

Carstairs, Andrew. 1988. Some implications of phonologically conditioned suppletion. Yearbook of Morphology 1988, ed. by Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle, 67-94. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

The article suggests that the following two questions: *how (if at all) is the distinction to be drawn between inflection and derivation* and *when may two or more phonetically distinct morphological units be analysed as 'the same' for morphological purposes* are related.

Cases are studied where morphs are phonetically dissimilar and the distribution can be described in purely phonological terms. Examples:

- Hungarian, 2Sg Indefinite Present Indicative *-ol* after sibilants and affricates, *-(a)sz* elsewhere;
- Fang, noun class prefix: *dz-* before vowels, *a-* before consonants;
- Turkana, number suffixes: *-a* after roots (CV)CVCVC, *-in* after C(G)VC, and *-i* after (C)VC(G)V;
- Italian, verb stem: 'go': *va(d)-* when stressed, *and-* when unstressed and others.

The article shows that phonologically conditioned suppletion occurs mostly in the cases traditionally considered as inflection, but there are also cases traditionally considered derivational (noun gender or causative formation). The cases where phonologically conditioned suppletion can occur represent “meaning-driven areas of morphology which coincide with neither the inflectional nor the derivational areas in traditional terms”. It is suggested that the notions of ‘meaning-driven’ vs. ‘form-driven’ cases should be used instead of the “elusive” notions of inflection and derivation.