompass the traditional categories of negation, i.e., contrary negation and contradictory negation.

One can observe that the groups "direct negation" and "indirect negation" are not mutually exclusive. An affix that forms a derivative of one type may also

form a derivative of the other (e.g. the derivatives of the English prefix *mis-*: "*to misfire*" is the direct negation of "*to fire*" (a gun), whereas "*to misunderstand*" is a case of indirect negation of "*to understand*"). Hence it may not be possible to predict *a priori* the distribution of the derivatives of a particular affix into the groups of direct or indirect negation.

Paraphrasing or "reading" of an affixal negation derivative may help in indicating the group into which the derivative can be accommodated, as shown by the two readings of the French verb *déconseiller*.

The distribution of the subtypes of these two groups needs to be explored further, which might give insights as to the role of various affixes in the distribution of their derivatives.

The observations of Sapir (cited by Cysouw 2006) regarding the imbalance of affixation seem to be challenged in the domain of negation. They have observed that in the domain of affixation, the number of suffixes is higher than the number of prefixes, which amounts to the imbalance in affixation. In the case of negative affixes, however, prefixes seem to outnumber suffixes. This phenomenon could be examined further to see whether it is linked to the distribution of affixal negation into the groups "direct" and "indirect".

List of references

1. I would like to express my sincere gratitude towards Remi Jolivet, Pierre Larrivée and Jayant Gadgil for discussions, reviews and insightful suggestions on draft versions of this article, which also benefited from the observations of the participants at the conference *A Contrario* (March 25, 2010), organized by Université de Caen Basse-Normandie.

2. The term "lexical negation" is used to indicate the negation of or at the level of a word. This includes antonymy as well as affixal negation. This does not include the negation of a verb with the help of *not* in English, *ne ... pas* in French, *nicht* in German, etc., which forms a part of "sentential negation", i.e., negation at the level of a sentence.

3. It must be specified that the term "affix" is used here to indicate "derivational affix" (as opposed to "inflectional affix"). There seem to be varied opinions as to the use of the term "affix" (for example, whether it should be used to indicate the elements used for derivation as well as inflection or whether it should be reserved for the elements helping in derivation and not for those participating in inflection). That debate is out of scope of the current article.

4. One can find allusions to this term "indirect negation" elsewhere in literature. Jespersen (1917) uses this very term, but in the context of sentential negation and not for affixal negation. Horn (2001, 274-276) briefly discusses a similar idea of "emotive / evaluative negation", which he calls "E-Neg".

5. Example given in Haïk 1998, 35-36.

6. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English* 1990.