

A Morphological Investigation of Suppletion in English

Aqeel Mohsin Abboud Al-Hussein

Asst. Lect., Babil, Iraq

Aqeel Kadhom Hussein

Asst. Lect., Diwaniya, Iraq

Received: June 16, 2022 Accepted: July 30, 2022 Published: August 1, 2022

doi:10.5296/jsel.v10i1.20136 URL: <https://doi.org/10.5296/jsel.v10i1.20136>

Abstract

This study tries to give an analysis of one of the morphological processes known as '*suppletion*', with a focus on how it is restricted in many languages, particularly English, the language under consideration. The *stem* or *root* of a word can be completely or partially changed as a result of this morphological process. Closed categories are assumed to be the only places where this morphological process takes place. As an example, this morphological process can be found in English verbs because it is confined to verbs, but it is not seen in all verbs because it is more general. Also, *suppletion* is a morphological process that can occur in English adjectives, notably in the comparative degree, but not all adjectives, as well as in nouns, especially in the process of Plural. It's worth noting that it's not a regular, standard, or systematic morphological procedure like the rest. To begin with, this procedure has the effect of completely altering the meaning of the word while also altering its grammatical structure. Several definitions of *suppletion* are included in the study, as is a discussion of the various subtypes of the process, as well as a presentation of the notion in the language itself.

1. Introduction

Morphological processes serve many purposes. There are some of these functions that alter the stem, giving rise to new meaning and even a new portion of speech '*derivational*'. Words are linked through morphological processes, which reveal their grammatical relationship '*inflectional*'.

In reality, morphological processes alter the *stem* or *root* of a word in order to gain a new vocabulary, which may result in a shift in meaning on the other hand. In other words, they might alter the *stem's* grammatical function.

Prefixing, suffixing, circumfixing, modifying, and reduplicating are all types of morphological processes that are often grouped together. To give light on a specific morphological process, the study focuses on suppletion. Suppletion is one of two morphological processes that alter a *root* or *stem*.

1.1 *The Study's Problem*

A morphological and a functional side to the problem is offered as the focus of the investigation. Allomorphs of morphemes are formed when one stem is replaced by another, resulting in an allomorph that differs from the other allomorph. These changes are seen as an inevitable by functionalists as a direct effect of linguistic evolution.

1.2 *The Study's Goal*

This study isn't just limited to verbs in English; it also occurs with adjectives and nouns, according to the study. It also seeks to show the various sorts that can be added.

1.3 *Hypothesis*

- Suppletion is thought to be a rare phenomenon in English.
- suppletion is not restricted to any one aspect of the English language.
- Suppletion is a morphological procedure that deals with very irregular inflection.
- There are two sorts of suppletion in question: stem and affix.

1.4 *Scope of the Investigation*

The investigation focuses on the suppletion which is a morphological process that is not limited to a particular part of speech.

1.5 *The Significant of the Study*

The investigation's value is purely theoretical. Students of linguistics, particularly morphology, are interested in learning about morphological processes and how they are influenced. Students of morphology, in particular, can benefit greatly from this resource.

2. Method of the Study

The study provides an accurate and sufficient description of the process of supplementation in English by presenting its definitions, classifications and forms in addition to the study conclusions.

3. Result and Discussion

3.1 Suppletion

Suppletion come from the Latin verb *supleō* means "fill up; make up a whole, make up for a loss, deficit, add anything that is missing in order to complete a whole" (Veselinova, 2006:1). Prior to the nineteenth century, no linguistic works had the concept of suppletion. There is a close call in the ancient works of language, however, with Pānini's difference between regular and irregular types of substitution.

The relationship between any language units A and B which match the following condition: the semiotic distinction between A and B is regular, while the formal distinction between them is not regular.

Maher (1977: 126) shows how the idea that our paradigm is suppletive justifies the regularity of phonological development. A common occurrence, and one that should be taken into consideration if the data suggests it, is completion. But even though this approach solves the phonological issue, it generates another: the origin of suppletion.

Emonds (1985: 171) notes that *suppletion* only occurs in closed categories, and that a notion of regular and irregular versions must be defined in order to describe *suppletion* appropriately:

There are regular inflectional versions of two words that result from applying the (regular) syntactic and phonological norms of languages in two different contexts to a single Lexical stem

Helps/helped are common synonyms in this context. It is also possible to have identical forms that are regular; in this case, have/have is a result of applying the norms of English *to have* in two contexts in addition to [TENSE, PRESENT, 1stPERSON, SINGULAR] and [TENSE, PRESENT, 1stPERSON, PLURAL]

As with a pair of regular variants, a pair of irregular variants differ only and precisely in their structural similarity, but they cannot be obtained from language-specific principles of syntax or phonetics.

As with am / are, irregular versions include sits/sat. Another example is cut/cut in the contexts of PRESENT and PAST. This means that only differences in the non-stem final consonant cluster can make two irregular versions suppletive. An example of suppletion is the employment of an unrelated form to finish a paradigm (as in English *go – went*), as illustrated by Howe (1996: 48).

Suppletion refers to the idea that semantic and grammatical links are conveyed by

unpredictability in the form of morphological patterns. Comparative and superlative degrees of the English adjectives *good* and *evil*, or the present and past tense of the English verb *go*, are the most common examples of this. As cited by Veselinova (2006: xv),

Matthews (2014: 392) defines suppletion as a morphological process or alternation in which a new form completely replaces the old one. The complete form or a stem *went-* is therefore subordinate to *go* in the noun phrase *went*. Only a portion of the form is replaced in partial suppletion. As an example, the *th-* of *think* (or *though-t*) remains unaltered, while *-ink* is affected.

Substituting one stem for another in the same group of related forms, as defined by the prior explanations and definitions, is called suppletion. As a result, lexicon, semantics, and grammar are all included. To put it another way, suppletive forms are uncommon in most languages, but when they do appear, they almost always include terms that are frequently used in that language.

3.2 *Suppletion Classification*

A distinction between suppletion and other processes is made by Burridge and Stebbins (2015: 109) by saying that it is not a regular process like other processes. When a grammatical morpheme is added to the original form, it is covered by this rule. It's impossible to get any phonetic information directly from the word "*went*." It's possible that we're not dealing with two distinct lexemes after all, given the grammatical relationship between *go* and *went*. The morphemes '*GO*' plus '*PAST*' are related as the suppletive form of *went*, and we consider them as inflectionally related.

That's according to Frajzyngier, Hodges and Rood (2005:37) "Sufficient justification exists for treating suppletion as an extreme case. A lexical item that has no shared phonological necessitates a more flexible approach. It will be an unusual type of typology, a typology of extremes, if we attempt a suppletion typology that focuses on "complete" suppletion. Lexemes, not languages, will be the focus of the study."

Signs X and Y correspond to specific types of supplements, and these supplements can be distinguished by looking for the following three characteristics:

- Derivational or inflectional suppletion is the type of relationship between X and Y in grammar.
- In other words, radical suppletion vs. affixal suppletion is a morphological distinction between X and Y.
- Morph vs. strong morpheme; X and Y are part of the primary class of signals (Booij , Lehmann & Mugdan, 2000: 515).

Mel'cuk (2006:420) provides an excellent illustration of this point "Suppose X and Y are two signs that are in a relation of substitution. Three characteristics should be addressed in order to better understand the kind of suppletion we're dealing with.

There is a difference in the type of semantics between X and Y. In this way, we can determine whether or not it is a DERIVATIVE or INFLECTIONAL supplementation. For example, if the

meaning difference between the two words is non-zero, the kind of suppletion is determined by its character—namely, if the difference is derivational, the type of suppletion is derivational and if the difference is inflectional, the suppletion is inflectional. In this case, the type of suppletion is determined by the affixes, which can be either derivational or inflectional, depending on the type of suffix. If the suffixes are radicals, then the type of substitution is determined by the factors conditioning the choice between X and Y, which is either derivational or inflectional depending on the type of suffix "

Base, root, stem, and affix are all morphs, according to Veselinova (2006: 5). Because of the significance attached to them, certain words and phrases are distinct. According to conventional wisdom, the base and stem have lexical meaning, whereas the affixes and suffixes provide grammatical or derivational meaning. Prefixes and suffixes can be realized as prefixes or suffixes, depending on their position relative to the root.....This means that a stem can be made up of one root, two roots or a mixture of roots like skydiver.

The most common types of suppletion are stem and affix suppletion for instance; *dive* as a root and an affix in *diver*.

3.3 Suppletion of the Stems

Stem suppletion is a term that refers to verbs with a high frequency of use, such as the English verbs *go – went* and *am – is*, which are examples of this phenomenon (Brown and Bowerman, 2008: 113).

Payne (2006: 13) Presupposes that there are three subdivisions of lexical expressions:

- (strong) stem suppletion – utilize an entirely new stem in a lexical expression (*go-went*)
- (weak) stem replacement - use a different stem (*bring – brought*)
- Isomorphism — the usage of the identical stem (*cut-cut*)

Whole stems are substituted in the so-called "strong stem suppletion" (Katamba , 2004:189).

There are several verb forms that appear to be unconnected to the infinitival form of the verb *go / went*, for example, according to Lobeck and Denham (2012: 172). Suppletion is the technical term for when two verb forms sound completely different on the phonetic level. The current conjugation of *go / went*, for example, are derived from the two distinct old English verbs, *gan* and *wendan* (related to the word *wend* : I *wended* my way home).

According to Petre (2014: 166), "Forms like "go" and "went" are part of the same paradigm. The ordinary past tense *wended* has long developed from the verb *wend*, from which *went* originates. Therefore, *go-went* is a case of non-overlapping suppletion.

There is no doubt that irregular conjugations of the verb "be" include "am," "is," "are," and "was/were," all of which have strong stem suffixation: "am" stands for present tense, while the suffixative "were" is used to express past. Because they cannot be deduced using ordinary phonological rules, suppletive forms like these should be included in the dictionary entry for the word. (Kroeger, 2005:290)

In fact, the comparative and superlative versions of the adjectives *good* and *bad* are examples of suppletion that are not limited to English verbs. The most typical examples of strong stem suppletion are the following:

Good-better-best

Bad-worse-worst

So-called *good* and *bad* adjectives are just like the verb *be*, which has become a typical type of inflectional expressions.

Weak suppletion is a form of lexical expression that may or may not be included with the others. One stem is swapped out for another, which is obviously similar to the first but cannot be deduced using any mathematical rule. Buy and bought both begin with b in the English language, implying that the two verbs are linked. For the most part, grammar rules do not suggest that one of these is derived from the other in the manner explained above for past tense rules that derive *called* from *call*. The author Payne (2006:13).

In weak suppletion, there are no irregularly connected stems that share some phonological content (as English think vs. thought), according to Michaelis et al. (2013: 212).

3.3 Affix Suppletion

Affix suppletion is far more common than stem suppletion. Affix suppletion, on the other hand, refers to a situation in which one conceptual category is conveyed by two wholly unrelated affixes in distinct subclasses, as in Payne (2006: 138). There are only few animals in the world that have the suffix [-ən], *oxen*, attached to their nouns in English. Like [-s], [-iz], and [-z], the form [-ən] is an allomorph of the morpheme multiple. However, [-ən] has no phonological connection to any other word. Allomorphs cannot be deduced from the same "underlying form" as all other allomorphs.

For example, Miestamo and Walchi (2007: 148) point out that the term suppletion can also be used as a synonym for the distribution of affixes, such as *ox-en* in the English language (ox-PL) and *boy-s* in the German language (boy-PL). English morpho-phonological norms do not explain the use of *-en* as a plural suffix, hence it is regarded an exception.

Bisetto, Magni and Scalise (2008: 18) claim that affix suppletion, which is likewise often linked with fusional as opposed to agglutinating morphology, is an even more severe kind of lack of one-to-one correlation between meaning and form. Affix suppletion is an allomorph that cannot be defined in phonological or morphological terms.

4. Conclusions

1. Suppletion is identified as a morphological phenomenon which include a perfect replacement of one stem by another within a set of related forms.
2. Suppletion refers to filling a gap in a paradigm with an alternative form.

3. There are three criteria for determining supplementation. These are: the type of grammatical relationship between X and Y, its morphological type and its main category.
4. suppletion comes in two varieties. Firstly, Stem suppletion is the unexpected change of root in form, e.g. (*go-went*). Secondly, affixal-completion refers to the case in which a conceptual category is expressed by two completely unrelated nouns in different subcategories. For example, the word "ox" in the English language belongs to a very small subclass having the plural suffix [-ən], bulls. It is not driven by any morphological bases.

References

- Booij, G. E., Lehmann, C., & Mugdan, J. (2000). *Morphologie: ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung = morphology: an international handbook on inflection and word-formation*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.
- Bowerman, M., & Brown, P. (2008). *Crosslinguistic Perspectives on Argument Structure*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Burridge, K., & Stebbins, T. N. (2015). *For the love of Language: an introduction to linguistics*. Port Melbourne, Australia: Cambridge University Press.
- Denham, K. E., & Lobeck, A. C. (2012). *Linguistics for Everyone: an introduction*. Australia: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Emonds, J. E. (1985). *A Unified Theory of Syntactic Categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Frajzyngier, Z., Hodges, A., & Rood, D. S. (2005). *Linguistic diversity and language theories*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub.
- Howe, S. (1996). *The Personal Pronouns in the Germanic Languages: a study of personal pronoun morphology and change in the Germanic languages from the first records to the present day*. Berlin: Gruyter.
- Katamba, F. (2004). *Morphology: critical concepts in linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Kroeger, P. R. (2005). *Analyzing Grammar: an introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Maher, J. P. (1977). *Papers on Language Theory and History*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Matthews, P. H. (2014). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mel'čuk, I., & Beck, D. (2006). *Aspects of the Theory of Morphology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Michaelis, S. M., Maurer, P., Haspelmath, M., Huber, M., & Revis, M. (2013). *The Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miestamo, M., & Wälchli, B. (2007). *New Challenges in Typology: broadening the horizons*

and redefining the foundations. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Payne, T. E. (2006). *Exploring Language Structure: a student's guide.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Petré, P. (2014). *Constructions and Environments Copular, Passive, and Related Constructions in Old and Middle English.* Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Scalise, S., & Bisetto, A. (2008). *Universals of Language Today.* New York: Springer.

Veselinova, L. N. (2006). *Suppletion in Verb Paradigms: bits and pieces of the puzzle.* Amsterdam: Benjamins

Copyright Disclaimer

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).