

BARBARA NYKIEL  
Bydgoszcz

ADJECTIVES DERIVED FROM SYNTACTIC PHRASES  
AND THE LEXICALIST THEORY OF WORD-FORMATION.

The scope of research of the present paper is a set of Polish adjectives traditionally described as "adjectives derived from syntactic phrases" /Grzegorzycowa 1979, Satkiewicz 1969, Oliwa 1961/; marginally, examples from English will be cited to illustrate certain theoretical points. My goal in this paper is to re-examine the relevant data in the light of the current morphological theories and provide a new analysis of the adjectives in question.

As the point of departure for my considerations I shall take the lexicalist point of view on the nature of morphological processes; more specifically, the models of generative morphology as presented in Siegel/1974/, Allen /1978/ and, to some extent, Aronoff /1976/. The basic assumptions that will underlie my analysis are the following:

1/ Morphological processes fall into two groups: derivation and inflection; all derivational processes precede the inflectional ones.

2/ All word-formation /i.e. derivational/ processes operate in the lexicon.

3/ Derivational morphology is level-ordered, i.e. rules of word-formation are organized into blocks with respect to the kind of boundary a given affix carries. Three such levels are distinguished:

- a/ Level I - the morpheme-boundary level
- b/ Level II - the word-boundary level
- c/ Level III - the double word-boundary level

No rule of a higher level may ever precede any rule of

a lower level; however, no order is obligatory among the rules of the same block.

4/ Words are not a concatenation of morphemes, but have a hierarchical internal structure.

5/ Word Formation Rules /WFRs/ cannot refer to the derivational history of their bases /the Adjacency Condition-further explanation will be given in the later sections/.

The adjectives I have in mind are of the type presented below:

/1/	podziemny	-	"underground"
	podwodny	-	"underwater"
	okołoziemski	-	"circumterrestrial"
	napowietrzny	-	"aerial", "overhead"
	pozaszkolny	-	"extra-school"
	dośrodkowy	-	"centripetal"
	ponadczasowy	-	"timeless", "universal"
	międzynarodowy	-	"international"
	przygraniczny	-	"situated on the border"
	przedmałżeński	-	"premarital", etc.

On the surface, each of these adjectives can be analysed into three morphological units: a prefix /pod-, około-, na-, poza-, etc./, a stem, which in all cases happens to be a noun /ziemi-a, wod-a, powietrz-e, szkoł-a, etc./ and an adjectival suffix /-ny, -owy- -ski/<sup>1</sup>. However, since words are not a linear string of morphemes put together, but are believed to have some internal structure of hierarchical nature, the question immediately arises what relationships hold among the three identified parts. Two possible ways of analysing the structure of such adjectives come into mind. One is to assume that first an /unprefixed/ adjective is derived from a noun by a rule of roughly the following form:

$$/2/ \quad [X]_N \longrightarrow \left[ [X]_N + \text{suff} \right]_A$$

Rule /2/ would derive adjectives like ziemny, wodny, ziemski, powietrzny, szkolny, etc. together with a large number of other denominal adjectives. The formula in /2/ actually stands

for three adjectivization rules - one for each suffix. The next step in the derivation of the forms in /1/ would be a set of prefixation rules /one for each prefix/ of the following form:

$$/3/ \quad [Y]_A \longrightarrow [Pre + [Y \ A]]_A$$

Thus the internal bracketing of the forms under discussion would be

$$/4/ \quad [Pre + [[X]_N + suff]_A]_A$$

The other way of accounting for the formation of the adjectives in /1/ is to assume, after Grzegorzczkova and the other authors cited in the first paragraph, that they result from the process of adjectivization of prepositional phrases.<sup>2</sup> It so happens that in each case the first of the three morphological units in the string is syntactically a preposition. Thus, an adjective like podwodny can be analysed into a prepositional phrase "pod wod-ą" and the adjectival suffix -ny, i.e. the preposition and the noun are bracketed together and the suffix is found outside these brackets.

Before we accept or reject one or the other of the suggested analyses, let us try both of them out and see if they are feasible within the theoretical framework I sketched above. Let us have a closer look at the first of the suggested approaches first. The first step along this line - the application of rule /2/, which, as I pointed out, stands for three adjectivization rules /one for each suffix/ presents no problem, since these rules are independently motivated in the morphology of Polish. Adjectives wodny, ziemny, ziemski, powietrzny, szkolny, narodowy, etc. exist independently of the corresponding prefixed adjectives. The problem arises when we pass on to the next rule, or, rather, a set of rules /3/, which are supposed to supply a given adjective with a suitable prefix. A survey of the adjectives of the type presented in /1/ brings as a result the observation that all such adjectives contain a nominal stem - in other words, the prefixes in focus attach only to denominal adjectives. Indeed, one

can find almost no examples of so prefixed adjectives other than denominal ones. There seems to be no way of constraining the operation of prefixation process other than restricting its application to denominal adjectives, in other words, specifying its base as a set of adjectives containing nominal stems.

Siegel /1978/ and Allen /1978/ make an interesting claim concerning the application of word formation rules. They propose that WFRs cannot make any references to the derivational history of their bases, that is, no WFR can be made to operate on a class of words specified as "denominal", "deverbal", "deadjectival", etc. The constraint that prohibits such a formulation of a WFR was given the term "the Adjacency Condition" and reads as follows:

/5/ "No WFR can involve X and Y, unless Y is uniquely contained in the cycle adjacent to X" /Allen 1978/.

If the structure of the adjectives in /1/ is

$$\left[ \text{Pre} + \left[ \left[ Y \right] + \text{suff} \right]_A \right]_A$$

where Y = nominal stem,

then the prefix and the nominal stem are not in the adjacent cycles, and therefore cannot be related by a WFR in a theory that includes the Adjacency Condition. One could attempt, I suppose, to avoid violating Adjacency Condition by specifying the base of the prefixation rule as the class of adjectives terminating with the suffixes -ny, -ski and -owy. Thus the rule would not be directly interested<sup>in</sup> the stem of the adjective it considers operating on; the only reference it makes is to the kind of suffix a given adjective utilizes. Although theoretically such a rule should be an acceptable WFR - the attachment of one affix is conditioned by the presence of another affix in the base, and in the adjacent cycle, its contents is somehow counterintuitive - there seems to be no reason why a certain class of prefixes should be related to a certain class of suffixes or vice versa; the true reason underlying this apparent interdependence is that the suffixes in question attach to nouns, and this is what triggers the prefixation process, although no explicit

reference is made to the nominal origin of the base. Thus a rule formulated in that way would merely describe what happens, but would be devoid of any explanatory force.

As the first of the suggested analyses has turned out to be unacceptable within the theory outlined above, let us try the other alternative and assume that the supposed prefix which, as I noted before, happens to be a preposition, and the nominal stem are bracketed together and form a prepositional phrase that, in turn, is subject to adjectivization process. The question immediately arises whether the lexicalist theory allows this, and the answer is no. Word formation processes form new words from morphemes, or words that have been produced by other word formation rules. WFRs operate on lexical categories such as Noun, Verb or Adjective, and the output of WFRs are also lexical items. Word formation processes are lexical processes and operate in the lexicon; no WFR can be ordered among the syntactic transformations or the rules of phonology. Since a prepositional phrase is a syntactic, not a lexical, unit, it cannot enter the lexicon, so it is inaccessible to word formation rules. For the same reason it cannot be formed by a word formation rule, as WFRs can only produce items belonging to major lexical categories.

Prepositional phrases are generated by the phrase structure rules of the base. In order for such phrases to be adjectivized, the processes of adjectivization would have to operate either there, or in the transformational component. The lexicalist theory of morphology does not allow either. Another argument against placing the rules of adjectivization among the rules of syntax is the fact that they would have to be stated twice in grammar - once in the lexicon, to derive simple denominal adjectives, and again outside the lexicon, to account for the adjectivization of prepositional phrases. Thus, what seems to be one morphological process would have to be treated as two independent processes, unless, of course, a claim is made that all new words are derived syntactically.

There is at least one more argument against bracketing an adjectival suffix outside a prepositional phrase. The problem here is that of morphological boundaries. Each word listed or

formed in the lexicon is supplied with external word boundaries before it is picked out by the lexical insertion rules and placed in a syntactic structure. Allen /1978/ calls this process the External Boundary Assignment. According to this principle, a prepositional phrase should contain a double word boundary separating the two lexical items it consists of. This is, at least, what a theory predicts - whether or not this is what actually happens in language is another matter.<sup>3</sup> Since the adjectival suffixes in question attach with a morpheme boundary/in fact, there are no convincing arguments that Polish makes use of internal word boundary at all/, i.e. they are all Level I suffixes, they cannot operate on bases containing a boundary stronger than a morpheme boundary; such a situation is not permitted in a theory where word formation rules are level-ordered.

I shall not go into any further details to show that this analysis, which is the one favoured by the traditional Polish school of linguistics, cannot be maintained within the lexicalist framework of morphology. Thus both of the suggested ways of analysing the troublesome adjectives must be, on closer examination, ruled out on purely theoretical grounds - the first analysis fails, because it violates the Adjacency Constraint; the other does even worse - it violates the basic principle of the lexicalist theory: that WFRs operate on lexical categories and only so.

It must be remembered, however, that it is the theory that ought to be adjusted to fit the data, and not vice versa. There are a couple of things that we can attempt in this particular case. We might, for instance, reject the lexicalist theory as such and turn to a model of morphology which permits word-formation processes to operate in syntax /this is known as the transformationalist approach to morphology/. That would probably be too drastic a move, especially since there is no transformationalist model of morphology right now that could successfully and convincingly compete with the lexicalist theory. Voices have been heard /Moody Bauer 1978/ that the lexicalist theory is not capable of handling adequately some of the linguistic phenomena that fall in the

domain of word-formation, but, at least to my knowledge, no coherent anti-lexicalist framework for the description of morphological issues has yet been proposed.

Another possibility is to get rid of the Adjacency Condition and let word-formation rules refer to the derivational history of their bases. This move seems like a lesser evil, for the fundamental tenets of the theory remain unchanged; however, relaxing that constraint adds a lot of power to the grammar and may, in effect, reduce the explanation of language mechanisms to a mere description of surface relationships.<sup>4</sup>

Theoretically, the best way out would be to extend the model we have in such a way that it handles adequately the data at issue, but does not lose any of its explanatory force. Allen's /1978/ idea of Overgenerating Morphology seems to offer such a possibility and now I would like to present another, in a way more abstract, analysis of the adjectives in focus, in which the concept of Overgenerating Morphology plays a central part.

One of the central claims of the lexicalist theory of word-formation is that word-formation processes operate in the lexicon. Such is the position of, among others, Aronoff /1976/ and Siegel /1974/. Allen /1978/ claims that WFRs do not apply in the lexicon.<sup>5</sup> If WFRs applied only to items contained in the lexicon, then words could only be formed from words which are themselves lexicalized. Allen's conclusion is that WFRs operate on words which are either 1/ underived, or 2/ potential well-formed outputs of a WFR with no regard whether or not these potential words are also occurring words. In other words, the actually occurring items are a subset of all the items derived by WFRs. Some of the items derived by a certain word-formation process may never occur in the language, which does not mean that they cannot serve as a base for other word-formation processes. This is, roughly, what Allen means by the term "overgeneration". The output of WFRs form a Conditional Lexicon, which contains both occurring and non-occurring words, the latter marked as not subject to lexical insertion processes. The

Permanent Lexicon is a list of only those items which are in some way exceptional in their form and/or meaning.

Allen's arguments for Overgenerating Morphology is the existence of forms which should be viewed as derived from non-occurring lexical items, e.g.

/8/ \*sightly - unsightly  
\*hearten - dishearten  
\*odorize - handedness, left-handed  
\*capsulate- encapsulate  
\*assuming - unassuming

The items of the left-hand column above are perfectly well-formed outputs of regular word-formation processes in English and they all enter the Conditional Lexicon, but the feature [- Lexical Insertion] prevents them from occurring in the language.<sup>6</sup> Yet they are not prevented from undergoing further word-formation rules, which is exemplified by the corresponding forms in the right-hand column of /8/.

Let us now return to the Polish data and see how the concept of Overgenerating Morphology helps to account for the formation of the adjectives like those presented in /1/.

At the beginning of this paper I presented two possible ways of accounting for the internal structure of such adjectives and then showed that none of the two analyses was adequate. My claim now is that these adjectives are derived from nouns. I have not suggested this possibility before, because the nominal base of the formations I chose as examples is not immediately apparent. Only two of the adjectives listed in /1/, namely podziemny and podwodny have corresponding nouns, podziemie and podwodzie respectively /all my examples are taken from Index a Tergo, which is a reliable list of the attested vocabulary items of Modern Polish/; for the remaining eight examples no corresponding nominal formations can be found. The adjectives in /1/ were chosen at random; I did not particularly try to find any special ones. The list in /1/ accidentally reflects what indeed is found in Polish: for



most of the adjectives of that type there are no attested nouns to which they could be formally related. Nevertheless, the list of occurring noun - adjective pairs is long enough to let one draw certain significant conclusions. Here are some examples of such related noun - adjective pairs:

- /9/ przedwiosnie "early spring" - przedwiosenny "id., adj."  
przedszkole "kindergarten" - przedszkolny "id., adj."  
"pre-school"  
międzywojnie "period between  
wars" - międzywojenny "interwar"  
zagranica "foreign countries" - zagraniczny "foreign"  
nabrzeże "embankment" - nabrzeżny "coastal"  
śródmieście "centre of the  
town" - śródmiejski "down-town"  
podskórze "subcutis" - podskórny "subcutaneous",  
"hypodermic"  
poddasze "attic" - poddachowy "id., adj."  
przedpokój "hall" - przedpokojowy "id., adj."  
przymorze "coast" - przymorski "littoral"

Each of the adjectives in /9/ could be easily derived from its corresponding noun by the same adjectivization process that produce such clearly denominal adjectives as wiosenny, szkolny, wojenny, miejski, dachowy, etc. Yet, as I have already noted, for the majority of adjectives under discussion, no nominal base can be found among the words occurring in the language; for instance, there is no word \*naziemie to derive the adjective naziemny from, or \*podmieście, \*pozaszkole, \*przedwojnie for podmiejski, pozaszkolny, przedwojenny respectively. Within the framework I outlined at the beginning of my article, this fact would be a sufficient argument against proposing that all the adjectives of this type be derived from nouns. Given the concept of overgeneration in morphology, the non-occurrence of such nouns is no longer a problem - all these words are formed by regular word-formation processes together with the items that actually occur in the language, and, since they are all found in the Conditional Lexicon, which is

exactly where word-formation rules operate, they can be subject to further lexical derivation.

The only problem that remains now is to account for the formation of the nouns such as those in /9/. Grzegorzczkova /1979/ again analyses such nouns as derived from syntactic /i.e. prepositional/ phrases. Obviously this line of reasoning would lead us exactly to the same conclusions that forced us to reject the prepositional phrase as a potential base for the derivation of adjectives. The only other possibility is to come back to the idea of prefixation and assume that the morphemes like przy, poza, pod, nad, około, na, etc. may function as prefixes as well as prepositions. At the point where I discussed the possibility of deriving the adjectives of /l/ by means of prefixation rules I did not go into details concerning the nature of the prefixes in focus; I only noted in passing that these prefixes are actually prepositions. At that point a discussion about the supposed prefixes seemed pointless, as the analysis was rejected because of other, more important, reasons. However, now that I have taken up the idea of prefixation again, I have to offer some arguments justifying my decision.

I claim that in Polish at least some prepositions also function as derivational affixes, in this case prefixes.<sup>7</sup> This is by no means unnatural and should not be surprising - prepositions belong to the group of clitics, i.e. morphemes which are "neither clearly independent words nor clearly affixes" /Zwicky 1977/. An example can be drawn from English, where the same morphemes can be prepositions, verb particles or clearly affixes /e.g. over - overestimate, overtime, under - undergo, underwear, out - outnumber, outweigh/. Another argument in support of the claim that prepositions are very close to affixes is phonological. Stanley /1973/ observes that "in Welsh preposition plus noun sequences are closer phonologically than any other two-word sequences". Chomsky and Halle /1968/ notice a similar phenomenon in Russian, where "a single occurrence of boundary separates the preposition from the following noun, whereas a word terminus intervenes between adjacent lexical categories" /SPE, p. 368/.<sup>8</sup>

Now if we let prepositions function as regular affixes, the derivation of nouns such as podziemie, przedszkole, nabrzeże, etc. is no longer problematic.<sup>9</sup> /The formation of these nouns looks like a two-step process, i.e. some suffixation rule seems to be at work here as well, but this is not relevant to our discussion/.

What is, now, the semantic function of the prefixation rule? The rule expresses some spacio-temporal relationship that holds between the base and the output. The meaning of the word derived is, roughly, "something being at some space or time distance from the base", the character of this distance being defined by the actual prefix used. Only prepositions that refer to Time, Place and Direction are involved in the process /prepositions like z "with", przez "by, through", dla "for", do "for" never appear in this context/, the only exception being bez "without". It seems to me that the nouns resulting from this process are primarily abstract nouns, denoting some kind of spacial or temporal reality. With this meaning they are found in the Conditional Lexicon. Sometimes, however, such nouns assume other, more concrete meanings and get into the Permanent Lexicon. And so the word przedszkole in its primary reading means "time before one begins regular education". This is the meaning predicted by the rule. Yet the meaning with which the word is generally used is "kindergarten". Although the word przedszkole is hardly, if ever, used in its first meaning, its corresponding adjective is frequently used, as for example in the phrase

"Nauczanie języków obcych w okresie przed-szkolnym".

The word is usually hyphenated in writing and receives double stress when pronounced /przèd - szkòlny/, so that it will not be confused with the word przedszkolny referring to "kindergarten", which has a higher frequency of occurrence. Other X-szkolny adjectives are pronounced with a single stress and are never marked in any way when written: pozaszkolny, przyszkolny, poszkolny, międzyszkolny, etc. Of all the possible items derived from the noun szkoła by means of prefixes, only przedszkole became lexicalized and entered the Permanent

Lexicon. Other examples: the word poddasze means primarily "space under the roof", but its concrete meaning is "part of the house immediately under the roof, the last floor, attic"; the word podwozie is never used with its primary abstract meaning "space under a car", but denotes a concrete part of a car, "chassis".

The semantic function of these prefixes provides another argument against attaching them directly to adjectives. As I have said, the prefixes concerned put their base in some spacio-temporal perspective. Logically, such an operation is only possible with nominal bases; adjectives, denoting abstract qualities, cannot be "placed" in time or space, or referred to in spacio-temporal terms. If so, the only way to derive such adjectives is via nouns, and even if this short paper does not answer all the questions which may arise in connection with the problem I have raised here, I hope that the step I have taken is a step in the right direction.

#### Footnotes

1. For the sake of simplicity I use the surface forms of these suffixes; their actual phonological shape /see Gussmann 1978/ is not relevant to the present discussion.
2. Compare the analysis of similar derivatives in Czech, Dokulil /1979/.
3. See further discussion on pages 8 - 9.
4. For the arguments in favour of the Adjacency Condition in the theory of morphology see Siegel /1978/ and Allen /1978/.
5. Whether WFRs operate in the lexicon or outside it depends, I think, on our definition of the lexicon. If the lexicon is defined strictly as a list of occurring words, then, of course, all the rest /rules etc./ must be placed somewhere else. Thus the lexicon would be only a part of a bigger section of grammar, WF component. It can also be assumed that the lexicon is itself an autonomous component of grammar and contains lists of morphemes and underived words, word-formation rules and the list of the vocabulary items of the language.

The latter model is, I believe, Siegel's and Aronoff's idea of the lexicon. The effect is the same, the only real difference is terminology. So Allen's claim that WFRs do not apply in the lexicon is not as radical as it might first appear. The idea of overgeneration is not totally original, either /the term is, though/; a roughly similar model of morphology was proposed by Halle /1973/. The novelty of Allen's approach is her concept of the Conditional Lexicon, which stores both the occurring and non-occurring but well-formed items, both groups being accessible to WFRs. Allen's understanding of the term "lexicon" is very narrow and refers only to the Permanent Lexicon, i.e. the list of exceptional items.

6. Allen's theory assumes the existence of two kinds of [ Lexical Ins. ] features: [- Lexical Insertion, Strong], which is inherited by all the derivatives of a given base, and [- Lexical Insertion, Weak], which is not inherited. The well-formed but non-occurring word \*arrivation is marked by the [- LIS] feature; the adjective \*arrivational, although also well-formed, automatically becomes [-LIS], which makes it inaccessible to lexical insertion rules. The word \*sightly, on the other hand, though also non-occurring, is marked [-LIW]; this feature is never inherited, so the word unsightly is an occurring word of English.

7. The same claim, I suppose, can be made for Czech /cf. Dokulil 1979/ and Russian /cf. Aronoff 1976 p. 96 for his analysis of adjectives with the preposition/prefix bez/.

8. Aronoff /1978/ argues convincingly that Preposition is not a lexical category at all.

9. Grzegorzczkova /1979/ distinguishes between nouns based on prepositional phrases and nouns formed by prefixation. In her analysis, the same morpheme may be interpreted once as a prefix directly attached to a noun, and in another case as part of the prepositional phrase a given noun is based on. And so derivatives like bezsens, beźład come as a result of prefixation, while words like bezwład, beznadzieja are believed to originate from prepositional phrases bez władzy and bez nadziei, respectively. She also says that in many

cases it is impossible to decide how exactly a given word is derived - by prefixation or from a syntactic phrase, the examples of such difficult words being przedbieg, nadtytuł, przedmecz, etc. Now, I can see absolutely no difference between the words bezsens, bezład on the one hand, and bezwład, beznadzieja on the other. Introducing such distinctions without any clear reason seems to me an unnecessary complication of the description. The fact that some such nouns can have two possible semantic interpretations /e.g. the word przedmecz may be interpreted as a "pre-match", or as "something happening before the match"/ does not necessarily imply that each such noun is actually two separately formed nouns. Cf. the discussion in the following paragraphs.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, M. 1978. Morphological Investigations, unpublished PhD dissertation. University of Connecticut.
- Aronoff, M. 1976. Word Formation in Generative Grammar, Linguistic Inquiry Monograph No 1, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Aronoff, M. 1978. "Lexical representations", Papers from the XIII th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Bauer, L. 1978. "Remarks on "Remarks"...", Re-publications of the English Institute of Odense University, No 12.
- Chomsky, N. and M. Halle, 1968. The Sound Pattern of English, Harper and Row, New York.
- Dokulil, M. 1979. Teoria derywacji, Ossolineum, Wrocław.
- Grzegorzczkova, R. 1979. Zarys słowotwórstwa polskiego, wyd. III, PWN Warszawa.
- Gussmann, E. 1978. Explorations in Abstract Phonology, The University of Maria Curie-Skłodowska Press, Lublin.
- Halle, M. 1973. "Prolegomena to a Theory of Word Formation", Linguistic Inquiry Volume 4 No 1, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Index A Tergo do Słownika języka polskiego pod redakcją W. Doroszewskiego, PWN Warszawa, 1973.
- Moody, M.D. 1978. "Some preliminaries to a theory of morphology", *Glossa*, 12:1.
- Oliwa, K. 1961. "Tworzenie przymiotników od wyrazów przyimkowych", Poradnik Językowy, Warszawa.

- Satkiewicz, H. 1969. Produktywne typy współczesnej polszczyzny, Warszawa.
- Siegel, D. 1974. Topics in English Morphology, unpublished PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Siegel, D. 1978. "The adjacency condition and the theory of morphology", in Proceedings of NELS VIII.
- Stanley, R. 1973. "Boundaries in phonology". In S. Anderson and P. Kiparsky, eds., A Festschrift for Morris Halle. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Zwicky, A. 1977. "On clitics" Phonologica 76, Innsbruck.

### Streszczenie

Niniejszy artykuł jest próbą analizy klasy polskich przymiotników tradycyjnie opisywanych jako przymiotniki derywowane od wyrażen syntaktycznych /Grzegorzczkova 1979/ w świetle leksykalistycznej teorii słowotwórstwa /Siegel 1974, Aronoff 1976, Allen 1978/.

Grzegorzczkova /1979/ i inni polscy autorzy wymienieni w artykule traktują decywały typu naziemny, podwodny, pozaszkolny jako przekształcenia wyrażen przyimkowych przez dodanie do nich odpowiednich sufiksów przymiotnikowych. Pozycja ta jest nie do utrzymania na gruncie teorii leksykalistycznej, ponieważ implikuje możliwość operowania regułą słowotwórczych na kategoriach syntaktycznych /w tym wypadku jest to wyrażenie przyimkowe/, podczas gdy jednym z podstawowych założeń teorii leksykalistycznej jest ograniczenie operowania regułą słowotwórczych do kategorii leksykalnych /rzeczownik, czasownik, przymiotnik/. Można by rozpatrywać powyższe przymiotniki jako derywaty odprzymiotnikowe utworzone za pomocą regułą prefiksacji. Na taką analizę nie pozwala jednak tak zwany warunek bezpośredniego sąsiedztwa bazy i afiksu /Adjacency Condition/; w teorii zawierającej powyższy warunek baza reguły słowotwórczej nie może być określona jako np. przymiotnik odrzeczownikowy, rzeczownik odczasownikowy, etc., a takiego właśnie sformułowania reguły wymagałaby omawiana analiza.

Rozwiązanie, które zostało zaproponowane w niniejszym artykule, jest rozwiązaniem bardziej abstrakcyjnym niż poprzednie i wykorzystuje koncepcję tak zwanej morfologii nadmiernie generującej /Overgenerating Morphology/. Derywacja wspomnianego wyżej typu przymiotników przebiega dwuetapowo. Pierwszym etapem jest prefiksacja rzeczowników /zakłada się, że przynajmniej niektóre przyimki w języku polskim mogą morfologicznie funkcjonować jako prefiksy/; większość z tak utworzonych rzeczowników nigdy nie pojawia się na powierzchni języka, mogą one jednak uczestniczyć w dalszych procesach derywacyjnych /jest to założenie morfologii nadmiernie generującej/. Następny etap to sufiksacja tychże rzeczowników przy pomocy sufiksów przymiotnikowych. Procesy tworzenia przymiotników odrzeczownikowych są niezależnie motywowane w morfologii derywacyjnej języka polskiego, nie jest więc konieczne formułowanie dodatkowych regułą dla derywacji interesującej nas klasy przymiotników.