

Paradigms in Word Formation: New perspectives on data description and modeling

Nabil Hathout (Université de Toulouse & CLLE) & Fiammetta Namer (Université de Lorraine & ATILF)

Among the many trends that shape contemporary morphology, paradigm-based approaches are attracting the interest of a growing number of morphologists.

In inflectional morphology, the paradigmatic approach is becoming a standard over the last decades (see e.g. Wunderlich & Fabri 1995, Stump 2001, Ackermann, Blevins, Maalouf 2009, Bearman, Corbett & Brown 2010). This development was made possible by the increasing importance taken by word-based models in morphology (Blevins 2013). Shifting from systems where a set of rules generate the inflected forms of a word from a base unit, to a model where the inflected forms are conceived as realizations of a lexeme, enabled the description of relationships between the forms of the lexemes and their grouping into sets of lexemes whose forms are in the same relations, that is to say, precisely, into paradigms.

For some years, the paradigmatic approach is gaining a growing support in the field of Word Formation (WF), essentially derivation. More and more work refers to it, as can be seen by referring to recent handbook articles on the issue (e.g. Stekauer 2014). The authors who are interested in the paradigmatic dimension of the derivation, or offering derivational paradigmatic models include (without claiming to be exhaustive) Van Marle 1985, Stump 1991, Bochner 1993 who introduces the notion of 'cumulative patterns', Bauer 1997, Pounder 2000, Booij 1997 and Hathout 2011, Roché & Plénat 2014.

In the wake of the word-based models (specifically in connection with the word and paradigm approach introduced by Blevins 2013), paradigmatic derivation is a response to the generative approach to WF and to their binary and oriented rules. Instead, paradigmatic models involve derivational relations that may be oriented both ways or have an unspecified direction (Jackendoff 1975 already challenged the unidirectionality of the WF rules). Moreover, these relations are not limited to base-derivative pairs.

In other words, in a paradigmatic perspective, the morphological paradigms are interconnected by more or less complex networks of words, reflecting the patterns of the many relations that each word has with the others. For a given word, these networks cluster into a derivational family.

The superposition of the derivational relations that make up these networks has been studied and modeled in terms of analogy (among others, see Skousen 1992, Blevins & Blevins 2009).

Derivational paradigms are characterized by several distinctive properties:

- the need for a strong meaning/form correlation
- the nature of the paradigmatic regularities, which (re)defines derivational canonicity
- the importance taken by derivational families and the fundamental question of their identity and their limits (unlike lexemes, families are open sets).

On the orthogonal dimension, we also have to figure out how morphological families are grouped into paradigms according to the properties shared by their matching relations. The paradigmatic conception of derivation leads us to define structures composed of partial and overlapping networks.

There is a good chance that the new way to perceive WF but also the structure of the lexicon, opened up by the notion of paradigm, will strongly boost the development of new models and lines of arguments, be they in descriptive or theoretical WF systems, in typological approaches to

morphology, in psycholinguistics, e.g. in language acquisition aspects, in natural language processing or in the framework of statistical modeling.

This workshop gives us the opportunity to discuss the recent advances on paradigms in Word Formation, particularly in derivation. Researches on any languages of the world are welcome, including, but not limited to, Indo-European, Semitic, Polysynthetic, etc. languages. Without claiming to be exhaustive, issues relevant to the workshop include the following questions:

- what does paradigmatic derivational morphology look like?
- what objects do we need to describe derivational paradigms?
- how are semantic and formal dimensions connected within derivational paradigms?
- what questions/issues/problems arise from the shift to paradigmatic Word Formation?

References

- Ackermann, Farrell, Blevins, James P. and Malouf, Robert (2009). "Parts and Wholes: implicative patterns in inflectional paradigms". *Analogy in Grammar*. Blevins, J. P. and Blevins, J. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 54-82.
- Baerman, M., Corbett, G. G., & Brown, D. P. (2010). *Defective Paradigms: Missing forms and what they tell us* (Vol. 163). Oxford University Press.
- Bauer, Laurie (1997). "Derivational Morphology". *Yearbook of Morphology 1996*. Booij, G. and van Marle, J. Dordrecht, Kluwer: 243-256.
- Blevins, James P. (2001). "Paradigmatic derivation." *Transactions of the Philological Society* **99**(2): 211-222.
- Blevins, James P. and Blevins, Juliette, Eds. (2009). *Analogy in grammar*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Blevins, James P. (2013). "Word-Based Morphology from Aristotle to Modern WP (Word and Paradigm Models)". *the Oxford Handbook of the History of Linguistics*. Allan, K. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 375-396.
- Booij, Geert (1997). "Autonomous morphology and paradigmatic relations " *Yearbook of Morphology 1996*: 35-53.
- Bochner, Harry (1993). *Simplicity in generative morphology*. Berlin / New York, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hathout, Nabil (2011). "Une analyse unifiée de la préfixation en anti-". *Des Unités Morphologiques au Lexique*. Roché, M. Paris, Hermès: 251-318.
- Jackendoff, Raymond (1975). "Morphological and semantic regularities in the lexicon." *Language* **51**: 639-671.
- Pounder, Amanda (2000). *Processes and Paradigms in Word Formation Morphology*. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Roché, Michel, & Plénat, Marc (2014). Le jeu des contraintes dans la sélection du thème présuffixal. In *Proceedings of the 4^e Congrès Mondial de Linguistique Française (CMLF 2014)*, pp. 1863-1878.
- Skousen, Royal (1992). *Analogy and Structure*. Dordrecht, Kluwer.
- Štekauer, Pavol (2014). "Derivational Paradigms". *The Oxford Handbook of Derivational Morphology*. Lieber, R. and Štekauer, P. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 354-369.
- Stump, Gregory (1991). "A Paradigm-Based Theory of Morphosemantic Mismatches." *Language* **67**(4): 675-725.
- Stump, Gregory (2001). *Inflectional Morphology: A Theory of Paradigm Structure*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- van Marle, Jaap (1985). *On the Paradigmatic Dimension of Morphological Creativity*. Dordrecht, Foris Publications.
- Wunderlich, Dieter and Fabri, Ray (1995). "Minimalist Morphology: An approach to Inflection." *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* **14**(2): 236-294.