Continue



```
Both morphology and syntax are related subfields of linguistics. Linguistics can be defined as the scientific study of natural human language. We will go deeper into the scientific aspects of morphosyntax in Chapter 2. The study of natural human language what do we mean when we say language? Linguists primarily study natural human language. A natural
language is a language that developed within a community without being planned or designed. Instead, a natural languages are designed intentionally. Constructed languages include languages designed for art, media, or fun, like Klingon for the Star
Trek series, or for a communicative purpose, such as Esperanto, which was designed with the international languages and non-human communication systems are valid and interesting objects of study. However, depending on the kinds of questions you are asking, they may
or may not be able to provide the evidence you need. For example, you may be studying the properties that languages around the world have in common. A constructed language, however, may have been constructed on purpose, we cannot know whether
the conscious choices of a language designer will result in the same kinds of patterns as subconscious language acquisition unless we study them separately and then compare. Some linguists hypothesize a genetic or biological component that underlies the human capacity for language. If this is the case, then we would expect there to be differences
between human communication and the communication and the communication of form and meaning. The form of language — the possible speech sounds and signs — is determined at the level of phonetics
and phonology. The meaning of language is determined at the level of semantics and pragmatics. In morphology and syntax, we study how to encode particular meaning with particular forms. Let's use the example in (1) to illustrate the relationship between form and meaning.
in (1), if it is spoken, sounds similar to (2), when represented in an IPA transcription, and its meaning describes something like the image shown in Figure 1. A toddler kicking a ball in a field. Photo by Paul Ney. Used under CC BY-NC-SA licence. But how do we get from the form in (2) to the meaning in
Figure 1? Well, we divide up the string of sounds in (2) into morphemes and morphemes 
ways. The different combinations produce different meanings, some of which make no sense. (3) a. The balls across the field. b. The toddlers kicked the ball across the field. In morphology and syntax, we are assigning a structure to a
string of sounds or signs and using that structure to determine its meaning. This structure indicates that there is more than one ball. On its own, -s just means more than one something, but we don't know what that something is until it is
part of a structure. Likewise, the morpheme kick indicates that an action of kicking is involved, but until kick is combined with a subject, object, and other modifiers, we don't know who did the kicking, what was kicked, or where the kicking happened. The
subfields of linguistics Linguistics is very broad and covers every aspect of language and subfields that focus on how the structure of language intersects with other aspects of the human experience. All of these areas of
research are important for advancing our understanding of how language works. There are also interactions between all of the different subfields. For example, you could study how to train a computer to produce artificial speech with the correct pronunciation (phonetics, phonology, and computational linguistics), how children acquire morphology
(morphology and first language acquisition), or how a word gains a special meaning within a particular community (lexical semantics, historical linguistics), and sociolinguistics, and sociolinguistics, and sociolinguistics, and sociolinguistics, and sociolinguistics.
Semantics is the study of meaning. One important idea in semantics is compositionality, which is the observation that the meaning of a sentence is derived by the meaning of a sentence is derived by the meaning of its parts and the way that they are combined. Phonetics
and phonology The subfields of phonetics and phonology intersect with morphology through the phenomenon of allomorphy. A morpheme may be pronounced in different ways depending on its phonology also intersect with syntax through prosody. Many
syntactic structures in various languages affect the prosody of the sentence. For example, in English, questions have a special rising intonation. Sociolinguistics In sociolinguistics In sociolinguistics of morphology and syntax. Some critics of
morphosyntax point out that we do not adequately account for variation in language. Psycholinguistics and acquisition of morphosyntactic models of grammar morphosyntactic theory argue that there is a mismatch between morphosyntactic models of grammar
and the ways we seem to process language. Anthropological linguistics is the study of the interaction between languages encode different languages. For example, some languages have grammatical categories that can be used to
indicate formality or respect, while others do not. Discourse analysis In discourse analysis, linguists study how different sentences or utterances are combined into wider texts or conversations. Some syntactic discourse analysis, linguists study how different sentences or utterances are combined into wider texts or conversations. Some syntactic discourse analysis, linguists study how different sentences or utterances are combined into wider texts or conversations.
discourse markers into syntactic structure, while morphologists might analyze their morphological structure. Computational linguistics A compu
there are still some areas of difference, if you look closely. Crip linguistics as a whole from the perspective of disability studies, challenging us to not consider any attempts at communicating to be deficient or defective. The term crip linguistics was coined by deaf
linguists Octavian Robinson and Jon Henner (e.g., McRuer 2006, Kafer 2013). In morphosyntax, we may investigate how various communicative behaviours exhibit morphological or syntactic patterning. Which subfields of linguistics are missing here?
How are they also connected to morphology and syntax? Linguistics can be defined as the scientific study of language. In both morphology and syntax, we study how to encode particular meanings with particular forms. Morphology and syntax interact with all of the other subfields
of linguistics. Check yourself! References and further resources Okrent, Arika. 2010. In the land of invented languages: Adventures in linguistic creativity, madness, and genius. Toronto: Random House. Academic sources Henner, Jon, and Octavian Robinson. 2023. Unsettling languages, unruly bodyminds: A Crip Linguistics manifesto. Journal of
Critical Study of Communication and Disability 1 (1): 7-37. Kafer, Alison. 2013. Feminist, queer, crip. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. definitionThe study of the structure of words; the study of the systematic co-variation of
form and meaning. The study of the structure of sentences and phrases; the study of how we combine words and encode the relationships between them. The scientific study of the structure of words, phrases, and sentences. The intersection of the fields of morphology and syntax. Language that arose out of use in a community,
rather than a language that was designed or constructed. A language designed for a particular purpose, as opposed to a natural language. An internationally recognized set of symbols developed in order to transcribe speech sounds with a one-to-one correspondence between sound and symbol. The study of the conventional meaning of language, and internationally recognized set of symbols developed in order to transcribe speech sounds with a one-to-one correspondence between sound and symbol. The study of the conventional meaning of language, and internationally recognized set of symbols developed in order to transcribe speech sounds with a one-to-one correspondence between sounds and symbol.
including the meaning of individual words (lexical semantics) and how meaning is derived by the meaning of its parts and the way that they are combined. The study of the physical properties of language, including how it is produced and
perceived. The study of the systematic rules and constraints that characterize human speech sounds and signs in and across languages. When the form of a morpheme varies depending on context, including variation based on broad social
categories like age, gender, and region, and the intersection of language and identity. The study of how language and identity and interact, including turn-
taking in conversation. Words or morphemes used to manage the structure and flow of discourse. The study of how we can model and process language with computers. A critical approach to the study of linguistics from the approach. As a
supplement to MGN's great answer on CxG in general, there's a closely related approach by Ray Jackendoff and Peter Culicover called "Parallel Architecture" that I think is relevant here. The question asks whether syntax determines/constrains semantics, semantics determines/constrains syntax, or neither. But there's a fourth possibility: both. Syntax
is inherently tree-structured; that's presumably uncontroversial. And semantics is also inherently tree-structured: PAST(LIKE(John, PROPERTY-OF(Mary, smile))) doesn't make sense unless the argument to PAST is the whole liking, and one of the arguments to LIKE is Mary's smile. There are also both syntactic and semantic mechanisms for
coreference. And so on. The way PA handles this is to treat each constructive with dependent syntax, but instead both a semantic structure with dependent syntax, but instead both a semantic structure with dependent syntax, but instead both a semantic structure with dependent syntax.
adds additional constraints).1 If you look at a fixed idiom construction, like MGN's "kick the bucket", you get a simple semantic structure: [VP kickV [NP^ the bucket]]1 In other words, at the syntactic level, we have a perfectly normal verb phrase, but the verb, noun head of the
complement, etc. aren't attached to any meaning; rather, the entire verb phrase is attached to a meaning (that's what the coindexed subscript represents). Or, for an idiom with a "variable" in it: cognitive structure: [NP theD motherN [PP ofP [NP allD [N' a1 -s]]]2 Here, both semantics and syntax are
compositional, but with different structures. The "a" inside the syntactic construction is linked to the entire semantic tree, but, e.g., the PP syntactic subtree isn't linked to anything. So, which tree do you "build first" when producing or processing a sentence? Neither. As you
go along, you select constructions that have both syntax and semantics and assemble them into larger compositions that also have syntax and semantics, following constraints on both. In fact, all of the things that traditional generative grammar considers "rules" are like this—the simple active sentence construction is just an idiom with more, and
more complicated, variables. Of course often both syntax and semantics are perfectly compositional, and coindexed in the obvious way, like this construction: 3 cognitive structure: PROPERTY-OF1(x2, y3) syntactic structure: PROPERTY-OF1(x2, y3) syntactic structure: [NP [DP [NP a2] - 's] bN, 3]]1 ... but that's just a very common feature of many constructions, not actually a rule that applies
everywhere, as it would be be in a syntax-first or semantics structure (as traditional generative Semantic structure (as traditional generative for no real purpose. But
Jackendoff and Culicover argue that can't be done. Their book Simpler Syntax is a reasonably approachable introduction to their argument. 1. In fact, there's also a phonological structure, and there's interfaces between all 6 pairs. For example, that's how you handle the altered prosody that goes with topicalization, or syntactic effects of phonological
weight in cases like heavy NP shift. 2. The "standard" way to draw things is with two trees, and arrows between nodes in the trees, because using "bracket trees" and indexes gets hard to follow as soon as you try to deal with large phrases or anything nonlocal like anaphora or coordination. But I'll try to keep things simple enough that we can stay
with brackets. 3. This is oversimplified; "Mary's" is probably a separable component at the semantic level as well as the syntactic level, and "-'s" probably has an inherent meaning that the "x's y" construction relies on rather than duplicating. And I've left out most of the semantic constraints on all of these trees—for example, as drawn, there's no
reason vou couldn't use these constructions to build a phrase like "John's mother of all Marys kicked the bucket", which you obviously can't. But I think this is enough to show the idea. Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format for any purpose, even commercially. Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for
any purpose, even commercially. The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the license terms. Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the licensor endorses you or your use.
ShareAlike — If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original. No additional restrict others from doing anything the license permits. You do not have to comply with the license for
elements of the material in the public domain or where your use is permitted by an applicable exception or limitation. No warranties are given. The license may not give you all of the permissions necessary for your intended use. For example, other rights such as publicity, privacy, or moral rights may limit how you use the material. CHAPTER
syntax: clitics, phrasal verbs like call up in which the two parts can sometimes be separated in sentences. KEY TERMSvalency, argument, active, passive, anti-passive, causative, applicative, noun-incorporation, clitic, phrasal verb, phrasal
far in this book, morphology is concerned with the ways in which words are formed in the languages of the world. Syntax, in contrast, is concerned with identifying the rules that allow us to combine words into phrases and phrases into sentences. Morphology and syntax, then, are generally concerned with different levels of linguistic organization.
Morphologists look at processes of lexeme formation and inflection such as affixation, compounding, reduplication, and the like. Syntacticians are concerning the interpretation of anaphors and pronouns. Nevertheless, there are many ways in which morphology and
syntax interact. We saw in chapter 6 that inflectional morphology is defined as morphology that carries grammatical meaning; as such it is relevant to syntactic processes. Case-marking, for example, serves to identify the syntactic function of an NP in a sentence. As a supplement to MGN's great answer on CxG in general, there's a closely related
approach by Ray Jackendoff and Peter Culicover called "Parallel Architecture" that I think is relevant here. The question asks whether syntax, or neither. But there's a fourth possibility: both. Syntax is inherently tree-structured; that's presumably uncontroversial. And semantics
is also inherently tree-structured: PAST(LIKE(John, PROPERTY-OF(Mary, smile))) doesn't make sense unless the argument to PAST is the whole liking, and one of the arguments to LIKE is Mary's smile. There are also both syntactic and semantic mechanisms for coreference. And so on. The way PA handles this is to treat each construction as having
not a syntactic structure with dependent semantics, or a semantic structure with dependent syntax, but instead both a semantic structure and a syntactic structure with dependent syntax, but instead both a semantic structure and a syntactic structure with dependent syntax, but instead both a semantic structure with dependent syntax, but instead both a semantic structure and a syntactic structure with dependent syntax, but instead both a semantic structure with dependent syntax, but instead both a semantic structure with dependent syntax, but instead both a semantic structure with dependent syntax, but instead both a semantic structure with dependent syntax, but instead both a semantic structure with dependent syntax.
the bucket", you get a simple semantic structure with a nonsimple syntax:2 cognitive structure: DIE1 syntactic structure: [VP kickV [NP^ the bucket]]1 In other words, at the syntactic level, we have a perfectly normal verb phrase is
attached to a meaning (that's what the coindexed subscript represents). Or, for an idiom with a "variable" in it: cognitive structure: SUPERLATIVE(x1)2 syntactic structure: INP theD motherN [PP ofP [NP allD [N' a1 -s]]]2 Here, both semantics and syntax are compositional, but with different structures. The "a" inside the syntactic construction is
linked to the "x" in the semantic construction, and the entire syntactic tree is linked to anything. So, which tree do you "build first" when producing or processing a sentence? Neither. As you go along, you select constructions that have both syntax and semantics and assemble
them into larger compositions that also have syntax and semantics, following constraints on both. In fact, all of the things that traditional generative grammar considers "rules" are like this—the simple active sentence construction is just an idiom with more, and more complicated, variables. Of course often both syntax and semantics are perfectly
compositional, and coindexed in the obvious way, like this construction: 3 cognitive structure: PROPERTY-OF1(x2, y3) syntactic structure: [NP [DP [NP a2] -'s] bN, 3]]1 ... but that's just a very common feature of many constructions, not actually a rule that applies everywhere, as it would be be in a syntax-first or semantics-first theory. If you could
show that in every case, the semantic structure can be derived from the syntactic structure (as traditional generative Semantics claimed), then this whole mechanism would just be extra complexity for no real purpose. But Jackendoff and Culicover argue that can't be done. Their book Simpler Syntax is a
reasonably approachable introduction to their argument. 1. In fact, there's also a phonological structure, and there's interfaces between all 6 pairs. For example, that's how you handle the altered prosody that goes with topicalization, or syntactic effects of phonological weight in cases like heavy NP shift. 2. The "standard" way to draw things is with
two trees, and arrows between nodes in the trees, because using "bracket trees" and indexes gets hard to follow as soon as you try to deal with large phrases or anything nonlocal like anaphora or coordination. But I'll try to keep things simple enough that we can stay with brackets. 3. This is oversimplified; "Mary's" is probably a separable component
at the semantic level as well as the syntactic level, and "-'s" probably has an inherent meaning that the "x's y" construction relies on rather than duplicating. And I've left out most of the semantic construction relies on rather than duplicating. And I've left out most of the semantic construction relies on rather than duplicating.
Marys kicked the bucket", which you obviously can't. But I think this is enough to show the idea. Morphology is the study of the smallest meaningful unit in a language or the study of ASL Linguistics there are two different morphology.
processes called derivational morphology and inflectional morphology is the process of making new units for the language by adding affixes. Such is the case when creating a noun from a verb. For example, adding the suffix "-r" to the end of the verb "write" to create the noun "writer". Inflectional Morphology is the process of
adding grammatical information to units that already exist. For example, changing the word "look" to "looks" or "looks" o
"topic" or the act of being placed under another's authority. In ASL there are noun-verb pairs: CAR and DRIVINGFOOD and
EATING[Homework 7]CompoundsNew signs can also be created by putting together two words to form a new word. For example, the words to form a new word to form a new word to form green and "house" can be combined to form green and "house". In ASL the signs THINK and OPPOSITE are compounded to create a sign that means "to disagree with". There are more compound signs that can be
created from compounding THINK with other signs, such as THINK-WARP, THINK-SELF, THINK-SAME-AS, THINK-TOUCH.[Homework 8] Fingerspelling is another way that signs can be created. Fingerspelling from compounding THINK with other signs, such as THINK-WARP, THINK-SELF, THIN
#BANK, #OFF, and #BUS.This lexicalization processes includes deletion of signs, change of location, orientation, and handshape, added movement and a second hand, and reduplication of movement and a second hand, and reduplication of movement and a second hand, and reduplication processes includes deletion of signs, change of location, orientation, and handshape, added movement and a second hand, and reduplication processes includes deletion of signs, change of location, orientation, and handshape, added movement and a second hand, and reduplication processes includes deletion of signs, change of location, orientation, and handshape, added movement and a second hand, and reduplication processes includes deletion of signs, change of location, orientation, and handshape, added movement and a second hand, and reduplication processes includes deletion of signs, change of location, orientation, and handshape, added movement and a second hand, and reduplication processes includes deletion of signs, change of location, orientation, and handshape, added movement and a second hand, and reduplication processes includes deletion of signs, change of location, orientation, and handshape, added movement and a second hand, and reduplication processes includes deletion of signs, and a second hand hand a second hand hand hand hand hand hand ha
acquired a movement that led away from the signer. Some signs are also fingerspelled for different purposes. For example, C-L-O-W-N could be fingerspelled before the sign CLOWN for clarification purposes. Another example would be fingerspelled before the sign CLOWN for clarification purposes. For example, C-L-O-W-N could be fingerspelled before the sign CLOWN for clarification purposes.
however, if you were to indicate the 'when' of the sentence then it would be easier and more straightforward to fingerspell W-A-S.[Homework 9]Numeral IncorporationHere we look at how number handshape is
incorporated into the sign MONTH to create the new sign THREE-MONTHS. Pictures courtesy of lifeprint.com Signs that involve numeral incorporation. For example, to indicate a dollar
amount hold up hand, palm forward, in front of chest area in the handshape of the appropriate number and then turn the hand around in a quick motion so the palm is now facing the signer. [Homework 10] Brice, R., Connecting oral and written language through applied writing strategies. Intervention in School and Clinic, 2004. 40: p. 38-47. Carlisle
J. and C.A. Stone, Exploring the role of morphemes in word reading. Reading Research Quarterly, 2005. 40: p. 428-447. Carlisle, J., Morphological processes that influence learning to read, in Handbook of language and literacy: Development and disorders, C.A. Stone, et al., Editors. 2004, The Guilford Press: New York. Green, L., et al., Morphological
development in children's writing. Journal of Educational Psychology, 2003. 95: p. 752-761. Henry, M., Spelling instruction in the upper grades: The etymology/morphology connection. Perspectives, 2005. 31: p. 1-4. Moats
L.C., When older kids can't read. Educational Leadership, 2001. 58(6): p. 36-40. Nagy, W., V. Berninger, and R. Abbott, Contributions of morphology beyond phonological to literacy outcomes of upper elementary and middle-school students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 2006. 98: p. 134-147. Tolman, C., Working smarter, not harder: What
teachers of reading need to know and be able to teach. Perspectives, 2005. 21: p. 15-23. ASL is a rich language with its own structure, form and grammar that separates it from English. ASL Linguistics of ASL. We will discuss phonology,
morphology, syntax, semantics and the use of the ASL languages is conveniently divided into two complementary sections: morphology and syntax. The relationship between them, as generally stated, is as follows: morphology
accounts for the internal structure of words, and syntax describes how words are combined to form phrases, clauses, and sentences. There are many words in English that are fairly obviously analyzable into smaller grammatical units. For example, the word "unacceptability" can be divided into un-, accept, abil-, and -ity (abil- being a variant of -able).
Of these, at least three are minimal grammatical units, in the sense that they cannot be analyzed into yet smaller grammatical units—un-, abil-, and ity. The status of accept, from this point of view, is somewhat uncertain. Given the existence of such forms as accede and accuse, on the one hand, and of except, exceed, and excuse, on the other, one
might be inclined to analyze accept into ac- (which might subsequently be recognized as a variant of ad-) and -cept. The question is left open. Minimal grammatical units like un-, abil-, and -ity are what Bloomfield called morphemes; he defined them in terms of the "partial phonetic-semantic resemblance" holding within sets of words. For example,
 "unacceptable," "untrue," and "ungracious" are phonetically (or, phonologically) similar as far as the first syllable is concerned and are similar in meaning in that each of them is negative by contrast with a corresponding positive adjective ("acceptable," "true," "gracious"). This "partial phonetic-semantic resemblance" is accounted for by noting that
the words in question contain the same morpheme (namely, un-) and that this morpheme has a certain phonological form and a certain meaning. Bloomfield's definition of the morpheme in terms of "partial phonetic-semantic resemblance" was considerably modified and, eventually, abandoned entirely by some of his followers. Whereas Bloomfield
took the morpheme to be an actual segment of a word, others defined it as being a purely abstract unit, and the term morph was introduced to refer to the distinction between phoneme and phone) may be explained by means of an
example. If a morpheme in English is posited with the function of accounting for the grammatical difference between singular and plural nouns, it may be symbolized by enclosing the term plural nouns in English differ from the corresponding
singular forms in that they have an additional final segment. In the written -s or -es (e.g., "cat": "dogs"; "fishes"). The word segment written -s or -es are morphs. So also is the word segment written -s or -es are morphs. So also is the word segment written -s or -es are morphs.
in English that differ from the corresponding singular forms in other ways (e.g., "mouse": "mice"; "criteria"; and so on) or not at all (e.g., "this sheep": "these sheep"). Within the post-Bloomfieldian framework no very satisfactory account of the formation of these nouns could be given. But it was clear that they contained (in some sense)
the same morpheme as the more regular plurals. Morphs that are in complementary distribution and represent the same morpheme are said to be allomorphs of that morpheme are said to be allomorphs of that morpheme. For example, the regular plurals of English nouns are formed by adding one of three morpheme are said to be allomorphs of that morpheme. For example, the regular plurals of English nouns are formed by adding one of three morpheme are said to be allomorphs of that morpheme are said to be allomorphs of that morpheme.
both /s/ and /z/ are written -s and /iz/ is written -es). Their distribution is determined by the following principle: if the morph to which they are to be added ends in a "sibilant" sound (e.g., s, z, sh, ch), then the syllabic allomorphs are selected, the voiceless
allomorph /s/ with morphs ending in a voiceless consonant (e.g., flea-s /fli-z/, dog-s /dog-z/). These three allomorphs, it will be evident, are in complementary distribution, and the alternation between them is determined by the phonological structure of
the preceding morph. Thus the choice is phonologically conditioned. Very similar is the alternation between the three principal allomorphs of the preceding morph ends with /t/ or /d/, then the syllabic allomorph /id/ is selected (e.g., wait-ed /weit-id/).
Otherwise, if the preceding morph ends with a voiceless consonant, one of the nonsyllabic allomorph /t/ when the preceding morph ends with a voiceless consonant (e.g., pack-ed /pak-t/) and the voiceless allomorph /t/ when the preceding morph ends with a voiceless consonant (e.g., row-ed /rou-d/; tame-d
/teim-d/). This is another instance of phonological conditioning. Phonological conditioning may be contrasted with the principle that determines the selection of yet another allomorph of the past participles) is not determined by the phonological structure of the morphs
show and see. For each English word that is similar to "show" and "see" in this respect, it must be stated as a synchronically inexplicable fact that it selects the /n/ allomorph. This is called grammatical conditioning. There are various kinds of grammatical conditioning.
and the /id/, /d/, and /t/ allomorphs of the past participle is frequently referred to as morphophonemic. Some linguists have suggested that it should be accounted for not by setting up a single morph in an intermediate morphophonemic representation. Thus, the regular plural
morph might be said to be composed of the morphophoneme /Z/ and the most common past-participle morph of the morphophoneme /D/. General rules of morphophoneme /D/. General rules of morphophoneme /D/. General rules of morphophoneme /D/.
stratificational treatment and, on the other, the generative approach, though they differ considerably in other respects. An important concept in grammar and, more particularly, in morphology is that of free and bound forms. A bound form is one that cannot occur alone as a complete utterance (in some normal context of use). For example, -ing is
bound in this sense, whereas wait is not, nor is waiting. Any free form consisting entirely of two or more smaller free forms was said to be a phrase (e.g., "poor John" or "ran away"), and phrases were to be handled within
syntax. Any free form that was not a phrase was defined to be a word and to fall within the scope of morphology. One of the consequences of Bloomfield's definition of the word was that morphology became the study of constructions involving bound forms. The so-called isolating languages, which make no use of bound forms (e.g., Vietnamese), would
have no morphology. The principal division within morphology is between inflection and derivation (or word forms that are all grammatically distinct forms of single vocabulary items, whereas derivational constructions yield distinct vocabulary items. For
example, "sings," "singing," "sang," and "sung" are all inflectional forms of the wocabulary item tradition of sing"; but "singer," which is formed by the addition of -ing), is one of the forms of a different vocabulary item. When this rough distinctionally referred to as "the verb to sing"; but "singer," which is formed from "sing" by the addition of -ing), is one of the forms of a different vocabulary item.
between derivation and inflection is made more precise, problems occur. The principal consideration, undoubtedly, is that inflection is more closely integrated with and determined by syntax. But the various formal criteria that have been proposed to give effect to this general principal consideration, undoubtedly, is that inflection is more closely integrated with and determined by syntax. But the various formal criteria that have been proposed to give effect to this general principal consideration, undoubtedly, is that inflection is more closely integrated with and determined by syntax.
probably must be admitted that the distinction between derivation and inflection, though clear enough in most cases, is in the last resort somewhat arbitrary. Bloomfield and most other linguists have discussed morphological constructions in terms of processes. Of these, the most widespread throughout the languages of the world is affixation; i.e., the
attachment of an affix to a base. For example, the word "singing" can be described as resulting from the base, it is a prefix; if it is put after the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; if it is put after the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; if it is put after the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and if it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and it is inserted within the base, it is a prefix; and it is a prefix; and it 
recognized by linguists need not be mentioned here, but reference may be made to the fact that many of Bloomfield's followers from the mid-1940s were dissatisfied with the whole notion of morphological processes. Instead of saying that -ing was affixed to sing they preferred to say that sing and -ing co-occurred in a particular pattern or
arrangement, thereby avoiding the implication that sing is in some sense prior to or more basic than -ing. The distinction of morpheme and morph (and the morphology and syntax of a language in terms of "arrangements" of items rather than in terms of "processes"
operating upon more basic items. Nowadays, the opposition to "processes" is, except among the stratificationalists, almost extinct. It has proved to be cumbersome, if not impossible, to describe the relationship between certain linguists no
longer feel that this is in any way reprehensible. Mama says I always liked words; that I was talking before I even got to kindergarten. For some reason, I like making words fit together like puzzle pieces, and coming up with the perfect rhyme. excerpt from Isaiah Dunn Is My Hero by Kelly J
Baptist As a supplement to MGN's great answer on CxG in general, there's a closely related approach by Ray Jackendoff and Peter Culicover called "Parallel Architecture" that I think is relevant here. But there's a fourth possibility
both. Syntax is inherently tree-structured; that's presumably uncontroversial. And semantics is also inherently tree-structured: PAST(LIKE(John, PROPERTY-OF(Mary, smile))) doesn't make sense unless the argument to PAST is the whole liking, and one of the arguments to LIKE is Mary's smile. There are also both syntactic and semantic mechanisms
for coreference. And so on. The way PA handles this is to treat each constructure with dependent semantic structure with dependent syntax, but instead both a semantic structure with dependent syntax, but instead both a semantic structure with dependent syntax, but instead both a semantic structure with dependent syntax, but instead both a semantic structure with dependent syntax.
adds additional constraints).1 If you look at a fixed idiom constructure: [VP kickV [NP^ the bucket]] In other words, at the syntactic structure with a nonsimple syntactic structure with a nonsimple syntactic structure with a nonsimple syntactic structure.
complement, etc. aren't attached to any meaning; rather, the entire verb phrase is attached to a meaning (that's what the coindexed subscript represents). Or, for an idiom with a "variable" in it: cognitive structure: [NP theD motherN [PP ofP [NP allD [N' a1 -s]]]2 Here, both semantics and syntax are
compositional, but with different structures. The "a" inside the syntactic construction is linked to the entire syntactic subtree isn't linked to anything. So, which tree do you "build first" when producing or processing a sentence? Neither. As you
go along, you select constructions that have both syntax and semantics and assemble them into larger compositions that also have syntax and semantics, following construction is just an idiom with more, and
more complicated, variables. Of course often both syntax and semantics are perfectly compositional, and coindexed in the obvious way, like this construction: 3 cognitive structure: PROPERTY-OF1(x2, y3) syntactic structure: PROPERTY-OF1(x2, y3) syntactic structure: [NP [DP [NP a2] -'s] bN, 3]]1 ... but that's just a very common feature of many constructions, not actually a rule that applies
everywhere, as it would be be in a syntax-first or semantics structure (as traditional generative Semantics structure can be derived from the syntactic structure (as traditional generative grammar holds), or vice-versa (as Generative Semantics structure can be derived from the syntax-first or semantics structure can be derived from the syntax first or semantics structure can be derived from the syntax first or semantics structure can be derived from the syntax first or semantics.
Jackendoff and Culicover argue that can't be done. Their book Simpler Syntax is a reasonably approachable introduction to their argument. 1. In fact, there's also a phonological structure, and there's interfaces between all 6 pairs. For example, that's how you handle the altered prosody that goes with topicalization, or syntactic effects of phonological
weight in cases like heavy NP shift. 2. The "standard" way to draw things is with two trees, and arrows between nodes in the trees, because using "bracket trees" and indexes gets hard to follow as soon as you try to deal with large phrases or anything nonlocal like anaphora or coordination. But I'll try to keep things simple enough that we can stay
with brackets. 3. This is oversimplified; "Mary's" is probably a separable component at the semantic level as well as the syntactic level, and "-'s" probably has an inherent meaning that the "x's y" construction relies on rather than duplicating. And I've left out most of the semantic constraints on all of these trees—for example, as drawn, there's no
reason you couldn't use these constructions to build a phrase like "John's mother of all Marys kicked the bucket", which you obviously can't. But I think this is enough to show the idea.
```