

Lexical integrity and lexical sharing: An approach to suspended affixation

Aaron Broadwell
SUNY Albany

The original formulation of such lexicalist theories as LFG and HPSG takes a strong view of the lexical integrity principle, and only allows fully formed words as terminal nodes of trees.

However, more recent work (based on work by Wescoat 2002, 2007) has adopted a slightly relaxed version of this principle, in which some lexical items may *instantiate* more than one node of a syntactic tree. The default relationship between terminal nodes and words is a one-to-one, but special lexical items and special affixes may be designated in the grammar as *coinstantiators* of adjacent terminal nodes. *Lexical sharing* is the general term for such a coinstantiation relationship with terminal nodes.

The fused preposition+determiner combinations of many Romance languages (e.g. French *du*) are examples of lexical items which display lexical sharing. Languages may also have morphological rules which specify coinstantiation relationships between terminal nodes and words. Turkish suspended affixation and Zapotec noun-adjective compounding are also susceptible to such analyses (Broadwell 2007, 2008). An advantage of the lexical sharing approach is that some morphological rules involve lexical sharing and while others do not. Thus the Turkish plural *-lar/-ler* involves lexical sharing, while the English plural *-s* does not. Even within a single language, some morphology operates via lexical sharing and some does not. Thus the Turkish plural allows suspended affixation, but the Turkish causative does not.

Because the lexical sharing approach requires special lexical items or morphological rules to license coinstantiation, there is no prediction that affixation should generally be able to apply to a conjoined base. In contrast, many syntactic approaches to word formation appear to make the incorrect prediction that all affixes should be able to apply to conjoined bases.