

SLAVIC COMPOUNDS AND ACATEGORIAL ROOTS

Background: There is broad consensus in Distributed Morphology that roots are acategorical (Josefsson 1995, 1997, 1998, 2001, Marantz 1997, 2001, Arad 2003, o.a.) and acquire a label in syntax as a result of merger with *n*, *v* or *a* functional heads, which can be phonologically null and whose grammatical content defines a nominal, verbal or adjectival domain.

Compounding has been taken as a type of word-building mechanism where evidence can be found for the use of acategorical roots (Harley 2009, De Belder 2011, 2017, Steddy 2019). So De Belder argues that a subtype of Dutch primary compounds involves an acategorical non-head, and Steddy claims that an acategorical non-head of a compound entails an idiosyncratic relationship between the two members of the compound.

This talk: Taking the rationale that the strongest empirical case in deliberating for or against the root-hypothesis is to probe into the relevant data in morphologically robust languages, we examine several types of compounds in Russian (R) and Serbo-Croat (SC) and conclude that none of them offer clear evidence for acategorical roots.

Inflection: Like Polish (Szymanek 2009), neither R nor SC have phrasal compounds: the first member (M_1) and the second member (M_2) are always syntactic heads rather than phrases. Their landscape, however, is very complex as their characteristics are intertwined: internally they can be **interfixed** (vowel-linked) (1)-(2) or **non-interfixed** (3)-(4), whereas structurally they can be **exocentric** ((1b-d), (4)); the declension class of the total is generally determined by M_2 ; exceptions will be discussed in the talk), **parasyntetic** (combining compounding with derivation, (2)), or **endocentric** (1a), (3b,c).

- | | | | |
|-----|----|---|------|
| (1) | a. | <i>krv-o-tok</i> ‘bloodstream’ ← <i>krv</i> ‘blood’ + <i>tok</i> ‘stream’ | SC |
| | b. | <i>plav-o-ok</i> ‘blue-eyed’ ← <i>plav</i> ‘blue’ + <i>ok(o)</i> ‘eye’ | SC |
| | c. | <i>jedn-o-rog</i> ‘unicorn’ ← <i>jedan</i> ‘one’ + <i>rog</i> ‘horn’ | SC |
| | d. | <i>volk-o-dav</i> ‘wolfhound’ ← <i>volk</i> ‘wolf’ + <i>-dav-</i> ‘press.ROOT’ | R |
| (2) | a. | <i>oč-e-vid-ac</i> ‘witness’ ← <i>oči</i> ‘eyes’ + <i>-vid-</i> ‘see.ROOT’ + <i>-ac-</i> (-er.AGT) | SC |
| | b. | <i>viš-e-bož-ac</i> ‘polytheist’ ← <i>-viš-</i> ‘higher’ + <i>bog</i> ‘god’ + <i>-ac-</i> (-er.AGT) | |
| | c. | <i>odn-o-obrazie</i> ‘uniformity’ ← <i>-odn-</i> ‘one’ + <i>-ob.raz-</i> ‘form’ + <i>-ij-</i> ‘-ness’ | R |
| | d. | <i>sam-o-ljub-ie</i> ‘amour-propre’ ← <i>sam</i> ‘self’ + <i>-ljub-</i> ‘love.ROOT’ + <i>-ij-</i> ‘-ness’ | |
| (3) | a. | <i>rak-rana</i> ‘greatest problem’ ← <i>rak</i> ‘cancer’ + <i>rana</i> ‘wound’ | SC |
| | b. | <i>žar-ptica</i> ‘Firebird’ ← <i>žar</i> ‘ember, heat’ + <i>ptica</i> ‘bird’ | SC/R |
| | c. | <i>šstorm-trap</i> ‘jacob’s ladder’ ← <i>šstorm</i> ‘sea storm’ + <i>trap</i> ‘ship/plane ladder’ | R |
| (4) | a. | <i>seci-kesa</i> ‘cut-purse’ ← <i>-sek-</i> ‘cut.ROOT’ + <i>kesa</i> ‘purse’ | SC |
| | b. | <i>perekati-pole</i> ‘tumbleweed’ ← <i>-pere.kat-</i> ‘roll over.ROOT’ + <i>pole</i> ‘field’ | R |

Interfixed compounds argue against treating M_1 as acategorical. If M_1 is a noun (1a), (2a), an adjective (1b), (2b), a numeral (1c), (2c), or a pronoun (2d), it is followed by a linking vowel [o] (turning to [e] after palatalized consonants (2a,b)). However, when M_1 is a verbal root (4), it must be inflected as an imperative (morphologically distinct from both the bare root and the infinitive). This [$\pm V$] juxtaposition clearly shows that M_1 is not devoid of lexical category. Furthermore, interfixed compounds may be interpreted idiosyncratically (1c,d), (2b), showing that a categorized M_1 is no impediment for special meaning (contra Steddy). Parasyntetic interfixed compounds like (2a,b), which suggest categorial underdeterminacy (M_2 can be a noun or a verb), cannot be taken as an independent argument for acategorical roots as the same lack of category-sensitivity is attested for these suffixes outside of compounding (5).

- | | | | |
|-----|----|---|----|
| (5) | a. | <i>bel-ac</i> ‘white person’ ← <i>bel</i> ‘white’ | SC |
| | b. | <i>bor-ac</i> ‘fighter’ ← <i>boriti se</i> ‘to fight’ | |
| | c. | <i>bosan-ac</i> ‘Bosnian’ ← <i>Bosnia</i> ‘Bosnia’ | |

A subset of exocentric interfixed compounds may be taken to argue for the lack of category for M_2 too, as M_2 can be a noun (1a-c) or a verb (1d), (6). Firstly, however, nominalization by truncation is available as an independent option (7). Secondly, ablauts, which occur for some

verbal M_2 (6) and are impossible for a nominal M_2 , indicate the presence of a phonologically null nominalizer (as in truncated nominalizations (7a)). Thirdly, such deverbal compounding always yields masculine nouns of the declension class I (the root *-pis-* is an exception in R), which never happens when M_2 is a noun of another declension class.

- (6) a. *živ-o-děr* ‘knacker’ ← *-živ-* ‘alive’ + *-děr-* ‘tear’ R
 b. *sam-o-gon* ‘moonshine’ ← *sam* ‘self’ + *-gŭn-* ‘chase.ROOT’
- (7) a. *gon* ‘rut’, GEN.SG: *gona* ← *gnati* ‘to chase’ ([[gŭn-a_{TH}]-t_{INF}]) ‘to chase’ R
 b. *zakat* ‘sundown’ ← *zakati* ([[[[za_{PFX}.kat_V]_V-i_{TH}]-t_{INF}]-s_{REFL}]) ‘to roll behind’
 c. *ispad* ‘disorderly conduct’ ← *izpadati* [[[iz_{PFX}-pad_V]_V-a_{TH}]-t_{INF}] ‘to fall out’ SC

Non-interfixed compounds fall into two independent categories, both with a nominal M_1 . *Dvandva* compounds like (8) are semantically intersective and involve two clear nouns characterized by nominal declension. *Non-declining compounds* like (9) (Shagalova 2003, Yanovich 2006, Kapatsinski and Vakareliyska 2013 for R, see Bidwell 1969, Surdučki 1978 for SC), productively have nominal loanwords as M_1 (these are independently used as nouns) but neither adjectival nor verbal ones. Furthermore, while typically, in both R and SC, M_1 belongs to the Class I masculine noun declension, characterized by a zero ending in the nominative, in some cases (9), (10) the nominative *-a* of feminine Class II nouns in M_2 clearly shows that M_2 is not a root (a root would be consonant-final). Irrespective of whether *-a* is treated as a declension class marker or a case marker, M_1 is an element with a category label. We will show that the non-productive and idiosyncratic cases exemplified in (3) can be assimilated to (9).

- (8) s *izboj-* *čitalnež* ‘with a village library & reading room’ R
 with log cabin.INS reading-room.INS
- (9) bez *data-* *štampa* ‘without a timestamp’ R
 without date.NOM stamp.GEN (NOM.SG: *data* ‘date’, GEN.SG: *daty*, ROOT: *-dat-*)
- (10) iz *lutka-* *filma* ‘from a puppet movie’ SC
 from doll.NOM movie.GEN (NOM: *lutka* ‘doll’, GEN: *lutke*, ROOT: *-lut-* + *-k-* (dim.))

Special cases: Cases like (11) are different in that there is only one accent. However, a single accent does not indicate the lack of a lexical category for M_1 : M_1 in (11a-c) are derived or inflected nouns or adjectives. In the extremely rare cases (Vinogradov 1999) where a verbal M_1 is followed by the interfix *-o-* to create an adjective (12) or a noun exocentrically (13) or parasynthetically (14), we suggest that M_1 is a null-derived noun (cf. (7)). As (3) and (11)-(14) are non-productive and often synchronically opaque (note the reversed modern R forms in (13a, d) and the dialectal nature of the motivating verb in (12a)), they cannot be used as primary evidence for acategorical roots in any case.

- (11) a. *svrsishodan* ‘purposeful’ ← *svrha* ‘purpose’, DAT: *svrsi* + *shodan* ‘fitting’ SC
 b. *čuvárkuća* ‘Easter egg’, ‘houseleek’ ← *čúvar* ‘watchman.AGT’ + *kùća* ‘house’
 c. *Djurdjjevdan* ‘St. George’s day’ ← *Djurdj-ev* ‘George-POSS’ + *dan* ‘day’
 d. *dàngubiti* ‘to waste time’ ← *dan* ‘day’ + *gubiti* ‘lose’
 e. *starmal* ‘young and old’ ← *star* ‘old’ + *mal* ‘small’
- (12) a. *lup-o-glaz-yj* ‘pop-eyed’ ← *lupati* ‘to blink (dial.)’ + *glaz* ‘eye’ R
 b. *puč-e-glaz-yj* ‘goggle-eyed’ ← *pučiti* ‘to expand from within’ + ‘eye’
- (13) a. *liz-o-bljud* ‘lick-spittle’ ← *lizati* ‘to lick’ + *bljudo* ‘dish’ (cf. also *bljudoliz*)
 b. *ščelk-o-pěr* ‘scribbler’ ← *ščelkati* ‘to click’ + *pero* ‘feather, quill’
 c. *vert-o-prax* ‘flibbertigibbet’ ← *verteti* ‘to turn’ + *prax* ‘dust, ashes’
 d. *skal-o-zub* ‘scoffer’ (arch., the modern form is *zuboskal*) ← *skaliti* ‘to bare (of teeth only)’ + *zub* ‘tooth’
- (14) *triasoguzka* ‘wagtail’ ← *trⁱasti* ‘to shake’ + *guzno* ‘butt’ + *-k-* (diminutive)

Conclusion: Slavic compounds, irrespective of the presence of an interfix or a derivational suffix, offer no evidence for acategorial roots. Time permitting we will discuss whether such category-neutral derivational suffixes as in (2a-b) and (5) do.

REFERENCES

- Arad, Maya. 2003. Locality constraints on the interpretation of roots: the case of Hebrew denominal verbs. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21, pp. 737-778.
- Bidwell, Charles E. 1969. Two morpho-syntactic patterns in Serbo-Croatian. *Language* 45, pp. 31-34.
- De Belder, Marijke. 2011. Roots and affixes: Eliminating lexical categories from syntax, Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht University.
- De Belder, Marijke. 2017. The root and nothing but the root: primary compounds in Dutch. *Syntax* 20, pp. 138-169.
- Harley, Heidi. 2009. Compounding in Distributed Morphology. In *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*, ed. by Rochelle Lieber and Pavol Štekauer, pp. 129-144. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Josefsson, Gunlög. 1995. The notion of word class and the internal makeup of words. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 56, pp. 1-45.
- Josefsson, Gunlög. 1997. *On the Principles of Word Formation in Swedish*. Lundastudier i nordisk språkvetenskap A 51. Lund: Lund University Press.
- Josefsson, Gunlög. 1998. *Minimal Words in a Minimal Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Josefsson, Gunlög. 2001. The meaning of lexical classes. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 24, pp. 218-231.
- Kapatsinski, Vsevolod and Cynthia Vakareliyska. 2013. [N[N]] compounds in Russian: A growing family of constructions. *Constructions and Frames* 5, pp. 69-87.
- Marantz, Alec. 1997. No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon. In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*, ed. by Alexis Dimitriadis, Laura Siegel, Clarissa Surek-Clark, and Alexander Williams. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 4.2, pp. 201-225. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Penn Linguistics Club.
- Marantz, Alec. 2001. Words. Paper presented at *WCCFL 20*, University of Southern California, Los Angeles
- Shagalova, E.N. 2003. Типы семантических отношений между компонентами в определительных композитах [Types of semantic relations between components in attributive compounds]. In *Компьютерная лингвистика и интеллектуальные технологии. Труды международной конференции Диалог'2003 [Computational linguistics and intellectual technologies: Proceedings of the International Conference "Dialogue 2003"]*. Moscow. Available at <http://www.dialog-21.ru/media/2687/shagalova.pdf>.
- Steddy, Sam. 2019. Compounds, composability, and morphological idiosyncrasy. *The Linguistic Review* 36, pp. 453-483.
- Surdučki, Milan. 1978. Noun compounding by juxtaposition in Serbo-Croatian. *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes* 20, pp. 398-404.
- Szymanek, Bogdan. 2009. IE, Slavonic: Polish. In *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*, ed. by Rochelle Lieber and Pavol Štekauer, pp. 464-477. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vinogradov, V. V. 1999. Вертопрах и шелкопёр [Vertoprax 'flibbertigibbet' and ščelkopër 'scribbler']. In *История слов [The History of Words]: Вертопрах и шелкопёр [Vertoprax 'flibbertigibbet' and ščelkopër 'scribbler']*, pp. 77-79. Moscow: Russian language institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Yanovich, E.I. 2006. Англоязычные лексические заимствования как словообразовательный ресурс современной русской речи (к вопросу о неологических тенденциях развития языка) [English-language lexical borrowings as a word-formation resource of modern Russian speech (on the question of

neological tendencies of language development)]. *Языки мира — в мир языков* [Language of the world into the world of languages] 1, pp. 71-81.

ABBREVIATIONS

AGT:	agentive suffix
DAT:	dative
GEN:	genitive
INF:	infinitive
INS:	instrumental
M ₁ /M ₂	the first/second root or stem in a compound
PFX:	prefix
POSS:	possessive
R:	Russian
REFL:	reflexive
SC:	Serbo-Croat
TH:	thematic suffix