

**Discussion questions: Haspelmath (2002), day 1 (sec 4.1-4.3)**

Haspelmath, Martin. 2002. Chapter 4, Inflection and derivation. *Understanding Morphology*, 60-84. London: Arnold.

---

**I. Chapter intro and inflectional categories**

- (1) [not for RR] Some basic points to understand
    - (a) What assumption is Haspelmath making about how inflection vs. derivation relates to the distinction between *lexeme* and *word-form*? (How does this assumption hold up under some of the concerns raised later in the chapter?)
    - (b) How does Haspelmath define *paradigm*? What assumption does this reveal about how a paradigm is represented in the mental lexicon?
    - (c) Make sure you understand what the categories in Table 4.1 refer to.
  
  - (2) About agreement
    - (a) Explain the difference between *noun agreement* and *NP agreement* as presented by Haspelmath. Illustrate your explanation with an example — from a language you know, if possible, or an example taken from the text if necessary.
    - (b) On p 67, Haspelmath asserts, “It is important to note that only the agreement dimensions as marked on the target are dimensions of inflectional categories. The corresponding dimensions on the controller need not be inflectional categories.” What does he mean by this claim?
    - (c) Assess the argument that Haspelmath gives for the claim in (b). Do you agree with his interpretation of the data? Why or why not? If not, do you think his overall claim in (b) is weakened?
- 

**II. Derivational meanings**

- (3) [not for RR] Some basic points to understand
    - (a) Can derivational affixes change the word-class (syntactic category, lexical category, “part of speech”) of the base they attach to?
    - (b) Do derivational affixes always change word-class?
    - (c) What do the terms *denominal*, *deverbal*, *deadjectival* mean?
- 

**III. Properties of [and, distinguishing between] inflection and derivation**

- (4) On distinguishing inflection and derivation
  - (a) What does Haspelmath mean by “relevant to the syntax”? How has this distinction been claimed to distinguish between inflection and derivation? Explain two of the problems that Haspelmath raises against this claim.
  - (b) Which is claimed to be obligatory, inflection or derivation? Does this claim hold up when we consider the following two cases:
    - (i) English has *I walked* (past) with the -ed tense suffix, but *I walk* (present) with no apparent tense suffix. Is this a counterexample to the claim?

(ii) We saw in the Aronoff & Fudeman reading that some languages, such as Japanese, never mark nouns for number, and other languages, such as Vietnamese, never mark verbs for tense. Is this a counterexample to the claim?

- (5) [not for RR] Be familiar with the “top 3” criteria and the additional criteria that Haspelmath presents in this section, and with some of the problems that the various criteria have.
- (6) Answer this modification of Exercise 4 (p 84): “At the beginning of this chapter, we asked whether the English deadjectival adverb-forming pattern (*nice* → *nicely*) is inflectional or derivational. Apply [at least five of] the criteria of Section 4.3 and try to form an opinion on this question.” Be sure to defend your opinion by discussing how you have applied the criteria and why the results of your analysis lead to the conclusion you support.