

Chapter 1 : Morphology (linguistics) - Wikipedia

*Morphological Theory: An Introduction to Word Structure in Generative Grammar [Andrew Spencer] on www.nxgvision.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. This is the first near-exhaustive introduction to the burgeoning field of morphology in generative grammar.*

Presupposing very little prior knowledge of linguistics, the book guides the reader from absolute basics to the most recent theoretical developments. Written in an accessible style, and including a wealth of exercises, this textbook is designed so that it can be used either on courses explicitly focused on morphology or as an adjunct to other courses, particularly in generative syntax and in phonology. The book opens with an account of the phenomena studied by morphologists, an outline of classical problems and an introduction to the earliest models of morphology proposed within the generative paradigm. Its second part deals with the interface between morphology and phonology and includes a detailed discussion of lexical Phonology, and related models, as well as a variety of types of nonconcatenative morphology. Part III begins with a comprehensive introduction to more recent theories of word structure, including inflectional morphology. Subsequent chapters examine the interface between morphology and syntax, exploring the processes which affect grammatical relations, such as passives and causatives. Further chapters examine compounding processes and the morphology, phonology and syntax of clitic systems. The final part of the book includes a full discussion of "bracketing paradoxes" and closes with a survey of models of morphology and competing views of the place of morphology in linguistic theory.

The Domain of Morphology. Morphemes, Morphs and Allomorphy. Types of Morphological Operation. Functions of Morphology -- Morphosyntax. Basic Concepts and Pre-Generative Approaches. Morphemes, Words and The Lexicon. The Nature of Words. Phonology and Syntax in the Standard Theory. The Standard Theory in Outline. Morphosyntax in the Standard Theory. Chomsky's Remarks on Nominalization: Generative Semantics and Lexical Transformations. Concluding Remarks on a Remarkable. Halle's Prolegomena. Siegel's Level Ordering Hypothesis. Aronoff's Word Formation in Generative Grammar. The Model in Outline. The Classical Model of Generative Morphology: Kiparsky's Alternation Condition. Cyclic Phonology and Lexical Phonology. Allomorphy in Natural Morphology. Zwicky's Shape Conditions. Nonlinear Approaches to Morphology. The Autosegmental Approach to Morphology. Further Applications of Nonconcatenative Morphology. Alternations Affecting Melody Elements. Alternations Affecting the CV Skeleton. Problems with Level Ordering. Constituent Structure in Morphology. The Nature of Inflection. The Constituent Structure of Words. Lieber's Organization of the Lexicon. Anderson's Extended Word-and-Paradigm Theory. Overview of the Phenomena. Transformational Theories of Passive. Baker's Incorporation Theory. Lexical Approaches to Valency Alternations. Valency Alternations in the Lexicon. Excursus on Adjectival Passives Levin and Rappaport. Syntactic and Lexical Approaches. Overview of Compound Types. Roeper and Siegel Di Sciullo and Williams Semantically Based Accounts of Inheritance. The Word in Generative Grammar. Bracketing Paradoxes in Lexical Phonology. A Prosodic Approach Aronoff and Sridhar. Williams's Theory of a Lexical Relatedness. Pesetsky's Morphological QR. Sproata's Mapping Principle. Bracketing Paradoxes and Paradigmatic Word Formation. The Place of Morphology. Di Sciullo and Williams's Definition of Word. Zwicky's Interface Program. Post-Syntactic Compounding in Japanese.

Chapter 2 : Morphological Theory: An Introduction to Word Structure in Generative Grammar by Andrew S

To send this article to your Kindle, first ensure no-reply@www.nxgvision.com is added to your Approved Personal Document E-mail List under your Personal Document Settings on the Manage Your Content and Devices page of your Amazon account.

Except for the quotation of short passages for the purposes of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher. Except in the United States of America, this book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise. Includes bibliographical references and index. Grammar, Comparative and general - Morphology. Excursus on adjectival passives Levin and Rappaport 7. Preface This book is about morphology, that is, the structure of words. Although I hope the book will be useful in helping to develop the skills of morphologists. Morphology is unusual amongst the subdisciplines of linguistics, in that much of it has been motivated by the needs of In addition, psycholinguists and computer scientists working on language processing. However, my primary audience is students of linguistics, and my intention is that the book should enable the student to understand the book. In a sense, the book has been designed as a kind of graduated guidebook to such literature. The syntax interface presents a much richer assortment of theoretical approaches. This should not be taken as an indication that work in other frameworks should be neglected. However, Government-Binding syntax is the framework with which students are most likely to be acquainted if they take courses in contemporary syntax. Moreover, the dominance of GB theory means that it tends to serve as the backdrop for theoretical discussion in any framework. This puts a serious onus on the student of linguistics, however. The book is written so as to be as autonomous as possible. The more important terms, whether from morphology or outside, are put in boldface at the first mention. It would, of course, be wrong to pretend that anyone can understand theory construction in morphology without a basic understanding of theoretical linguistics. These should provide more than sufficient background, especially in phonology and syntax. For the more elementary courses say, second-year undergraduate, one might use part I, the less advanced sections of part II, the first two chapters. A more advanced course say, second-semester postgraduate might take part I as basic background reading and then use the book to concentrate on topics from parts II, III or IV. All the chapters except the last are furnished with exercises. Some of the exercises are effectively feedback exercises on the chapter itself and may have relatively straightforward answers. Others are problem sets illustrating the theoretical issues discussed in that chapter and earlier chapters. Not infrequently, the exercises include data which are actually problematical for some of the theoretical proposals discussed in the chapter. In some cases, the exercises are simply meant to raise more general questions, often taken up again in later chapters. This means that the exercises are an integral part of the book. Neil Smith deserves special thanks for suggesting the idea in the first place, and for reading most of the book and giving me extremely detailed comments, as well as much needed encouragement. Likewise, Dick Hayward and Iggy Roca read a large part of the manuscript and provided extremely helpful criticism. These three colleagues merit my special gratitude. In addition, I must thank Liliane Haegeman for inviting me to teach in Geneva for a year, where much of the book was written or prepared. Conversations with her and Ian Roberts did much to clarify my thinking in a variety of areas. Finally, special thanks to Fay Young, for much more than just. This citation is self-explanatory except for the term portmanteau, which in this context means a type of fusion of two morphemes into one see below. Hockett objects to solution 5 because it appeals to the idea of a morpheme which consists of a process of replacement, and this is foreign to the IA approach by definition. On the other hand, the maximally simple solution 1 is unsatisfactory because, in effect, it fails to capture the fact that took is the past tense form of take just as baked is the past tense form of bake. The second solution is able to capture this but has the disadvantage that it fails to distinguish ablaut from total suppletion of the kind go - went. This solution, in effect, likens the took - take alternation to the stem allomorphy found in electric - electricity, except that the phonological alternation is caused by an allomorph which has no physical realization. Hockett therefore rejects this solution, too. However, this preference is relative to IA

theory. As Rocket points out, in a different theoretical framework we would expect different solutions to be favoured. Hockett mentions one other approach in passing, the Word-and-Paradigm theory, and devotes much of his discussion to what he sees as the main alternative to IA, the Item-and-Process IP theory. In an IP account we would distinguish between basic or underlying forms of a morpheme and forms derived after the application of certain processes. In the first, the process is affixation of -ed or perhaps of the allomorph *ftf*; in the second the process is phonological in that the vowel of *take* is replaced by, or changed into, *fuf*. The IP approach historically precedes the IA approach described by Hockett its most extended defence is probably given in Sapir, The problem is that both IA and IP are fundamentally agglutinating theories. In IA, in which there is no distinction between underlying forms and surface forms, all morphology is essentially agglutinative. In IP word structure need not necessarily look agglutinative on the surface, but it is assumed to be agglutinative at the underlying level. Here we have four morphemes all realized by a single portmanteau morph, as in 2. In addition, we often find situations in which a single category is realized in more than one way within a word, that is, when there is many-one correspondence between form and function. This has been referred to as extended or overlapping exponence. English strong verbs provide a simple example of this. Most such verbs end in -en in the past participle. However, many of them also show ablaut, and in certain cases the vowel of the stem is unique to the past participle form, for instance: The extended exponence of the past participle category can be diagrammed as in 2. Other cases of multiple exponence are less easy to handle, however. Matthews discusses an example from Latin which is typical of the problems posed by inflecting languages. Thus, we have forms such as those in 2. In the form *re*: The latter would be regarded as an automatic phonological alternation, though the vowel lengthening is non-automatic and could plausibly be said to be a partial realization of the category of Perfective. This means that a mapping from the morphosyntactic categories to their surface realizations for *re*: This is the Word-and-Paradigm WP approach to inflectional morphology.;

Robins pointed out that there are certain generalizations which can only really be stated at the level of the whole word. His proposal was to revamp a much earlier tradition of word analysis derived from classical grammarians some writing 2, years ago, such as Pa! In an agglutinating system the correspondence rules will be rather simple, amounting to one morphosyntactic category per formative and one formative per category. But there is no necessity for the categories and the morphological elements which express those categories to be in a one-one correspondence, as there is in the IA theory. A result of this approach is that it is rather a simple matter to describe syncretism. For instance, the fact that all oblique cases have the same ending in the feminine singular namely -oj can be stated directly in the WP approach, in which the morphosyntactic description is separated from the morphological formatives as such. A potential price for this descriptive luxury is that it would appear possible to describe any conceivable patterning of data this way, including hypothetical systems which never seem to occur in real life. This is the kind of property that tends to arouse the suspicions of generative linguists. On the other hand, in chapters 4 and 5 we will see how changes in assumptions concerning the relation between morphology and phonology have allowed some theoreticians to propose basically IP or IA models which can handle some of the problems posed by inflectional and other types of non-agglutinative morphology. In chapter 1 I mentioned that morphemes may appear in different phonological shapes because of the effects of general phonological processes. In other words, [e] is an allophone, or variant, of the e-phoneme which occurs whenever that phoneme is both preceded and followed by a palatalized consonant. This is an example of an automatic alternation, governed solely by the phonological form of the words concerned, and applying to every word of the appropriate form in the language. Moreover, the *e*/*ef* distinction is never by itself contrastive in Russian, that is, there can be no pair of words which differ solely in that one has *fef* where the other has *fef*. In contemporary generative phonology a situation like this would be handled by taking the *fef* allophone as basic and postulating a raising rule applying in the environment of palatalized consonants. In the tradition of structuralist phonemics we would say that the two allophones of the e-phoneme occur in complementary distribution: This means that we have a case of homonymy, rather like the homonymy we find in the English word *case* as in *suitcase*, *court case*, or *genitive case*. Matters get more interesting when we look at 2. However, the *luk* case is different from the *case* case. There are no voiced obstruents in word final position in Russian which is why the English words

back and bag sound alike when spoken with a Russian accent. The second sequence [lug] would therefore be an unpronounce-able word in Russian witness what I said about speaking English with a Russian accent, so where we might expect [lug] we actually hear [luk]. In contemporary and also in European structuralist parlance the gfk alternation illustrated here is a case of neutralization of a phonemic contrast. Neutralizations pose problems for certain IA approaches to morphology. In the post-Bloomfieldian tradition represented by, for example, Hockett, statements about morphemes have to be kept distinct from statements about phonemes. The reasons for this are to do with controversial assumptions about the way linguistic analysis has to proceed and about the nature of phonological representations. Why this should be so was never made clear but it had the effect of placing stringent conditions on the way that grammars could be written. The two variants consist of different phonemes and the type of entities that consist of different phonemes are morphs, for example, allomorphs of a single morpheme. A solution favoured by post-Bloom: This was the morphophonemic level and its elements were morphophonemes. Others would have an indirect In the Prague School tradition of structuralism, which followed the ideas of Trubetskoy and Jakobson, the G of 2. This feature would then be specified as a function of its position whether word final or not. A partially specified phonological element of this sort is called an archiphoneme. It codes in a rather direct way the idea that an otherwise distinctive opposition is suspended or neutralized in certain circumstances. The American concept of morphophonemics was somewhat different from this, however. The biuniqueness requirement meant that phonemes were not allowed to change into other phonemes.

Chapter 3 : Morphological Theory : Andrew Spencer :

Morphological Theory: An Introduction to Word Structure in Generative Grammar "What Andrew Spencer aims to offer us here-for the first time-is a comprehensive.

The familiar examples of paradigms are the conjugations of verbs and the declensions of nouns. Also, arranging the word forms of a lexeme into tables, by classifying them according to shared inflectional categories such as tense, aspect, mood, number, gender or case, organizes such. For example, the personal pronouns in English can be organized into tables, using the categories of person first, second, third; number singular vs. plural. The inflectional categories used to group word forms into paradigms cannot be chosen arbitrarily; they must be categories that are relevant to stating the syntactic rules of the language. Person and number are categories that can be used to define paradigms in English, because English has grammatical agreement rules that require the verb in a sentence to appear in an inflectional form that matches the person and number of the subject. Therefore, the syntactic rules of English care about the difference between dog and dogs, because the choice between these two forms determines which form of the verb is used. However, no syntactic rule for the difference between dog and dog catcher, or dependent and independent. The first two are nouns and the second two are adjectives. An important difference between inflection and word formation is that inflected word forms of lexemes are organized into paradigms that are defined by the requirements of syntactic rules, and there are no corresponding syntactic rules for word formation. The relationship between syntax and morphology is called "morphosyntax" and concerns itself with inflection and paradigms, not with word formation or compounding. Allomorphy[edit] Above, morphological rules are described as analogies between word forms: In this case, the analogy applies both to the form of the words and to their meaning: One of the largest sources of complexity in morphology is that this one-to-one correspondence between meaning and form scarcely applies to every case in the language. Even cases regarded as regular, such as -s, are not so simple; the -s in dogs is not pronounced the same way as the -s in cats; and, in plurals such as dishes, a vowel is added before the -s. These cases, where the same distinction is effected by alternative forms of a "word", constitute allomorphy. Phonological rules constrain which sounds can appear next to each other in a language, and morphological rules, when applied blindly, would often violate phonological rules, by resulting in sound sequences that are prohibited in the language in question. Similar rules apply to the pronunciation of the -s in dogs and cats: Lexical morphology[edit] Lexical morphology is the branch of morphology that deals with the lexicon, which, morphologically conceived, is the collection of lexemes in a language. As such, it concerns itself primarily with word formation: Models[edit] There are three principal approaches to morphology and each tries to capture the distinctions above in different ways: Morpheme-based morphology, which makes use of an item-and-arrangement approach. Lexeme-based morphology, which normally makes use of an item-and-process approach. Word-based morphology, which normally makes use of a word-and-paradigm approach. While the associations indicated between the concepts in each item in that list are very strong, they are not absolute. Morpheme-based morphology[edit] Morpheme-based morphology tree of the word "independently" In morpheme-based morphology, word forms are analyzed as arrangements of morphemes. A morpheme is defined as the minimal meaningful unit of a language. In a word such as independently, the morphemes are said to be in-, depend-, -ent, and ly; depend is the root and the other morphemes are, in this case, derivational affixes. More recent and sophisticated approaches, such as distributed morphology, seek to maintain the idea of the morpheme while accommodating non-concatenated, analogical, and other processes that have proven problematic for item-and-arrangement theories and similar approaches. Morpheme-based morphology presumes three basic axioms: Roots and affixes have the same status as morphemes. As morphemes, they are dualistic signs, since they have both phonological form and meaning. Morpheme-based morphology comes in two flavours, one Bloomfieldian and one Hockettian. For him, there is a morpheme plural using allomorphs such as -s, -en and -ren. Within much morpheme-based morphological theory, the two views are mixed in unsystematic ways so a writer may refer to "the morpheme plural" and "the morpheme -s" in the same sentence. Lexeme-based morphology[edit] Lexeme-based morphology usually takes what is

called an item-and-process approach. Instead of analyzing a word form as a set of morphemes arranged in sequence, a word form is said to be the result of applying rules that alter a word-form or stem in order to produce a new one. An inflectional rule takes a stem, changes it as is required by the rule, and outputs a word form; a derivational rule takes a stem, changes it as per its own requirements, and outputs a derived stem; a compounding rule takes word forms, and similarly outputs a compound stem. Word-based morphology[edit] Word-based morphology is usually a word-and-paradigm approach. The theory takes paradigms as a central notion. Instead of stating rules to combine morphemes into word forms or to generate word forms from stems, word-based morphology states generalizations that hold between the forms of inflectional paradigms. The major point behind this approach is that many such generalizations are hard to state with either of the other approaches. Word-and-paradigm approaches are also well-suited to capturing purely morphological phenomena, such as morphemes. Examples to show the effectiveness of word-based approaches are usually drawn from fusional languages , where a given "piece" of a word, which a morpheme-based theory would call an inflectional morpheme, corresponds to a combination of grammatical categories, for example, "third-person plural". Morpheme-based theories usually have no problems with this situation since one says that a given morpheme has two categories. Item-and-process theories, on the other hand, often break down in cases like these because they all too often assume that there will be two separate rules here, one for third person, and the other for plural, but the distinction between them turns out to be artificial. The approaches treat these as whole words that are related to each other by analogical rules. Words can be categorized based on the pattern they fit into. This applies both to existing words and to new ones. Application of a pattern different from the one that has been used historically can give rise to a new word, such as *older* replacing *elder* where *older* follows the normal pattern of adjectival superlatives and *cows* replacing *kine* where *cows* fits the regular pattern of plural formation. Morphological typology In the 19th century, philologists devised a now classic classification of languages according to their morphology. Some languages are isolating , and have little to no morphology; others are agglutinative whose words tend to have lots of easily separable morphemes; others yet are inflectional or fusional because their inflectional morphemes are "fused" together. That leads to one bound morpheme conveying multiple pieces of information. A standard example of an isolating language is Chinese. An agglutinative language is Turkish. Latin and Greek are prototypical inflectional or fusional languages. It is clear that this classification is not at all clearcut, and many languages Latin and Greek among them do not neatly fit any one of these types, and some fit in more than one way. A continuum of complex morphology of language may be adopted. The three models of morphology stem from attempts to analyze languages that more or less match different categories in this typology. The item-and-arrangement approach fits very naturally with agglutinative languages. The item-and-process and word-and-paradigm approaches usually address fusional languages. As there is very little fusion involved in word formation, classical typology mostly applies to inflectional morphology. Depending on the preferred way of expressing non-inflectional notions, languages may be classified as synthetic using word formation or analytic using syntactic phrases. Examples[edit] Pingelapese is a Micronesian language spoken on the Pingelap atoll and on two of the eastern Caroline Islands, called the high island of Pohnpei. Similar to other languages, words in Pingelapese can take different forms to add to or even change its meaning. Verbal suffixes are morphemes added at the end of a word to change its form. Prefixes are those that are added at the front. The verb *alu* means to walk. A directional suffix can be used to give more detail. When added to non-motion verbs, their meanings are a figurative one. The following table gives some examples of directional suffixes and their possible meanings.

Chapter 4 : [Andrew spencer] morphological_theory(www.nxgvision.com) for taha - [PDF Document]

Morphological Theory has 8 ratings and 0 reviews. This is the first near-exhaustive introduction to the burgeoning field of morphology in generative grammar.

Thirteen chapters are descriptive essays based on presentations to a conference in at La Trobe University. They are followed, by way of conclusion, by an overview chapter by John Hajek. The book opens with a detailed introduction by Dixon, and this sketches the basic descriptive schema used in the descriptive chapters. All thirteen studies discuss, as far as possible, phonological, morphological, and syntactic criteria for adjectiveness, as well as the typical semantic classes of adjectives or adjective-like words. I noticed one or two editorial lapses. There are a few misprints elsewhere, but generally this is a very useful and usable resource. The variety of the grammatical systems explored serves as an impetus to further research. In some cases the descriptive issue is how many adjective classes there are, while in other languages the question arises as to whether there is a class of adjectives at all, and if so, how important it is in the grammar. The problem is that, even in languages that clearly distinguish nouns and verbs morphologically and syntactically, the adjective class may have relatively few properties unique to itself other than those that plausibly are due solely to the lexical semantics and may share a number of morphosyntactic properties with nouns or verbs or both. First, the class should include words with the four prototypically adjectival meanings dimension, age, value, and color. Second, the class should either function as an intransitive predicate or as the complement to a copular verb, or function as an attributive modifier to a noun with the NP. More controversially, he argues that all languages will turn out to have a distinct category of adjective if you look hard enough for it. Backhouse Japanese and Carol Genetti and Kristine Hildebrandt Manange argue that their languages have more than one class of adjectives. Backhouse provides a very succinct and clear overview of a much-debated question, and offers persuasive arguments that there is a class of inflecting adjectives ending in -i in their citation form. There is also a class of adjectives that has more in common with nouns. Backhouse argues that in both instances it makes sense to delineate these as subclasses inflecting and noninflecting of an adjective class. In Manange, one class of adjectives takes verb inflections. Its syntax, however, is rather different from that of true verbs: While verb-like adjectives share several properties with true verbs in the perfective aspect, they differ from verbs when in the imperfective aspect. Ho-Min Sohn, likewise, argues that Korean has a clearly distinguishable class of adjectives, even though there is a large degree of morphological overlap with verbs. Another intriguing difference is found in prenominal modification. Both verbs and adjectives have to form relative clauses to function as attributives. Verbs inflect in the past -un

Chapter 5 : Morphological Theory - Andrew Spencer - Häftad () | Bokus

Andrew Spencer Morphological Theory Amazoncom: linguistics: an introduction (, written by a team based at one of the world's leading centres for linguistic teaching and research, the second.

Chapter 6 : Andrew Spencer | University of Essex - www.nxgvision.com

Morphological Theory: Andrew Spencer is a lecturer in the Department of Language and Linguistics at the University of Essex. Types of Morphological Operation.