

## GENDER AGREEMENT VIA DERIVATIONAL MORPHOLOGY IN GREEK

ANASTASIA CHRISTOFIDOU – URSULA DOLESCHAL – WOLFGANG U. DRESSLER

In this paper we will try to counter two usual assumptions: a. that gender agreement only relates to syntax and inflectional morphology and b. that inflection and derivation constitute two completely different domains of language (split morphology). Further it will be shown how gender agreement can be treated within the framework of natural morphology, since this theory assumes a rather fuzzy boundary between inflection and derivation due to a continuum from prototypical inflection to prototypical derivation. For this purpose we bring substantial evidence from Greek data, like the – typically – derivational suffix *-iko*, which builds the neuter form of many greek adjectives.

## 1. Introduction

1.1 In linguistic theory and in the description of many languages (but less so of Modern Greek), agreement has been the topic of many recent studies and even of two volumes published in 1988 (Barlow – Ferguson 1988; Brentari et al. 1988), but we could not find a study on our specific topic in gender agreement. Our contribution has two aims: First, we want to counter the usual assumption that gender agreement only relates to syntax and inflectional morphology. Second, we want to show how gender agreement can be treated within the framework of Natural Morphology (cf. Dressler et al. 1987). Our data come from Modern Standard Greek as spoken in Athens (for other languages cf. Dressler – Doleschal 1990).

For the purpose of this contribution we may assume (cf. Anderson 1985: 176ff; Kibrik et al. 1977) that gender, in a gender language, is an inherent feature of each noun. However a specific gender may be constitutive for a declensional class, either obligatory or as the default value so that gender becomes the feature of a declensional class. Note the following paradigm - structure condition (in the sense of Wurzel 1989):

All Greek nouns in Sg. Nom. vowel (mostly -a, -i), Gen. Sg. and Pl. Nom. ending in -s are feminine such as *i xóra, tis xóras*, Pl. *i xóres* «the land», *i jajá, tis jajás*, Pl. *i jajá + des* «the granny», *i nífi, tis nífis*, Pl. *i nífes*, etc., whereas nouns with -s in Sg. Nom. and Gen. in vowel are masculine (cf. Seiler 1958; Dressler – Acson 1985). Exceptions are represented by the neutralizing class of nouns in -os which designate professions, e.g. *o filólogos* vs. *i filóloga* «the philologist» (cf. Thomadaki 1990), and those in -as, e.g. *o tamías*, vs. *i tamías* «the cashier»; Gen. Sg. is *tu/tis filológou* and *tu/tis tamía* (but Gen. Fem. often *tis tamías* according to the paradigm - structure condition). The feminized variants *ifilóloga, iximikú* (m. *oximikós*) are either pejorative or belong to sociolects such as high - school jargon.

The dominant paradigm - structure condition for neuters is that Nom. and Gen. Sg. and Nom. Pl. end in vowel, e.g. *to neró*, Gen. *tou nerú*, Pl. Nom. *ta nerá* «the water», *to pedí*, Gen. *tou pediú*, Pl. *ta pediá*. (Indeclinable loan - words such as *to*, *tu*, *ta atú* «the atout» conform as well). The minor classes in unstressed Nom. Sg. - *ma*, -*simo*, -*os* have a sigmatic Gen. Sg. but a vocalic Pl. Nom., e.g. *to ónoma*, *tu onómatos*, *ta onómata* «the name», *to désimo*, *tu desímatos*, *ta desímata* «the binding», *to váthos*, *tu váthous*, *ta váthi* «the depth».

The major adjective classes have Nom Sg. m. / -o + s/, f. / -i, -a, -ia/, n. / -o/ and m. / -í + s/, f. / -i + á/, n. / -í/. The other cases closely follow the above models of nouns.

There is as yet no systematic study about semantic/pragmatic criteria of nominal classification via gender in Modern Greek, comparable to Zubin – Koepcke (1984, 1990) on German.

1.2 Gender agreement of pronouns, adjectives, articles, participles in -*ménos*, and nouns (if possible) is an agreement in gender feature (whose markers, in general, combinatorily represent number and case as well), but not necessarily in declension class (cf. Anderson 1985: 176).

We consider agreement in terms of the semiotic parameter of indexicality (cf. Dressler 1989b):

1.3 Agreement is either exophoric as in Tokharian A *näs*, «I», Gk. (*egó*) *íme kurasménos/ xoriátis* «I am tired/ a peasant» (in reference to a male speaker) vs. Tokh. A *ñuk* «I», Gk. (*egó*) *íme kurasméni/ xoriátisa* (in reference to a female speaker). Exophoric reference to neuters is limited to deixis to a present or imagined object designated by a neuter noun, e.g. *Kita aftó* (sc. *to korítsi*) «Look at this one (sc. the girl)», *ná to* «There it is» (sc. the girl), *kita to naziáriko* «look at this jocular one», referring to a girl, a baby, a dog (all neuter nouns); it may be referred to a man, if one thinks of the neuter diminutive, i.e. n. *andr + aki* instead of m. *ándras* or if one compares (at least implicitly) the man (or woman) with a baby (of course these types of exophoric neuter reference merit further study).

1.4 Or agreement is endophoric as in syntactic agreement with the gender of a noun (or pronoun) within or across a sentence, as in ... *to korítsi. (Aftó) íne kurasméno* «... the girl. (It) is tired»; if one wants to say that the girl is a peasant, one has to use exophorically the fem. form *íne xoriátisa* (similar to German) or use a paraphrase (such as «comes from the countryside») or use an adjective (the corresponding adjective *xoriátikos*, - *iki*, - *iki*, however, can only refer to objects such as bread, but non to girls). The trigger/controller of endophoric agreement is the gender feature of an inflectional class (or lexically marked in an exceptional noun) within the same text/ discourse, the trigger of exophoric agreement an extratextual referent («natural gender»), i.e. either a referent conceived of as animate (male or female, including personifications, cf. Beard 1986: 3.2, but note the above problem with neuters) or a class of referents where male may be regarded as unmarked such as in the following Greek utterances of a female speaker: *íme kalós odigós* «I'm a good (adj.) driver» (instead of fem. *kalí odigós*; and rather obligatorily Pl. *imaste kalí odigi*).

1.5 In the following we will use male and female as exophoric signata («natural gender»), m(asculine), f(eminine) and n(euter) as morphological gender features, and M, F, N as overt markers, i.e. if a declension class has a gender feature, and overt declensional markers (e.g. affixes) cosignal the respective gender feature.

1.6 What we want to contradict, is a discrete distinction between inflection and

derivation as assumed by protagonists of Split Morphology (e.g. Anderson 1982, Perlmutter 1988, cf. Zwanenburg 1988), by theorists such as Scalise (1988), by the Lexical Integritty Hypothesis (Lapointe 1980:8), and by those followers of N. Chomsky who assume an agreement node dominated by an INFL node (see references and further developments in Pollock 1989).

## 2. Gender agreement of nouns

2.1 Gender is inherent in nouns (cf. 1.2). However, personal nouns (i.e. nouns denoting persons, cf. Beard 1986) exhibit a tendency of gender mobility either in being marked by the article (always gendered in the Sg.), or by means of derivation such as in *kathigitís* (M), *kathigitria* (F) «professor» where the change in gender is brought about by a derivational affix, or *fil-os* (M) - *fil-i* (F) where it is signalled by the respective declensional class suffix. This mobility serves the function of denoting the sex of persons. Contrary to inflectional gender in e.g. adjectives, gender motion in nouns is not fully productive, but subject to various restrictions (cf. Doleschal 1989, 1990 for German and Italian), as expected for a derivational rule.

2.2 Nevertheless the gender mobility of personal nouns may be exploited for the scope of agreement - exophoric and endophoric. E.g. in German there is a strong tendency to use a derived female noun in a predicative NP when the subject refers to a woman, although nouns in predicative NPs do not identify referents and thus the information [+fem] conveyed by the derivational suffix is redundant. Therefore we have to interpret this use of derived female nouns instead of the unmarked male ones as an attempt at (exophoric and endophoric) agreement in gender as in:

- 1a. Aftí íne xoriát- isa «she is a peasant»
- b. Aftí íne xoriát- a «she is like a peasant» (pejorative)

Here gender agreement is obligatory. Cf. Czech *Zeme živitelka* / \**živitel* «Earth as nourisheress/ \*nourisher» = Croatian *Zemlja hranitelica* / \**hranitel*.

2.3 This sort of agreement is optional, however, for many personal nouns as in:

2. I María ítan o protagonistís tis vradías «Mary was the (M) protagonist (M) of the evening».

But agreement is obligatory, if «protagonist» designates the professional role in a movie (which is, of course, sex - specific):

3. I María ítan i protagonístria tu érgu «Mary was the (F) main actress (F) of the movie».

2.4 Agreement by derived female nouns eventually occurs both in non - predicative NPs and with non - personal nouns. In the latter case we are dealing with endophoric agreement made possible by personification of the controller noun:

- 4a. I Eláda vgíke níkitria/ níkitís «The (F) Greece (F) came out as victor (victorious) (F/M)»
- b. I Diethnís Amnistía san organóttria/ organotís... «The (F) Amnesty (F) International (genus commune in high standard) as organizer (F/M)...»
- c. I Néa Dimokratía íxe ton rólo tu paratirití/ tis paratiritrias «The (F) Nea Dimokratia had the role of the (M/F) observer (M/F)», where m. is preferred.

2.5 Although it is claimed that nouns in predicative NPs behave essentially like adjectives, in that they do not denote extralinguistic entities, but only properties (cf. Werner 1975, Padučeva 1985), there is a difference as to gender. If in predicative NPs, nouns behaved exactly like adjectives we would expect them to agree in gender, at least when this is possible, but this is not always the case. In fact we can establish a hierarchy of decreasing obligatoriness of agreement for agent nouns (cf. Dressler – Doleschal 1990), which shows at the same time that there is indeed a type of predicative NP where nouns cannot be distinguished from adjectives on purely syntactic or semantic grounds. All the words involved in this hierarchical scale are derived by the agent suffixes m. *-tis*, f. *-tria/-tra/-(t)isa*:

predicative without article > predicative with article > generic

- 5a. *I María íne metafrástria* «The (F) Mary (F) is translator» (F obligatory).
- b. *I María káni ton metafrásti/ tin metafrástria* «The (F) Mary (F) has the job of the (M/F) translator (M/F)» (where m. represents the unmarked class).
- 6a. *I María ítan protagonístria/? protagonístis sto párti* «The (F) Mary (F) was protagonist (F/?M) at the party».
- b. *I María ítan o protagonístis tu párti/? i protagonístria tu párti* «The (F) Mary (F) was the (M/?F) protagonist (M/?F) of the party».

We are dealing with preferences. However, it is clear that the existence of the definite article indicates reference to an extralinguistic entity whereas the absence of an article indicates reference to a property of the respective subject (or person referred to).

2.6 Generic NPs on the other hand are, so to say, «NPs in their own right» i.e. they do not depend on other NPs syntactically, but at the same time they are non-referential, like predicative NPs, and therefore undergo agreement more easily than referential NPs in which the indication of gender is in itself a means of reference in order to identify a discourse referent, cf.:

- 7a. *I María milái san pragmatikós kathigitís* «The (F) Mary (F) speaks like a real (M) professor (M)».
- b. *O Kóstas milái ópos i kathigíttria pu akúsame xtes sto sinédrio* «The (M) Kostas (M) speaks like the professor (F) whom we heard yesterday in the congress».

Of course the above is valid only for article languages that allow predicative and generic NPs both with and without article (more in Dressler – Doleschal 1990).

### 3. Gender agreement of adjectives

3.1 Greek agentive nouns can be used rather marginally as adjectives; then they obligatorily agree in gender with their controller noun as in:

- 8a. *I níkitria Eláda/ omáda* «the (F) victorious (F) Greece/ team (F)».
- b. *O níkitis Olimbiakós* «the (M) victorious (M) Olimpiakos (team) (M)».

Such examples have no frequent occurrence, but are still incompatible with Split Morphology (similar to the much more frequent examples in French and Italian, cf. Dressler – Doleschal 1990). Normally, however, in Greek, paraphrases or synonymous adjectives

tives are used such as in:

- c. O nikióros stratós, i nikióra fregáda, to nikióro plío «The victorious army/fregate/ vessel».

3.2 Another Greek agentive suffix *-(i)áris* ( Thomadaki 1988: 41 - 44) originated from a Byzantine transformation of Latin *-arius* suffixation (the source of English and German agentive *-er* suffixations as well). In fact, nowadays, there are two, partially homonymous suffixes:

a) a nominal and now rather unproductive suffix, used for deriving names of professions from nominal bases, e.g. *várka* «boat» → *vark - áris* «boatsman», *fúrnos* «oven» → *furn - áris* «baker»; the variant *-iáris* is relatively rare, e.g. *kopádi* «flock» → *kopad - iáris* «flock owner». Female counterparts can be derived by the motion suffix *-isa*: *vark - ár - isa* «boat - owner» (F), *furn - ár - isa* «baker» (F). Morphophonemically corresponding neuters in *-ári* are synchronically unrelated concrete nouns such as *fanári* «lantern», *fegári* «moon».

b) The adjectival suffix designating properties developed later. Bases can be verbs, nouns, adjectives or numbers. Its usual form is *-iáris* e.g. *ksexnó* «I forget», aorist *kséxasa* → *ksexas-iár-is* «forgetful», *taksídi* «trip» → *taksid-iár-is* «fond of travelling», *palavós* «foolish» → *palaviáris* «behaving like a fool»; *-áris* is a rare variant, such as in *pízma* «obstinacy» → *pizmat-ár-is* «obstinate», except in the regular subclass denoting «X - years - old», e.g. *triánda* «30» → *triand - áris* «thirty - years old».

The feminine form of the adjective is regularly formed by transferral into the feminine inflectional affix class in *-a* (*-isa* is a nominal suffix only). So far everything is in line with the traditional division between inflection and derivation (taken up by adherents of Split Morphology).

However, the neuter form of adjectives in *-áris/ -iáris* cannot be formed by mere dropping of the masculine inflectional suffix *-s*, but needs the addition of another –typically adjectival– derivational suffix, *-iko*. Thus we get the following adjective forms:

9. m. *ksexas- iár -is* f. *ksexas - iár- a* n. *ksexas- iár- ik- o*

The process is fully productive and the only way of deriving the neuter of adjectives in *-áris/iáris*, such as in *dekaen -iár- is/a/ ik- o* «19 years old», *asprul- iár- is/a/ik -o* «whitish» etc., as in:

10. o *ksexasiáris* ándras, i *ksexasiára* ginéka, to *ksexasiáriko* pedí «the forgetful man/woman/child».

Neuter gender agreement thus makes use of the most productive derivational adjectivization suffixation in *-ikos*. (Lexicalizations of substantivized adjectives are a different matter, e.g. the coin *to dek - áriko* and the bank - note *to xili- áriko*).

3.3 More general, the adjectives in unstressed *-is* follow this declension and take the derivational suffix/ *iko/* in the neuter. Examples (generally of Turkish origin) are:

11. m. *tembélis* «lazy», f. *tembéla*, n. *tembéliko* (Turk. *tembel* N. and adj.); *grusúzis/a/iko* «bringing mischief (Turk. *uğursuz*)»; *lixúdis/a/iko* «sweet - tooth (adj.)».

Another, productive subclass consists of adjectival bahuvrihi compounds denoting properties such as

12. *zguromális/a/iko* «curly - haired», *makromítis/a/iko* «long - nosed».

Again a derivational means of forming the neuter.

3.4. We can observe a quite different situation in Katharevusa adjectives in - *ódis*, which may be enlarged by - *ikos* in all genders in order to conform to paradigm - structure conditions, i.e. m. = f. - *ódis*, n. - *ódes* → m. - *ódikos*, f. *ódiki*, m. - *ódiko* (cf. Simeonidis 1989: 77f).

However, the isolated Katharevusa adjective m. = f. *afthádis* «insolent» has two neuters: either a higher form in - *es* (*afthádes*) or the more popular form in - *iko* (*afthádiko*). A m. *afthádikos* is hardly ever accepted. Thus *afthádis* joins the class of III. 3 (cf. also 3. 6).

3.5 The distribution is more complex and variable with diminutive adjectives in - *úlis*, such as *míkr - úl - is/a/ik - o* «little» (dim.). This diminutive formation maintains the either nominal or adjectival word class and (with very few, lexicalized exceptions) the gender of the base: Nouns belong to the expected gendered inflection classes in m. - *úlis*, f. - *úla*, n. - *úli*, e.g.

13. O *thíos* «the uncle» → o *thiúlis* (regular only with family designations)  
i *diatriví* «the dissertation» → i *diatrivúla* (very productive, also with proper names)  
to *avgó* «the egg» → to *avgúli* (rather rare)

Adjectives have the parallel series

14. I. m. -*úlis* f. -*úla* n. -*úli*  
II. m. -*úlikos* f. -*úliki(a)* n. -*úliko*

where variants II may have a more intensive diminutive connotation than variants I. Accordingly one would expect parallel frequency distributions of these variants in actual use. However gender and class membership are independent of one another only in the masculine. In the feminine, class II membership is extremely rare, in the neuter, class I membership is relatively rare. Thus the actual use prefers a mixed class

15. III m. -*úlis* f. -*úla* n. - *úliko*  
e.g. *ásximos* «ugly» → *asximúlis*, -*úla*, -*úliko*, *kondós* «short» → *kondúlis*,  
*tsaxpínis* «jocular» → *tsaxpinúlis*

These preferences may shed light on the origin of gender agreement via derivation in 3. 2 - 4.

3.6 Most surprising are the gender forms of the adjectives in - *lís* (from the harmonizing Turk. suffix - *li/lu/lü/lI*): *gurlís* «bringing luck» (form Turk. *uğurlu*), *meraklís* «taking a fancy to» (from Turk. *meraklı*), *maxmurlís* «sleep - loving» (form Turk. *mahmurlu*), *paralís* «having much money» (from Turk. *paralı*). In the m., the form in /li/ has been generalized, in accordance with nouns and adjectives in /ís/, thus, - *lís*. In the f., the labial harmonizing form in / lu/ has been generalized, thus - *lú*, maybe in analogy to the adjective agentive subclass in - *arú* moved from m. *arás* (e.g. m. *xoreftarás* «good dancer» → f. *xoreftarú*). Thus an inflectional gender form is constructed in analogy to a derivational one, i.e. inflectional «motion» follows derivational motion.

The corresponding neuter ends in - *lidiko*. e.g. *gurlídiko*, *meraklídiko*, *maxmurlídiko*.

Masculine and feminine forms in - *lídikos*, - *lídiki(a)* seem to be restricted to inanimate objects such as

16. ο *gurlídikos kathréftis* «the luck - bringing mirror», ο *kaimaklídikos kafés* «the creamy coffee» (thus ?*kaimaklís* seems to be inapplicable to animate beings)

whereas otherwise /*ikos*/ can be used with animate nouns as well. The base is the generalized /*li*/ as in m. (see above). Then the enlarged suffix - *dikos* is added, reanalyzed from combinations of masc. nouns in - *ás*, Gen. - *á*, Pl. - *ád-es* with the adjectivizing suffix /*iko*/ and in parallel to - *ódikos* (3. 4). Synchronically we have another instance of gender agreement via derivational morphology, although animacy / inanimacy is a lexical category which is close to inflectional categorization in many languages.

3.7 An only apparently similar, but isolated example can be identified in *tsimblís* «bleary», f. *tsimbliára*, n. *tsimbliáriko*. In fact these motion forms are loaned from the synonymous *tsimbliáris* (cf. 3. 2), i.e. *tsimblís* is defective.

#### 4. Gender and the inflection - derivation continuum

4.1 Gender agreement via derivational morphology is incompatible with Split Morphology hypotheses (see I.6). In contrast, it is compatible with Natural Morphology. Adherents of Natural Morphology have assumed that there is no discrete difference between inflection and derivation, but rather a fuzzy boundary due to a continuum from prototypical inflection to prototypical derivation (cf. Dressler, Mayerthaler, Panagl, Wurzel 1987; Wurzel 1984: 40ff; Bassarak 1985; for similar proposals in other models cf. Plank 1981: 8ff; Stephany 1982; Bybee 1985: 81ff). Dressler (1989a) has differentiated between prototypical criteria (or properties) of inflection vs. derivation and prototypical representatives of inflection vs. derivation:

4.2 Prototypical, but not absolute properties of inflection (as opposed to derivation) are, e.g., a. obligatoriness within a syntactic construction, b. no rule variation/ competition (e.g. typically a noun has just one case form in a given case, at least in a singular unmarked for number), c. categorial meaning is rather abstract and/ or relational, d. actual meaning of an inflectional form is morphosemantically more transparent, e. inflectional rules are (more) productive and f. do not change word class, g. they are difficult to reapply recursively, h. inflectional forms are organized into tighter paradigms, i) inflectional suffixes are more peripheral than derivational affixes etc., and – the property we are studying here - j) grammatical agreement/ concord occurs in inflection (according to Seiler 1989, agreement is the primary locus of gender). These properties are deductively interdependent and dependent of the difference between the functions of inflection vs. derivation (see Dressler 1989a) and seem to make correct predictions about crosslinguistic distribution, particularly if one adds typological criteria.

4.3 Prototypical representatives of derivation are, e.g. deverbal result nouns (as in E. *building* = *edifice* ≠ *act of building something*), denominal adjective formation, but not agent formation (E. *-er*) nor diminutive formation. Prototypical representatives of inflection are, e.g., the categories of case and definiteness in nouns, person, number, tense and voice in verbs.

4.4 Gender in nouns is not a prototypical inflectional category, first of all, because

gender differentiation is more typical in the inventory of pronouns than of nouns (as in English, cf. Priestly 1983); in many languages gender differentiation is more overt in adjectives than in nouns. Second, the above, selected list of prototypical criteria points to the same conclusion, if we compare gender with both prototypically inflectional case and non - prototypically inflectional number in nouns (see Dressler – Doleschal 1990). And in some languages gender may even be derivational.

## 5. Conclusions

5.1 Similar to gender agreement in general, strict agreement via derivational morphology is limited to adjectives. In a recent paper on French gender formation, Zwanenburg (1988) insisted on distinguishing derivational gender in nouns from inflectional gender in adjectives and even mentioned the fact that French feminines in *-trice*, *-euse*, *-eresse* may be both nouns and adjectives, however without discussing our problem. According to Zwanenburg «la syntaxe... introduit les traits qui trouvent leur expression dans l' affixation flexionnelle» and «la syntaxe [... règle] à l' aide de transformations l' accord de l' adjectif avec le nom», and this of course in declension. Thus we would be forced to assume that the French f. *-trice* is an inflectional form of m. adj. *-teur* and, in Italian, *-trice* of m. adj. *-tore* etc. (Such as it is clearly the case in Sp. m. *-dor*, f. *-dor-a*). This would be a case of suppletion without parallel in the inflection both of these languages and of Modern Greek (which has much less inflectional suppletion than Ancient Greek), moreover the adjectival alternation would be just accidentally homophonous with the respective derivational affix alternation of nouns – what coincidence!

Even worse for the above distinction is Modern Greek where neuter declension would introduce as inflectional marker the most common adjectivizing derivational suffix *-iko* just in the neuter. Of course inflection is involved, insofar as the addition of /iko/ inserts the neuter adjective within the most productive neuter declension of nouns and adjectives, i.e. derivation serves inflection and thus the syntax of agreement.

5.2 Our Greek examples are either agentive or diminutive derivations or adaptations from Katharevusa or Turkish. As stated above, agent formations are non - prototypical representatives of derivational morphology (cf. Dressler 1989a). Therefore our paradoxical result of finding the syntactic and inflectional category of gender agreement outside inflectional morphology, viz. also in derivational morphology, is less paradoxical insofar as it is the non - prototypically inflectional category of gender which appears with non - prototypical representatives of derivational morphology. The same holds for diminutives which are non - prototypical derivations. And the category of animacy is another transitional category.

Adaptations from another language or from the (at least earlier) diglossic high register Katharevusa would constitute stop - gap measures.

5.3 In contrast, a strict separation of inflection and derivation cannot be upheld in the sense of Split Morphology (for other critiques, cf. Stump 1989), and agreement cannot be used as a strict criterion distinguishing inflection and derivation (e.g. according to the model of Scalise 1988). In our view gender agreement is:

- 1) only prototypically a distinctive property of inflection (and especially of inflectional classes);
- 2) it may use non - prototypical representatives of word formation rules, but is



barred from prototypical representatives of WFRs;

- 3) in the languages investigated by Dressler – Doleschal (1990) gender agreement via derivational morphology is limited to an easily enumerable number of derivational types and restrictive conditions so that gender agreement may be called a default criterion of inflectional morphology. Modern Greek fits this view.

5.4 From the very beginnings of Natural Morphology in the mid- seventies, we have assumed interacting modules, one module being morphology with submodules such as inflectional and derivational morphology. But boundaries are fuzzy. If we compare, in an overly simplistic way, the components of a specific language with provinces of the same country, then these provinces interact according to country (i.e. language) specific constitutions that reflect universals of constitutions. One universal would be that, within morphology, inflectional morphology should be the primary interacting partner of syntax. However there are no iron curtains between provinces and thus syntax may reach into borderline districts of derivational morphology, and borderline areas of inflection and derivation interact one with another.

Anastasia Christofidou – Ursula Doleschal – Wolfgang U. Dressler  
 Institut für Sprachwissenschaft Universität Wien

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson S.R. 1982: «Where's morphology?». *Linguistic Inquiry* 13, 571 - 612.  
 Anderson S.R. 1985: «Inflectional morphology». In T. Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description III* (Cambridge Univ. Press) 150 - 201.  
 Barlow M. – Ch. A. Ferguson (eds.) 1988: *Agreement in natural language*. Approaches, theories, descriptions (Stanford: CSLI).  
 Bassarak A. 1985: «Zur Abgrenzung zwischen Flexion und Derivation (anhand Türkischer Verbformen)». *Linguistische Studien A* 126, 1 - 50.  
 Beard R. 1986: *Natural gender as animacy in Slavic* (ms).  
 Booij G. E. 1986: «Form and meaning in morphology: the case of Dutch 'agent nouns'». *Linguistics* 24, 503 - 518.  
 Brentari D. et al. (eds.) 1988: «Parasession on agreement in grammatical theory». *Papers of Chicago Linguistic Society* 24, 2.  
 Bybee J. 1985: *Morphology* (Amsterdam: Benjamins).  
 Carstairs A. 1987: *Allomorphy in inflection* (London: Croom Helm).  
 Doleschal U. 1989: *Movierung im Deutschen* (Dipl. Arb. Univ. Wien).  
 Doleschal U. 1989b: «Probleme der Movierung im Deutschen und Italienischen», to appear in *Parallela 4* (ed. M. Berretta, Tübingen: Narr).  
 Dressler W.U. 1989a: «Prototypical differences between inflection and derivation». *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikation* 42, 3 - 10.  
 Dressler W.U. 1989b: *Semiotische Parameter einer textilinguistischen Natürlichkeitstheorie* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften).  
 Dressler W.U. – V. Acson 1985: «On the diachrony of subtractive operations: evidence

- for semiotically based models of Natural Phonology and Natural Morphology form Northern and Anatolian Greek Dialects». In L. J. Fisiak (ed.), *Proceedings 6th Internat. Conference on Historical Linguistics* (Amsterdam: Benjamins) 107 - 127.
- Dressler W.U. – U. Doleschal 1990: *Gender agreement via derivational morphology* (Ms. for *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*).
- Dressler W.U. – W. Mayerthaler, O. Panagl. – W.U. Wurzel 1987: *Leitmotifs in natural morphology* (Amsterdam: Benjamins).
- Ferguson Ch. A. – M. Barlow. 1988: «Introduction». In Barlow – Ferguson (eds.), 1 - 22.
- Kibrik A. E. et al. 1977: *Opyt strukturnogo opisanija arčinskogo jazyka* (Moskva: Izd. MGU).
- Lapointe S. G. 1980: *A theory of grammatical agreement* (PhD diss., Univ. of Amherst).
- Pedučeva E. V. 1985: *Vyskazyvanie i ego sootnesennost's dejstivitel'nost'ju* (Moskva: Nauka).
- Perlmutter D. 1988: «The split morphology hypothesis: evidence from Yiddish». In M. Hammond – M. Noonan (eds.), *Theoretical morphology* (San Diego: Academic Press) 79 - 100.
- Plank F. 1981: *Morphologische (Ir-) Regularitäten* (Tübingen: Niemeyer).
- Pollock J.Y. 1989: «Verb movement, universal grammar, and the structure of IP». *Linguistic Inquiry* 20, 365 - 424.
- Priestly T. M.S. 1983: «On 'drift' in Indo - European gender systems». *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 11, 339 - 363.
- Scalise S. 1988: «Inflection and derivation». *Linguistics* 26, 561 - 582.
- Seiler H. 1958: «Zur Systematik und Entwicklungsgeschichte der griechischen Nominalkdeklination». *Glotta* 37, 41 - 67.
- Seiler H. 1989: «A functional view of prototypes». *akup* 77 (also: Linguistic Agency, University of Duisburg A 247).
- Simeonidis Ch. 1989: «Mia teleftéa theórisi ton epithimáton - *itsi - itsa, útsikos* etc. Triti simvoli: -*útsikos*». In *Studies in Greek Linguistics*, Proceedings of the 9th Annual Meeting of the Dept. of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy. Aristotle Univ. of Thessaloniki, 71 - 85.
- Stephany U. 1982: «Inflectional and lexical morphology: A linguistic continuum». *Glossologia* 1, 27 - 55.
- Stump G. T. 1989: *Breton inflection and the Split Morphology hypothesis* (Ms.).
- Thomadaki E. 1987: *Die wichtigsten Verfahren der Wortbildung im Neugriechischen* (Magisterarbeit Univ. Köln.).
- Thomadaki E. 1990: «O rólos tu génuos sti diamórfosi ton N.E. klitikón paradigmáton: thiliká usiastiká se: os». In *Studies in Greek Linguistics*, Proceedings of the 10th Annual Meeting... Thessaloniki, 247 - 269.
- Werner O. 1975: «Appellativa - Nomina propria. Wie kann man mit einem begrenzten Vokabular über unbegrenzt viele Gegenstände sprechen?» In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Linguistics 11* (Bologna: Mulino) 171 - 87.
- Wurzel W.U. 1984/1989: *Flexionsmorphologie und Natürlichkeit* (Berlin: Studia Grammatica 21. English translation: *Inflectional Morphology and Naturalness*. Dordrecht: Kluwer).
- Zubin D.A. – K.M. Koepcke 1984: «Affect classification in the German gender system». *Lingua* 63, 41 - 96.