

Similarities and differences between inflectional and derivational paradigms: individual languages and beyond

Lívía Körtevélyessy and Pavol Štekauer (P.J. Šafárik University, Košice, Slovakia)

The notion of paradigm was almost exclusively discussed within the field of inflectional morphology. Blevins (2012) clearly demonstrates that the treatment of inflectional morphology on the basis of the concept of paradigm has had a very long tradition dating back to Aristotelian times. This concept became firmly established in grammatical descriptions of (mainly) European inflectional languages (cf. Matthews' (1972) discussion of the Word-and-Paradigm model). Especially since the second half of the 20th century it has become an object of extensive theoretical considerations reflected in new models of paradigmatic relations, for example, Anderson's *Extended Word and Paradigm* model (1982) and his *A-Morphous Morphology* (1992), and the model of *Paradigm Function Morphology* (Stump 2001). Furthermore, new perspectives and directions of systematic research were identified, such as the issues of defective paradigms (e.g., Baerman, Corbett, Brown 2010) and typological research into paradigmatic relations (e.g., Corbett 2015).

Contrary to this long 'paradigmatic' tradition in inflectional morphology, the idea of paradigmatic nature of derivational morphology has, for a long time, been subject to mistrust. This situation was caused, among other things, by an established belief that derivational morphology – in contrast to inflectional morphology and syntax – is irregular, fraught with idiosyncrasies, and far less productive than inflectional morphology (cf. Chomsky 1970).

In fact, an inherent part of almost all discussions of the differences between inflection and derivation used to be the claim that inflectional morphology is paradigmatic while derivational morphology is not. As admitted by van Marle (1985: 14), "the relationships between elements in absentia are not a 'popular' field of investigation" not only in the generative rule-based tradition of word-formation. Plank (1994: 1672) maintains that inflectional categories form "a more or less closed system, being alternatively realized by a limited number of terms", while derivational categories are "not part of any well-organized categorial system," and Dressler (1989: 8) assumes that inflectional morphology "is typically organized in paradigms... whereas the paradigmatic organization of DM [derivational morphology] ... is much weaker."

Parallel to the traditional belief of irregularity and unpredictability of derivational morphology and, by implication, of the peripheral position of derivational paradigms, there are views postulating the paradigmatic nature of word-formation in accordance with Stump's (1991: 710) assumption that "there can be no principled objection to the notion of a derivational paradigm..." and that "many of the arguments that motivate the postulation of paradigms in the inflectional domain have straightforward analogues in the domain of derivation" (Stump 2005: 65). From a different perspective, van Marle (1994: 2929) does not accept the view that "paradigmatics is of little or no importance to derivational morphology. The only conclusion which is justified is that in derivation paradigmatic structure it may manifest itself in a fundamentally different way from the way it does in inflection."

These views were given strong support from recent research (e.g., Bauer 1997, Beecher 2004, Furdík 2004, Pounder 2006, Booij 2008, Štekauer 2014). Both theoretical considerations and models of derivational paradigms show that derivational paradigm is a well-defined concept that should not be perceived with skepticism.

Thus, given the fact that both inflectional and derivational paradigms are **paradigms** they necessarily share some fundamental features, such as regularity, systematicity, functionality, i.e., formally realized grammatical/semantic categories, pattern-like nature, restriction to affixation processes, etc. The fundamental difference as stated by Bauer (1997) and Štekauer (2014) is the crucial role of potential words in derivational paradigms vs. actual units in inflectional morphology. In other words, the existing gaps in derivational paradigms can be filled in by means of regularly formed potential words.

This general situation determines the focus and the main topics of the proposed workshop:

- similarities and differences between paradigms in inflectional morphology and derivational morphology
- typological aspects of research into morphological paradigms
- problems of paradigms in individual languages

References:

- Anderson, Stephen R. 1982. "Where's Morphology." *Linguistic Inquiry* 13, 571-612.
Anderson, Stephen R. 1992. *A-Morphous Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Baerman M, Corbett GG, Brown DP. (2010) *Defective Paradigms: missing forms and what they tell us*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beecher, Henry. 2004. Derivational Paradigm in Word Formation. <http://pdfcast.org/pdf/research-paper-i-derivational-paradigm-in-word-formation>.
- Blevins, James P. 2013. Word-based morphology from Aristotle to modern WP'. In K. Allan (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Linguistics*. OUP, §16: 375–396.
- Blevins, James P. 2015 “Inflectional paradigms.” In M. Baerman (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Inflection*. OUP, §5: 87–111.
- Booij, Geert E. 2008. Paradigmatic morphology, in Bernard Fradin (ed.), *La raison morphologique. Hommage à la mémoire de Danielle Corbin*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 29-38.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1970. “Remarks on Nominalization.” In: R. Jacobs, and P. Rosenbaum (eds.), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*. Waltham, MA: Ginn, 184-221.
- Corbett GG. (2015) “Morphosyntactic complexity: a typology of lexical splits.” 91 Edition. *LSA Language*, 1, pp. 145-193.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1989. “Prototypical Differences between Inflection and Derivation.” *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 42, 3-10.
- Furdík, Juraj. 2004. *Slovenská slovotvorba*. Prešov: Náuka.
- Marle, Jaap van 1985. *On the Paradigmatic Dimension of Morphological Creativity*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Marle, Jaap van. 1994. “Paradigms.” In: R. E. Asher (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 6, 2927-2930
- Matthews, Peter H. 1972. *Inflectional Morphology: A theoretical study based on aspects of Latin verb conjugation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Plank, Frans. 1994. “Inflection and Derivation.” In: R. E. Asher and J. M. Y. Simpson (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 3. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1671-1678.
- Pounder, Amanda. 2000. *Processes and Paradigms in Word-Formation Morphology*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Štekauer, P. 2014. “Derivational paradigms.” In: Lieber, R. – Štekauer, P. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Derivational Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 354-369.
- Stump, Gregory T. (1991). “A Paradigm-Based Theory of Morphosemantic Mismatches.” *Language* 67, 675-725.