

- CHANG, WILL; CHUNDRA CATHCART; DAVID HALL; and ANDREW GARRETT. 2015. Ancestry-constrained phylogenetic analysis supports the Indo-European steppe hypothesis. *Language* 91.1.194–244.
- FRUEHWALD, JOSEF. 2013. *Phonological involvement in phonetic change*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania dissertation.
- HAAK, WOLFGANG; IOSIF LAZARIDIS; DAVID REICH; et al. 2015. Massive migration from the steppe was a source for Indo-European languages in Europe. *Nature*, to appear. Published online 2 March 2015. DOI: 10.1038/nature14317.
- MORRISON, DAVID A. 2011. *Introduction to phylogenetic networks*. Uppsala: RJR Productions.
- YANG, CHARLES. 2002. *Knowledge and learning in natural language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Department of Linguistics  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305  
[dringe@sas.upenn.edu]

**Making new words:** Morphological derivation in English. By R. M. W. DIXON. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. 472. ISBN 9780198712374. \$110 (Hb).

Reviewed by PAVOL ŠTEKAUER, *P. J. Šafárik University*

With regard to books describing English word formation, 2014 was a very prolific year, including Bauer et al. 2014, Miller 2014, and the presently reviewed book by R. M. W. Dixon. Each has contributed in its specific way to our knowledge of English morphology. Certainly, there are many more books on English word formation that have emerged since Marchand's groundbreaking *Categories* (1960). Some of them are mentioned as an important source of data by D himself.

Given this multiplicity of recently published books dealing with English word formation, it is not easy to be innovative and bring to the market ideas that attract the attention of the readership. If I claim that every teacher and student of English linguistics should possess this excellent book in their library, one may ask what it is that MAKES THE DIFFERENCE. I believe this book to be a worthy successor to Marchand's *Categories* (1960, 1969), and, as such, it deserves to be labeled (like *Categories* was by Zandvoort (1961:120)) a 'truly monumental work' synthesizing and expanding the available knowledge in the field. While its scope only encompasses affixation processes, these are described with remarkable comprehensiveness and systematicity. Like *Categories*,<sup>1</sup> D's volume does not deal with demanding theoretical issues of word formation; this kind of discussion is reduced to the necessary minimum. D appears to ably pursue the goal of being theory-neutral in order to concentrate on practical aspects of modern English word formation. What is embarrassing in some places, however, is the avoidance of established terminology and use of a few new terms that may cause confusion among morphologists. This is most evident in his use of the term 'double-duty words', to which I return below.

Another similarity to Marchand's volume is D's scrupulous adherence to the diachronic-synchronic method in the description of every single affix. D is right in saying that our understanding of the use of a particular affix with a particular stem cannot be reduced to a single factor; it is rather an interaction of several factors that are at play. Therefore, the account of synchronic phenomena has, throughout the whole volume, very strong support from diachronic data, which facilitate the understanding of various ostensible (from the synchronic point of view) idiosyncrasies. Highly systematic and meticulous coverage of individual affixes pays relevant attention to each affix's origin and historical development (including the date of the first occurrence of the corresponding affixed words), its semantic scope and current use, the productivity of the affix across time, and selectional restrictions, including historical, structural, phonological, and se-

<sup>1</sup> It should, however, be noted that Marchand 1960 contains brief but highly important theoretical foundations of his structuralist approach to word formation.

mantic combinability of affixes with various types of roots/stems (e.g. use with Germanic and/or Romance bases, class-changing or class-maintaining affixes, etc.). Where relevant, the text also discusses mutual potentiation of prefixes and suffixes.

Perhaps the most intriguing and valuable feature of the volume is the systematic comparison of various semantically related affixes with each other. The comparisons are illustrated with well-chosen examples and lucid tables. In this way the reader is guided through the complexities of competing, semantically related affixes.

Given that nothing in this world is perfect, I find only several minor flaws in this excellent volume. Ironically, most of them pertain to what should serve (merely) as background, in particular, some theoretical aspects of the book. Due to the lack of space, I very briefly comment on only a few.

First, D replaces the term *CONVERSION* with the term *DOUBLE-DUTY WORDS*. This is confusing and misleading because ‘double-duty’ suggests that one and the same word fulfills its function within two different word classes (see p. 397). This position is difficult to accept. A word with, for example, a nominal inflectional paradigm cannot fulfill the function of a verb without changing its nominal paradigm to a verbal one, that is, without being converted to a verb. Furthermore, D speaks about the primary function of double-duty words. Again, this kind of formulation raises the question of determining which of the functions is primary, secondary, or even tertiary. As with Marchand’s criteria for directionality of conversion (1964), D’s criteria are not leakproof (see, for example, Štekauer 1996). The idea of a single word fulfilling several word-class functions faces serious problems in cases like *cheat*, *guide*, and *witness*, where the nominal member evidently acquires a completely new aspect of meaning compared to the verbal member of the pair—in these cases the semantic category of Agent. Finally, with ‘conversion’ having been replaced with ‘double-duty’, it comes as a surprise that the stress differences in noun-verb pairs like *'import* vs. *im'port* and verb-adjective pairs like *'frequent* vs. *fre'quent* are explained as cases of conversion. Štekauer 1996 (pp. 55ff.) demonstrates that stress in these cases is not a word-formation device; instead, it should be treated as a word-class indicator for one type of converted words.

Second, the criteria for the distinction between affixed words and compounds do not seem to be persuasive. Thus, D claims that compounds do not meet the criterion of multiple occurrences. It is not quite clear whether this assumption refers to the multiplicity of new words produced by a particular affix and compound constituent, or the frequency of occurrence in corpora. In either case one cannot conclusively distinguish between affix and compound constituent. For example, in the *Longman dictionary of contemporary English* (2003 edition), I found thirty-nine compound words with *black* as the first constituent. No doubt, there are more of them. Similar cases of compounds abound. By contrast, there are affixes that have produced only a few words (e.g. the suffix *-ern* is used in just four words; p. 263), and it is generally known that the productivity of individual affixes significantly varies both synchronically and diachronically.

Another criterion, not met by compounds according to D, concerns the predictable semantic effect. Once again, it does not work universally. English affixes are polysemous and/or homonymous. By implication, the meaning of affixed words is not infrequently rather difficult to predict if one encounters such a word for the first time. Note the frequently discussed problem of the polysemy/homonymy of the *-er* suffix(es). If one adds to it the effects of semantic shift, the problem of predictable semantics becomes even more serious. By contrast, there are synthetic compounds whose meaning predictability is fairly high. This is also true of compounds with participles such as *blue-eyed*, *hard-working*, and so on. This brings us to complex words with *well* as the first constituent. D distinguishes cases with clear semantics from those in which ‘meanings cannot be inferred from the meanings of the components’ (128). He therefore treats the latter as compounds (e.g. *well-being*, *well-off*, *well-heeled*) in which *well* has the meaning ‘in an approved manner’. A standard dictionary like Longman lists a considerable number of basic meanings of *well*, including ‘satisfactorily’ (which corresponds to D’s ‘suffix’ meaning), ‘thoroughly’, and so on. Each of the meanings of the lexeme *well* can combine with the meanings of other lexemes to form a compound. One of these meanings can be identified in any *well* compound. Picking one of them and treating it as predictable in contrast to the other meanings does not seem appropriate.

The numbers of prefixes and suffixes described by D (ninety and 110, respectively) are much higher than those in Marchand 1960 (sixty-six and eighty, respectively). This is precisely related to D's inclination to treat a number of elements, traditionally viewed as compound constituents, as prefixes. Apart from the above-mentioned case of *well*, D considers, for example, *self* words as prefixations if the meaning is clearly inferable from its parts. He also includes particle-based words in the group of prefixed words, contrary to Schmid 2011, Miller 2014, and, importantly, Marchand, who maintains that '[i]n all periods of the language there have been locative particles as first-words of compounds' (1960:66). This classification is, however, in accordance with Lieber 2005 and Bauer et al. 2014. Finally, D surprisingly classifies units such as *-maker*, *-wright*, *-smith*, *-woman*, and so on as suffixes, a view that differs from any previous publication on word formation. This approach might lead to enormous and unjustified proliferation of 'suffixes'—there would be dozens of similar candidates.

This bias toward affixes does not seem to be well founded from the perspective of psycholinguistic research into semantic transparency of compounds either. Thus, for example, Libben (1998) aptly distinguishes between constituency, which pertains to the use of morphemes in their original/shifted meaning, and componentiality, which indicates whether the meaning of a compound as a whole can be inferred from the meanings of its constituents. In his concept of morphological transcendence, Libben (2010) assumes that a compound constituent used as a modifier in a large number of compound words can gradually acquire a 'compound' meaning independent of the original free lexeme. Similarly, Gagné and Shoben (1997) relate the semantic transparency of compounds (not derived words) to the frequency of use of the modifier concept in a particular semantic relation to the head concept of a compound. In their well-known example, they illustrate that if there are many compounds with the modifier *mountain* used with a locative meaning, then it should be easier to process *mountain bird* 'a bird in the mountains' than *mountain magazine* 'a magazine about mountains' (1997:74). From this it follows that neither the number of words in which a compound constituent occurs nor a meaning that differs from the core meaning of a free lexeme can serve as a criterion for the distinction between compounds and derived words. If one adds to it a closely related process of lexicalization that can affect any complex word and complex word constituent, D's criteria do not seem to be well based.

A third problem is that, given the book's focus on affixation processes, I would expect it to cover some recent (though peripheral) developments in the field of infixation, such as the use of the genuine infix *-iz* (basically restricted to hip-hop). Miller (2014) also mentions some other cases of true infixation, other than the traditionally cited examples of nongenuine, free-word-based 'infixes' in English.

Fourth, referencing in the volume is somewhat problematic. There are minimal references to other sources when dealing with the essential theoretical issues, as the nature of the volume justifies their absence. But the use of references elsewhere seems to be rather haphazard and unsystematic: thus, for example, Charles Hockett, Leonard Bloomfield, and Henry Gleason are cited within a brief discussion of the nature of morpheme; there is a reference to D himself bearing on phonological conditioning of the comparison of adjectives (although no such reference is given to the other aspects of the English inflectional system); there is a reference to Edward Sapir and D concerning morphological processes in other languages; a few references within the double-duty problem; and a few more. By contrast, there are dozens of other issues that are left without any references. On p. 52 we read that 'there is no correlation between productivity, on the one hand, and broadness of meaning'. This is a nice illustration of a place where I would have liked a reference to a different view (cf. Aronoff's 1976 attempt to relate productivity and semantic coherence). The few references provided in the text are mostly outdated (which is not to say that they are irrelevant). One would also expect references to more recent publications.

Within the limited space it is not possible to discuss all issues that may raise questions, nor is this the purpose of the review. What matters is that these minor reservations do not overshadow the extraordinary contribution and significance of the volume. D's monograph is one of the most impressive reference books of recent years.

## REFERENCES

- ARONOFF, MARK. 1976. *Word formation in generative grammar*. (Linguistic Inquiry monograph 1.) Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- BAUER, LAURIE; ROCHELLE LIEBER; and INGO PLAG. 2014. *The Oxford reference guide to English morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- GAGNÉ, CHRISTINA L., and EDWARD J. SHOBEN. 1997. Influence of thematic relations on the comprehension of modifier-noun combinations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 23.71–87.
- LIBBEN, GARY. 1998. Semantic transparency in the processing of compounds: Consequences for representation, processing, and impairment. *Brain and Language* 61.30–44.
- LIBBEN, GARY. 2010. Compound words, semantic transparency, and morphological transcendence. *Linguistische Berichte Sonderheft* 17.1–14.
- LIEBER, ROCHELLE. 2005. English word-formation processes. *Handbook of word-formation*, ed. by Pavol Štekauer and Rochelle Lieber, 375–428. Dordrecht: Springer.
- MARCHAND, HANS. 1960. *The categories and types of present-day English word-formation*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- MARCHAND, HANS. 1964. A set of criteria for the establishing of derivational relationship between words unmarked by derivational morphemes. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 69.10–19.
- MARCHAND, HANS. 1969. *The categories and types of present-day English word-formation*. 2nd rev. edn. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- MILLER, D. GARY. 2014. *English lexicogenesis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SCHMID, HANS-JÖRG. 2011. *English morphology and word-formation*. Berlin: Schmidt.
- ŠTEKAUER, PAVOL. 1996. *A theory of conversion in English*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- ZANDVOORT, R. V. 1961. Review of Marchand 1960. *English Studies* 42.120–24.

Department of British and American Studies  
 P. J. Šafárik University  
 Petzvalova 4  
 04001 Košice, Slovakia  
 [pavel.stekauer@upjs.sk]

**The origins of language: A slim guide.** By JAMES R. HURFORD. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp. 173. ISBN 9780198701668. \$65 (Hb).

Reviewed by FREDERICK J. NEWMAYER, *University of Washington, University of British Columbia, and Simon Fraser University*

The Oxford University Press ‘Slim guides’ are intended ‘to be non-technical, readable, and short, while still conveying what is unique and special about language and its continuity with non-human life’ (from the front matter). James R. Hurford is uniquely placed to produce such a guide on the topic of language origins. He wrote one of the first linguistically informed articles on the topic (Hurford 1989) and has recently published two mammoth volumes covering the origins and evolution of linguistic meaning and grammar (Hurford 2007, 2012, respectively). I doubt that there is any other living scholar (with the possible exception of Derek Bickerton) who combines the breadth of knowledge of language evolution studies with the ability to synthesize complex, often contradictory, material into a readable package for the lay reader.<sup>1</sup> The degree to which H has succeeded is exemplified by the glowing testimonials (on the inside cover of the book) by four scholars whose approaches to language differ markedly from each other: Cedric Boeckx, N. J. Enfield, Tecumseh Fitch, and Maggie Tallerman. Boeckx has phrased his evaluation in a

<sup>1</sup> [Editor’s note] Bickerton’s book on this topic, *More than nature needs* (Harvard University Press, 2014), is also reviewed in this issue of *Language*.