

PARTY, BE, CANCEL, BECAUSE, OF, BROTHER, ILLNESS. Note that we have assumed that *because of* represents two lexemes. This assumption, however, is controversial, because one could argue that *because of* is a compound preposition. After all, if *because of* were a phrasal unit, its meaning should be compositional and predictable, which it is not. Under the assumption that *because of* is one lexeme, our sentence features seven lexemes.

With regard to grammatical words, the same problem arises, so that we can count either seven or eight grammatical words, with the grammatical word *my* occurring twice. Here is a list of the grammatical words: *my, birthday party, is, cancelled, because, of* (or *because of*), *brother's, illness*.

Exercise 1.6

Since *-ly* is a suffix, it can be either inflectional or derivational in nature. Working our way down through the criteria in (16), the first problem is whether adverbial *-ly* encodes a lexical meaning or a grammatical category. Considering the meaning of *slow* vs. *slowly*, *aggressive* vs. *aggressively*, for example, there is no difference in meaning observable, *-ly* does not contribute anything to the meaning of the word. This is the kind of behavior we expect from inflectional suffixes. However, *-ly* does not seem to indicate a grammatical category (tense, aspect, voice, number, etc.) either.

Is *-ly* syntactically relevant? Yes. Whether *-ly* is attached to an adjective solely depends on the adjective's position in the sentence. If the adjective modifies a noun, it never takes adverbial *-ly*, if the adjective modifies a verb or an adjective, the adjective must take *-ly*. Thus, it is the syntax, i.e. the grammatical rule system, that demands the occurrence or non-occurrence of *-ly*, just as the syntax demands when third person singular must be marked on the verb.

The ordering of *-ly* with regard to derivational adjectival suffixes (*-ive-ly*, *-ent-ly*, *-ful-ly*) also indicates that *-ly* behaves rather like an inflectional suffix: *-ly* is always outside all derivational suffixes and is the last suffix to be attached. (The only exception to the latter generalization are the comparative and superlative suffixes *-er* and *-est*, which occur outside adverbial *-ly*, as in *quick-li-er/-est*. These suffixes are generally considered inflectional, however.)

Let us consider the next criterion, change in part of speech. One might argue that *-ly* makes adverbs out of adjectives, which means that *-ly* is category-changing, hence derivational. This analysis depends, however, on the assumption that adjectives and adverbs are really distinct categories. It has however been argued that adjectives and adverbs are just instances of only one single underlying category. Depending on where in a sentence the members of this category occur, they either have *-ly* or they don't. Thus, we could rename adjectives as 'adnominal adjectives' (because they stand with nouns) and adverbs as 'adverbal adjectives' (because

they stand with verbs). This analysis would be in line with the observation that *-ly* attachment is syntactically triggered.

Are *-ly* derivatives often semantically opaque? As already mentioned above, *-ly* does not add any meaning to its base word's meaning, hence we would not expect any semantic opacity effects. An example violating this expectation is *hardly*, which is an adverb whose meaning is not the same as the meaning of the base *hard*, hence we are dealing with a case of semantic opacity. There are very few cases like that, however.

The last point to consider concerns restrictions in productivity. It seems that most adjectives can take *-ly*, with less than a handful of exceptions (e.g. **fastly*, **goodly*).

Let us summarize our findings. Although it has to be admitted that the picture is not always clear, it seems that most of the criteria speak against classifying *-ly* as a derivational suffix. I have inserted 'yes' and 'no' into table 1A below to illustrate the results of our discussion. The last criterion is given in parentheses because, *-ly* being a suffix, it does not say anything about *-ly* being derivational or inflectional.

Table 1A *Adverbial -ly: derivation or inflection?*

derivational property	inflectional property
– encodes lexical meaning – no	– encodes grammatical categories – no
– is not syntactically relevant – no	– is syntactically relevant – yes
– can occur inside derivation – no	– occurs outside all derivation – yes
– changes part of speech – yes/no	– does not change part of speech – yes/no
– is often semantically opaque – no	– is always semantically transparent – yes
– is often restricted in its productivity – no	– is fully productive – yes
(– is not restricted to suffixation)	(– is always suffixational)

We can learn from the discussion of adverbial *-ly* that the distinction between derivation and inflection is not categorical. Rather, we are dealing with a continuum on which the different processes can be located. Some are clearly inflectional, some are clearly derivational, some lie somewhere in between the two extreme poles of the continuum.

Chapter 2

Exercise 2.1

The words in (a) are related to each other by conversion, i.e. the words on the left are derived from the words on the right without any visible marking.