Paradigms in derivational morphology
Camiel Hamans
UAM, Poznań

chamans@wa.amu.edu.pl
hamans@telfort.nl

The aim of this paper is to show how paradigms may function in derivational morphology and how they may give rise to productive processes of word formation. This will be done by discussing a few types of examples from English, Dutch and French, that are normally considered as marginal.

Traditionally paradigms are considered to be an inherent part of inflectional morphology. Within inflectional paradigms there appears only one major instance of language change: Ausgleich or paradigmatic levelling. However, in derivational morphology paradigms and language change may go hand in hand, especially when it comes to recent processes of word formation which so far were seen as quite uncommon, extra grammatical (Doleschal & Thornton 2000) and even irregular, such as *clipping on –o* in English, French, Dutch and some other languages or *lib fixing* (Zwicky 2010).

A few examples may show how the processes work. First trochaic clipping on *–o*.

(1) French	(2) English	(3) Dutch
aristo < artistocrate	psycho <psychopath	aso < asociaal
ado < adolescent	dipso <dipsomaniac	Indo <Indonesisch
Sarko< Sarkozy	nympho<nymphomaniac	provo<provocateur

According to Zabrocki (1980) speakers of these languages recognised a common part in these paradigms, the so called *confusivum*, which is here *–o*. This common segment may be used after other clipped forms not ending themselves in *–o*.

(4) proll+o < proletarien	(5) journ+o< journalist	(6) frust+o<gefrustreerd
metall+o < metallurgist	garb+o < garbage man	real+o <realist

A following step in this productive pattern is *'suffixing –o after non clipped forms'*, whereby the suffix *–o* means 'a person who is X':

(7) follo < foux/folle 'mad'	(8) dumbo < dumb	(9) lullo < lul 'penis'

Via *lib fixing*, or *secretion* as this phenomenon is called by Jespersen (1922:384), an element of a non complex form is 'liberated'. At the moment the lib fix becomes part of a new paradigm it may become a productive derivational segment, most often a suffix-like segment. Warren (1990) and others call such a segment a *combining form*. An example from English will show how this process works.

>   (10) entertainment

In this non complex form speakers recognize a part *enter*, which for instance appears also as a confusivum in the verb *enter*, since *entertainment* and *enter* are part of a list, or paradigm of forms starting with *enter*.

>   (11) enter
>   entertainment

enterprise

Since the words of this list share a common part or confusivum *enter*, speakers may think that *entertainment* and *enterprise* are complex forms, which means that *–tainment* and *-prise* also must have a certain morphological status. So *–tainment* could start a career as a libfix and became productive in a new paradigm such as

(12) docutainment
     edutainment
     musitainment
     relitainment
     militainment

Lib fixing not necessarily has to start with a list of forms with a common confusivum. Reanalysis of opaque forms as if they were complex forms or a syntagma, as Marchand (1969: 2) would call this process, also is a source for new libfixes. However, a lib fix only becomes productive when it can be used in a derivational paradigm. See for instance the opaque French form *panorama*, borrowed from Greek, which has been reanalysed as consisting of two parts *pan* and *─(o)rama*

(13) panorama
(13a) diorama
      cyclorama
      etc.

Another source for new libfixes comes from reanalysing successful blends as example (14) shows

(14) daycation   from day + vacation
      staycation
      graycation
      praycation
(14a) girlcation
      mancation.

It will be clear that the difference between example (12) in which a common confusivum is supposed to be the basis of the change and example (14) where reanalysis of a productive blend pattern is considered to be the starting point of the new process, is not self-evident.

Conclusion
However, what both examples, trochaic clipping and lib fixing, show is that paradigmatic language change leads to new derivational processes.

References

    Doleschal, Ursula and Anna Thornton (eds) 2000. *Extragrammatical and marginal morphology*. München: Lincom.
    Hamans, Camiel 1996. A lingo of abbrevs. In: *Lingua Posnaniensis* 38, 69-78.
    Hamans, Camiel 2009. Het belang van paradigmatische productiviteit. Over blends, clippings en andere oddities. Ronny Boogaart, Josien Lalleman, Marijke Mooijaart & Marijke van der Wal (eds) *Woorden wisselen. Voor Ariane van Santen bij haar afscheid van de Leidse universiteit.* Leiden: Stichting Neerlandistiek Leiden, p. 37-51.

Hamans, Camiel 2013. Historical word-formation caught in the present – changes in modern usage. Jacek Fisiak & Magdalena Bator (eds.), *Historical English Word-Formation and Semantics*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, p. 299-324.

Jespersen, Otto 1922. *Language its nature development and origin*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Marchand, Hans 1969. *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation*. Second, completely revised and enlarged edition. München: C.H. Beck.

Warren, Beatrice 1990. The importance of combining forms. Wolfgang U. Dressler, Hans C. Luschützky, Oskar E. Pfeiffer and John R. Rennison (Eds.). *Contemporary Morphology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 111-132.

Zabrocki, Ludwik 1980 = 1967-9. Phonologie und distinktive Morphologie. Ludwik Zabrocki, *U podstaw struktury i rozwoju języka, At the Foundation of Language Structure and Development.* Warsawa – Poznań: Pań stwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe: 105-112.
Zwicky, Arnold 2010. Libfixes. Arnold Zwicky's Blog.
arnoldzwicky.org/2010/01/23/libfixes