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TOWARDS A NON-PARADIGMATIC MORPHOLOGY*
A. Ford and R. Singh
Université de Montréal

Everybody uses the notion of paradigm. In spite of this, it is a somewhat vague notion.

It is generally used to characterize a set of interrelated forms but there are extended usages that go far beyond our present concerns -- such as those of de Saussure (1915) or Hjemslev (1963), not to speak of Kuhn (1973). There are also restricted uses as well, the subtleties of which are not pertinent to the present discussion. For example, the structure of a paradigm is generally given in terms of the relationships between the forms, most often by defining the members of a paradigm as functions of a given basic form. The formulations in (1) make that clear:

(1) i) "Each of these groups is called a paradigmatic group, or paradigm and each form of the group is called an inflected form or inflection." (Bloomfield, 1933: 210)

ii) "For the same reasons, we are often led to construct an artificial base." (Bloomfield: 205)

iii) For any lexeme l, the paradigm of l is the set of all the alphabets s etc., such that for a given w, s*Rs and w*Fl (where *R = "is a realization of" and *F = "is a form of" in the sense specified in Matthews (1965:272-273)).

The basic difference lies in the nature of the basic form. For Priscian, for example, the basic form is a member of the paradigm; for Bloomfield and Matthews this is not the case. For them it is an abstraction, though not of the same sort. For Bloomfield, it is a purely formal abstraction, a theme on which the forms of the paradigm are constructed. For Matthews, it is a semantic abstraction; the basic form is the nucleus of meaning which underlies the set of forms of the lexeme. This nucleus is related exponentially to the basic form. These differences, however, are not germane to the argument presented in this paper. It should be obvious that the notion is somewhat vague. There is, for example, no formal criterion that permits us to decide whether we are faced with one, two or three paradigms in any given case. The use of the term reflects this fact. The vagueness also reflects, we shall argue, the fact that the notion of paradigm is a somewhat wavering and incomplete effort to capture lexical relatedness. Although the not infrequent hand-waving is clearly an indication of the fact that there is more to lexical relatedness than paradigms, it is almost never seen as such. We shall attempt to show precisely how incomplete an effort it really is and why the hand-waving should be taken more seriously than it is.
When we refer to the verbal paradigm, we are generally referring to the set of possible forms a given verb can take. We can represent these forms in terms of abstract formulas, such as 3rd person singular present indicative. The set of these forms is what constitutes the verbal paradigm. Thus, in answer to the question of how many verbal paradigms there are, the reply should be one. But generally, we do not answer one, but two, three, five or ten, depending on the language in question. Perhaps in order to avoid this sort of problem, certain grammarians have used a different term. To designate this meaning of paradigm, the term declension was coined to designate noun case paradigms. In other cases, no special term is in use and the word paradigm must be used. For example, for number (singular, dual, plural), there is no special term, nor is there one for degrees of comparison. In case-languages, we can incorporate these distinctions into the declension and number can also be incorporated into the conjugation in the case of verbs. Aside from these contexts, the term paradigm is used.

Another example of the vague or ambivalent nature of the term paradigm is its use in referring to parts of a paradigm. For example, we have already seen that the term paradigm refers to the set of all forms of a verb, in the case of a verb, that is the set of all forms in a conjugation. But it can also refer to a set of finite verb forms for a given tense or to the set of declined forms for a given number in the case of nouns. In this way we can speak of present, past or passive verb paradigms or the plural paradigm. This use is often conditioned by the actual structure of the paradigm in question. For example, if one recognizes several paradigms within the conjugation of a given verb, it is usually because one recognizes several basic forms. In Latin, for example, we speak of the principal parts of a verb: /ago/ /agere/ /egi/ /aktum/. Any one of these forms constitutes the basic form of a different paradigm:

(2) \[\begin{array}{l}
\text{ago} & \text{present} \\
\text{agere} & \text{future} \\
\text{egi} & \text{preterit} \\
\text{actum} & \text{passive}
\end{array}\]

There is an asymmetry with respect to the noun declension. There can be two or more principal parts of a noun, such as the nominative and the genitive, for example mos, moris, but never to our knowledge has anyone ever named the set of forms derived from mos and moris, as paradigms.

The foregoing demonstrates the imprecision associated with the term paradigm. However, in our opinion, there are many more drawbacks associated with this term. To make them explicit requires the elucidation of another example. We take the case of Latin declensions under the standard classical analysis, the one we
learned in our school primers and which is based directly on Priscian's grammar. We display it in (3):

(3)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nom</th>
<th>insula</th>
<th>mūrus</th>
<th>bellum</th>
<th>puer</th>
<th>pater</th>
<th>rex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voc</td>
<td>insula</td>
<td>mūre</td>
<td>bellum</td>
<td>puer</td>
<td>pater</td>
<td>rex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc</td>
<td>insulam</td>
<td>mūrum</td>
<td>bellum</td>
<td>puerum</td>
<td>patrem</td>
<td>rēgem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen</td>
<td>insulae</td>
<td>mūrī</td>
<td>bellī</td>
<td>puerī</td>
<td>patris</td>
<td>rēgis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat</td>
<td>insulae</td>
<td>mūrō</td>
<td>bellō</td>
<td>puerō</td>
<td>patrī</td>
<td>rēgī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl</td>
<td>insulā</td>
<td>mūrō</td>
<td>bellō</td>
<td>puerō</td>
<td>patre</td>
<td>rēge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nom</th>
<th>cīvis</th>
<th>nōmen</th>
<th>tempus</th>
<th>mare</th>
<th>terror</th>
<th>mōs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voc</td>
<td>cīvis</td>
<td>nōmen</td>
<td>tempus</td>
<td>mare</td>
<td>terror</td>
<td>mōs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc</td>
<td>cīvem</td>
<td>nōmen</td>
<td>tempus</td>
<td>mare</td>
<td>terrorem</td>
<td>mōrem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen</td>
<td>cīvis</td>
<td>nōminis</td>
<td>temporis</td>
<td>maris</td>
<td>terrōris</td>
<td>mōris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat</td>
<td>cīvī</td>
<td>nōminī</td>
<td>temporī</td>
<td>marī</td>
<td>terrorī</td>
<td>mōrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl</td>
<td>cīve</td>
<td>nōmine</td>
<td>tempore</td>
<td>marē</td>
<td>terrōre</td>
<td>mōre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nom</th>
<th>nōbēs</th>
<th>senex</th>
<th>dux</th>
<th>pēs</th>
<th>gens</th>
<th>vectīgal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voc</td>
<td>nōbēs</td>
<td>senex</td>
<td>dux</td>
<td>pēs</td>
<td>gens</td>
<td>vectīgal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc</td>
<td>nōbem</td>
<td>senem</td>
<td>ducem</td>
<td>pedem</td>
<td>gentem</td>
<td>vectīgal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen</td>
<td>nōbis</td>
<td>senis</td>
<td>ducis</td>
<td>pedis</td>
<td>gentis</td>
<td>vectīgalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat</td>
<td>nōbī</td>
<td>senī</td>
<td>ducī</td>
<td>pedī</td>
<td>gentī</td>
<td>vectīgālī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl</td>
<td>nōbe</td>
<td>sene</td>
<td>duce</td>
<td>pede</td>
<td>gente</td>
<td>vectīgālī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nom</th>
<th>casus</th>
<th>cornū</th>
<th>domus</th>
<th>diēs</th>
<th>rēs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voc</td>
<td>casus</td>
<td>cornū</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>diēs</td>
<td>rēs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc</td>
<td>casum</td>
<td>cornū</td>
<td>domum</td>
<td>diem</td>
<td>rem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen</td>
<td>casūs</td>
<td>cornūs</td>
<td>domūs</td>
<td>diēī</td>
<td>refī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat</td>
<td>casūf</td>
<td>cornūf</td>
<td>domūf</td>
<td>diēī</td>
<td>refī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl</td>
<td>casū</td>
<td>cornu</td>
<td>domū</td>
<td>diē</td>
<td>rē</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We use this model, rather than Bloomfield's or Matthews', because there is no analysis of Latin declension in the latter models and we do not want to extrapolate. However it must be clear that what we say concerning paradigms in the Priscian analysis applies equally to the other models. The analysis states, grosso modo, that there are about twenty declensions in Latin. That is to say that if we know a noun in Latin in the nominative, its other case forms would correspond to one of these twenty odd categories.

In general, we can criticize this approach for three reasons:

1) it prevents generalizations from being formulated
2) it does not account for acquisition in a natural fashion
3) it does not seem adequate for an account of the language's evolution.

In order to see this, let us take the case of the nouns templum, nomen, tempus, mare, vectīgal and cornu. For all these nouns,
the nominative, accusative and vocative forms are identical. Nonetheless, according to the paradigmatic analysis, these belong to six different classes. Even if we divide classes into five principal declensions, with all the defects mentioned, there are three of these declensions included among these words. We actually know that what is at stake is a generalization concerning neuter nouns. If there are no nouns from the first and fifth declensions, it is because these declensions do not contain any neuter nouns. Note that an analysis with paradigms must necessarily have redundancies of this nature.

A list of other generalizations of this type that can and in our opinion must be expressed for Latin are given in (4):

(4) i) the nom. and acc. are identical for a neuter noun
   ii) if the nom. ends in -s, the acc. is formed by replacing the
   -s with -m
   iii) the nom. and the voc. are identical everywhere except for
   nouns like murus
   iv) if the acc. ends in -um, the dative is formed by replacing
   -um with -o
   v) if the dative ends in -o, the ablative is identical.

It is evident that if we enlarge the paradigm to plural forms, the generalizations will be all the more striking but we limit ourselves to the singular, for ease of presentation.

As far as acquisition is concerned, the paradigmatic model does not constitute a natural model in the sense that it has never, as far as we know, been demonstrated that during language acquisition paradigms are constructed and actually used. For example, it has been proposed that certain forms are acquired before others, generally according to the order presented by Jakobson's markedness theory. A partial list of some of the oft-cited generalizations from this theory is given in (5):

(5) Unmarked                Marked
    present                 preterit
    3rd pers.               other pers.
    singular                plural
    finite forms            participal forms
    direct case             oblique case
    masculine               feminine

Some of the acquisitional counterparts of the generalizations in (5) are listed in (6):

(c) The indicative is acquired before the subjunctive (cf. Ruke-Dravina and Simoes and Stoel-Cammon).
(d) The third person form of the verb is acquired before forms of other persons (cf. Ruke Dravina, Bates, and Simoes and Stoel-Gammon).

These generalizations seem to offer evidence for the classical paradigm theory, which seems to require that the unmarked form be acquired before the marked form. But note that this is no more than a tendency. As Tiersma (1982) has shown very well, it is necessary, in order for markedness to obtain, that in certain circumstances the plural rather than the singular, the oblique rather that the direct case be the unmarked form. A list of Tiersma's local principles is given in (7):

(7) Principle 1: When the referent of a noun naturally occurs in pairs or groups, and/or when it is generally referred to collectively, such a noun is locally unmarked in the plural.
Principle 2: In languages with case systems, nouns referring to places are locally unmarked in the locative (or another local) case, and nouns referring to tools or instruments are locally unmarked in the instrumental.
Principle 3: Verbs of perception and emotion may be locally unmarked in the 1st person.

The very existence of these principles seems to us to cast doubt on the paradigm as a model of acquisition. It seems only reasonable to suppose that a speaker can have, starting from any given form, access to all associated forms. For this reason, the paradigmatic model, which is directional, seems to us to fail (cf. Ford and Singh: 1985).

With respect to the explanation of diachronic change as well the paradigm model fails. This contention can be illustrated with Bybee (1980), which relies on the paradigm model. What she calls paradigm-internally motivated morphophonemic change is the levelling of an alternation in favour of the alternant that is basic. She cites the following change:

(8) cierro cierramos cierra cerro
    ↓ cierramos ↓ cierro

According to her the change is always in the direction of the least marked or basic form.

What she calls paradigm-externally motivated change is, grosso modo, what happens when a verb changes its paradigm. For example, the verb pensar that does not participate in the alternation illustrated in (8) above is said to undergo this type of change after the fashion of verbs like cierro:

(9) pienso pensamos pensa penso
    ↓ ↓
    pienso piensa
According to her, this kind of change can happen in either direction. Consider, for example, the change illustrated below:

(10) \[
\begin{array}{cccc}
tiemblo & \quad & \text{temblamos} & \quad & \text{tiembla} & \quad & \text{tembló} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
temblo & & \text{temblamos} & & \text{tiembla} & & \text{tembló}
\end{array}
\]

Whereas the motivation for the change in (9) resides in the pattern furnished by verb like cierro, the change in (10) is fashioned after verbs like invento.

Now consider the change illustrated in (11):

(11) a) pido pedimos b) pido pedimos
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
pidimos & & \text{but not} & & *pido
\end{array}
\]

Whereas (11a) is according to her paradigm-internally motivated, the possible change in (11b) does not take place because, according to her, there is no paradigm after which it could be fashioned. And there is no possibility of paradigm-internally motivated change here because, according to her, one could not, to put it in terms of word-formation rules, go from right to left in a word-formation rule. But Oroz (1966: 314) provides an example of precisely that kind in Chilean Spanish, given in (12):

(12) ingerir : ingerio
      sugerir : sugero

Rosenblat (1946: 217) provides similar examples for Ecuadorian and Argentinian Spanish.

Let's try to formulate the strongest morphological generalizations concerning the data in (3) and constrain these generalizations in the two ways given in (13):

(13) i) that they be formulated in terms of the general formula: 
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
[X]_A & \leftrightarrow & [X']_B \\
\end{array}
\]

\text{where X and X' are words, A and B are categories and \leftrightarrow signifies a bidirectional relation.}

ii) that the morphological operation expresses only the differences between X and X' that do not follow from phonology, that is to say phonotactics (cf. Singh: 1984).

This analysis gives us the following strategies for singular nouns in Latin:

(14) i) \[
\begin{array}{cccc}
[X]_{\text{Nom}} & \leftrightarrow & [X]_{\text{Acc}} \\
\text{Neuter} & \leftrightarrow & \text{Neuter}
\end{array}
\]

ii) \[
\begin{array}{cccc}
[Xs]_{\text{Nom}} & \leftrightarrow & [Xm]_{\text{Acc}} \\
\end{array}
\]
Note that this analysis: i) permits the clear expression of generalizations blocked by a paradigmatic description, ii) accounts for acquisition facts and diachronic change. If we suppose with Kurylowicz that the two phenomena are linked we make strong predictions on how young Romans expressed themselves and in which direction the language should have changed. In (15) we show several changes that are documented for Vulgar Latin. They are all explainable in terms of the strategies in (12).

(15)  
nom.-acc  
0-0 3,8,9,10,18,20.  
â-am 1  
s-m 2,6,13,15,17,19,21  
is-em 7  
0-um 4  
0-m 5,11.  
s-rem 12  
ex-em 14  
ês-edem 16  
nom.-gên.  
us-ê 2  
a-aê 1  
ês-is 13  
is-is 7  
um-ê 3  
us-ôs 19,21.  
0-ê 4  
ô-is 5,8,11,18.  
s-is 6,15,17.  
us-oris 9  
ôs-oris 12  
e-is 10  
ex-is 14  
ês-edis 16  
u-ôs 20  
ês-êi 22,23  

acc.-gên.  
um-ê 2,3.  
am-aê 1  
em-is 4,5,6,7,11,12,13,14,15,16,17.  
o-is 8,18.  
us-ôs 19,21.  
em-êi 22,23.  
us-oris 9  
o-is 10  
ô-ôs 20  

Compare our proposal with the classical versions of the break-up of the case system in Latin in terms of a paradigmatic analysis, of which a sample is given in (16), and you can decide for yourselves which of the two analyses is more revealing.

(16)  
nom.  
ager > agrus  
aedês > aedis  
faciêês > facia  
bôs > bovis  
herês > heredis  
honos > honor  
cornu  
acc.  
agrum  
aedem  
faciem  
bovem  
eredem  
honorem  
cornu > cornum  
gên.  
agrif  
aedis  
faciêi  
bovis  
heredis  
honoris  
cornuf
mare  mare > marem  maris  
fructus  fructum  fructūs > fructī  
Sabina  Sabinam  Sabinae > Sabinaes

For those who are not familiar with the data we would like to close with an illustration of the efficiency of the model in the solution of another problem. The data is given in (17). It should be noted that with respect to other dialects, Quebec French is characterized by the development of certain new verb forms. At present, the form which interests us is the third person, present indicative plural. Some examples appear in (17):

(17)  sg.  pl. standard  pl. québécois
ri  ri  riz
pu  pu  puz
zu  zu  zuz

It will be seen that a paradigmatic theory will be hard-pressed to account for this type of development. It is not what Bybee has called interparadigmatic because the new plural does not come from the singular. Neither is it extraparadigmatic because the new paradigm formed did not previously exist. The closest one would be a verb like dire or lire but if we say the verb rire has entered the dire paradigm we should have *nous risons, *vous rîtes but we have nous rions, vous riez. In the same fashion, if we would like to say that rire has passed over to the lire paradigm, we should have *nous rіsons, *vous rіsez (cf. li- sez, lіsons). Thus a new paradigm has been created. The same phenomenon is observed in the case of verbs such as jouer and puer. There is no verb in the standard language that has an infinutive in er which also has a third person plural in -z. Nevertheless, jouer, puer, suer and several other verbs have acquired this property.

Note that in the framework proposed here, we do not need to change paradigms in order for morphological change to occur. We can simply say that these verbs are in conformity with the strategy that says that when a third singular terminates in a vowel, we add -z to make the plural. This strategy is one amongst others that are in competition with the dominant strategy: that the first and third persons singular and plural are identical.

Our main contention is that if word-formation rules are appropriately represented by bidirectional strategies like (14) that capture lexical redundancies in the lexicon and provide, when activated, models for creating or understanding new items, the notion of paradigm is not needed for it is, at best, a partial and somewhat distorted attempt to capture what might be called lexical relatedness. Word-formation processes form a network and the paradigm gives us only a distorted picture of that network. What it really looks like is something we explore in another paper (cf. Ford and Singh: forthcoming).
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