An Analysis of Deverbal Adjectivization in the Framework of Distributed Morphology

Junya Morita (morita@kinjo-u.ac.jp)

Kinjo Gakuin University

1. The interaction between syntax and morphology is a central theme of recent studies in the generative framework. In a current theory of antilexicalism, Distributed Morphology (DM), the core properties of word construction are attributed to its syntactic structure while the role of its formal make-up is consigned to the morphological module, due to an economy constraint which requires information available to each stage of computation to be narrowly restricted (Marantz 1997, Embick 2010). The analyses of denominal adjectivization (Harizanov 2018) and adjectival passive formation (Bruening 2014) have been proposed within the framework of DM. The present study proposes a DM-theoretic analysis of deverbal "active" adjectivization in English and Japanese to substantiate the DM model: based on a detailed observation of deverbal adjectivals extracted from large-scale corpora, their syntactic (§2) and postsyntactic morphological (§3) aspects are elucidated and accounted for.

2. Two types of deverbal adjectivizers are proposed to be distinguished: one is semantically transparent, productive, and argument-inheriting (*-ing*$_2$, *-ive*$_2$), and the other is idiosyncratic, unproductive, and non-argument-inheriting (*-ing*$_1$, *-ive*$_1$). Each type of adjectivals is subdivided into compound and derived forms. The relevant properties are fully confirmed by our corpus-based research. Given that the domains for word formation are classified according to the height of attachment of a head morpheme (Arad 2003), both types are structurally distinguished: (1) "low" adjectival (*surface-active agents/striking woman*) and (2) "high" adjectival (*memory-enhancing drug/provisive of comfort*) structures. (The 'root' category is symbolized as √ and no lexical item is actually inserted at the level of syntax.) Arad's thesis is also supported by the two-level distinction of Japanese deverbal adjectivizers, *-teki*$_1$ and *-teki*$_2$.: (4) "low" adjectival (*kyuushin-teki(-na) shisoo* 'radical thought') and (5) "high" adjectival (*daitooryoo-ni kenshin-teki-na minpei* 'militia devoting themselves to the President) structures.

(1) $[[\sqrt{\text{agent}}_i]_{n\text{P}}\ [[\text{PRO}_i]_{d\text{P}}\ [\underline{[\sqrt{\text{act}}\ a_{\text{-ive1}}]_a}\ [\sqrt{\text{surface}}]_{d\text{P}}]_{a\text{P}}]_{a\text{P}}]_{n\text{P}}$

(2) $[[\sqrt{\text{drug}}_i]_{n\text{P}}\ [[\text{PRO}_i]_{d\text{P}}\ [\underline{a_{\text{-ing2}}\ [v_{\text{CAUSE-}\emptyset}\ [\sqrt{\text{enhance}}\ [\sqrt{\text{memory}}]_{d\text{P}}]_{\sqrt{\text{P}}}]_{v'}}]_{a\text{P}}]_{a\text{P}}]_{n\text{P}}$

(3) $[\text{T}\ [[\sqrt{\text{drug}}]_{d\text{P}}\ [v_{\text{CAUSE-}\emptyset}\ [\sqrt{\text{enhance}}\ [\sqrt{\text{memory}}]_{d\text{P}}]_{\sqrt{\text{P}}}]_{v'}]_{v\text{P}}]_{\text{T}'}$ (Drug enhances memory.)

(4) $[[\sqrt{\text{shisoo}}_i]_{n\text{P}}\ [[\text{PRO}_i]_{d\text{P}}\ [\underline{[\sqrt{\text{kyuushin}}\ a_{\text{-teki1}}]_a}]_{a\text{P}}]_{a\text{P}}]_{n\text{P}}$

(5) $[[\sqrt{\text{minpei}}_i]_{n\text{P}}\ [[\text{PRO}_i]_{d\text{P}}\ [\underline{a_{\text{-teki2}}\ [v_{\text{CAUSE-}\emptyset}\ [\sqrt{\text{kenshin}}\ [p_{\text{-ni}}\ [\sqrt{\text{daitooryoo}}]_{d\text{P}}]_{p\text{P}}]_{\sqrt{\text{P}}}]_{v'}}]_{a\text{P}}]_{a\text{P}}]_{n\text{P}}$

After motivating the two-level distinction by affixation, compounding, and context-dependent online adjectivization, it is argued that the contrastive properties of both adjectivals originate in their syntactic configurations; a high adjectival and its clausal equivalent (3) share the core of the structure (*v´*), whereas a low adjectivizer directly attaches to a root to make a word, domain of idiosyncrasies (Marantz 2013). Furthermore, it is shown that our antilexical approach provides a unified and elegant account of the relevant contrast as well as the overall similarity of a high adjectival and its clausal counterpart, thereby resolving theoretical and empirical problems inherent in lexicalism (e.g. Aronoff 1976).

3. At the PF interface after Spell-Out, the syntactic outputs undergo readjustment: lexical items in Vocabulary (e.g. *-ing*$_2$*/-Ø/√enhance*) are inserted into the terminal nodes, which triggers morphological operations like merger and impoverishment, deriving word structures (*[[√memory √enhancing]*$_{\sqrt{}}$ *a*$_{\text{-ing2}}$*]*$_a$). The insertion conditions of adjectivizers (6)-(7) are devised based on extensive data, where their internal features, license environments, and complements are respectively specified in (i), (ii), and (iii). According to these conditions, allomorphic competition and blocking are regularly implemented in local environments (Embick and Marantz 2008:7); *-ive*$_2$ is selected for Latinate roots in verbal environments, especially ending in /*-s*/ or /*-t*/, each of which is generally specified in its lexical entry, whereas *-ing*$_2$ is prevented from joining to these base forms and it is selected elsewhere. For example in *Pertwee's indicative of deep affection* (BNC), *-ive*$_2$, which denotes the modal meaning of 'tending to,' is chosen for a Latinate root ending in /-t/, inheriting the base's argument and blocking its rival nominalizer.

(6) *-ive*$_2$: (i) [property]([modal]), (ii) *a*, (iii) +< *v*, Latinate, /*-s*, *-t*/>, *v*={ √compete, … }

(7) *-ing*$_2$: (i) [property], (ii) *a*, (iii) +<*v*>

References

Arad, Maya (2003) “Locality Constraints on the Interpretation of Roots,” NLLT 21, 737-778.

Aronoff, Mark (1976) Word Formation in Generative Grammar, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Bruening, Benjamin (2014) “Word Formation Is Syntactic: Adjectival Passives in English,” NLLT 32, 363-422.

Embick, David (2010) Localism versus Globalism in Morphology and Phonology, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Embick, David and Alec Marantz (2008) “Architecture and Blocking,” Linguistic Inquiry 39, 1-53.

Harizanov, Boris (2018) “Word Formation at the Syntax-Morphology Interface: Denominal Adjectives in Bulgarian,” Linguistic Inquiry 49, 283-333.

Marantz, Alec (1997) “No Escape from Syntax: Don’t Try Morphological Analysis in the Privacy of Your Own Lexicon,” University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics 4, 201-225.

Marantz, Alec (2013) “Locality Domains for Contextual Allomorphy across the Interfaces,” Distributed Morphology Today, ed. by Ora Matushansky and Alec Marantz, 95-115, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.