Homework

- Read chapter 4
- For Monday 2/21
  - Do exercises 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2
Word-based morphology

- **Word Based Hypothesis**: All regular word-formation processes are word-based. A new word is formed by applying a regular rule to a single already existing word. Both the new word and the existing one are members of major lexical categories.

- No list of morphs: only free forms are listed

- WFRs are schemata for producing new words out of old words

  \[ X^V -er \] \_N `one who Xs habitually, professionally, etc.`

- The output of a WFR can be stored in the dictionary
Word-based morphology

- WFRs put various syntax, semantic, phonological, and morphological constraints on the base

- Adjustment rules modify the phonological form of a word, conditioned by the presence of certain morphemes

- WFRs can be applied in reverse to get at the ‘root’ of words like *tangible* and *fungible*

- Knowledge of WFRs can be used to produce back-formations like *babysit*

- Some forms are *predicted*, others are *motivated*
Morphological change

- Back-formations, et al. are not really the result of WFRs, but of things we do with WFRs
- Similar processes (both conscious and unconscious) lead to morphological changes in language
- Haspelmath distinguishes four types:
  - Pattern loss
  - Coalescence
  - Analogical Change
  - Reanalysis
Morphological change

• Inflectional pattern loss

• Inflectional paradigms get simplified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adelphós</td>
<td>adelphó</td>
<td>adelphoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ánthrōpos</td>
<td>anthrōpō</td>
<td>ánthrōpoi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘brothers’

‘people’

• Sometimes inflectional distinctions are lost “without a trace”

• Germanic gender

| der Apfel | de appel | the apple |
| die Sock  | de sok   | the sock  |
| das Haus  | het huis | the house |
Morphological change

- Derivational pattern loss
- Stage one: productive rules (-ness)
- Stage two: rules which are no longer productive, but still salient (-al)
- Stage three: rules which no longer productive or salient (-ster)
- Stage four: rules which have been obscured by semantic changes (draw / draft, drive / drift, may / might, weigh / weight)
- Stage five: arbitrary signs
Morphological change

- Coalescence ("univerbation")
- Lexical items take on a specialized function by a process of grammaticalization (before)
- Unstressed grammatical words get phonologically reduced and attached to an adjacent word

I am going to...
I’m going to...
I’m gonna...
I’m a...
Morphological change

- Tense affixes come from auxiliary verbs
  
  `cantare habeo > cantar he > cantaré`

- Case affixes come from prepositions (which are usually grammaticalized nouns)

- Old Lithuanian:
  
  `galvo ‘head’ + na ‘in’ > galvôn ‘onto the head’ (ILLATIVE)`
  `galvo ‘head’ + pie ‘at’ > galvôspi ‘to the head’ (ALLATIVE)`
Morphological change

- Analogical change arises when WFRs become more widely applicable

- Polish -owie

  \( \text{syn} : \text{synowie} = \text{pan} : (\text{panowie}) \)

  son : sons = lord : lords

- English -able

  change : changeable = wash : washable

- Analogic leveling (e.g., Germanic plurals)
Morphological change

• Reanalysis follow the same path as back-formations

• Greek

-ízō: kithára ‘guitar’ → kitharízō ‘do (i.e, play) the guitar’
-tēs: kitharízō → kitharistēs ‘guitar player’

• Reanalysis produced a new suffix

-istēs: pnevmat- ‘spirit’ → pnevmatisís ‘spiritist’

• Secretion

alcoholic → workaholic, chocaholic
Watergate → travelgate, nannygate
economics → Reaganomics, cybernomics
Productivity

• Word-based Morphology has no Filter, so WFRs need to be carefully restricted

• Aronoff compared the de-adjectival noun suffixes -ness and -ity as they combine with -ous

• Phonological

  sérious       sériousness
  cúrious       curiósity
  várioius      variety

• Lexical

  nebulous      nebulosity
  credulous     credulity
Productivity

- Words in -ness have three meanings
  - ‘the fact that Y is X’ *His callousness surprised me.*
  - ‘the extent to which Y is X’ *His callousness surprised me.*
  - ‘the quality or state of being X’ *Callousness is not a virtue.*
- Words in -ity can have many specialized meanings

  *The are several varieties of fish in the lake.*
  *They admired his dress, but only as a curiosity.*
  *The continuities for next week’s episode...*
For some words, we can predict that -ity won’t apply:

- **glorious**
  - *gloriosity*
  - **gloriousness**
- **furious**
  - *furiosity*
  - **furiousness**
- **gracious**
  - *graciosity*
  - **graciousness**
- **fallacious**
  - *fallaciousity*
  - **fallaciousness**
- **acrimonious**
  - *acrimoniosity*
  - **acrimoniousness**

The existence of a noun (glory, fury, ...) blocks the formation of a synonym.

Panini’s Principle (aka Elsewhere Condition): A more specific rule trumps a more general rule.

Completely predictable forms aren’t listed in the dictionary, so aren’t subject to blocking effects.
Blocking

- Back to these
  
  | arrive | arrival | *arrivation |
  | refuse | refusal | *refusation |
  | derive | *derival | derivation |
  | describe | *describal | description |
  | approve | approval | approbation |
  | recite | recital | recitation |
  | propose | proposal | proposition |

- Blocking is very general (*this night / tonight) and somewhat mysterious
Blocking

- Conjunctive vs. disjunctive rule ordering (Kiparsky 1982)
- Sanskrit sandhi: final [s] assimilates to place of following coronal, or it becomes [h]

\[
\begin{align*}
s t & \rightarrow s t \\
s \hat{s} & \rightarrow \hat{s} \hat{s} \\
s \hat{c} & \rightarrow \hat{s} \hat{c} \\
s m & \rightarrow h m \\
s a & \rightarrow h a \\
s & \rightarrow h
\end{align*}
\]
Blocking

- Conjunctive ordering seems to miss the point
  \[ s \rightarrow [ \alpha F ] / \_\_ \# \ C[ +\text{coronal}, \alpha F ] \]
  \[ s \rightarrow h / \_\_ \# \{ C[ -\text{coronal }], V, \text{pause} \} \]

- Disjunctive ordering
  \[ s \rightarrow [ \alpha F ] / \_\_ \# \ [ +\text{coronal}, \alpha F ] \]
  \[ s \rightarrow h / \_\_ \# \]

- The application of a specific rule blocks the application of the general rule

- Disjunctive ordering lets us write a general ‘elsewhere’ rule that applies then the more specific rule or rules don’t