Class discussion: Haspelmath (2002)
W Jan 25 - F Jan 27 - M Jan 30

(1)   Haspelmath starts out the chapter by assuming:
  •   *Derivation* creates a new *lexeme*
  •   *Inflection* is what creates a *word-form*
  Are these assumptions consistent with his positions later in the chapter?

(2)   The "top 3" criteria usually used for distinguishing inflection (I) from derivation (D)
  i. syntactically relevant (I=yes, D=no)
  ii. obligatory (I) vs. optional (D)
  iii. can be replaced by simple word (D=yes, I=no or N/A)

(3)   Additional potential criteria
  iv. same concept as base (I=yes, D=no)
  v. abstract meaning (I) vs. concrete (D)
  vi. always semantically regular (I=yes, D=no)
  vii. meaning of I less relevant to meaning of base
  viii. categories can be applied to base w/o arbitrary limitations (I)

(4)   The *-ly* discussion

Criterion	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii	viii
-ly	???	???	???		I	I		I

(5)   Approaches to the I/D divide, and implications for the architecture of the grammar

  (A) Dichotomy approach
  •   Common implementations:
      - lexicon as location of derivational processes
          - this implies: not all 'lexemes' are stored; some are productively created

      - syntax intervenes between derivation and inflection - explains why inflection is
          often 'outside' derivation
          - explains why inflection is more "syntactically relevant"

  •   Questions/problems: What do we do about the fact that there isn't necessarily a clean
      division between I and D?

  (B) Continuum approach
  •   In this approach, we don't need to (and shouldn't?) assume that the syntax 'divides'
      morphology as it does in the dichotomy approach

  (C) Tripartite approach
  •   A useful compromise?
      - Syntax can still set apart contextual inflection
      - There can still be a continuum between inherent inflection and derivation