McFetridge, Chapters 11 and 12 (to p. 255)

LATIN SUFFIXES

The type of affix added at the end of a word is a <u>suffix</u>.

> — suffixes can change the lexical category of a word, e.g., in CE the word "nation" is a noun. Add "-al" and you've got "national", which is an adjective.

The goal in this unit is to build your knowledge of basic Latin suffixes and to help you understand …

1. some of the rules by which suffixes build lexemes (morphology),

2. some of the processes that affect the final form of these lexemes (phonology).

We begin with "-al". It works this way: $[\text{Lex}_{adj} \Rightarrow \text{Lex} + \text{al}]_{\text{Latin}}$

Root	root + al	other words formed with the same root
√leg = read, select	legal	legislate
√voc = voice	vocal	vocation
√reg = rule	regal	regent
√equ = equal	equal	equation
√annu = year	annual	annuity
√nav = sailor	naval	nautical

The meaning of "-al" glosses as "pertaining to". But there's another suffix with that meaning: "-ar". This should make us suspicious right away because both "l" and "r" are … what kind of sounds?

Consider these lexemes that end in "-ar":

Root	root + ar	other words formed with the same root
√sim = same	similar	assimilate
√popul = people	popular	populate
√famili = household	familiar	family
√jug = join	jugular	junction
√sol = sun	solar	solstice

In all cases with an "-ar" ending, we find the suffix immediately preceded by "l" (except for "familiar").

— if the suffix were "-al" we would encounter a phonetically awkward "l" + "al" combination. So the the "l" of the original "-al" suffix dissimilates to "r". Thus, unlike assimilation, this is a process that makes sounds **<u>unlike</u>** one another.

So we propose the rule [l + (i) a l → l + (i) a r]_Latin.

Not mentioned in your text, however, is that we <u>do</u> have the word "familial", where you might think dissimilation would apply. Why might it not? (Hint: the first usage of this word was in 1900.)

Interestingly, dissimilation of "-al" can apply beyond the immediately preceding consonant position where we found the triggering "l".

Thus we find "plantar" < "plant"; "linear" < "line"; "lunar" < "lun"

We think in these cases that the nasal sound [n] in the root is facilitating dissimilation. Evidence for this is that <u>dissimilation fails in roots with no nasal</u>: "legal" < "leg"; "local" < "loc"

Further non-dissimilating forms occur when an "r" sound is present as in "plural" < "plus"; "floral" < "flos"; "liberal" < "liber". (How does the "r" arise in "floral" and "plural"?)

But enough of "-al"!

The suffix "-ic" means "pertaining to" and sometimes surfaces with an augmented "t"…

Root	root + (t)ic	other words, same root
√civ = home	civic	civilian
√acid = sour	acidic	acidity
√class = rank	classic	classify
√lact = milk	lactic	lactate
√rus = country	rustic	rural
√aqua = water	aquatic	aquifer
√here = choose	heretic	heresy

The rule here is [Lex$_{Adj}$ ⇒ Lex +(t)ic]$_{Latin}$.

We've often noted in LING 110 that language isn't a free-for-all. There are constraints on possible word forms.

One such constraint is the ordering of suffixes. Thus we find only "-ic" and "-al" in that order, e.g., "metr<u>ical</u>", "class<u>ical</u>" and "canon<u>ical</u>".

Now let's consider a suffix that forms nouns: "-ity"…

root	root + ity	other words, same root
√grav = heavy	gravity	grave
√san = healthy	sanity	sane
√annu = year	annuity	annual
√brev = brief	brevity	breviary
√cav = hollow	cavity	cave

The suffix "-ity" is said to attract stress. What does this mean?

> — simply that unless certain other conditions are present, the syllable preceding "-ity" will be stressed. This arises from the general Latin stress rule that required main word stress on the syllable third from the end of that word, e.g.,

> hum**an**ity, compl**ex**ity, caus**al**ity

"-bil" meaning "able to"

The common "suffixes" "-able" and "ible" really derive from "-bil". It's the thematic vowel that actually conditions whether the ending will be "-able" or "-ible". Thus:

> prob + **a** + ble

> aud + **i** + ble

> cred + **e** + ble (where "e" raises to "i")

But consider words that appear to be formed off the past participle:

Root	words formed off the past participle	root + PPP + ble
√rup = break	corrupt	corruptible
√duc = lead	deduct	deductible
√fac = do	fact	perfectible

The problem is that these words already have thematic vowels and in each case it is "e", so the "-ible" is not coming from there …

corruptible = con + (rup + e + t) + ible

digestible = dis + (ges + e + t) + ible

collectible = con + (leg + e + t) + ible

In these newer words the thematic vowel was "invisible" and the suffix was reanalyzed as the single form "-ible".

Rounding out these complications is the fact that the productive form of the suffix in English is "**-able**" and that's what we find on English words like "doable", "workable", "laughable".

So what is the morpheme here?

Note these word pairs:

>   portable / portability
>
>   capable / capability
>
>   credible / credibility

We can say either that "i" deletes when "bl" is the sole suffix or that an "i" is inserted when "bl" precedes another prefix.

>   Well, we don't like insertion rules because they're costly: how do we explain the insertion of "i" as opposed to some other vowel?

Better that "i" deletes. We can back this up with facts about **stress**.

In *"portabile", there's little stress on the "-bil" and so the "i" deletes. This type of thing is common crosslinguistically.

But in "portab**i**lity", that "i" IS stressed and so remains.

The rule is given in your text as $[i° \rightarrow \varnothing]_{Latin}$, meaning that an unstressed "i" deletes. (The normal way of representing an unstressed vowel is a "ring under", e.g., [i̥].)

the suffix -ous meaning "characterized by". It creates adjectives that attribute the quality of a root to the noun that it modifies.

root	root + ous	other words, same root
√fam = fame	famous	fame
√decor = beauty	decorous	decorate
√vari = change	various	vary

Sometimes this suffix appears with a "connecting" vowel the appearance of which is not predictable:

root	root + ous	other words, same root
√cur = care	cur**i**ous	cure
√aqu = water	aqu**e**ous	aquatic
√spec = see	conspic**u**ous	species

<u>P</u>AST PARTICIPIAL SUFFIXES

The suffix -or carries an **agentive** meaning. As you would expect, this is a <u>derivational</u> affix, but it also adds a new <u>semantic</u> component.

— the kinds of mechanical rules we've been writing, e.g.,

$$[\text{Lex}_N \Rightarrow \text{Lex}_{V[PPP]} + \text{or}]_{\text{Latin}}$$

don't capture that semantic difference.

Root	word formed off the past participle	nominal (ppp + or)
√ag = act, do	act	actor
√teg = cover	detect	detector
√grad = step	aggressive	aggressor
√cid = cut	incisive	incisor

This suffix is no longer productive in English which uses "-er" for the same purpose.

The suffix "-ion" meaning "act of" …

This suffix makes nouns out of verbs, viz., it "nominalizes" verbs. The usual rule looks much like the last one:

$$[\text{Lex}_N \Rightarrow \text{Lex}_{V[PPP]} + \text{ion}]_{\text{Latin}}$$

So, instead of "actor", we have "action"; instead of "detector", we have "detection". Not too profound.

However, there are some exceptions where the nominal is formed straight off the root:

root	word formed off the past participle	word formed off the root
√op = choose	option	opinion
√tag = touch	contact	contagion
√leg = read	collection	legion

the prefix "-ure" meaning "result of"

Another one that forms nouns: $[Lex_N \Rightarrow Lex_{V[PPP]} + ure]_{Latin}$

root	word formed off the root	noun PPP + ure
√cap = have	incipient	capture
√frag = break	fragile	fracture
√pug = pierce	pugilist	puncture

Last one: "-ive" meaning "nature" or "quality of": $[\text{Lex}_A \Rightarrow \text{Lex}_{V[\text{PPP}]} + \text{ive}]_{\text{Latin}}$

root	word formed off the past participle	adjective PPP + ive
√scrib = write	description	descriptive
√pos = place	position	positive
√ag = drive	action	active

Further to our earlier discussion about the co-occurrence of suffixual material, "-ul- often follows "-ic":

root	other words	-icul-
√mater = mother	maternal	matriculate
√art = art	art	articulate
√curr = run	current	curriculum
√rid = laugh	risible	ridiculous
√part = part	partition	particular

Extensions

These little elements don't usually create new lexemes, but rather require <u>another</u> suffix to enable their use.

the diminutive "-ul-"

A CE diminutive is "-let" as in "booklet". "-let" makes something small. In Latin we see it appear with the past participle and the thematic vowel "a" indicating a new structure:

root	other words	root + ul + ate
√circ = ring	circus	circulate
√spec = see	species	speculate
√calc = chalk	calcium	calculate

The same "-ul- can be followed by another suffix, "-al".

— since both the diminutive and the suffix both end in "-l", we might expect dissimilation to occur. And it does!

root	other words	ul + al
√glob = ball	globe	globula**r**
√nod = knot	node	nodula**r**
√gran = grain	grain	granula**r**
√cell = room	cell	cellula**r**

The form "-il" can actually be used as a suffix to create adjectives and also as an extension, "-il-", with the suffix "-ity" to form nouns.

root	adjective	noun
√sen = be old	senile	senility
√civ = home	civil	civility
√puer = boy	puerile	puerility
√hum = low	humble	humility

Inchoative "**-esc-**"

This morpheme imparts the meaning "begin to do something" or "become something". It was added to a root before the thematic vowel, e.g., √pub (meaning "old") > pub + **esc** + e + ent.

These new forms always take the thematic "e" irrespective of the original thematic vowel.

root	inchoative	other words, same root
√qui = rest	quiescent	quiet
√tum = swell	tumescent	tumor
√putr = be rotten	putrescent	putrify
√lumen = light	luminescent	luminous

The Greek Partition

We know that Ancient Greek underpins philosophy, Western science and medicine, and Christianity. We would expect this rich heritage to impact our language. And it does.

> There are some significant similarities between Latin and Greek — in some cases they share identical morphemes — but phonology differentiates the two languages.

English borrowed heavily from Latin and that meant borrowing a lot of its morphology and phonology. We didn't borrow so much from Greek, although the influence of the latter is still prodigious.

We'll begin by looking at Greek prefixes and draw attention to similarities to, and differences from, Latin, where appropriate.

First up is **syn**- meaning "together", "with" …

root	syn + root + ...	other words, same root
√tax = arrange	syntax	taxi
√ag = do	synagogue	demagogue
√chrono = time	synchronize	chronometer
√log = word	syllogism	logic
√bio = life	symbiotic	biology
√path = feel	sympathy	pathology

We can propose an assimilation rule to account for "symbiotic" and "sympathy": [n + labial → m + labial]$_{Greek}$. But we've still got a problem with "syllogism". Why?

Because back in Ch. 7 when we were dealing with the negative prefix "an" we had a rule that deleted [n] before other consonants: $[n + C \rightarrow C]_{Greek}$.

But here we find [n] assimilating. We can solve our little impasse by **constraining** the original deletion rule as follows:

$[an + C \rightarrow a + C]_{Greek}$

That rule would apply **before** an assimilation rule such as:

$[n + l \rightarrow l + l]_{Greek}$

So **rule ordering matters**! But there's still another dilemma:

root	syn + root + …	other words, same root
√(hi)st = stand	system	histamine
√sarc = flesh	syssarcosis	sarcasm
√stel = order	systolic	systaltic
√zyg = yoke	syzygy	zygote

An assimilation rule similar to the one on the previous slide with help us out with "syssarcosis", e.g., n + s → s + s.

But that rule overgenerates and would give us *sysstem.

As good fortune would have it though, we've got a rule in Latin that dealt with a similar situation:

[s + s consonant → + s consonant]$_{Latin}$

We'll use the same thing for Greek:

[s + s consonant → + s consonant]$_{Greek}$

That takes care of "system" and "systolic".

But we've now generated *syzzygy. We'll need a **degemination** rule to cure that: zz → z. Done!

Last Greek prefix for today: "**ana**-" meaning "up" or "throughout"

root	ana + root + …	other words, same root
√lys = loosen	analysis	dialysis
√log =word	analogy	logic
√tom = cut	anatomy	atom
√ball = throw	anabolic	symbolic
√i = go	anion	cation
√eur(y) = broad	aneurism	eurythmics
√hod = way	anode	odometer

Vowel deletion at work here: $V_1 V_2 \rightarrow V_2$. So how can we be sure we're dealing with "ana-" and not the negative prefix "an-"?