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Description:

Preparatory: (ANTH 310, ENGL 301, COMS 420). Analysis of morphological and syntactic structures in a variety of natural languages; an examination of major grammatical theories. (3 units/Lecture)

A senior-level linguistics course on the nature of morphology and syntax. This class is designed to cover general concepts of morphological/syntactic systems within a language and across language typologies. While English morpho-syntax will be the central language of focus, other languages such as East Asiatic and Indo-European language-types will be held in contrast. Generally speaking, there is currently a debate between whether morphology patterns more like ‘rule-based’ syntax (and is thus productive in nature), or if morphology patterns more like ‘lexical items’ themselves (and so is less productive). The debate will be used more-or-less as a pedagogical device in fleshing out what the role of morphology/syntax is in language. Other questions may be structured around topics regarding morphological processing and storage, syntactic rule-manipulation, and the more recently articulated ‘language-to-brain’ corollary. Aspects of synchronic as well as diachronic morphological perspectives will be examined as well as a note on normal/abnormal morpho-syntactic development in children. Syntax will assume a Chomskyan Framework.

This course is primarily designed (i) to allow students to gain a sufficient amount of ‘explicit’ (conscious) knowledge of Morphology and Syntax and (ii) to provide students a general framework in order to appreciate how morpho-syntax plays an intricate role in language design and usage. The course is divided into two main lectures (each of which will form an essay-based exam (traditional mid-term/final). The class will be run as a lecture-style seminar.
Course Objectives:
• Understanding the theory, processing and structures of morphology and syntax.
• Understanding how phonology plays a role in morphology.
• Understanding how morphology plays a role in syntax.
• Understanding morpho-syntactic typological distinctions between languages.

Assignments:
• Readings (based on Lectures)
• Two ‘in-class’ Exams (one after each of the two lectures: bluebook) on relevant lecture topics
• One Paper based on selected Case Study (3,000 words max).

Languages analyzed: English, French, Spanish, Italian, Japanese, Mohawk.

Method of Instruction:
The two lectures are based on material taken from the text. Regular attendance is essential. Absences and missed exams must be discussed directly with the instructor.

Grading:
All evaluated work is based on a five point scale:
5 (=A, 90%+), 4 (A/B, 85%+), 3 (B/C, 75%+), 2 (C/D, 65%+), 1 (F, failed)

Lecture I: Intro. Processing, Morpho-phonology, Morphology, Word?
Mid-term = 40%

Lecture II: Morphological typologies, Principles-Parameters, Syntax, Development
Final = 40%

Paper based on one case study = 20%
Lecture outline

**Lecture 1**

**Week: Topics/readings:**

**Weeks 1-2:** Introduction (Chapter 1)
- Basic concepts (Chapters 2-3)
  ‘Two approaches to morphological rules’:
  -- The Dual Mechanism Model (Chapter 3)
  ‘[fascinating]’ vs. ‘[[celebrat]ing]’ typologies.

**Week 3:**
- Processing:
  - Stored vs. Rule’ (Chapter 5, p. 102-105)
  - Pre-syntactic: word formation, compounding, Derivational
  - Post-syntactic: Inflectional

  **Case Study 1: Processing Experiments**

**Weeks 4-6:**
- Morphophonology (Chapter 10)
  - Word Stress Compounding (Ch. 2, p. 18)

  **Case study 2: From stress to Headedness**
  - Clitics showing movement vs. affix:

  **Case study 3: Clitics: What forms a word?**

**Weeks 7-8:**
- What is a ‘Word’? (Ch. 2-3)
  - [+/-INFL] or [+/-Decomposed] types in processing
  - Morphological Rules: segmenting morphemes
  - Lexical vs. Functional, [[stem] + affix] processing
  - Decomposed vs. Undecomposed

  **Case study 4: +/-INFL languages**

→ Mid-term (Bluebook: Essay)
Lecture II

Week 9-10

Morphological Typologies (Chapters 6, 7, 9).

- What a speaker knows: words, rules, productivity.
- Productive v. Non-productive morphological clines
  -- Inflectional vs. Derivational
- Morphological Trees Hierarchical Structure

Weeks 11-13

Syntax (Chapters 8, 11)

- Syntax (Chapter 8, p. 156)
  -- syntagmatic/horizontal vs. paradigmatic/vertical
- Inflectional Paradigms (Feature Theory) p. 163
- Underspecification of Features p. 176
- Rules (Phrase Structure rule)
- Syntactic Tree Analysis
- Principles & Parameters Framework/Morphology-Syntax
  -- morpho-syntactic tree diagrams

Case study 5: Principles & Parameters

Weeks 14-16:

Functional affixes: Case, Agreement
(Chapter 11, p. 241)
- Inflectional markings (Japanese, Italian, French, Spanish)

Case study 6: Case & AGR

Weeks 17-18

Movement of Synthetic Compounds vs. Non-movement of Root Compounds (Chapter 11, p.249-52)

- e.g., ‘pipe smoker’ (SC) vs. ‘chain smoker’ (RC)
- Valence & Movement (p. 251)
- [±Move] Functional categories vs. [−Move] Lexical categories

Case study 7: [±Move] and Valence

A Special lecture on Morpho-syntax in Child Development and in Special Populations.

Case study 8

→ Final (Bluebook: Essay)
Introduction: What is Language? Processing & Theory
Chapters: 1-2
A brief outline of theories on language processing: ‘Rule-based’ Nativism
(Chomsky) vs. ‘Frequency-based’ Behaviourism (Skinner)—this duality will
make-up part of our pedagogical device. Linguistic perspectives, What is
morphology? What is morphological typology: ‘Fascinating’ vs ‘Celebrating’
language types? What is syntax? Why might syntax be considered ‘special’
among all other factors of language design? What is ‘The biological basis of
language’ (Language and Brain) re. language processing and development?

Case study 1: Processing Experiments

Phonology & Morphophonology
Chapters 1, 2, 3, 9, 10.

Topics: Readings:
· IPA/Assimilation (A brief review). Lecture
· Word Stress Compounding:
  -- e.g., Trochaic (English: /sőfə/) vs. Iambic (French: /sőf/)  Case study 2:
  -- e.g., [[Tóy] [cár-crùsher]] vs. [[Tóy-cãr] [crùsher]] From stress to Headedness
  -- e.g., [v break] [n fast] => [n breakfast] (final-vowel reduction/schwa)
  -- e.g., English ‘house-boat’ ((a kind of boat) trochaic = /modification initial)
  -- e.g., French ‘Moulin rouge’ (mill red, (= red mill)) iambic = /modification final)
· Phonetic Bootstrapping Hypotheses in Word Segmentation Lecture
· Base modification. Ch. 2, p. 18
· Stem allomorphy Ch. 10, p. 212
  -- e.g., ‘wife => wives’, ‘breathe => breath’
· Vowel lowering e.g., ‘nation => national’ p. 213
· Morphemes & Allomorphs (Tense, Agreement, Genitive inflections). Ch.2, p. 22
· Note on Final ‘s’: morpho {s} vs. phonetic /s/ ;
  -- e.g., /spiks/ (speaks) vs /flks/ (fix).
· Constituency through movement Ch. 1, p. 8
  -- e.g., [bláck] [bírd] vs [bláckbird] => (bi-stress = two-words)
  (bi-stress) vs. (single-stress) Ch. 9, p. 192
· Clitics as part of phonetic word boundary Ch. 9, p 197
  -- e.g., #[can’t]#he? vs *[can]#[not]#he? => [can]#he#[not]?
· Clitics showing movement: Case study 3: Clitics
  -- e.g., [Je [t’aime]], [Yo [te-amo]] (= I you love)
· Assimilation, Prosodic & Stress in Morphology What forms a word?
  Ch. 10, p.222

(A fuller discussion of morpho-syntactic movement will be presented in lecture II).
Basics of English Morphology
Chapters 2, 3, 5.

Topics:                           Readings:
· What is a ‘Word’? What is a ‘Morpheme’?                     Ch. 2-3.
· Free vs Bound morphemes                                       Ch. 5
· Inflectional vs. Derivational Morphology                      Lecture
· [+/- Bare Verb stem]: Bare vs. non-bare-stem languages     Case study 4: +/-INFL
· [+/- INFL] languages: (e.g., Spanish vs. English)           languages,
  (Morphological typologies will be fuller development in lecture II)
· [+/- INFL] or [+/- Decomposed] types in processing          Inherent/Contextual INFL. p.100
  —e.g., regular vs irregular, inflectional vs. derivational,
· How does ‘gatti’ (It. ‘cats’) process like irregulars in English? Ch. 2, p. 21
  (e.g., ‘children’)?                                           · Decomposed vs. Undecomposed
· Morphological Rules: segmenting morphemes                    e.g., [[who][m]] vs. [him] (accusative marking)
  · Lexical vs. Functional, [[stem] + affix] processing         · Compounding
  · Decomposed vs. Undecomposed                                  e.g., ‘Rat-eater’ Experiment (Gordon)
  e.g., [[who][m]] vs. [him] (accusative marking)               Ch. 5, pp. 104, 138
· Two Approaches to Morphological Rules:                      · Two Approaches to Morphological Rules:
  (The Dual Mechanism Model), ‘Stored vs. Rule’                 (Ch. 3, p. 40)
  --Pre-syntactic: word formation, compounding, Derivational    Ch. 5, p. 102-105
  --Post-syntactic: Inflectional

→ Mid-term (Bluebook: Essay)

Lecture II

Morphological Typologies
Chapters 6, 7, 9.

Topics:
· What a speaker knows: words, rules, productivity.                         Ch. 6, p. 114
· Restrictions on Word Formations.                                           p. 117
  e.g., strong vs. weak rhythm/phonological constraints                    p. 118
· Productivity based on origin of word: Latin/Germanic                      p. 122
  e.g., ‘give’ vs. ‘donate’ (dative-argument structure)                    p. 123
  Theory: productivity more closely related to morphology than to syntax.  --morphology closer to the lexicon
  --decomposed words [[stem] + affix] (Dual model)                           p. 123-7

(galasso/ling404/csun/spr. 2012)
Language types: +/-INFLectional Languages
   e.g., [fascinating] v. [[celebrat]jing] typologies/clines
   e.g., Polysynthetic vs. Isolating types

Productive v. Non-productive morphological clines
   --Inflectional vs. Derivational

Morphological Trees Hierarchical Structure
   --compounding
   --compounding & phonological stress
   --Heads & Complements
   e.g., ‘house-boat’ vs. ‘boat-house’
   (English Head of compound is on right branch, modification initial)

Syntax
Chapters 8, 11

Topics:

   · Syntax (Tree diagrams)
     --syntagmatic/horizontal vs. paradigmatic/vertical
   · Inflectional Paradigms (Feature Theory)
   · Underspecification of Features
   · Rules (Phrase Structure rule)
   · Syntactic Tree Analysis
   · Principles & Parameters Framework/Morphology-Syntax
     --morpho-syntactic tree diagrams

Functional affixes: Case, Agreement
   --inflectional markings (Japanese, Italian, French, Spanish)

Movement of Synthetic Compounds vs.
Non-movement of Root Compounds
   e.g., ‘pipe smoker’ (SC) vs. ‘chain smoker’ (RC)

Valence & Movement
   [+Move] Functional categories vs. [-Move] Lexical categories
     e.g., [DP hunting of whales] (SC) vs. [NP whale hunting] (RC)
     e.g., [DP bottle of wine] (Genitive) vs. [AdjP wine bottle]

A Special lecture on Morpho-syntact in Child Development and in Special Populations.

Case study 8

→ Final (Bluebook: Essay)
Case Studies:

1. **Processing Experiments:**
Reproduce one of the presented processing experiments. For example, how might the ‘Sally experiment’ and/or ‘Wugs test’ be slightly redesigned to reveal similar conclusions? Children or Second Language Learners could be used in this task.

* Paper will include the following sections: introduction, methods, design, data, and conclusion. 4-5 pages single-spaced (3,000 words).

2. **From stress to Headedness (Compounds):**
Select a foreign language—one not presented in class—and sift through its language data to see if indeed a correlation holds between (i) *trochaic* and *head at right-branch* (e.g., modification initial languages like English), and (ii) *iambic* and *head at left-branch* (e.g., modification final languages like Spanish). Phonological analysis of the given language must be written-out using IPA with appropriate stress markings along with morphological tree diagram showing head initial or head final within e.g., compounds—e.g.,

a). ‘House-boat’ (English, = a kind of a boat).
b). ‘Boat-house’ (English, = a kind of a house).

A secondary topic could be advanced regarding Synthetic vs. Root Compounding (with the former (SC) showing syntactic movement). For example:

a). Pipe-smoker (= a person who smokes pipes)
   a’). smoker of pipes.

(Transitive formation—‘smoker’ takes the argument complement ‘of pipes’).

```
  NP (SC) => DP ((SC), shows movement)
   / \                      /   \
  N   N                  D   D'
 /     \                 /   /   \
Pipe  smoker            Smoker of
      \   /                 \   \
      NP                  Pipe smoker
     /   \               /     /
    NP (RC)             Smoker of
                       Pipe smoker
```

b). Chain-smoker (not a person who smokes chains).
   b’). *smoker of chains.

(Intransitive formation—‘smoker’ cannot take the argument complement ‘of chains’).

Also, compare these data to page 249 on Valence in Compounding.

* Paper will include a brief literature review of N+N compounding. Please provide a good selection of examples taken from the language(s). 4-5 pages single-spaced (3,000 words).
3. Clitics/What forms a word?
A clitic is a bound-word form which must remain attached to its host. It doesn’t have phonological/independent stress, and due to this, its behavior is similar to bound-affix morphology. Provide further examples of how clitic formations behave differently from their full-form counterparts—e.g.,

**not vs. n’t**

a). He can *not* come home (Base-generated SVO word order).

b). Can he *can not* come home? (Aux-inversion of ‘can’ => Question).

c). Can’t he *can’t* come home? (clitic movement w/ aux).

*d). Can *not* he *can not* come home? (* marks ungrammatical)

You may use further examples taken from English or any other language which show a similar phenomenon. Particularly focus of forms of clitics which mark subject, object weak pronouns (French *il, le*, respectively), copular ‘Be’ verbs, negation, possession, dative case, etc.

Note. Other ‘contractions’ may also be used here as clitic formations, such as the ‘wanna’ contraction—e.g., who do you ‘wanna’ (want to), ‘gonna’ (going to), etc. Other examples come to mind: *won’t, shouldn’t, ain’t*...

See if you can unravel the ungrammaticality of the ‘wanna’ contraction in (ii) below. Pay attention to syntax of movement and trace theory.

(i) Who do you ‘wanna’ help?

(= You do want to help who?)

(ii) Who do you *‘wanna’ help you?

Who do you want to help you?

(= You do want who to help you)

**Free/strong vs. Bound weak clitic subject-object forms (p. 196-7)**
French uses the Free/strong subject pronouns (e.g., personal names or masculine pronouns *Il*) whenever the subject can be topicalized in initial position (a-b). When used as a Bound/weak clitic, French subjects pronouns cannot be topicalized free-standing (c). Free/strong subject forms are allowed to move (a term called ‘clefting’) whereby they can be topicalized in first (subject) position, or they can be clefted (d). Note the ungrammaticality of (g_{ii}), correct in (h): it seems ‘and’-coordination in French requires the second subject to be strong (e_{ii}). The topicalized French pronoun *Il* is considered weak based on its phonological dependency as well as it syntactic distribution. Weak clitics below are to be analyzed in closed brackets—e.g., *[Il-est] grand.*
**Some Data**

a). *Paul* est grand (Paul is big).
b). *[Il]-est* grand (He is big). (⇒ Clitic)
c). *[Lui]-est* grand (He is big). (⇒ non clitic)
   (note contrast between weak-Il and strong-Lui).
d). *Paul* est grand, C’est *Paul* qui est grand. (Paul is big, It is Paul who is big).
e). *Paul* est grand, C’est *Lui* qui est grand.
f). *Paul* est grand, *C’*est-Il qui est grand
g). *Elle* est petite; et *[Il]-est* grand (She is small and He is big) (contrast w/ (b)).
h). *Elle* est petite et *Lui* est grand (She is small and He is big).

Also consider French objects:
i) Le chien [le-mange] (The dog it eats (SOV order) (= The dog eats it)).
j) Le chien mange le biscuit (= The dog eats the cookie (SVO order)).

Note how only weak pronoun/clitics can movement (a term called clitic climbing). Compare these example to Spanish, Italian, as discussed in class—e.g., Yo te amo (SOV) vs. Yo amo a Maria (SVO), etc.

**Clitic vs. Affixes: Clitic are free to move. Affixes are not.** (p. 197)

k) The person [who you are talking about] *‘s walking over here.  (*‘s* = clitic)
   (i) The person’s walking over here.
   (ii) The person is walking over here.

l) The person like [who you are talking about] *-s Mary.  (*-s* = affix)
   (i) The person like-s Mary

* Paper will include brief introduction of what constitutes a ‘Clitic’. Please present data with analysis on what makes the selected pronouns a clitic by examining phonological /morpho-syntactic properties. 4-5 pages single-spaced (3,000 words).

4. +/- INFlectional Language Types and Inherent vs. Contextual INFL

In the class lectures, the idea was introduced that there are roughly two types of languages (morphologically speaking)—viz., [fascinating]-types and [[celebrat[ing]-types. The former emphasized a processing of word-formation which parallels that of the lexicon (substantive, frequency-dependent, and, to a large degree, more stable while less productive). It could be said that derivational morphology coincides with this form of processing. The latter celebrating-type seems to be more rule-based and syntactic in nature, less lexical while more productive. Please provide other examples taken from English (or other languages) which show this morphological type distinction.
Also, one can consider what happens in child language acquisition and/or second language development regarding language omissions and commissions. For instance, why might a developing ESL student readily drop the final affix {s} in ‘speaks’ [[speak]s] (e.g., ‘He speak-0 English’) but have very little trouble with a final affix {er} in ‘play-er’ [[play]er] (where deletion of {er} goes unattested (@) e.g., (@‘He is a play-Ø’), and where the full formation is readily produced (‘He is a player’))? Why should INFlectional vs. Derivational morphology have such a distribution? Also, a discussion of storage & processing distinctions may be addressed.

**Some data**

**Incorporation & Infixes:**

**Infixes.** German allows incorporation of INFL plural {s} as infix within N+N compounding (a), while English disallows this (b). How might the plural {s} in the two languages be contrasted in showing distinct distributions?

**German:**
a). Q: What do you call a [Wagen] (car) which holds [Volk-s] (people)? 
   a’). [[Volk-s]-[wagen]].

**English:**
b). Q: What do you call a thing that [Eat-s] [Rat-s]? (Gordon)  
   b’). [[Rat]-[eater]]  
   b’’). *[ [[Rat]-s]-[eater] ].

Note how plural INFL {s} deletes in English [N+N] compounding, but not in German [N+N] compounding. What can be said about this difference regarding the inflectional system in the two languages? Might the {s} in English be more rule-based than the {s} in German? What does it mean to say the German infix in such examples is semantically empty? (p. 139).

**Incorporation.** In Agglutinative languages like Turkish, there could be incorporations of up to ten or more morphemes per word. The question regarding such long strings of morphemes is whether or not they really get decomposed when parsed, or whether such morpheme-strings might be somehow stored as part of the lexicon of the individual word. If the latter is correct, we might say that Turkish processes like English derivational morphology. If so, such affix morphology is stable, frequency dependent and more or less unproductive. Consider one Turkish conjunction of the token verb ‘read’:

**Turkish:** okú-ya-ma-yabil-ir-im (p. 68)  
Read-potential-neg-potential-tense-1SG  
(I might not be able to read)

**Mohawk:** atya’tawi
While the above word in Mohawk literally translates ‘thing-one-puts-on-one’s-body’, the word as a single lexeme has an undecomposed meaning reduced to [noun: ‘dress’] (Baker, p. 90). In an extreme way, this is not unlike what we might find in English with a word such as ‘puncher’ where decomposed, one could literally segment [punch: IE, five] + [{er}: derivational, person who performs the act of ‘five’] and derive the word ‘puncher’ as a person who does five (meaning five knuckles, etc. => a man who hits with fist). Notice that same deconstruction analysis would not apply for ‘kick’ which packages a different etymology. Nonetheless, ‘punch’ and ‘kick’ are used analogously as ‘strike with fist’, ‘strike with foot’ respectively. In French, one would have to use three words ‘coup de poing’ and ‘coup de pied’ to express what in English could be said using one word ‘punch/kick’. Clearly, in English, we have lost the notion of [five] for ‘punch’, as the decomposed has become undecomposed as a lexical chunk. The burning question—in the minds of neuro-linguists and morphologists—regarding polysynthetic languages like Turkish or Mohawk is to what extent does parse-processing break-down each potential segment to yield independent morpheme-based meanings.

**Inherent vs. Contextual INFL.**  
**Inherent inflections** may be separate from **contextual inflections** insofar that inherent features (i) may be processed as chunks (e.g., Agglutination), (ii) partake in semantic interpretations, and (iii) may become over time as part and parcel of the lexical item (a process known as **lexicalization**).

**Examples of Inherent inflections:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ev-de</td>
<td>[house-location] (in the house).</td>
<td>alongside (= alongside)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(along-the-side)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case:</th>
<th>English /EME</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[[The]-m]</td>
<td>(became lexicalized)</td>
<td>[[who]-m] (remains decomposed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[[who]-m]</td>
<td>(whom)</td>
<td>I/he/she/we/they vs. me/him/her/us/them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case:</th>
<th>French/on Pronouns</th>
<th>Japanese/All Case Marking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject vs Object</td>
<td>Je vs. moi</td>
<td>Subject vs. Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{-ga} vs. {-o}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense:</th>
<th>English</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sing&gt;</td>
<td>sang (past)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>children</td>
<td>(plural)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(galasso/ling404/csun/spr. 2012)*
Examples of Contextual inflections:

**Agreement:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number/Person</td>
<td>Le-s petite-s fille-s</td>
<td>She speak-s [3psg/pres]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Case:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject/object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject/object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bare Stem.** In Italian, the stems can never go bare. How might apparent Italian contextual inflection on the stem contrast with that in English?

**Plural:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a). [[cat]-s] {s}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[cat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*[gatto] {o}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note how the Italian noun stem ‘gatt-o’ (‘cat’-masculine/singular) cannot parse without singular {o} or plural {i} number inflection.

**Note: AGR/Italian:**

La man-o rugos-a (p. 163) (the-fem-sg hand-sg wrinkled-fem-sg)

(The wrinkled hand).

**INFLections:** *{o} Number/singular, {a} Gender/feminine, singular

Note above that in the Italian noun [mano], the affix {o} does not seem to agree in gender with the feminine {a} suffixes across the phrase. This is similar to our note made regarding Italian bare stems. Perhaps what could be said here is that the {o} forms part of the bare-stem (since the stems [man], like [gatt] is ungrammatical), namely, the {o} in ‘mano’ becomes lexicalized whereby the inflection {o} only serves to mark number (singular). Gender continues to be marked on the adjective ‘rugos-a’. In this sense, the {o} inflection in [mano] is to a certain degree an inherent inflection and has become lexicalized.

**Feature Theory.** In class, Chomsky’s ‘Feature Theory’ was discussed. How might the distinctions between Interpretable and Uninterpretable features be shown to capture similar processing/distributional distinctions of say Derivational vs. Inflectional? For example, what could be said about differences between the plural {s} on nouns (intra-phrase) and the subject verb agreement {s} on verbs (inter-phrase)? Why might the latter AGR {s} be more prone to deletion in early child language acquisition and/ or second language development?

* Paper will include brief introduction of what constitutes a ‘strong’ vs. ‘weak’ Inflectional language type. Please present data with analysis. 4-5 pages single-spaced (3,000 words).

P&P has been used to describe similarities and differences found amongst the world’s languages. In morphology, parameter such as [+/-INFL], or [+/-Bare Verb Stem] has help to determine how a language selects from a wide array of possible UG configurations. Based on class discussion, use P&P to compare two very different language types. Include aspects of Head directionality, Pro-drop, Movement, Bare Verb Stem, etc.

Some data:  

**Japanese**

John-ga Mary to renaisite iru  
(John-subj Mary obl-obj in love is)  
(‘John is in love with Mary’)

**English**

John is talking with Mary

**Spanish** [+/- Head final]  
**English** [+ Head initial]

* Paper will include brief introduction of what constitutes a ‘strong’ vs. ‘weak’ Inflectional language type. Please present data with analysis. 4-5 pages single-spaced (3,000 words).
6. **Case & AGReement**

Case and AGR are considered contextual inflections (namely, these inflectional markers which only show-up in special environments, such as nominative/subject position [Case], or plural formation [Number] or subject-verb agreement [Person/Number]. See Case Study #4 for some data.

Please provide examples taken from languages other than English which demonstrate a robust formation of Case and Agreement. Please segment all morphological markers correctly. Explain where on the spectrum the languages fall:

```
Ø INFL -INFL polysynthetic +INFL

isolating
```

If the language under investigation is isolating (e.g., Vietnamese), please analyze all individual morphemes with equivalent glosses for English.

Horizontal line shows INFLectional cline.
Vertical line shows language-type.

**Some Data:**

**AGRernent/Spanish:** Mi-s carro-s rojo-s (showing plural agreement)
(my-PL car-PL red-PL)
(‘My red cars’).

**AGR/French:** Le-s petite-s fille-s (showing feminine/plural)
(the-Fem-Pl small-Fem-Pl girls-Fem-Pl)
(‘The small girls’).

**INFlections:** {s} plural on noun/adjective (for both Spanish/French)

**AGR/Italian:** La man-o rugos-a (p. 163)
(the-fem-sg hand-sg wrinkled-fem-sg)
(‘The wrinked hand’).

**INFlections:** *[o] Number/singular, *[a] Gender/feminine, singular

```
Cred-i che Gianni verr-à.
((you)think that Gianni will come.
```

**INFlections:** {i} 2P/sg/pres, {à} 3P/sg/future
Case/Japanese

John-ga Mary-o butta (John-subj Mary-obj hit) (SOV order) ('John hit Mary')

John-no imooto-ga sinda (John-poss sister-subj died) ('John’s sister died')

INFLections: {ga} Nominative case, {o} Accusative case, {no} Genitive/possessive case.

Word order/Mohawk

ashkii at’êd bi-ilstá. (OSV/passive) (boy girl saw) {bi} morpheme on verb ('The girl saw the boy')

At’êd ashkii yiyi-iltsá (SOV/active) (girl boy saw) {yiyi} morpheme on verb ('The girl saw the boy')

Noun-incorporation/Mohawk

Owira’a wahrake ne o’wahru

('Baby ate the meat')

Owira’a waha’wahrake”. (Noun Incorp) ('Baby meat-ate')

(Also see case study # 2 (SC) for movement)

* Paper will include brief introduction of what constitutes a language-type and whether or not the language is ‘strong’ vs. ‘weak’ in Inflection. Please present data with analysis. 4-5 pages single-spaced (3,000 words).
7. Move and Valence
In this case study, all aspects of movement could be placed under investigation. See data in case study # 2, # 3, as well as aspects of what is called operator movement for question (Aux inversion, Wh-move).

a) When is the boy ___ going to play ball___?
a’) The boy is ___ going to play ball when?

Constituency may also be discussed;

b) * [Which___ ] does she _____ want to see [___ film]?
b’ ) [Which film] does she _____ want to see ______?
c) ________ ____ she does want to see which film?

8. Morphology in special populations
In this case study, you may undertake a literature review of any topic related to morphological omission and/or delay related to (i) child language acquisition, (ii) language impairment (including Specific Language Impairment (SLI), Autism, etc.). Some data will be presented in our final lectures.

Please present data with analysis. 4-5 pages single-spaced (3,000 words).