Cross-linguistic research into derivational networks

Danišovce, Slovakia

27-29 April 2017

1. Layout and structure of chapters with obligatory content areas for all contributors
2. Finalization of semantic categories
3. Affixoids, polysemy, hyponymy and semantic transfer
4. Discussion by groups (related languages)
5. Time schedule for project implementation; miscellaneous

3. **Affixoids, polysemy,** hyponymy **and semantic transfer**
   (Agreement on methods and theoretical principles)

Basic principles of classification of derived words

Only **affixed** words (including circumfixation, prefixal-suffixal derivation, infixation), i.e. no conversion, back-formation or compounding.

.

The semantic category is identified on the basis of the last word-formation process, i.e. on the basis of the affix attached in the most recent derivational step

…

· **Degrees of morphotactic transparency**

      e.g.   Derivatives that are not clearly *felt* to be derivatives

            Sp.   *padecer / (un) pac**iente***

                     *rastro / rastr**illo***

                     *red / red**ada***

                     *regla / regul**ar***

· Affixoids or productive semi-affixes (and combining forms?)

e.g.　　Ic.　　*-lendi* (neut., from *land*)　*-rækni* (fem.)

-lífi (neut., from *life*)　　*-hafi* (masc., from *have*)

Ger.　　*-los*, as in *zahnlos* 'toohless'

Include affixoids, provided they are identified from established affixes along certain parameters?

If, as in Ic., they are numerous and of various types, they may be included pending later confirmation that they are relevant (maybe present them in the final chapters, if they are well described and differentiated).

By contrast, German excluded them as instances of compounding.

· **Polysemy**

· All the semantic categories represented by an affix attached to a particular word-base should be recorded. However:

> Metaphorical/metonymical meanings are excluded because they are not systematic
>
> No semantic shifts are recorded unless the polysemy/homonymy represent the core meanings of a word-formation rule.

> Thus, irrespectively of whether it is polysemy or homonymy, various senses should be listed
>> e.g. En. *-er*   both INSTRUMENT and AGENT should be included.
>> *-al*   both PROCESS and RESULT should be included
>> (listed twice: under two different semantic categories)
>
> i.e.
> 'Semantic shifts should be taken into consideration only if they represent and are the meaning triggering the derivation, regardless of theoretical arguments on homonymy or polysemy'.

· **Homonymy**

e.g. Ic.   *gefa*^{V} 'give'   yields   *gef-andi*^{N} 'giver'
gefandi^{Adj} 'giving'

Hence, one entry or one level:

1A: *gefa*^{V} *gef-and*.DER-*i*.INFL (N, A), 'giver, giving'

or two:

1A: giver
1B: giving

Focus is on what semantics is expressed by the process of affixation and affixes are relevant insofar as they mediate semantics.
What matters is what meaning is expressed by the process of affixation, not by which affix.
Option two (separate entries per meaning) is proposed for representation of all the semantic categories that are systematically expressed.

· **Homonymy of past participles vs. adjectives**

        e.g.   En.   *baked*

In principle, they should not be included because the *adjective* is **converted** from the corresponding past participle.

I.e. there is no affixation, unless we postulate a separate process of formation of *-ed* adjectives in English.

If the situation in a particular language is different, the relevant consideration must be language-specific.