

Linguistic Society of America

Review: [untitled]

Author(s): D. Terence Langendoen

Reviewed work(s):

The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation by Hans Marchand
Source: *Language*, Vol. 47, No. 3 (Sep., 1971), pp. 708-710

Published by: Linguistic Society of America

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/412387>

Accessed: 12/05/2009 12:08

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=lsa>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Linguistic Society of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Language*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

REFERENCES

- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- DECAMP, DAVID. 1958. The genesis of the Old English dialects: a new hypothesis. *Lg.* 34.232-45.
- FILLMORE, CHARLES. 1966. *Toward a modern theory of case*. Project on Linguistic Analysis, Report 13, pp. 1-24. Columbus: Ohio State University.
- . 1968. The case for case. *Universals in linguistic theory*, ed. by E. Bach and R. Harms, 1-91. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- FRIES, CHARLES C. 1940. On the development of the structural use of word order in modern English. *Lg.* 16.199-208.
- KUHN, SHERMAN M. 1961. On the syllabic phonemes of Old English. *Lg.* 37.522-38.
- , and RANDOLPH QUIRK. 1953. Some recent interpretations of Old English digraph spellings. *Lg.* 29.143-57.
- LAKOFF, GEORGE. 1966. *Stative adjectives and verbs in English*. Mimeographed.
- SOUTHWORTH, JAMES G. 1954. *Verses of cadence: an introduction to the prosody of Chaucer and his followers*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- STOCKWELL, R. P., and C. W. BARRITT. 1951. Some Old English graphemic-phonemic correspondences: æ, ea, and a. (*Studies in Linguistics, occasional papers, 4.*) Norman, Okla.
- . 1955. The Old English short digraphs: some considerations. *Lg.* 31.372-90.
- TRAUGOTT, ELIZABETH CLOSS. 1965. *Diachronic syntax and generative grammar*. *Lg.* 41.402-15.

The categories and types of present-day English word-formation. By HANS MARCHAND. Second edition. (*Handbücher für das Studium der Anglistik.*) München: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1969. Pp. xxvi, 545. DM 40.00.

Reviewed by D. TERENCE LANGENDOEN, *City University of New York*

This is a second, completely revised and enlarged edition of a book which appeared originally in 1960 and which was enthusiastically reviewed, especially in Europe. This edition also deserves an enthusiastic welcome. As a handbook, it could not have been more conveniently designed; the text is elaborately broken down into paragraphs, and the indexing is lavish. The main body of the work consists of grouped examples and discussion of the history and current status of the various types of complex word-formation in English, chapters being devoted to compounding (118 pages), prefixation (80 pages), suffixation (150 pages), derivation by zero-morpheme (32 pages), back-derivation (12 pages), clipping (10 pages), and blending and word-manufacture (6 pages). The bibliographies and indexes occupy an additional 89 pages, and there is a 10-page introduction.

Marchand takes what can best be described as a common-sense approach to the problem of English complex word-formation. He avoids going into detail concerning processes which are no longer productive; he distinguishes carefully among various uses of English, and restricts his attention primarily to processes that are alive in non-technical standard English; and he is finely tuned in to semantic nuances. This last feature, especially, is what makes this book so valuable.

Marchand's theoretical framework gives the appearance of being very rigorous, but in actuality it can best be described as loosely and informally transformational in character. The superficial appearance is a result of Marchand's

thoroughgoing classification and labeling of processes which relate complex words to sentences; however, the actual processes themselves are not formally described, as they could be within a strict transformational framework. This lack of rigor might be thought a virtue, in view of the wealth of detail that is required for an adequate description of complex word-formation in English, and the difficulties and pitfalls one faces in attempting to approach the problem rigorously, as in Lees 1960. But it is not really a virtue; and ultimately, it may be hoped, a strict formal account of English complex word-formation will be written, using the insights expressed by Marchand in this book.

Quite apart from its informality, Marchand's work is flawed by his insistence on a number of principles of complex word-formation that strike me as poorly motivated. The two that concern me most are enunciated in the first paragraph of the chapter on compounding (11):

(A) The coining of new words proceeds by way of combining linguistic elements on the basis of a determinant/determinatum relationship called syntagma.

(B) In the system of languages to which English belongs, the determinant generally precedes the determinatum.

The most obvious difficulty with principle A is that it excludes the proper treatment of dvandva (additive or copulative) compounds like *blue-green*, *church-state*, *Kennedy-Nixon* (as in 'the Kennedy-Nixon debates'), *Austria-Hungary*, *fighter-bomber* etc. Accordingly, Marchand's discussion of dvandva-compound formation in English is weak, much of it being devoted to the formulation of alternative analyses, which simply are wrong. Thus, concerning the type *fighter-bomber*, he says (41):

A *fighter-bomber* may be understood as 'both fighter and bomber'. This, however, is a semantic distinction of a subjective kind, implying that both elements are equally prominent in the speaker's mind. Grammatically, *fighter-bomber* is an attributive syntagma which must be based on a determinant/determinatum relationship, reducible to a copula sentence 'the bomber is (also) a fighter'.

In general, Marchand's principle is, as stated on the same page,

(C) Additive compounds should not be analysed as 'A + B', but as 'B which is also A'.

But, as the ancient Indian grammarians understood, incidental conjunction (*samuccaya*) is never the underlying basis for dvandva compounding. For example, in English, *blue-green* refers only to a color which is a mixture of, or which occupies a position in the spectrum between, blue and green—never, say, to a pattern consisting of alternate blue and green stripes. Marchand adds, in defense of his principle C of dvandva-compound formation, that the proposed 'additive' source would not be an underlying sentence, but only a phrase. Thus *church-state*, as in 'church-state relations', would be derived from the phrase *between church and state*, not a sentence. But this is not a valid objection to the traditional analysis of dvandva compounds; in fact it only points out the error of the assumption that compounds are necessarily to be derived from sentences.

Principle A also leads to a certain artificiality in Marchand's analysis of bahuvrihi compounds such as *redskin*, *pigtail*, *threadbare* etc., and of other exocentric compounds of the sort *showoff*, *pickpocket* etc. Since *red* and *skin* are not

determinant and determinatum in the compound *redskin*, Marchand is obliged to postulate that *redskin* as a whole is a determinant of a zero-determinatum 'person', this zero being parallel to the overt *-er* of such derivatives as *teenager*, *old-timer*, etc. But this zero element is motivated only so that principle A (and B) can be maintained for such cases, and hence is entirely gratuitous.¹

Marchand's defense of principle B requires him to empty the terms 'determinant' and 'determinatum' entirely of their semantic content. The intuitively correct meanings of these terms are succinctly expressed by Marchand as follows (11): 'Semantically speaking, the determinatum represents the element whose range of applicability is limited by the determinant.' But then, in order to show that *stewardess*, *streamlet*, *blackish* etc. conform to principle B, Marchand is obliged to recast the relation between determinant and determinatum as a trivial syntactic one (12). And even if he is successful in his defense of principle B for the cases he discusses, I do not see how the principle can be saved in light of examples, such as *student dissidents*, in which the determinant is the word which receives the main stress.

Marchand has little to say about English segmental morphophonemics in this book, largely because of his view that there are no segmental alternations that are currently productive in complex word-formation processes (5):

In the case of English compounds we have seen that no changes of vowel or consonant take place when an independent morpheme becomes the constituent of a compound. Exceptions to this rule are therefore indicative of formation outside the present-day stage of linguistic structure. Let us apply the same method to the analysis of suffixal derivatives.

This claim is false, in view of the admitted productivity (313) of nouns in *-ability* /əbɪləti/ from adjectives in *-able* /əbəl/; but as an expression of the tendency of modern English, the claim is doubtless correct. For suprasegmental alternation, Marchand gives many details, which can profitably be compared with and checked against the rules of Chomsky & Halle 1968 for stress assignment.

REFERENCES

- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
 —, and MORRIS HALLE. 1968. *The sound pattern of English*. New York: Harper & Row.
 LEES, ROBERT B. 1960. *The grammar of English nominalizations*. Bloomington: Indiana University. (5th printing, Mouton, The Hague, 1968.)

¹ Compare the arguments against overmorphologizing in Chomsky (1965:170-4). The treatment of bahuvrihi compounds is one of the issues at the heart of the current controversy among transformational grammarians as to whether transformational rules apply at all to the structures that underlie lexical items. Marchand's proposed derivation of *redskin*-type nouns, from expressions like 'someone characterized as having red skin,' fails to capture the idiomatic character of the compounds. The derivation proposed by Lees (1960:128-9, 156-7), from sentences like 'Indian who has red skin', on the other hand, does justice to the meaning of the compound, but now the relative clause is not acting as a determinant. The correct solution probably involves no derivation whatever, but rather the entering of *redskin* etc. in the lexicon with the definition 'Indian', perhaps with the qualification 'so called because Indians have been presumed to be characterized by red skin'.