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My talk tests Manova’s (2011) approach to suffix ordering (A cognitive approach to SUFF1-SUFF2 combinations: A tribute to Carl Friedrich Gauss, Word Structure 4:2) against data from Russian.

For suffix combinations in English and Bulgarian, Manova (2011) shows that there is a systematic relationship between SUFF1 (i.e. a derived base terminating in a suffix) and the syntactic-category specification of the SUFF2 suffixes that attach to it, in the sense that there is a clear tendency for SUFF1 to select only one particular SUFF2 of a major syntactic category, N, V and ADJ. If more than one SUFF2 with the same syntactic-category specification exists, either one of the SUFF2 suffixes applies by default (i.e. most of the derivatives exhibit that suffix) or semantic rules differentiate between the different SUFF2 suffixes and allow the attachment of only one particular SUFF2 depending on what the speaker intends and due to blocking (Aronoff 1976, among others). Additionally, since derivation is prototypically word-class-changing (Dressler 1989; Booij 2000), SUFF1 and SUFF2 usually have different syntactic-category specifications. I define the syntactic-category specification of a suffix cognitively, i.e. I see word classes as cognitive categories (Langacker 1987; Croft 1991), which is also compatible with Lieber (2004).

(1) and (2) illustrate the structure of the Slavic and English words respectively (cf. Manova 2011).

(1) Schema of the structure of the Slavic word
(PREFIX) - BASE - (DERIVATIONAL SUFF) - (THEMATIC MARKER) - (INFLECTIONAL SUFF)

A slot that is associated with more than one arrow can host more than one affix. Ø means that English does not possess morphemes that correspond to the Slavic thematic markers. The term ‘evaluative’ (1) is used after Scalise (1984) and denotes
diminutive and augmentative suffixes, which in the Slavic languages, unlike in English, differ from the non-evaluative suffixes in combinability (Szymanek & Derkach 2005; Manova & Winternitz 2011).

In the talk I will analyze the combinations of 30 non-evaluative suffixes from Russian with the other suffixes in this language. The data come from Zaliznjak’s dictionary (Zaliznjak 1977), the Academy grammar (Švedova 1980), the Russian National Corpus, and the Internet; the suffix combinations were also checked by native speakers.

The Russian suffix combinations will be compared with the results obtained by Manova for English and Bulgarian. In the discussion, I will, among other things, devote special attention to the importance of the direction of derivation to suffix ordering. I will argue in favor of base-driven morphology, i.e. the direction of derivation is from SUFF1 to SUFF2, cf. Plag (1996).
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