

Morphemes

Andrew Murphy

andrew.murphy@uchicago.edu

Morpheme

A systematic morphological syncretism which does not define a (syntactically or semantically) natural class.

Parasitic features

Features which are inserted by postsyntactic operations but predictable from strictly syntactic features and possibly structural syntactic context.

1 Spanish

- Spanish theme vowels (based on Halle & Marantz 1994):

(1)

		1	2	3	
		MASC		FEM	
singular	ACC	<i>me</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>lo</i>	<i>la</i>
	DAT	<i>me</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>le</i>	<i>le</i>
	REFL	<i>me</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>se</i>
plural	ACC	<i>nos</i>	<i>os</i>	<i>los</i>	<i>las</i>
	DAT	<i>nos</i>	<i>os</i>	<i>les</i>	<i>les</i>
	REFL	<i>nos</i>	<i>os</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>se</i>

- What do you notice about the theme vowels?
- The theme vowel is assumed to be inserted as ‘dissociated morpheme’

(2) $\emptyset \rightarrow []_{th} / [Det] \underline{\quad}$

(3) $[Det] [Theme] [Number]$

(4) VIs for Det

- $/n/_{[I]} \leftrightarrow [1] / [+PL]$
- $/m/_{[III]} \leftrightarrow [1]$
- $/\emptyset/_{[I]} \leftrightarrow [2] / [+PL]$
- $/t/_{[III]} \leftrightarrow [2]$
- $/l/ \leftrightarrow [] / CASE$
- $/s/_{[III]} \leftrightarrow []$

(5) VIs for Theme

- $/e/ \leftrightarrow [III]$
- $/a/ \leftrightarrow [II]$
- $/o/ \leftrightarrow []$

(6) VIs for Number

- $/s/ \leftrightarrow [+PL]$
- $\emptyset \leftrightarrow []$

(7) Redunancy Rules

- $[] \rightarrow [Class III] / [DAT]$
- $[] \rightarrow [Class II] / [+FEM]$

- What kind of features are Class features in this analysis (parasitic/non-parasitic)?
- What could we say about the theme vowels associated with certain nouns?

(8)

	Stem	Theme	Number		
a.	padr	-e	-s	‘fathers’	(masc)
b.	madr	-e	- \emptyset	‘mother’	(fem)
c.	poet	-a	- \emptyset	‘poet’	(masc)
d.	pal	-a	- \emptyset	‘shovel’	(fem)
e.	pal	-o	-s	‘sticks’	(masc)

2 Dhaasanac

(9)		sg	pl	A	B		
	1 INCL	—	A	a.	leeḏi	leeti	'fall down (perf)'
	1 EXCL	A	B	b.	kufi	kuyyi	'die (perf)'
	2	B	B	c.	guurma	guuranna	'migrate' (impf)'
	3.F	B	A	d.	yes	ces	'kill (perf)'
	3.M	A	A				

Trommer's DM reinterpretation of the Network Morphology analysis:

- (10) a. [] → [+B] / [___ +Agr, +1, -2, +pl]
 b. [] → [+B] / [___ +Agr, -1, +2]
 c. [] → [+B] / [___ +Agr, -1, -2 -masc, -pl]
 d. [] → [-B] / [___ +Agr]
- (11) a. [+B] ↔ *B form* (phonological changes?)
 b. [-B] ↔ *A form* (elsewhere)

What kind of syncretism does this look like? Can we do it with impoverishment?

3 Romance U-shaped morpheme

(12)	'to fly'	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
	Ind.	vol-o	vol-i	vol-a	vol-iamo	vol-ate	vol-ano
	Subj.	vol-i	vol-i	vol-i	vol-iamo	vol-iate	vol-ino

(13)	'to climb'	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
	Ind.	salg-o	sal-i	sal-e	sal-iamo	sal-ite	salg-ono
	Subj.	salg-a	salg-a	salg-a	sal-iamo	sal-iate	salg-ano

(14) Trommer's analysis

- a. *Redundancy rules*
 (i) [] → [+U] / [___, +G]V[+1, -PL]
 (ii) [] → [+U] / [___, +G]V[-PL, +SUBJ]
 (iii) [] → [+U] / [___, +G]V[+PL, -1, -2]
 (iv) [] → [-U]
- b. *Theme Insertion*
 ∅ → []_{th} / []_v___
- c. *Vocabulary Item*
 [+U] ↔ -g

What kind of features do we need (parasitic/non-parasitic)?

What about English passive/past participles?

- (15) stem – perfect part. – passive part.
- (16) a. leave – left – left
 b. send – sent – sent
 c. buy – bought – bought
- (17) a. tell – told – told
 b. prove – proven – proven
- (18) a. break – broken – broken
 b. beat – beaten – beaten
- (19) a. put – put – put
 b. sing – sung – sung

References

Trommer, Jochen (2016). A Postsyntactic Morpheme Cookbook. In D. Siddiqi and H. Harley (eds). *Morphological Metatheory*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam. 59–93.