

Assignment 1

Rui Qiu #999292509

The word *long*, which originated from Old English *lang*, means long, first appeared in Middle English (2012:495). However, its paired word *elongate* in this example was originally Late Latin *ēlongāre* (2012:278). For the other pair, the word *bond*, was first used in Middle English as a variety of Old Norse *band* (2012:99). And the word *bondage* was also from Middle English, could be traced back to Old Norse *bōndi*, present participle of *būa*, to live (2012:99). ✓

If the two pairs we are looking into have the same morphemes, at least they are two pairs of allomorphs. However, according to the third principle in *English Vocabulary Elements*, allomorphs share a common history and similar pronunciation (2007:77). Therefore, *-long-* in *elongate* is not the same morpheme as the word *long* because they have different ancestor sources. Similarly, *bond-* in *bondage* and the word *bond* itself are two different morphemes, though they were both from Old Norse, but distinct words with distinct meanings. ✓

Nevertheless, according to the etymologies above, the two pairs of words came from different linguistic sources, they do have related meanings and similar forms. And this could be rather confusing, such that people would simply separate the words into several parts, and take the parts with identical forms as the same morpheme. For example:

- *e-long-ate* has the morph *-long-*, means *long*;
- *bond-age* has the morph *bond-*, means *bond*. ✓

In this way, a mistake is made due to the seemingly likely 'morphemes'. Many other examples can be listed when referring to zoological terminologies. Specifically speaking, the names of most of species came from Latin or other local languages, while the modern spelling of those words have no direct relations with its original words, for instance ✓
✓ *cockroach* (2007:66) is not *cock-* plus *-roach*, it came from Spanish *cucaracha*. Besides, *-roach* gained the meaning of cockroach after the birth of the word *cockroach*, while *-roach* came from Old French *roche*, means big stone (2012:717).

In the case above, it is an example that supports etymological analysis rather than morphological analysis. Yet etymological analysis is actually not the best solution all the time, because there are lots of words in English which do come from the same origin, do have the similar forms and pronunciation in their modern spelling, thus do share the same

morphemes. In other words, the two pairs discussed above are more like 'exceptions'. Hence, using etymological analysis is not always the most efficient way to identify a morpheme to some extent.

But back to the core of this short essay, we have to clarify that, under the circumstances of etymological analysis, the given two pairs of words don't have the same morphemes at all. On the other hand, however, it would be more clear if we can categorize these two types of 'morphemes', namely, we can define *-long-* in *elongate* as a '**discontinuous allomorph**' which stands for those allomorphs with distinct histories but similar contemporary meaning, then we call the entity of these allomorphs '**discontinuous morphemes**'; while we define those counterparts with common history '**continuous allomorph**' and '**continuous morphemes**' correspondingly.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

DENNING, K., & KESSLER, B. 2007. *English Vocabulary Elements*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. 2012. *The American Heritage Dictionary*. 5th edition. New York: Dell Pub.

Assignment 1 marking rubric

Name: Rui Qiu Student #: _____ Tutorial #: _____

ARGUMENTATION & ORGANIZATION	
Argumentation is clear, concise, logical, and well-organized. Demonstrates excellent understanding of the question(s). Student has proficiently addressed all questions/criteria in assignment guidelines (see below).	5
Generally coherent arguments addressing all questions/criteria; may have minor omissions or could benefit from improved clarity in parts. Generally logical but may be vague in parts, or require better organization.	4
Adequate discussion addressing most questions below, but may lack clarity or not have addressed one or more questions in full. Could be better organized or more logical/coherent.	3
Discussion may be vague or unclear, errors may be present, or several of the questions/points below may not be addressed. Claims may not be fully supported, could be considerably more coherent or logical.	2
Inadequate discussion: not clearly reasoned, insufficient, vague, illogical, or demonstrating major errors in understanding. Insufficient or inadequate examples/evidence. Few of the questions below are addressed.	1
Discussion is completely off-topic or does not address the question(s) at all.	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did student summarize etymologies of all four words, in enough detail? • Were opposing arguments presented and addressed (i.e., pros and cons discussed)? • Was student's conclusion for each pair of words clearly argued for? • Has student clearly distinguished between statements of fact and opinion? 	
UNDERSTANDING & APPLICATION OF COURSE CONCEPTS	
Demonstrates excellent understanding of morphology and etymology, the relationship between the two, and why the question posed in the assignment is interesting. Relevant terminology used where applicable.	4
Student's understanding of relevant course concepts (e.g. morphology, etymology) may be in doubt. Terminology may be incorrect, vague or incomplete.	2
Use of terminology is incorrect or absent, or demonstrates complete lack of understanding of concepts.	0
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	
STYLE: GRAMMAR, SPELLING, PUNCTUATION, ETC.	
Few/no errors, spelling mistakes, or typos. Evidence of careful editing/proofreading; appropriate style.	2
Some errors but not so many that they compromise clarity. More careful editing would help.	1.5
Numerous, significant errors compromise clarity; grader must re-read sentences to discern meaning. Style may not be appropriate for a university assignment.	1
Numerous, significant errors completely obscure meaning of significant portions of the assignment.	0
CITATIONS & ATTRIBUTIONS	
In-text citations and references are complete and correct, and student has adequately incorporated his/her own opinion with ideas from other sources which are properly attributed.	2
Student has attempted to incorporate his/her own ideas/opinions with those from other sources, but in-text citations or references have minor omissions or are not fully integrated properly.	1
Student's own ideas not successfully integrated with source material; there may be major omissions in citations or references, or inadequate attribution through quotations, paraphrasing, etc. (NB: If plagiarism is suspected, the instructor will be notified.)	0

NOTE: This rubric is a guideline only; the final grade is at the discretion of the instructor and TAs, who reserve the right to modify this grading scheme and/or make additional deductions.

TOTAL: 13 /13