

Inflection-Inflection vs. Inflection-Derivation Competition in loanword integration

Loanword integration is mostly treated from the mere perspective of phonological approximation (e.g. Chang in press, Dohlus 2005, LaCharité & Paradis 2005, Paradis & LaCharité 2008) and of individual lexical analogies (e.g. André 1971, Biville 1990, 1995) but never in light of the decisive factor of morphological productivity.

The goal of the present contribution is 1) to demonstrate that inflectional integration is determined ultimately by rules productivity rather than by gender assignment rules (as maintained, e.g., by Audring 2004+ and Thornton 2009); and 2) to enlighten the mechanisms of rules competition which govern the process of inflectional class assignment. The data are drawn largely from Latin and Italian in the role of receiving languages and cover their development over a time-span of almost 2,000 years.

In this paper, adopting both the morphological race model (cf. Baayen, Dijkstra & Schreuder 1997) and a competing motivations approach (cf. Du Bois 1985, Bates & MacWhinney 1989, Haspelmath 1999), I show not only that in the process of morphological integration different rules of inflection may compete for the same input, but also that this competition may be carried out at different *loci* of the morphological processing, that is, it may occur both within the inflectional module of morphology and across inflection and derivation. Two scenarios are then conceivable: Either two or more productive inflectional classes compete with each other, that is, competition occurs intra-modularly (Inflection-Inflection Competition), or an inflectional pattern competes with a productive derivational one, that is, competition occurs inter-modularly (Inflection-Derivation Competition).

In the corpus investigated, the analysis of the morphological variants of loanwords not only reveals different grades of morphological integration, e.g., in Latin the Graecisms *stacta* -ae (f) ‘gum-resin’ from *στακτή* -ῆς (f) vs. the corresponding less integrated Graecising form *stacte* -es (f), but also indicates competition between different inflectional classes. Inflection-Inflection Competition can occur either between classes which display different degrees of productivity, as in example (1), or between two or more classes which display an identical degree of productivity, as in (2):

- (1) AGr. *lampás* -ádos f > Latin *lampada* -ae f (Plautus) vs. *lampas* -adis f (Plautus) ‘torch’
- (2) AGr. *gausápēs* -ou m > Latin *gausape* -is n (Lucilius) vs. *gausapa* -ae f (Varro) vs. *gausapum* -i n (Ovidius) ‘cloth of woollen frieze’

Differently, in Inflection-Derivation Competition, derivational morphology intervenes in the process of inflectional class assignment on the basis of partial, superficial phonological similarities. In example (3), the assignment of the Arabic noun to the mid-productive class *cane* -i is determined by the pressure of the Italian productive derivational suffix *-one*. The resulting lexeme *cotone* stands, in Old Italian, alongside *cotono* which, in turn, is determined by the full productivity of the class *libro* -i:

- (3) Arabic *quṭn* m > *cotono* m vs. *cotone* m (both attested in 1281-82) ‘cotton’

The result of these types of competitions are allomorphic lexemes whose success can be ascertained only in terms of a diachronic examination.

References:

- André, Jacques. 1971. *Emprunts et suffixes nominaux en latin*. Genève: Droz.
- Audring, Jenny. 2004+. *Constraint competition in gender assignment to loanwords*. Manuscript, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. [under review]
- Bates, Elisabeth & Brian MacWhinney. 1987. Competition, variation, and language learning. In Brian MacWhinney (ed.), *Mechanisms of language acquisition*, 157–193. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Baayen, R. Harald, Teun Dijkstra & Robert Schreuder. 1997. Singulars and plurals in Dutch: Evidence for a parallel dual route model. *Journal of Memory and Language* 37. 94–117.
- Biville, Frédérique. 1990. *Les emprunts du latin au grec. Approche phonétique*, tome I. Louvain, Paris: Peeters.
- Biville, Frédérique. 1995. *Les emprunts du latin au grec. Approche phonétique*, tome II. Louvain, Paris: Peeters.
- Chang, Charles B. (in press). Phonetics vs. phonology in loanword adaptation: Revisiting the role of the bilingual. In Alex Bratkievich, Daniel Bruhn, Amy M. Campbell, Ramón Escamilla, Lindsey Newbold, and Russell Rhodes (eds.), *Proceedings of the 34th annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: general session and parasession on information structure*. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Dohlus, Katrin. 2005. Phonetics or phonology: Asymmetries in loanword adaptations – French and German mid front rounded vowels in Japanese. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 42. 117-135.
- Du Bois, John W. 1985. Competing motivations. In John Haiman (ed.), *Iconicity in syntax*, 343-365. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1999. Optimality and diachronic adaptation. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 18(2). 180-205.
- LaCharité, Darlene & Carole Paradis. 2005. Category preservation and proximity versus phonetic approximation in loanword adaptation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36(2). 223-258.
- Paradis, Carole & Darlene LaCharité. 2008. Apparent phonetic approximation: English loanwords in Old Quebec French. *Journal of Linguistics* 44(1). 87-128.
- Thornton, Anna M. 2009. Constraining gender assignment rules. *Language Sciences* 31. 14-32.