

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:


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

\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





note: labeling is efficient, but smc blocks multiple wh extraction – too strict


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.


(cf. Brody'98, Svenonius'16, Harizanov&Gribanova'19, Branigan'23, ...)

(z strong)



(y strong)





Conjecture: adapting Michaelis'98, Kobele'02, head moved trees are MCF

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: vi instantiated trees MCF

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; word-forming hm, vi are post-mrg, post-lbl

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
 Brody'98 Projection and phrase structure
 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'01 Derivation by phase
 Chomsky&al'23 Merge and the Strong Minimalist Thesis
 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 Φ 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'97 Derivational minimalism
 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
 Yuan'25 Morphological conditions on movement chain resolution