Succinct Typology of Derivational Zero Affixes

Matthias Gerner
(Shanghai Jiaotong University)

Among the criteria that typologists provide to draw a distinction between inflectional and derivational affixes (Aronoff 2005: 160; Haspelmath 2002:71; Whaley 1997:121), only two appear reliable: the **productivity** of the affix and the **boundness** of its host. On this view, an inflection is an affix which is productive and whose host is bound, whereas a derivational affix is either unproductive or is attached to a host which is morphologically free.

I	Derivational affix:	host is bound and affix is unproductive;
II	Derivational affix:	host is free and affix is unproductive;
III	Derivational affix:	host is free and affix is productive;
IV	Inflectional affix:	host is bound and affix is productive.

⬩ **Type I:** Host is bound and zero affix is unproductive

In Warlpiri, product nominalizations are lexicalized verb roots for a limited number of verbs. As verb roots are bound, they only provide the input of morphological processes (Simpson 1983:207). Product nominalizations thus involve a derivative zero affix.

(1)

Verb root (bound)	Product Nominalization
jarda- 'sleep'	jarda-∅ 'a sleep', 'a nap'
kulu- 'fight'	kulu-∅ 'a fight', 'a combat'
wajili- 'chase'	wajili-∅ 'a chase'
wirlinyi- 'hunt'	wirlinyi-∅ a 'hunt'
yinka- 'laugh'	yinka-∅ 'a laughter'

⬩ **Type II:** Host is free and zero affix is unproductive

In Gayo (Austronesian, Indonesia), dynamic verbs roots are bound, whereas roots of stative and resultative verbs are morphologically free. Bound verb roots attach several prefixes, in particular the prefix *mu*-, which outputs controlling intransitive predicates, whereas free verb roots are either unmarked or marked by the prefix *mu*- in which case the verb becomes a dynamized intransitive predicate (Eades 2005:72-76, 154-159).

(2)

Verb root (bound)	Controlling Intransitive Predicate	Verb root (free)	Dynamized Intransitive Predicate
-tuh 'fall'	mu-tuh 'fall'	∅-tue 'old'	mu-tue 'get older'
-sôt 'answer'	mu-sôt 'answer'	∅-pesam 'warm'	mu-pesam 'get warmer'
-alak 'sweat'	m-alak 'sweat'	∅-beluh 'gone'	mu-beluh 'go away' (involuntarily)

Not every free verb root may attach *mu*-, for example verbs of emotion, which allow stative/dynamic interpretations, do not use *mu*- (Eades 2005:106-109). We therefore can posit a zero prefix ∅- that encodes stative/resultative meaning but only for verb roots that also take the prefix *mu*-.

⬩ **Type III:** Host is free and zero affix is productive

Almost all Russian verbs have imperfective/ perfective forms. The perfective form is encoded by one of 16 selective verb prefixes, while the absence of prefixes expresses the imperfective form. The absence of prefixes is a derivational zero prefix of type II. The purported zero prefix is associated with im-

(3)

Imperfective	Perfective	Gloss
∅-dyelat'	s-dyelat'	'do'
∅-chitat'	pro-chitat'	'read'
∅-pisat'	na-pisat'	'write'
∅-dumat'	po-dumat'	'think'
∅-gotovit'	pri-gotovit'	'cook'

perfective meaning, is productive and its host is free. For a small set of 14 nondirectional motion verbs, the verb root is free and actually underspecified for the distinction imperfective/perfective (Tolskaya 2014:8). This suggests that the host is morphologically unbound – independently of the imperfective zero prefix.

Within generative grammar, the Warlpiri zero suffix supports *weak lexicalism* ('derivative morphology takes place in the lexicon', Anderson 1992:70), whereas the Gayo and Russian zero prefixes are morphological processes outside the lexicon.

References:

Anderson, S. (1992). *A-Morphous Morphology*. Cambridge: CUP.

Aronoff, M. and K. Fudeman (2005). *What is morphology*? Oxford: Blackwell.

Eades, D. (2005). *A grammar of Gayo*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Haspelmath, M. (2002). *Understanding morphology*. London: Arnold.

Simpson, J. H. (1983). *Aspects of Warlpiri Morphology and Syntax*. PhD diss., MIT.

Tolskaya, I. (2014). Verbal prefixes in Russian. *Journal of Linguistics* **51**, 1-31.