Shishir Bhattacharja

University of Dhaka, Bangladesh, and
National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics, Tokyo, Japan

All that French words like *bijouterie* tell us about diachronic morphology

For most models of morphology words have internal hierarchical structure constituted of smaller units labelled as *morpheme, stem, affix,* etc., and changes in morphology necessarily consist in the evolution of these units. In this article, we try to show how W(hole) W(ord) M(orphology) (elaborated in Ford et al. 1997), a model which claims that no morphological operation needs to involve units smaller than the word, accounts for diachronic morphology. For WWM, only W(ord) F(ormation) S(trategies) like (1) represent morphology, and each WFS has to be licensed by a set of semantically related pairs of words showing the same i) formal contrast and ii) categorical affiliation. For example, words like *laiterie* were attested as early as 13th century, and we assume that (1) was licensed by a set of word-pairs like (1a) and (1b).

1. $/XC/_N \leftrightarrow /XC\text{əʁi}/_N$ 'place where /XC/ is made or sold'
a. *lait* /lɛt/ 'milk' $\leftrightarrow$ *laiterie* /lɛtəʁi/ 'dairy' (attested in 1285)
b. *fruit* /fʁɥit/ 'fruit' $\leftrightarrow$ *fruiterie* /fʁɥitəʁi/ 'fruit store'(attested in 1315)

A good number of French words underwent apocope between 11th and 15th centuries (see Fouché 1961), and as a consequence, we assume, (2) emerged as a new WFS. For some reason or other words like *graineterie* /gʁɛntəʁi/ 'seed shop' were formed, again we assume, by mapping *graine* /gʁɛn/ 'grain' onto (2) rather than (1). As words like *graine* end in a closed coda, (3) emerged as a new WFS. It is possible that *bijouterie* was formed with (3).

2. $/XV/_N \leftrightarrow /XVtəʁi/_N$ 'place where /XV/ is made or sold'
a. *lait* /lɛ/ 'milk' $\leftrightarrow$ *laiterie* /lɛtəʁi/ 'dairy'
b. *fruit* /fʁɥi/ 'fruit' $\leftrightarrow$ *fruiterie* /fʁɥitəʁi/ 'fruit store'

3. $/X/_N \leftrightarrow /Xtəʁʁi/_N$ 'place where /X/ is made or sold'
a. *graine* /gʁɛn/ 'grain' $\leftrightarrow$ *graineterie* /gʁɛntəʁi/ 'seed shop' (attested in 1660)
b. *lait* /lɛ/ 'milk' $\leftrightarrow$ *laiterie* /lɛtəʁi/ 'dairy'
c. *bijou* /biʒu/ 'ornament' $\leftrightarrow$ *bijouterie* /biʒutəʁi/ 'jeweller's shop' (attested in 17th)

If a WFS is licensed with a few pairs only (e.g. (4)), and no new words are formed with it, we can call it a 'dormant' WFS. Such WFSs run the risk of death, but this does not mean that every dormant WFS must die, because the number of pairs that license a WFS may increase (or decrease) in different periods of time (see Bauer 2001:9 for similar cases). However, when a WFS cannot be licensed with a minimum number of two pairs (e.g. (5)), the WFS dies or disappears from the morphological module. Once 'dead', no WFS can resurrect unless it can be motivated by a set of adequate pairs of words.

4. $/XC_{+ \text{ Palatal}}/_N \leftrightarrow /XC_{+ \text{ Palatal}}e/_N$ 'who deals with $/XC_{+ \text{ Palatal}}/$'
a. *fromage* /fʁomaʒ/ 'cheese' $\leftrightarrow$ *fromager* /fʁomaʒe/ 'cheese maker'
b. *horloge* /ɔʁlɔʒ/ 'clock' $\leftrightarrow$ *horloger* /ɔʁlɔʒe/ 'clock or watch maker'

5. */XCɛt/$_N$ ↔ /XCtje /$_N$ 'X-tree'

noisette /nwazet/ 'hazelnut' ↔ *noisetier* /nwaztje/ 'hazel' (1530)

WWM proposes an alternative view of diachronic morphology consisting of death and birth of WFSs following the phonological, semantic and categorical changes the words of their licensing pairs undergo between two periods of time. As a consequence, the total morphological network motivated by the lexicons of two different periods cannot be constituted of the same WFSs.

We compare the WWM account with other possible (following among others Aronoff 1976, Kiparsky 1996, Lieber 1992) and existing analyses (e.g. Hatzfeld et al. 1924, Bloomfield 1933, Hockett 1958, Stein 1971, Mel'cuk 1993, 2000, Pagliano 2003) of the same words. In this article we have tried to show that: i) it is possible to account for diachronic morphology without postulating categories smaller than the word, and ii) there are cases like the formation of doublets (e.g. *grainetier/grainier* 'seed-merchant') that can be better handled in WWM as compared to other competing models.

References

Aronoff, Mark. 1976. *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge:MIT Press,
Bauer, Laurie. 2001. *Morphological productivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Bloomfield, Leonard. 1984 [1933]. *Language*. New York: Henry Holt.
Ford, Alan, Singh, Rajendra and Martohardjono, Gita. 1997. *Pace Panini, towards a word-based theory of morphology.* New York: Peter Lang.
Fouché, P. 1961. *Phonétique Historique du Français*. Paris: Klincksieck.
Hatzfeld, A., Darmesteter, A., Thomas, A., 1924. *Dictionnaire Général de la Langue Française du Commencement du XVIIe siècle jusqu'à nos jours, Traité de la Formation de la Langue* (t.1 et 2). Paris: Delagrave.
Hockett, Charle F. 1958. *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New York:Macmillan.
Kiparsky, Paul. 1996. Allomorphy or Morphophonology. *Trubetzkoy's orphan*. Rajendra Singh (ed.), 13-31. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Lieber Rochelle. 1992. *Deconstructing morphology: word formation in syntactic theory*, The University of Chicago press, Chicago and London.
Mel'cuk, Igor, 1993, 2000. *Cours de Morphologie Générale*, vol-1 (1993) and vol-5 (2000). Montréal : La Presse de l'Université de Montréal.
Pagliano, Claudine. 2003. *Epenthèse consonantique en Français. Ce que la syntaxe, la sémantique et la morphologie peuvent faire à la phonologie*. Ph.D. dissertation. Université de Nice.
Stein, G. 1971. La dérivation française et le problème des consonnes intercalaires. *Cahier de Lexicologie* XVIII -1, 43-64.

Shishir.bhattacharja@gmail.com

Total number of words in the text: 472