SLE 2013. University of Split. Book of abstracts

SLE2013

etymological counterparts in the ancient IE languages. Interestingly, most of the properties not inherited from Proto-IE in Baltic and Slavic – as far as I can judge from the data available – are not inherited in Finnic either. This means that these properties were created relatively recently, and that the major part of these properties is the result of common developments in Baltic, Finnic and East Slavic.

References

Blake, B. J. 1994: *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Second Edn.

Corbett, G. 1994: Systems of grammatical number in Slavonic, Slavonic and East European Review 72, no. 2, 201-217. A revised version of Systems of grammatical number in Slavonic, In: David Gil (ed.) Studies in Number and Quantification. European Science Foundation Programme in Language Typology: Theme 7, Noun Phrase Structure: Working Paper no. VII/19, pp. 1-17.

Corbett, G. 2000: *Numerals*. Cambridge textbooks in linguistics. Cambridge, UK, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Huumo, T. 2010: Nominal aspect, quantity, and time: The case of the Finnish object, *Journal of Linguistics* 46, 83–125.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. 2001: A piece of the cake and a cup of tea: partitive and pseudo-partitive nominal constructions in the Circum-Baltic languages. In: Ö. Dahl and M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages. Typology and Contact*. Vol. 2. *Grammar and Typology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. 523-568.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. and Wälchli, B. 2001: *The Circum-Baltic languages: An areal-typological approach*. In: Circum-Baltic Languages, Östen Dahl, M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), Volume 2. 615-750.

Larsson, L.-G. 1983. *Studien zum Partitivgebrauch in den ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Uralica et Altaica Upsaliensia 15. Uppsala: Borgströms Tryckeri AB.

Sasse, H.-J. 2002. Recent activity in the theory of aspect: Accomplishments, achievements, or just non-progressive state?, *Linguistic Typology* 6, 199–271.

Productivity of selected deadjectival suffixes in Czech.*

Sevcikova, Magda
(Charles University, Prague)

Productivity has become one of the central issues of research into word-formation in recent decades; it has mostly been studied on the basis of corpus data. In the respected literature on word-formation in Czech, however, the productivity of word-formation means has been indicated only generally, based usually on existing dictionaries and using scales like "very productive / less productive / unproductive" (cf. Dokulil 1962, Daneš et al. 1967, Šmilauer 1971, Hauser 1980, Dokulil et al. 1986, Karlík et al. 2000).

In our paper, we present a pilot corpus-based study of productivity of selected suffixes used for deadjectival derivation of nouns in Czech. After an introductory comparison of how productivity is defined across approaches (cf. Baayen 1992 and 2001, Bauer 2001, Štekauer – Lieber 2005), and a brief survey of selected approaches to measuring productivity in languages other than English (e.g. Bolozky 1999, Evert – Lüdeling 2001, Gaeta – Ricca 2006, Pustylnikov – Schneider-Wiejowski 2009), we focus on the suffixes that compete in deriving names of qualities from adjectives in Czech: the suffixes *-ost/-nost*, *-ota* and *-da* are used to derive feminine names (e.g. *lehkost* `lightness', *kritičnost* `criticality', *samota* `loneliness', *pravda* `truth'), *-ství/-ctví* and *-í* occur in neuter derivates (e.g. *slabošství* `fecklessness', *pokrytectví* `hypocrisy', zdraví `health'). The analysis is based on recent language data stored in representative sub-corpora of the Czech National Corpus (SYN2000, SYN2005 and SYN2010). The productivity of the suffixes is determined according to their token frequency, type frequency and to the count of their hapax legomena in the corpora (Baayen 1992). The results obtained will be compared with results from several corpora of journalistic texts (Prague Dependency Treebank 2.0, SYN2006PUB, SYN2009PUB) on the one hand, and with the frequency data from the recent dictionary of Czech (Filipec et al. 1998) on the other.

The analysis of productivity is completed with an analysis of the lexical meaning of the derivates, which enables us to detect the differences among competing suffixes, to describe the polysemy of the derivates (and the suffixes), to speculate on reasons why some adjectives are compatible with more than one of the suffixes while with other adjectives only one suffix is used, and to ask further related questions. For instance, the suffix *-ost* is expected to be the most frequent (and most productive) one among suffixes used for derivation of names

SLE 2013. University of Split. Book of abstracts

SLE2013

of qualities (type frequency), nevertheless, if there are several nouns derived from the same base adjective, the noun with the suffix *-ost* is often less frequent than the others (token frequency; e.g. *mládí* vs. *mladost* `youth' with 3853 vs. 101 tokens in the SYN2010 corpus, *veselí* vs. *veselost* `merriment' with 987 vs. 185 tokens in the same corpus).

The presented analysis might be a considerable, real data-based contribution to the theoretical discussion on which component of the linguistic description productive derivates belong to in Czech, i.e. whether they should be considered a part of the lexicon or of the grammatical component. Our paper concludes with a discussion of dis/advantages of both possibilities.

References
Bauer, L. (2001): *Morphological Productivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Baayen, H. (1992): Quantitative aspects of morphological productivity. In: Booij, G. – van Marle, J. (eds.): *Yearbook of Morphology 1991*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 109–149.
Baayen, H. (2001): *Word frequency distributions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Bolozky, S. (1999): *Measuring Productivity in Word Formation: The Case of Israeli Hebrew*. Leiden – New York – Köln: Brill Academic Publishing.
Czech National Corpus. Institute of the Czech National Corpus, Faculty of Philosophy and Arts, Charles University in Prague. Available from: http://www.korpus.cz
Daneš, F. – Dokulil, M. – Kuchař, J. (1967): *Tvoření slov v češtině 2: Odvozování podstatných jmen*. Praha: Nakladatelství ČSAV. [Word-Formation in Czech 2: Derivation of nouns]
Dokulil, M. (1962): *Tvoření slov v češtině 1: Teorie odvozování slov*. Praha: Nakladatelství ČSAV. [Word-Formation in Czech 1: Theory of Word-Formation]
Dokulil, M. – Horálek, K. – Hůrková, J. – Knappová, M. – Petr, J. a kol. (1986): *Mluvnice češtiny 1. Fonetika, fonologie, morfonologie a morfematika, tvoření slov*. Praha: Academia. [Grammar of Czech 1: Phonetics, Phonology, Morphonology and Morphematics, Word-Formation]
Evert, S. – Lüdeling, A. (2001): Measuring morphological productivity: is automatic preprocessing suffiecient? In: P. Rayson – A. Wilson et al. (eds.): *Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics 2001 Conference*. Lancaster: Peter Lang, pp. 167–175.
Filipec, J. – Daneš, F. – Machač, J. – Mejstřík, V. (1998; red.): *Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost*. Praha: Academia. [Dictionary of Standard Czech for School and the Public]
Gaeta, L. – Ricca, D. (2006): Productivity in Italian word formation: A variable-corpus approach. *Linguistics*, 44: 1, pp. 57–89.
Hajič, J. – Panevová, J. – Hajičová, E. – Sgall, P. – Pajas, P. – Štěpánek, J. – Havelka, J. – Mikulová, M. – Žabokrtský, Z. – Ševčíková Razímová, M. (2006). *Prague Dependency Treebank 2.0*. CD-ROM, Cat. Nr. LDC2006T01. Philadelphia, Linguistic Data Consortium.
Hauser, P. (1980): *Nauka o slovní zásobě*. Praha: SPN. [Theory of Vocabulary]
Karlík, P. – Nekula, M. – Rusínová, Z. (2000; eds.): *Příruční mluvnice češtiny*. Praha: NLN. [Reference Grammar of Czech]
Pustylnikov, O. – Schneider-Wiejowski, K. (2009): Measuring Morphological Productivity. In: Köhler, R. (ed.): *Issues in Quantitative Linguistics* 5. Lüdenscheid: RAM, pp. 1–9.
Šmilauer, V. (1971): *Novočeské tvoření slov*. Praha: SPN. [Word-Formation in Modern Czech]
Štekauer, P. – Lieber, R. (2005; eds.): *Handbook of Word-Formation*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Examining the role of structural features upon that/zero variation in verbs of locution: a diachronic corpus-based multivariate analysis of say, tell, assert, declare, and state.

Shank, Christopher and Plevoets, Koen
(Bangor University and University of Ghent)

Most of the attention following Rissanen (1991) and Finnegan and Biber's (1995) seminal research on the rise and predominance of the zero-complementizer form as an object-clause link in PDE has focused on the mental state verbs (i.e. think and know) while considerably less has been directed at the equivalent claims and conclusions made regarding the remaining 50% of their data set namely say and tell aka verbs of locution