

# UCLA

## UCLA Previously Published Works

**Title**

Review of Fertig (2013): Analogy and morphological change

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/92t5p7tr>

**Journal**

Diachronica, 32(1)

**ISSN**

0176-4225

**Author**

Andersen, Henning

**Publication Date**

2015-04-10

**DOI**

10.1075/dia.32.1.05and

Peer reviewed

# John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Diachronica* 32:1  
© 2015. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible only to members (students and faculty) of the author's/s' institute. It is not permitted to post this PDF on the internet, or to share it on sites such as Mendeley, ResearchGate, Academia.edu.

Please see our rights policy on <https://benjamins.com/#authors/rightspolicy>

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com)).

Please contact [rights@benjamins.nl](mailto:rights@benjamins.nl) or consult our website: [www.benjamins.com](http://www.benjamins.com)

## REVIEWS / COMPTES RENDUS / BESPRECHUNGEN

*Analogy and morphological change* (Edinburgh Historical Linguistics). By David Fertig. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013. Pp. viii, 160.

Reviewed by Henning Andersen (University of California, Los Angeles)

This is the first volume in a new series, Edinburgh Historical Linguistics, edited by Joe Salmons and David Willis and dedicated to advanced textbooks on language change and comparative linguistics. As a whole, the series is intended “to provide a comprehensive introduction to this broad and increasingly complex field” (back cover). Analogy seems an excellent choice of topic for this first volume: A notion that has been central to the study of synchronic and diachronic morphology since antiquity, and which continues to attract the interest of theoretical linguists.

The volume (hereafter *A&MC*) covers its topic in eight chapters (1–140) to be detailed below. It concludes with a list of “References” (141–156) and an “Index” of names, languages and concepts (157–160).

The first chapter (“Fundamental concepts and issues”, 1–18) introduces the notion of analogy. It provides basic historical background since the 1870s, clarifies the polysemy of the word *analogy*, distinguishing cognitive analogy vs. analogical formation, analogical innovation vs. change and change vs. diachronic correspondences. It alerts the reader to some of the different senses in which the word *analogy* is used in the literature and contrasts analogy with reanalysis, sound change, language contact and grammaticalization.

Chapter 2 (“Basic mechanisms of morphological change”, 19–41) continues the description of the essential conceptual apparatus, contrasting the reanalysis types resegmentation and revaluation with actualization, and discussing associative interference, extension, the role of transmission (acquisition) in grammatical innovation and static vs. dynamic conceptions of grammar. A key part of this chapter is a novel classification of analogical innovations (27–37). It is based on the traditional proportional equation’s  $A : B = C : D$  and distinguishes A-, B-, C-, and D-reanalysis. “Exaptation” (37–40) is viewed as a separate change type not subsumed in this classification. I return to these below.

Chapter 3 (“Types of analogical change: Introduction and proportional change”, 42–56) discusses the difference between proportional and nonproportional analogy, suggests the limitations of the proportional scheme and goes through the traditional subtypes: four-part analogy, extension, backformation, (ir)regularization and singular vs. “across-the-board” changes.

Several kinds of nonproportional analogy, folk etymology, contamination and blends are reviewed in Chapter 4 (“Types of analogical change: Non-proportional change”, 57–70).

Chapter 5 (“Types of analogical change: Problems and puzzles”, 71–84) looks at paradigm leveling, analogical nonchange and phantom analogy and returns to the issue of irregularization.

Chapter 6 (“Analogical change beyond morphology”, 85–101) looks at syntactic, semantic, morphophonological and phonological change with a view to determining to what extent changes in these parts of grammar can be considered analogical. Of particular interest here is the interplay of regular sound change and analogical change, including the issue of therapeutic changes.

Chapter 7 (“Constraints on analogical innovation and change”, 102–121) is concerned, first of all, with the apparent excessive generality of the kinds of explanation that are advanced for morphological change. It covers such topics as optimization, preference theory, constructional iconicity, system congruity, the role of frequency, naturalness and optimality, constraints on the direction of change and teleology.

Chapter 8 (“Morphological change and morphological theory”, 122–140) concludes the exposition with perspectives on acquisition, linguistic universals, exemplar-based vs. rule-based conceptions of grammar, rules vs. constraints and the issue of morphology as morphosyntax vs. as wordform paradigms.

The lay-out of the volume is handsome. There are very few misprints; repeated tokens of *probabalistic* (104) stand out. I noted that Gleason’s 1958 classic is missing in the References.

It can be gathered from the preceding survey that this short monograph is conceptually very rich. Chapters 1 and 2 introduce an articulate conceptual apparatus for the analysis and interpretation of morphological changes. Throughout the volume, the exposition of each type of problem acknowledges relevant views of scholars who have been concerned with morphological change. Apart from the special role played by the work of Hermann Paul’s generation in the exposition, the emphasis is naturally on work produced since the 1970s renaissance of historical linguistics (cf. Anttila 1972), but particularly on theorizing in the last couple of decades.

One unintended effect of the manner of presentation is that the internal coherence of individual scholars’ approaches becomes hard to see, and their views on individual issues tend to appear as mere opinions. To take an example, under the heading “The interaction of analogy with sound change” (98–100), the text discusses the question of (a) prophylaxis (avoidance, preventive analogy) vs. (b) therapy (repair, remedial analogy). Various scholars are mentioned as subscribing to (a) or (b), one scholar actually changing his mind from (a) to (b) “after being

scolded by” (99) a colleague, another reverting from (b) to (a). It does not become clear at all why these opinions are held, or under what circumstances only one of these motivations would be possible or plausible. A few pages further on, under “One function-one form” (106–109) the issue reappears in the guise of homonymy reduction (avoidance or repair). Here the reader is told that avoidance or repair of dysfunctional homonymy is an old idea that has been espoused by a series of scholars from the 1800s to the present; references and examples are given. But the idea is emphatically rejected by one scholar; the latter argues that sound change often results in homonymy that is tolerated for centuries; therefore avoidance of homonymy cannot be the motivation for changes that eliminate homonymy. This view appears to be given the same weight as the views it opposes. This is one of many places in which the author has an opportunity to explain that sharply divergent views of morphological change may be coherent with distinct research ideologies, but — analogically speaking — he drops the ball.

It is also one of the many places where the explication of a type of change would have benefited from reference to the fact that all change is enacted through variation. Variation is mentioned often enough in the volume, as the index attests, but mostly in abstract terms. And the exposition in Chapter 2 emphasizes the distinction between diachronic correspondences and the actual changes they summarize (7). Still almost all examples are presented as diachronic correspondences. The fact that in the progression of a change, innovated and inherited elements coexist as covariants puts the “prophylaxis or therapy” issue in a different light: A synchronic stylistic variation between an inherited pronunciation and an innovated one that results in homonymy can presumably easily be overridden by the need for clarity in communication. As a consequence, the older, inherited pronunciation can be selectively retained in specific morphosyntactic contexts. Such a scenario would involve neither avoidance nor repair in the traditional sense, for no appeal to either foresight or post-factum adjustment would be called for.

Fertig’s typology of analogical changes, which is presented in Chapter 2 (see above), is a nice way of paying homage to the great Hermann Paul and the proportional analogies of the grammatical tradition. It does seem quaint, not to say illogical, that acknowledged covert innovations have to be described exclusively in terms of overt, surface wordforms. But it is an interesting exercise, and it has the unexpected effect of highlighting types of morphological change to which the time-honored proportional formulae cannot be applied.

Ideally, for an introduction such as *A&MC*, in which different theoretical approaches need to be compared, one should have a set of theory-neutral descriptive notions that would make it possible to show, for each approach, which of the known types of change it captures, and with what degree of precision. In the following I will comment briefly on the central change types in Fertig’s exposition

using a few elementary notions. It will be seen that they make it possible to overcome the shortcomings of the proportional scheme.

In an example of “A-reanalysis” (35), the adjectival suffix Gm. *-ig*, Eng. *-y* “characterized by, prone to” (*anгр-y*, *hair-y*, *sleep-y*, etc.) loses its syntactic specification ‘denominal’ and comes to form deverbal adjectives (*sleep-y*, *runn-y*, *shak-y*, etc.). The essence of the reanalysis is that a morphosyntactic constraint is not detected in such ambiguous formations as *sleep-y* and hence not acquired. As a consequence, nothing bars the formation of deverbal neologisms with Gm. *-ig*, Eng. *-y*.

In “B-reanalysis” (32), derivatives like OE *forgifen-ess* (with PGmc. \*-*assu*) are resegmented (metanalysed) as *forgive-ness*; the new suffix (allomorph) is used to form OE *gōd-ness* “goodness”, *beorhtness* “brightness”, etc. What is reanalysed is the expression (*signifiant*); the meanings (*signifiés*) of stem and suffix are unaffected. Surprisingly, Fertig sees a parallel to this in such special cases as *helicopter* > *copter* and *heli-* (as in *heli-port*) (34), in which both of the resulting expression allomorphs *heli-* and *copter* have the same content (*signifié*) as the unsegmented *helicopter*. Although *helicopter* is discussed under “B-reanalysis”, no proportions are offered for its two clippings, as they would traditionally be called. They are unusual, compared to normal clippings (*deli* for *delicatessen*, *mum* for *chysanthemum*), in which only one part of the clipped source expression is assigned the source content.

In a “C-reanalysis” (29) the collective singular *peas(e)* is reanalysed as a count-noun plural *pea-s*, which implies a singular *pea*. Fertig writes a proportion with “*beans* : *bean* ...”, choosing the name of another pulse with the same stem vowel. But beans have no more to do with the analysis of *pea-s* than do bananas or legos. From the point of view of acquisition, [pe:z] ⇒ *pea-s* is just as innovative as is OE [forgiveness] ⇒ *forgife-ness* — a fresh segmentation and valuation of a word’s two constituents — with *pea-s* motivated by the final [z] and the word’s multiple referents. When we call *pea* a backformation from *peas(e)* we are guided by etymological knowledge that no learner possesses. We should not let this knowledge distract us from focusing on what actually occurs in the analysis of surface forms in grammar formation.

In a “D-reanalysis” (28) productive rules produce, say, a participle *melted*, which gains acceptance as a variant of the inherited *molten* and eventually supersedes this, except in fixed attributive functions. Fertig posits that *molten* was initially lexicalized and thereby “opened the door” for *melted*. But no lexicalization was necessary for *holpen* to be superseded by *helped* or in cases like *boden* > *bid*, *croppen* > *crept*, *doven* > *dived*, *glidden* > *glided*, *thriven* > *thrived*, etc. What was necessary, in these as in all cases of morphological change, was the coexistence in grammar and usage of the newer and older variants, from the former’s creation to

the latter's curtailment from its former functions. The existence of *melte* made it possible to curtail *molten*.

Fertig's "D-reanalysis", then, is not a reanalysis, but an extension of an unmarked (default) stem allomorph (*melt-*) and an unmarked suffix allomorph (*-ed*). The subsequent leveling of the *melte* ~ *molten* variation — a tiny step in the ongoing loss of strong verb forms — can be viewed in the larger perspective as part of the long-drawn-out actualization of the weak conjugation, which has been underway since it was grammat(icaliz)ed in prehistoric Germanic.

Another token of the same change type is discussed further on in the book (46). It is presented as *sui generis* and especially interesting because it is difficult to accommodate in the proportional mold: It is the replacement of the 2SG present ending in modals, e.g., MHG *darf-t* > ModGm. *darf-st* (cf. older Eng. *wil-t*, *shal-t*). Neither *mache* : *machst* = *darf* : X, nor *machen* : *machst* = *dürfen* : X can resolve X as *darf-st*. But here, too, there was an extension of an unmarked allomorph (*-st*) and an eventual leveling of the resulting *-st* ~ *-t* variation in each of the modal verbs. No proportion is needed.

If we explicitly distinguish expression (*signifiant*), content (*signifié*) and syntactic specifications, we can junk the pseudo-teleological notion of "exaptation" (37–40) and recognize changes so labeled as counterparts to some of Fertig's types. Reanalysis can affect an element's content-syntactic specifications (as in "A-reanalysis") or its expression-syntactic (morphophonemic) specifications (discussed 90–92 and *passim*). It can affect an element's expression (as in "B- and C-reanalysis"), or an element's function or semantic content. While a new segmentation (or valuation) of an expression may give rise to a new stem (*pea-*) or affix (*-ness*), a new valuation may ascribe new function or content to a stem or an affix. Thus, syntactic variants of the English distal demonstrative (*that*) were reanalysed as definite articles (*the*) (37), that is, a variant stem was ascribed a new grammatical function. In another example of Fertig's (38), the endings of prehistoric Germanic deadjectival *n*-stem derivatives (the modern-day weak adjective endings) were reanalysed as markers of NP definiteness. (Much later, in the Middle Ages, when demonstratives were reanalysed as signs of definiteness, reanalysis of the weak endings reduced them to the syntactically conditioned allomorphs (indexes) they are today.) For more examples of the application of these simple conceptual tools to morphological change, see Andersen (2006, 2008).

By choosing to make the most of proportional analogy Fertig has, apparently unintentionally, provided strong arguments for the final retirement of that venerable, Procrustean scheme. The failure of the *mach-e* : *mach-st* = *darf-Ø* : X proportion alone demonstrates the fatal weakness of proportional analogy: Its unmotivated preoccupation with expression elements, which at best leaves essential content and syntactic properties implicit, at worst ignores them. Any approach

to morphological change that explicitly accounts for the analysis of all relevant aspects of grammatical elements in grammar formation should be preferred.

The points of criticism that have been raised in the preceding pages should not overshadow the valuable aspects of this well-written, up-to-date and competent guide to analogy and morphological change.

As mentioned, this volume introduces the reader to a rich conceptual apparatus. Its thorough and detailed exposition is rich in illustrative examples as well, most of them from English and German, and many of recent vintage. Accompanied by selected readings of more specialized works on morphological change, *A&MC* will prove an excellent introduction in a graduate course. Even if it is used as a stand-alone textbook, its wealth of examples will invite discussion in the light of the analytic and interpretive conceptual tools it introduces and is likely to produce valuable insights into the nature of morphology and into the analytic decisions made by speakers that give rise to morphological change.

## References

- Andersen, Henning. 2006. Grammatication, regrammatication, and degrammatication: Tense loss in Russian. *Diachronica* 23(2). 231–258. DOI: 10.1075/dia.23.2.02and
- Andersen, Henning. 2008. Grammaticalization in a speaker-oriented theory of change. In Þórhallur Eythórsson (ed.), *Grammatical change and linguistic theory: The Rosendal papers* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 113), 11–44. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/la.113.02and
- Anttila, Raimo. 1972. *An introduction to historical and comparative linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.
- Gleason, Jean Berko. 1958. The child's learning of English morphology. *Word* 14. 150–177.

## Reviewer's address

Henning Andersen  
Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures  
University of California, Los Angeles  
P.O. Box 951502  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1502  
USA  
andersen@humnet.ucla.edu