Homework

- Read chapter 11
Bracketing paradoxes

• Examples like ungrammaticality are part of a larger class of problem examples

  marine biologist, macroeconomist, moral philosopher, Gödel numbering, cross-sectional, white-washed

• Very common, but only with lexicalized compounds

  wooden fluitist, bad grammarian

• Similar to the bracketing puzzles posed by clitics

  Pat’s coming to the party.
Bracketing paradoxes

• Reanalysis (Kiparsky 1982, Sproat 1984)

\[
\begin{align*}
&[[\text{grammatical}]_{A+ity}]_N \quad \text{Level 1} \\
&[\text{un+}[[\text{grammatical}]_{A+ity}]_N]_N \quad \text{Level 2} \\
&[[\text{un+}[[\text{grammatical}]_{A+ity}]]_{A+ity}]_N \quad \text{Reanalysis}
\end{align*}
\]

• Lexical relatedness (Williams 1981)

macroeconomic
macroeconomist
microeconomist

• QR raising (Pesetsky 1985)

\[\text{Tom saw nobody} = \text{Tom didn’t see anybody}\]
Bracketing paradoxes

- Reanalysis works well for examples like *transformational grammarian*
- It doesn't handle examples like *macroeconomist* (from *macroeconomics*) as well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>moral philosopher</td>
<td>moral philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marine biologist</td>
<td>marine biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theoretical linguist</td>
<td>theoretical linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monumental mason</td>
<td>monumental masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>southern Finn</td>
<td>southern Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>southern Dane</td>
<td>southern Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East German</td>
<td>East Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bracketing paradoxes

- For many of these, there is no affix to trigger reanalysis
- William’s relatedness theory doesn’t work either, for examples like
  
  *baroque flautist*
  *Modern Linguist*

- These examples are all what Spencer (1988) calls *personal nouns*, and are part of a productive pattern

  *grammar* : *grammariam*
  *transformational grammar* : ?
Bracketing paradoxes

• Only works for lexicalized forms
  
  *wooden flautist
  *bad grammarian

• Derivational paradigms, cryptotypes

• Other paradigms

  king  royal
  president  presidential
  governor  gubernatorial
  bishop  episcopal
  Governor-General  vice-regal
Bracketing paradoxes

- **Suffix -ed with body (or clothing part)**
  
  green-eyed
  ruddy-cheeked
  flat-chested
  open-necked
  short-sleeved

- **Suffix -er with a measure phrase (with phonological constraints)**
  
  three-tonner
  one-yearer
  fifteen-footer
  *ten-furlonger
  *two-hourer
The status of the interface between morphology and phonology is the subject of much debate.

Lexical phonology had an explanation for cyclicity, but also many problems.

Bracketing paradoxes are a theoretical challenge.

Modern phonological theories (e.g., Optimality Theory) reject rules, derivations, and intermediate levels.
Morphosyntax

• Inflectional morphology indicates relations between elements in a clause

• Predicate/argument structure

  *Pat stole $20 from the cashbox.*

  *steal*  
  *agent*  
  *Pat*  
  *Subject*  
  *theme*  
  *$20*  
  *Direct object*  
  *source*  
  *the cashbox*  
  *Oblique (from)*

• Argument structure is made up of semantic or thematic roles (agent, theme, etc.)

• Syntactic valence (or subcategorization) from is made up grammatical relations (subject, object, etc.)
Grammatical relations

• There is a canonical mapping between thematic roles and grammatical relations

  *The cake fleaped Pat. ≠ Pat baked the cake.*

• Valence alternations reflect non-canonical mappings

  *The cake was baked by Pat.*
  *Sandy baked Pat a cake.*
  *The baked easily.*
  *Pat baked the cake dry.*
  *Pat baked the cake naked.*
Grammatical relations

• Case and agreement marking helps identify grammatical relations

  He sees her.

• Nominative case marks subjects, accusative case marks objects, dative case marks indirect objects

• Oblique cases mark other, non-core relations

  a varázsló: kives edj njul-at a kalap-bo:l
  ‘The magician (NOM) pulls a rabbit (ACC) from the hat (OBL).’

  a varázsló: megmutatja a njul-at a djerek-nek
  ‘The magician (NOM) shows the rabbit (ACC) to the child (DAT).’
Grammatical relations

- Canonical mapping links most agent-like argument to subject and most patient-like argument to object

  *Pat ate the hot dog.*

  *Pat photographed the hot dog.*
  *Mustard covered the hot dog.*

  *Pat likes hot dogs.*
  *Hot dogs please Pat.*

  *Pat fell.*
  *Pat jumped.*
Grammatical relations

- In most languages, the single argument of an intransitive verbs gets marked like the agent of a transitive verb.

- In some languages, the single argument of an intransitive verbs gets marked like the *patient* of a transitive verb.

- **nominative** = \{ A, I \}
  **accusative** = \{ O \}

- **absolutive** = \{ O, I \}
  **ergative** = \{ A \}

- Other syntactic evidence (usually) identifies the absolutive argument as the subject.
Grammatical relations

- Ergative case marking (Hindustani perfectives)

  'aurat chal-ī
  woman went-FEM.SG
  'The woman went.'

  mard chal-ā
  man went-MASC.SG
  'The man went.'

  'aurat-nē ghōṛā mārā
  woman-ERG horse struck-MASC.SG
  'The woman struck the horse.'
Grammatical relations

• Split ergativity is common (Pitjantjatjara)

\[
\text{Tjitji} \quad a-nu \\
\text{child(ABS)} \quad \text{go-past}
\]
\[
\text{‘The child went.’}
\]

\[
\text{Ngayu-lu} \quad a-nu \\
\text{1SG-NOM} \quad \text{go-PAST}
\]
\[
\text{‘I went.’}
\]

\[
\text{Tjitji-ngku} \quad \text{ngayu-nya} \quad \text{nya-ngu} \\
\text{child-ERG} \quad \text{1SG-ACC} \quad \text{see-PAST}
\]
\[
\text{‘The child saw me.’}
\]

\[
\text{Ngayu-lu} \quad \text{tjitji} \quad \text{nya-ngu} \\
\text{1SG-NOM} \quad \text{child(ABS)} \quad \text{see-PAST}
\]
\[
\text{‘I saw the child.’}
\]
Grammatical relations

• Active case systems (Choctaw)

  Hilha-li-tok
dance-1SG-PAST
‘I danced.’

  Sa-hohchafo-h
1SG-hungry-PRED
‘I am hungry.’

  Chi-bashli-li-tok
2SG-cut-1SG-PAST
‘I cut you.’

  Ano is-sa-hottopali-tok
I 2SG-1SG-hurt-PAST
‘You hurt me.’
Agent demotions

- Valence changing morphology marks non-canonical mappings between thematic roles and grammatical relations

- Active voice

  Pat ate the hot dog.

  eat  agent    Pat    Subject
  patient    hot dog    Direct object

- Passive voice

  The hot dog was eaten by Pat.

  eat  patient    hot dog    Subject
  agent    Pat    Oblique (by)
Agent demotions

- Chichewa

  \textit{Naphiri a-na-lemba kalata}
  
  N. 3SG-PAST-write letter
  
  ‘Naphiri wrote a letter.’
  
  \textit{Kalata i-na-lemb-edwa (ndi Naphiri)}
  
  letter 3SG-PAST-write-PASS (by N.)
  
  ‘A letter was written (by Naphiri).’

- The passive voice backgrounds the agent (making it optional)

- Some languages allow impersonal passives

  \textit{Er werd enthusiast gedanst.}
Agent demotions

- Other related alternations are less productive
- Middle voice
  
  Pat painted the walls.
  The walls were painted by Pat.
  Walls like these paint easily.

- Pseudo-passive
  
  Chris walked through the door.
  The door was walked through (by Chris).