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Abstract

Demonette (Hathout & Namer [13]) is a derivational database (DDB) of French with a relational structure: its entries describe a large number of properties of derivational relations connecting word pairs, such as LANCER ‘launch’ → LANCEUR ‘launcher’ or LANCEUR → LANCEMENT ‘launching’. The entries also specify the categorical, semantic and morpho-phonological properties of the connected words. We here present the morpho-phonological ones and show how Demonette’s organization allows an original representation of these properties. Demonette’s entries provide phonological transcriptions of the word pairs and syllabic decompositions. It also specifies their stems and the possible variations they display.

1 Introduction

Demonette (Hathout & Namer [13]) is a derivational database (DDB) of French which represents the morphological information in an original way: entries do not describe the properties of the derivatives; they describe the properties of the derivational relations connecting pairs of lexemes, such as LANCER ‘launch’ → LANCEUR ‘launcher’ \(_{\text{masc}}\) or LANCEUR → LANCEMENT ‘launching’. These relations specify the derivational properties of the lexemes they connect. One consequence of this conception is that the overall properties of a lexeme are the outcome of all the properties induced by each of the relations the lexeme occurs in. More generally, Demonette's structure is completely determined by this conception: The DDB is redundant, because relations are direct, indirect and bi-directional. Demonette describes relations between derivationally related pairs of lexemes \([L1, L2]\), where \(L1\) is morphosemantically motivated by \(L2\). It includes relations between derived words and their bases (e.g. \([\text{LANCEUR}, \text{LANCER}]\), where LANCEUR’s meaning can be defined as “the one who performs the action of LANCER”), and
relations between base words and their derivatives (eg. [LANCER, LANCEUR], where LANCER means “doing what a LANCEUR does”). The network also contains indirect relations between lexemes of the same derivational family, where none is the base of the other such as [LANCEMENT, LANCEUR]. In this relation, LANCEMENT can be defined as “activity performed by the LANCEUR”. The relation is part of a network which contains [LANCER, LANCEUR], [LANCEUR, LANCER], [LANCEMENT, LANCER] (LANCEMENT is the “activity of LANCER”), [LANCER, LANCEMENT].

Derivational relations define derivational families, and are organized into paradigms. In previous publications, we focused on the morphosemantic characteristics of Demonette. We here address the morphophonological aspects of the DDB, and we show how these properties are described in Demonette and how morphophonological paradigms can be represented.

2 Derivational databases

One key feature of derivational morphology is its lexicality. Moreover, the analysis of complex lexemes relies on a large amount of memorized information.

In recent years, several efforts have improved the morphological analysis by using large corpora (Cotterrel [9], Lazaridou [15]), but progress on morphological information storage and harmonization has been weaker. A lot remains to be done: the accumulation of morphological knowledge is crucial for many researches in descriptive morphology, lexicology, teaching, etc.

The first DDBs were designed by psycholinguists in order to create experimental data. The best-known DBB is CELEX (Baayen et al. [2]) whose first version was released in the 90s. This resource covers English, German and Dutch and offers a broad range of phonological, morphosyntactic, inflectional and derivational information. It remains a reference with no real equivalent, despite its limited coverage, when compared to the size of the corpora available today.

Other large-scale resources have been created for English, such as CatVar (Habash & Dorr [11]), a lexicon of derivational family intended primarily to NLP applications. More recently, a similar resource has been developed for German: DerivBase (Zeller et al. [30]) was automatically built from corpora, with the help of distributed semantics methods. Another significant resource is DerivaTario (Talamo et al. [26]), a derivational dictionary of Italian; It provides analyses based on strong hypotheses regarding allomorphy and suppletion. For instance, BELLICOSO ‘bellicose’ is analyzed as a derivative of GUERRA ‘war’. For French, the only comparable resource is Demonette. Its main characteristics are presented hereafter.
3 Demonette

One goal of Demonette (Hathout & Namer [13]) is to help satisfy the need for reliable and broad-coverage morphological resources of French. Demonette is a DDB characterized by an original structure based on the derivational relations. Moreover, it can host morphological descriptions from research works such as PhDs in morphology, or from manual-assessed NLP lexical resources, like VerbAction (Tanguy & Hathout [27]). In its current state (Hathout & Namer [14]), Demonette (version 1.3) includes information coming from four sources: DériF (Namer [18], [19]), Morphonette (Hathout [12]), VerbAction and Lexeur (Fabre et al. [10]). They have been added in three successive stages. Overall, Demonette contains 167,369 entries. Derived words in Demonette can be deverbal action nouns (ESSORAGE ‘spin’), deverbal masculine or feminine agent nouns (RAMASSEUR ‘collector’, RAMASSEUSE ‘collector’) or deverbal adjectives (PRODUCTIF ‘productive’). Demonette also includes simplex verb predicates (CONSTRUIRE ‘build’).

The fields used to describe the derivational relations in the Demonette do not form a closed list and can be extended if needed. Among the existing fields, the most original ones are probably those used for the semantic description, and include morphosemantic types (eg. @AGF for feminine agents), concrete definitions giving the meaning of L1 with respect to L2 (eg. MARCHEUSE in the relation [MARCHEUSE, MARCHER] is defined as “she who performs the action of MARCHER”), and abstract definitions generalizing the concrete ones where the meanings of L1 and L2 are replaced by their respective semantic type (eg. @AGF: “she who performs @”). Relations with the same abstract definition are inserted into the same morphosemantic paradigm. This is the case with the ones listed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1, cat</th>
<th>L2, cat</th>
<th>Type L1</th>
<th>Type L2</th>
<th>Concrete def</th>
<th>Abstract def</th>
<th>Affix L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARCHEUSE, NFem 'walker(fem)'</td>
<td>MARCHER, V 'walk'</td>
<td>@AGF</td>
<td>@</td>
<td>&quot;she who performs the action of marcher&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>euse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENSEIGNANTE, NFem 'teacher(fem)'</td>
<td>ENSEIGNER ,V 'teach'</td>
<td>@AGF</td>
<td>@</td>
<td>&quot;she who performs the action of enseigner&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;she who performs the action of @&quot;</td>
<td>ante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTRICE, NFem 'director(fem)'</td>
<td>DIRIGER,V 'direct'</td>
<td>@AGF</td>
<td>@</td>
<td>&quot;she who performs the action of diriger&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>rice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Concrete and abstract definitions of three feminine agent nouns
4 Morpho-phonological descriptions within Demonette

The 167,369 [L1, L2] entries of Demonette1.3 have been completed with morphophonological information: L1 and L2 phonological representations, the properties of their stems and exponents, and a description of the morphophonological variations that occur in the [L1, L2] relation. This information is mostly unpredictable in a language with rich morphology such as French and is therefore crucial for a comprehensive description of its derivational system. This additional knowledge is interconnected with the rest of the entries properties and in particular with the morphological and the morphosemantic ones.

In Demonette, morphophonological properties are described in a similar way to the morphosemantic ones: we distinguish concrete and abstract levels; some of the morphophonological descriptions of the L1 and L2 lexemes are induced by the derivational relation which connects them. Morphophonology is both easier and harder to describe than morphosemantics. On the one hand, it is simpler, because IPA transcriptions are part of the mainstream in linguistics: we don’t have a similar standard for morphosemantic representation. On the other hand, it is more complex, because lexemes are abstract objects that do not have formal properties by themselves, unlike the inflected forms (or word forms) that realize them. We also consider that each word form can be decomposed into an inflectional stem and an inflectional exponent (Baerman et al. [3]).

Following Boyé [8], Bonami & Boyé [4] and Montermini & Bonami [17], we define word form exponents in French as the maximal rightmost strings that are common across the patterns, and interpret all the remaining variation as stem allomorphy (see Spencer [25] and Bonami & Boyé [7] for a discussion), where stems are pure forms (or morphomes, in Aronoff’s terms [1]). As often discussed in the literature (see Bonami & Boyé [4, 6], Montermini & Boyé [16], Montermini & Bonami [17] among others), stems form a paradigmatic organization called stem space (deriving from Pirrelli & Battista’s [21] ‘Overall Distribution Schema’). Stem spaces are made of cells forming a graph where stems are in a dependency relation with each other. The value of a stem occupying one cell depends on the value of stem in one or several other cells. By default, this value is inherited from them without change. Allomorphic stems correspond to override of the default inheritance. The complexity of the stem space is language and part-of-speech dependent. For instance, the stem space of French verbs is a graph of at least 13 cells. Table 2 lists the 13 stems of the verb BOIRE ‘drink’. Each stem is used by one or several inflection rules to produce one or several forms of the verb1.

---

1 C1 is used for the IND.PRS.SG; C2: IND.PRS.3PL; C3: IND.IPFV & IND.PRS.1PL & 2PL; C4: PTCP.PRS; C5: IMP.2SG; C6: IMP.1PL & 2PL; C7: SBJV.PRS.SG & 3PL; C8: SBJV.PRS.1PL & 2PL; C9: INF.PRS; C10: IND.FUT & COND.PRS; C11: IND.PST; C12: PTCP.PST.M; C13: PTCP.PST.F.
Likewise, adjective and noun stems are organized in stem spaces: in French, a 3 cells space is required for adjectives (C1: M.SG; C2: F.SG; C3: M.PL; see Boye & Bonami [5]) and a 2 cells one for nouns (C1: SG; C2: PL; see Roché [23]). Table 3 shows the spaces of the adjective BEAU ‘beautiful’ and of the noun CHEVAL ‘horse’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADJ</th>
<th>NOUN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bo</td>
<td>bel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Stem spaces of the French adjective BEAU and noun CHEVAL.

Stem spaces also play a central role in word formation: word formation patterns use particular cells in the stem space of the input lexemes. For instance, -able suffixed deverbal adjectives are formed with the C3 verb stem. Therefore, the stem /byv/ is selected to derive BUvable ‘drinkable’ from BOIRE. Similarly, deadjectival prefixed verbs are generally built on the C2 adjective stem: EMBELLIR, for instance selects the /bél/ stem of the adjective BEAU.

In Demonette we only provide the morphophonological properties of lexemes (or more precisely, of the wordforms that realize them) relevant for word formation (Plénat [22], Roché [23]). Therefore, stems and exponents are listed in the [L1, L2] description only if they are involved in derivational constructions. For French, this means that, out of the stem spaces illustrated in Tables 2 and 3, only the following are needed:

- For nouns, C1, e.g. CHEVAL ‘horse’ → CHEVALIER /ʃvalje/ ‘horseman’
- For adjectives, C1 and C2 are relevant: the M.SG stem /bo/ of BEAU is used to form the property noun BEAUTÉ /bote/ ‘beauty’, and the F.SG stem /bél/ to form the pejorative noun BELLÂTRE /béltré/ ‘fop’.
/sulɛvмā/ ‘lift\textsubscript{N}’), and C3 for -\textit{able} suffixed adjectives (BOIRE ‘drink’ \rightarrow BUVABLE /byvabl/ ‘drinkable’).

The main source of automatic acquisition for the IPA transcription of the selected stems is the freely available database GLÅFF (Sajous \textit{et al.} [24]), which contains more than 1.4 million entries of inflected forms annotated with phonetic representation encoded in SAMPA (Wells [29]). When needed, it is completed with data coming from Lexique3 (New [20]), which uses phonetic transcriptions very similar to SAMPA, which makes the mapping task relatively trivial.

All but one of the stems of the lexemes present in GLÅFF or Lexique3 can be directly retrieved from the word forms for which they have been used. The exception is C3 for verbs, because this stem is always concatenated to an exponent in the word forms: the C3 stem is thus computed from the IND.PRS.1PL form by stripping off the final /\textit{/}\textsubscript{5}/ exponent (e.g. buvons ‘(we) drink’, /byv\textsubscript{5}/ = /byv/ \textsubscript{æ}/ /\textsubscript{5}/). The entries also contain various other pieces of information that describe the morphophonological specificity of L1, L2 and the [L1, L2] relation (see Tables 4 and 5).

In Table 4, the features Rad1 and Rad2 can be compared to determine the formal distance between L1 and L2. When [L1, L2] are in a base/derivative relation, as in [BOIRE, BUVEUR], Rad2 is obtained by removing the suffix Suf2 (e.g. /œr/) from the word form of the derivative (e.g. BUVEUR). Rad1 is selected from the stem space of the base (e.g. BOIRE) in such a way that it is the most similar to one of the possible values of Rad2. In the example [BOIRE, BUVEUR], it is C3 (see Table 2).

When L1 and L2 are in an indirect relation, as in [ADMIRATEUR\textsubscript{N}, ADMIRATION\textsubscript{N}], both words being derived from ADMIRER\textsubscript{V} ‘admire\textsubscript{V}’, the value of Rad\textsubscript{i} is obtained by depriving \textit{L}_{i} from the suffix Suf\textsubscript{i}. For [ADMIRATEUR\textsubscript{N}, ADMIRATION\textsubscript{N}], we get Rad1 = /admirat/ and Rad2 = /admiras/. For each \textit{L}_{i}, the Rad\textsubscript{i} description also includes the number of syllables Size\textsubscript{i}, and the properties of its last syllable (onset, vowel, final consonant), as value of, respectively, LastOnset\textsubscript{i}, LastV\textsubscript{i} and LastC\textsubscript{i}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rad1</td>
<td>Size1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOIRE ‘drink\textsubscript{V}’</td>
<td>byv 1 b y v --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIRATEUR ‘admire\textsubscript{V}’</td>
<td>admirat 3 r a t œr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Rad1 and Rad2
Table 5 gives more examples of \([L_1, L_2]\) formal properties, and shows how allomorphy is described.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(L_1)</th>
<th>(L_2)</th>
<th>Rad(_{1})</th>
<th>Rad(_{2})</th>
<th>Suf(_{1})</th>
<th>Suf(_{2})</th>
<th>Alternation</th>
<th>Concrete Phon Rel</th>
<th>Abstract Phon Rel</th>
<th>Phon Rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>boire</td>
<td>buveur</td>
<td>byv</td>
<td>byv</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>byv = byv / byvœr</td>
<td>Z / Zœr</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>admirateur</td>
<td>admiratif</td>
<td>admirat</td>
<td>admirat</td>
<td>cer</td>
<td>if</td>
<td>admirat = admiratœr / admiratif</td>
<td>Zœr / Zif</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>admirer</td>
<td>admirateur</td>
<td>admir</td>
<td>amat</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>admir at = admir matœr / admir matœr</td>
<td>Zœr / Zatœr</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>administrateur</td>
<td>admiration</td>
<td>admirat</td>
<td>jós</td>
<td>if</td>
<td>admira t</td>
<td>/ admira tœr / admira tœr</td>
<td>Zœr / Zsjo</td>
<td>→ [+sib]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>extincteur</td>
<td>extinction</td>
<td>ekstěkt</td>
<td>ekstěks</td>
<td>jós</td>
<td>jós</td>
<td>ekstěkt</td>
<td>ekstěktœr / ekstěktœr</td>
<td>Zœr / Zsjo</td>
<td>→ [+sib]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>éteindre</td>
<td>extinction</td>
<td>ekstěkt</td>
<td>ekstěkt</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>cer</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>etěœ / ekstěktœr</td>
<td>etěœ / ekstěktœr</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>aliment</td>
<td>alimentaire</td>
<td>alimã</td>
<td>alimãt</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>er</td>
<td>alimã</td>
<td>/ alimãœt / alimãœt</td>
<td>Z / Zter</td>
<td>+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>cheval</td>
<td>hippique</td>
<td>jõval</td>
<td>jõval</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>ic</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>jõval / ipik</td>
<td>jõval / ipik</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Identity and variation in a derivational relation

Columns \(L_i\), \(Rad_i\), \(Suf_i\) contain the orthographic representation, the radical and suffix of each of the lexemes \(L_1\) and \(L_2\) (cf. above Table 4). The other columns describe the properties of the \([L_1, L_2]\) relation.

- The field **Concrete Phon(ological) Rel(ation)** reproduces the sequences formed by the concatenation of \(Rad_1\) and \(Rad_2\) (cf. Table 4).
- The longest common subsequence of \(Rad_1\) and \(Rad_2\) is given in \(Z\). \(Z\) can be identical to \(Rad_1\) and \(Rad_2\) as with /byv/ and /admirat/, in raw 1 and 2; it can be identical to \(Rad_1\) and included in \(Rad_2\): both \(Rad_1\) /admir/ in raw 3 and /alimã/ in raw 7 are included in their corresponding \(Rad_2\); it can be a subpart of \(Rad_1\) and \(Rad_2\), such as /admira/ (raw 4), /ekstěk/ (raw 5) and /e/ (raw 6), or it be empty (raw 8).
• When $Z$ has a non-null value, the difference between $Rad_1$ and $Rad_2$ is given in the field $Alternation$. When $Rad_1$ and $Rad_2$ are identical, the value of $Alternation$ is ‘=’ (raws 1 and 2). The value ‘tls’ (in raws 4 and 5) says that the variation between $Rad_1$ and $Rad_2$ is a change in their last consonant; the value ‘lat’ in raw 3 (resp. ‘lt’ in raw 7) says that $Rad_2$ is the concatenation of $Rad_1$ with /at/ (resp. with /t/). We consider the $Alternation$ value to be not relevant (value ‘--’) when the two stems are completely different (raw 8), or when their difference (i) is not reproduced elsewhere in the lexicon, and (ii) is greater than their likeliness (raw 6).

• When relevant, $Alternation$ is characterized phonologically. The explanation (assibilation, insertion, sonorization, etc.) is encoded as a rule in the $Phonological Rule$ field (last column). The rule is identity, symbolized by ‘=’ in raws 1 and 2. It contains the value ‘NONE’, e.g. in raw 3 because the difference between $Rad_1$ /admir/ and $Rad_2$ /admirat/ does not have a phonological origin but an historical one (/admirat/ is the Latinate bound stem of the verb ADMIRER). Likewise, the rules in raws 6 and 8 have a ‘NONE’ value because the stem variations between L1 and L2 are not phonologically motivated. Conversely, the ‘tls’ alternation in the relations of raws 4 and 5 can be qualified as a case of palatalization (or sibilantization), represented by the ‘→[+sib]’ rule. The insertion of /t/ at the stem/suffix boundary of /alimãťer/ in raw 7 is phonologically motivated (as opposed to the /at/ insertion in raw 3): it is the sonorization (symbolized with ‘+C’) of the latent final consonant on the orthographical form aliment.

• $Z$ is used to generalize the $Concrete Phon Rel$ into an $Abstract Phon(ology) Rel(ation)$, where the $Z$ symbol substitutes for the value of the $Z$ attribute. This abstract relation emphasizes the morphophonological organization of the lexicon, in particular in terms of stem and exponent variation. This abstract representation also identifies the set of morphophonological relations that connect each lexeme to the rest of its derivational family.

The descriptions exemplified in Tables 4 and 5 allows us to separate the derivational relations into four categories according to morphophonological criteria, based on their identity, the variation between their stems, and the nature of their formal relation. This categorization uses the values of $Alternation$ and $Abstract Phon Rel$ fields. The four categories are:

(i) no stem variation (raw 1, 2);
(ii) phonologically motivated variation (raws 4, 5, 7);
(iii) stem variation surfacing as an alternation not phonologically motivated (raw 3);
(iv) suppletion, i.e. no sequence in common (raws 6, 8).

The alternations define morphophonological classes of derivational (sub-)families: for instance, the same set of $A \leftrightarrow B$ stem variations are shared by $[L_1, L_2]$ pairs in several derivational families, as shown in Table 6. Stem variations are evidenced by the Abstract Phon Rel value in each of the relevant $[L_1, L_2]$ entries.

Table 6 shows that (COMPOSER<sub>V</sub> ‘compose’, COMPOSITEUR<sub>N</sub> composer (m’), COMPOSITRICE<sub>N</sub> composer (f’), COMPOSITION<sub>N</sub> ‘composition’) and (INHIBER<sub>V</sub> ‘inhibit’, INHIBITEUR<sub>N</sub> ‘inhibitor (m)’, INHIBITRICE<sub>N</sub> ‘inhibitor (f)’, INHIBITION<sub>N</sub> ‘inhibition’) share the same set of stem variations, and have the same suffix exponents -eur, -rice and -ion. Moreover, the indirect relations in Demonette highlights the formal organization of the lexicon. These relations make it possible to identify sub-regularities, for instance between EXTINCEUR<sub>N</sub> ‘extinguisher’ and EXTINCTION<sub>N</sub> ‘extinction’ (raw 5, Table 5) or between PRÉDATEUR<sub>N</sub> ‘predator’ and PRÉDATION<sub>N</sub> ‘predation’: whereas the standard derivational connections between the first noun pair can be retrieved from their individual relations with their verb base ÉTEINDRE ‘extinguish’, as shown in Table 5, raw 6, there is no such direct base/dervived relation in the French contemporary lexicon, between PRÉDATEUR or PRÉDATION and a common verb base.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deriv. families</th>
<th>PRED(V)</th>
<th>M. AGENT(N)</th>
<th>F. AGENT(N)</th>
<th>EVENT(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSER&lt;sub&gt;V&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>COMPOSITEUR&lt;sub&gt;N&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>COMPOSITRICE&lt;sub&gt;N&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>COMPOSITION&lt;sub&gt;N&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>INHIBER&lt;sub&gt;V&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>INHIBITEUR&lt;sub&gt;N&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>INHIBITRICE&lt;sub&gt;N&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>INHIBITION&lt;sub&gt;N&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zt ↔ Zit</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z ↔ Z</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z ↔ Zis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zt ↔ Zis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Morphophonological organization of derivational families

5 Paradigmatic view of the derivational lexicon

With the organization we outlined above, Demonette has a triple network of morphological, morphosemantic and morphophonological relations able to capture paradigmatic regularities and sub-regularities at different levels. Just like morphosemantics, morphophonological information is described at two levels, a concrete one and an abstract one, which multiplies the perspectives of observation.

For instance, at the concrete level, noun pairs EXTINCEUR ↔ EXTINCTION, ADIMIRATEUR ↔ ADMIRATION and PRÉDATEUR ↔ PRÉDATION
behave in the same way, whereas at the abstract level, (ADMARIRER, ADMIRATEUR, ADMIRATION) and (ÉTEINDRE, EXTINCTEUR, EXTINCTION) belong to two distinct series.

Examined at different levels, the same data leads to different findings. For example, crossing morphology and morphophonology leads to the insertion of [PRÉDATEUR, PRÉDATION] in the sub-paradigm of the paradigm (ADMIRATEUR, ADMIRATION, ADMIRER).

If we consider the morphosemantic / morphophonology opposition, triplets (ADMIRER, ADMIRATEUR, ADMIRATION) and (CONSPIRER ‘conspire’°, CONSPRIATEUR ‘conspirator(m)’°, CONSPIRATION ‘conspiracy’°) belong to two different morphosemantic paradigms (ADMIRER and ADMIRATION are stative predicates, whereas CONSPIRER and CONSPIRATION are eventive ones), but to the same morphophonological paradigm; conversely (ENSEIGNER ‘teach’, ENSEIGNANT ‘teacher(m)’, ENSEIGNEMENT ‘teaching’) is in the same morphosemantic paradigm as (CONSPIRER, CONSPRIATEUR, CONSPIRATION), but the two sub-families belong to distinct morphophonological paradigms.

Finally, the two families presented in Table 6 illustrate a case of uniform paradigm: members of the same morphophonological category share the same semantic category and the same part-of-speech (INHIBER and COMPOSER are verbal predicates, COMPOSITEUR and INHIBITEUR, masculine agent nouns, INHIBITRICE and COMPOSITRICE, feminine agent nouns, and COMPOSITION and INHIBITION event nouns). They result from the same derivational processes (the verbs are simplex, and the nouns are suffixed in -eur, -rice and -ion respectively) and are two by two in the same phonological relations, as shown in Table 6.
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