#### Morphological patterns: concatenative vs. non-concatenative morphology

#### Alexander Fraser fraser@cis.uni-muenchen.de

CIS, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Morphology 2017 2017-06-12

#### Announcement: Exercise Room Change

Exercises are in Kalahari unless otherwise marked on the course web page

### Outline

#### 1. Introduction

- 2. Affixation and compounding
- 3. Base Modifications
- 4. Reduplication
- 5. Conversion
- 6. Word operations outside the realm of morphology
- 7. Approaches to morphological rules

Slides adapted from Weller and Haselbach (IMS Stuttgart) by Liane Guillou (and later Alexander Fraser)

Originally based on: Haspelmath, M. & Sims, A. D. (2010): *Understanding Morphology* [2<sup>nd</sup> ed.], chapter 3 'Rules', London: Hodder Education.

### Outline

#### 1. Introduction

- 2. Affixation and compounding
- 3. Base Modifications
- 4. Reduplication
- 5. Conversion
- 6. Word operations outside the realm of morphology
- 7. Approaches to morphological rules

### Introduction

Morphological patterns

- Morphological structure can be more various than simply combining affixes with bases
- German plural formation: add an umlaut to the vowel (the stem vowel changes, no morpheme is added)

singular	plural	
Mutter	Mütter	'mother(s)'
Vater	Väter	'father(s)'
Tochter	Töchter	'daughter(s)'
Garten	Gärten	ʻgarden(s)'
Nagel	Nägel	ʻnail(s)'

- **Morphological pattern**: Cover term for processes in which morphological meaning can be associated with a segmentable part of the word and examples where this is not possible
- In this sense, a morpheme is a subtype of morphological pattern

### Outline

#### 1. Introduction

- 2. Affixation and compounding
- 3. Base Modifications
- 4. Reduplication
- 5. Conversion
- 6. Word operations outside the realm of morphology
- 7. Approaches to morphological rules

## Affixation and compounding: Concatenative morphology Introduction

- Basic types of morphological patterns:
  - concatenative morphology: two morphemes are ordered one after another i.e. affixation and compounding (segmentation)
  - non-concatenative morphology: everything else
- An affixation rule also states which *types* of morphemes may combine: this is the **combinatory potential** of the affix

#### Affixation and compounding: Concatenative morphology Combinatory potential

- An affixation rule also states which *types* of morphemes may combine: this is the **combinatory potential** of the affix
- We can't just combine any base and any affix. The **word-class** of the base in an important factor:
  - combinatory potential of un-
  - combinatory potential of -able
  - combinatory potential of comparative -er
  - combinatory potential of -ful

[ \_Adjective ] [ Verb\_ ] [ Adjective\_ ] [ Noun ]

- Adjective examples: un-intelligent, \*intelligent-able, \*intelligent-ful, however \*intelligent-er (more intelligent)
- Test: check the combinatory potential of some other words

### Outline

#### 1. Introduction

- 2. Affixation and compounding
- 3. Base Modifications
- 4. Reduplication
- 5. Conversion
- 6. Word operations outside the realm of morphology
- 7. Approaches to morphological rules

# Base modifications: Non-concatenative morphology Introduction

- Old definition of base: The base is the part of a word that an affix is attached to
- **New definition**: The base of a morphologically complex word is the element to which a morphological operation applies
- **Base modification** (aka. stem modification/alternation): The shape of the base is changed without adding segmentable material

## Base modifications: Non-concatenative morphology

Fronting and palatalization

- **Fronting** of the stem vowel, so that it is produced near the front of the mouth e.g. German plural formation with umlaut (cf. slide 5)
- Palatalization of the last consonant,

e.g. plural formation in Albanian:

armik [k]	'enemy'	armiq [c]	'enemies'
<i>fik</i> [k]	'fig'	<i>fiq</i> [c]	'figs'
frëng [g]	'Frenchman'	frëngj [ɟ]	'Frenchmen'
murg[g]	'monk'	murgj [ɟ]	'monks'
papagall [4]	'parrot'	papagaj [j]	'parrots'
portokall [4]	'orange'	portokaj [j]	'oranges'

# Base modifications: Non-concatenative morphology Weakening

- Morphological patterns may involve a changed manner of articulation
- Weakening of word-initial obstruent consonants, e.g. Scottish Gaelic indefinite nouns, genitive plural

nom sg indef	gen pl indef	
[b] <i>bard</i>	[v] bhàrd	'bard'
[k <sup>j</sup> ] ceann	[ç] cheann	'head'
[g] guth	[y] ghuth	'voice'
[t <sup>h</sup> ] tuagh	[h] thuagh	'axe'
[b] balach	[v] bhalach	'boy'

## Base modifications: Non-concatenative morphology Gemination

- Morphological patterns may involve a changed manner of articulation
- Gemination (consonant lengthening/doubling),
  - e.g. causitive verb formation in Standard Arabic

darasa	'learn'	darrasa	'teach'
waqafa	'stop (intransitive)'	waqqafa	'stop (transitive)'
damara	'perish'	dammara	'annihilate'

## Base modifications: Non-concatenative morphology

Lengthening

• Lengthening of the final stem vowel,

e.g. first person singular inflection of verbs in Huallaga Quechua:

aywa-nki	'you (SG) go'	aywa:	ʻl go'
aywa-pti-ki	'when you (SG) went'	aywa-pti:	'when I went'
aywa-shka-nki	'you (SG) have gone'	aywa-shka:	'I have gone'

(Long vowels are indicated by a colon)

# Base modifications: Non-concatenative morphology Shortening

Shortening of the stem vowel,

e.g. intransitive verb formation in Hindi/Urdu:

ma:r-	'kill'	mar-	'die'
kho:l-	ʻopen (tr.)'	khul-	ʻopen (intr.)'
phe:r-	'turn (tr.)'	phir-	'turn (intr.)'

## Base modifications: Non-concatenative morphology

Tonal change

• Tonal change (stress shift),

e.g. adjective formation in Chalcatongo Mixtec:

ká?ba	'filth'	ká?bá	'dirty'
žuù	'rock'	žúú	'solid, hard'
xa?à	'foot'	xá?á	'standing'

(High tone indicated by 'tone diacritic)

• Stress shift in English: discount (noun); discount (verb)

- **Test**: have a go at saying the above words

# Base modifications: Non-concatenative morphology Voicing

- Voicing of the last consonant,
  - e.g. a few verbs in English are derived from nouns by voicing:

house	[haʊs]	to house	[haʊz]
thief	[θirf]	to thieve	[θirv]
wreath	[riːθ]	to wreathe	[riːð]

- Test: have a go at saying the above words

# Base modifications: Non-concatenative morphology Subtraction

- Interesting but less common morphological patterns arise from:
- **Subtraction** (deletion of one or more segments from the base), e.g. plural formation in Murle:

nyoon	'lamb'	пуоо	'lambs'
wawoc	'white heron'	wawo	'white herons'
onyiit	'rib'	onyii	ʻribs'
rottin	'warrior'	rotti	'warriors'

# Base modifications: Non-concatenative morphology Metathesis

• **Metathesis** (switching of two of more segments within the base), e.g. actual vs. non-actual (i.e. hypothetical) events in Clallam

non-actual	actual	
qq'í-	qíq'-	'restrain'
pk <sup>w</sup> 'é-	pék <sup>w</sup> '-	'smoke'
ť cé-	ť éc-	'shatter'
k <sup>w</sup> 'sé-	k <sup>w</sup> 'és-	'count'

### Outline

#### 1. Introduction

- 2. Affixation and compounding
- 3. Base Modifications

#### 4. Reduplication

- 5. Conversion
- 6. Word operations outside the realm of morphology
- 7. Approaches to morphological rules

- **Reduplication**: A part of the base or the complete base is copied and attached to the base
- Position of reduplicant:
  - initial reduplication: [ŋaŋaj] 'a long time'  $\rightarrow$  [ŋa-ŋaŋaj] 'a long time (in years)' (Agta)
  - final reduplication: [wafte] 'good (SG)'  $\rightarrow$  [wafte-fte] 'good (PL)' (Dakota)
  - internal reduplication: *alofa* 'he/she loves (SG)'  $\rightarrow$  *a-lo-lofa* 'they love (PL)' (Samoan)

Introduction

• Reduplication of the entire stem,

e.g. weakening the meaning of an adjective in Malagasy  $% \left( {{{\left[ {{{\left[ {{{\left[ {{{c_{{\rm{m}}}}} \right]}} \right.}$ 

be	'big, numerous'	be-be	'fairly big, numerous'
fotsy	'white'	fotsi-fotsy	'whitish'
maimbo	'stinky'	maimbo-maimbo	'somewhat stinky'
hafa	'different'	hafa-hafa	'somewhat different'

### Reduplication

Consonant-vowel and vowel-consonant sequences

- Alternatively only part of the base may be copied:
- Reduplication of a consonant-vowel sequence before the base, e.g. participle formation in Ponapean

duhp	'dive'	du-duhp	'be diving'
mihk	'suck'	mi-mihk	'be sucking'
wehk	'confess'	we-wehk	'be confessing'

• Reduplication of a vowel-consonant sequence after the base, e.g. participle formation in Mangap-Mbula

kuk	'bark'	kuk-uk	'be barking'
kel	'dig'	kel-el	'be digging'
kan	'eat'	kan-an	'be eating'

- Mixture between affix and reduplicant: duplifix
- Plurals in Somali: duplifix -aC (C is the last consonant of the base)

buug	'book'	buug-ag	'books'
fool	'face'	fool-al	'faces'
koob	'cup'	koob-ab	'cups'
jid	'street'	jid-ad	'streets'

Examples

- Mixture between affix and reduplicant: duplifix
- 'Sort of' adjectives in Tzutujil: duplifix -*Coj* (C is the first consonant of the base)

saq	'white'	saq-soj	'whitish'
rax	'green'	rax-roj	'greenish'
q'eq	'black'	q'eq-q'oj	'blackish'
tz'iil	'dirty'	tz'il-tz'oj	'dirtyish'

### Outline

#### 1. Introduction

- 2. Affixation and compounding
- 3. Base Modifications
- 4. Reduplication
- 5. Conversion
- 6. Word operations outside the realm of morphology
- 7. Approaches to morphological rules



- **Conversion**: A morphological pattern in which the form of the base remains unaltered
- Examples from English verbs and nouns:

noun	verb
hammer	hammer
plant	plant
ship	ship
walk	walk
drink	drink

• Conversion is invoked only for derivational morphology, and primarily for relating two lexemes that differ only in lexical class (i.e. noun vs. verb)

### Outline

#### 1. Introduction

- 2. Affixation and compounding
- 3. Base Modifications
- 4. Reduplication
- 5. Conversion
- 6. Word operations outside the realm of morphology

#### 7. Approaches to morphological rules

## Outside the realm of morphology

Abbreviations and blends

- Other operations that can be used to create new words:
- Abbreviations:
  - acronyms: NATO ['neitou] (North Atlantic Treaty Organization)
  - alphabetisms: CD [sir'dir] (Compact Disc)
- Blends:

*smog* (from *smoke* and *fog*), *infotainment* (from *information* and *entertainment*)

• Test: think of some German examples of abbreviations and blends

## Outside the realm of morphology

- Other operations that can be used to create new words:
- Clippings (removal of a part of a word to form a new word):
  - final clipping (apocope): *gas* (*gasoline*), DE *Auto* (*Automobil* 'car')
  - initial clipping (apheresis): chute (para<u>chute</u>), NO bil (automo<u>bil</u> 'car')
  - medial clipping (syncope): ma'am (<u>madam</u>)
- Test: think of some German examples of clippings
- $\rightarrow$  These operations are **not** morphological processes because the new words do not have different meanings from the longer words (no systematic change in meaning)

Clippings

#### Summary: Morphological Patterns

- **Concatenative morphology**: two morphemes are ordered one after the other
  - Affixation: e.g. cat-s, un-happy, wash-ed
  - **Compounding**: e.g. FIRE + WOOD = FIREWOOD
- Non-concatenative morphology: everything else
  - Base modifications: the shape of the base is changed without adding segmentable material,

e.g. stress shift in English: discount (noun); discount (verb)

 Reduplication: a part of the base or the complete base is copied and attached to the base, e.g. weakening the meaning of an adjective in Malagasy

be ('big') ; be-be ('fairly big')

 Conversion: a morphological pattern in which the form of the base remains unaltered,

e.g. hammer (noun and verb)

### Outline

#### 1. Introduction

- 2. Affixation and compounding
- 3. Base Modifications
- 4. Reduplication
- 5. Conversion
- 6. Word operations outside the realm of morphology

#### 7. Approaches to morphological rules

#### Morphological rules Systems

- Goal: create a system of morphological rules that mimics speakers' linguistic knowledge
  - System should accurately represent morphological generalisations
  - Rules should be elegant and cognitively realistic
- Note: **concatenative patterns** are more common in the world's languages than **non-concatenative patterns** 
  - Because morphological structure is similiar to syntactic structure?
  - Or because of the way languages changed through history?
- Two possible systems:
  - Morpheme-based model
  - Word-based model

Morpheme-based model

- Morpheme-based model: morphological rules combine morphemes like syntactic rules combine words
- E.g. we can use syntactic **phrase structure rules** to create a sentence:

а.	sentence	=	noun phrase $+$ verb phrase
b.	noun phrase	=	(i) determiner (+ adjective) + noun
			(ii) sentence
c.	verb phrase	=	verb (+ noun phrase)
d.	determiner	=	the, a, some,
e.	noun	=	cat, rat, bat,
f.	verb	=	chased, thought, slept,
g.	adjective	=	big, grey,

• Replace elements on the left of "=" by elements on the right

Applying phrase structure rules

• Produce the sentence: A big cat chased the bat

sentence: A big cat chased the bat

•  $X \to Y$  means "insert Y for X"

Word-structure rules

- Word-structure rules are analogous to syntactic phrase structure rules
- Can be used to describe the structure of complex English words like: *cheeseboard, bags, unhappier, eventfullness*
- a. word-form = stem (+ inflectional suffix)
  b. stem = (i) (deriv. prefix +) root (+ deriv. suffix) (ii) stem + stem
   c. inflectional suffix = -s, -er, ...
   d. derivational prefix = un-, ...
- e. root = bag, event, cheese, board, happy, ...
- f. derivational suffix = -ful, -ness, ...

Word-structure rules: test

- Test: produce the word bags
- a. word-form = stem (+ inflectional suffix)
- b. stem = (i) (deriv. prefix +) root (+ deriv. suffix) (ii) stem + stem
- c. inflectional suffix = -s, -er, ...
- d. derivational prefix = un-, ...
- e. root = bag, event, cheese, board, happy, ...
- f. derivational suffix = -ful, -ness, ...

Word-structure rules: solution

• **Test**: produce the word *bags* 

word-form: *bag-s* 

Pros and cons of the morpheme-based model

Pro:

• **Concatenative patterns**: natural explanation of the fact that morpheme concatenation is the most common kind of morphological pattern in the worlds' languages

Con:

• Non-concatenative patterns: base modification (Mutter  $\rightarrow$  Mütter) and conversion (hammer (N)  $\rightarrow$  hammer (V)) are difficult to accommodate

Word-based model

- Word-based model: word-schemas represent features common to morphologically related words
- E.g. the similarities among the English words *bags, keys, gods, ribs, bones, gems* (etc.) can be expressed by the word schema:

Words: bags, keys, gods, ribs, bones, gems

Lexical entries for words:

Word schema:

Word-based model: word-schemas

- A word schema contains information on:
  - Pronunciation (phonological representation e.g. /z/)
  - Syntactic properties (e.g. N)
  - Meaning (e.g. 'plurality of...')
- Additionally a word-schema may contain: variables (/X/

/Xz/N 'plurality of *xs*'

- A word-schema stands for complete words, not individual morphemes (in the sense of the morpheme-based model)
  - It is a generalisation based on lexical entries (e.g. bags, keys, gems), which are themselves word-forms, not morphemes

Pros and cons of the word-based model

Pro:

Non-concatenative patterns: such as hammer(N) / hammer(V) can be described quite naturally (this is difficult for the morpheme-based model)

• **Back-formations**: words like *babysit* which is historically derived from *babysitter* are possible (but not easy to explain in the morpheme-based model)

Con:

- The model is not **restrictive** (unlike the morpheme-based model)
  - It allows morphological rules of virtually any type even those that do not exist in any language

Summary: morpheme-based vs. word-based models

	Morpheme-based	Word-based
Concatenative patterns easy	Yes	No
to capture?		
Non-concatenative patterns	No	Yes
easy to capture?		
Back-formations are easy to	No	Yes
describe?		
Restrictive?	Yes	No

## Questions?

## Thank you for your attention