Francesco Gardani

Scientific Report

1. Purpose of the visit

Language contact can give rise to morphological change. For example, in Arnhem Land (Australia), Ritharngu (Pama-Nyungan) has borrowed from Ngandi (Gunwinyguan) a suffix -ʔmayʔ, which inflectionally realizes negation on verbs or other non-verbal constituents, replacing the independent particle *yaka* previously used. The following example illustrates this case (data from Heath 1980: 101–102, 108).

(1)   a.   Ritharngu   b.   Ngandi
                wa:n-i-ʔmayʔ-ṇi: *gu-dawal-ʔmayʔ*
                go-fut-neg-you   cm-place-neg
                'Don't you go!'   'not at place'

Phenomena of this kind have long been ignored in the literature, because contact-induced change occurs less frequently in morphology than in other areas of grammar, for example, lexical borrowings. In recent times, progresses in both linguistic typology and morphological research have promoted a research branch that combines the study of language contact with theories of morphology (Myers-Scotton 2002; Gardani 2008, 2012; Meakins 2011). Nevertheless, the relevance of morphological borrowing as a source of external evidence for the theory of morphology, in terms of generalizations about the so-called architecture of grammar, is still considerably underestimated.

The main purpose of the stay at the Centre for Linguistics at Leiden University was to work on a project *Morphological Borrowing*, aimed at the study of contact-induced morphological change in a typological perspective. More specifically, I aimed to write a chapter of a book provisionally titled *Typology of morphological borrowing* to be completed within 1,5 years.

2. Description of the work carried out during the visit

My stay in Leiden has made immense resources available to me, both material and human. On the one hand, I had access to the extensive collections of Leiden University libraries; on the other, I got to discuss my ideas and results with prominent scholars, in particular Geert Booij (morphological theory), Maarten Kossmann (language contact), and Martine Robbeets (historical linguistic), as well as with several promising doctoral students. The work I carried out consisted of a) collecting data, b) writing a paper, and c) discussing the results.

a) Data collection: The stay in Leiden was particularly fruitful in this respect, as I had the chance to attend the defense of a PhD dissertation on the grammar of Ghomara Berber by Khalig Mourigh (Mourigh 2015). This variety of Berber spoken in the Ghomara area in Morocco shows the most interesting instances of the phenomenon that Maarten Kossmann has labeled Parallel System Borrowing (see below).

b) Writing: I wrote 80% of a chapter, *Crossing the boundaries—the borrowing of morphology*, focusing on cases in which morphological formatives are borrowed and come to be used in a recipient language in a systematic way.

c) Discussion: I discussed data on Parallel System Borrowing with Maarten Kossmann and Khalig Mourigh; the role of the investigation of contact-induced language change for the Altaic hypothesis with Martine Robbeets; and several morphological topics with Geert Booij, including

the 'stratal effect' and the borrowing of compounding subschemata within the framework of Construction Morphology (Booij 2010).

3. Description of the main results obtained

I wrote 80% of a paper provisionally titled *Crossing the boundaries—the borrowing of morphology*. The chapter investigates cases in which morphological formatives are borrowed and come to be used in a recipient language (RL) in a systematic way. The main question to be addressed concerns the demarcation of apparently similar phenomena, such as Parallel System Borrowing (PSB) (Kossmann 2010) and borrowing proper. From which moment on can we claim that a formative has crossed the boundaries of a language? Does the presence of foreign morphology in a language per se constitute a threshold in this respect? Or are there other criteria necessary to precisely delimit the spread of morphological formatives?

I take a psycholinguistic stance and propose to discriminate between what is accessible and what is not accessible to speakers, in terms of perceptual analyzability and morphological awareness. Analyzability is conceived of as "the extent to which speakers are cognizant of the presence and semantic contribution of component symbolic elements" (Langacker 2000: 127) and morphological awareness is "the knowledge that multimorphemic forms are indeed multimorphemic" (Rice et al. 2002). Advances in psycholinguistic research, that run under the heading of 'psycholexical' studies, support a view of the mental lexicon as a "dynamic place", in which several conflicting representations are activated in order to maximize the opportunity for meaning creation (Libben 2014, forthc.). In theoretical terms, this can be modeled by assuming two co-existing layers of morphology, viz. 'inactive morphology' and 'active morphology'.

I distinguish between two fundamental types of borrowing, a first type, in which borrowed formatives apply to non-native bases only, and a second type, in which borrowed formatives also apply to native bases of the RL. Often, when inflectional and derivational formatives cross the boundaries between two languages in contact, they do not apply to native vocabulary items of the RL but they remain constrained to loanwords or non-native strata of the RL's lexicon. That is, foreign formatives occur on non-native lexemes only. This phenomenon can be explained in terms of a 'stratal effect' (a term suggested to me by Geert Booij, 13.02.2015). The stratal effect is responsible for a differential morphological treatment of loanwords vs. native words in an RL, in terms of etymon-related compartmentalization. By way of example, consider the overall transfer of paradigms in some languages. The stock example is the English *alumnus alumni*, a singular-plural pair borrowed *tout court* from Latin, by retaining the (relevant) Latin inflections. The use of form pairs such as *alumnus alumni* or *curriculum curricula* is restricted to the speech of rather educated speakers, of course, who may have some kind of sensitivity to the Latin inflections.[1] Recently, Kossmann (2010) has shown that this phenomenon is more diffused than is generally assumed, and has labeled it *Parallel System Borrowing* (PSB). PSB is a process of transfer by which loanwords retain their original paradigms, thus coming to establishing themselves as systems parallel to the native paradigms of the host language. (As a matter of fact, transferred inflections can engage in competition with native inflections, such as the English *fungus*, which has both a learned plural form *fungi* and a nativized word-based plural form *funguses*.) In languages with elaborated paradigms, PSB is more prominent, as shown in the following example from the Northern Berber language of Ghomara, northwestern Morocco,

---

[1] For similar cases occurring at the level of individual bilingualism, Matras (2015: 48) speaks of 'morphological compartmentalization' and claims that this occurs "in situations in which speakers embrace and flag a bilingual identity". See Friedman (2013) for the term 'compartmentalized grammar'.

where the paradigms of the native Berber verb *kšəm* 'enter' (2a), and of the Arabic-borrowed verb *ṭlaqa* 'meet' (2b, c), coexist as parallel systems (data from Kossmann 2010, based on Mourigh's fieldwork).

(2)   (Ghomara Berber)
a.   Native paradigm   b.   Loan paradigm (prf)   c.   Loan paradigm (impf)
    1sg   *kəšm-əx*   *n-ṭlaqa*   *ṭlaqi-t*
    2sg   *t-kəšm-ət*   *t-ṭlaqa*   *ṭlaqi-t*
    3sg.m   *i-kšəm*   *i-ṭlaqa*   *ṭlaqa*
    3sg.f   *t-əkšəm*   *t-ṭlaqa*   *ṭlaqa-θ*
    1pl   *n-əkšəm*   *n-ṭlaqa-w*   *ṭlaqi-na*
    2pl   *t-kəšm-əm*   *t-ṭlaqa-w*   *ṭlaqi-θum* (?)
    3pl   *kəšm-ən*   *i-ṭlaqa-w*   *ṭlaqa-w*

PSB is one specific type of morphological matter crossing the boundaries of its source language and coming to be part of the active morphology of an RL. However, there are cases both of languages that borrow foreign inflectional formatives and use them to inflect native lexemes, and of languages that form new lexemes through borrowed derivational formatives operating on native bases of the RL. Consider the following example of mat-borrowing occurred in Turkish. Here, the adjectivizer *-vari*, borrowed from Persian, applies to the Turkish noun *yengeç* 'crab' (data from Seifart 2013).

(3)   (Turkish)
    a.   *yengeç-vari*   b.   *pishrow-var*
        'crab-like'   'leader-like'

I term 'borrowing proper' only case such as (1a) and (3), on the basis of a constraint according to which *morphological borrowing occurs when formatives apply to native lexemes of the recipient language and have become stabilized within a speakers' community*. In these terms, borrowing is envisioned as a matter of both full nativization and stabilization.

4. Future collaboration with host institution
Further collaboration with Geert Booij is planned for the future. The first step will be an encounter in Leiden in September 2015. The stay was also aimed to foster collaboration with two internationally renowned Leiden-based experts in contact linguistics, Maarten Kossmann and Martine Robbeets. Future collaboration is aimed to test the theory against a body of relevant data drawn from Afro-Asian languages and Transeurasian languages, respectively, in which the colleagues are specializing (Kossmann 2013; Robbeets 2012).

5. Projected publications / articles resulting or to result from the grant (ESF must be acknowledged in publications resulting from the grantee's work in relation with the grant); Chapter 3 of a book provisionally titled *Typology of morphological borrowing*.

6. Other comments (if any).
—

References

Booij, Geert E. 2010. *Construction morphology* (Oxford Linguistics). Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Friedman, Victor A. 2013. Compartmentalized grammar: The variable (non)-integration of Turkish verbal conjugation in Romani dialects. *Romani Studies* 23(1). 107–120.

Gardani, Francesco. 2008. *Borrowing of inflectional morphemes in language contact*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Gardani, Francesco. 2012. Plural across inflection and derivation, fusion and agglutination. In Lars Johanson & Martine I. Robbeets (eds.), *Copies versus cognates in bound morphology*, 71–97. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Heath, Jeffrey. 1980. *Basic materials in Ritharngu: Grammar, texts and dictionary* (Pacific Linguistics. Series B, Monographs 62). Canberra: The Australian National University.

Kossmann, Maarten. 2010. Parallel System Borrowing: Parallel morphological systems due to the borrowing of paradigms. *Diachronica* 27(3). 459–487.

Kossmann, Maarten. 2013. *The Arabic influence on Northern Berber* (Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 67). Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2000. *Grammar and conceptualization*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Libben, Gary. forthc. Word-formation in psycholinguistics and neurocognitive research. In Peter O. Müller, Ingeborg Ohnheiser, Susan Olsen & Franz Rainer (eds.), *Word-formation*: *An international handbook of the languages of Europe*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Libben, Gary. 2014. The nature of compounds: A psychocentric perspective. *Cognitive Neuropsychology* 31(1-2). 8–25.

Matras, Yaron. 2015. Why is the borrowing of inflectional morphology dispreferred? In Francesco Gardani, Peter Arkadiev & Nino Amiridze (eds.), *Borrowed morphology* (Language Contact and Bilingualism 8), 47–80. Berlin, Boston & Munich: De Gruyter Mouton.

Meakins, Felicity. 2011. *Case-marking in contact*: *The development and function of case morphology in Gurindji Kriol* (Creole Language Library 39). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mourigh, Khalid. 2015. *A grammar of Ghomara Berber*. Leiden: University of Leiden PhD dissertation.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Contact linguistics*: *Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Rice, Sally, Gary Libben & Bruce Derwing. 2002. Morphological representation in an endangered, polysynthetic language. *Brain and Language* 81(1-3). 473–486.

Robbeets, Martine. 2012. Shared verb morphology in the Transeurasian languages: Copy or cognate? In Lars Johanson & Martine I. Robbeets (eds.), *Copies versus cognates in bound morphology*, 427–446. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Seifart, Frank. 2013. *AfBo: A world-wide survey of affix borrowing*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Available online at http://afbo.info.