International Symposium of Morphology Nancy, September 13-15, 2023

From competing patterns to competing structures:

Verbal constructions based on loanwords in Hebrew

Lior Laks
Bar-Ilan Univeristy

Hebrew derived verbs based on loanwords

Base		Derived verb		Verbal Pattern
dibag	'debug'	dibeg	'debug'	CiCeC
spam	`spam'	hispim	'send a spam'	hiCCiC
blok	'block'	balak	'block'	CaCaC
pijama	'pajamas'	hitpajem	'wear a pajamas'	hitCaCeC

Hebrew derived verbs based on loanwords

Base		Derived verb		Verbal Pattern
dibag	'debug'	dibeg *hidbig *dabag	'debug'	CiCeC *hiCCiC *CaCaC
spam	`spam'	hispim *sipem *sapam	'send a spam'	hiccic *cicec *cacac
blok	'block'	balak	'block'	CaCaC
pijama	'pajamas'	hitpajem	'wear a pajamas'	hitCaCeC 3

kol exad yaxol letakbek'Everybody can write a talkback'

https://www.dwh.co.il/226-dwhcoil/1411-%D7%A9%D7%93%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%92-%D7%94%D7%90%D7%AA%D7%A8-%D7%A9%D7%90%D7%91-1-1

kol adam yaxol lixtov tokbek
 'Every person can write a talkback'

http://www.oritkamir.org/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%A9-%D7%94%D7%91%D7%999%D7%98%D7%95%D7%99-%D7%99%D7%95%D7%AA%D7%A8-%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%99-%D7%99%98%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%95%D7%AA-%D7%9E%D7%93%D7%99-%D7%97%D7%95%D7%96-%

tokbek 'talkback' tikbek (CiCeC)
katav tokbek
'wrote a talkback'

- spam hispim ~ šalax spam 'send a spam'
- pijama hitpajem ~ lavaš pyjama 'wear pajamas'
- ristart ristert ~ asa restart 'do restart'

The Current Study

Goal

 Accounting for the criteria that play a role in the selection between morphological and periphrastic formation of verbal constructions

Methodology

- Web-search on Google
- hebTenTen Corpus

https://app.sketchengine.eu/#dashboard?corpname=preloaded%2Fhetenten21_yap

- Methodological problems
- Native/ Non-native speakers
- 2. Homonymy and homography
- 3. Quantification of the data
- Contrast between items that are found and items that are not found or are extremely rare.

- Competition between morphological and periphrastic structures from different points of view
- Haspelmath 2000, Kiparsky 2005, Booij 2010, Corbett 2013, Bonami 2015, Aronoff 2016, Rainer 2016, Štekauer 2016, Masini 2019, among many others)
- Few studies have addressed it with respect to Semitic morphology, especially in derivation.

Competition in Morphology

Rainer at al. (2020)

One winner

Blocking?

Blocking and defectivity (Sims 2015, Brown & Evan 2022)

More then one winner Variation

Overabundance

- Doublets
- 'Cell-mates' (Thornton 2011, 2012)

Malkiel 1977

Kroch 1989, 1994

Taylor 1994

Anttila 1997

Fehringer 2004

Corbett 2005, 2007

Dal & Namer 2006

Aronoff 2016, 2017

Stump 2016

Acquaviva 2008

Embick 2008

Parker 2022

Economy vs. Expressivity (Kiparsky 2005)

Semitic word formation

- Non-concatenative / Non-linear morphology
- Root & Pattern Morphology
- Patterns indicating the prosodic structure,
 vocalic patterns and affixes (if any).

(Berman 1978, Bolozky 1978, McCarthy 1981, Schwarzwald, 1981, Ravid 1990, 1995, Bat-El 1994, 2011 Aronoff 1994, Doron 1999, 2003, Borer 1991, 2013).

1. Number of syllables

Most studies have focused on the competition between patterns.

dibag - dibeg (CiCeC)/ *hidbig 'debug'
vs.

spam - hispim (hiCCiC)/ *sipem 'send a spam'

Cluster preservation - faithfulness to the base

 Structural transparency - the importance of preserving properties of the base in Hebrew verb formation

(Bolozky 1978, 1999, Bat-El 1994, 2017, 2019, Ussishkin 1999, 2005, Faust 2015, among others).

- Low structural transparency can also block verb formation
- Preference for periphrastic constructions (see Halevy-Nemirovsky 1998).
- Most verbs are derived from bases that do not exceed 2 syllables.
- In case of 3 or more syllables, at least one vowel has to be deleted (and also consonants), making the derived verb less faithful to the stem.

tokbek 'talkback' 'write a tackback' vs.

katalog 'catalogue' -kitleg 'put in a catalogue'

- Deletion of second vowel
- tokbek tikbek > katalog kitleg
- Such cases are possible, but less frequent.

fotošop 'Photoshop' –

*fitšep /asa fotošop 'do Photoshop'

- There seems to be no other reason for not deriving such verbs.
- This reflects tendencies rather than a dichotomy.

babysitter - (???) bister / asa babysitter relocation – asa relocation

taekwondo

filibuster

paparazzi

 The more syllables there are the smaller the chances of verb formation.

- Implications for a word-based approach (Aronoff 1976, Blevins 2006)
- Stem Modification > Root extraction
 (Bat-El 1994, 2029, Ussishkin 1999, 2005)

2. Non-native suffixes

- Loanwords with typical non-native suffixes do not have derived verbal counterparts.
- The is mostly found in loanwords with the English suffix -ing.
- Hebrew speakers identify these words as typical loanwords.
- They are less likely to be integrated into the morphological system.

```
šoping 'shopping' -
(??) šipeng < asa šoping 'do shopping'.
gosting 'ghosting' - *gisteng
mingling 'mingling'
fišing 'fishing (data)'
gazlayting 'gaslighting'
deyting 'dating'
striming 'streaming'
```

 Items with high frequency in verbal periphrastic constructions, but no (or highly rare) derived verbs.

French

- Verbs derived from loanwords ending with -ing tend not to be integrated into the verbal system.
- -ing tends to be dropped
 (Namer & Laks, in preparation)
 shopping shop-er > (??) shopping-er
 quiet quitting quietquit-er / * quietquiting-er

- Sensitivity of the morphological mechanism to the morphological structure of loanwords.
- In cases where it identifies typical nonnative morphological elements, it tends not to integrate such words into the verbal system.

1. Semantic transparency

- Low semantic transparency blocks periphrastic formation.
- The meaning of the derived verb is not transparent in relation to the base.
- format 'format' firmet (CiCeC)
- The verb does not mean formatting in general but formatting a computer.
- šina format 'change format' sam be-format 'put X into a format'

- The noun format is borrowed into Hebrew but in a more general sense, not restricted to the domain of computers.
- Only the morphological construction is used.
- torpedo 'torpedo' tirped (CiCeC) 'ruin (plans)'
- The verb has a metaphorical meaning, which is not expressed via a periphrastic construction.

Lexical-semantic criteria 2. Lexical category

Verbs	>	Nouns	>	Adjectives
Morphological formation only		Variation		Mostly periphrastic formation

2. Lexical category

- Verb obligatory morphological formation
- Verbs that are borrowed directly into
 Semitic languages must have a pattern.

hitfayed 'fade' dilver 'deliver'

- No periphrastic alternative
- Words like fade are not used in Hebrew because they are verbs.

 Nouns - borrowed directly without morphological adaptation (only phonological, apart from rare cases)

lazanya 'lasagna'

deyt 'date'

beysbol 'baseball'

kroson~korason 'croissant'

 Noun can be the base for both morphological and periphrastic formation

kambek 'comeback'
hitkambek / asa kambek
'make a comeback'

- Adjectives an intermediate category between nouns and verbs with respect to borrowing (Ravid 1990, Schwarzwald, 1998, 2002, 2013).
- Direct borrowing
 No morphological adaptation
 snob 'snob'
 kul 'cool'

- 3 types of morphological adaptation
- (i) affixation of -i
- efektiv-i 'effective'
- (ii) truncation of a final consonant, which results in an i ending adjective,

komi 'comic'

(iii) templatic formation medupras 'depressed' (meCuCaC)

(Ravid 1992, Schwarzwald 1998, 2002)

 Most adjectives have periphrastic verbal constructions.

larj 'large (generous)' - nihya larj / *hitlarej 'become large'

targi 'tragic' senili 'senile'

 Adjectives are perceived as derived entries and morphologically more complex and there is a tendency to avoid further derivations.

- Nouns both constructions can be found.
- Pobsesya 'obsession' -
- hi?tabses (hitCaCeC) / nihya be-?obsesya
- 'become obsessed'

Lexical-semantic criteria 2. Lexical category

Verbs	>	Nouns	>	Adjectives
Morphological formation only		Variation		Mostly periphrastic formation
fayd 'fade' hitfayed		kambek 'comeback' hitkabek ~ asa kambek		komi nihya komi 'become comic'

- Nouns never undergo morphological adaptation, verbs are systematically integrated into the morphological system of root and pattern, and adjectives are in the middle.
- This intermediary status of borrowed adjectives is also manifested in the selection between morphological and periphrastic constructions to express a verbal meaning.

Basic vs. derived froms

- Nouns perceived as basic entries (borrowed as is)
- Adjectives (partially) perceived as derived, typically undergo morphological adaptation
- Similar tendencies in Hebrew native adjectives

Basic vs. derived froms

Basic adjectives
 raxav 'wide'
 hitraxev ~ nihtya raxav 'become wide'
 vs.

Derived adjectives axil 'edible' (cf. axal 'eat')

Conclusions

- The selection between morphological and periphrastic formation can be partially predicted based on systematic guidelines.
- Morpho-phonological criteria block morphological formation due to low structural transparency between the base and the derived verb and the existence of non-native suffixes.
- Low semantic transparency tends to block periphrastic formation - cases with no alternative periphrastic construction that would express the same meaning of the derived verb.

Conclusions

The lexical category of the base provides partial prediction with respect to the possibility to employ wither construction.

Conclusions

- The study adds to previous studies that examine the competition between morphological and periphrastic formation in general.
- It offers criteria that play a role in selecting either pattern.
- The study also sheds light on the degree of integration of loanwords.
- This provides direct access to word formation and shows how different types of criteria are taken into consideration.

THANK YOU!

How are such novel Hebrew verbs formed?

- Is there an independent representation of the consonantal root in the lexicon?
- Is there a mechanism of root extraction?

At least 5 'scnerios' (Bat-El 2017)

Independent root representation?	Root/word- based derivation	Method of derivation
YES	Root	Root-to-pattern association
YES	Word	Root extraction
YES	Word	Stem modification
NO	Word	Root extraction
NO	Word	Stem modification

Word-based approach

- The lexicon consists of words/stems
- Aronoff 1976, 2007
- Blevins 2005, 2006

Word-based approach

Root-extraction

Stem modification

McCarthy 1981

Ornan 1983

Bat-El 1986

Davis & Zawaydeh 2001

Steriade 1988

McCarthy & Prince 1990

Bat-El 1994, 2003, 2011

Ussishkin 1999, 2005

- Template satisfaction (McCarthy 1981, McCarthy & Prince 1986, among others)
- Template imposition (Faust & Hever 2010)

The Problem of Transfer

Bat-El 1994, 2017, 2019, Ussishkin 1999, 2000, 2005

- Which elements are transferred from the base to the derived form?
- 1. Root consonants
 - a. order
 - b. number (a few exceptions)
 - c. features

The Problem of Transfer

- 2. Vowels
- 3. Derivational affixes
- 4. Consonant clusters
- 5. Stress pattern and stress location

If possible...

Initial cluster preservation

dibagdibeg (CiCeC)/ *hidbig (hiCCiC)'debug'

spam

```
hispim (hiCCiC) / *sipem (CiCeC)
'send a spam'
(Bolozky 1978, 1997, Bat-El 1994, 2001, 2017, 2019)
```

Vowel preservation (with variation)

tof 'drum' - tofef ~ tifef 'play the drum'

kod 'code' - koded ~ kided 'code'

(Bat-El 1994, 2019, Usshishkin 1999m 2005, Faust 2019)

- Arabic broken plural forms (Hammond 1988, McCarthy & Prince 1990)
- Preservation of:
- derivational prefixes
- 2. stress pattern
- 3. vowel length

Arabic broken plural forms

CaCa:CiC pattern

daftar - dafa:tir 'notebook'

maktab - maka:tib 'office'

filter - fala:tir 'filter'

CaCa:Ci:C pattern

maktub - maka:ti:b 'letter'

malyu:n - mala:yi:n 'million'

- All approaches agree that:
- (i) some words are derived directly from words
- (ii) the word need to "look like Semitic words", namely to conform to one of the patterns

- Root-based approaches do not assume that Semitic word formation relies only on the consonantal root.
- Some words are derived directly from roots, while other words are derived directly from words.

(Arad 2003, 2005; Doron 2003; Faust & Hever 2010; Faust, 2015; Kastner 2019, 2020, Rasin at al., to appear)

- This does not mean that root-based approaches do not consider such relations (Faust 2019, Kastner 2019)
- Assuming that the morphological mechanism both examines such relations and then performs extraction, would render redundancy.

- Such cases do not imply that root-based approaches do not consider relations between words (Faust 2019, Kastner 2019).
- However, assuming that the morphological mechanism both examines such relations and then performs extraction would render redundancy.
- The current study adds to the ongoing debate on the nature of Semitic morphology, demonstrating the importance structural transparency between words.

- The current study adds to the ongoing debate on the nature of Semitic morphology, demonstrating the importance structural transparency between words.
- Non-concatenative word formation and lack thereof can be partially predicted based on morpho-phonological properties of the base.
- Word formation relies highly on faithfulness to the base, making the relations between the base and the derived form as structurally transparent as possible.

Lexical-semantic criteria

- The importance of semantic transparency
- Booker Johnson & Sims 2021