

REVIEWS

Morphological Analysis in Comparison. 2000. Edited by Wolfgang Dressler, Oskar E. Pfeiffer, Markus Pöchtrager, and John R. Rennison. Amsterdam: Benjamins. Pp. 253.

Reviewed by Rajendra Singh, Université de Montréal, Montréal

A war-time baker's dozen presented by Dressler and three of his colleagues at the University of Vienna, *Morphological Analysis in Comparison (MAC)*, is a collection of papers presented at the VII International Morphology Meeting held in Vienna in February 1996. It offers a kaleidoscope of some of the contemporary theoretical trends in morphology.

As a majority of contributions address questions seen as important within the generative enterprise, perhaps they should be taken up first. These are authored by Albizu and Eguren, Davis, Gràcia and Azkarate, Gràcia and Fullana, McDonough, Spencer, and Williams.

Albizu and Eguren cast a shadow of doubt on Distributed Morphology (DM), particularly on what DM calls Impoverishment Rules, though the thrust of their paper is to provide an OT analysis of Ergative Displacement in Basque. They draw an analogy between OT's treatment of reduplication, a treatment according to which reduplicants will copy exactly as much of their base as possible, subject to prosodic constraints on the size of the reduplicant, and their claim that the same correspondence constraints apply in the mapping from syntax/morphology to lexical insertion. Given Downing (1999), that seems to me to be somewhat unwarranted, but their analysis of 'default prefixes' as fillers that are inserted to satisfy morphological well-formedness conditions of Basque deserves attention, not the least as an invitation to reexamine the general belief that OT has successfully dispensed with the idea of repair.

Spencer, who one must be grateful to for publishing in this volume a cleaner and now more accessible version of his contribution to Hariprasad et al. (1997, reviewed in Neuvel (2000)), also finds the model of Distributed Morphology (DM) inadequate. His evidence comes from Chukchee and Koryak. He shows why the facts of these languages are impossible to handle in syntax-driven models of morphology, particularly in DM, which can handle the replacement of values deleted under Impoverishment but only if what surfaces is unmarked. What happens in the languages he is concerned with is that they involve a retreat to a marked form, not made available by default specifications countenanced by DM. He argues very convincingly indeed that the syncretism between the inverse and antipassive forms in these languages is best captured by realizational models of morphology and concludes by presenting an analysis of the relevant facts within Stump's model.

Gràcia and Azkarate invoke Lieber's (1992) Licensing Conditions to explain the dual use of some prefixal elements in Romance languages. In one use, they act as heads (cf. Fr. *sousmarin*); in the other, as modifiers (cf. Fr. *sousjacent*). They argue that the adoption of Lieber's LC's allows them to explain why Basque, an OV language, does not have prefixal heads. This adoption is, of course, subject to a prohibition against movement in morphology for it is only under such a constraint that the transparent lack of head/modifier symmetry in the syntax and morphology of Romance can be maintained.

Gràcia and Fullana also reject a movement-based incorporationist analysis à la Baker (1988) for what they call Catalan compounds. No movement in morphology allows them to explain the modifier/head asymmetry in Catalan syntax and Catalan compounds: the modifier

appears to the right of the verb in syntax because (only) in syntax the verb raises over the modifier to check its inflectional features. They note, however, that despite their success they “cannot explain why the fusion of the two variables [in Catalan compounds – RS] is necessary” (p. 84). This fusion is accomplished with what they call “the process of lexical subordination” (p. 76). I am inclined to believe that the culprit here is the internal structure they assign to their compounds. Given the fact that they provide only semantic evidence, it is not clear why one should accept the [NV]_v structure they assign these compounds. To put the matter another way, they seem not to realize the implications of the process of lexical subordination they are forced to postulate. As what actually follows from the idea that morphology, of any sort whatsoever, IS lexical subordination is discussed at some length in Ford, Singh, and Martohardjono (1997) and Singh and Dasgupta (1999), I shall not belabour the point here.

Like Gràcia and Fullana, Williams, who, in what seems to be a frontal attack on what he sees as mere lexicalist overtures of Minimalism, launches a plea for what he calls lexical style, also ignores the implications of lexical subordination. He argues against the assumptions that syntactic differences between languages are due to purely lexical differences and that differences amongst lexica are reducible to properties of individual items in them. Although he argues quite convincingly that under a strict lexicalist theory, ingredients of what looks like a conspiracy to make languages look lexicalist – the Mirror Principle and Larsonian shells, for example – are really not needed, he seems to accept the syntax of words lock, stock and barrell. He argues, in other words, against the importation and duplication of the syntax of words into the syntax of phrases, but does not even consider the possibility that words actually may have no syntax whatsoever. There is, I am afraid, a stricter interpretation of his strict lexicalist hypothesis, and, being a syntactician, he is understandably not interested in examining it. One is tempted to add that as long as morphology continues to be seen as just another syntax, generativists, of whatever stripe, are going to find it difficult to investigate morphology by itself. It IS important to look at the interface between syntax and morphology, but that interface is no more morphology than the interface between phonology and morphology is phonology. Doing morphology seriously may make it impossible to “simply assume”, as Williams does, that some Swahili markers are stems and not prefixes (p. 235).

On the basis of data from Lillooet Salish, Davis argues for the hypothesis that the best derivationalist account of the causative/inchoative alternation is obtained by deriving causatives from inchoatives and allowing for optionally available operations to derive anticausativized inchoatives. He carefully examines the standard empirical arguments in favour of the causative to inchoative hypothesis, and finds that some of them actually argue against that hypothesis. The selectional restrictions argument of Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995), based on some facts of English, is shown to be of that nature. Even if one feels that his demonstration of the universality of lexical semantic representations is weaker than he thinks, his arguments in favour of his version of the inchoative hypothesis are worth a very serious consideration because they may provide a timely corrective to an Indo-Europeanist bias.

McDonough argues against the notion of “position class morphology”, generally advocated for Athabaskan. She reviews her 1990 dissertation, which sketches out a standard Paninian description of Navajo verbs, and some later work and concludes that the position class template is an unmotivated prosthetic extension. She says that once a reasonable answer to the question “what does affix A attach to?” is made available, there is no need for position class. Although I am sympathetic to her desire to eliminate yet another kind of morphology, I am not sure if Athabaskan can be as easily assimilated to her preferred model(s) of morphol-

ogy as she thinks. Besides, their efficacy even for languages they claim to be able to handle remains a matter of debate.

The remaining four papers in the volume are not only not generativist in orientation but also not as paradigm-bound as the ones discussed so far, and raise and attempt to answer questions that entire families of models of morphology, including, of course, the generative family, have to come to terms with.

In a deceptively simple paper, Plungian illustrates the difficulties one runs into in using dichotomies like word/affix and inflection/derivation, dichotomies taken for granted by all neo-Paninian theories of morphology, to describe a morphological system like Dogon's. Given Williams' ‘assumption’ that Swahili TENS markers are stems and not prefixes, he could have easily added other Paninian constructs to his list. He focuses on Dogon *ne*, which appears to be both inflectional and derivational and is “more suffix than something else” (p. 187). Like Bauer (1985), Plungian is reluctant to give anything up, and suggests a bit of tinkering with definitions of terms like “inflection”, “derivation”, “clitic”, and “affix”. Such tinkering is, I am afraid, unlikely to solve any problems and can only multiply the number of terms needed for talking about such gradient phenomena. I believe a straightforward answer is available in Whole Word Morphology, summarized in Ford and Singh (1991) and Singh and Ford (2000) and outlined in Ford, Singh, and Martohardjono (1997): the only dichotomy needed is variable vs. constant. To take an example from English, there is no need to say, as Marchand did, that the *man* in *countryman*, *Englishman*, *postman* etc. is an affixoid – it is simply the constant in such words, quite like *ness* in *goodness* and *house* in *doghouse*. Other solutions to problems created by derivational markers which behave like inflectional ones and by lightweight roots and heavyweight affixes seem unsatisfactory to me, but perhaps I am biased.

Whereas Plungian does not argue against any particular model of morphology, Lehrer does. He argues against Beard's position that affixes are not like lexemes and provides ample data to support his contention that quite a few English derivational suffixes exhibit some of the semantic properties typical of lexemes: polysemy, synonymy, and antonymy. Unlike Beard, he concludes that affixes are signs. Unfortunately, he does not examine the traditional argument that the meanings of affixes are word-held. That argument can explain some of the relevant properties of affixes, particularly polysemy and the restrictions on it. Although I am inclined to disagree with the formulation of the problem by both (Beard and Lehrer), I invite the reader to enjoy Lehrer's very interesting data. What is perhaps more bothersome is the assumption that the status of affixes is decisive for morphology (what about non-affixal morphology?).

In her contribution, Ladányi looks at the difficulty of defining verbal prefixes in Hungarian. They are difficult to define because they tend not to be very different in their behaviour from other preverbal elements in Hungarian. Through the analysis of a relatively young Hungarian verbal prefix, she attempts to establish that one can determine the status of the debatable part of the preverb + verb formations by their productivity. This, she argues, is possible because some characteristic changes take place when an adverbial element with an original lexical meaning becomes a verbal prefix. In this context, productivity is diagnostic of category change. It is a well argued contribution to morphologization and grammaticalization and likely to increase our understanding of what sign-posts to expect on the proverbial road from yesterday to today.

In what is perhaps the most significant contribution to the volume, Kilani-Schoch and Dressler present a beyond-modularity, constructivist picture of morphogenesis (apologies to Sheldrake!). They look at fillers and show how these position holders end up corresponding to adult morphemes (which, they add, then replace them). *En route* we encounter what they

refer to as pre- and proto-morphology, stages in which segmental and prosodic phonology are not clearly distinguished from morphology because they have not yet been modularized. As the authors themselves point out towards the end of the paper – very politely indeed – their contribution is a significant challenge to ‘split morphology’, which integrates inflectional morphology into syntax, to separationist morphology, which divorces form from interpretation, and to nativist assumptions of internal modularity. Although I am sure they would agree that the constructivist case is somewhat less difficult to make in morphology than in syntax, they make a very strong one indeed. Their evidence and their analyses can be ignored only at one’s own peril.

Although I wish *MAC* contained more inter-paradigmatic comparisons than it does, I learnt a lot from the contributions it does contain, and I am grateful to the editors and the publishers for making this interesting kaleidoscope available at a point when morphology is in the process of re-establishing itself as a component of grammar that deserves as much attention as syntax does.

REFERENCES

- Baker, M. 1988. *Incorporation*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Bauer, L. 1985. *English Word Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beard, R. 1995. *Lexeme-Morpheme Based Morphology*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Downing, L. J. 1999. “Morphological constraints on Bantu reduplication”. *Linguistic Analysis* 29 (1-2), 6-46.
- Ford, A. and R. Singh. 1991. “Propedeutique morphologique”. *Folia Linguistica* 25. 549-575.
- Ford, A., R. Singh, and G. Martohardjono. 1997. *Pace Panini*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Hariprasad, M. et al. (eds.). 1997. *Phases and Interfaces of Morphology*. Hyderabad: CIEFL.
- Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav. 1995. *Unaccusativity*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Lieber, R. 1992. *Deconstructing Morphology*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Neuvel, S. 2000. “Review of Hariprasad et al.” *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics - 2000*. 257-261.
- Singh, R. and P. Dasgupta 1999. “On so-called compounds”. *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics - 1999*. 318-332.
- Singh, R. and A. Ford. 2000. “In praise of Sakatyayana: Some remarks on whole-word Morphology”. *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics - 2000*. 303-312.