## **Morphonotactics**

Katarzyna Dziubalska-Kołaczyk (School of English, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań),
Wolfgang U. Dressler (University of Vienna),

and Daniel Śledziński (Department of Linguistics, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań)

Fuzzy boundaries and interfaces have long been at the focus of interest of linguists. The morphology/phonology case received various solutions, ranging from complete overlap through total separation via a variety of intermediate steps. The approach represented in this paper is that of Dressler (1985, 1996, this conference), which shows affinity to such earlier stands as that of Baudouin de Courtenay and Kruszewski, the former being often referred to as the father of morphophonology.

The question of the paper is whether, in parallel to the patterns of interrelationships observed between morphological rules and phonological processes, there are relationally analogous patterns between morphological rules and phonotactic constraints. It will be investigated which criteria decide about the interaction, from among universal, typological and language–specific ones, and whether they are rather of a morphological or phonological nature. In particular, some morphonotactic patterns occurring in Polish, German and English will be confronted with the universal preferences for phonotactics formulated within Beats–and–Binding phonology (Dziubalska–Kołaczyk 2002, in press). We will look at the cases of:

- (a) morphology motivating marked phonotactics (forms occurring exclusively or by default in morphologically derived environments, e.g. E. cat+s; cap+s),
- (b) morphology repairing bad phonotactics, which can be called "preventive avoidance" (forms which allow for variants, e.g. P. willa 'villa' GEN will ~ will+i; mizdrzyć się 'to wheedle' IMP mizdrz się ~ mizdrz+yj),
- (c) phonotactics blocking morphological forms or operations (e.g. P. GEN  $d\dot{z}d\dot{z}u$  'drizzle'  $^*d\dot{z}d\dot{z}$  NOM),
- (d) cases of performance simplification and avoidance in existing marked forms (e.g. reductions, cf. G. tanz+st 'dance',  $2^{nd}$  PER SG  $\rightarrow$  [homophonous with] tanz+t  $3^{rd}$  PER SG; avoidance, cf. G. Du

 $r\ddot{o}ntg+st$  'you x-ray'  $\rightarrow Du$  machst ein Röntgen 'you do an x-ray',  $ge+r\ddot{o}ntg+t$  PAST  $\rightarrow ein$  Röntgen gemacht),

(e) phonotactically loaded morphological rules (DIM formation in P., e.g. *kot+ek* 'cat' vs. \**kotk*, *bar+ek* 'bar' although *bark* 'shoulder').

## References

Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1985 Morphonology. Ann Arbor: Karoma Press.

- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1996 A functionalist semiotic model of morphonology. In: R. Singh (ed.)

  \*Trubetzkoy's Orphan.\* Amsterdam: Benjamins. 67-83, 102-105.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. Morphonology as constrained interaction between Natural Morphology and Natural Phonology. This conference (PLM 2005).
- Dziubalska-Kołaczyk, Katarzyna. 2002. *Beats-and-Binding Phonology*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Dziubalska-Kołaczyk, Katarzyna. in press. Phonotactics of consonant clusters in the history of English. In Bertacca, Antonio (ed.). *Proceedings of the SLIN conference 2003*. University of Pisa: PLUS (Pisana Libraria Universitatis Studiorum).