

Chapter 1 : Syntax - Wikipedia

This volume is a companion to "Sounds, Words, Texts and Change: Selected Papers from 11 ICEHL, Santiago de Compostela, September ". The papers reflect the concerns of English historical linguistics at the beginning of the 21st century and the methodologies applied to address them.

Indeed, the process in English is rather erratic: In fact, one of the ways that morphology typically differs from syntax is its combinatoric irregularity. Words are mostly combined logically and systematically. Consider the adjectival forms of the names of countries or regions in English. There are at least a half a dozen different endings, and also many variations in how much of the name of the country is retained before the ending is added: To make it worse, the word for citizen of X and the general adjectival form meaning associated with locality X are usually but not always the same. And there are some oddities about pluralization: The plural forms "the Frenches" and "the Chineses" are not even possible, and the singular forms "the Greek" and "the Canadian" mean something entirely different. This brings up George W. For years, there has been a web feature at Slate magazine devoted to "Bushisms", many if not most of them arising from his individual approach to English morphology. Some of the early and famous examples, from the presidential campaign, focus on the particular case under discussion here: This follows the common model of Brazil:: Kosovians, instead of the correct but unpredictable forms East Timorese, Greeks and Kosovars. Despite these derivational anfractuositities, English morphology is simple and regular compared to the morphological systems of many other languages. One question we need to ask ourselves is: What is a word? In some languages, the application of these terms is even clearer. In languages like Latin, for example, words can usually be "scrambled" into nearly any order in a phrase. However, the morphemes that make up each of these two words must occur in a fixed order and without anything inserted between them. Among many others, the modern Slavic languages such as Czech and Russian show a similar contrast between words freely circulating within phrases, and morphemes rigidly arranged within words. In such languages, the basic concepts of word and morpheme are natural and inevitable analytic categories. In a language like English, where word order is much less free, we can still find evidence of a similar kind for the distinction between morphemes and words. In accordance with this, we can introduce other material into the white space between the words: And there are other forms of the sentence in which the word order is different -- "has she arrived? A recent and controversial official spelling reform of German make changes in both directions splitting some compounds orthographically while merging others: As this change emphasizes, the question of whether a morpheme sequence is written "solid" is largely a matter of orthographic convention, and in any case may be variable even in a particular writing system. English speakers feel that many noun-noun compounds are words, even though they clearly contain other words, and may often be written with a space or a hyphen between them: These are common combinations with a meaning that is not entirely predictable from the meanings of their parts, and therefore they can be found as entries in most English dictionaries. But where should we draw the line? What about say government tobacco price support program? Of course, in German, the corresponding compound would probably be written solid, making its "wordhood" plainer. There are a number of interesting theories out there about why morphology exists, and why it has the properties that it does. If these theories turn out to be correct, then maybe linguistics will be as lucky with the complexities of morphology as physics was with "Greek alphabet soup" of elementary particles discovered in the fifties and sixties, which turned out to be complex composites of quarks and leptons, composed according to the elegant laws of quantum chromodynamics. Universality of the concepts "word" and "morpheme" Do the concepts of word and morpheme then apply in all languages? The answer is " probably yes". Certainly the concept of morpheme -- the minimal unit of form and meaning -- arises naturally in the analysis of every language. The concept of word is trickier. There are at least two troublesome issues: In some languages, this boundary is even harder to draw. In the case of Chinese, the eminent linguist Y. It is therefore a matter of fiat and not a question of fact whether to apply the word "word" to a type of subunit in the Chinese sentence. The Chinese writing system has no tradition of using spaces or other delimiters to mark word boundaries; and in fact the whole issue of how and whether to define "words" in

Chinese does not seem to have arisen until , although the Chinese grammatical tradition goes back a couple of millennia. Status of clitics In most languages, there is a set of elements whose status as separate words seems ambiguous. The sound pattern of these "little words" is also usually extremely reduced, in a way that makes them act like part of the words adjacent to them. However, these forms are like separate words in some other ways, especially in terms of how they combine with other words. Members of this class of "little words" are known as clitics. Their peculiar properties can be explained by assuming that they are independent elements at the syntactic level of analysis, but not at the phonological level. In other words, they both are and are not words. Some languages write clitics as separate words, while others write them together with their adjacent "host" words. These two morphemes are pronounced in exactly the same variable way, dependent on the sounds that precede them:

Chapter 2 : English Historical Syntax and Morphology : Teresa Fanego :

From the rich programme (over papers were given during the conference), the present twelve papers were carefully selected to reflect the state of current research in the fields of English historical syntax and morphology.

The familiar examples of paradigms are the conjugations of verbs and the declensions of nouns. Also, arranging the word forms of a lexeme into tables, by classifying them according to shared inflectional categories such as tense, aspect, mood, number, gender or case, organizes such. For example, the personal pronouns in English can be organized into tables, using the categories of person first, second, third; number singular vs. plural. The inflectional categories used to group word forms into paradigms cannot be chosen arbitrarily; they must be categories that are relevant to stating the syntactic rules of the language. Person and number are categories that can be used to define paradigms in English, because English has grammatical agreement rules that require the verb in a sentence to appear in an inflectional form that matches the person and number of the subject. Therefore, the syntactic rules of English care about the difference between dog and dogs, because the choice between these two forms determines which form of the verb is used. However, no syntactic rule for the difference between dog and dog catcher, or dependent and independent. The first two are nouns and the second two are adjectives. An important difference between inflection and word formation is that inflected word forms of lexemes are organized into paradigms that are defined by the requirements of syntactic rules, and there are no corresponding syntactic rules for word formation. The relationship between syntax and morphology is called "morphosyntax" and concerns itself with inflection and paradigms, not with word formation or compounding. Allomorphy[edit] Above, morphological rules are described as analogies between word forms: In this case, the analogy applies both to the form of the words and to their meaning: One of the largest sources of complexity in morphology is that this one-to-one correspondence between meaning and form scarcely applies to every case in the language. Even cases regarded as regular, such as -s, are not so simple; the -s in dogs is not pronounced the same way as the -s in cats; and, in plurals such as dishes, a vowel is added before the -s. These cases, where the same distinction is effected by alternative forms of a "word", constitute allomorphy. Phonological rules constrain which sounds can appear next to each other in a language, and morphological rules, when applied blindly, would often violate phonological rules, by resulting in sound sequences that are prohibited in the language in question. Similar rules apply to the pronunciation of the -s in dogs and cats: Lexical morphology[edit] Lexical morphology is the branch of morphology that deals with the lexicon, which, morphologically conceived, is the collection of lexemes in a language. As such, it concerns itself primarily with word formation: Models[edit] There are three principal approaches to morphology and each tries to capture the distinctions above in different ways: Morpheme-based morphology, which makes use of an item-and-arrangement approach. Lexeme-based morphology, which normally makes use of an item-and-process approach. Word-based morphology, which normally makes use of a word-and-paradigm approach. While the associations indicated between the concepts in each item in that list are very strong, they are not absolute. Morpheme-based morphology[edit] Morpheme-based morphology tree of the word "independently" In morpheme-based morphology, word forms are analyzed as arrangements of morphemes. A morpheme is defined as the minimal meaningful unit of a language. In a word such as independently, the morphemes are said to be in-, depend-, -ent, and ly; depend is the root and the other morphemes are, in this case, derivational affixes. More recent and sophisticated approaches, such as distributed morphology, seek to maintain the idea of the morpheme while accommodating non-concatenated, analogical, and other processes that have proven problematic for item-and-arrangement theories and similar approaches. Morpheme-based morphology presumes three basic axioms: Roots and affixes have the same status as morphemes. As morphemes, they are dualistic signs, since they have both phonological form and meaning. Morpheme-based morphology comes in two flavours, one Bloomfieldian and one Hockettian. For him, there is a morpheme plural using allomorphs such as -s, -en and -ren. Within much morpheme-based morphological theory, the two views are mixed in unsystematic ways so a writer may refer to "the morpheme plural" and "the morpheme -s" in the same sentence. Lexeme-based morphology[edit] Lexeme-based morphology usually takes what is

called an item-and-process approach. Instead of analyzing a word form as a set of morphemes arranged in sequence, a word form is said to be the result of applying rules that alter a word-form or stem in order to produce a new one. An inflectional rule takes a stem, changes it as is required by the rule, and outputs a word form; a derivational rule takes a stem, changes it as per its own requirements, and outputs a derived stem; a compounding rule takes word forms, and similarly outputs a compound stem. Word-based morphology[edit] Word-based morphology is usually a word-and-paradigm approach. The theory takes paradigms as a central notion. Instead of stating rules to combine morphemes into word forms or to generate word forms from stems, word-based morphology states generalizations that hold between the forms of inflectional paradigms. The major point behind this approach is that many such generalizations are hard to state with either of the other approaches. Word-and-paradigm approaches are also well-suited to capturing purely morphological phenomena, such as morphemes. Examples to show the effectiveness of word-based approaches are usually drawn from fusional languages , where a given "piece" of a word, which a morpheme-based theory would call an inflectional morpheme, corresponds to a combination of grammatical categories, for example, "third-person plural". Morpheme-based theories usually have no problems with this situation since one says that a given morpheme has two categories. Item-and-process theories, on the other hand, often break down in cases like these because they all too often assume that there will be two separate rules here, one for third person, and the other for plural, but the distinction between them turns out to be artificial. The approaches treat these as whole words that are related to each other by analogical rules. Words can be categorized based on the pattern they fit into. This applies both to existing words and to new ones. Application of a pattern different from the one that has been used historically can give rise to a new word, such as *older* replacing *elder* where *older* follows the normal pattern of adjectival superlatives and *cows* replacing *kine* where *cows* fits the regular pattern of plural formation. Morphological typology In the 19th century, philologists devised a now classic classification of languages according to their morphology. Some languages are isolating , and have little to no morphology; others are agglutinative whose words tend to have lots of easily separable morphemes; others yet are inflectional or fusional because their inflectional morphemes are "fused" together. That leads to one bound morpheme conveying multiple pieces of information. A standard example of an isolating language is Chinese. An agglutinative language is Turkish. Latin and Greek are prototypical inflectional or fusional languages. It is clear that this classification is not at all clearcut, and many languages Latin and Greek among them do not neatly fit any one of these types, and some fit in more than one way. A continuum of complex morphology of language may be adopted. The three models of morphology stem from attempts to analyze languages that more or less match different categories in this typology. The item-and-arrangement approach fits very naturally with agglutinative languages. The item-and-process and word-and-paradigm approaches usually address fusional languages. As there is very little fusion involved in word formation, classical typology mostly applies to inflectional morphology. Depending on the preferred way of expressing non-inflectional notions, languages may be classified as synthetic using word formation or analytic using syntactic phrases. Examples[edit] Pingelapese is a Micronesian language spoken on the Pingelap atoll and on two of the eastern Caroline Islands, called the high island of Pohnpei. Similar to other languages, words in Pingelapese can take different forms to add to or even change its meaning. Verbal suffixes are morphemes added at the end of a word to change its form. Prefixes are those that are added at the front. The verb *alu* means to walk. A directional suffix can be used to give more detail. When added to non-motion verbs, their meanings are a figurative one. The following table gives some examples of directional suffixes and their possible meanings.

Chapter 3 : Morphology and Syntax | Department of Linguistics

This book will be an indispensable textbook on English historical syntax for many years to come. - Ursula Lenker, English Studies This textbook is a remarkable accomplishment: a very accessible combination of formal and descriptive approaches to syntactic change in English, incorporating the latest research.

These 10 animal facts will amaze you Syntax looks at the rules of a language, particularly how the various parts of sentences go together. While similar to morphology, which looks at how the smallest meaningful linguistic units, called morphemes, are formed into complete words, syntax examines how fully formed words fit together to create complete and understandable sentences. The Purpose of Syntax Linguists and grammarians who study syntax are not necessarily prescriptivist, which means they do not attempt to tell people how to "correctly" form a sentence. Rather, they are descriptivist, in that they look at how people actually speak and then create rules that describe what a language community considers grammatical or non-grammatical. Syntax deals with a number of elements, all of which help to facilitate being understood through language. Without rules, there would be no foundation from which to discern meaning from a bunch of words strung together; whereas these rules allow for a virtually infinite number of sentences. Word Order in Language Construction Perhaps the most important aspect of syntax is how the various parts of speech connect together. Every language has rules that dictate where certain types of words can be used in a sentence, and how to interpret the resulting sentence. A new language learner has to understand how this word order is structured, which can be difficult for someone used to a different language. Ad In English, the basic order is "Subject- Verb -Object;" this means that in a simple sentence, the first noun phrase is the subject, and the subsequent predicate includes the verb phrase and may contain an object. This allows English speakers to understand that in the sentence "The boy kicked the ball," the "boy" is the subject, and therefore the one doing the kicking, whereas the "ball" is the object being kicked. If someone wrote the sentence, "The ball kicked the boy," the meaning would be reversed somewhat strangely, and "Kicked the ball the boy," would immediately be recognized as a violation of basic syntactical order and read as nonsense. Not all languages follow this same order, however. In Spanish, for example, the order of the words is more flexible in most cases, and serves to shift the emphasis of a sentence rather than its meaning. Similarly, adjectives in English usually precede the word they describe, while they come after the described word in languages such as French. Parts of Speech Another aspect of syntax covers the various parts of speech that a language uses and separates the words of the language into these groups. Each part of speech in turn has various rules that may be applied to it, and other rules that dictate when it cannot be used. English, for example, makes use of nouns, verbs, adjectives, and other word types, while different languages may not have a separate class for adjectives or make use of classes not found in English. Run-Ons and Incomplete Sentences Through an understanding of proper syntax, speakers and writers know how sentences should be broken up. When two or more sentences are improperly combined into a single sentence, it usually creates a "run-on. Understanding linguistic rules allows speakers and writers to effectively communicate ideas to others.

Chapter 4 : HISTORY OF MORPHOLOGY and MORPHOLOGICAL INTERFACE ~ 4-Learning English

In linguistics, morphology (/ m ɔːr ˈfɒl ɒːl ɪ ˈdʒɪ n i /) is the study of words, how they are formed, and their relationship to other words in the same language. It analyzes the structure of words and parts of words, such as stems, root words, prefixes, and suffixes.

Chapter 5 : Linguistics -- Lecture 7 -- Morphology

The papers, which have been selected for presentation and publication, reflect the various concerns of English historical linguistics at the beginning of the 21st century and the different methodologies applied to address them.

Chapter 6 : Reviews: Morphology and syntax

*English Historical Syntax and Morphology: Selected papers from 11 ICEHL, Santiago de Compostela, September Volume 1 (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory) [Teresa Fanego, Javier PÉrez-Guerra, María-José López-Couso] on racedayv1.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers.*

Chapter 7 : Morphology (linguistics) - Wikipedia

English Historical Syntax and Morphology: Selected Papers from 11 ICEHL, Santiago de Compostela, September , vol. 1 (review) Alexander Bergs.

Chapter 8 : English Historical Syntax and Morphology: Selected Papers from 11 ICEHL - Google Books

Morphology is the branch of linguistics (and one of the major components of grammar) that studies word structures, especially in terms of morphemes, which are the smallest units of language.

Chapter 9 : What is Syntax? (with pictures)

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.