MORPHOLOGICAL CHANGE (Part 2)

Analogical changes that have little or nothing to do with regularization:

1.   In the course of leveling, extension may be made from inflected rather than from
        base forms → **back formation**: an analogic process involving reinterpretation of
        the morphological structure of the word

        Differences between back formation and proportional analogy;

        i.   back formation involves the creation of a new *base form*, whereas
             proportional analogy involves creation of a new *derived form*

             operation   :   *operate*
             orientation   :   X = *orientate*

             worker   :   *work*
             burglar   :   X = *burgle*

        ii.   back formation is often preceded by misanalysis (= reinterpretation)

             OE *pise* 'pea' *pisan* (Pl.)   Latin *pisum*   (Sg.)

                OE *pise* > *pes*

             bean-s   :   *bean*
             pea-s   :   X = *pea*

(Nursery rhyme: "Pease porridge hot")

Similarly: English *cherry* <   Old French *cheris* (Modern French *cerise*); *-s* was part of
the original root, but was interpreted as the plural *–s* .

buriels < *byrgels* 'tomb'< Gmc. **burg-*   *-s* was part of the original root, but was
interpreted as the plural *–s*. On the pattern of funeral, it was spelled with an *a* : *burial*.

2. **Folk etymology**: another analogical process, one that involves the reinterpretation of words whose surface morphology has become synchronically opaque using morphemes that are more familiar.

Obscure morphemes are misanalysed (=reinterpreted) in terms of more familiar morphemes.

examples: *garden snake <   garten snake*

sandblind   <   OE *samblind* 'halfblind' (the OE word *sam* 'half' ceased to exist, thus speakers substituted the word *sand*   phonetic similarity + semantic relationship (blowing sand may cause temporary blindness)

ME *sirloin <*   French *sur-loin* (*sur* < Latin *super* 'upper')
       ↓
the upper part of the loin is *sir* 'noble' piece of meat

In German, adjectives may be derived from place names with the suffix *–er*. *Hamburger* is an adjective, derived from the name of the city *Hamburg*. In English, the first part of this adjective was reinterpreted as *ham*; the reanalysis has given rise to numerous other *burgers*: *chickenburger*, *pizzaburge,r* etc. Also: *Burger King*!

3. **Contamination:** one special case of analogical leveling; its domain is neither the morphological nor the grammatical paradigm.
The phonetic shape of a morpheme is changed in such a way that it becomes more like some other morpheme; both morphemes belong to a class defined by some close semantic relationship.

ME *father* : the [ð] cannot be derived in a regular manner from PIE and Gmc.
 PIE -t- > Gmc. -θ- when preceded by a stressed syllable. Otherwise it became -ð-, and -ð- > OE -d-: OE *fæder* > Middle English *fader*.
Modern English should have -d-.
Because *father* belongs to a semantic set that includes such words as *brother* < PIE *bhrate:r* (where the -ð- is a regular development), a substitution was made in *father*: d > ð.

Other examples:
English *four* should not have initial *f* (Latin *quattuor*, Skt. *catvaras*). The *f* is introduced under the influence of the number *five* (where the *f* is the regular reflex of the first Gmc. consonant shift (Greek *pente*, Skt. *panca*).

Russian: *devʲatʲ* ' nine' is unexpected: Latin *novem,* English *nine*, etc. The *d* is a result of contamination from *desʲatʲ*   'ten'.

Old Irish:

In Pre-Celtic, under certain syntactic conditions, voiceless consonants became voiced when preceded by a word-final nasal:

> *secht* 'seven' < **septm* : *secht cenela* 'tribe' > *secht genela*

> the numbers noi and deich have the same effect: < **novem*, **dekm*

> However, *ocht* < ** okto*: 'eight' has the same effect, even though it never had a nasal: OIr. *ocht genela.*

Morphological change as a source of new inflectional markers: **Grammaticalization**

Antoine Meillet: grammaticalization is …"the attribution of a grammatical character to a formerly independent word". The independent word with independent meaning may develop into an auxiliary word, and may end up as a grammatical marker or bound grammatical morpheme.

For example: English –*dom* and –*hood*
In OE these forms were used to create compounds:
freːo 'free' + *doːm* 'quality' > *freːodom* 'freedom'
camp 'battle' + *haːd* 'state' > *camphad* 'warfare'

The cognates of these elements in German have also became suffixes: -*tum* and –*heit*
(*Freihei*t 'freedom' *Königtum* 'kingdom')

Suffix clipping: erroneous interpretation of forms may establish entities as independent suffixes.

Example: OE *aθeling* 'nobleman' < *aθele* 'noble' + -*ing*
Erroneous division: new suffix: -*ling*
deːor + *ling* > *darling* (*deːor* 'dear')
English *will* originally meant 'want' (*If you will* = "If you want')
will lost its meaning 'want' and became grammaticalized as future marker.

4.   **Syncretism**

> | The distinctions of grammatical categories that are morphologically marked are eliminated. |
> |---|

   Example: Latvian nominal inflection.

In Proto-Baltic, the accusative and the instrumental cases had different morphemes: for the *–jo* and the *–o* stems, the Acc Sg morpheme was **-an*, the Instr Sg morpheme was *–u*.

In Latvian: V + -n > *i* or *u*, agreeing in backness with the preceding vowel. Later: metathesis took place, followed by apocope: *-an > au > ua > u. Thus, the Acc Sg of the *–jo* stem nouns became identical to the Instr Sg:

es redzu *teːvu* 'I see father' : es eju ar *teːvu* 'I go with father'

On the analogy of the *–jo* stems, other noun stems will show the same pattern.

Example: *-ijo* stems have *–i* in the Acc Sg (< **ii* < **in*); however, the Acc Sg *-i* replaced the Instr Sg *–u*:

Acc Sg			Instr Sg	
teːvu	'father'	:	*teːvu*	
braːli	'brother'	:	X	
			X >	*braːli*

Conditions for analogical change

Question: Are there any tendencies or directionalities in analogical change?

Two Polish linguists, J. Kurylowicz and W. Maínczak have gone most deeply into this isuue.

1. J. Kurylowicz bases his generalizations on the intuition about change which he built up over a number of years of research into analogy.

He proposes several "rules" (or laws):

i.   A two-fold morphological marker tends to replace one that is single.
        Example: the Pl. *–e* in German, causing umlaut in some stems, such as

Gast 'guest' *Gäste* Pl.

This two-fold marking was extended to forms such as *Baum* 'tree' *Bäume* Pl., replacing earlier *Baume*.

ii.   Analogy proceeds from the base form to the derived form, e.g.:
        sputnik, sputniks Pl.

Counter example: *pease* to *pea* (see above)!

iii.   Any construction consisting of a constant plus a variable is used as a pattern for an isolated entity with the same function.

Example: the pattern *wrongly* from *wrong* was extended to endingless adverbs, such as *slow* to *slowly*.

iv.   A new analogical form takes over the primary function of a contrast, while the replaced form will have a secondary function.

Examples: *brothers* Pl. (new form) of *brother*
                brethren (old form): peripheral function.

also: *older* vs. *elder*

Counter examples to the rules suggest that the rules *do not permit us to predict analogy, nor to determine what its direction has been under poorly known situations in the past*.

However, these rules provide explanation for some instances of analogical extension.

2. W. Man′czak based his observations on a statistical analysis of the analogical changes described in standard handbooks on the historical grammar of various (mainly European) languages. His generalizations are stated as **tendencies**. Some of these are:
- longer words more frequently are remade on the model of shorter words than vice versa;
- root alternation is more often abolished than introduced;
- longer inflectional forms are more frequently remade on the model of short forms than vice versa;
- Ø endings are more frequently replaced by full ones than vice versa.

The relationship between analogy and sound change

R. Anttila (1989): "Sound change is regular and causes irregularity; analogy is irregular and causes regularity".

For example, umlaut was a regular sound change; back vowels were fronted before a syllable containing a front vowel:
brother + -en (Pl.) > *brethren*

This sound change resulted in two variants for the root 'brother':
brother and brethr-

Irregular (not across the board) analogical change with the Sg/Pl pattern of *sister/sisters* resulted in undoing the irregularity; *brethren* survives only in restricted context; *brothers* is the regular Pl. form in Modern English.

See also the Latin example in Part 1 (rhotacism and interaction of analogy with sound change).