Morphology and its Demarcations

Wolfgang U. Dressler Dieter Kastovsky Oskar E. Pfeiffer Franz Rainer

MO 30809088 Y AND ITS DEMARCATIONS

SELECTED PAPERS FROM THE 11TH MORPHOLOGY MEETING, VIENNA, FEBRUARY 2004

Edited by

WOLFGANG U. DRESSLER
DIETER KASTOVSKY
OSKAR E. PFEIFFER
Universität Wien
FRANZ RAINER
Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien

With the assistance of

FRANCESCO GARDANI MARKUS A. PÖCHTRAGER

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY
AMSTERDAM/PHILADELPHIA



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences — Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

International Morphology Meeting (11th: 2004: Vienna, Austria)

Morphology and its demarcations: selected papers from the 11th Morphology Meeting, Vienna, February 2004 / edited by Wolfgang U. Dressler ... [et al.].

p. cm. -- (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series IV, Current issues in linguistic theory, ISSN 0304-0763; v. 264)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Grammar, Comparative and general--Morphology--Congresses. I. Dressler, Wolfgang U., 1939- II. Title. III. Series.

P241.I58 2004

415'9--dc22

2005044075

ISBN 90 272 4778 1 (Eur.) / 1 58811 638 7 (US) (Hb; alk. paper)

© 2005 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. • P.O.Box 36224 • 1020 ME Amsterdam • The Netherlands John Benjamins North America • P.O.Box 27519 • Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 • USA

Adresses of authors and editors

Dany AMIOT Université d'Artois UFR de Lettres 9, rue du Temple – BP 665 62030 Arras Cedex, France e-mail: damiot@nordnet.fr

Laurie BAUER
Victoria University of Wellington
School of Linguistics and Applied
Language Studies
PO Box 600
Wellington, New Zealand
e-mail: laurie.bauer@vuw.ac.nz

Antonietta BISETTO Università di Bologna Dipartimento di Lingue e Letterature Straniere Moderne Via Cartolerie 5 40100 Bologna, Italia e-mail: bisetto@lingue.unibo.it

Corrien BLOM Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam Faculteit der Letteren De Boelelaan 1105 1081 HV Amsterdam, Nederland e-mail: c.blom@let.vu.nl

Geert BOOIJ Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam Faculteit der Letteren De Boelelaan 1105 1081 HV Amsterdam, Nederland e-mail: ge.booij@let.vu.nl Michael CYSOUW
Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary
Anthropology
Deutscher Platz 6
04103 Leipzig, Deutschland
e-mail: cysouw@eva.mpg.de

Andres ENRIQUE-ARIAS Universitat de les Illes Balears Departament de Filologia Espanyola Moderna i Llatina Edifici Ramon Llull Cra de Valldemossa Km 7,5 07122 Palma (Balears), España e-mail: andres.enrique@uib.es

Bernard FRADIN Laboratoire de linguistique formelle Tour centale, case 7003, 2, place Jussieu, 75251 Paris Cedex 05, France e-mail: bernard.fradin@linguist.jussieu.fr

Emiliano GUEVARA
Università di Bologna
Dipartimento di Lingue e Letterature
Straniere Moderne
Via Cartolerie, 5
40100 Bologna, Italia
e-mail: emiliano@lingue.unibo.it

Bernd HEINE Universität zu Köln Institut für Afrikanistik Meister-Ekkehart-Straße 7 50923 Köln, Deutschland e-mail: bernd.heine@uni-koeln.de Christa KÖNIG Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Institut für Afrikanische Sprachwissenschaften Dantestraße 4-6 3.Stock 60054 Frankfurt am Main, Deutschland e-mail: christa.koenig@uni-koeln.de

Maria-Rosa LLORET Departament de Filologia Catalana Universitat de Barcelona Gran Via de les Corts Catalanes, 585 08071 Barcelona, España e-mail: mrosa.lloret@ub.edu

Stela MANOVA
University of Vienna
Department of Slavic Studies
Universitätscampus AAKH
Spitalgasse 2-4, Hof 3
1090 Wien, Österreich
e-mail: stela.manova@univie.ac.at

Jasmina MILIĆEVIĆ Dalhousie University French Department 6135 University Avenue # 1114 Halifax, Nova Scotia B3H 4P9, Canada e-mail: jmilicev@dal.ca

Davide RICCA
Università di Torino
Dipartimento di Scienze del Linguaggio
Via sant'Ottavio, 20
10124 Torino, Italy
e-mail: davide.ricca@unito.it

David ROOD University of Colorado Department of Linguistics 295 UCB Boulder, Colorado 80309-0295, USA e-mail: Rood@colorado.edu Sergey SAY Institut lingvističeskix issledovanij RAN 199053, Tučkov per. 9, Saint-Petersburg, Russia e-mail: serjozhka@yahoo.com

Sergio SCALISE Università di Bologna Dipartimento di Lingue e Letterature Straniere Via Cartoleria 5, 40100 Bologna, Italia e-mail: scalise@lingue.unibo.it

Pavol ŠTEKAUER Prešovká univerzita Filozofická fakulta Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky ul. 17. novembra 1 080 01 Prešov, Slovakia e-mail: stekpal@unipo.sk

Gregory T. STUMP University of Kentucky Department of English 1215 Patterson Office Tower Lexington, KY 40506-0027, USA e-mail: gstump@uky.edu

Rok ŽAUCER
University of Ottawa
Department of Linguistics
70 Laurier East
Ottawa (Ontario) K1N 6N5, Canada
e-mail: rok.zaucer@guest.arnes.si

Editors:

Wolfgang U. Dressler Universität Wien Institut für Sprachwissenschaft Berggasse 11 1090 Wien, Österreich e-mail: wolfgang.dressler@univie.ac.at Dieter Kastovsky Universität Wien Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik Spitalgasse 2, Hof 8 1090 Wien, Österreich e-mail: dieter.kastovsky@univie.ac.at

Oskar E. Pfeiffer c/o Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Wien Berggasse 11 1090 Wien, Österreich

Franz Rainer
Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien
Institut für Romanische Sprachen
Nordbergstrasse 15
1090 Wien, Österreich
e-mail: franz.rainer@wu-wien.ac.at

Editorial assistants:

Francesco Gardani Universität Wien Institut für Romanistik Garnisongasse 13 Universitätscampus AAKH, Hof 8 1090 Wien, Österreich e-mail: francesco.gardani@univie.ac.at

Markus A. Pöchtrager c/o Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Wien Berggasse 11 1090 Wien, Österreich e-mail: markus.poechtrager@univie.ac.at

Introduction*

Wolfgang U. Dressler, Dieter Kastovsky, Oskar E. Pfeiffer, and Franz Rainer

This volume contains selected papers from the International Morphology Meeting held in Vienna from February 14 to 18, 2004, which was the eleventh of a series of morphology conferences held alternatively in Austria and Hungary. This volume includes those papers which addressed the main topic of the meeting¹ and which were selected by an international reading committee. This topic concerns external and internal demarcations of morphology.

Several authors deal with the external demarcation between syntax and morphology:

David S. Rood claims, with his concept of "syntactic morphology", that the incorporating-polysynthetic language Wichita possesses several instances of affixes which would be expected, in typologically different languages, to either belong to noun inflection or be constituents of noun phrases, but are in fact bound morphemes of Wichita verbs.

Michael Cysouw surveys, in many typologically and genetically unrelated languages, so-called ditropic clitics, i.e. clitics which exhibit a mismatch between their semantic and positional relations to their neighbours, i.e. host and clitic do not form a semantic unit. Such paradoxical constellations differ both from morphological arrangements of affixes and from syntactic positions of corresponding non-clitic constituents.

Jasmina Milićević devotes her study to standard Serbian future tense markers and argues that they are clitics rather than affixes, in spite of the fact that they share some properties with the latter. The frame-work used is the Meaning–Text model and the methodology of using lexical, morphological, syntactic and morphonological criteria.

Corrien Blom describes those particle verbs of Dutch which can be identified as separable complex verbs. By combining this synchronic with a diachronic perspective, she concludes that most of them exhibit a stronger degree

of grammaticalization than of lexicalization. Thus she can locate different types of particle verbs in different slots of the syntax–morphology continuum.

Andrés Enrique-Arias argues that the restriction in mobility which Old Spanish unstressed object pronouns have suffered in the historical process of cliticization and morphologization was due to two main factors, namely the frequency of the sequence pronoun + finite verb in Old Spanish and the fact that this order allowed to preserve the most natural prosodic pattern in Spanish, while no correlation has been found with word order typology.

Bernd Heine and Christa König discuss grammaticalization and claim that grammatical hybrids of the African language !Xun do not allow a clear-cut distinction between verb serialization, compounding and derivation. This is inserted into the typological and diachronic perspective of chains of grammaticalization.

In contrast to theoretical discussions in previous literature on internal boundaries within morphology, which have concentrated on the boundary between inflection and derivation, this volume attributes equal importance to demarcations between compounding and derivation:

Laurie Bauer deals with this borderline and concludes that, although it is permeable, it nevertheless allows a certain demarcation of the two domains on the basis of the independence of the involved elements. This is demonstrated by discussing instances of diachronic shifts from compounding to affixation and from affixation to word-status of the affixes resulting in compounds. Other related topics deal with the ambivalent status of synthetic compounds, unique morphs, and neo-classical compounds.

Geert Booij discusses compounding vs. prefixes, prefixoids, suffixes and suffixoids and argues within the framework of construction morphology that compounding and affixal derivation differ in degrees of abstractness of their construction schemas. Thus he rejects Steven Anderson's dichotomic approach of A-morphous Morphology.

Sergio Scalise, Antonietta Bisetto and Emiliano Guevara set out to show that selection is not exclusively found in suffixation but also in compounding, and that both in suffixation and compounding it is the head which selects the base. Despite these similarities, they claim to have identified differences with respect to how selection works in suffixation and compounding, and even within different types of compounding.

Pavol **Štekauer**, on the basis of a cognitive-onomasiological approach to word-formation, which regards the latter basically as an act of naming, argues that there are no principled differences between compounding and affixation, nor between prefixation and suffixation. This follows from his assumption

that there is a general principle of Morpheme-to-Seme Assignment and the identification of the head with the "onomasiological base", regardless of its position. His analysis thus is basically semantic-referential rather than formal-morphological.

Bernard Fradin shows that the French suffix *-eur* places "strong and precise" restrictions on its verbal base, whereas French V+N compounds allow any semantically plausible instantiation of V. This difference is argued to follow in a principled way from general differences between derivation and compounding.

Dany Amiot's contribution is dedicated to the borderline between composition and prefixation in French. The author analyses eight formatives that appear both in compounding and in prefixation and concludes that "[t]here is a continuum between elements which have to be considered real prefixes and others that are still prepositions".

A wide variety of phenomena regarding commonalities and *demarcations* of *inflection and derivation* is discussed in the following contributions:

Davide Ricca presents evidence that cumulative exponence, a common phenomenon in inflection, may also involve derivational categories. The fact that cumulative exponence is rare in derivation is explained as a consequence of more general properties such as the scarcity of semantically relevant derivational categories and their far weaker paradigmatic structuring.

Maria-Rosa Lloret focuses on the evidence of phonological (and morphonological) patterns which are distinct for inflection and derivation and for nominal vs. verbal inflection in regional variants of Oromo and Catalan and accounts for them within the framework of Optimality Theory.

Stela Manova modifies differentiation criteria for assigning the transitional categories of diminutive formation, gender change (from masculine to feminine) and imperfectivization in Bulgarian, Russian and Serbian dominantly to either inflection or derivation (only in the case of diminutives).

Sergey Say investigates so-called reflexive Russian *sja*-verbs and develops a complex picture of the interplay between derivation and inflection in different subtypes of these "anti-passive" verbs.

Rok **Žaucer** studies verbal prefixes in Slovenian and other Slavic languages to which he assigns an event value of state. They have derivational properties when they express, e.g., directionality or attenuation, but have inflectional characteristics of verbal aspect formation as well.

Gregory T. **Stump** studies Sanskrit causatives and explains why criteria arguing for a derivational status are insufficient, whereas the criteria of paradigmatic opposition and of uniformity entail that the causative suffix *-aya-* (or *-ay-a-*) is a mark of inflection-class membership.

Notes

- * We would like to express our profound gratitude for financial support to the Gemeinde Wien, to the Österreichische Forschungsgemeinschaft and to the Wiener Fremdenverkehrsverband, for patronage to the University of Vienna and to the Austrian Academy of Sciences, for help in the selection of papers especially to Ursula Doleschal (University of Klagenfurt), Ferenc Kiefer (Hungarian Academy of Sciences), Hans-Christian Luschützky (University of Vienna) and to the main speakers of the meeting: Geert Booij (Free University of Amsterdam), Bernd Heine (University of Cologne), Martin Maiden (University of Oxford), Ingo Plag (University of Siegen), Keren Rice (University of Toronto).
- 1. Several papers on other morphological topics, are published in Folia Linguistica 38, 3-4 (2004) [Paolo Acquaviva, Martin Maiden, Ingo Plag] and in the Yearbook of Morphology 2004.

Table of contents

Adresses of authors and editors	VI
Introduction	X
Wichita word formation: Syntactic morphology David S. Rood	
Morphology in the wrong place: A survey of preposed enclitics Michael Cysouw	17
Clitics or affixes? On the morphological status of the future-tense markers in Serbian Jasmina Milićević	39
The demarcation of morphology and syntax: A diachronic perspective on particle verbs *Corrien Blom*	53
When clitics become affixes, where do they come to rest? A case from Spanish Andrés Enrique-Arias	67
Grammatical hybrids: Between serialization, compounding and derivation in !Xun (North Khoisan) Bernd Heine and Christa König	81
The borderline between derivation and compounding Laurie Bauer	97
Compounding and derivation: Evidence for Construction Morphology Geert Booij	109
Selection in compounding and derivation Sergio Scalise, Antonietta Bisetto, and Emiliano Guevara	133
Compounding and affixation: Any difference? Pavol Štekauer	151

On a semantically grounded difference between derivation and compounding Bernard Fradin	161
Between compounding and derivation: Elements of word-formation corresponding to prepositions Dany Amiot	183
Cumulative exponence involving derivation: Some patterns for an uncommon phenomenon Davide Ricca	197
Revising the phonological motivation for splitting morphology Maria-Rosa Lloret	215
Derivation versus inflection in three inflecting languages Stela Manova	233
Antipassive <i>sja</i> -verbs in Russian: Between inflection and derivation Sergey Say	253
Slavic prefixes as state morphemes: From state to change-of-state and perfectivity *Rok Žaucer*	277
Delineating the boundary between inflection-class marking and derivational marking: The case of Sanskrit -aya Gregory T. Stump	293
Language index	311
Subject index	313

Wichita word formation*

Syntactic morphology

David S. Rood University of Colorado

1. Introduction

At least since Postal (1969) articulated it clearly, a primary assumption by many students of morphology has been that words have internal integrity, i.e. that the components inside a word do not have independent referential properties. From this it follows that all the morphemes in the word must relate only to that word. Even agreement morphology, which is controlled from the outside, functions to categorize the word of which it is a part, not the item with which it agrees; we speak, for example, of the "third person singular feminine form" of a verb, meaning that the verb is expressing redundantly certain properties of a relevant nominal, not that this inflection is telling us something new. The announced theme of the conference at which the papers in this volume were initially presented covertly perpetuated this assumption by proposing that the discussion of inflection, derivation, and compounding exhausts the categories of word formation.

Challenges to the absolute validity of the principle of lexical integrity have generally looked at lexical morphemes. Thus the debate about noun incorporation between Marianne Mithun and Jerold Saddock in the 1980s (Mithun 1984, 1986; Saddock 1986), during which Saddock claimed that elements inside Greenlandic words could be referred to independently, concerned the possibility of reference to the incorporated noun part of a complex word. Likewise, Robert Sproat (1993) reported English examples from natural conversations in which one member of a compound is later treated as the antecedent of an anaphoric pronoun (e.g. "I refer you to the [Schachter paper]; he is very proud of it" (Sproat 1993:182)) and even an example of the stem of a form

with a bound derivational suffix treated similarly ("Mary has been [fatherless] for several years. He died when she was five." (Sproat 1993:186)). In contrast with these examples of pronominal reference into words, however, Alice Harris (2004) has recently shown that in Udi and Georgian other kinds of words may fail to have total internal integrity. For example, Georgian allows referential pronouns to be the heads of derived lexical items.

This paper will present evidence from a language whose whole grammar relies almost entirely on bound verbal morphology that lexical integrity can be violated by morphemes that are not lexical roots or stems. I will describe two of them. These morphemes signal properties of an argument, but they occur in the verb. They are not agreement, because they do not agree with anything; they are the only representatives of their function in the sentence, and that function is discourse-specific (i.e. it is not an inherent property, like gender). In one case, a multi-part morphological construction in the verb modifies one of the arguments of the verb in an adjective-like way. In the other case, the verbal morpheme signals an argument property that would, in many familiar languages, be taken to be an inflection on the argument. These morphemes thus provide new information about components of the syntactic construction other than the word to which they are bound; I therefore call them "syntactic morphemes", claiming they are neither lexical, inflectional, nor derivational.

The existence of morphemes like these correlates with another fact of Wichita structure which I hold is important for understanding the overall pattern of the grammar, namely, that the notion of "phrase" is only weakly relevant to the syntax of this language. Phrase structure correlates a linear dimension of morphemes sequenced in time with a hierarchical dimension of groups of words or morphemes functioning together. In Wichita and languages like it, despite Baker's (1996) abstract analyses to the contrary, the hierarchical organization diverges from the linear. Many "constituents" in the English translations of Wichita are represented non-contiguously by combinations of independent words and bound verbal morphemes. Despite this poorly developed phrase structure, Wichita utterances are coherent syntactic constructions; the syntactic information is made available through the morphology.

The claim that phrase structure is not very important for the grammars of languages like Wichita has also been made by Zellmayer (mss. 2003a, b); he discusses Pawnee and Arikara, especially with regard to the weak manifestation of the notion "noun phrase". He refers to this grammatical phenomenon insightfully as "syntactic underspecification".

To summarize: I am claiming that Wichita verbs may include, in part, a class of morphemes which is syntactic, in that its members function like ele-

ments of NP structure. These morphemes occur in the verb, but they indicate properties that an argument has in the current discourse, and they are required by the demands of the current discourse, not parts of stored words.

In Rood (2002), I made a similar claim about the existence of syntactic morphology, based on two kinds of evidence. The first is the fact that person and case marking affixes in this language are pronouns, and not agreement morphemes, and consequently words in this language are syntactic constructions if sentences with pronouns in other languages are syntactic constructions (cf. the extensive discussion of the "pronominal argument" hypothesis, beginning with Jelinek 1984). Second, the fact that the open-ended nature of noun incorporation allows the creation of unlimited numbers of words with selfcontained, internal predicate-argument structure, exactly the same way other languages allow for the creation of an unlimited number of sentences, argues for syntactic input into word formation. Below I will present two additional examples of Wichita word formation in which the morphological components are more like syntactic elements than the usual kinds of word-forming material, but before that, I provide an overview of Wichita structure and a description of the Wichita substitutes for locative prepositional phrases (to emphasize the low functional load of phrase structure as a device for showing syntactic relationships).

Two additional disclaimers are in order, however. First, I am not entering into the formalist debate about whether morphological and syntactic rules are of the same kind or not (see e.g. Borer 1998 and other papers in the same volume); I am interested in morphological function instead. Second, and related, I am not looking into whether polysynthetic languages can be analyzed to reveal a configurational structure or not. Some examples of that debate include Spencer (1991: 208–214), Baker (1996) and Rice (1998).

2. An introduction to Wichita

Wichita is spoken in central Oklahoma, in the southern plains of the U.S. It belongs to the small Caddoan family; its closest relatives include Pawnee and Arikara. There are about eight people still alive who can more or less speak the language, though only one of those is really fluent. I have been studying the language for nearly 40 years, however, and have data that no one today could provide. Almost all of the examples I use in this paper are from spontaneously produced narratives or conversations, or were elicited from a fully fluent speaker at least 20 years ago.

The language is structurally an extreme example of polysynthesis. Most of the information needed to associate arguments with predicates or predicates with other predicates is presented in bound verbal morphology. Word order plays only pragmatic roles, though there are clear preferences for word sequencing which suggest that it could be classified OV. A minimal verb contains four morphemes (tense/mode, argument person marker, root, and aspect/subordination), and every verb is marked for all its arguments: there are no non-finite forms, though there are subordinate clauses. In addition to the root, many verbs require an additional morpheme called a "preverb" near the beginning of the word. Some preverbs can also be used optionally to show that a pronominal affix has changed its case role to dative (for objects) or possessive (for subjects or objects). Verbs are assembled according to a rigid template for morpheme sequences comprised of roughly 30 position classes. The phonology at morpheme boundaries is complex, but otherwise the morphemes line up in a well behaved, agglutinative sequence.¹

3. Locatives: Derivational substitutes for adpositions

Let us turn now to a consideration of some of the morphemes in Wichita verbs. The first ones to be discussed are the least problematic, for they can easily be classified as derivational. I include them here, however, to introduce the idea that phrase structure in this language is considerably different from that of most other languages. These forms are the only semantic analogs to the locative adpositions found in most languages, but they occur as modifiers of the verb stem rather than as particles. They are not applicatives, for they do not promote an oblique argument to core argument status; they merely specify details about the location of the event. Examples are in (1), all from the same episode in a story about a land turtle who is trying to hitch a ride across a river on a buffalo; the turtle and the buffalo are negotiating where the turtle should ride. Note that the morpheme-by-morpheme analysis is often incomplete when it is irrelevant to the present point, and you are witnessing only the buffalo's contributions to the conversation.²

(1) a. iskite?e:ki nackwi:r?ic?írih i- s- *kita*- ?i:ki na- t- wi:r?ic- ?i- hrih³ imper- 2sub- *on*- sit ppl- 1sub- shoulder- be- loc 'sit on my shoulder'

- b. natí:?arihkite?er?í:?arikírih harah iste?erhí:kawa
 na- t- i:- ?arik- r- kita- ?ir?i:?ariki- hrih harah ippl- 1sub- poss- horn- pl- on- protrude- loc there impers- te?erhi: ka- wa
 2sub- brush-covered.area- in- go
 'Get into the long hair up where my horns stick out'
- c. iskawa natíri?iskirik?írih
 i- s- *ka* wa na- t- i:- ri?iskirik- ?i- hrih
 imper- 2sub- *in* go ppl- 1sub- poss- anus- be- loc
 'Go into my anus'
- d. nakhissah harah wah naka:?icakih a:kihi?iyaskwa
 na- ka- hissa- h harah wah na- ka:- ?icakippl.3sub-in- go- subord there now ppl.3sub-inside- sith a:ki- hi?iyaskwa
 subord quot.3sub.past- cross.water
 'Going in and sitting inside there, he crossed the water.'

These examples illustrate four of the 20 or 30 morphemes in this category: kita 'on top', te²erhi: 'where stuff sticks up and you have to push it aside, as in tall grass, or a cornfield, or a crowd of people', ka 'in a topless place' and ka: 'in something with a covering over it'. Example (1b) also illustrates the fact that more than one locative can occur in the same verb. When a nearby word is marked with a locative suffix, as illustrated with the words for 'shoulder', 'where my horns stick out', and 'anus', the combination of the locative in the verb and the locative nominal translates into English as a prepositional phrase. But if no such object is available, as in the words for 'up where my horns stick out', 'going in', and 'sitting inside', the morpheme translates as a locative adverb. In both types of cases, the Wichita morpheme can be analyzed as derivational, creating verb stems meaning things like 'sit on', 'protrude on top', 'go into brush', 'go in', and 'sit inside'. That these locatives are derivational is also indicated by the fact that they do not combine freely with all verbs. For example, there is a locative hita meaning 'at the edge of a body of water', but if you want to say 'we are going to eat beside the creek', you cannot add that locative to the verb 'to eat'; you must use two verbs, 'eat' and one that means 'to be a certain kind of place', and say 'we will eat where the edge of the water is'; cf. example (2).