

## Lecture 1: **Definitions and Scope**

### 1. Introduction

- Greek μορφή ‘form, shape, figure’
  - Morphology = “the branch of grammar that deals with the internal structure of words” (Matthews, p. 9)
  - *labitur et labetur in omne volubilis aevum* (Horace)  
‘It glides on, and will glide on for ever.’
  - 7 phonological words but 6 lexemes
  - Matthews claims we have 3 different types of ‘words’  
phonological unit, broken down into syllables and further into phonemes  
the lexeme – the word which the phonological unit is a realisation of  
the form – e.g. the past participle of the lexeme = grammatical word
  - Word forms can often be analysed into segments  
*labitur* = *lab-it-ur*, *labetur* = *lab-et-ur*  
cf. English *unacceptable* = *un-accept-able*.
  - These segments are called morphs and *mean* something  
*Un-* = negative, *accept* = lexeme, *-able* = adjective formant ‘it is possible’  
*lab-* = lexeme, *-it-* = present indicative, *-et-* = future indicative, *-ur* = passive
  - Morphs = segments of the phonological unit: /un/
  - Morphemes = segments of the grammatical word: {negative}
  - Morphemes represent choices from a set of options which together form a grammatical category
- | <b>Grammatical category</b> | <b>Morpheme</b>                     |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Person                      | 1, 2, 3                             |
| Number                      | sg. pl.                             |
| Tense                       | present, future, perfect, imperfect |
| Mood                        | indicative, subjunctive, imperative |
| Voice                       | active passive                      |
- Inflectional = full set of word forms of a single lexeme = **paradigm**
  - e.g. *amas* and *amatur* different forms of the same lexeme AMO
  - Derivational affixes create the stems of new lexemes from roots or other stems:
 

$\pi\rho\alpha\gamma - + -\mu\alpha\tau-$	a noun stem from a root
$\pi\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha\tau- + -\iota\omicron-$	an adjective stem from a noun stem
  - Difference: a change in inflectional morphology changes the forms of one word class, while a change in derivational morphology actually changes the word-class.

## 2. Difficulties

### a) Distinction between inflectional and derivational morphology not clear

- How should we determine a particular word-class?
1. Has a characteristic syntactic distribution or slot in the sentence  
e.g. He kicked a **ball**  
He kicked the **chair**
  2. Are associated with a particular set of grammatical categories  
e.g. nouns: number and case; verbs: number, person, voice, tense, aspect, mood
    - But what about participle e.g. λαβοντι?
  1. Learnt as part of the verb, but declines like a 3<sup>rd</sup> declension adjective. Expresses some nominal categories e.g. case and number, and some verbal categories e.g. aspect and voice
  2. Syntactic distribution also confirms mixed nature:  

περὶ πολλοῦ ἂν, ποιησαίμην, ὃ ἄνδρες, τὸ τοιοῦτους ὑμᾶς ἐμοὶ δικαστὰς περὶ τούτου τοῦ πράγματος γενέσθαι, οἷοίπερ ἂν ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς εἴητε τοιαῦτα πεπονθότες· εὖ γὰρ οἶδ' ὅτι, εἰ τὴν αὐτὴν γνώμην περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἔχετε, ἤνπερ περὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, οὐκ ἂν εἴη ὅστις οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῖς γεγενημένοις ἀγανακτοίη

I would be very grateful, gentlemen, if you would behave towards me in this matter as you would to yourselves *if you had suffered the same things*. I know well that if you have the same opinion towards others as you have towards yourselves not one of you would fail to be vexed at *these happenings*

Lysias I
- Morphology of participles = inflectional morphology?

### b) Segmentation

- Phoneme = abstract grouping of several allophones  
the phoneme /p/ has the allophones [p], [p<sup>h</sup>] and [p<sup>-</sup>]
- The choice of the allophone depends on the phonetic environment
- Similarly morpheme = abstract grouping of several allomorphs.  
*cat:cats, dog:dogs, horse:horses*: [s], [z] and [ɪz]
- These allomorphs are also dependent on the phonetic environment.
- But not all allomorphs are dependent on phonetic environment.
- For example: *ox: oxen* cf German *Rechnung: Rechnungen*
- Also *sheep: sheep, fish: fish* = zero-morph
- Different kinds of morphs:

Prefix	un-acceptable
Suffix	unaccept-able
Affix	ζεύγ-νυ-μι
Infix	λα-ν-θανω, abso-bloody-lutely
Reduplication	διδωμι
Modification	λείπω: ἔλιπον
- In all these words, the morphs are easy to segment  
cf *antidisestablishmentarianism*  
Turkish *angyaghllangyugtuq* = 'he wants to acquire a big boat'.
- But not always: e.g. bad: worse, go: went, goose: geese, man: men

### **Tangent: i-mutation**

Raising and fronting of a root vowel in anticipation of "i" or "y" sound in a suffix.

Plural of *man* in Old English was \*manniz

The existence of the i-suffix 'raised' the vowel to \*menniz

Then the final syllable dropped off and the morphological segmentation of the word became opaque

### **c) Different types of exponence**

- Chinese: an isolating language: every word invariable with its own meaning
- Turkish: an agglutinative language:

	'village'	
	Singular	Plural
Absolute	<i>köy</i>	<i>köyler</i>
Dative	<i>köye</i>	<i>köylere</i>
Locative	<i>köyde</i>	<i>köylerde</i>
Ablative	<i>köyden</i>	<i>köylerden</i>

- Latin and Greek = inflectional:

<i>amat</i>	<i>amatur</i>
<i>amant</i>	<i>amantur</i>
-t expresses third person singular	
-nt expresses 3 <sup>rd</sup> person plural	
-ur expresses passive voice.	

- Markers are polyfunctional = Multiple exponence.
- 1 morphosyntactic category expressed by more than one marker = extended exponence  
e.g. in *rēg-s-ī* the category 'perfect' is expressed by
  1. the long root vowel (as opposed to present *reg-ō*),
  2. -s-
  3. the perfect specific ending *-ī*

### **d) The interface with syntax.**

- Syntax – from Greek συντάσσω 'to put together in order'
- Sentence 'He said' is incomplete. Type of construction verb requires covered by syntax.
- But morphology and syntax often very close  
e.g. 'they are trying hard' = 5 morphs?
- But -ing does not express 'present progressive' morpheme by itself – needs auxiliary 'are'
- Also a close connection between the verb 'try' and the adjective 'hard'.
- Is this the present progressive of the verb 'try-hard'?
- In some languages this will be done purely morphologically cf Turkish e.g. above
- Should the English construction be covered under morphology or syntax?
- Just a terminological question? But morphology is often 'old syntax'

### e) Grammaticalisation

- Bill is going to go to college after all
- 2 different meanings of 'going to', one involving motion, one involving futurity.
- Future tense marker can be reduced to 'gonna', other one can't:  
*Bill is gonna go to college after all*  
*\*Bill is going to gonna college after all*
- Future tense is discussed under morphology, but this originally a syntactic collocation  
*'I am going to the shops'* = just motion  
*'I am going to buy some milk'* = *'I am on the way to buy some milk'* = purpose
- Even more clearly related to morphology: Italian future *cantaremo*  
Latin future = inflectional (*cantabo*)
- Alternative:  
*Haec habeo*                      *cantare*  
These have-1.sg.-PRES      sing-IN
- Construction with gerundive involved obligation and thus future tense  
*Aedem habuit tuendam*  
house            had    look:after-GER  
'He had a house to look after' = 'He had to look after a house'
- Construction with infinitive arose in competition with competition with the gerundive:  
*Quid habes dicendum/ Quid habes dicere*
- First *habeo* before the verb. But new order introduced:  
*Et si interrogatus fueris, quomodo dicere habes? Veritatem dicere habeo.*
- *cantare habemus* > *\*cantarabemus* > *\*cantaremus* > *cantaremo*
- Latin *cantabimus* itself an amalgamation of two verbs *\*kanta b<sup>h</sup>umos* (*b<sup>h</sup>umos* = we are)

### 3. Conclusions

- Morphology not so easily defined a field as thought
- Difference between inflectional and derivational morphology not clear-cut
- Problems of segmentation
- Morphological analysis useful to different degrees in different languages
- Morphology difficult to separate from syntax
- In different languages, same concepts may be expressed by either morphology or syntax
- Even within one language, one category (e.g. tense) not expressed in the same way
- Morphology is often 'old syntax'

### Reading list

<http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/IPA/fullchart.html> For the IPA chart

Hopper and Traugott 1993, *Grammaticalisation*

Matthews P.H. 1991, *Morphology* (2nd ed.)

Lyons J 1969, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*, chapter 5