

PREFACE

The present issue of *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* is special in two important ways. First of all, with this issue we celebrate the 50th anniversary of our journal, which was launched by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1951 under the name *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*. The aim of the journal was to publish scholarly papers in English, French, German, Italian and Russian “on Finno-Ugric, Slavonic, Germanic, Oriental and Romance linguistics as well as general linguistics”. The first issue contains a brief introduction, whose content was symptomatic of the political climate of the early fifties in Hungary (as well as elsewhere in Eastern Europe) and is worth quoting in full: “The aim of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in starting the *Acta Linguistica* is to contribute to the improvement of international relations in progressive science, to the further development of science, to the cause of peace, progress and the closer friendship of the peoples.” The Introduction was published in four languages starting with Russian followed by German, French and English. Fortunately, the scholarly papers in the journal do not show any traces of the ideological pressure which was so typical of that time. The editor of the journal was Julius Németh, an internationally renowned Turcologist, who was at the same time the director of the Research Institute of Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (founded in 1949). Though he was a historical linguist, he was convinced of the importance of synchronic studies of language (a research group working on the generative grammar of Hungarian was formed at his institute in the early sixties). The Editorial Board was composed of Dezső Pais, the leading scholar in Hungarian linguistics at that time, Zsigmond Telegdi, who was an expert both in Iranian studies and in general linguistics, and Miklós Zsirai, an outstanding Finno-Ugrist. After the death of Julius Németh in 1975, the Romanist and general linguist Joseph Herman and the Germanist Claus-Jürgen Hutterer became the editors of the journal, five years later Hutterer, who had moved to the University of Graz, was replaced by Ferenc Kiefer who has been the managing editor of the journal since 1988.

In the fifties and sixties most papers of the journal were written in German, followed by French. English gained ground from the seventies onward. At the beginning approximately half of the papers were on historical linguistics.

Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest

tics, but their number slowly diminished toward the end of the sixties. At the same time, the journal became more international. While in the early issues all contributors were Hungarian scholars (in fact, *Acta Linguistica* used to be the exclusive foreign language publication for Hungarian linguists in the fifties), from the sixties onward more and more foreign scholars contributed to the journal, which by today has become truly international. Thematically, during the first two decades, most papers were devoted to Uralic (including Hungarian) linguistics, consequently it was an indispensable source for scholars working in this field, though it was less known outside of the field. In the meantime there has been a considerable shift in the scope of the journal, as stated on the cover: “*Acta Linguistica Hungarica* publishes papers on general linguistics with particular emphasis on discussions of theoretical issues concerning Hungarian and other Finno-Ugric languages. Papers presenting empirical material must have strong theoretical implications. The scope of the journal is not restricted to the traditional areas of linguistics (phonology, syntax and semantics, both synchronic and diachronic), it also covers other areas such as socio- and psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, discourse analysis, the philosophy of language, language typology, and formal semantics.” This is clearly a considerable shift in content.

To ensure quality it seemed to be useful to publish thematic issues. Thus, for example, two double issues were devoted to Hungarian syntax (guest edited by Katalin É. Kiss, Vol. 44/3–4 (1997) and Vol. 45/1–2 (1998)), one double issue to semantics (Vol. 46/1–2 (1999)), another one to the grammar and sociolinguistics of Gipsy (guest edited by Zita Réger and Katalin Kovalsik, Vol. 46/3–4 (1999)). Vol. 47 (2000) contains a selection of papers presented at the 8th International Morphology Meeting held in Budapest, 12 through 14 June 1998, Vol. 48/1–3 (2001) is devoted to problems of the mental lexicon (guest edited by Zoltán Bánréti), Vol. 48/4 (2001) and Vol. 49/1 (2002) to the history of Hungarian (guest edited by Lea Haader), Vol. 49/3–4 (2002) to phonetics and phonology (guest edited by Mária Gósy).

And now we come to the second anniversary which makes this issue special. The present issue of *Acta Linguistica* contains a selection of papers presented at the 10th International Morphology Meeting held in Szentendre (Hungary), 9 through 12 May, 2002. With this issue we thus celebrate a second jubilee: the 10th International Morphology Meeting. At the very beginning of the eighties it occurred to Professor Wolfgang Dressler and myself that it would be timely to launch a series of conferences devoted to theoretical morphology. Both of us had been working on morphology earlier, Wolfgang Dressler had published a book on morphophonology in 1977 (*Grundfragen*

der Morphonologie, Vienna) and I had published a generative monograph on Swedish (*Swedish Morphology*, Stockholm, 1970) and another one on French morphology (*Generative Morphologie des Neuf Französischen*, Tübingen, 1973). Morphology was still a neglected field of research and we were convinced that a series of meetings devoted to morphology would be more than welcome. The first meeting was organized in Veszprém (Hungary) in 1982 with a small number of participants, which was followed by a second meeting in 1986, again in Veszprém, which was already a truly international meeting with almost fifty participants (papers were presented, among others, by Stephen Anderson, Robert Beard, Manfred Bierwisch, Geert Booij, Rudolf Botha, Wolfgang Dressler, John Jensen, Dieter Kastovsky, Elene Kubrjakova, Jaap van Marle, Franz Rainer, Tom Roeper, Soledad Varela, Irene Vogel, Wolfgang Wurzel, and Wiecher Zwanenburg). Unfortunately, no proceedings were published. Morphology became a hot topic. We then decided that there should be a morphology meeting every second year alternating between Austria and Hungary (in the late nineties, a Mediterranean Morphology Meeting (MMM) was added to the Austro-Hungarian ones so that now we are in the fortunate situation of having a morphology meeting every year, which testifies that morphology has become a well-established field of research). Consequently, the third meeting was organized by Wolfgang Dressler in Eisenstadt (Austria), the fourth meeting took place in Hungary again. From the fourth meeting onwards, a selection of papers presented at the Hungarian meetings was published in *Acta Linguistica* (4th meeting: Vol. 40/1–2 (1991–1992); 6th meeting: Vol. 43/1–2 (1995–1996); 8th meeting: Vol. 47/1–4 (2000)).

The present anniversary issue is devoted to the problem of prefixation, which was the main topic of the 10th meeting. The authors of papers dealing with morphological topics other than prefixes were not invited to contribute. All papers were refereed by at least two referees whom we wish to express our thanks at this place.

Farrell Ackerman (“Lexeme derivation and multi-word predicates in Hungarian”) discusses several types of phrasal predicates in Hungarian, in particular causative formation, causal predicate formation, so-called reiterated activity formation expressed by reduplicated preverbs, and the interaction of these operations with category changing derivation. The theoretical background of the analysis is the word and paradigm model of morphology combined with the realizational approach of morphological exponence.

Laurie Bauer (“English prefixation—a typological shift?”) observes that in Old English there were a number of prefixes which were unstressed and phonologically constrained. These prefixes lost ground, they have either been

replaced by corresponding learned prefixes, or have simply become marginalized. At the same time, the prefix-like elements which are the most productive in present-day English carry their own stress, are phonologically unconstrained, and many of them are semantically much more lexeme-like. The more compound-oriented modern stage is being achieved through a conspiracy of different changes which have the combined effect of leaving erstwhile prefixal elements looking more like lexemes.

Heike Behrens approaches the problem of prefixation from a psycholinguistic point of view (“Verbal prefixation in German child and adult language”). The data show that the child starts to produce prefixed verbs and prepositional phrases very early. Also, the child’s speech gets attuned to the precise frequency distribution of these constructions in the input. These findings support theories of linguistic relativity which emphasize the importance of the conventionality in language use for language processing and acquisition.

Corrien Blom and Geert Booij (“The diachrony of complex predicates in Dutch: a case study in grammaticalization”) investigate the grammaticalization of words into prefixes via the intermediate stage of separable particles. The structural change of particles becoming inseparable prefixes is triggered by semantic change: the loss of independent semantic content, accompanied by other specific semantic developments, leads to the loss of syntactic independence.

The paper by Livio Gaeta and Davide Ricca (“Italian prefixes and productivity: a quantitative approach”) investigates the Italian prefixes using basically Baayen’s quantitative approach to morphological productivity. An improvement over Baayen’s approach is achieved by calculating productivity values at equal token numbers for different affixes based on a 75-million-size newspaper corpus. Variably-sized subcorpora are sampled to compare affixes displaying different token frequencies. In this way the Italian productive prefixes *ri-* and *in-* can be ranked by productivity within their respective derivational domains. In addition, the impact of different derivational cycles on the measure of productivity can be dealt with in a satisfactory way.

Gerd Haverling’s paper is devoted to Latin prefixes (“On prefixes and actionality in Classical and Late Latin”). Early and Classical Latin had a rich and complex system of verbal prefixes which were used to perfectivize or to mark the beginning or the end of an activity or process. Also, the opposition between dynamic and non-dynamic as well as between transitive and intransitive verbs was expressed by various prefixes. In later centuries, the difference between prefixed and unprefixed verbs became blurred and a new system arose. The changes also affected the relationship between the

perfect and imperfect tenses. In Romance the functions of the old actional forms are expressed by means of the definite and indefinite articles.

Ferenc Kiefer and László Honti discuss Uralic prefixation (“Verbal ‘prefixation’ in the Uralic languages”). The paper provides an overview of preverbs and prefixes in the Uralic languages and describes the possible positions of preverbs. The discussion of the grammaticalization of preverbs is based on Hungarian since appropriate data are available for Hungarian only. It is shown that the development of aspectual and aktionsart-meaning may follow two paths: it may either follow through the stages ‘adverbial meaning > adverbial meaning and aspectual meaning > aspectual meaning > aspectual meaning and aktionsart-meaning’ or through the stages ‘adverbial meaning > adverbial meaning and aspectual meaning > aspectual meaning and aktionsart-meaning’. The first route is typical of the old layer of preverbs, the second one of more recent preverbs.

Marianne Mithun argues (“Why prefixes?”) that hypotheses about the functional advantages of having suffixes rather than prefixes, such as the cognitive simplicity of cross-category harmony between syntax and morphology or preferences for processing the lexical meaning in stems before the grammatical material in affixes, cannot constitute explanations in themselves without accounts of the mechanisms by which the advantages are translated into grammatical structure. It is also shown that the numerous exceptions to such hypotheses can be explained when the individual histories of the affixes are considered, including both their sources and the steps by which they develop.

Coralie Roger discusses the derivation of change-of-state verbs in French (“Derived change-of-state verbs in French: a case of semantic equivalence between prefixes and suffixes”). She argues—using Danielle Corbin’s morphological model—that in French there is a neat semantic distribution between prefixes and suffixes because each affix is specified by its semantic instructional identity. However, the affixes *a-*, *en-*, *é-* and *-is(er)*, *-ifi(er)* seem to constitute exceptions in this case since all of them are used to derive deadjectival change-of-state verbs. She proposes that the notion of ‘the paradigm of morphological processes’ should be abandoned and the principle that each affix corresponds to just one word formation rule should be adopted instead.

Helma van den Berg’s paper deals with spatial prefixes in Dargi (“Spatial prefixes in Dargi (East Caucasian)”). In Dargi, too, prefixes have developed from adverbs. She argues that verbs that were historically derived by means of spatial prefixes should be considered to be bipartite stems on the synchronic level. Such stems seem to be a characteristic feature of the East Caucasian language family as a whole.

Jochen Zeller's paper is entitled "Word-level and phrase-level prefixes in Zulu". The article investigates two strategies of relative clause formation in Zulu, a Bantu language spoken in South Africa. The standard way of forming a relative clause in Zulu involves a prefix which is attached to the predicate of the relative clause. In this strategy, the morpheme of relative concord expresses agreement with the subject of the relative clause. In a second strategy, the morpheme of relative concord seems to be prefixed to the first word of the relative clause; in this position, it agrees with the head noun. The main claim of the article is that the second strategy of relative clause formation in Zulu is an example of phrasal affixation.

The papers in the present volume approach the problem of prefixation from various points of view. Prefixation can be considered from the point of view of grammaticalization, it can also be examined in relation to word formation, especially compounding, or it can be approached from a typological perspective.

Ferenc Kiefer