

Morphology

- Ling 105-

Spring 2023

Giuseppina Silvestri
(she/her)

Week 7, Class 2

Roadmap for today's class

1. Morphology Lab 13
2. Compounds vs phrases
3. Free forms vs bound forms
4. Clitics vs affixes
5. Lexical integrity

Announcements

- Instructions for Assignment #3 to be posted in the next few hours
- Details and sign-up sheet for research presentations available soon as well

Morphology Lab 13

- after consulting WALs, answer the following questions

<https://wals.info>

- 1) how are the **causative** constructions expressed in the world's languages?
- 2) can you give an example of each type you find?
- 3) what is, in your own word, a causative construction?

Words vs Phrases

- differences between words and phrases not easy to identify
- defining what a word is becomes a strenuous task
- we can apply what we know in order to identify the different properties that words and phrases exhibit
- these same differences can be used to identify word boundaries

Compounds vs Phrases

Compounds vs Phrases

- compounds may consist of two (or more) lexeme stems that are juxtaposed in a single word-form
- some languages do not allow phrases consisting of two juxtaposed lexemes of those same word-classes, the combination must be a compound

(1) segnalibri (Italian)

[indicate-books]

‘bookmark’

(1) is a compound: structurally not similar to a phrase with a similar meaning

Occasionally compounds even have a special segmental marker.

-in German interfixes *-s-* and *-en-* are used to form compounds

(2) *Liebe-s-brief* ‘love letter’; *Schwan-en-gesang* ‘swansong’

Compounds vs Phrases

- how can we distinguish a compound from a syntactic phrase when ambiguity arises?

I. semantic criterion

- in almost all compounds a dependent noun does not denote a particular referent but the entire class;

- a dependent noun in a compound is not referential but generic.

(3) piano-tuner

=> the element 'piano' refers to pianos in general.

(4) Ponapean

a. *I pahn kang wini-o.*
1SG FUT eat medicine-DEM
'I will take that medicine.'

b. *I pahn keng-wini.*
1SG FUT eat-medicine
'I will take medicine.' (Lit.: 'I will do medicine-taking.')

(Rehg 1981: 209–14)

Compounds vs Phrases

- how can we distinguish a compound from a syntactic phrase when ambiguity arises?

I. semantic criterion

- in almost all compounds a dependent noun does not denote a particular referent but the entire class;
- a dependent noun in a compound is not referential but generic
- *however*, generic interpretation is not a sufficient criterion by itself.
- a dependent noun in a noun phrase need not necessarily be referential!

(5) *Haus aus Holz* (German; phrase)

‘house from wood’

=> *Holz* ‘wood’ can be just as generic as in *Holzhaus* ‘wood house’ (compound)

- we cannot conclude that the expression is a compound just because a dependent noun is generic.
- **But**, conversely, if a dependent noun is referential, we can be fairly certain that the expression is a phrase and not a compound.

Compounds vs Phrases

II. **Phonological criterion:** stress

- In English, each word has one main stress
- main stress on only one member of a compound-like expression suggests that it is a word

(6) a. *góldfish*
báckdròp
Whíte Hòuse

b. *góld médal*
báckstáirs
whíte kníght

III. **Morphological criterion**

- English: *brother-in-law* vs *brother-in-laws*

Compounds vs Phrases

IV: **Syntactic criterion**: separability

- phrases are often separable, whereas compounds are inseparable

- Hausa N–N compounds

- adjective insertion: compound is inseparable, whereas phrase is separable

- (7) a. *gida-n-sauroo* *bàbba* (**gidaa bàbba na sauroo*)
house-REL.M-mosquito big
'big mosquito net'
- b. *gidaa* *bàbba* *na* *Muusaa*
house big REL.M Musa
'Musa's big house'

(Newman 2000: 109)

Compounds vs Phrases

V: **Syntactic criterion**: **expandability** of the dependent element

-dependents in compounds cannot generally be expanded by modifiers such as adjectives or adverbs

(8) a. *kingmaker* vs **illegitimate kingmaker*

(?)‘someone who makes an illegitimate king’

- In compounds, the head noun cannot be replaced by an anaphoric pronoun

(9) a. *My aunt has one gold watch and three silver ones*
(i.e. *three silver watches*).

b. **My aunt knows one goldsmith and three silver ones*
(i.e. *three silversmiths*).

Compounds vs Phrases

VI: **Syntactic** criterion: ellipsis

- one of two identical elements in coordinated phrases can be optionally left out
- the same cannot happen in compounds

- (10)
- a. *Large fish and small fish were mistakenly placed in the same tank.*
 - b. *Large Ø and small fish were mistakenly placed in the same tank.*
-
- a. *Flying fish and small fish were mistakenly placed in the same tank.*
 - b. **Flying Ø and small fish were mistakenly placed in the same tank.*

Free forms vs bound forms

Free forms vs Bound forms

(11) French pronouns

a. *lui* 'he' (free form)

b. *il* 'he' (bound form)

- bound forms used in normal subject + verb constructions

(12) je=joue 'I play' / tu=joues 'you play' / il=joue 'he plays'

- when the pronoun is topicalized, the free form is used

(13) moi, je=joue 'as for me / I play', not *je, je=joue

- in coordination, the free form is used

(14) moi et toi jouons 'you and I play', not *je et tu jouons

- bound form cannot be used when the pronoun is separated from a viable host and/or in a position that requires sentential stress
- cross-linguistically, free forms thus exhibit more syntactic freedom of movement, and movement tests like clefting and topicalization can be useful to distinguishing free forms from bound forms.

Free forms vs Bound forms

Generalizations

- bound form cannot be used when the pronoun is separated from a viable host and/or in a position that requires sentential stress
- cross-linguistically, free forms thus exhibit more syntactic freedom of movement, and movement tests like clefting and topicalization can be useful to distinguishing free forms from bound forms.

Free forms vs Bound forms

- cross-linguistically, free forms thus exhibit more syntactic freedom of movement
- movement tests like clefting and topicalization can be useful for distinguishing free forms from bound forms.

(15) Italian demonstrative 'quel / quello'

- a. quel tavolo è rotto
that.MSG table.MSG is broken.MSG
'that table is broken'
- b. il tavolo rotto è quello / *quel
the.MSG table.MSG broken.MSG is that.MSG
'the broken table is that one'

Clitics vs affixes

What is a clitic?

- What could a definition of clitic be?
- Perhaps the most salient property of clitics is that they have freedom of host selection
 - i.e. a clitic can often occur with hosts of various syntactic categories, and its host need not be syntactically related to it
- English clitic = 's has freedom of host selection = ***how much freedom?***

Do clitics have the same freedom as the alleged freedom that affixes show?

- I. Affixes do not have such freedom of host selection
 - they combine with stems to which they are syntactically related
- II. Clitics may be less prosodically integrated with their hosts than are affixes:
 - affixes are always within the domain of word stress, but clitics may or may not be
- III. morphophonological rules are less likely to operate across the boundary between a host and a clitic than across the boundary between a stem and an affix

Do clitics have the same freedom as the alleged freedom that affixes show?

III. morphophonological rules are less likely to operate across the boundary between a host and a clitic than across the boundary between a stem and an affix

- many languages have morphophonological rules that operate within the domain of the word-form, but not within the clitic group

Dutch

- obstruents are devoiced word-finally, and no such devoicing occurs when a vowel-initial suffix follows the same morpheme
- when a vowel-initial clitic follows it, devoicing still occurs
- clitic is 'invisible' to the rule of final devoicing.

Do clitics have the same freedom as the alleged freedom that affixes show?

Dutch

- obstruents are **devoiced** word-finally, and no such devoicing occurs when a vowel-initial suffix follows the same morpheme
- when a vowel-initial clitic follows it, devoicing still occurs
- clitic is 'invisible' to the rule of final devoicing

(16)	a.	<i>verband</i> 'bandage'	[vərˈbɑnt]	<i>verband-ig</i> 'bandage-like'	[vərˈbɑndɪx]	-devoicing; suffix
	b.	<i>ik brand</i> 'I burned'	[ɪgˈbrɑnt]	<i>brand=ik</i> 'I burned'	[ˈbrɑntɪk]	+devoicing; clitic

less-free clitics and Wackernagel clitics Law

- Some clitics have less freedom of movement than others
- we can detect some “second-position clitics”
 - aka **Wackernagel clitics**
- appear after the first element of the (simple) sentence, which serves as the host
- depending on the language, the first element may be either the first stressed word, or the first syntactic constituent.
 - examples from **Pitjantjatjara** and **Serbian** (next slide)

less-free clitics and Wackernagel clitics Law

- examples from **Pitjantjatjara**

- (17) a. *Tjitji-ngku* =*ni* *nya-ngu.*
child-ERG =ACC.1SG see-PST
'The child saw me.'
- b. *Tjitji* *nyanga* *pulka-ngku* =*ni* *nya-ngu.*
child this big-ERG =ACC.1SG see-PST
'This big child saw me.'

(Bowe 1990: 12)

less-free clitics and Wackernagel clitics Law

- examples from **Serbian**

- (18) a. *Marija* *=ga* *voli.*
 Marija *=him* *loves*
 ‘*Marija loves him.*’
- b. *Voli* *=ga* *Marija.*
- c. **Marija voli* *=ga.*

- (19) a. *Marija* *njega* *voli.*
 Marija *him* *loves*
 ‘*Marija loves HIM.*’
- b. *Voli njega Marija.*
- c. *Marija voli njega.*

Clitics vs Affixes

(19)

Clitics	Affixes
freedom of host selection	no freedom of stem selection
possible freedom of movement	no freedom of movement
less prosodically integrated	more prosodically integrated
may be outside the domain of a phonological rule	within the domain of a phonological rule
do not trigger/undergo morphophonological or suppletive alternations	may trigger/undergo morphophonological or suppletive alternations
clitic–host combinations... do not have idiosyncratic meanings do not have arbitrary gaps	affix–base combinations... may have idiosyncratic meanings may have arbitrary gaps

Clitics are naughty!

- clitics are like affixes in some respects, and like independent word-forms in others
- clitics do not themselves constitute a uniform group
- All clitics are prosodically dependent on a host and have some freedom of host selection
- yet, some clitics are prosodically or phonologically integrated with their hosts while others are not; some have special syntax, but others do not...
- heterogeneous behavior justified at the **diachronic level**
 - inflectional morphology commonly arises from free words
 - arguably clitics represent the intermediate stages in this transition

HOW?

- arguably fast speech processes lead to reduced variants of already prosodically weak grammatical elements
 - reduced variants are then susceptible to being reanalyzed by a new generation of speakers as distinct lexical expressions
 - over time, these clitics may acquire further affixal properties:
 - reduced stem selection reduced freedom of movement, morphological and phonological cohesion, etc.

Lexical Integrity

- words differ from syntactic phrases in many different ways and in a number of crucial respects

Q:

why do these differences exist?

Are those differences crucial to define the concept of **wordhood**?

Lexical Integrity Principle

- the various differences in the behavior of words and phrases might reflect a single general principle:

Lexical Integrity Hypothesis/Principle

Rules of syntax can refer/apply to entire words or the all the properties of entire words, but *not* to the internal parts of words or their properties.

- as far as syntactic rules are concerned, words have no internal structure

Introducing Morphophonology

Leading question:

Do morpheme change based on their phonological environment?

I will see you next week:
what can we do in the meanwhile?

- review the lecture slides
- do reading from the textbook
 - chapters 8 and 9
- take a look at the instructions for Assignment #3 – it will be announced
- Attend sections

STAY SAFE & STRONG