
UNIT 3: WORK-FORMATION IN ENGLISH – 2

Structure

- 3.0 Objectives
- 3.1 Derivational Morphology
- 3.2 Classification of Derivational Affixes
 - 3.2.1 Derivational Prefixes
 - 3.2.2 Conversion
- 3.3 Conversion
 - 3.3.1 Conversion vs Derivation
 - 3.3.2 Classifying Cases of Conversion
- 3.4 Compounding
 - 3.4.1 The Syntactic Approach
 - 3.4.2 The Semantic Approach
 - 3.4.3 The Syntactic-semantic Approach
 - 3.4.4 Some Minor Compound Types
 - 3.4.5 Writing Conventions for Compounds
- 3.5 Let Us Sum Up
- 3.6 Key Words
- 3.7 Bibliography
- 3.8 Questions & Exercises
 - Notes on Questions & Exercises

3.0 OBJECTIVES

Our objectives in this unit are to enable you to

- distinguish between derivation, conversion and compounding as processes of word-formation in English
- understand the different approaches to the study of these processes, their merits and demerits

3.1 DERIVATIONAL MORPHOLOGY

What is strictly called word-formation, and refers to the ability of a speaker of a language to form new words on the pattern of words she has used before refers not to the kind of morphology we discussed in the previous unit (ie inflectional morphology) but to the other kind (ie **derivational morphology**) which we will discuss in this unit. The reason for this is clear: the words created through the processes of inflectional

morphology are really not new words: they are merely grammatical forms of the same old word. Thus **works, working, worked** are grammatical words generated by applying certain grammatical rules to the word **work**. Anyone who knows and uses English (and therefore knows and uses the rules of English grammar) will automatically produce these forms when producing sentences of English. But when someone produces the word **yellowish** or **purplish** or **pinkish** to mean not exactly what people would call the colour X but somewhat like it, or when someone says that s/he would be home **ninish** or **elevenish** to mean not exactly at nine/eleven 'but around that hour', he produces a new word. (These particular words may not be new as they have been produced by people many times before, but one could cite examples like **skybluish, sports-greyish, ten-fifteenish** and so on.) Such coinages are quite frequent and journalists and writers depend on them for making their writing interesting and appealing. Possibly no dictionary can contain all such words, nor does it need to, because those who know English can well understand what they mean: this understanding is indeed a part of what it means to understand English.

In this section we will look at those processes by which, utilising a comparatively small number of 'core' words and a number of bound lexical morphemes (which are realized as prefixes and suffixes), English allows you to considerably multiply your stock of words. The words that are thus created are 'new' in the sense that they mean something different from the core words from which they are created, and their meanings cannot be related to the meanings of the core words in a systematic way. We might occasionally note some system, as in the example of the suffix above, but, as you will see below, this holds true only in a limited way.

In discussing derivational morphology there is less reason to maintain a constant distinction between the affixes themselves and the bound morphemes they realize, since the two ultimately refer more or less to the same objects. This is unlike the case of inflectional morphology, where a bound morpheme is not always realized as an affix but sometimes as a modification inside the word and sometimes not even this. Still, in inflectional morphology, one can make a guess about the presence of the morpheme from the context and meaning. In derivational morphology, on the other hand, the bound morphemes are always realized as affixes; therefore we can make our description simpler and less cumbersome by talking of bound morphemes as if they referred directly to the affixes. But, for the purposes of theoretical justification, the relationship we have posited between the levels of the morpheme and the word in Unit 1, Sec. 1.4 remains intact.

We can start by recapturing the distinctive characteristics of derivational affixes. As we noted in Unit 2, Sec. 2.3,

1. Derivational affixes are attached to lexical words to create new lexical words. As lexical words, these new words are also subject to the same kind of treatment in the language as all lexical words, e.g., they make their grammatical paradigms like other words in their grammatical category, they can serve as stems for other derivational affixes, and so on.
2. Derivational affixes modify the meanings of the stems but not in a regular and fixed way as do inflectional affixes. The effect a derivational affix will have on the meaning of the stem cannot be predicted with exceptionless regularity, though subsets of stems may show partial regularities.
3. In a complex word containing both derivational and inflectional affixes, derivational affixes are attached first, inflectional affixes last. Once an inflectional affix has been attached to a stem, no derivational affixes can be attached to it.

4. Unlike inflectional affixes, derivational affixes often change the grammatical category of the stem to which they are attached. Thus the addition of a derivational suffix may turn a verb into a noun, a noun into an adjective, an adjective into a verb, and so on. This cannot happen with inflectional affixes.
When we pay closer attention to the English derivational affixes, we find a few more characteristics worth mentioning. They are:
5. Inflectional affixes in English are all suffixes, but derivational affixes come both as prefixes and suffixes.
6. As compared to inflectional affixes, the number of derivational affixes is quite large.
7. While a bound grammatical morpheme (or, loosely, an inflectional affix) occurs with all the members of a grammatical class, or subclass, without exception, a bound lexical morpheme (loosely, a derivational affix) may occur with only a few members of a class and not with others. This is because, as we have pointed out, earlier, the occurrence of bound grammatical morphemes is determined by grammatical rules, which apply without exception, whereas the occurrence of bound lexical morphemes is not so determined. For example, the bound grammatical morpheme **PLURAL** occurs with all the members of the Count subclass of the class of common nouns, but the bound lexical morpheme **-ISH**, though it occurs with adjectives, cannot occur with all the adjectives.
8. Not only does an inflectional affix occur with all the members of a given class, it occurs only with the members of that class and not with the members of any other class. Derivational affixes, on the other hand, can sometimes occur with members of more than one class.

3.2 CLASSIFICATION OF DERIVATIONAL AFFIXES

A careful study of these features of derivational affixes will reveal the difficulties that we face when trying to classify the derivational affixes. We had little difficulty in classifying the inflectional affixes: we could easily classify them according to the part of speech of the stem: inflectional affixes of the noun, of the verb, of the adjective, and so on. We cannot do this with derivational affixes, because the same derivational affix may occur with stems belonging to different parts of speech. Thus, for example, the negative prefix **dis-** can be attached to nouns (**disorder**), adjectives (**disloyal**) or to verbs (**disobey**); the suffix **-hood** can be attached to nouns (**boyhood**) as well as adjectives (**falsehood**). Another reason why we cannot classify derivational affixes on the basis of the grammatical category of the stems is mentioned in (7) above: no derivational affix applies to all or even a majority of stems belonging to a particular category. For example, the suffix **-er** is attached to verbs to derive 'actor' nouns (e.g., **player**, **killer**, **runner**, etc.), but it cannot be attached to all verbs as the impossibility of words like ***Liver**, ***dier**, ***understander**, ***cheater**, etc. will show. Nor can we very satisfactorily classify the affixes on the basis of the grammatical category of the word resulting from the affixation, the reason again being that the same affix may produce words of different categories. For example, the suffix **-ful** produces nouns (**handful**, **mouthful**, **cupful**) as well as adjectives (**useful**, **beautiful**, **sorrowful**).

Our description of the derivational affixes of English must include facts like these but also account for the effect the affixation has on the meaning of the stem, which is another possible basis for classifying the affixes. In fact, when we talked about **dis-** being a 'negative' prefix, or **-er** being an 'actor' suffix, we were already using meaning

as a basis of classification. Interestingly, while a meaning-based classification seems to work for derivational prefixes, it fails with suffixes. The reason may be that while derivational prefixes in English are rather few, and are used to perform a few well-defined functions, the number of derivational suffixes is rather large and the effects they have on the meanings of the stems are quite variegated. Almost every suffix has a different effect on the meaning of the stem and sometimes the same suffix has different effects with different stems. For example, with some stems the suffix **-er** produces the meaning 'person who does X', where X stands for the action denoted by the verb; with some other stems the resulting word does not refer to a person at all but to an instrument that is used to do X (e.g., **cooker, silencer, screwdriver, stapler**); with still other (noun) stems **-er** contributes the meaning 'having the characteristic denoted by the noun' (e.g., **teenager, three-wheeler**) while with some other noun stems the meaning may be almost specific to the stem (e.g., **gardener, villager, townplanner**). Of course, in such cases we have the option of recognizing two or more suffixes with different meanings but the same phonological shapes (or suffixal homophones).

In recent years, there has been an attempt to provide another basis to the classification of derivational affixes by relating the derived words to their 'syntactic underlying forms'. For example, it is said that words with the derivational suffix **-able** (e.g., **breakable, salable, achievable, readable**) can be related to their syntactic interpretations ('that which can be broken/sold/achieved/read' respectively). The argument given is that these words show the same restrictions that their syntactic parents do. For example, we can say **breakable** but not ***fallable**, **drinkable** but not ***sleepable**, **debatable** but not ***disappearable**. These facts, it is argued, are accounted for automatically if we derive words with **-able** suffixes from their underlying syntactic forms. We will find that only those words are acceptable which have acceptable underlying forms.

Y breaks X :	X can be broken	→	breakable
*Y falls X:	*X can be fallen.	→	*fallable
Y drinks X.:	X can be drunk.	→	drinkable
*Y sleeps X:	*X can be slept.	→	*sleepable
Y debates X:	X can be debated.	→	debatable
*Y disappears X.	*X can be	→	*disappeared.-

This kind of argument is valid so far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. For example, it does not tell us anything about the effect on meaning. If, however, it is implied that the meaning of the word is the same as that of the underlying syntactic form, then clearly this is untrue. To take only one example, **breakable** may mean the same thing as **that which can be broken**, but **readable** certainly does not mean **that which can be read**: it means **that which can be read easily or enjoyably**. Any number of such instances can be cited.

We have examined four possible reasons for the classification of derivational affixes - the category of the stem, the category of the resulting word, meaning, and the underlying syntactic form - and found none of them adequate. The reason perhaps is that we have set our goal too high; we are aiming at a classification which will cover all the cases without exception, will account for the forms as well as the meaning, will also link them to their syntactic underlying forms, etc. What is more, we want a single mode of classification to achieve all this. Perhaps we don't know enough about the structure of the English language yet to be able to do this; perhaps we can try an alternative approach which is a combination of these methods. This alternative approach would not reveal to us the 'mystery' of the English derivational affixes, but at

least it would help us to know them better. Maybe at some future date, when more knowledge about the structure of the English language has been uncovered by new approaches and techniques of language study, we can get closer to the more ambitious goal.

We will therefore try the following approach:

1. ... We will use meaning as the basis wherever it gives us good and consistent results, e.g., in describing the prefixes.
2. We will first classify all suffixes according to the category of the resulting word. Thus suffixes which form nouns will be called **Noun suffixes**, suffixes which form verbs will be called **Verb suffixes**, and so on.
3. We will further subclassify each class of suffixes according to the category of the stem. Thus **Noun suffixes** will be subclassified into those which form nouns from noun stems, adjective stems and verb stems respectively. These subclasses of suffixes will be called **Denominal**, **Deadjectival** and **Deverbal Noun Suffixes**. The same pattern of classification and similar terminology will be used for all suffixes. Thus, the term **Deadjectival Verb Suffix** will denote a suffix which forms verbs from adjective stems, whereas the term **Deverbal Adjective Suffix** will denote a suffix which forms adjectives from a verb stem.

Using this combination of approaches, we hope to be able to cover all the interesting facts about derivational morphology in English.

3.2.1 Derivational Prefixes

There is a small set of affixes in English which are attached at the beginning of a stem to modify its meaning. Some well-known examples are the negative prefixes **un-**, **in-**, and **dis-**. But negation is not the only modification of meaning the prefixes are used for: as we shall see, there are a few other modifications too. The reason why we think of English prefixes readily in terms of their effect on the meaning of the stem is that, unlike most suffixes, the prefixes do not affect the grammatical category of the stem at all, so the grammar-based system of classification described in 2 and 3 above is of no use to them. Instead of having subclasses like **Denominal Noun Prefix**, **Deverbal Verb Prefix**, it is better simply to state that derivational prefixes do not change the category of the stem and try to say something more useful about them. The change in meaning at least tells us exactly how the resulting word differs in meaning from the stem.

Here are some of the ways in which the prefixes modify the meaning of the stem:

1. **Negation:** Prefixes like **un-**, **a-**, **in-**, **dis-**, **a-** and **non-** negate the meaning of the stem adding the meaning 'not', 'opposite of', 'lacking in', etc. e.g., **unkind**, **unwanted**, **incomplete**, **dissimilar** **amoral**, **non-violent**, etc. The prefix **in-** has four allomorphs: **in-** with stems beginning with /p/, /b/, and /m/; **ir-** with stems beginning in /r/; **il-** with stems beginning in /l/, and **in-** elsewhere.
2. **Reversal & Deprivation:** **de-** is a typical reversative and privative prefix. Prefixed to a noun or a verb, it produces the meaning 'reverse the action', e.g., **decontrol** (= lift the control), or the meaning 'deprive of' (**dethrone** = deprive of the throne). The prefixes **dis-** and **un-** are also used in this sense, e.g., **disown**, **disconnect**, **unpack**, **unseat**.
3. **Disparagement:** Prefixes like **mal-**, **mis-**, **pseudo-**, etc. are called **pejorative affixes** because they add the meaning 'bad', 'badly', 'wrong', 'false', etc. to the meaning of the stem, thus adding a disparaging shade to stems with a neutral meaning, e.g., **maltreat**, **malnutrition**, **mislead**, **misfortune**, **pseudo-intellectual**.

4. **Expressing number, degree, rank, size, etc.:** The prefixes *bi-*, *mono-*, *semi-*, *poly-* express numbers; *arch-*, *co-*, *extra-* express degree; *micro-* and *mini-* express size; *super-*, *sub-*, *under-* express rank, e.g., *bimonthly*, *arch-enemy*, *minibus*, *undersecretary*.
5. **Expressing time, order, location, attitude and orientation:**
- Time and order:** *ex-*, *fore-*, *pre-*, *post-*, e.g. *ex-president*, *pre-war*.
- Location:** *fore-*, *inter-*, *super-*, *sub-*, *trans-*, e.g., *foreground*, *superscript*, *substructure*, etc.
- Attitude:** *pro-*, *anti-*, *counter-*, etc., e.g., *pro-change*, *anti-war*.
- Orientation:** *counter-*, *anti-*, *contra-*, as in *counter clockwise*

None of these prefixes affect the category of the stem. There are some prefixes (e.g., *en-*, *vem-* as in *entrain*, *embitter*, *imperial*, *be-* as in *becalm*, *befriend*) which do change the category of the stem. The number of such prefixes, called **conversion prefixes**, is however very small.

3.2.2 Derivational Suffixes

The first classification of the suffixes is to be made on the basis of the grammatical category to which the word resulting from the suffixation belongs. On this basis the suffixes are classified as follows:

- A. **Noun Suffixes:** Suffixes that produce nouns, e.g., *-hood*, *-dom*, *-ism*, *-ship*
- B. **Adjective Suffixes:** Suffixes that produce *-e.g.*, *-ful*, *-ish*, *-less*
- C. **Noun-Adjective Suffixes:** Suffixes that produce words that can be used either as nouns or as adjectives : e.g., *-ese*, *-ian*, *-ist*
- D. **Verb Suffixes:** Suffixes that produce verbs: e.g., *-fy*, *-ize*, *-en*
- E. **Adverb Suffixes:** e.g., *-ward*, *-wise*, *-ly*

In the second classification each of these types is subclassified on the basis of the grammatical category of the stem to which the suffix is added. The first classification tells us the grammatical category of the word after the suffixation; the second classification takes as its basis the category of the original word, i.e. the stem. On this basis, we arrive at the following scheme of classification of suffixes:

- A. **Noun Suffixes: Suffixes forming nouns**
- A. 1: from noun stems: **Denominal Noun Suffixes**
- A. 2: from adjective stems: **Deadjectival Noun Suffixes**
- A. 3: from verb stems: **Deverbal Noun Suffixes**
- B. **Adjective Suffixes: Suffixes forming adjectives**
- B. 1: from noun stems: **Denominal Adjective Suffixes**
- B. 2: from adjective stems: **Deadjectival Adjective Suffixes**
- B. 3. from verb stems: **Deverbal Adjective Suffixes**
- C. **Noun-Adjective Suffixes: Suffixes forming words which can be used as nouns (N) or as adjectives (A)**
- C.1 from noun stems: **Denominal N-A Suffixes**
- C.2 from adjective stems: **Deadjectival N-A Suffixes**

- D. Verb Suffixes: Suffixes forming verbs**
- D.1** from noun stems: **Denominal Verb Suffixes**
- D.2** from adjective stems: **Deadjectival Verb Suffixes**
- E. Adverb Suffixes: Suffixes forming adverbs**
- E.1** from noun stems: **Denominal Adverb Suffixes**
- E.2** from adjective stems: **Deadjectival Adverb Suffixes**
- E.3** from adverb stems: **Deadverbial Adverb Suffixes**

It is possible to carry the classification further: e.g., Type A.1 **Denominal Noun Suffixes** and Type A.3 **Deverbal Noun Suffixes** can be further subclassified into suffixes which form abstract nouns vs. those which form concrete nouns. Thus a fairly detailed description of the suffixes can be achieved. However, we will conclude our description by giving you examples of only the subtypes that have been listed above (the list of suffixes is not intended to be exhaustive). No attempt has been made to give the meanings as they are quite diverse:

Type A.1: Denominal Noun Suffixes (Noun → Noun)

- age : bag > baggage; bond > bondage
- dom : king > kingdom; star > stardom
- eer : engine > engineer; profit > profiteer
- er : teenage > teenager; garden > gardener
- ery : jewel > jewelery; slave > slavery
- hood : boy > boyhood; widow > widowhood
- ing : shirt > shirting; farm > farming
- let : book > booklet; drop > droplet
- ship : member > membership; fellow > fellowship

Type A.2: Deadjectival Noun Suffixes (Adjective → Noun)

- dom : free > freedom (Also Type A.1)
- er : five > fiver; six > sixer (Also Type A.1)
- hood : false > falsehood (Also Type A.1)
- ness : bitter > bitterness; dark > darkness
- th : warm > warmth; with change of stem in broad > breadth; long > length; deep > depth, etc.

Type A.3: Deverbal Noun Suffixes (Verb → Noun)

- age : break > breakage; cover > coverage
- ant : inhabit > inhabitant; lubricate > lubricant
- ation : alter > alteration; starve > starvation
- ee : employ > employee; train > trainee
- er : write > writer; dance > dancer
- ment : appoint > appointment; equip > equipment

Type B.1: Denominal Adjective Suffixes (Noun → Adjective)

- al\-ial\-ical : culture > cultural
- president > presidential; philosophy > philosophical
- ful : beauty > beautiful; use > useful
- ish : child > childish; fool > foolish
- less : child > childish; pain > painless
- ly : mother > motherly; woman > womanly
- y : filth > filthy; hair > hairy

- Type B.2: **Deadjectival Adjective Suffixes (Adjective → Adjective)**
-ish : green > greenish; eight > eightish
- Type B.3: **Deverbal Adjective Suffixes (Verb → Adjective)**
-able : attain > attainable; break > breakable
-ant\-ent : differ > different; depend > dependent
-ful : forget > forgetful; resent > resentful
-ive\-ative : attract > attractive; talk > talkative
- Type C.1: **Denominal Noun-Adjective Suffixes (Noun → Noun\Adjective)**
-ese : China > Chinese; Japan > Japanese
-(i)an : Shakespeare > Shakespearian; India > Indian
-ist : violin > violinist
- Type C.2: **Deadjectival Noun-Adjective Suffixes (Adjective → Noun-Adjective)**
-ist \ist\ : social > socialist; loyal > loyalist
- Type D.1: **Denominal Verb Suffixes (Noun → Verb)**
-ify, -fy : code > codify; beauty > beautify
-ize : terror > terrorize; criminal > criminalize
- Type D.2: **Deadjectival Verb Suffixes (Adjective → Verb)**
-en : short > shorten; ripe > ripen
-ify, -fy : false > falsify; simple > simplify
-ize : equal > equalize; modern > modernize
- Type E.1: **Denominal Adverb Suffixes (Noun → Adverb)**
-ward, -wards : home > homeward;
-wise : length > lengthwise; clock > clockwise
- Type E.2: **Deadjectival Adverb Suffixes (Adjective → Adverb)**
-ly : silent > silently; angry > angrily
- Type E.3: **Deadverbial Adverb Suffixes (Adverb → Adverb)**
-ward, -wards : up > upwards; north > northwards

3.3 CONVERSION (OR ZERO DERIVATION)

3.3.1 Conversion vs. Derivation

Look at the following sentences:

- 1a. A **beggar** stood outside the door.
- 1b. The scene of the sunset **beggared** description.
- 2a. I want to buy a **carpet** for my room.
- 2b. I want my room **carpeted**.

You will notice that the words **beggar** in 1a and **carpet** in 2a are used as nouns, as the use of the indefinite article with them would show; the same words are used as verbs in 1b and 2b respectively, as their use in past tense forms indicates. The

important thing to note is that the base form of the word does not undergo any change, i.e. no suffix or prefix is added to convert the noun into a verb (or the verb into a noun, depending on which way the conversion is). There can be no doubt there is a process of word-creation involved here, in fact one which is quite popular in English. The process creates a new lexical word, with sufficiently different meaning to merit a separate entry in the dictionary. At the same time, however, one can detect some relationship between the meanings of the word **beggar** in 1a and 1b, and of the word **carpet** in 2a and 2b, and the relationship is sufficient indication that we have a case of derivation here, even if no affixes are in evidence. Thus **beggar** (verb) may be paraphrased as 'to make into a beggar'; **carpet** (verb) may be paraphrased as 'to cover with a carpet', and so on. The relationship between the pair of words seems to be similar to the one that exists in pairs like **slave** → **enslave** (= 'to make a slave'), **friend** → **befriend** ('make into a friend'), **crust** → **encrust** ('cover with a crust'), etc., which are all cases of derivation with an affix. That is the reason why cases of conversion like the present ones are often described as cases of derivation without an affix, or with a zero affix.

Conversion cases of course also share the other features of cases of derivation: A word cannot undergo conversion after an inflectional affix has been added to it (e.g., the plural form of a noun cannot convert to a verb; the past tense of a verb cannot become a noun), but it can still undergo conversion if it has acquired a derivational affix: e.g., **dirt** > **dirty** > **dirty**; **pack** > **package** > **to package** (note that **beg** > **beggar** > **to beggar** is not an example of this as historically the word **beggar** predates the word **beg**. Which was derived from the former by backformation; see the section on **Back-formation** in the next unit). In fact, compounds (see Sec. 3.4) can also undergo conversion, e.g., **to outlaw** > **an outlaw**, **to bypass** > **a bypass**. Secondly, conversion means a change in the grammatical category of the word, a feature we find only with cases of derivation. Thirdly, like a case of derivation, a word derived by conversion forms its inflectional paradigm on the pattern of words belonging to the category to which it belongs after conversion/derivation. For example, when the noun **carpet** is converted into a verb, the verb **carpet** has all the four forms of a regular verb (**carpet**, **carpets**, **carpeting**, **carpeted**); similarly when a verb like **attack** is converted into a noun, the noun **attack** has a plural form (**attacks**), and may also have the possessive form (as in **the attack's severity**, though the preferred expression is **the severity of the attack**).

How do we decide the direction of the conversion? E.g., we have said that the noun **carpet** is converted into the verb **carpet** and the verb **attack** is converted into the noun **attack**: why not the other way round? How do we decide?

We use the following two criteria:

1. **The criterion of meaning:** If the word denotes a person, or an object, it is first a noun; if it denotes a quality, it is primarily an adjective; if it denotes an action, it is primarily a verb, and so on. By this criterion, **carpet** is primarily a noun and the verb **carpet** is a conversion, **attack** is primarily a verb and the noun **attack** a conversion, **intellectual** is primarily an adjective and the noun **intellectual** a conversion.
2. **The criterion of form:** Some affixes are typical of nouns (e.g., **-tion**, **-ion**), others of adjectives (e.g., **-al**), still others of verbs (e.g., **re-**). When we find a word with a typical noun affix used as a verb, we can conclude that the verb is a conversion from a noun, e.g., the word **vacationing** in the sentence **They are vacationing in Shimla**. The same thing applies to nouns with typical verb prefixes (e.g., **a refill**, **a recount**) or with typical adjective suffixes (e.g., **an intellectual**, **a multinational**).

3.3.2 Classifying Cases of Conversion

Since conversion is very much like derivation, we can follow the same method of classification with cases of conversion that we followed with cases of derivation, viz. the method of double classification, first in terms of the category of the word resulting from conversion (**Conversion to Noun, Conversion to Verb, etc.**) and then in terms of the category of the base word, or the word from which it was converted (**From Verb Base, From Adjective Base, etc.**). We can also use parallel terminology to describe the classes.

Conversion to Noun

I From Verb Bases (Verb → Noun)

The noun denotes

- a. the agent of the action (denoted by the verb): **cheat, rebel, spy**
- b. the object the action: **a good catch; a real find**
- c. a single instance of the action: **attack, attempt, laugh, murder**
- d. the instrument used for the action: **the cover of the machine; lift; wrench**
- e. feeling, emotion, state of mind expressed by the action: **desire, love, need, taste**
- f. place of the action: **dump, retreat**

II From Adjective Bases (Adjective → Noun)

Almost any adjective can be made into a plural noun by putting the definite article before it, e.g., **the rich, the poor, the high and the mighty**, but these nouns are at best cases of **partial conversion**, as the nouns thus produced cannot be used like full nouns. For example, they have no singular form; moreover, they must always occur with the definite article, and, finally, unlike other nouns they can inflect like adjectives: **the richer, the poorer, the higher and the mightier**.

The following cases of adjective-noun conversion are however different: here the adjectives become full nouns, i.e. they have a full noun paradigm:

criminal, intellectual, noble, progressive: these adjectives-turned-nouns inflect for number as well as case

daily, weekly, monthly, annual: when referring to newspapers and magazines, these words also show the full properties of nouns

III From other Bases

In the following examples you find auxiliaries, conjunctions, particles, even affixes and phrases turned into nouns:

This is a **must**.

No **ifs and buts** please.

..... **the ups and downs** of life

..... the various **isms** of the modern world

haves and have-nots, also rans, high-ups

These too are cases of partial conversion.

Conversion to Verb**I From Noun Bases (Noun → Verb)**

We can describe these noun-based verbs on the basis of the kind of meanings they convey vis-a-vis the meaning of the noun, e.g.

- a. Perform an action which will result in the NOUN: to queue (up), to parade, to orbit
- b. To put something in the NOUN: to pocket, to catalogue
- c. To provide with, or apply, the NOUN: to butter, to grease, to powder, to wax
- d. To produce or make, to change into, to go or send by means of, the NOUN: to tunnel, to group, to ship, to bicycle, etc.

II From Adjective Bases: (Adjective → Verb)

- a. To be or to become ADJECTIVE: to slim, to sour, to empty
- b. To cause to become ADJECTIVE: to dirty, to humble, to free

III From Other Bases

From adverbs: to near, to further (the goal)

From particles: to up (As in 'He upped and left.'). to down (As in 'The workers downed their tools.')

Conversion to Adjective

Nouns are often used in a modifying function, i.e. like an adjective, e.g., a brick house, a gold chain, a silver bowl. Some adjectives are also derived from verbs but they are not cases of pure conversion: they usually require a 'conversion prefix' as in sleep... asleep, float → afloat. etc.

3.4 COMPOUNDING

Next to derivation and conversion, compounding is the most productive process of word-creation in English. Compounding is the process of creating compound words, which we defined in the previous unit as words made up of two (or more) free morphemes. Being free, these morphemes can also be realized as independent words, and the compound may equally well be seen as made up of these two (or more) independently occurring words. However, the compound as a single word has an independent entity. Neither its meaning, nor its phonological shape, as we shall see below is completely predictable from the meaning and phonology of the words that make it up.

Compounding, like derivation, is a highly productive process, so productive indeed that it is not possible for any dictionary to list all the possible compounds. In fact, the speakers of English keep producing new compounds everyday, almost as they produce new sentences. At the same time, however, putting any two words together will not produce a compound. This only shows that there must be certain well defined rules and processes by which compounds can be produced with the assurance that they will be understood by the listener. Various attempts have been made to discover what these rules and processes are.

3.4.1 The Syntactic Approach

There are at least two reasons why putting together any two words arbitrarily will not make a compound word: first, only words of certain categories can be combined to form compounds. If we consider only two-word compounds for the moment, we can divide them into three main types, with noun, adjective or verb as the second word. No other category of word (except particles like *out*, *up*, etc. in a few cases) occurs in the second position. This second position enjoys a special status in compounds, as in a good majority of cases the compound belongs to the same grammatical category to which the word in the second position does. E.g., in the words **ballpen**, **darkroom**, **casebook**, etc. the second word is a noun and so is the compound itself; in the words **icy-cold**, **waterproof**, **taxfree**, the second word is an adjective and so is the compound. It can also be seen that the first word is not always a noun in the first set, and not always an adjective in the second. For this reason, the word on the right in such cases is called the **HEAD** of the compound. It must, however, be noted that not all compounds are of this type.

Compounds of this type can now be conveniently classified according to their syntactic category into noun, verb and adjective compounds. We can then subdivide each of these types into three sub-types depending on the syntactic category of the first word: noun, adjective or verb. We thus get the following nine types in all:

- | | | |
|----------------------|--------|---|
| I. Noun Compounds: | IA | Noun + Noun (girl-friend, icecream) |
| | IB | Adjective + Noun (darkroom, blackboard) |
| | IC | Verb + Noun (breakfast, pickpocket) |
| II. Adj. Compounds: | II.A | Noun + Adj. (Waterproof, taxfree) |
| | II.B | Adj + Adj. (icy-cold, deaf-mute) |
| | II.C | Verb + Adjective (freezing-cold) |
| III. Verb Compounds: | III.A | Noun + Verb (brain-wash, bottle-feed) |
| | III. B | Adj + Adj (dry-clean, fine-tune) |
| | III. C | Verb + Verb (Sleep-walk, write-produce) |

At first, not all of these types appear to be equally productive: types II.C and III.C, for example. IIC is the Verb + Adjective type. It is seen in compounds like **freezing-cold** and **fightingfit**, but not many others. However writers have come out with creative compounds like **wringing wet** and **yawning dull**. Still it can perhaps be said that there is more creativity involved in some compounds than in others. For example, Verb + Verb compounds still tend to be rare. Examples like **sleep-walk** are not really of this type (more likely type III.A), while compounds like **write-produce** in **He wrote-produced the play** still sound highly creative. As we shall see below, one reason why it sounds less like a compound than a case of a missing conjunction is the necessity for putting both verbs in the past tense: if it were indeed one word, as a compound is, there would be need only for a single past form, just as in the plural of the compound noun **boyfriend** only the whole word needs to take a suffix not both the constituent words (ie **boyfriends** not ***boysfriends**).

Apart from the above types, a few types involving adverbs and particles (words like *over*, *up*, *down*, *out*, *in*, etc.) are also to be found. The special characteristic of these compounds is that they do not have a **HEAD**, i.e. the grammatical category of the compound cannot be predicted from the grammatical category of either of the words in it. This can be seen in the following examples:

Type I.D: Particle + Verb (income, outcast)

Type I.E: Verb + Particle (dropout, fallout)

Type I.F: Particle + Noun (afterthought, overdose)

We have called these compounds Type I because they are all nouns, but two of them (D & E) do not contain a noun word at all. They cannot therefore be said to have a head.

In contrast, the following verb compound does seem to have a head as the word on the right is a verb:

Type III. D: Verb Compound: Particle + Verb (overflow, underestimate)

However, compounds of this type can also be labelled Type I.F (Noun Compounds: Particle + Noun), since they also occur as nouns and the words **flow** and **estimate** too are used as nouns.

The notion of a grammatical, (ie syntactic) head of a compound is thus not very useful even for classification purposes, and of course it tells us very little about why some words can combine into compounds while others can't. It hardly needs to be demonstrated that not all combinations of the type listed here would result in acceptable compounds. While **icecream** is acceptable, **creamice** is not, while **darkroom** is acceptable, **bright room** is not, while **freezing-cold** and **burning hot** are acceptable, **burning-cold** and **freezing-hot** are not. The system of description based on the syntactic category of the compound and of its constituent words does not tell us anything about such cases. It only tells us that possibly such words as auxiliaries, conjunctions, etc. do not occur in compounds, which is not very helpful.

3.4.2 The Semantic Approach

This brings us to the second reason why not every combination of words results in a compound, and the reason is semantic: only those words in combination produce a compound which, when brought together, are capable of producing a signification which is more than the sum of the signification of the two words independently. Thus **icecream** does not signify an object obtained by mixing **ice** and **cream** together but a specially prepared, sweetened and flavoured food which also happens to be frozen like **ice**; a **darkroom** is not any room which is dark but a room specially designed for photographic processing which also happens to be dark; a **blackboard** is not any black board but a board used in the classroom specially prepared so that it can be written on with chalk, and which is often, but not always, black, and so on. In this sense, a compound is a new word, with full and independent signification. However, the meanings of the constituent words also play a role, ranging from an almost imperceptible one to a rather direct one, with various shades in between.

At the imperceptible end are compounds like **hot dog** and **tallboy**, which respectively stand for 'hot sausage served in a soft bread roll with onions and mustard' and 'tall chest with a drawer for clothes' respectively - meanings which have little to do with the meanings of the constituent words. At the other end are words like **girl friend** and **Indian-American** in which both the constituent words play a definite role in the meaning of the compound: a **girl friend** is someone who is both a girl and a friend, an **Indian-American** is one who is both an Indian (in origin) and an American (by citizenship). It must however be emphasised that the meanings of the constituent words do not exhaust the meaning of the compound: there is still an additional element which is typical of the compound. Thus not any person who is both a girl and a friend is a girlfriend: for one thing, only boys have girlfriends; for another, even a boy may have several friends who are girls but only one **girlfriend**. The 'additional element' in the meaning of the compound **Indian-American** is indicated in the brackets above. It is actually the size of this 'additional element' of meaning in the compound which determines the place of the compound on the suggested continuum. In compounds like

hot dog and tallboy, this element is the largest; in compounds like **girlfriend** and **Indian-American** it is perhaps the smallest. In between are words like **icecream**, **darkroom**, **blackboard**, etc. in which the constituent words play a suggestive rather than a definite role in the meaning of the compound. **Ice** and **cream** are among the various ingredients that go to make **icecream**, but they have been picked up as the most suggestive ones of the final product; a **darkroom** is a kind of room which is kept dark, even if these are not its defining features; a **blackboard** is a kind of board which is often, even if not always, black, though its defining feature is the purpose for which it is used. In all these cases, the meanings of the constituent words do have some relevance to the meaning of the compound, though they of course do not wholly determine it. In fact, if they determined it in its entirety, the word would not be a compound but a modifier-noun combination. Thus a **blackboard** (compound) is contrasted with the phrase a **black board** (=a board which is black), a **darkroom** is contrasted with a **dark room** (a room which is dark), **White House** (the residence of the US President) is contrasted with a **white house** (=a house which is white in colour), and so.

The semantic distinction between a compound and a phrase is reinforced by a phonological distinction. In a compound, it is the first constituent that carries the primary stress; in a phrase the primary falls on the second constituent:

a black board	vs.	a black board
a dark room	vs.	a dark room
a white house	vs.	White House

The placement of the stress on the first constituent in a compound indicates a kind of cementing of the two elements into a new entity and de-emphasises their separateness. It is significant that in a large number (though not all) cases, this unity of the constituents in a compound is also indicated orthographically by writing the compound as one word rather than two.

Between the two extreme points of the compound continuum, with the largest and the smallest sizes of the additional meaning element respectively, lie hundreds of compounds in English. The unpredictability, of the 'additional meaning element' in most of these arises from the arbitrary nature of the relationship the compounds assume between the constituent elements — a relationship which is not constant even among compounds which look grammatically identical on the surface. For example, the compounds **cleaning woman** and **walking stick** are superficially similar: both have the structure **Verb-ing + Noun**. Yet the relationship between the constituents is quite different. While a **cleaning woman** is a woman who cleans, a **walking stick** is not a stick which walks. Similarly, a **working model** is a model which works but a **working paper** is not a paper that works (but a paper that you work on), and so on. A list of the various kinds of relations that compounds assume between their constituents would run into several pages (see, for example, Quirk et al 1985: pp. 1570-78). Here is a sample which confines itself to noun compounds only:

- a) Subject + verb: **cleaning woman** = The woman cleans.
- b) Verb + object: **killjoy** = Someone kills joy.
- c) Adverbial + verb: **downpour** = Rain pours down.
- d) Subject + BE + Adjective: **highchair** = The chair is high.
- e) Subject + BE + noun: **maidservant** = The servant is a maid.
- f) Subj + BE + for + gerund: **walking stick** = The stick is for walking.
- g) Subject + BE + for + noun: **cowshed** = The shed is for cows.
- h) Subject + Have + noun: **doorknob** = The door has a knob.

This list can be made much longer, but the examples cited should be enough to show that while the constituent words of a compound do have some contribution to make, the meaning of the compound as a whole depends mainly on the kind of relationship that is postulated between the constituents, and this relationship is not at all constant. Admittedly, the possible types of relationship that can occur are not infinite: for example, if everyday on my way to office I meet a man carrying a bottle I cannot form a compound *bottleman*, postulating the relationship Subject + carry + noun + adverbial. But, though they are not infinite, the types of relationships are nevertheless too large to allow us to predict which words can combine with which other words to form compounds with what semantic results.

Actually, compounds like *hot dog* and *tallboy* make it quite unlikely that the effort to find a 'semantic' solution to the problem of compounds will succeed. Quite a large number of frequently used compounds are of this type: the constituent words provide no clue at all to the meaning of the compound. For example:

blockhead:	a foolish person
egghead:	an intellectual
headhunter:	a company that recruits top executives for its client companies
highbrow:	person with superior intellectual and cultural tastes
hot foot (verb):	to move fast
redtape:	bureaucratic delay
turncoat:	a renegade

Compounds of this type are in sharp contrast with the *darkroom* and *highchair* type of compounds: in the latter type, not only does the compound share the syntactic category of the second element (the HEAD), but also shares its meaning: after all, a darkroom is a kind of room, a highchair is a kind of chair, a blackboard is a kind of board, and so on. In some sense, the head of the compound represents the 'centre' (both syntactically and semantically) of the compound. That is the reason why compounds of this type are described by linguists as *endocentric* compounds, or compounds that have their centre within them (Bloomfield 1933:235ff.). In contrast, compounds of the *hot dog* type seem to have little to do with their constituents syntactically or semantically (i.e. in grammar or in meaning). Syntactically, some compounds with a noun as the second element can be used only either as verbs (e.g., *hot foot*) or as adjectives (*blue-eyed*); semantically, the compound does not share the meaning of the second constituent at all: a *turncoat* is not a type of coat, *redtape* is not a type of tape. These compounds thus do not seem to have any centre at all, and if there is one, it is outside the compound — the meaning which it carries. That may be the reason behind calling such compounds *exocentric* compounds. Exocentric compounds show that we cannot have a meaning-based account of English compounds, i.e. we cannot derive the meaning of compound from the meanings of its constituent words and then make this a basis of which words can be combined to form compounds.

3.4.3 The Syntactic-semantic (or Generative) approach

In recent years, a new approach to grammar, known as generative grammar, has become quite popular. It believes that the job of grammar is not only to classify items of language into classes, but to set out a finite set of rules by which all the possible sentences of a language could be generated, (=produced). Since the set of all possible sentences of a language is infinite, this means that the set of finite rules must be able to generate an infinite number of sentences. When applied to compounding, this approach (Selkirk 1982) means that the grammar must be able to formulate a set of

rules which can generate all the possible compounds of the English language. The approach believes that the set of possible compounds in English is also infinite, i.e. we cannot set out a list of the English compounds. Every English speaker produces new compounds, some of which become popular while others don't. Nevertheless, the new compounds are always understood by the English speakers so long as they are produced in accordance with the rules of compounding in English. The real task with respect to compounding in English is not to classify the compounds according to their (or their constituents') syntactic category, or to list the semantic relations between the constituents of the compounds, but to discover these rules. In a sense, every English speaker knows these rules: that is why he is able to produce and understand new compounds.

If this approach is correct then we gain a big advantage: we don't have to list the compounds in the dictionary at all. Rather we simply refer to the rules of the grammar of English compounding to decide whether a given compound is a possible compound in English or not.

But what are these rules? They cannot be like the ones that we have seen in the syntactic and the semantic approaches above. We have seen that it is not possible to account for all kinds of English compounds by describing them in terms of either the syntactic category of their constituents or the semantic relations that hold between them.

The generative approach scores at the very start by claiming that the rules required for generating the compounds are not separate from the rules required to generate the sentences of English. The grammar of English sentences has a set of rules which generate strings of constituents with certain kinds of syntactic and semantic relations between them. For example, the following rules, where the arrow is to be interpreted to mean 'has the constituents', generates, among others, the strings given after the rules:

S → NP VP	(Sentence has the constituents Noun Phrase & Verb Phrase)
NP → (Det) N (PP)	(Noun Phrase can have up to three constituents: Determiner + Noun + Prepositional Phrase, but only Noun is compulsory; other may or may not occur)
VP → V (NP) (PP)	(Verb phrase can have upto three constituents: Verb + Noun Phrase + Prepositional Phrase, but only Verb is compulsory)
PP → P NP	(Prepositional Phrase has two compulsory constituents; Preposition and Noun Phrase)

These few rules will generate (i.e. will define as grammatical) a large number of strings including the following:

(Det + N)NP + (V + N) (e.g. The man sells books/The man tells fortunes)

(Det + N)NP + V (e.g., The woman cleans)

The generative approach claims that we can use these very rules to generate compounds. With a little additional mechanism, we can use the same rules that generate 'The woman cleans' to generate the compound **cleaning woman**, the rules that generate 'The man sells books' to generate the compound **bookseller**. The big advantage of this approach is that we do not require any separate set of rules to explain why certain words cannot combine to form compounds. The same rules that exclude a sentence as ungrammatical will also exclude the impossible compound. E.g., if ***bookgrower** and ***seeming woman** are not possible compounds, this is simply because the rules of grammar do not generate the corresponding sentences ***The man**

grows books and *The woman seems. We can now also explain why *freezing-hot and *burning-cold are not possible compounds while freezing-cold and burning-hot are. The reason is that the rules of grammar allow the sentences It's so cold that it'll freeze you and It's so hot that it'll burn you but not *It's so hot that it'll freeze you and *It's so cold that it'll burn you.

The generative approach seems very interesting and promising. Making use of both the syntactic and semantic relations between the constituents of a compound, it is able to explain both the grammar and the meaning of a compound, while also explaining why some combinations of words are acceptable as compounds and not others. It will explain compounds like walking stick by relating it to such other compounds as fishing rod and sewing machine, deriving them from rules which generate the phrases stick used for walking, rod used for fishing and machine used for sewing respectively.

However, this approach will have difficulty in explaining compounds like hot dog and tallboy and will perhaps rightly, ask them to be listed in the dictionary as single words, or non-compounds, which accidentally share the compound character. It will also have difficulty in explaining how and whence compounds like darkroom and girlfriend get the 'additional element' of meaning which distinguishes them from the corresponding modifier + noun phrase combinations. If all such compounds are also to be listed in the dictionary, then the advantage gained by the generative approach in treating one set of compounds will be neutralized by its failure to treat another set. The generative grammarian can of course argue that since no other theory is able to explain such compounds either, it is still ahead of them in the ways outlined above.

3.4.4 Some Minor Compound Types

The account given above does not cover all possible types of English compounds, for example the compounds in bold in the following sentences:

- a) The award was received by the **author-publisher** in person.
- b) The **socio-political** implications of the decision were enormous.
- c) After a lot of **dilly-dallying**, the government conceded their demands.
- d) He turned away, a **spare-me-the-details** look making his attitude quite obvious.

The compound in (a) is called the **coordinate type** of compound: it differs from the **endocentric type** in that both constituents are equally important and no single word can be called the head of the compound. The compound refers to a single person who is both the author and the publisher of the book. The compound in (b) is also of this type (meaning 'social and political'), but here the first word is put in a special form (called the **combining form**) before combining it with the other word. Such compounds are called **combining-form compounds**. The compound **dilly-dally** in (c) is called the **reduplicative type** of compound. We will discuss this type in the next unit (see Unit 4, Sec. 4.2). The type of compound that occurs in (d) is almost always used in a modifying function; any phrase can be turned into a modifying compound by putting hyphens between the words of the phrase, e.g., **his more-than-usual** interest in my studies, **the come-and-take-it-if-you-can** look on his face, etc. Appropriately, compounds of this type are called **phrase compounds**.

3.4.5 Writing Conventions for Compounds

You might have noticed that we have written the compounds in the above account in three different ways: some (like **darkroom**, **girlfriend**, **tallboy**) have been written as single words; some (like **sleep-walk**, **freezing-cold**) have been written with a hyphen,

while still others (like **cleaning woman, walking stick, hot dog**) have been written as two words. These three varieties of 'orthographic' (= written or printed) compounds are known as **solid, hyphenated and open** compounds. These three modes of writing compounds, it must be remembered, do not represent a progressively decreasing degree of 'unity' in the compounds, though a visual impression of this kind is created. In fact, few reliable generalizations can be made about the way compounds are written. Many compounds are in fact written, sometimes by the same writer in the same piece of writing, in all the three styles, e.g., **birdcage, bird-cage or bird cage; winebottle, or wine bottle**. In other words, the writing and printing of compounds in English still remains largely idiosyncratic, and one usually tries to follow the practice of the majority.

3.5 LET US SUM UP

We have made the following points in this unit:

1. Derivation is a process by which new lexical words are created from old ones by adding affixes to them. Such affixes are called derivational affixes.
2. Derivational affixes are different from inflectional affixes in a variety of ways. Basically, inflectional affixes do not create new words, only grammatical forms of the same lexical word.
3. The addition of a derivational affix to a word modifies its meaning, and this modification has no predictable direction.
4. Inflectional affixes do not change the category of the word to which they are attached, derivational affixes often do. This makes the classification of derivational affixes more complicated.
5. Derivational affixes cannot be classified on the basis of the category of the stem because the same affix can be attached to stems belonging to different categories. Moreover, no derivational affix can be attached to all the stems of given a category.
6. Derivational affixes also cannot be classified on the basis of the category of the word resulting from the affixation since the same affix produces words of different categories.
7. Nor can derivational affixes be classified on the basis of the effect they have on the meaning of the stem because this effect is not constant (except with derivational prefixes).
8. Another approach to the classification of derivational affixes relates the derived word to the underlying syntactic forms. But differences of meaning between the derived word and the underlying forms are not explained by this approach.
9. A combination of some of the approaches above (5-8) is used here for classifying derivational affixes.
10. Derivational prefixes are classified on the basis of the meaning criterion into Negative, Reversative, Privative, Pejorative and a few other types.
11. Derivational suffixes are first classified on the basis of the category of the stem to which the suffix is added.
12. When words belonging to one grammatical category are used as words of another category, we have 'conversion'.

13. A word cannot undergo conversion if it has already undergone inflection, but it can still undergo conversion if it has undergone derivation.
14. The direction of conversion can be determined by using the criteria of form and meaning.
15. Each case of conversion is classified first in terms of the category of the word resulting from conversion, and then subclassified in terms of the category of the word from which it is converted.
16. Even after undergoing conversion, some words do not inherit all the properties of the acquired category. They are cases of 'partial conversion'.
17. The meaning of a case of conversion can be stated by relating it in some way to the meaning of the word from which it was converted.
18. Compounding is a highly productive process of word-formation in English. When two or more free morphemes are joined together to produce a new lexical word, we get a compound.
19. Not any two free morphemes (ie words), however, can be put together to produce a compound. Linguists have been trying to discover the rules which govern the formation of compounds.
20. The syntactic approach describes the formation of compounds in terms of the grammatical categories of the words that are combined into compounds. However, not all words belonging to those grammatical categories can be combined with each other. Moreover, some kinds of combinations are more productive than others.
21. The semantic approach describes the compounds in terms of the relationships between the meanings of the words combined. The meaning of a compound is always more than the sum of the meaning of its constituent words. However, usually the meanings of the constituent words provide some lead into the meaning of the compound.
22. In endocentric compounds, for example, the compound denotes a specific instance of the object denoted by the second word in the compound, also called the 'head' of the compound.
23. Not all compounds are, however, endocentric. There are exocentric compounds in which the meanings of the constituent words have no relationship to the meaning of the compound.
24. The syntactic-semantic (generative) approach believes that compounds are generated freely from sentential structures and therefore do not need to be listed in the dictionary. The same rules that restrict the combination of words in sentential structures also restrict it in compounds. No separate rules are needed.
25. In this approach, the meanings of compounds are stated in terms of the semantic relations obtaining between the underlying sentence constituents.
26. This approach also cannot describe the exocentric type of compound, in which the meaning of the compound cannot be deduced from the meanings of the constituent words. Even some endocentric types, in which the 'additional meaning element' is very prominent, are outside its scope. The approach would prefer to list such words in the dictionary as non-compounds with accidental compound character.
27. Coordinate compounds, combining-form compounds, reduplicative compounds and phrase compounds are some other types of compounds to be found in English.

28. Compounds are written in English in three different ways: as single words (solid), hyphenated, or as two words (open). These systems of writing have however not yet been standardized.

3.6 KEY WORDS

Adjective Suffix: a derivational suffix which, added to a stem, results in an adjective

Adjective Compound: A compound which, as a whole unit, belongs to the category 'adjective'

Adverb Suffix: A derivational suffix which, added to a stem, results in an adverb

Combining-form Compound: A compound in which one of the constituent words takes a special form. This form occurs only when this word is combined with another word in a compound.

Compound: A word made up of two or more free morphemes each of which can be realized as an independent word

Conversion (or Zero Derivation): A process of word-formation without affixation; creates new lexical words by converting words of one grammatical category into words of another category.

Coordinate (or Dvanda) Compound: A type of compound whose meaning is the sum of the meanings of its constituent words and can be derived by joining the constituent words with 'and'

Deadjectival: Derived\converted from an adjective

Deverbal: Derived\converted from a verb

Endocentric Compound: A compound whose meaning does not lie totally outside the compound and has something to do with the meaning of the constituent words, particularly with that of the second word (the head of the compound)

Exocentric Compound: A compound whose meaning has nothing to do with the meaning of the constituent words and lies totally outside the compound

Negative Prefix: A derivational prefix that adds the meaning 'not', 'opposite of', 'lacking in', etc. to the meaning of the stem

Noun Compound: A compound which, as a whole unit, belongs to the category 'noun'

Noun Suffix: A derivational suffix which, when attached to a stem, results in a noun

Noun-Adjective Suffix: A derivational suffix which, added to a stem, results in a word which may be used as a noun or as an adjective

Partial Conversion: A type of conversion in which the converted word does not acquire all the characteristics of the category into which it has been converted

Pejorative Prefix: A derivational prefix that adds the meaning 'bad', 'badly', 'wrongly', 'false', etc. to the meaning of the stem

Phrase Compound: A compound which consists of more than two constituents

Privative Prefix: A derivational prefix that adds the meaning 'deprive (someone of something)'

Reduplicative Compound: A compound in which the second word duplicates the first with minor differences

Reversative Prefix: A derivational prefix that contributes the meaning 'reverse the action', or 'undo the action' denoted by the stem

Semantic approach to Compound Formation: An approach that describes compounds in terms of the relationships between the meanings of the words combined

Syntactic approach to Compound Formation: An approach that describes the formation of compounds in terms of the grammatical categories of the constituent words

Syntactic-Semantic approach to Compound Formation: An approach to the formation of compounds that assumes that compounds are generated freely from sentential structures and therefore do not need to be listed in the dictionary. The same rules that restrict the combination of words in sentential structures also restrict it in compounds and no separate rules are needed. The meanings of compounds are stated in terms of the semantic relations obtaining between the underlying sentence constituents.

Verb Suffix: A derivational suffix which added to a stem results in a verb

Verb Compound: A compound which, as a whole unit, belongs to the category 'verb'

3.7 BIBLIOGRAPHY

On derivational morphology: Akmajian et al: pp.28ff.; Hockett: Ch 28; Katamba: pp.60ff.; Quirk et al: pp. 1540ff.

Classification of derivational affixes: Akmajian et al: pp. 50ff.; Quirk et al: pp.1539ff.

Derivational prefixes: Katamba: pp. 62ff.; Marchand: Pt. III; Quirk et al pp. 1539ff.

Conversion: Adams: Ch 4; Katamba: pp. 70ff.; Marchand: Pt. V; Quirk et al: pp. 1558ff.

Compounding: Adams: Chs. V-IX; Akmajian et al: pp. 26ff., 45ff.; Katamba: pp. 72ff.; Marchand: Pt II; Quirk et al: pp. 1567ff.

The generative approach to compounding: Akmajian et al: pp. 28ff., 45.; Katamba: pp. 74ff.; Selkirk

Endocentric vs. exocentric compounds: Bloomfield: 235; Hockett: 184; Katamba pp. 73ff.; Marchand: 1969: pp. 21-45

phrase compounds: Marchand: 2.53-56

Reduplicative Compounds: Marchand: 2.20

1. Adams, V. (1973) **An Introduction to Modern English Word Formation**, London: Longman
2. Akmajian, A., Demers, R.A., Farmer, A.K. & Harnish, R.M. (1995) **Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication**, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press/ Prentice-Hall of India 1986
3. Bloomfield L. (1993) **Language**, London: Allen & Unwin
4. Hockett, C.F. (1958) **A Course in Modern Linguistics**, New York: Macmillan
5. Katamba, F. (1994) **English Words**, London: Routledge
6. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and Svartvik, J (1985) **A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language**, London: Longman

7. Marchand, H. (1969) *The Categories and Types of Present-day English Word-formation*. Munich: C.H. Beck
8. Selkirk, E.O. (1982) *The Syntax of Words*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press

3.8 QUESTIONS & EXERCISES

1. In Section 1.1 we cited examples of some prefixes (*dis-*) and suffixes (*-hood*) which can be attached to words belonging to more than one part of speech (or 'grammatical category').
 - (a) Cite three more affixes of this type and give examples of words to illustrate your choice.
 - (b) What point about the classification of derivational affixes does the existence of such cases support?
2. Now cite three examples (other than the ones you have cited in answer to question (1)) to show that the same affix may be found with words belonging to different grammatical categories. What point about the classification of derivational affixes do these cases support?
3. What are suffixal homophones? Give examples (other than those cited in the lesson).
4. What meanings do the following affixes contribute to resulting words?

E.g.,	-age	as in	baggage:	'collection of (bags)'
	-age	as in	bondage:	'state of (being in a bond)'
	-ee	as in	payee:	
	-eer	as in	mountaineer:	
	-ful	as in	glassful:	
	hood	as in	boyhood:	
	-ive	as in	attractive	
	-let	as in	starlet:	
	-ly	as in	motherly:	
	a-	as in	amoral:	
	micro-	as in	micro-organism:	
	sub-	as in	subhuman:	

5. Explain the following terms:

E.g., **Denominal noun suffix:** a suffix which, attached to a noun, produces a noun

 - (a) Deverbal adjective suffix
 - (b) Denominal verb suffix
 - (c) Deadjectival noun suffix
 - (d) Denominal adverb suffix
 - (d) A conversion prefix
6. Label each affix according to the scheme of classification used in the lesson:
 - (a) **anti-** as in **anticlockwise**
 - (b) **de-** as in **decarbonize**
 - (c) **dis-** as in **disarm**
 - (d) **il-** as in **illegal**

(e) mal-	as in	maladjusted
(f) mini-	as in	minicomputer
(g) -en	as in	sharpen
(h) -ent	as in	absorbent
(i) -ic	as in	heroic
(j) -ing	as in	shirting
(k) -ize	as in	hospitalize
(l) -ly	as in	angrily
(m) -ly	as in	cowardly
(n) -ment	as in	equipment
(o) -th	as in	warmth

7. The following 'nonce-words' ('words invented for one particular occasion') have been used recently in the contexts provided. Do you know what the words signify? Comment on the affixes used and the effectiveness of the nonce formation:
- 'Tiger Woodsian debut' (John Updike on Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*)
 - 'the chutneyfication of history' (Salman Rushdie on the mixed influences of east and west that make up the world of the Indian writer in English today)
 - 'deyuppification' (from *yuppie* = 'Young Urban Professional Person; used in the context of the deyuppication of a neighbourhood)
 - 'Lebanonisation of Bosnia'
 - 'The McDonaldization of Society' (Title of a book by George Ritzer)
'McDonaldization' is explained by the author as 'the process by which the principles of the fast-food restaurant are coming to dominate more and more sectors of American society as well as of rest of the world.'
8. Identify the cases of conversion in the following sentences. Then label each case following the system of classification used in the lesson.
- Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day; teach him how to fish and you feed him for life.
 - The boat steamed into the harbour.
 - He was arrested for harbouring a convict.
 - While I talked, she busied herself with the cat on her lap.
 - He was in the know but refused to admit it.
 - His upper-class manner immediately made him a suspect in the group.
 - He muddied the picture further by raising the racial issue.
 - Try to picture the scene to yourself then think of the best expression to use.
 - A big deficit during the current fiscal is now unavoidable.
9. Using the generative approach, say why the compounds on the left are possible while the ones on the right are not:
- good-looking *sad wanting
 - odd-seeming *stupid supporting

- (c) fast-moving *slow-owing
 (d) wage-earner *cow-stinker
 (e) profit-sharing *loss working

10. What do the following compounds mean? Can you suggest any relationship between the meaning of the compound and the meanings of the constituent words?

- (a) bookworm (f) bootlicker
 (b) jailbird (g) tell-tale
 (c) lay-about (h) holdfast
 (d) birdbrain (i) kickback
 (e) scarecrow (j) spin-off

NOTES ON QUESTIONS & EXERCISES

1. (a) For example: un-: unwise (adj.), undo (vb.)

-ly friendly (n.) wisely (adj.)

(b) The point about the classification of derivational affixes that the existence of such cases supports is that derivational affixes cannot be classified on the basis of the category of the stem alone.

2. For example:

-ful: beautiful (adj.), handful (n.)

-ese: Chinese (adj./n.), officialese (n.)

re- : rebuild (vb.), reunion (n.)

The point that they support is that derivational affixes cannot be classified on the basis of the grammatical category of the word resulting from the affixation alone.

3. When two or more derivational suffixes belonging to different (sub) categories have the same phonological form, we have suffixal homophones. E.g., -ing (deverbal noun suffix as in building, opening, etc.) and -ing (denominal noun suffix as in matting, carpeting, etc.)

4.	-ee	as in	payee: 'one who is (paid)'
	-eer	as in	mountaineer: 'one who is engaged in (the kind of activity suggested by the stem)'
	-ful'	as in	glassful: 'quantity which would fill (a glass)'
	-hood	as in	boyhood: 'state of being (a boy)'
	-ive	as in	attractive 'of the kind that (attracts)'
	-let	as in	starlet: 'a small (star)'
	-ly	as in	motherly: 'having the qualities of (a mother)'
	a-	as in	amoral: 'neutral with regard to the quality of being (moral)'
	micro-	as in	micro-organism: 'very small version of (organisms)'
	sub-	as in	subhuman: 'belonging to a species/rank lower than that of (a human)'

5. (a) Deverbal adjective suffix: attached to a verb produces an adjective
 (b) Denominal verb suffix: attached to a noun produces a verb
 (c) Deadjectival noun suffix: attached to an adjective produces a noun
 (d) Denominal adverb suffix: attached to a noun produces an adverb
 (e) A conversion prefix: a prefix that changes the category of the word to which it is attached.
6. (a) **anti-** : Orientation prefix
 (b) **de-** : Reversative prefix
 (c) **dis-** : Privative prefix
 (d) **il-** : Negative prefix
 (e) **mal-** : Pejorative prefix
 (f) **mini-** : Prefix of size
 (g) **-en** : Deadjectival verb suffix
 (h) **-ent** : Deverbal adjective suffix
 (i) **-ic** : Denominal adjective suffix
 (j) **-ing** : Denominal noun suffix
 (k) **-ize** : Deadjectival adverb suffix
 (l) **-ly** : Deadjectival adverb suffix
 (m) **-ly** : Deadjectival adjective suffix
 (n) **-ment** : Deverbal noun suffix
 (o) **-th** : Deadjectival noun suffix
7. (a) From Tiger woods, a young golf player who broke all records in his very first professional performances and created a world-wide sensation in the golfing world.
- (b) From 'chutney', the Hindi word, taken in the sense of a mixture, or melange, of various ingredients. The Indian writer of English today is open to influences ranging from the pop culture of the west to the centuries-old traditions of the regional Indian cultures, and often seems alienated, rootless and confused. But at the same time he is very alive and very sensitive. This gives his perceptions pungency, which is conveyed strikingly by the word 'chutney'. Thus the expression actually conveys the idea of not only a mixture but a tangy and pungent mixture.
- The denominal verb suffix **-fy** derives 'chutneyfy', from 'chutney'; in turn, the deverbal noun suffix **-ation** turns 'chutneyfy' into 'chutneyfication'.
- (c) From 'yuppie' ('Young Urban Professional Person') referring to the young professionals in the business world who are paid exorbitantly high salaries and have a fancy life style. The word, which captures an entire class of people, their attitudes and life-styles, is used in a derogatory sense to express the speaker's disapproval of the class.
- The ending **-ie** or **-y** is a familiarity marker (as in **buddy**, **chappie**, etc.). The denominal verb suffix **-fy** is added next to get 'yuppify'; next the reversative prefix **de-** gives us 'deyuppify' from which the deverbal noun suffix **-ation** derives 'deyuppification'.
- (d) 'Lebanonization' comes from the name of the country 'Lebanon', which, in recent years, has seen a bitter and prolonged civil conflict turning into a

running sore. When the same thing happened in Bosnia, the process could be described using the single word 'Lebanonization'. The denominal verb suffix -ize is added to 'Lebanon', followed by the suffix -ation.

- (e) 'McDonaldization' comes from McDonald's, the American fast-food restaurant chain which, starting only a few decades ago, now has around 15,000 restaurants all over the world, more outside than inside USA. McDonald's has become synonymous with the American (and the 'modern') way of life, its efficiency and reliability combined with its fast pace and alienation from traditional values. The success of the McDonald model has not only made fast food a world-wide craze, but all businesses have been trying to imitate the business principles of McDonald. Its values are being adopted increasingly by the young generation everywhere. In this sense the word describes a sociological phenomenon very aptly.

The morphological processes are the same as in 'Lebanonization'.

8. (a) fish (noun → verb)
 (b) steam (noun → verb)
 (c) harbouring (noun → verb); convict (verb → noun)
 (d) busied (adjective → verb)
 (e) know (verb → noun)
 (f) upper-class (noun → adjective); suspect (verb → noun)
 (g) free-for-all (phrase → verb)
 (h) muddied (adjective → verb)
 (i) picture (noun → verb)
 (j) fiscal (adjective → noun)
9. The compounds on the left are possible because they are derived from possible sentences (e.g., **good-looking** is derived from the sentence **X looks good**; those on the right are not possible because the underlying sentences are not possible (e.g., ***sad-wanting** has the impossible source ***X wants sad**).
10. (a) **bookworm**: Refers to a person who is very fond of books; like the worm that likes to live in books and eats holes into them
 (b) **jailbird**: describes a person who is frequently in jail for the crimes he commits; like a bird flying in and out of a jail
 (c) **lay-about**: used for a lazy person who avoids work; he prefers to 'lie around or about the place'
 (d) **birdbrain**: a stupid person; with a brain as small as that of a bird
 (e) **scarecrow**: a human like figure dressed in old clothes set up in a field to frighten (scare) away birds (crows)
 (f) **bootlicker**: a flatterer; one who would 'lick the other's boots'
 (g) **tell-tale**: a person who tells tales i.e. reveals other people's secrets
 (h) **holdfast**: a hook, clamp or bolt; something that holds things fast
 (i) **kickback**: money paid to someone illegally on some deal; passing something on to someone by kicking it backwards to him so that it is not seen
 (j) **spin-off**: incidental gain; something that spins off, e.g., a spinning-wheel but is not intended as its main product