

Preface

MARTINA WERNER AND WOLFGANG U. DRESSLER

The interaction of derivation and inflection is a morphological issue which has gained a lot of research interest so far, especially in the last 30 years. And still a lot is unclear, especially in contrastive studies and linguistic typology. To enhance a deeper understanding of the interaction of these two morphological levels, the working group “Morphology” was founded at the Austrian Academy of Sciences (ACDH-CH, ÖAW) by Wolfgang U. Dressler and Martina Werner.

In the powerful Viennese environment of Natural Morphology and in the inspiring Nobel prize-winning atmosphere of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, the working group aims to bring together and connect morphologists from the ÖAW and from the different universities in Vienna, who work on different subfields in several European and non-European languages. Although the initiative consists of a loose but highly focused group of Viennese morphologists, it has now established itself as a reliable constant in busy times as a local fixture in Viennese morphology.

The following members of the group contributed to this volume: as full and corresponding Austrian members of the ÖAW, Wolfgang U. Dressler, Stephan Procházka and Johanna Laakso (all from the University of Vienna) as well as Franz Rainer (WU Vienna). ÖAW members from abroad who contributed to this volume are Hans Basbøll (Odense), Pier Marco Bertinetto (Pisa), and Michele Loporcaro (Zurich). Temporarily associated researchers from our initiative are Boglárka Németh (Cluj-Napoca), Luca Ciucci (Cairns, Queensland), Katharina Korecky-Kröll (University of Vienna & ACDH-CH), and Martina Werner ACDH-CH (ÖAW) & University of Vienna.

Unfortunately, sometimes unforeseeable things happen and irreversible consequences occur. This volume is dedicated to the beloved memory of Ferenc Kiefer. Sadly, he did not live to see the publication of the volume. We would still like to enter into discussions with him. And we miss him – linguistically and personally.

Research and research output would not be possible without the support of others. First, we want to thank the Austrian Centre for Digital

Humanities and Cultural Heritage (ACDH-CH), and especially the ACDH-CH's director, Alexandra N. Lenz, for her continuous infrastructural and financial support for this volume and the inspiring atmosphere at the institute. Without this support, the realization of this volume would not have been possible. We also thank all participants of the 2018's workshop for their enthusiastic input and stimulating discussions, especially Franz Rainer for providing us with literature. Many thanks also go to Carolin Rumpler (FWF, P32415-G) for formal help.

Last, but not least, we would like to thank two foundations for funding, both being located at the Austrian Academy of Sciences, namely *DDr. Franz-Josef Mayer-Gunthof Wissenschafts- und Forschungsstiftung* (Mayer-Gunthof-Foundation) as well as *Stiftung der Familie Philipp Politzer* (Poltitzer Foundation), for the individual financial support with respect to the production of this volume.

INTRODUCTION

The question of how to distinguish the two morphological areas derivation and inflection, which are similar due to a variety of formal properties, has a long tradition in linguistics. Generally, inflection is considered to depend on syntax and to be much less lexically determined than derivation. Therefore, inflection creates word forms, while derivation is considered to be lexical and serves for the creation of new words or for the motivation of already existing complex words (cf. Aronoff 1976). When taking a closer look, there are some other problems with regard to the derivation/inflection divide.

One and the same morphological phenomenon might be characterized as derivational in one language, while in another, closely related language, the same phenomenon might be classified as inflectional. This holds, for instance, for diminutive formation, which in most languages is rather derivational (i.e., belonging to non-prototypical derivational morphology), whereas it is rather inflectional in Bantu languages. Diminution does not create a new lexeme, but adds a semantic specification to the simple lexeme (if the relation is morpho-semantically transparent); the same holds, e.g., for gradation.

Formal and semantic aspects may contradict each other. Conversion is also ambivalent: morphological conversion changes – as typically all derivational morphology does – the semantics and also inflection, for example in the conversion of adjectives to nouns as in plural formation, e.g. *G. gut-e Frau-en* 'good women' can be converted into *Gute* 'good

(women)’. But consider Sg. *das Gut* ‘the property’, Pl. *die Güt-er* ‘the good-s’, whereas in syntactic conversion the inflection remains the same, as in G. *der blind-e Mann* ‘the blind man’ = *der Blind-e*, Pl. *die blind-en Männ-er* ‘the blind men’ = *die Blind-en* ‘the blind’.

So, one may conclude that the aforementioned basic definition of derivation vs. inflection might be too tentative and simplistic, especially because fundamental questions of morphology – such as the definitions of a word or if a word is a lexeme – are automatically co-addressed or implied.

Although each of them might be seen as controversial, let us first outline the major criteria for a derivation/inflection distinction in more detail (summarized in Štekauer 2015: 222–231). Note that these criteria have been the outcome of decades-long discussions. A more fine-grained differentiation including further references to the history of linguistics is provided by Rainer (1993: 35–40).

- Function: while derivational morphology contributes to lexical enrichment, inflectional morphology serves deixis and marks syntactic constructions with special word forms. In other words, inflectional morphology is obligatory in a syntactic construction, while derivational morphology is not. But consider, for instance, the English suffix *-ly* for adverb formation, which is obligatory. It is unclear whether it functions as an adverb marker for grammatical or for lexical-semantic reasons (Giegerich 2012). Furthermore, we find historical developments where the obligatoriness of inflection even had to be developed, such as adjectival inflection in the history of German, cf. early New High German *unser täglich Brot* developed into *unser tägliches Brot* ‘our daily bread’ (Pounder 2001). In parallel to the extension of adjectival inflection, the adverb marker *lich* decreased – which nicely illustrates that derivational and inflectional processes can be linked across categories, as is here proven by diachronic markedness changes in German modifiers.
- Range of categories: Inflectional morphology usually involves smaller meaning changes than derivational morphology. When we look at Latin tense, for instance, which is inflectionally encoded, we clearly see, however, that the meaning changes are sometimes dramatic – but the same meaning changes are encoded by derivation or analytically by verbal periphrases in other languages such as English. Cf. *laudare* ‘to praise’ – *laudo* ‘I praise’ – *laudavi* ‘I have praised’. Furthermore, inflection can be irregular and paradoxical, just like derivation. Compare for instance, Latin *verba deponentia*

such as *sequi* ‘to follow’. Verba deponentia are morphologically passive, but semantically active (cf. *sequ-or* ‘I follow’, with *-or* which usually marks 1.PS-Present-Passive). In all of these cases, we see drastic changes in semantics which are also all caused by inflection. Furthermore, we find cases with semantic changes that cannot be easily ascribed to derivation such as diminution. In addition, derivation is often linked to inflection and vice versa. But if we look again at diminution, we can see with respect to gender languages that diminution shows a cross-linguistic tendency towards the feminine gender (Corbett 1991: 64 and 89f; Bakema & Geeraerts 2004: 1048).

- Transparency: As regards semantic and formal aspects, inflectional morphology is usually more transparent than derivational morphology. However, plural irregularity such as *children*, *mice*, *leaves* instead of **childs*, **mouses*, **leafs* and plural allomorphy such as German *Worte/Wörter* ‘phrases; words’ can occur. By contrast, rules of derivation are often transparent, such as deadjectival verbalization in English marked by zero-derivation (such as *dry/blue/wet* > *to dry/blue/wet*)
- Productivity & regularity: While rules of inflectional morphology are typically highly productive and regular, the productivity of derivational morphology is restricted and has idiosyncrasies. However, given that the definitions of morphological productivity vary, it is obvious that this has consequences for morphological processes such as derivation, although the process itself cannot be blamed for the varying terminology. Furthermore, inflection can also be irregular, as seen before.
- Word class change: While prototypical inflectional morphology does not change the word class, derivational morphology often serves to create new words through word class changes. However, a classic in-between example is the pattern of German denominal *-er*-verbs (such as *löchern* ‘to punch holes’, *blättern* ‘to skim, to browse’, *gliedern* ‘to structure, to order’). They originated from historically neuter nouns (such as *Loch* ‘hole’, *Blatt* ‘leaf’, *Glied* ‘limb’) which had an *-er*-plural (G. *Löcher*, *Blätter*, *Glieder*). Together with other historically mutually related forms, these denominal verbs form a closed class. Nowadays they are unproductive, but the *-er* inflectional plural morpheme is still productive, while the same verbalizing morpheme *-er-* is considered synchronically as derivational with a denominal base, but can also be considered inflectional for historical reasons since the morpheme *-er-* goes back to an inflec-

tional morpheme. Exactly the same is observed for Breton, where the morpheme *-où* is a plural morpheme which is preserved in the formation of denominal verbs. Cf. Breton *aval* ‘apple’ > *avaloù* ‘apples’ > *aval-où-a* ‘to look for apples’ (Booij 2000: 367). Generally, word class changes usually involve changes in inflection so that the ability to change the word class is only one side of the coin. The other one is the inherently word class-specific inflectional change, which coincides with word class change.

- Recursiveness: rules of inflectional morphology are not recursive, while rules of derivational morphology can be reapplied. The order of inflectional morphology is fixed or semantically irrelevant, while the order of derivational morphology usually reflects the order of semantic operations. However, we very often, and perhaps mostly, regularly find cases for which rules of derivation cannot be applied. See, for instance, German *-heit* nominalizations, which cannot be converted into adjectives via derivation, cf. *Krankheit* ‘sickness’ – **krankheitlich*, *Wahrheit* ‘truth’ – **wahrheitlich* or *Kindheit* ‘childhood’ – **kindheitlich*. Only for a couple of exceptional cases, is the restriction abolished, cf., e.g., *gesundheitlich* (< *Gesundheit* ‘health’), *mehrheitlich* (< *Mehrheit* ‘majority’), *einheitlich* (< *Einheit* ‘unity’). In other words, recursion could be seen as a phenomenon which underlies restrictions independently from derivational or inflectional processes. Exceptional cases need to be investigated in detail (cf. the literal translation from Latin “*exemplum probat*”). Furthermore, we also find cases in which rules of inflection can be reapplied. Consider, for instance, the noun form *Männern* which is the dative (-*n*) plural (-*er* + umlaut) form of the German noun *Mann* ‘man’.
- Paradigms: While inflectional morphology is traditionally organized into paradigms, the paradigmatic organization of derivational morphology is considered much weaker. But we often see that while inflection is seen as a part of grammar, derivation is seen as a lexical process, although this is not uncontroversial, as was shown, e.g., for the Russian aspect (V. Lehmann 2004) and for nominal derivation in the German gender system (Werner 2012). Also, derivation provides grammatical semantics to a lexical base, while the principles of base selection and formal output (e.g. word class change, cf. Scalise 1989) are inherently grammatical. By contrast, plural assignment rules are often paradigmatic, but also morphematically intransparent (as in German due to allomorphy) and therefore a matter of intense discussion.

- Mental lexicon: While accepted derived words are likely to be stored as wholes in memory, inflected word forms are usually not. However, we sometimes find forms as part of the lexicon (cf., e.g., Acquaviva 2008). Consider pluralia tanta such as German *Ferien* ‘holidays’ or French *lunettes* ‘glasses’ or *ciseaux* ‘scissors’. The examples show defective inflectional paradigms, i.e., the lexemes have no plural form. By contrast, it is not entirely clear whether derived forms are stored as a whole in the mental lexicon or whether the extent of parsing, which affects all affixing processes, differs from one language to another.
- Affix order: Inflectional morphemes typically have a more peripheral position in the word form than derivational morphemes. According to the Greenbergian approach, inflectional affixes should always follow derivational ones. But in several languages this is not true for the non-prototypical inflection category plural and for the non-prototypical derivation category diminutive, as, e.g., in G *Kind+er+chen/lein* ‘children-DIM’. Such exceptional patterns are still active. Another example is German *Lied+er+chen* ‘song+s+DIM’ (such examples are considered by native speakers to be much more acceptable than any other diminutive-plural combinations).
- Headedness: Only derivational, but never inflectional affixes can function as heads. However, we easily find “classic cases” in morphology which are located between derivation and inflection and where – if defined as such – inflection provides headedness: Participles fall to various degrees in the transition area between inflection and derivation, e.g. G. *ge+lehr+t* corresponds either to E. *learn+t* or to *learn+ed* (as in *learned society*), and its nominalization G. *Ge+lehr+t+er* means simply ‘scholar, scientist’. Another example is comparatives (and superlatives) in many languages: E. *old+er than* exemplifies a prototypically inflectional comparative, whereas *eld+er brother* is derivational and less old than *my older brother* and old than *my old brother*. As for the superlative, the Latin suffix *-issimus*, for example, has been mainly inflectional, but has turned into a derivational morpheme in Romance languages as an elative in the sense of, e.g., *very old* and can no longer be used in phrases such as *the oldest among us*.
- Exponents: the positioning and the (supra-)segmental, syllabic, and morphological structure of the exponents of inflectional categories are relatively similar, while those of derivational categories are dissimilar. But, for instance, diminutives are more inflectional in

Bantu languages and more derivational in most other languages (see also, e.g., Bauer & Bauer 2012 on cross-linguistic differences).

- Bases: While inflectional morphemes are typically added to existing bases, derivational morphemes can also attach to non-existing bases. As Rainer (1993: 38) points out, only derivation can change argument structure, while inflection does not. So, as we can see, derivation is less restricted than inflection, which speaks for a wider distribution cross-linguistically. Furthermore, we also find inflected lexemes which belong to a defective paradigm. For instance, see plural inflected nouns (such as German *Elter-n* ‘parents’) without any singular form and, hence, without any existing base (**Elter* ‘parent’). Furthermore, especially for these cases, derivation or compounding with a semantically bleached head, which is similar to a derivational morpheme, fills in the form of the defective paradigm (such as G. *Elternteil* lit. ‘part of parents’, i.e., ‘parent’).

For that reason, it was argued – originally by Meyer (1897) (see Rainer 1993: 35 and the references therein) and later by Mayerthaler’s (1980) observations in the framework of Natural Morphology – that the inflection/derivation divide is not absolute but allows for gradience and fuzzy boundaries and that we are dealing with a scale with more and less prototypical examples in between (e.g. Haspelmath 1996 and Štekauer 2015, and the respective references therein). More concretely, we find three major approaches in the literature (Haspelmath, to app.: 21–22):

- Inflection and derivation are distinct classes, but have fuzzy boundaries.
- Inflection and derivation possess prototypes, i.e., we find patterns which are more or less prototypical (e.g. Dressler 1989).
- Inflection and derivation are organized as a continuum (e.g. Stephany 1982, Bybee 1985: chapter 4).

A potential solution, which may refer to Coseriu’s notion of universals including the assumption of a degree of generality (Coseriu 1974: 47–73), could be (a) to structure better the criteria above, which partly overlap or imply each other, (b) to focus more on differences when both inflectional and derivation morphemes co-occur in one word (such as affix order, word class change, directionality of word class change, obligatoriness and assignment principles), and (c) finally to rely on productivity and to tolerate rare counter-examples, which do not automatically falsify, against the Neogrammarian claim, the individual generalization (simi-

larly, Manova 2005, ten Hacken 2014). This would perhaps help to detect or support cross-linguistic constraints and interactions of both patterns alike. If this were to lead to the observation that both areas can be unified but recursively apparent in one word, this would probably strengthen the idea that grammatical semantics possess an internal architecture and that some categorial morphemes with certain more core grammar-like contents (such as aspect morphemes) attach closer to the stem than others (e.g. modal morphemes; cf. Leiss 1994).

The main aim of this volume is to describe and explain phenomena at the transition area between derivation and inflection including criteria and methods that have either not been used at all or have been used only in a limited way, but never in the format of a volume, moreover, also applied to languages which have received less attention. The perspectives are either synchronic and typological or diachronic or ontogenetic. The main transition studied is the gradual scalar one between derivation and inflection, with a particular emphasis on derivation because derivation, unlike inflection, is located either in grammar (like inflection) or in the lexicon, depending on the morphological approach. But generally, the transition between syntax and derivation and between derivation and individual simple lexical items is also dealt with.

In this light, the morphological methodologies used in this volume are of the following types:

1. Models of continua from phrases over compounds, derivations, inflections of simple words are used and described, with a special emphasis on transitions between derivation and inflections.
2. For the last transitions, there is the option of assuming a continuum from prototypical derivation (e.g. denominal and deverbal adjective derivation) via non-prototypical derivation (e.g. deverbal agent and action nouns, diminutives) and non-prototypical inflection (e.g. plural formation, adjective gradation) to prototypical inflection (e.g. case, tense), cf. Dressler (1989).
3. A variant is the so-called ordering typology (*G. ordnende Typologie*) defined by Hempel & Oppenheim (1937) as gradual ordering on a scale. For example, within the scale from genitives to clitics, the English Saxon genitive is most clitic, while the Danish correspondent is less so, still less the German one, whereas Latin and Slavic genitives are prototypically inflectional.
4. A different approach consists in assuming interactions between well-defined components of, e.g., derivation and inflection, for example

in regard to diminutives, which in most languages are rather derivational, but in Bantu languages rather inflectional.

5. Moreover, there is the possibility to apply the approach initiated for word formation by Mattiello & Dressler (2021, 2022), namely to apply the concept of superposition (taken over from quantum physics) to our main topic by assuming a superposition for transition patterns, i.e., that these patterns are simultaneously derivational and inflectional (similar to light being proven to represent both particles and waves simultaneously).

The volume provides an overview about different areas of research regarding the derivation/inflection divide and aims to illuminate problems related to that topic from a language-specific and/or cross-linguistic perspective. In light of the various open theoretical questions in the literature, the morphological aspects addressed in the individual papers cover a variety of linguistic disciplines, phenomena and languages for the first time. The linguistic disciplines range from contrastive studies with regard to the description of less-known languages (such as Zamucoan by Bertinetto & Ciucci) to language acquisition (Sommer-Lolei & Dressler's paper on German and Basbøll's paper on Danish) to historical linguistics (Laakso on Finno-Ugric and Werner on German), the morphology-prosody interface (again Basbøll's paper) to variational linguistics (Loporcaro and Rainer on Romance; Korecky-Kröll on German in Austria, and Procházka on Arabic), and further theoretical questions addressed in the individual papers.

The linguistic phenomena of this volume address aspects at the formal borderline between derivation and inflection (such as Rainer's paper on nominal diminution in Romance, Korecky-Kröll's contribution on adjective gradation in German in Austria, Procházka on verbal plurality and Loporcaro on gender agreement), as well as the interaction between inflection and derivation (e.g. Werner on verbal categories in nominal conversion, Németh & Kiefer on nominal derivation in Hungarian).

The investigated language families range from Romance (Rainer, Loporcaro) to Germanic (Basbøll on Danish, Sommer-Lolei & Dressler on German, Werner on historical German, Korecky-Kröll on German in Austria), Finno-Ugric (Németh & Kiefer on Hungarian, Laakso on various Finno-Ugric languages) to Zamucoan (Bertinetto & Ciucci) and the varieties of Arabic (Procházka). In the following, the individual papers will be summarized in alphabetical order.

The paper by Hans Basbøll presents a model for both inflectional and derivational suffixes with an emphasis on the interaction between prosody and morphology in Danish complex words. It is shown that different languages grammaticalize their individual suffixes differently and the vowel space can be phonologized differently (with a different number of phonemes, different boundaries between them, etc.). In Danish, the two extreme degrees in the general system are distinguished, but the three in the middle are not, which leads to three degrees of integration: minimal integration (suffixes that are both added as default and to a word, not just an abstract stem), maximal integration (suffixes that are not added to new words, and not signalled phonotactically as an ending), and medium integration (suffixes added as default but only to an abstract stem, to a new word, and not to a new word, but signalled phonotactically as an ending). This latter category is morphologically heterogeneous, but considering phonological and prosodic aspects, as will be shown, it is not.

The paper by Pier Marco Bertinetto & Luca Ciucci is about the Zamucoan languages (Ayoreo and Chamacoco, plus Old Zamuco), a language family in the Chaco region of central South America, which possesses typical fusional features. This paper shows that the Zamucoan languages possess non-prototypical derivation besides other, typologically more standard forms of derivation. In particular, the Zamucoan languages have (a) gender motion in both basic and derived nouns (i.e., *nomina agentis*), also including possessive classifiers, which morphologically speaking behave like nouns; (b) affix transcategoriality, by which one and the same affix can attach to both nouns and verbs; (c) gender motion and affix transcategoriality in evaluatives. Finally, the paper argues that the currently fusional Zamucoan languages might have had a (fairly remote) agglutinating past.

The contribution by Ferenc Kiefer & Boglárka Németh deals with *-hatnék* derivation, which has become very productive in present-day Hungarian. The paper is devoted to the examination of the semantic and pragmatic conditions under which the derivation is possible. More concretely, in *olvas-hat-né-k* 'I could read', *-hatnék* is a composite inflectional suffix composed of the possibility suffix *-hat*, the conditional suffix *-né* and the 1-Sg personal suffix *-k*. However, the same morphological form can also be used as a non-composite derivational suffix expressing something like 'having the desire to do X', for example, *olvas-hatnék* 'I have the desire to read'. This form can also take a possessive suffix (here, *-om* Poss 1-Sg) where it only functions as a noun: *olvas-hatnék-om van* 'I have the desire to read'. These morphological forms have the external

distribution of a noun, cf. *Rám jött az ír-hat-né-k* ‘I was overcome by the urge to cry’, or *Csodálom az ír-hat-né-k-od-at* ‘I admire your urge to write’ where the conditional *írhatnék* ‘I may write’ functions as a noun.

The article by Katharina Korecky-Kröll deals with adjective gradation in German in Austria as an especially interesting morphological phenomenon between derivation and inflection. It not only shows strong regional variation, but also significant inter- and intraindividual variation in speakers living in the same region. The paper discusses the reasons for this phenomenon and identifies two aspects: first, the morphological structure of comparatives and superlatives is clearly prone to variation. Second, comparatives and especially superlatives have very low token frequencies in spontaneous speech, which makes German adjective gradation a special challenge not only for L2 learners and young children acquiring German as their first language, but also for adult native speakers who also show significant uncertainties when producing or judging comparatives and superlatives, an issue that has only been researched recently. The present chapter compares results from three different studies.

It is sometimes claimed that weak delimitation of derivation from inflection is characteristic of languages of the classical agglutinative macrotype such as the Uralic languages. In the paper by Johanna Laakso, the diachronic implications of this fuzziness in demarcation are investigated in more detail. In the continuum of grammaticality or fusion, derivation is situated between lexicon and inflection – but this continuum does not necessarily reflect real diachronic grammaticalization paths. In fact, derivation in Uralic seems to be diachronically fairly stable, both functionally and suffix-wise. Interestingly, many of the borderline cases are situated in verb morphology; this may be due to contacts with languages with different tense and aspect systems (in particular, Russian with its morphological aspect) but also to the inherent fluidity and interconnections of TAM and diathetic categories.

The paper by Michele Loporcaro discusses different cases of nouns in Romance serving as agreement targets. In some cases, (gender) agreement on such nouns is realized via derivational morphology, as is the case for Italian agent nouns formed with the suffix *-tore/-trice* and for their Romance cognates. Such nouns have given rise to homophonous adjectives, which may show cumulation of derivation and inflection. In other cases, non-derived nouns may also display gender agreement, as apparent from Romance examples. Thus, predicative use, conversion to adjective and cumulative expression of derivational and inflectional meanings may

or may not go hand in hand. In Asturian, typically nouny lexemes such as ‘wolf’, ‘dog’ or ‘son’ are converted into adjectives and used as predicates without any overt derivational morphology by simply taking on adjective inflection. Finally, this evidence from Asturian is contrasted with that provided by the Marchigiano dialect of Ripatransone (central Italy), where nouns become agreement targets even in an argument (direct object) position and, in that case, take on adjectival inflection but by maintaining noun syntax. Thus, what at first sight seems to be one and the same morphological process, whereby a noun (root) takes on adjective endings signalling gender/number agreement, upon closer inspection boils down to two quite different cases, with conversion taking place in Asturian, but not in Ripano. On the whole, this discussion of evidence at the fringe of noun morphology and morphosyntax in Romance shows that careful scrutiny of variation across this well-known language family is bound to reveal many more typologically interesting phenomena than its position at the core of Standard Average European would lead one to suspect.

The paper by Stephan Procházka deals with verbal plurality in different varieties of Arabic. The few existing studies on verbal plurality in Arabic mostly deal with Classical Arabic, in particular with the so-called Form II verbs containing a doubled medial root consonant. This verbal class is used for the marking of object-distributive plurality. It is also widely attested for many spoken Arabic varieties, e.g. Baghdad *nigab* ‘to bore a hole’ (Form I) vs. *naggab* ‘to bore many holes’ (Form II). In a couple of Arabic dialects spoken in Eastern Anatolia and in some oases of the Syrian Steppe, the distribution of transitive Form I and Form II verbs is determined to a very high degree by the number of their object. This means that Form I verbs are the default with singular objects, Form II verbs with dual and plural objects. This phenomenon particularly occurs with nouns that denote clearly separated and usually individuated objects. The action expressed by the verb is thus iterative and non-continuative, whereas continuative and distributive actions do not trigger the shift from Form I to Form II. The same is true for habitual actions. The linguistic data from the available corpora suggest that the morphological marking of object plurality is especially frequent with telic verbs which imply a change of state.

In the overwhelming majority of cases, diminutive suffixes follow ordinary derivational suffixes and precede inflectional ones, as in German *des Schneid-er-lein-s*. The contribution by Franz Rainer focuses on some counter-examples to this generalization in the Romance languages by presenting three studies. In these, diminutives turn out to be very versa-

tile positionally: although they normally occupy the canonical position, they can also, under certain circumstances, precede ordinary derivational suffixes and follow inflectional suffixes. The first of these two anomalies has often been observed and has normally been attributed to the lexicalization of the word containing the diminutive. As spontaneous language data show, lexicalization in the usual sense of the word (semantic drift) is not a necessary condition where the diminutive preserves its pragmatic function but is subject to further derivation. The other studies discuss cases where the diminutive suffix follows inflection. The paper discusses how such an “anomaly” could arise and argues that prosodic optimization was given precedence over morphological orthodoxy. In sum, all case studies are argued to provide evidence against models of morphology that try to enshrine it in a rigid architecture with components or subcomponents arranged in a fixed order.

Based on earlier work on (non-)prototypicality in the continuum between inflection and derivation and its application to language acquisition, Sabine Sommer-Lolei & Wolfgang U. Dressler focus on the order of emergence of prototypical vs. non-prototypical categories of German inflection and especially derivation with an emphasis on agent and instrument nouns. As the authors show, non-prototypical nominal plural formation, adjective gradation and infinitives emerge earlier than prototypical case inflection person present and perfect tense formation. Among derivational categories, non-prototypical diminutive formation emerges earliest, followed by non-prototypical deverbal agent/instrument formation, non-prototypical deverbal particle verbs (before denominal ones, despite of German noun bias), etc.

The paper by Martina Werner deals with the interaction of inflectional categories and derivation by taking a look at the nominalization of verbal complexes in German. She shows that verbal categories based on auxiliaries have undergone zero-derivation (also: ‘conversion’) in the history of German (such as *das Besucht-Worden-Sein* lit. ‘the having-been-visited’). The diachronic expansion of the originally simple infinitives (such as *das Besuchen* ‘the visiting’) in favour of nominalized infinitives marked for passive, tense, and modality exactly follows the pathway of the grammaticalization of verbal categories. As argued, the difference between the verbal and the nominalized infinitival complexes is that epistemic verbal complexes resist infinitive nominalization, whereas verbal complexes with deontic and reportative modal verbs are not constrained in that way, i.e., they can undergo nominalization. It is concluded that derivational processes in which categorical inheritance of verbal catego-

ries is involved can be constrained not only by the input, but also by the output word class (target of derivation in the word class change) due to formal and semantic reasons.

We hope that the volume will enrich the discussion from an empirical point of view through descriptions of individual languages as well as from a theoretical point of view through language comparison, typology, and the merging of subject-specific traditions.

CITED REFERENCES

- Acquaviva, Paolo 2008. Lexical plurals. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aronoff, Mark 1976. Word Formation in Generative Grammar. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bakema, Peter / Geeraerts, Dirk 2004. Diminution and augmentation. In: Booij, Geert, Lehmann, Christian, Mugdan, Joachim, Skopeteas, Stavros (eds.): *HSK Morphology/Morphologie*, vol. 2, 1045–1052.
- Bauer, Laurie / Bauer, Winifred 2012. The inflection-derivation divide in Māori and its implications. In: *Te reo* 55, 3–24.
- Booij, Geert E. 2000. Inflection and derivation. In: Geert E. Booij / Christian Lehmann / Joachim Mugdan (eds.): *HSK Morphology/Morphologie*, vol. 1, 360–369.
- Bybee, Joan L. 1985. Morphology: A study of the relation between meaning and form. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Corbett, Greville 1991. *Gender* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coseriu, Eugenio 1974. “Les universaux linguistiques (et les autres).” *Proceedings of the International Congress of Linguists* 11(1), 47–73.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1989. Prototypical differences between inflection and derivation. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 42, 3–10.
- Giegerich, Heinz J. 2012. The morphology of -ly and the categorial status of ‘adverbs’ in English. *English Language and Linguistics* 16, 341–359.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1996. Word-class changing inflection and morphological theory. In: Geert E. Booij and Jaap van Marle (eds.): *Yearbook of Morphology 1995*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 43–66.
- Haspelmath, Martin. to app. Inflection and derivation are merely ways of speaking. Ms.
- Hempel, Carl G. / Oppenheim, Paul. 1937. Der Typusbegriff im Lichte der neuen Logik. Wissenschaftstheoretische Untersuchungen zur Konstitutionsforschung und Psychologie. Leiden: Sijthoff.
- Leiss, Elisabeth. 2017. Markiertheitszunahme als natürliches Prinzip grammatischer Organisation. In: Köpcke, Klaus-Michael (ed.): Funktionale Untersuchungen zur deutschen Nominal- und Verbmorphologie: Tübingen: Niemeyer, 149–160.
- Lehmann, Volkmar. 2004. Grammaticalization via extending derivation. In: Bisang W. et al. (eds.) What Makes Grammaticalization? A Look from its Fringes and its Components. Berlin / New York: 169–186.
- Manova, Stela. 2005. Derivation versus inflection in three inflecting languages. In: Dressler, Wolfgang U. / Kastovsky, Dieter / Pfeiffer, Oskar E. / Rainer, Franz (eds.):

- Morphology and its demarcations: Selected papers from the 11th Morphology meeting, Vienna, February 2004. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 233–252.
- Mattiello, Elisa & Wolfgang U. Dressler. 2021. A post-loan word formation pattern: Latinate vs. non-Latinate English synthetic compounds. *Lingua* 253(2), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2021.103029>
- Mattiello, Elisa & W. U. Dressler. 2022. Dualism and superposition in the analysis of English synthetic compounds ending in -er. *Linguistics* (2022) 60/2, 395–461. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2021-0235>
- Mayerthaler, Willi 1980. *Morphologische Natürlichkeit*. Athenaion: Wiesbaden
- Meyer, Richard M. 1897. Klassensuffixe. In: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 22, 548–563.
- Plank, Frans. 1994. Inflection and derivation. In: Ronald E. Asher (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*. Vol. 3, 1671–1678. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Rainer, Franz. 1993. *Spanische Wortbildungslehre*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Scalise, Sergio. 1988. Inflection and derivation. *Linguistics* 26, 561–581.
- Štekauer, Pavol. 2015. The delimitation of derivation and inflection. In: Peter O. Müller / Ohnheiser, Ingeborg / Olsen, Susan / Rainer, Franz. (eds.): *HSK 40.1. Wortbildung / Word-formation*. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter Mouton, 218–234.
- Stephany, Ursula 1982. Inflectional and lexical morphology – a linguistic continuum. In: *Glossologia* 1, 27–55.
- ten Hacken, Pius. 2014. Delineating derivation and inflection. In: Lieber, Rochelle / Štekauer, Pavol (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Derivational Morphology*. Oxford: OUP, 10–25.
- Werner, Martina 2012. *Genus, Derivation und Grammatikalisierung. Zur Funktion der Suffigierung und verwandter Phänomene im Deutschen*. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter.