

# Realizational Morphology in a Modular Minimalist Grammar

Edward Stabler, stabler@ucla.edu

Mathematics of Language 2025

- **Modular minimalist grammars with realizational morphology are briefly motivated and defined**

**modular** = relatively independent components separated

**realizational** = atoms of syntax not pronounced words

- **Captures generalizations missed by previous MGs and many other generative grammars**

Paper, slides, code: <https://github.com/epstabler/mol25>

## Something generative grammars systematically miss?

**Chomsky&Lasnik'77, Lasnik'00:** “*Syntactic Structures* makes the claim that there could be another language just like English but where Affix Hopping is optional. The theory we’re looking at now . . . makes the claim that there couldn’t be any such language.

Affix Hopping and DO-Support. . . describe but don’t capture the. . . generalization: *A stranded affix is no good.* ”

**Bresnan'00:** “To counter the fact that DO is ungrammatical elsewhere, there must be a constraint that penalizes its presence”

**Grimshaw'97, Sag'11:** “[DO is] necessary whenever it is possible”

## Non-lexicalist, late insertion, realizational theories

**Kayne'93:** “There is no auxiliary selection rule”

**Bjorkman'11:** “BE is not directly selected for, but is instead inserted to support inflectional material that was unable to combine with a main verb”

**Olivier'25:** “HAVE and BE are allomorphs”

**Kalin&Weisser'25:**

“Combining all the evidence. . . the most adequate model:”  
non-lexicalist (syntactic word-building),  
post-syntactic (syntactic atoms have no phonology),  
phonology ‘realizes’ features but not in lexical increments

## Modular vs monostratal

Let **monostratal** = each rule application builds one piece of structure

**Examples:** CFG, MCFG, CG, CCG, TAG, 1990's MG,...

Let **modular** = each piece of structure respects a number of relatively independent, separately stated constraints

**Examples:** Most of theoretical linguistics

**Here:** A (simple, preliminary) modular formulation of MG, with realizational morphology, close to recent Chomskian proposals

## A modular grammar

**mrg:** accepts/transduces binary trees over finite set of atoms

**sel:** checks match of selection features

**agr:** checks match of agreement features

**hm:** move heads to highest accessible 'strong' positions

**lin:** linearize

**vi:** vocabulary insertion

The derived **(tree) language** is the range of the composition  $g$

$$g = vi \circ lin \circ hm \circ agr \circ sel \circ mrg$$

## 1. mrg

mrg: an identity transduction on binary trees

$$\text{mrg } t = \begin{cases} t & \text{if } t \text{ is an atom} \\ S (\text{mrg } x) (\text{mrg } y) & \text{if } t = S \times y \end{cases}$$

where the atoms have the form:


$$\begin{array}{lll} \sqrt{\text{destroy}} & : & D.D \quad \multimap \quad V \\ \sqrt{\text{destroy}} & : & N \end{array}$$

$\multimap$ : 'negative occurrences' of features conjoined on left, positive on right. First pos = 'category'


## 2. sel

$$\text{sel } x = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \text{ is labelable} \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- Labeling checks features of opposite polarities, in order. . .





external merge  
if no subtree on left has positive f  
as its first unchecked feature




undefined otherwise

if (smc) no two subconstituents have same first unchecked feature. 7








### 3. agr


$$\text{agr } t = \begin{cases} t & \text{if } t \text{ can be instantiated} \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$


- Atoms given set of type:value features, each with a tier, where  $\text{tier} \approx \text{features of visible heads on spine}$
- 'probe'  $\phi:-$  or  $\phi:\underline{3s}$  instantiated by 'goal'  $\phi:3s$ , in bottom-up order, in 'tier-adjacent' head

(Béjar&Rezak'09)

(Hanson'23)









## 4. hm

Heads can be raised from the phrases they form



## 4. hm


Heads can also be lowered from the phrases they form



Stabler'01: Folded in with mrg, sel, and lin: 5 MG rules  $\Rightarrow$  13

## 4. hm

Heads can also be lowered from the phrases they form



Stabler'01: Folded in with mrg, sel, and lin: 5 MG rules  $\Rightarrow$  13

Chomsky'01: There are some reasons to suspect that a substantial core of head-raising processes... may fall within the phonological component.






## 4. hm


Arregi&Pietrazko'21: Head movement determined by 2 diacritics:

- Diacritics:  $-\sqrt{\text{root}}$  is 'dependent',  $\sqrt{\text{root}}^@$  is 'strong'
- In a maximal, non-recursive sequence of first-merged heads:  
     $-h_0, -h_1, \dots, h_n$ 
  - Heads 'roll up' span, adjoining to form  $h_n, \dots, -h_0$ .
  - If no head marked @, heads placed in highest position,  $h_0$ ;
  - Else: all to highest @-marked head.

(z strong)



(y strong)



## 5. lin

- (ord) Put first merges head-first, else head-final.

(Kayne'94,'20, Chomsky'95, Cinque'23)

(del) Delete non-final internally merged elements\*

$\text{lin} = \text{ord} \circ \text{del}$

\* del is too simple –

e.g. Yuan'25: deletion of non-final copies blocked when those copies are needed to host affixes, etc

## 6. vi

- Vi rules phonologically instantiate roots, based on context

$$\sqrt{\text{cat}} \rightarrow \text{cat}$$

$$\phi:3p \rightarrow -s$$

So we transform the leaf

$$(\sqrt{\text{cat}}, N, \phi:3p) \Rightarrow (\text{cat } -s, N, \phi:3p).$$

- More specific rules take precedence, 'blocking' simpler ones:

$$\sqrt{\text{mouse}}, \phi:3s \rightarrow \text{mice}.$$

- vi rules can apply to a complex formed by head movement:

$$\sqrt{\text{chase}} \sqrt{\text{past}} \rightarrow \text{chase } -\text{ed}.$$

- vi rules can also target spans – sequences of first-selected heads, not marked 'dependent' but in the domain of a vi rule:

$$(\sqrt{\text{de}}) (\sqrt{\text{el}}) \rightarrow \text{del}.$$

(Halle&Marantz'93, Embick&Marantz'08, Svenonius'16, Haugen&Siddiqi'16, i.a.)

## 6. vi

- defaults are negative conditions –  
new in MGs, but not new in grammars  
(Buszkowski'95, Groenink'95, Boullier'98, Kracht'98, . . . )
- MCFGs lack negative conditions –  
so expressible in Horn clauses, parsable in Datalog  
(Kanazawa)
- But here, the competition domains for defaults are finite in  
number and scope, so still: MCFG equivalent

## The modular grammars

**mrg:** accepts binary trees over finite set of atoms

**sel:** check match of selection features

**agr:** check match of agreement features

**hm:** move heads to highest accessible 'strong' positions

**lin:** linearize

**vi:** vocabulary insertion

$$\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{vi} \circ \mathbf{lin} \circ \mathbf{hm} \circ \mathbf{agr} \circ \mathbf{sel} \circ \mathbf{mrg}$$

**Each particular  $\mathbf{g}$  specified by atoms and vi rules**

$\mathbf{mrg}$ ,  $\mathbf{sel}$  and  $\mathbf{agr}$  are identities;  $\mathbf{hm}$ ,  $\mathbf{lin}$  and  $\mathbf{vi}$  preserve hierarchy.

morphology is non-lexicalist, post-syntactic, and realizational.

# Nominalization

Chomsky'70: common underlying form → different pronunciations

The barbarians destroy the city



The destruction of the city by the barbarians

The oligarchs capture the markets

The capture of the markets by the oligarchs

(√capture)	→	capture
(√destroy V)	→	destroy
(√destroy N)	→	destruction.

# Auxiliaries: English




(Bjorkman'11, Arregi&Klecha'15, Fenger'19, Cruschina&Calabrese'21, i.a.)




# Auxiliaries: French

(Olivier'25, Bjorkman'11)



## Dependencies among modules

- Dependencies more explicit than in rule-based MGs:



$$\mathbf{g} = \begin{array}{l} vi \circ lin \circ \underline{hm} \circ \underline{agr} \circ sel \circ mrg \\ vi \circ lin \circ \underline{agr} \circ \underline{hm} \circ sel \circ mrg \end{array}$$

- Future work: unify sel/agr in labeling; vi/hm in interface



- lin is structurally trivial, so dependency arguments weak

# Conclusions

## **MG properties adjusted**

- modular; roots in atoms; sel, agr, lin, hm, vi post-mrg

## **MG properties preserved: Two conjectures**

- Modular grammars (with smc,del) weakly MCF
  - major components already treated (sel, agr, lin); todo: hm, vi
- MCF parsing/learning may extend easily to del, smc replacements
  - re del: easy extension from MCFGs to ‘parallel’ MCFGs
  - re smc: distinct, stipulated condition can be replaced

## **New capture of prominent generalizations**

- Halle&Marantz: roots, allomorphy, last-resorts
- Chomsky&Lasnik, Bjorkman, Olivier: ‘overflow’ auxiliaries
- But not: ‘Stray affixes are no good’

Alexiadou&Borer'20 Introduction, Nominalization: 50 Years on from Chomsky's Remarks  
 Bjorkman'11 BE-ing Default: The Morphosyntax of Auxiliaries  
 Branigan'23 The Grammar of Multiple Head Movement  
 Bruening'18 The lexicalist hypothesis: Both wrong and superfluous  
 Boullier'04 Range concatenation grammars  
 Buszkowski'96: Categorical grammars with negative information  
 Chomsky'57 Syntactic Structures  
 Chomsky'70 Remarks on nominalization  
 Chomsky&Lasnik'77 Filters and control  
 Collins'02 Eliminating labels  
 Collins&Kayne Towards a theory of morphology as syntax  
 Engelfriet,Lilin&Maletti'09 Extended multi bottom-up tree transducers  
 Ermolaeva&Kobele'22 Agree as information transmission over dependencies  
 Giannoula'25 Deciphering mirror principle violations  
 Goto&Ishii'25 Seeking an optimal design of search and merge  
 Graf'22 Typological implications of tier-based strictly local movement  
 Graf'23 Subregular tree transductions, movement, copies, traces, and the ban on improper movement  
 Graf&Kostyszyn'21 Multiple wh-movement is not special  
 Grimshaw'97: Projection, heads, and optimality  
 Groenink'95: Literal movement grammars  
 Halle&Marantz'93 Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection  
 Halpert&Zeijlstra'24 Off phases: It's all relative(ized)  
 Hanson'25 Tier-based strict locality and the typology of agreement  
 Harizanov&Gribanova'19 Whither head movement?  
 Haugen&Siddiqi'16 Towards a restricted realization theory  
 Holmberg'17 The final-over-final condition and linearization in generative grammar

Kalin&Weisser'25 Minimalism and morphology  
 Kanazawa'07 Parsing and generation as Datalog queries  
 Kanazawa'09 The pumping lemma for well-nested multiple context-free languages  
 Kanazawa'17 Parsing and generation as Datalog query evaluation  
 Kayne'93 Toward a modular theory of auxiliary selection  
 Kayne'20 Antisymmetry and externalization  
 Ke'24 Can agree and labeling be reduced to minimal search?  
 Keine'25  $\Phi$  feature sharing  
 Kobele&Liu'25 Formalizing feature inheritance  
 Kracht'98 Strict compositionality and literal movement grammars  
 Lasnik'00 Syntactic Structures Revisited  
 Marantz'98 No escape from syntax  
 Olivier'25 A syntactic account of auxiliary selection in French  
 Sag'10 Sex, lies, and the English auxiliary system. Stanford  
 Sag&al'20 Lessons from the English auxiliary system  
 Stabler'01 Recognizing head movement  
 Stabler'11 Computational perspectives on minimalism  
 Stanojević'19 On the computational complexity of head movement and affix hopping  
 Vanden Wyngaerd&al'15 Late insertion and root suppletion