

Trends in Linguistics

Studies and Monographs 49

Contemporary Morphology

Wolfgang U. Dressler

Hans C. Luschützky

Oskar E. Pfeiffer

John R. Rennison

(Editors)

**MOUTON
DE GRUYTER**

Contemporary Morphology

Edited by

Wolfgang U. Dressler, Hans C. Luschützky,
Oskar E. Pfeiffer, John R. Rennison



Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York 1990

Mouton de Gruyter (formerly Mouton, The Hague)
is a Division of Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin.

- ⊗ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines of the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Contemporary morphology / edited by Wolfgang U. Dressler
... [et al.].

p. cm. — (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs ; 49)

“Selected papers from the Third International Morphology Meeting held, under the auspices of the International Association of Morphology, in Krems (Austria) from July 4 to July 7, 1988” — Pref.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes,
ISBN 0-89925-663-5 (acid-free paper)

1. Grammar, Comparative and general — Morphology — Congresses.

I. Dressler, Wolfgang U., 1939 — , II. International Morphology Meeting (3rd : 1988 : Krems an der Donau, Austria)
III. International Association of Morphology. IV. Series.

P241.C66 1990

415 — dc20

90-42745

CIP

Deutsche Bibliothek Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Contemporary morphology / ed. by Wolfgang U. Dressler ... —
Berlin ; New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 1990

(Trends in linguistics : Studies and monographs ; 49)

ISBN 3-11-012349-5

NE: Dressler, Wolfgang U. [Hrsg.]; Trends in linguistics / Studies and monographs

© Copyright 1990 by Walter de Gruyter & Co., D-1000 Berlin 30.

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Typesetting: Arthur Collignon GmbH, Berlin. — Printing: Gerike GmbH, Berlin. — Binding: Lüderitz & Bauer, Berlin. — Printed in Germany.

Contemporary Morphology

Trends in Linguistics

Studies and Monographs 49

Editor

Werner Winter

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin New York

Preface

This volume presents selected papers from the Third International Morphology Meeting held, under the auspices of the International Association of Morphology, in Krems (Austria) from July 4 to July 7, 1988. In contrast to the relatively small previous meetings in Veszprém (Hungary), the Krems conference was an open congress which attracted many participants from the immediately preceding Sixth International Phonology Meeting.¹ In effect, the last day of the Phonology conference overlapped with the first day of the Morphology meeting.

Accordingly our volume opens with the topic “Interface” (mainly between morphology and phonology) where Spencer’s morpholexical approach to morphophonemics contrasts with Shapiro’s semiotic approach to isomorphism of rule types. Carstairs’ paper on suppletion focuses on phonological triggers, Bayer and Lahiri’s on morphosyntactic constraints on Bengali clitics.

Within the second topic “Word formation” a wide range of subjects is covered: Corbin presents her own rule-based model of complex words, whereas Motsch discusses conflicting proposals for word-structure theory (e.g., analogy vs. constraints vs. rules). Principles of headedness in compounds are in Di Sciullo’s contribution on argument inheritance and in Vogel’s account of shortening of English loans in Italian. Beard argues against morphemes as lexical items and for a strict separation of meaning and form in derivational morphology, Dressler and Kiefer deal with the morphopragmatics of Austrian and Hungarian diminutives, Warren with types of phonologically modified English compounds. Zwanenburg discusses the order of compounding and inflection in French, Scalise argues why Italian adverbs are derivational, not inflectional.

Although belonging to the third topic “Inflectional morphology and clitics”, Zwicky’s presentation of his modular approach to both sub-topics includes their relations to other modules as well; Wurzel’s approach to inflection arrives at comparable conclusions although couched in a model of markedness. Morin adduces arguments for lexicon-internal

1. The selected papers of that conference will be published under the title *Phonologica 1988* by the Cambridge University Press.

inflection from the history of French, P. K. Andersen against a universal morphological category “passive”. Joseph applies Zwicky’s classificatory criteria on Modern Greek clitics reinterpreted as affixes, whereas Manoliu-Manea analyses pronominal and pragmatic functions of Rumanian clitics.

From the conference topic “Computer morphology” only the paper by Meijs (on his ASCOT model) has been included in this volume; from the topic “The psycholinguistic study of morphology” there are Derwing’s experimental evidence for a full-listing hypothesis about the representation of morphology in the mental lexicon and van Marle’s reappraisal of analogy with evidence from Dutch derivational morphology.

The last topic “Typology and non-Indo-European morphology” is represented by Hagège’s substitution of classical morphological types with intralingual polytypical complexity due to phonetic evolution, and S. Anderson’s comparison of Sapir’s morphological typology with recent theoretical conceptions.

In this way our volume offers a representative cross-section of contemporary developments in theoretical morphology. Papers given at workshops are published separately: on Aphasia by J.-L. Nespoulous and P. Villiard,² on Natural Morphology by J. Mendez Dosuna and C. Pensado Ruiz.³ The discussion papers have already been published in two separate volumes.⁴

Wolfgang U. Dressler
Oskar E. Pfeiffer

Hans C. Luschützky
John R. Rennison

2. *Morphology, Phonology and Aphasia* (New York: Springer).

3. *Naturalists at Krems* (Universidad de Salamanca).

4. *Wiener linguistische Gazette*, supplement 7 *Interface*, supplement 8 *Morphology*.

Contents

Topic 1: <i>Interface</i>	1
Josef Bayer and Aditi Lahiri	
Bengali emphatic clitics in the lexicon-syntax interface	3
Andrew Carstairs	
Phonologically conditioned suppletion	17
Michael Shapiro	
On a universal criterion of rule coherence	25
Andrew Spencer	
The advantages of morpholexical phonology	35
Topic 2: <i>Word formation</i>	41
Danielle Corbin	
Associativité et stratification dans la représentation des mots construits	43
Anna-Maria Di Sciullo	
Formal relations and argument structure	61
Wolfgang U. Dressler and Ferenc Kiefer	
Austro-Hungarian morphopragmatics	69
Wolfgang Motsch	
Problems of word structure theories	79
Sergio Scalise	
Constraints on the Italian suffix <i>-mente</i>	87
Irene Vogel	
English compounds in Italian: the question of the head	99
Beatrice Warren	
The importance of combining forms	111
Wiecher Zwanenburg	
Compounding and inflection	133

Topic 3: <i>Inflectional morphology and clitics</i>	139
Paul Kent Andersen	
Arguments against the passive as a universal morphological category	141
Robert Beard	
The empty morpheme entailment	159
Brian D. Joseph	
The benefits of morphological classification: on some apparently problematic clitics in Modern Greek	171
Maria Manoliu-Manea	
Case markers and pragmatic strategies: Romanian clitics	183
Yves-Charles Morin	
Parasitic formation in inflectional morphology	197
Wolfgang Ullrich Wurzel	
The mechanism of inflection: lexicon representations, rules, and irregularities	203
Arnold M. Zwicky	
Inflectional morphology as a (sub)component of grammar	217
Topic 4: <i>Computer morphology</i>	237
Willem Meijs	
Morphology in LDOCE and in the ASCOT system	239
Topic 5: <i>The psycholinguistic study of morphology</i>	247
Bruce L. Derwing	
Morphology and the mental lexicon: psycholinguistic evidence	249
Jaap van Marle	
Rule-creating creativity: analogy as a synchronic morphological process	267
Topic 6: <i>Typology and non-Indo-European morphologies</i>	275
Stephen R. Anderson	
Sapir's approach to typology and current issues in morphology	277

Claude Hagège	
Do the classical morphological types have clear-cut limits?	297
Index of languages	309
Subject index	311
List of contributors	315

Topic 1: Interface

Bengali emphatic clitics in the lexicon-syntax interface*

Josef Bayer and Aditi Lahiri

1. Introduction

In this paper, we advocate the view that to provide an adequate account of certain clitic constructions, one must refer to more than one component of the grammatical system. We will argue that the emphatic clitics in Bengali must be licensed by both the morphophonemics of the lexicon and the syntax of logical form, where the latter largely obeys the constraints on overt syntactic movements. After presenting some of the core facts, we will first discuss the lexical account and then turn to the complementary logical-form account. In the last section, we will present our solution to a paradox that appears to arise when both the morphophonemic and semantic aspects of these clitics are considered together.

2. The core facts

/o/ and /i/ are the so-called emphatic clitics in Bengali which mean something like ‘too’ and [+ emphatic] respectively. Since only /o/ introduces a new lexical meaning, we will mostly use /o/ for the examples, but /i/ behaves alike in all important respects. At a first glance, /o/ and /i/ seem to adjoin as enclitics to an element of type X^0 which is then the focus of the clitic, e.g.,

* We wish to thank Probal Dasgupta for his advice and Jogamaya Bayer for discussing the Bengali data presented here. We are also grateful to Wim van der Wurff and an anonymous reviewer for their suggestions. Realizing that proposals independently made in Dasgupta (1984, 1987, in press) turned out to be similar in spirit to ours gave us encouragement to pursue this work.

- (1a) *babul- o kha- be*
 Babul- too eat- [fut, 3rd pers]
 'Also BABUL will eat'
- b) *babul kha- be- o*
 Babul eat- [fut, 3rd pers]- too
 'Babul will also EAT'

In (1a) we see that /o/ can adjoin to a syntactic word and (1b) shows that it can attach to an inflected verb. The clitic can also attach to an overtly inflected N.

- (2) *babul chele- ke- o mereche*
 Babul boy- [obj]- too beaten-has
 'Babul has beaten also his SON'

The facts concerning the attachment of the clitic to the verb are more complicated. As we have seen in (1), /o/ can come after the inflected verb, and in most instances, it cannot be added between the stem and the ending. Compare the following pairs of sentences where the second member is ruled out.¹

- (3a) *mar- i- o*
 beat- [1pers]- too
 '(I/we) also BEAT'
- b) **mar-o-i*
- (4a) *mar- ch- i- o*
 beat- [prog]- [1pers]- too
 '(I/we) am/are also BEATING'
- b) **mar-o-ch-i*

Now consider instances where the clitic can be added before the inflectional ending is attached. Examples are given in (5b) and (5d).²

- (5a) *babul cheleke mere- che-o*
 Babul boy[obj] beaten- has-too
 'Babul has also BEATEN the boy'
- b) *babul cheleke mere-o-che*
- c) *mer- e- ch- i- l- am- o*
 beat- [prt]- [prog]- [link]- [past]- [1pers]- too
 '(I) have also BEATEN'
- d) *mer-e-o-ch-i-l-am*

Although the clitic can be attached between the stem and the inflection, it cannot be inserted between affixes. The choice is binary – either the clitic comes right after the stem, or it must come after all the affixes are added. Thus the forms in (6) are ungrammatical in Bengali.

- (6a) **mer-e-ch-i-o-l-am*
 b) **mer-e-ch-i-l-o-am*

It must be noted that there are no instances of categories other than verbs in which the emphatic clitic could be “infixd”. For instance, (7) is ungrammatical. /o/ appears here between a noun stem and the case-marker *-ke*, which is arguably an inflectional ending.

- (7) **babul chele-o-ke mereche*
 ‘Babul has beaten also the BOY’

This restriction also holds for compound-like word formations. Bengali has a verbal noun, which is derived by attaching the suffix *-a* to a V-stem, e.g., *pər* ‘read’ + *a* → *pəra* ‘reading’. Similar to German infinitives such as *rad+fahren* ‘bike riding’, the verbal noun can incorporate an N^o-object into the verb stem involved, e.g., *gɔlpə pər-a* ‘story reading’. As (8a) below shows, /o/ can adjoin to the verbal noun and select its focus inside, but as shown in (8b), it cannot adjoin to the focused N incorporated. For these examples, imagine a preceding discourse in which someone states that (s)he liked somebody’s reading of stories very much.

- (8a) *tader [kobita pər- a]- o bhalo laglo*
 their poetry read-ing- too pleased-has
 ‘(I) was pleased by also their reading of POETRY’
 b) **tader [kobita-o pər-a] bhalo laglo*

This also holds true for the so-called dvandva constructions such as in (9) below. The contrasting sentences with different clitic placements are given in (10).

- (9a) *bap ma*
 father mother
 ‘parents’
 b) *uttor dokkhin*
 north south

- (10a) [*bap ma*]-o
 b) *[*bap-o ma*]
 c) [*uttor dokkhin*]-o
 d) *[*uttor-o dokkhin*]

The interpretation of dvandvas such as (10a) suggests that /o/ attaches to the whole dvandva as indicated by the bracketing, not to its second constituent. Thus (10a) can only mean ‘the parents too’, but not ‘father and also mother’.

Given these observations there seem to be two obvious questions that come to mind. First, what is the domain to which the clitics can attach? Second, if this domain is not identical to the stem to which all affixes can attach, how do the clitics differ from regular affixes?

3. Emphatic clitics in the lexicon

The fact that (3b) and (4b) are bad but not (5b) can be accounted for by examining the minimal phonological unit that /o/ can attach to. Observe that /o/ can attach to *mere* but not to *mar*. We will argue that the host of the clitics must minimally be a phonological word. Under this view, *mere* constitutes a phonological word while *mar* is merely a stem. In the following discussion, we will focus on the facts which constitute evidence for differentiating phonological words from stems, indicating also how the clitics themselves are different from regular affixes.

3.1. Bengali has a rule which degeminates syllable-initial geminates. The underlying form of the progressive affix is /cch/, a geminate affricate. After a vowel-final stem the geminate is retained (since it can close the preceding syllable), but is degeminated when preceded by a consonant-final stem.

- (11a) *kha- cchi* → *khac.chi* (closure of preceding syllable)
 eat- [prog, 1pers]
 ‘(I) am eating’
- b) *mar- cchi* → *mar.chi* (C deleted)

The same holds true after the causative affix /a/ is added to the stem; the geminate is retained as after a stem final vowel.

- (12) *mar- a- cchi* → *ma.rac.chi*
 beat- [caus]- [prog, 1pers]
 ‘(I) am having (him) beaten’

Resyllabification is, however, blocked outside the domain of a phonological word; after *mere*, the geminate remains syllable initial and is degeminated.³

- (13) *mar-* *e-* *cchi* → *me.re.chi* (not: **me.rec.chi*)
 beat- [past prt]- [prog, 1pers]

Implicit in this view is the claim that affixes can be added to stems as well as to larger units like words. The compound-like constructions (cf. 9–10) also have affixes added at the end ([*bap ma*]*r* ‘of parents’, [**bap-er ma*]). Moreover, the prosodic unit after the addition of a clitic to a phonological word, is still a word to which an affix can be added.

3.2. Evidence that *mere* is indeed a phonological word and that there is less cohesion between word+affix than stem+affix comes from reduplicating echo words. In Bengali, an echo word can be formed by reduplicating the entire word except for the initial consonant which is usually replaced by a coronal. The echo word could be interpreted as ‘X and so forth’ with perhaps a slight pejorative tinge. There is a constraint, however, in what can be reduplicated. All stem+affix constructions can be reduplicated, but no stems alone.

- (14a) Nominal forms:

<i>pa</i> – <i>ʈa</i>	‘leg’
<i>baʀi</i> – <i>ʈaʀi</i>	‘house’
<i>chele</i> – <i>ʈele</i>	‘boy’
<i>kobita pɔra</i> – <i>ʈobita pɔra</i>	‘poetry reading’

- b) Verb forms:

<i>mare</i> – <i>ʈare</i>	‘[3rd pers] beat’
<i>khæ</i> – <i>ʈæ</i>	‘[3rd pers] eat’
<i>mere</i> – <i>ʈere</i>	‘[past part] beat’

- c) Inadmissible verb stems:

* <i>kha</i> – <i>ʈa</i>	‘eat’
* <i>mar</i> – <i>ʈar</i>	‘beat’

The affixation pattern also shows the distinction between the stem and the word. The past-participial form *mere* can have the affix *-che* added to it and then become reduplicated; but the *-che* can also be added after reduplication has taken place. Compare the forms under (15).