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1 Introduction

English has a number of adjectives of the type unXable, adjectives that contain the prefix un- and the adjectivising suffix -able, e.g. unlockable or undoable. Many of these adjectives are ambiguous. If a door is unlockable, it may either mean that it cannot be locked (it is not lockable), or it may mean that it can be unlocked.

Following a long series of discussions, ranging from introductory textbooks like Stewart & Vaillette (2001:121) over theoretical articles like Larson & Ludlow (1993:317) to psycholinguistic treatments like Almeida & Libben (2005:374), we take the two different interpretations of unlockable to be the result of the adjectives in question having two different possible structural analyses, viz.

- one in which the immediate constituents are un- and lockable, (1a)/(2a), and
- another one where the immediate constituents are unlock and -able, (1b)/(2b):
(1) a. \textit{un-lockable} $= \text{[un- [lock-able]]} = \text{that cannot be locked}$  \\
    Da. \textit{ulåselig}  \\
    Fr. \textit{inverrouillable}  \\
    Ge. \textit{unverschließbar}

b. \textit{unlock-able} $= \text{[[un-lock] -able]} = \text{that can be unlocked}$  \\
    Da. \textit{oplåselig}  \\
    Fr. \textit{déverrouillable}  \\
    Ge. \textit{aufschließbar}

(2)

\begin{align*}
\text{(a)} & \quad \text{Adj} & \text{unlockable} \\
& \quad \text{Aff} & \text{un} \\
& \quad \text{Adj} & \text{lockable} \\
& \quad \text{V} & \text{lock} \\
& \quad \text{Aff} & \text{able} \\
\text{(b)} & \quad \text{Adj} & \text{unlockable} \\
& \quad \text{V} & \text{unlock} \\
& \quad \text{Aff} & \text{un} \\
& \quad \text{V} & \text{lock}
\end{align*}

Other examples with the same properties (from Almeida & Libben 2005:390-394):

\textit{unbendable, unbucklable, unbuttonable, uncoilable, uncorkable, undoable, undressable, unfastenable, unfoldable, unhookable, uninstallable, unloadable, unpackable, unpluggable, unrollable, unscrewable, unscramlable, unsealable, untieable, untwistable, unwindable, unwrapable, unzipable.}

In his paper "A fundamental misconception of modern linguistics", Bill McGregor (2003:59-61) argues that such analyses in terms of different hierarchical structures are not motivated, and that instead, morphological structure is "\textit{string concatenation without hierarchy}". He further says: "It is difficult to construe \textit{un-} as serving in a constituency relation to the larger unit \textit{un-lock} in [2b] – as serving a function within that whole (what would that function be?) – or to the larger unit \textit{un-lock-able} in [2a]." (Adapted from McGregor 2003:60.)

We argue that the different hierarchical structures are indeed motivated, that morphological structure is \textbf{not} just "\textit{string concatenation without hierarchy}", and that \textit{un-} is a function. In(1a)/(2a), \textit{un-} is a function that takes the adjective \textit{lockable} as its argument and has the adjective \textit{unlockable} as its output, and in (1b)/(2b), it is a function that takes the verb \textit{lock} as its argument and has the verb \textit{unlock} as its output.

It is true that this use of "function" differs from McGregor's use above. Our "function" here is the one current in mathematics and formal semantics, cf. e.g. Partee, ter Meulen, Wall (1990:30), Cann (1993:94). This difference in terminology should however, not obscure the fact that \textit{un-} has a function also in McGregor's sense within \textit{unlockable}, comparable to the "grammatical function" that a sentential negation has within a clause.
2 Morphological analysis

2.1 Hierarchical morphosyntactic analysis

We would like to capitalise on some facts that have often been noticed, namely:

- that it is a property of the affix which word class it may combine with, and
- that it is a property either of the affix or of the stem what the resulting word class is.

For instance, the suffix \(-ity\) combines only with an adjective, and the result is always a noun:

\[ [\text{Adj legal}] + [\text{ity}] \rightarrow [\text{N legality}] \]

Thus, morphemes may be partitioned in morpheme classes according to their distributional properties. Such morpheme classes may be designated by their subcategorisation frame (cf. Lieber 1980:63 and Selkirk 1982:5, 61 for morphology and e.g. Haegeman 1994:42 for syntax). A morpheme like \(-ity\) has a lexical entry containing the categorial information shown in (3):

(3) \(-ity: \quad \text{Aff, } [\text{N Adj }]\)

The notation \([\text{N Adj }]\) means that the entity in question (here \(-ity\)) may be inserted immediately following an adjective) and that Adj + \(-ity\) makes up a new unit belonging to the class N.

Examples of partial lexical entries for other types of morphemes:

(4) a. \(-able: \quad \text{Aff, } [\text{Adj V }]\)
    b. \(-able_n: \quad \text{Aff, } [\text{Adj N }]\)
    c. \(-ify: \quad \text{Aff, } [\text{V N }]\)
    d. \(-e: \quad \text{Aff, } [\text{V }]\)
    e. \(-un_{A}: \quad \text{Aff, } [\text{A }]\)
    f. \(-un_{V}: \quad \text{Aff, } [\text{V }]\)

The word formation processes involving the affixes mentioned in (3)-(4) thus involve the rules in (5):

(5) a. Adj Aff \rightarrow N as in (3)  d. N Aff \rightarrow V as in (4c)
    b. V Aff \rightarrow Adj as in (4a)  e. Aff V \rightarrow V as in (4d,f)
    c. N Aff \rightarrow Adj as in (4b)  f. Aff Adj \rightarrow Adj as in (4e)

With this, we can illustrate the morphological build-up of a word like reclassify:

(6) \(\text{re- + classify}\)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{re} & \text{classify} & \text{ify} \\
[\text{V N }] & [\text{V N }] & [\text{V N }] \\
\hline
\text{classify} & \text{V} & \text{reclassify} \\
\end{array}
\]

The conditions of the subcategorisation frames for \(-ify\) and \(-e-\) are satisfied, so \textit{class} and \(-ify\) may combine to form the verb \textit{classify}, and \textit{re-} and \textit{classify} may combine to form the verb \textit{reclassify}. In other words, \(-ify\) is a function that here takes the noun \textit{class} as its argument and has the verb \textit{classify} as its output, and \textit{re-} is a function that takes the verb \textit{classify} as its argument and has the verb \textit{reclassify} as its output.

We can also describe why a morphological combination like the one found in a nonsense word like \textit{repokity} does not constitute a possible English word (example adapted from Libben 2003:223-224):
(7) a. reponkity

\[ \text{[v \_ V]} \begin{array}{c} \text{re-} \\ \text{ponk} \end{array} \quad \text{-ity} \quad \begin{array}{c} ? \\ \text{[N Adj \_]} \end{array} \]

b. reponk + -ity

\[ \begin{array}{c} \text{re} \\ \text{ponk} \end{array} \quad \text{ity} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{[v \_ V]} \quad \text{V} \\ \text{[N Adj \_]} \end{array} \]

\[ \text{reponk} \quad \text{V} \]

c. re- + ponkity

\[ \begin{array}{c} \text{re} \\ \text{ponk} \end{array} \quad \text{ity} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{[v \_ V]} \quad \text{Adj} \\ \text{[N Adj \_]} \end{array} \]

\[ \text{ponkity} \quad \text{N} \]

Even though we are free to assign any class to the non-existing *ponk*, e.g. either V or Adj, the whole formation will not result in an acceptable English word. If we interpret *ponk* as a verb, (7b), *reponk* will form a verb, but this does not satisfy the subcategorisation frame of -ity, which demands an adjective. If we interpret *ponk* as an adjective, (7c), it may now combine with -ity to form the noun *ponkity*, but then there will be a conflict between the noun and the subcategorisation frame of re-.

### 2.2 Morphosemantic analysis

Consider again reclassify with the morphological structure [re- [class -ify]]. The base is class. The affix -ify is polysemous and has among its meanings one that may be glossed as "make the thing in question go to/in/on the verb-base " (Lieber 2004:77). This is a function that takes the meaning of the verb-base class as argument and has as value the semantic structure that underlies the meaning "arrange in classes". classify thus implies that someone causes a certain state to come about, namely the state of something being arranged in classes. That is, this result-state should be a part of the semantics of a verb like classify.

It is precisely this state that is relevant to the interpretation of the prefix re-. In reclassify, where the base is formed by classify, the meaning of re- may be glossed something like "make the result-state of the event described by the verb obtain for a second time" (cf. Dowty 1979:256).

As shown in Lieber (2004:147), this analysis explains why re- only combines with verbs that imply a result, and why this result may not be "finite, fixed or permanent". Verbs like yawn or push do not imply result-states, and therefore there is no *reyawn* or *repush*. Similarly, there is no *reeat the apple*, because the result-state cannot be obtained again.

It is worth stressing that such an analysis only works if the morphological elements are parts of a hierarchical structure. The meaning of re- is a semantic function that takes the meaning of classify as argument, not the meaning of class and not the meaning of -ify. In other words, re- is on the same level as classify, and class and -ify are one level further down.

### Summary, section 2:

- Illustrated a morphological analysis both on a morphosyntactic and on a morphosemantic level.
- Affixes have subcategorisation properties.
- Morphological structure is hierarchical.
- These two assumptions to be essential both for how morphemes may be combined and for how they may be interpreted.
3 The ambiguity of *un-X-able*

3.1 The two prefixes *un-*

English has two affixes of the form *un-*-, indicated here by the indexes A and V (for *adjective* and *verb*):

- *un*A has the subcategorisation frame \([\text{Adj} ___ \text{Adj}]\) and a negative meaning.
- *un*V has the subcategorisation frame \([\text{V} ___ \text{V}]\) and a reversative meaning.

Examples of *un*A are *untrue*, *unclean*, *unclear*, *uncomfortable*, and their meanings are obtained by negation of the base adjective, i.e. "not true, not clean, not clear, not comfortable" (cf. Marchand 1969:201-204).

Examples of *un*V are *unlock*, *unload*, *unwind*. Their meanings are reversative, that is, like the prefix *re-*, the meaning of *un*V operates on the result-state of an event deriving the meaning "make the result-state of the event described by the base verb cease to obtain" (cf. Marchand 1969:205-206, Dowty 1979: 257-258, Lieber 2004:116-117).

For instance, when *lock the door* means "cause the door to be in the state fastened", *unlock the door* means "cause the door to cease to be in the state fastened". As in the case with *re-* (cf. section 2.2 above), the semantics of *un*V implies that it only combines with verbs denoting an event that yields a result which is not permanent. This is why there is no *unyawn*, *unpush* or *uneat the apple*.

3.2 The two suffixes *-able*

As was the case with *un-*-, there are also two affixes of the form *-able* (cf. e.g. Aronoff 1976:48), indicated here by the indexes N and V (for *noun* and *verb*):

- *able*N has the subcategorisation frame \([\text{Adj} \text{N} ___ ]\) and means something like "the thing in question is full of N".
- *able*V has the subcategorisation frame \([\text{Adj} \text{V} ___ ]\) and means something like "it is possible to V the thing in question", or even in some cases "it is necessary to V the thing in question" (cf. Klinge 1997).

Examples of *able*N are *comfortable*, *fashionable*, *profitable* and *reasonable*, and their meanings may be rendered as "which may yield comfort, which is full of fashion, which may yield profit", and "which is full of reason".

Examples of *able*V are *readable*, *admirable*, *acceptable* and *questionable*, and their meanings may be rendered as "which can be read, which should be admired / accepted / questioned". The semantics of *able*V thus requires that the verb with which it combines must have an agent and a patient, hence the impossibility of *sleepable*, *ripenable* or *witherable*.

Whereas both of the *un*-prefixes are relevant for the ambiguity of *unlockable* to be discussed in further detail below, this is not the case for the two *-able*-suffixes, in that both senses of *unlockable* utilises *able*V, and hence *able*N will not be directly relevant.
3.3 The ambiguity

Consider again (2) above, repeated here as (8):

\[(8)\]

(a) \[
\text{Adj} \\
\text{lockable}
\] \\
\[
\text{Aff} \\
\text{un}
\]

(b) \[
\text{Adj} \\
\text{unlockable}
\] \\
\[
\text{V} \\
\text{lock}
\] \\
\[
\text{Aff} \\
\text{able}
\]

In (8a), where \textit{unlockable} means "which cannot be locked" (\textit{un-lockable}), the verb \textit{lock} first combines with \textit{able}, satisfying its subcategorisation frame \([\text{Adj} \ V \ ___ ]\), and yielding the meaning for the resulting adjective \textit{lockable} "which can be locked".

On the next higher level, the resulting adjective \textit{lockable} combines with \textit{un}, satisfying its subcategorisation frame \([\text{Adj} \ ___ \ Adj ]\), and yielding the negative meaning for the resulting adjective \textit{unlockable} "which cannot be locked".

In (8b), where \textit{unlockable} means "which can be unlocked" (\textit{unlock-able}), the verb \textit{lock} first combines with \textit{un}, satisfying its subcategorisation frame \([\text{V} \ ___ \ V ]\), and yielding a reversative meaning for the resulting verb \textit{unlock}, i.e. "cause the door to be in the state not fastened".

On the next higher level, the resulting verb \textit{unlock} combines with \textit{able}, satisfying its subcategorisation frame \([\text{Adj} \ V \ ___ ]\), yielding the meaning for the resulting adjective \textit{unlockable} "which can be unlocked".

\[\text{Summary, section 3:}\]

- \textit{-able} has a function in both (8a) and (8b).
- It is the same function in both cases.
- \textit{un-} has a function in both (8a) and (8b).
- The function of \textit{un-} in one case is different from the function of \textit{un-} in the other case.
4 The case of French inXable

French has two distinct words corresponding to the two senses of English unlockable, namely inver-rouillable 'not lockable' and déverrouillable 'that can be unlocked'. Both of these are unambiguous. However, as noted by Dal & Namer (2000), certain French words in inXable have two distinct meanings, so a situation close to that of English unlockable arises. Examples of ambiguous inXable words in French are infiltrable, ingérable and inversable.¹ These derivations are structurally ambiguous in a way similar to English unlockable:

- **in-filtrable** 'unfilterable' (cf. (9a) below)
- **infiltr-able** 'infiltratable' (cf. (9b) below)
- **in-gérable** 'unadministrable'
- **ingér-able** 'ingestable'
- **in-versable** 'unoverturable'
- **invers-able** 'invertable'

The unXable cases in English are characterised by the systematic opposition between negative un and reversative un. This bipartition is partly mirrored in French in that the formations with the structure in-Xable, like the English words in un-Xable, regularly have the meaning "not Xable".

However, where the English words with the unX-able structure regularly have the reversative meaning, the French words with the inX-able structure are irregular. None of the French ambiguous in-words have a reversative meaning. The predominant reversative prefix in French is dé-, as exemplified by déverrouiller in (1) and by other examples like décommander 'cancel', démonter 'dismantle, dismantle', dépaqueter 'unpack, unwrap'.

The prefix in- found in French verbs is not productive; almost all the verbs in this group, e.g. infiltrer 'infiltrate', ingérer 'ingest', inverser 'invert', are wholesale loans from Latin², borrowed into French centuries ago, e.g. the first attested instance of infiltrer, which is from about 1370 (French national dictionary "Trésor de la langue française" 1971-1994, http://atilf.atilf.fr/tlf.htm). They are clearly not felt to be related to the simplex verb any longer, so in a synchronic analysis infiltrer, ingérer or inverser cannot be meaningfully decomposed into in- + filtrer / gérer / verser. Therefore the two analyses of ambiguous French words on in- are not exactly parallel to the analyses given in (2) and (8). As may be seen in (9b), the French tree structure of one of the two interpretations of infiltrable lacks a third level as compared to the English unlockable:

(9) a. Adj
   in-filtrable
   Aff in

   Adj
   filtrable
   V filtr(er)

   Aff able

b. Adj
   infiltr-able
   V infiltr(er)

   Aff able

¹ Dal & Namer (2000) mentions the following examples of this type of words: importable, imprécisable, inacti-vable, incitable, infiltrable, infléchissable, informable, ingérable, inhumable, intaillable, insonorisable, invalidable, inversable.
² And so are their English cognates infiltrate, ingest and invert.
In (9a), where *infiltrable* means "unfilterable" (*in-filtrable*), the verb *filtrer* first combines with *able*, satisfying its subcategorisation frame \[ \text{Adj V \_\_\_} \], and yielding the meaning for the resulting adjective *filtrable* "which can be filtered".

On the next higher level, the resulting adjective *filtrable* combines with *in*, satisfying its subcategorisation frame \[ \text{Adj \_\_\_ Adj} \], and yielding the negative meaning for the resulting adjective *infiltrable* "which cannot be filtered".

In (9b), where *infiltrable* means "which can be infiltrated" (*infiltr-able*), the verb *infiltrer* ('infiltrate'), which is unanalysable, combines directly with *able*, satisfying its subcategorisation frame \[ \text{Adj V \_\_\_} \], yielding the meaning for the resulting adjective *infiltrable* "which can be infiltrated".

**Summary, section 4:**

- The structurally-based ambiguity found in English *unXable* words may also be found in other languages, provided the right conditions are present. This is (at least partly) the case in French, where *in-* is both a productive adjectival prefix and a Latin-based verbal prefix.

**5 Lack of ambiguity in Danish and German**

In many languages, e.g. Danish and German, the equivalents of *unXable* words are not ambiguous, that is, these languages have two distinct words each corresponding to one of the two senses.

This fact is easily accounted for in terms of the structural properties of the affixes concerned. In Danish and German, what corresponds to the two different morphemes *unA* and *unV* is realised in two clearly distinct ways: *unA* corresponds to Danish *u-* and German *un-*, whereas *unV* corresponds to Danish *op-* and German *auf-*. 

(10) a. ulåselig (= that cannot be locked)
    b. opåselig (= that can be unlocked)

What makes possible the ambiguity in English *unXable* words is first that *unA* may combine with the adjective *lockable*, and that *unV* may combine with the verb *lock*, and second that both the adjective and the verb can be detected inside *lockable*. Also in Danish *låselig*, it is possible to detect both a verb (*låse 'lock*) and an adjective (*låselig 'lockable'). However, the prefixes *u-* and *op-* have combinatorial and semantic properties that exclude the ambiguity of the results.
Thus Danish *u-, which has a negative meaning, may only combine with an adjective, and does not combine with a verb to form a new verb in modern Danish (there is no possible verb *ulåse). Thus, like English *unA, Danish *u- is characterised by the subcategorisation frame \([\text{Adj} \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \text{Adj}]\). On the other hand, the Danish affix -lig resembles English ableV both combinatorially and semantically, and, like ableV, it has the subcategorisation frame \([\text{Adj} \quad \_ \quad \text{V} \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \text{Adj}]\). So there is only one analysis possible for ulåselig, the one in (11a), which is completely parallel to the one in (2a), (8a) and (9a).

(11) a. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Adj} \\
\text{u-låselig} \\
\text{Aff} \\
\text{u} \\
\text{V} \\
låse \\
\end{array}
\]

b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Adj} \\
\text{*ulåse-lig} \\
\text{Aff} \\
\text{u} \\
\text{V} \\
låse \\
\end{array}
\]

(11a) is possible because on the lowest level the verb låse combines with the suffix -lig, satisfying the latter's subcategorisation frame \([\text{Adj} \quad \_ \quad \text{V} \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \text{Adj}]\), and yielding the adjective låselig with the meaning "that can be locked", which on the next level combines with the negative prefix u- with the subcategorisation frame \([\text{Adj} \quad \_ \quad \text{Adj}]\). This last combination gives rise to the adjective ulåselig with the negative meaning "that cannot be locked".

In contrast, (11b) is impossible. On the lowest level it is not possible to combine u- with the verb låse, because the subcategorisation frame of u- is \([\text{Adj} \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \text{Adj}]\), and this cannot be satisfied by a verb. Thus the derivation of another meaning for ulåselig is made impossible.

Consider now the other Danish equivalent of unlockable, the adjective oplåselig, which means "that can be unlocked". Here, the only possible analysis is oplåse-lig. In other words, the complex oplåselig has the verb oplåse as a constituent element. Now, verbs of this sort are formed from a particle op (literally "up") and a simplex verb låse ('lock'), where the particle normally occurs postverbally as shown in (12):

(12) a. ...
fordi hun ikke ville låse op
... because she not would (un)lock PRT

b. ...
idet hun låste døren op
... as she (un)locked door-the PRT

Here the particle op has the same reversible meaning as English unV, as can be seen from e.g. binde op 'untie, undo', knappe op 'unbutton', pakke op 'unpack', etc. However, in formal language and in further morphological derivations, verbs of this type are realised with the particle incorporated as a prefix (cf. e.g. Vikner 2001:42): oplåse 'unlock', oplåsning 'unlocking', en oplåser 'an unlocker', opknappet 'unbuttoned', oppakning 'pack, kit'. As oplåselig 'unlockable' is clearly a formation of this last sort, we will treat op- as a prefix on a par with un-, in-, u-, etc. above.

Like the other reversible prefixes discussed above, the reversible op- combines only with verbs to form new verbs, and must therefore be associated with the subcategorisation frame \([\text{V} \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \text{V}]\). This results in the analysis in (13b) below, to the exclusion of (13a):
In (13b), the verb låse on the lowest level satisfies the subcategorisation frame of op, which is [V ___ V ], and the result is the verb oplåse with the reversative meaning "unlock". On the next level, the verb oplåse combines with the suffix -lig satisfying the subcategorisation of the latter, which is [Adj V ___ ] as before. This yields the adjective oplåselig meaning "which can be unlocked".

On the other hand, (13a) is out, because op- does not combine with adjectives in word formation processes in modern Danish, and therefore the combination on the middle level op-låselig is not possible.

Similar reasoning explains not only the lack of ambiguity in the German derivations un-verschließbar, i.e. un-verschließbar, 'that cannot be locked', and aufschließbar, i.e. aufschließ-bar, 'that can be unlocked', but also in the French inverrouillable, i.e. in-verrouillable 'that cannot be locked' and déverrouillable, i.e. déverrouill-able 'that can be unlocked'.

It has to be admitted that native German reversative verbs tend to correspond to non-reversative verbs with a different particle:

- aufschließen - verschließen 'unlock - lock',
- aufklappen - zuklappen 'unfold - fold',
- ausgraben - begraben 'unbury/excavate - bury',

In order to obtain a German parallel to the above Danish examples, we may therefore have to cheat and turn to borrowings like deinstallieren - installieren 'uninstall - install', which yield the two different translations of uninstallable:

- [de-installier-bar] which may be analysed as in (10a) and (11a),
- [de-installier]-bar which may be analysed as in (10b) and (13b).

Summary, section 5:

- The assumption of an underlying hierarchical morphological structure is essential for the understanding of why the English word unlockable and the French infiltrable are ambiguous while their counterparts in Danish and German are not.
- If we assumed that there was no hierarchical structure in morphology, and consequently that there were no differences in hierarchical structure between the two versions of unlockable/infiltrable, it would remain a mystery why exactly this ambiguity is not found in similar words in Danish and German.
- Under the assumption that morphological structure is "string concatenation without hierarchy" (McGregor 2003:61), one would expect that u- in the Danish expression ulåselig 'that cannot be locked' would only be able to see the next morpheme låse 'lock', but this could not possibly result in the right interpretation, cf. the discussion of (11b) above.
- Rather, u- in ulåselig must be able to see the next two morphemes, in fact, it must even be able to see that these two morphemes together make up an adjective. Precisely the same is true for the English un- found in the unlockable which means 'that cannot be locked', cf. the discussion of (8a) above. Thus, u-/un- must have access to hierarchical morphological structure.
6 Unambiguous words on unXable

In this section, we will try to support our account by seeing what it has to say about cases in which derived words that resemble unlockable very closely and which in principle should be just as ambiguous as unlockable may nevertheless be completely unambiguous.

6.1 The verb does not denote an event which implies a result-state

It is necessary for un to be combined with a verb that denotes an event that implies a result-state\(^3\). Consider to wrap, where she wrapped the present implies that the state "the present is wrapped" comes about. On the other hand, un does not yield a semantically acceptable result when it is combined with a verb which itself denotes a state directly, e.g. to understand. This is because states do not imply any result-state, e.g. she understood the message does not imply that the message ends up in a particular state. Thus there is no result-state to be reversed at all.

Therefore, it is actually not possible to ununderstand someone or to unbeliev something, and it is consequently predicted that ununderstandable and unbelievable are not ambiguous. They cannot have the meaning "that may be brought into the state of not being understood / believed", but only the meaning "that may not be brought into the state of being understood / believed".

Until around 10 years ago, it was not possible to unlike something, as it would have to mean that 'X no longer finds Y nice/good', and as this would not have a result-state, i.e. it makes no difference to the state of a particular book whether or not Fred likes it (whereas does make a difference to the state of a particular door whether or not Fred locks it).

However, in the new (Facebook/Instagram) sense of like = 'X registers on the web that X finds Y nice/good', it is perfectly possible to unlike something = 'X removes the notice on the web that X finds Y nice/good'. Here, there is a resultant state of like. (It would thus seem that it does make a difference to a particular book/person whether or not Fred has stated on the web that he likes it/him/her.)

6.2 The verb denotes an event which is not reversible

Part of the derivation of unlockable in the sense "which can be unlocked" (unlock-able, (8b)), is that we start out with the verb lock meaning "cause the door to be in the state fastened" and then we combine this with un, which yields a reversative meaning for the resulting verb unlock, i.e. "cause the door to be in the state not fastened".

It is thus crucial that the event denoted by the verb prefixed by un must not only yield a result-state but one with which is reversible and not permanent. This is not the case for e.g. read or drink, where a book can not be unread once it has been read and a glass of malt whisky can not be undrink once it has been drunk. This account therefore correctly predicts unreadable and undrinkable not to be ambiguous, as they can not have the meaning "that may be brought into the state of not being read / drunk", but only the meaning "that may not be brought into the state of being read / drunk".

6.3 The same un cannot apply twice

If un were to apply twice, one of them would – so to speak – cancel out the other, and this is presumably why this is not possible, (14a). It is not even possible to get the pragmatically derived reading that ununX is slightly less than X, the way this is possible with not unX meaning somewhat less than X in (14b), cf. e.g. Horn (2001:296-308).

\(^3\) This observation is due to Dowty (1979:257). Events that imply a result-state correspond to what is called "accomplishments" in Vendler (1967) and Dowty (1979) and "complex events" in Vikner & Vikner (1997:269-270).
(14) a. *Mary is ununhappy.
b. Mary isn’t unhappy.

The same holds for unV, if it applied twice, one would cancel out the other, and thus (15a) is not possible, neither with the reading of (15b), nor with any other reading, e.g. Mary almost locked the door.

(15) a. *Mary ununlocked the door.
b. Mary locked the door.

It is therefore no surprise that when we find two cases of un adjacent, they have to constitute a combination of unA and unV. Although there are several words of the type ununXable, they are thus all unambiguous, even though they all in principle could have no less than five possible derivations:

(16) a. *[A [prf unA - unA ] [A lock - able]] un cannot modify the prefix un
b. *[A [V [prf unV - unV ] lock] able] unV cannot modify the prefix un
c. *[A unA [A unA [A lock - able]]] unA cannot modify an adjective
    that is already prefixed by unA
d. *[A [V unV [V unV - lock] ] able] unV cannot modify a verb that is
    already prefixed by unV
e. [A unA [A [V unV - lock] ] able] the only possible reading, i.e.
    "that cannot be unlocked"

(17) a. *

Because both cases of un- are prefixes, they cannot change the word class, and so if one should apply directly to the output of the other, they would have to be the same un- (i.e. either un unV- or unA-), but this is not possible, cf. (14a) & (15a). This leaves only one possible case, namely the one where one un- does not apply directly to the output of the other because a suffix intervenes, (17e). To make all the necessary distinctions, morphological structure has to include hierarchical information.

Summary, section 6:
- The assumptions made in sections 1-5 above are not only compatible with but also constitute essential parts of the explanations for different unambiguous cases of unXable.
- (A similar set of assumptions will account for why also French infinfiltrable 'not infiltratable' is unambiguous, even though infiltrable is ambiguous, as discussed in section 4 above.)
Lack of ambiguity in other multimorphemic words

As structural ambiguity is an important part of the account presented above, it might seem as if we would expect the vast majority of the world's multimorphemic words (words consisting of three or more morphemes) to be structurally ambiguous, i.e. as if all words of the type abc should have two different readings corresponding to $a[bc]$ and $[ab]c$. However, many if not most multimorphemic words are not ambiguous, and this is due to the fact that the affixes only combine with certain word classes, as shown in section 2.1 above.

In section 5 above, we already saw cases of lack of ambiguity from Danish, German and French, and in this section we want to show how our account is compatible with the fact that most multimorphemic words in English do not show an ambiguity like the one found in unlockable-words. For instance, reclassify and reloadable are both unambiguous and have only one morphological structure each. Thus, re-classify and reload-able are possible, but reclass-ify and re-loadable are not.

This follows from the combinatorial properties of the morphemes concerned. For reclassify we have already shown the morphological structure in (6) in section 2.1 above, repeated here as (18).

(18) $re$ + classify

\[
\begin{array}{c}
re \\
[N \_ V] \\
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{classify} \\
V \\
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{reclassify} \\
V \\
\end{array}
\]

The affixes $re$- and -ify have only the subcategorisation frames shown, i.e. $[V \_ V]$ and $[V N \_]$. So even though class may also be a verb, and there is thus the possibility of combining $re$- and class to form a new verb reclassify; this element cannot combine with -ify, which needs a noun stem.

In reloadable, both the combination reload and loadable are possible, but because $re$- only combines with verbs, it cannot combine with an adjective like loadable (to give re-loadable, which might have had a meaning something like "possible to be made loadable again"), and this leaves only the possibility of $[Adj [V re [V load ]] able]$, "possible to be loaded again".

Conclusion

- Morphology has an important property in common with syntax, namely that the difference between close and less close connections between adjacent elements can be modelled by the elements being arranged in a hierarchical tree structure.
- This argues against the view that morphological structure is "string concatenation without hierarchy" (McGregor 2003:61).
- In section 2, we argued that
  - affixes have subcategorisation properties and
  - that morphological structure is hierarchical.
  These two assumptions were essential both for how morphemes may be combined and for how they may be interpreted.
- In section 3, we applied such an analysis to the ambiguity of unXable, showing how the ambiguity of the un- was linked to the level where the prefixation took place.
• Section 4 demonstrated how these assumptions were able to deal with ambiguities similar to unX-able in other languages (e.g. French inXable).
• Finally, sections 5-7 illustrated how the analysis could be prevented from overgenerating, i.e. how it could account for various cases of lack of ambiguity:
  o in Danish and German correspondents of unXable,
  o in English cases structurally similar to unXable, and
  o in multimorphemic words in general.
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