More LPM & Bracketing Paradoxes
When Modules Disagree

Matthew A. Tucker

Linguistics 105: Morphology
Fall 2012

November 28, 2012

Announcements

Homeworks & Reading

- HW #8 due on Wednesday.
- Should have received HW #7 by now.
- I have old homeworks — see me after class.

Other

- Chris Kennedy (UChicago)'s two talks:
  1. 11am–noon, LCR: "A 'neo-Fregean' semantics for modified and unmodified numerals"
  2. 4pm–6pm, Stevenson Fireside: "Incremental Theme: 'Measuring out' is measuring change"

Announcements

Homeworks & Reading

- HW #8 due on Wednesday.
- Should have received HW #7 by now.
- I have old homeworks — see me after class.

Other

- Chris Kennedy (UChicago)'s two talks:
    1. *11am–noon, LCR:* "A 'neo-Fregean' semantics for modified and unmodified numerals"
    2. *4pm–6pm, Stevenson Fireside:* "Incremental Theme: 'Measuring out' is measuring change"

Announcements

Homeworks & Reading

- HW #8 due on Wednesday.
- Should have received HW #7 by now.
- I have old homeworks — see me after class.

Other

- Chris Kennedy (UChicago)'s two talks:
    1. 11am–noon, LCR: "A 'neo-Fregean' semantics for modified and unmodified numerals"
    2. 4pm–6pm, Stevenson Fireside: "Incremental Theme: 'Measuring out' is measuring change"

Announcements

Homeworks & Reading

- HW #8 due on Wednesday.
- Should have received HW #7 by now.
- I have old homeworks — see me after class.

Other

- Chris Kennedy (UChicago)'s two talks:
  1. *11am–noon, LCR*: "A 'neo-Fregean' semantics for modified and unmodified numerals"
  2. *4pm–6pm, Stevenson Fireside*: "Incremental Theme: 'Measuring out' is measuring change"

ANNOUNCEMENTS

HOMEWORKS & READING

- HW #8 due on Wednesday.
- Should have received HW #7 by now.
- I have old homeworks — see me after class.

OTHER

- Chris Kennedy (UChicago)'s two talks:
  1. *11am–noon, LCR*: "A 'neo-Fregean' semantics for modified and unmodified numerals"
  2. *4pm–6pm, Stevenson Fireside*: "Incremental Theme: 'Measuring out' is measuring change"

Announcements

Homeworks & Reading

- HW #8 due on Wednesday.
- Should have received HW #7 by now.
- I have old homeworks — see me after class.

Other

- Chris Kennedy (UChicago)'s two talks:
  1. *11am–noon, LCR*: "A 'neo-Fregean' semantics for modified and unmodified numerals"
  2. *4pm–6pm, Stevenson Fireside*: "Incremental Theme: 'Measuring out' is measuring change"

LPM Remainders

Morphological Rules in LPM

- *Desiderata* include:
  1. the class of bases/stems affected
  2. the affix attached/structure changed
  3. the location of the change
  4. the category of the result

Formalism for Morphological Rules

At Stratum s:
Do R in environment $[X \_\_ Z]_X$
Output: w

Morphological Rules in LPM

- *Desiderata* include:
  1. the class of bases/stems affected
  2. the affix attached/structure changed
  3. the location of the change
  4. the category of the result

Formalism for Morphological Rules

At Stratum s:
Do R in environment $[X \_\_ Z]_X$
Output: w

Morphological Rules in LPM

- *Desiderata* include:
  1. the class of bases/stems affected
  2. the affix attached/structure changed
  3. the location of the change
  4. the category of the result

Formalism for Morphological Rules

At Stratum s:
Do R in environment $[X \_\_ Z]_X$
Output: w

Morphological Rules in LPM

- *Desiderata* include:
    1. the class of bases/stems affected
    2. the affix attached/structure changed
    3. the location of the change
    4. the category of the result

Formalism for Morphological Rules

At Stratum s:
Do R in environment $[X \_\_ Z]_X$
Output: w

MORPHOLOGICAL RULES IN LPM

- *Desiderata* include:
  1. the class of bases/stems affected
  2. the affix attached/structure changed
  3. the location of the change
  4. the category of the result

FORMALISM FOR MORPHOLOGICAL RULES

At Stratum s:

Do R in environment $[X \_\_ Z]_X$

Output: w

Morphological Rules in LPM

- *Desiderata* include:
  1. the class of bases/stems affected
  2. the affix attached/structure changed
  3. the location of the change
  4. the category of the result

Formalism for Morphological Rules

At Stratum s:
Do R in environment $[X \_\_ Z]_X$
Output: w

Postlexical Phonology

- Post-lexical rules apply across word-boundaries:

  (1)   Amica Insurance → [ʔəmicɚ ɪnʃɛɹɪns]

- Lexical rules are cyclic (phonologically):

  (2)   ˈorigin → oˈriginal → origiˈnality

- Post-lexical rules are not structure-preserving:

  (3)   It's not → [tsnɑt]

- Post-lexical rules are automatic/obligatory:

  (4)   /kæt/ → [kæʔ]

POSTLEXICAL PHONOLOGY

- Post-lexical rules apply ACROSS WORD-BOUNDARIES:

(1)   Amica Insurance → [ʔəmicɚ ɪnʃɛɹɪns]

- Lexical rules are CYCLIC (phonologically):

(2)   ˈorigin → oˈriginal → origiˈnality

- Post-lexical rules are NOT STRUCTURE-PRESERVING:

(3)   It's not → [tsnɑt]

- Post-lexical rules are AUTOMATIC/OBLIGATORY:

(4)   /kæt/ → [kæʔ]

Postlexical Phonology

- Post-lexical rules apply ACROSS WORD-BOUNDARIES:

(1) Amica Insurance → [ʔəmicɚ ɪnʃɛɹɪns]

- Lexical rules are CYCLIC (phonologically):

(2) ʹorigin → oʹriginal → origiʹnality

- Post-lexical rules are NOT STRUCTURE-PRESERVING:

(3) It's not → [tsnɑt]

- Post-lexical rules are AUTOMATIC/OBLIGATORY:

(4) /kæt/ → [kæʔ]

POSTLEXICAL PHONOLOGY

- Post-lexical rules apply ACROSS WORD-BOUNDARIES:

(1) Amica Insurance → [ʔəmicɚ ɪnʃɛɹɪns]

- Lexical rules are CYCLIC (phonologically):

(2) *ˈorigin → oˈriginal → origiˈnality*

- Post-lexical rules are NOT STRUCTURE-PRESERVING:

(3) *It's not* → [tsnɑt]

- Post-lexical rules are AUTOMATIC/OBLIGATORY:

(4) /kæt/ → [kæʔ]

POSTLEXICAL PHONOLOGY

- Post-lexical rules apply ACROSS WORD-BOUNDARIES:

(1)   Amica Insurance → [ʔəmicɚ ɪnʃɛɹɪns]

- Lexical rules are CYCLIC (phonologically):

(2)   ˈorigin → oˈriginal → origiˈnality

- Post-lexical rules are NOT STRUCTURE-PRESERVING:

(3)   It's not → [tsnɑt]

- Post-lexical rules are AUTOMATIC/OBLIGATORY:

(4)   /kæt/ → [kæʔ]

Postlexical Phonology

- Post-lexical rules apply ACROSS WORD-BOUNDARIES:

  (1)   Amica Insurance → [ʔəmicɚ ɪnʃɛɹɪns]

- Lexical rules are CYCLIC (phonologically):

  (2)   ˈorigin → oˈriginal → origiˈnality

- Post-lexical rules are NOT STRUCTURE-PRESERVING:

  (3)   It's not → [tsnɑt]

- Post-lexical rules are AUTOMATIC/OBLIGATORY:

  (4)   /kæt/ → [kæʔ]

Postlexical Phonology

- Post-lexical rules apply ACROSS WORD-BOUNDARIES:

(1) Amica Insurance → [ʔəmicɚ ɪnʃɛɹɪns]

- Lexical rules are CYCLIC (phonologically):

(2) ˈorigin → oˈriginal → origiˈnality

- Post-lexical rules are NOT STRUCTURE-PRESERVING:

(3) It's not → [tsnɑt]

- Post-lexical rules are AUTOMATIC/OBLIGATORY:

(4) /kæt/ → [kæʔ]

Postlexical Phonology

- Post-lexical rules apply ACROSS WORD-BOUNDARIES:

(1) Amica Insurance → [ʔəmicɚ ɪnʃɛɹɪns]

- Lexical rules are CYCLIC (phonologically):

(2) ˈorigin → oˈriginal → origiˈnality

- Post-lexical rules are NOT STRUCTURE-PRESERVING:

(3) It's not → [tsnɑt]

- Post-lexical rules are AUTOMATIC/OBLIGATORY:

(4) /kæt/ → [kæʔ]

A Somewhat Complex Example

Arabic "Mediopassives"

- Arabic (Std.) has many derived verb forms with -t-:

(5) Form V/VI:

    a. kassara, 'break' →
       ta-kassara, 'be broken'

    b. sallama, 'hand over' →
       ta-sallama, 'to receive'

    c. ʕaanaqa, 'embrace' →
       ta-ʕaanaqa, 'embrace e. o.'

    d. faahama, 'understand' →
       ta-faahama, 'understand e. o.'

(6) Form VIII:

    a. jamaʕa, 'gather' →
       ɪj-**t**-amaʕa, 'meet w/ e.o.'

    b. rafaʕa, 'rise' →
       ɪr-**t**-afaʕa, 'be risen'

    c. zawwaja, 'pair' →
       ɪz-**d**-awwaja, 'be paired'

    d. ħafala, 'congregate' →
       ɪħ-**t**-afala, 'party'

Empirical Claim

These are actually the same affix, attached at different lexical strata.

Arabic "Mediopassives"

- Arabic (Std.) has many derived verb forms with *-t-*:

(5) Form V/VI:
  a. kassara, 'break' →
     ta-kassara, 'be broken'
  b. sallama, 'hand over' →
     ta-sallama, 'to receive'
  c. ʕaanaqa, 'embrace' →
     ta-ʕaanaqa, 'embrace e. o.'
  d. faahama, 'understand' →
     ta-faahama, 'understand e. o.'

(6) Form VIII:
  a. jamaʕa, 'gather' →
     ij-**t**-amaʕa, 'meet w/ e.o.'
  b. rafaʕa, 'rise' →
     ir-**t**-afaʕa, 'be risen'
  c. zawwaja, 'pair' →
     iz-**d**-awwaja, 'be paired'
  d. ħafala, 'congregate' →
     iħ-**t**-afala, 'party'

Empirical Claim

These are actually the same affix, attached at different lexical strata.

Arabic "Mediopassives"

- Arabic (Std.) has many derived verb forms with -*t*-:

(5) Form V/VI:
- a. kassara, 'break' →
  ta-kassara, 'be broken'
- b. sallama, 'hand over' →
  ta-sallama, 'to receive'
- c. ʕaanaqa, 'embrace' →
  ta-ʕaanaqa, 'embrace e. o.'
- d. faahama, 'understand' →
  ta-faahama, 'understand e. o.'

(6) Form VIII:
- a. jamaʕa, 'gather' →
  ɪj-**t**-amaʕa, 'meet w/ e.o.'
- b. rafaʕa, 'rise' →
  ɪr-**t**-afaʕa, 'be risen'
- c. zawwaja, 'pair' →
  ɪz-**d**-awwaja, 'be paired'
- d. ħafala, 'congregate' →
  ɪħ-**t**-afala, 'party'

Empirical Claim

These are actually the same affix, attached at different lexical strata.

Arabic "Mediopassives"

- Arabic (Std.) has many derived verb forms with -*t*-:

(5) Form V/VI:
  a. kassara, 'break' →
     ta-kassara, 'be broken'
  b. sallama, 'hand over' →
     ta-sallama, 'to receive'
  c. ʕaanaqa, 'embrace' →
     ta-ʕaanaqa, 'embrace e. o.'
  d. faahama, 'understand' →
     ta-faahama, 'understand e. o.'

(6) Form VIII:
  a. jamaʕa, 'gather' →
     ɪj-**t**-amaʕa, 'meet w/ e.o.'
  b. rafaʕa, 'rise' →
     ɪr-**t**-afaʕa, 'be risen'
  c. zawwaja, 'pair' →
     ɪz-**d**-awwaja, 'be paired'
  d. ħafala, 'congregate' →
     ɪħ-**t**-afala, 'party'

Empirical Claim

These are actually the same affix, attached at different lexical strata.

Phonological Considerations

- Form VIII is an infix; form V/VI is a prefix.

- Vowel Deletion: Form VIII deletes underlying /a/ of /-ta-/:

(7) raabat$^\Omega$a, 'line up' →
     taraabat$^\Omega$a, 'be lined up'

(8) rabat$^\Omega$a, 'bind' →
     ɪrtabat$^\Omega$a, 'be bound'

- Form VIII has root allomorphy for C_1 =/w/:

(9) $\sqrt{ws\Omega}$: ɪttasaʕa, 'expand'

(10) $\sqrt{whm}$: ɪttahama, 'accuse'

- Form VIII has assimilation of /t/:

(11) a. $\sqrt{dɣm}$: ɪddaɣama, 'assimilate'
      b. $\sqrt{\theta\Omega r}$: ɪθθaʔara, 'flourish'

(12) a. $\sqrt{dxl}$: tadaxxala, 'meddle'
      b. $\sqrt{\theta ql}$: taθaaqala, 'be heavy'

⇒ /-t-/ is /ta-/ attached at an earlier level.

Phonological Considerations

- Form VIII is an infix; form V/VI is a prefix.
- Vowel Deletion: Form VIII deletes underlying /a/ of /-ta-/:

(7) raabatˤa, 'line up' →
    taraabatˤa, 'be lined up'

(8) rabatˤa, 'bind' →
    ɪrtabatˤa, 'be bound'

- Form VIII has root allomorphy for C_1 =/w/:

(9) $\sqrt{wsʕ}$: ɪttasaʕa, 'expand'

(10) $\sqrt{whm}$: ɪttahama, 'accuse'

- Form VIII has assimilation of /t/:

(11) a. $\sqrt{dɣm}$: ɪddaɣama, 'assimilate'
     b. $\sqrt{θʔr}$: ɪθθaʔara, 'flourish'

(12) a. $\sqrt{dxl}$: tadaxxala, 'meddle'
     b. $\sqrt{θql}$: taθaaqala, 'be heavy'

⇒ /-t-/ is /ta-/ attached at an earlier level.

PHONOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Form VIII is an infix; form V/VI is a prefix.
- Vowel Deletion: Form VIII deletes underlying /a/ of /-ta-/:

(7) raabatˤa, 'line up' →
taraabatˤa, 'be lined up'

(8) rabatˤa, 'bind' →
ɪrtabatˤa, 'be bound'

- Form VIII has root allomorphy for C_1 =/w/:

(9) $\sqrt{wsˤ}$: ɪttasaˤa, 'expand'

(10) $\sqrt{whm}$: ɪttahama, 'accuse'

- Form VIII has assimilation of /t/:

(11) a. $\sqrt{dɣm}$: ɪddaɣama, 'assimilate'
b. $\sqrt{θʔr}$: ɪθθaʔara, 'flourish'

(12) a. $\sqrt{dxl}$: tadaxxala, 'meddle'
b. $\sqrt{θql}$: taθaaqala, 'be heavy'

⇒ /-t-/ is /ta-/ attached at an earlier level.

Phonological Considerations

- Form VIII is an infix; form V/VI is a prefix.
- Vowel Deletion: Form VIII deletes underlying /a/ of /-ta-/:

(7) raabatˤa, 'line up' →
    taraabatˤa, 'be lined up'

(8) rabatˤa, 'bind' →
    ɪrtabatˤa, 'be bound'

- Form VIII has root allomorphy for C_1 =/w/:

(9) $\sqrt{wsʕ}$: ɪttasaʕa, 'expand'

(10) $\sqrt{whm}$: ɪttahama, 'accuse'

- Form VIII has assimilation of /t/:

(11) a. $\sqrt{dɣm}$: ɪddaɣama, 'assimilate'
     b. $\sqrt{θʔr}$: ɪθθaʔara, 'flourish'

(12) a. $\sqrt{dxl}$: tadaxxala, 'meddle'
     b. $\sqrt{θql}$: taθaaqala, 'be heavy'

⇒ /-t-/ is /ta-/ attached at an earlier level.

PHONOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Form VIII is an infix; form V/VI is a prefix.

- Vowel Deletion: Form VIII deletes underlying /a/ of /-ta-/:

(7) raabatˤa, 'line up' →
     taraabatˤa, 'be lined up'

(8) rabatˤa, 'bind' →
     ɪrtabatˤa, 'be bound'

- Form VIII has root allomorphy for C_1 =/w/:

(9) $\sqrt{\text{wsˤ}}$: ɪttasˤaʕa, 'expand'

(10) $\sqrt{\text{whm}}$: ɪttahama, 'accuse'

- Form VIII has assimilation of /t/:

(11) a. $\sqrt{\text{dɣm}}$: ɪddaɣama, 'assimilate'
      b. $\sqrt{\text{θʔr}}$: ɪθθaʔara, 'flourish'

(12) a. $\sqrt{\text{dxl}}$: tadaxxala, 'meddle'
      b. $\sqrt{\text{θql}}$: taθaaqala, 'be heavy'

⟹ /-t-/ is /ta-/ attached at an earlier level.

PHONOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Form VIII is an infix; form V/VI is a prefix.
- Vowel Deletion: Form VIII deletes underlying /a/ of /-ta-/:

(7) raabatˤa, 'line up' →
     taraabatˤa, 'be lined up'

(8) rabatˤa, 'bind' →
     ɪrtabatˤa, 'be bound'

- Form VIII has root allomorphy for C_1 =/w/:

(9) $\sqrt{\text{wsʕ}}$: ɪttasaʕa, 'expand'

(10) $\sqrt{\text{whm}}$: ɪttahama, 'accuse'

- Form VIII has assimilation of /t/:

(11) a. $\sqrt{\text{dɣm}}$: ɪddaɣama, 'assimilate'
      b. $\sqrt{\text{θʔr}}$: ɪθθaʔara, 'flourish'

(12) a. $\sqrt{\text{dxl}}$: tadaxxala, 'meddle'
      b. $\sqrt{\text{θql}}$: taθaaqala, 'be heavy'

⇒ /-t-/ is /ta-/ attached at an earlier level.

Phonological Considerations

- Form VIII is an infix; form V/VI is a prefix.
- Vowel Deletion: Form VIII deletes underlying /a/ of /-ta-/:

(7) raabatˤa, 'line up' →
     taraabatˤa, 'be lined up'

(8) rabatˤa, 'bind' →
     ɪrtabatˤa, 'be bound'

- Form VIII has root allomorphy for C_1 =/w/:

(9) $\sqrt{\text{wsʕ}}$: ɪttasaʕa, 'expand'

(10) $\sqrt{\text{whm}}$: ɪttahama, 'accuse'

- Form VIII has assimilation of /t/:

(11) a. $\sqrt{\text{dɣm}}$: ɪddaɣama, 'assimilate'
      b. $\sqrt{\text{θʔr}}$: ɪθθaʔara, 'flourish'

(12) a. $\sqrt{\text{dxl}}$: tadaxxala, 'meddle'
      b. $\sqrt{\text{θql}}$: taθaaqala, 'be heavy'

⇒ /-t-/ is /ta-/ attached at an earlier level.

Phonological Considerations

- Form VIII is an infix; form V/VI is a prefix.
- Vowel Deletion: Form VIII deletes underlying /a/ of /-ta-/:

(7) raabatˤa, 'line up' →
     taraabatˤa, 'be lined up'

(8) rabatˤa, 'bind' →
     ɪrtabatˤa, 'be bound'

- Form VIII has root allomorphy for C_1 =/w/:

(9) $\sqrt{\text{wsʕ}}$: ɪttasaʕa, 'expand'

(10) $\sqrt{\text{whm}}$: ɪttahama, 'accuse'

- Form VIII has assimilation of /t/:

(11) a. $\sqrt{\text{dɣm}}$: ɪddaɣama, 'assimilate'
      b. $\sqrt{\text{θʔr}}$: ɪθθaʔara, 'flourish'

(12) a. $\sqrt{\text{dxl}}$: tadaxxala, 'meddle'
      b. $\sqrt{\text{θql}}$: taθaaqala, 'be heavy'

⇒ /-t-/ is /ta-/ attached at an earlier level.

Phonological Considerations

- Form VIII is an infix; form V/VI is a prefix.
- Vowel Deletion: Form VIII deletes underlying /a/ of /-ta-/:

(7) raabatˤa, 'line up' →
     taraabatˤa, 'be lined up'

(8) rabatˤa, 'bind' →
     ɪrtabatˤa, 'be bound'

- Form VIII has root allomorphy for C_1 =/w/:

(9) $\sqrt{\text{wsʕ}}$: ɪttasaʕa, 'expand'

(10) $\sqrt{\text{whm}}$: ɪttahama, 'accuse'

- Form VIII has assimilation of /t/:

(11) a. $\sqrt{\text{dɣm}}$: ɪddaɣama, 'assimilate'
      b. $\sqrt{\text{θʔr}}$: ɪθθaʔara, 'flourish'

(12) a. $\sqrt{\text{dxl}}$: tadaxxala, 'meddle'
      b. $\sqrt{\text{θql}}$: taθaaqala, 'be heavy'

⇒ /-t-/ is /ta-/ attached at an earlier level.

Phonological Considerations

- Form VIII is an infix; form V/VI is a prefix.
- Vowel Deletion: Form VIII deletes underlying /a/ of /-ta-/:

(7) raabatˤa, 'line up' →
    taraabatˤa, 'be lined up'

(8) rabatˤa, 'bind' →
    ɪrtabatˤa, 'be bound'

- Form VIII has root allomorphy for C_1 =/w/:

(9) $\sqrt{\text{wsʕ}}$: ɪttasaʕa, 'expand'

(10) $\sqrt{\text{whm}}$: ɪttahama, 'accuse'

- Form VIII has assimilation of /t/:

(11) a. $\sqrt{\text{dɣm}}$: ɪddaɣama, 'assimilate'
     b. $\sqrt{\text{θʔr}}$: ɪθθaʔara, 'flourish'

(12) a. $\sqrt{\text{dxl}}$: tadaxxala, 'meddle'
     b. $\sqrt{\text{θql}}$: taθaaqala, 'be heavy'

⇒ /-t-/ is /ta-/ attached at an earlier level.

Phonological Considerations

- Form VIII is an infix; form V/VI is a prefix.
- Vowel Deletion: Form VIII deletes underlying /a/ of /-ta-/:

(7) raabatˤa, 'line up' →
     taraabatˤa, 'be lined up'

(8) rabatˤa, 'bind' →
     ɪrtabatˤa, 'be bound'

- Form VIII has root allomorphy for C_1 =/w/:

(9) $\sqrt{\text{wsʕ}}$: ɪttasaʕa, 'expand'

(10) $\sqrt{\text{whm}}$: ɪttahama, 'accuse'

- Form VIII has assimilation of /t/:

(11) a. $\sqrt{\text{dɣm}}$: ɪddaɣama, 'assimilate'
      b. $\sqrt{\text{θʔr}}$: ɪθθaʔara, 'flourish'

(12) a. $\sqrt{\text{dxl}}$: tadaxxala, 'meddle'
      b. $\sqrt{\text{θql}}$: taθaaqala, 'be heavy'

⇒ /-t-/ is /ta-/ attached at an earlier level.

Semantics and Productivity Considerations

- Form VIII doesn't always have a free base form; V/VI nearly always do:

(13) a. ɪrtaʕasˤa, 'writhe'   b. *raʕasˤa

- Form VIII can have pretty bizzare semantics.

(14) a. xalaa, 'be empty'   (15) a. kataba, 'write'
      b. ɪxtalaa, 'retire'   b. ɪktataba, 'subscribe'

Conclusion

Form VIII is formed at Level 1 and Form V/VI at Level 2.

- There are even analogous forms w/ /ta-/ for $\sqrt{CCCC}$ roots.

Semantics and Productivity Considerations

- Form VIII doesn't always have a free base form; V/VI nearly always do:

(13)   a. ɪrtaʕasˤa, 'writhe'   b. *raʕasˤa

- Form VIII can have pretty bizzare semantics.

(14)   a. xalaa, 'be empty'   (15)   a. kataba, 'write'
       b. ɪxtalaa, 'retire'   b. ɪktataba, 'subscribe'

Conclusion

Form VIII is formed at Level 1 and Form V/VI at Level 2.

- There are even analogous forms w/ /ta-/ for $\sqrt{CCCC}$ roots.

SEMANTICS AND PRODUCTIVITY CONSIDERATIONS

- Form VIII doesn't always have a free base form; V/VI nearly always do:

(13) a. ɪrtaʕasˤa, 'writhe'   b. *raʕasˤa

- Form VIII can have pretty bizzare semantics.

(14) a. xalaa, 'be empty'   (15) a. kataba, 'write'
      b. ɪxtalaa, 'retire'   b. ɪktataba, 'subscribe'

CONCLUSION

Form VIII is formed at Level 1 and Form V/VI at Level 2.

- There are even analogous forms w/ /ta-/ for $\sqrt{CCCC}$ roots.

Semantics and Productivity Considerations

- Form VIII doesn't always have a free base form; V/VI nearly always do:

(13) a. ɪrtaʕasˤˤa, 'writhe'   b. *raʕasˤa

- Form VIII can have pretty bizzare semantics.

(14) a. xalaa, 'be empty'   (15) a. kataba, 'write'
      b. ɪxtalaa, 'retire'   b. ɪktataba, 'subscribe'

Conclusion

Form VIII is formed at Level 1 and Form V/VI at Level 2.

- There are even analogous forms w/ /ta-/ for $\sqrt{CCCC}$ roots.

Semantics and Productivity Considerations

- Form VIII doesn't always have a free base form; V/VI nearly always do:

(13) a. ɪrtaʕasˤˤa, 'writhe'   b. *raʕasˤˤa

- Form VIII can have pretty bizzare semantics.

(14) a. xalaa, 'be empty'   (15) a. kataba, 'write'
      b. ɪxtalaa, 'retire'   b. ɪktataba, 'subscribe'

Conclusion

Form VIII is formed at Level 1 and Form V/VI at Level 2.

- There are even analogous forms w/ /ta-/ for $\sqrt{CCCC}$ roots.

Semantics and Productivity Considerations

- Form VIII doesn't always have a free base form; V/VI nearly always do:

(13) a. ɪrtaʕasˤa, 'writhe' b. *raʕasˤa

- Form VIII can have pretty bizzare semantics.

(14) a. xalaa, 'be empty' (15) a. kataba, 'write'
      b. ɪxtalaa, 'retire'   b. ɪktataba, 'subscribe'

Conclusion

Form VIII is formed at Level 1 and Form V/VI at Level 2.

- There are even analogous forms w/ /ta-/ for $\sqrt{CCCC}$ roots.

Semantics and Productivity Considerations

- Form VIII doesn't always have a free base form; V/VI nearly always do:

(13) a. ɪrtaʕasˤa, 'writhe'   b. *raʕasˤa

- Form VIII can have pretty bizzare semantics.

(14) a. xalaa, 'be empty'   (15) a. kataba, 'write'
      b. ɪxtalaa, 'retire'   b. ɪktataba, 'subscribe'

Conclusion

Form VIII is formed at Level 1 and Form V/VI at Level 2.

- There are even analogous forms w/ /ta-/ for $\sqrt{CCCC}$ roots.

Semantics and Productivity Considerations

- Form VIII doesn't always have a free base form; V/VI nearly always do:

(13) a. ɪrtaʕasˤa, 'writhe'   b. *raʕasˤa

- Form VIII can have pretty bizzare semantics.

(14) a. xalaa, 'be empty'   (15) a. kataba, 'write'
      b. ɪxtalaa, 'retire'   b. ɪktataba, 'subscribe'

Conclusion

Form VIII is formed at Level 1 and Form V/VI at Level 2.

- There are even analogous forms w/ /ta-/ for $\sqrt{CCCC}$ roots.

Issues

1 LPM Remainders

2 A Somewhat Complex Example

3 Issues

4 Bracketing Paradoxes

AFFIX STRATA IDENTITY ISSUES

- Some affixes seem to need to be in both strata:

(16) a. repair   (17) a. Catholic → Catholicize
      b. redo   b. Wisconsin → Wisconsinize

- There are instances of Level 1 attachment to outputs of Level 2:

(18) [[[Big play]-able]-ity]   (Troy Aikman, 11/25/12)

- BRACKETING PARADOXES are big trouble (next section).

- Some rules are hard to place — English voicing assimilation:

(19) fi[fθ]   (20) ʔat'[s k]oming

AFFIX STRATA IDENTITY ISSUES

- Some affixes seem to need to be in both strata:

(16)   a. repair
       b. redo

(17)   a. Catholic → Catholicize
       b. Wisconsin → Wisconsinize

- There are instances of Level 1 attachment to outputs of Level 2:

(18)   [[[Big play]-able]-ity]   (Troy Aikman, 11/25/12)

- BRACKETING PARADOXES are big trouble (next section).

- Some rules are hard to place — English voicing assimilation:

(19)   fi[fθ]

(20)   ʔatʼ[s k]oming

Affix Strata Identity Issues

- Some affixes seem to need to be in both strata:

(16)   a.   repair   (17)   a.   Catholic → Catholicize

         b.   redo   b.   Wisconsin → Wisconsinize

- There are instances of Level 1 attachment to outputs of Level 2:

(18)   [[[Big play]-able]-ity]   (Troy Aikman, 11/25/12)

- BRACKETING PARADOXES are big trouble (next section).

- Some rules are hard to place — English voicing assimilation:

(19)   fi[fθ]   (20)   ʔatˈ[s k]oming

Affix Strata Identity Issues

- Some affixes seem to need to be in both strata:

(16) a. repair
      b. redo

(17) a. Catholic → Catholicize
      b. Wisconsin → Wisconsinize

- There are instances of Level 1 attachment to outputs of Level 2:

(18) [[[Big play]-able]-ity]   (Troy Aikman, 11/25/12)

- Bracketing Paradoxes are big trouble (next section).
- Some rules are hard to place — English voicing assimilation:

(19) fi[fθ]   (20) ʔat'[s k]oming

AFFIX STRATA IDENTITY ISSUES

- Some affixes seem to need to be in both strata:

(16) a. repair
      b. redo

(17) a. Catholic → Catholicize
      b. Wisconsin → Wisconsinize

- There are instances of Level 1 attachment to outputs of Level 2:

(18) [[[Big play]-able]-ity]   (Troy Aikman, 11/25/12)

- BRACKETING PARADOXES are big trouble (next section).

- Some rules are hard to place — English voicing assimilation:

(19) fi[fθ]

(20) ʔatʼ[s k]oming

Affix Strata Identity Issues

- Some affixes seem to need to be in both strata:

(16) a. repair
      b. redo

(17) a. Catholic → Catholicize
      b. Wisconsin → Wisconsinize

- There are instances of Level 1 attachment to outputs of Level 2:

(18) [[[Big play]-able]-ity]   (Troy Aikman, 11/25/12)

- Bracketing Paradoxes are big trouble (next section).

- Some rules are hard to place — English voicing assimilation:

(19) fi[fθ]   (20) ʔat'[s k]oming

Affix Strata Identity Issues

- Some affixes seem to need to be in both strata:

(16) a. repair

  b. redo

(17) a. Catholic → Catholicize

  b. Wisconsin → Wisconsinize

- There are instances of Level 1 attachment to outputs of Level 2:

(18) [[[Big play]-able]-ity] (Troy Aikman, 11/25/12)

- BRACKETING PARADOXES are big trouble (next section).
- Some rules are hard to place — English voicing assimilation:

(19) fi[fθ] (20) ʔat'[s k]oming

AFFIX STRATA IDENTITY ISSUES

- Some affixes seem to need to be in both strata:

(16) a. repair
      b. redo

(17) a. Catholic → Catholicize
      b. Wisconsin → Wisconsinize

- There are instances of Level 1 attachment to outputs of Level 2:

(18) [[[Big play]-able]-ity]   (Troy Aikman, 11/25/12)

- BRACKETING PARADOXES are big trouble (next section).
- Some rules are hard to place — English voicing assimilation:

(19) fi[fθ]   (20)   ʔat'[s k]oming

Affix Strata Identity Issues

- Some affixes seem to need to be in both strata:

(16) a. repair
      b. redo

(17) a. Catholic → Catholicize
      b. Wisconsin → Wisconsinize

- There are instances of Level 1 attachment to outputs of Level 2:

(18) [[[Big play]-able]-ity]   (Troy Aikman, 11/25/12)

- Bracketing Paradoxes are big trouble (next section).
- Some rules are hard to place — English voicing assimilation:

(19) fi[fθ]

(20) ʔat'[s k]oming

How Many Strata, Again?

- Multiple affixes seem to require stratal iteration:

(21)   *origin → original → originality*

- Halle and Mohanan (1985) propose *five* strata:
  1. Irregular derivation and irregular inflection
  2. Regular derivation
  3. Compounding
  4. Regular inflection

- Even Kiparsky himself changed his mind:
  - 1983: Two strata (the theory used today)
  - 1982b: Three strata:

HOW MANY STRATA, AGAIN?

- Multiple affixes seem to require stratal iteration:

(21)   *origin → original → originality*

- Halle and Mohanan (1985) propose *five* strata:
  1. Irregular derivation and irregular inflection
  2. Regular derivation
  3. Compounding
  4. Regular inflection
- Even Kiparsky himself changed his mind:
  - 1983: Two strata (the theory used today)
  - 1982b: Three strata:

HOW MANY STRATA, AGAIN?

- Multiple affixes seem to require stratal iteration:

(21) *origin → original → originality*

- Halle and Mohanan (1985) propose *five* strata:
  1. Irregular derivation and irregular inflection
  2. Regular derivation
  3. Compounding
  4. Regular inflection
- Even Kiparsky himself changed his mind:
  - 1983: Two strata (the theory used today)
  - 1982b: Three strata:
    - First two strata fused in the above
    - Compound stratum merges with regular inflection
    - Regular inflection

HOW MANY STRATA, AGAIN?

- Multiple affixes seem to require stratal iteration:

(21)   *origin → original → originality*

- Halle and Mohanan (1985) propose *five* strata:
  1. Irregular derivation and irregular inflection
  2. Regular derivation
  3. Compounding
  4. Regular inflection
- Even Kiparsky himself changed his mind:
  - 1983: Two strata (the theory used today)
  - 1982b: Three strata:
    - First, one stratum used in the above
    - Second, some irregular morphology
    - Regular inflection

HOW MANY STRATA, AGAIN?

- Multiple affixes seem to require stratal iteration:

(21)   *origin → original → originality*

- Halle and Mohanan (1985) propose *five* strata:
  1. Irregular derivation and irregular inflection
  2. Regular derivation
  3. Compounding
  4. Regular inflection
- Even Kiparsky himself changed his mind:
  - 1983: Two strata (the theory used today)
  - 1982b: Three strata:

How Many Strata, Again?

- Multiple affixes seem to require stratal iteration:

(21)   *origin → original → originality*

- Halle and Mohanan (1985) propose *five* strata:
  1. Irregular derivation and irregular inflection
  2. Regular derivation
  3. Compounding
  4. Regular inflection
- Even Kiparsky himself changed his mind:
  - 1983: Two strata (the theory used today)
  - 1982b: Three strata:

HOW MANY STRATA, AGAIN?

- Multiple affixes seem to require stratal iteration:

(21)   *origin → original → originality*

- Halle and Mohanan (1985) propose *five* strata:
  1. Irregular derivation and irregular inflection
  2. Regular derivation
  3. Compounding
  4. Regular inflection
- Even Kiparsky himself changed his mind:
  - 1983: Two strata (the theory used today)
  - 1982b: Three strata:
    - First non-inflectional in the class
    - Second non-inflectional class-changing
    - Regular inflection

HOW MANY STRATA, AGAIN?

- Multiple affixes seem to require stratal iteration:

(21)   *origin → original → originality*

- Halle and Mohanan (1985) propose *five* strata:
  1. Irregular derivation and irregular inflection
  2. Regular derivation
  3. Compounding
  4. Regular inflection
- Even Kiparsky himself changed his mind:
  - 1983: Two strata (the theory used today)
  - 1982b: Three strata:
    1. Irregular inflection and derivation
    2. Regular derivation and compounding
    3. Regular inflection

HOW MANY STRATA, AGAIN?

- Multiple affixes seem to require stratal iteration:

(21)   *origin → original → originality*

- Halle and Mohanan (1985) propose *five* strata:
  1. Irregular derivation and irregular inflection
  2. Regular derivation
  3. Compounding
  4. Regular inflection
- Even Kiparsky himself changed his mind:
  - 1983: Two strata (the theory used today)
  - 1982b: Three strata:
    1. Irregular inflection and derivation
    2. Regular derivation and compounding
    3. Regular inflection

HOW MANY STRATA, AGAIN?

- Multiple affixes seem to require stratal iteration:

(21)   *origin → original → originality*

- Halle and Mohanan (1985) propose *five* strata:
  1. Irregular derivation and irregular inflection
  2. Regular derivation
  3. Compounding
  4. Regular inflection
- Even Kiparsky himself changed his mind:
  - 1983: Two strata (the theory used today)
  - 1982b: Three strata:
    1. Irregular inflection and derivation
    2. Regular derivation and compounding
    3. Regular inflection

HOW MANY STRATA, AGAIN?

- Multiple affixes seem to require stratal iteration:

(21) *origin → original → originality*

- Halle and Mohanan (1985) propose *five* strata:
  1. Irregular derivation and irregular inflection
  2. Regular derivation
  3. Compounding
  4. Regular inflection
- Even Kiparsky himself changed his mind:
  - 1983: Two strata (the theory used today)
  - 1982b: Three strata:
    1. Irregular inflection and derivation
    2. Regular derivation and compounding
    3. Regular inflection

HOW MANY STRATA, AGAIN?

- Multiple affixes seem to require stratal iteration:

(21)   *origin → original → originality*

- Halle and Mohanan (1985) propose *five* strata:
  1. Irregular derivation and irregular inflection
  2. Regular derivation
  3. Compounding
  4. Regular inflection
- Even Kiparsky himself changed his mind:
  - 1983: Two strata (the theory used today)
  - 1982b: Three strata:
    1. Irregular inflection and derivation
    2. Regular derivation and compounding
    3. Regular inflection

HOW MANY STRATA, AGAIN?

- Multiple affixes seem to require stratal iteration:

(21)   *origin → original → originality*

- Halle and Mohanan (1985) propose *five* strata:
  1. Irregular derivation and irregular inflection
  2. Regular derivation
  3. Compounding
  4. Regular inflection
- Even Kiparsky himself changed his mind:
  - 1983: Two strata (the theory used today)
  - 1982b: Three strata:
    1. Irregular inflection and derivation
    2. Regular derivation and compounding
    3. Regular inflection

Bracketing Paradoxes

BRACKETING PRELIMINARIES

BRACKETING PARADOX

A theoretical contradiction derived from level ordering in the lexicon.

- Logically, two different kinds:
  1. Level 1 attachment needs info only available at Level 2.
  2. Level 2 attachment needs info only available at Level 1.

- (2) is possible because internal structure at one level isn't available to subsequent levels by. . .

BRACKET ERASURE CONVENTION

Between lexical levels, all brackets are erased.

- **NB**: We *need* the BEC — it is what derives (non-)neutrality.

BRACKETING PRELIMINARIES

BRACKETING PARADOX

A theoretical contradiction derived from level ordering in the lexicon.

- Logically, two different kinds:
  1. Level 1 attachment needs info only available at Level 2.
  2. Level 2 attachment needs info only available at Level 1.
- (2) is possible because internal structure at one level isn't available to subsequent levels by. . .

BRACKET ERASURE CONVENTION

Between lexical levels, all brackets are erased.

- **NB**: We *need* the BEC — it is what derives (non-)neutrality.

BRACKETING PRELIMINARIES

BRACKETING PARADOX

A theoretical contradiction derived from level ordering in the lexicon.

- Logically, two different kinds:
  1. Level 1 attachment needs info only available at Level 2.
  2. Level 2 attachment needs info only available at Level 1.
- (2) is possible because internal structure at one level isn't available to subsequent levels by. . .

BRACKET ERASURE CONVENTION

Between lexical levels, all brackets are erased.

- **NB**: We *need* the BEC — it is what derives (non-)neutrality.

BRACKETING PRELIMINARIES

BRACKETING PARADOX
A theoretical contradiction derived from level ordering in the lexicon.

- Logically, two different kinds:
  1. Level 1 attachment needs info only available at Level 2.
  2. Level 2 attachment needs info only available at Level 1.
- (2) is possible because internal structure at one level isn't available to subsequent levels by. . .

BRACKET ERASURE CONVENTION
Between lexical levels, all brackets are erased.

- **NB**: We *need* the BEC — it is what derives (non-)neutrality.

BRACKETING PRELIMINARIES

BRACKETING PARADOX

A theoretical contradiction derived from level ordering in the lexicon.

- Logically, two different kinds:
  1. Level 1 attachment needs info only available at Level 2.
  2. Level 2 attachment needs info only available at Level 1.
- (2) is possible because internal structure at one level isn't available to subsequent levels by. . .

BRACKET ERASURE CONVENTION

Between lexical levels, all brackets are erased.

- **NB**: We *need* the BEC — it is what derives (non-)neutrality.

BRACKETING PRELIMINARIES

BRACKETING PARADOX

A theoretical contradiction derived from level ordering in the lexicon.

- Logically, two different kinds:
  1. Level 1 attachment needs info only available at Level 2.
  2. Level 2 attachment needs info only available at Level 1.
- (2) is possible because internal structure at one level isn't available to subsequent levels by. . .

BRACKET ERASURE CONVENTION

Between lexical levels, all brackets are erased.

- **NB**: We *need* the BEC — it is what derives (non-)neutrality.

BRACKETING PRELIMINARIES

BRACKETING PARADOX

A theoretical contradiction derived from level ordering in the lexicon.

- Logically, two different kinds:
  1. Level 1 attachment needs info only available at Level 2.
  2. Level 2 attachment needs info only available at Level 1.
- (2) is possible because internal structure at one level isn't available to subsequent levels by. . .

BRACKET ERASURE CONVENTION

Between lexical levels, all brackets are erased.

- **NB**: We *need* the BEC — it is what derives (non-)neutrality.

TYPE 1: LACK OF MORPHOSYNTACTIC INFO IN INPUT

- If we cannot see brackets internal to a word then we cannot know its derivational history.
- *E.g.*, Level 2 sees [topicality] not [[[topic]al]ity].
- But this can lead to paradoxes when category selection restrictions are not met at the right level.
- Deadjectival /un-/ doesn't attach to nouns (*untree*, *unclass*, *etc.*).
- /-ity/ is a Level 1 affix.
- These words are then predicted to be ungrammatical:

(22)   a. un-grammatical-ity   c. un-interruptabil-ity
        b. un-acceptabil-ity   d. un-governabil-ity

- *Predicted Bracketing*: *[$_N$un[$_N$grammaticality]]
- *Actual Bracketing*: [$_N$[$_A$ungrammatical]ity]

TYPE 1: LACK OF MORPHOSYNTACTIC INFO IN INPUT

- If we cannot see brackets internal to a word then we cannot know its derivational history.

- *E.g.*, Level 2 sees [topicality] not [[[topic]al]ity].

- But this can lead to paradoxes when category selection restrictions are not met at the right level.

- Deadjectival /un-/ doesn't attach to nouns (*untree*, *unclass*, *etc.*).

- /-ity/ is a Level 1 affix.

- These words are then predicted to be ungrammatical:

(22)   a. un-grammatical-ity   c. un-interruptabil-ity
       b. un-acceptabil-ity   d. un-governabil-ity

- *Predicted Bracketing*: *[$_N$un[$_N$grammaticality]]

- *Actual Bracketing*: [$_N$[$_A$ungrammatical]ity]

TYPE 1: LACK OF MORPHOSYNTACTIC INFO IN INPUT

- If we cannot see brackets internal to a word then we cannot know its derivational history.
- *E.g.*, Level 2 sees [topicality] not [[[topic]al]ity].
- But this can lead to paradoxes when category selection restrictions are not met at the right level.
- Deadjectival /un-/ doesn't attach to nouns (*untree*, *unclass*, *etc.*).
- /-ity/ is a Level 1 affix.
- These words are then predicted to be ungrammatical:

(22) a. un-grammatical-ity
      b. un-acceptabil-ity
      c. un-interruptabil-ity
      d. un-governabil-ity

- *Predicted Bracketing*: *[$_N$un[$_N$grammaticality]]
- *Actual Bracketing*: [$_N$[$_A$ungrammatical]ity]

TYPE 1: LACK OF MORPHOSYNTACTIC INFO IN INPUT

- If we cannot see brackets internal to a word then we cannot know its derivational history.
- *E.g.*, Level 2 sees [topicality] not [[[topic]al]ity].
- But this can lead to paradoxes when category selection restrictions are not met at the right level.
- Deadjectival /un-/ doesn't attach to nouns (*untree*, *unclass*, *etc.*).
- /-ity/ is a Level 1 affix.
- These words are then predicted to be ungrammatical:

(22)   a. un-grammatical-ity   c. un-interruptabil-ity
       b. un-acceptabil-ity   d. un-governabil-ity

- *Predicted Bracketing*: *[$_N$un[$_N$grammaticality]]
- *Actual Bracketing*: [$_N$[$_A$ungrammatical]ity]

TYPE 1: LACK OF MORPHOSYNTACTIC INFO IN INPUT

- If we cannot see brackets internal to a word then we cannot know its derivational history.
- *E.g.*, Level 2 sees [topicality] not [[[topic]al]ity].
- But this can lead to paradoxes when category selection restrictions are not met at the right level.
- Deadjectival /un-/ doesn't attach to nouns (*untree, *unclass, *etc*.).
- /-ity/ is a Level 1 affix.
- These words are then predicted to be ungrammatical:

(22)   a. un-grammatical-ity   c. un-interruptabil-ity

        b. un-acceptabil-ity   d. un-governabil-ity

- *Predicted Bracketing*: *[$_N$un[$_N$grammaticality]]
- *Actual Bracketing*: [$_N$[$_A$ungrammatical]ity]

Type 1: Lack of Morphosyntactic Info in Input

- If we cannot see brackets internal to a word then we cannot know its derivational history.
- *E.g.*, Level 2 sees [topicality] not [[[topic]al]ity].
- But this can lead to paradoxes when category selection restrictions are not met at the right level.
- Deadjectival /un-/ doesn't attach to nouns (*untree, *unclass, *etc.*).
- /-ity/ is a Level 1 affix.
- These words are then predicted to be ungrammatical:

(22)   a.   un-grammatical-ity   c.   un-interruptabil-ity

          b.   un-acceptabil-ity   d.   un-governabil-ity

- *Predicted Bracketing*: *[$_N$un[$_N$grammaticality]]
- *Actual Bracketing*: [$_N$[$_A$ungrammatical]ity]

TYPE 1: LACK OF MORPHOSYNTACTIC INFO IN INPUT

- If we cannot see brackets internal to a word then we cannot know its derivational history.
- *E.g.*, Level 2 sees [topicality] not [[[topic]al]ity].
- But this can lead to paradoxes when category selection restrictions are not met at the right level.
- Deadjectival /un-/ doesn't attach to nouns (*untree, *unclass, *etc.*).
- /-ity/ is a Level 1 affix.
- These words are then predicted to be ungrammatical:

(22) a. un-grammatical-ity   c. un-interruptabil-ity
      b. un-acceptabil-ity   d. un-governabil-ity

- *Predicted Bracketing*: *[$_N$un[$_N$grammaticality]]
- *Actual Bracketing*: [$_N$[$_A$ungrammatical]ity]

TYPE 1: LACK OF MORPHOSYNTACTIC INFO IN INPUT

- If we cannot see brackets internal to a word then we cannot know its derivational history.
- *E.g.,* Level 2 sees [topicality] not [[[topic]al]ity].
- But this can lead to paradoxes when category selection restrictions are not met at the right level.
- Deadjectival /un-/ doesn't attach to nouns (**untree*, **unclass*, *etc.*).
- /-ity/ is a Level 1 affix.
- These words are then predicted to be ungrammatical:

(22)   a. un-grammatical-ity   c. un-interruptabil-ity

           b. un-acceptabil-ity   d. un-governabil-ity

- *Predicted Bracketing*: $*[_N \text{un}[_N \text{grammaticality}]]$
- *Actual Bracketing*: $[_N[_A \text{ungrammatical}]\text{ity}]$

Type 1: Lack of Morphosyntactic Info in Input

- If we cannot see brackets internal to a word then we cannot know its derivational history.
- *E.g.*, Level 2 sees [topicality] not [[[topic]al]ity].
- But this can lead to paradoxes when category selection restrictions are not met at the right level.
- Deadjectival /un-/ doesn't attach to nouns (**untree*, **unclass*, *etc.*).
- /-ity/ is a Level 1 affix.
- These words are then predicted to be ungrammatical:

(22) a. un-grammatical-ity   c. un-interruptabil-ity

       b. un-acceptabil-ity   d. un-governabil-ity

- *Predicted Bracketing*: *[$_N$un[$_N$grammaticality]]
- *Actual Bracketing*: [$_N$[$_A$ungrammatical]ity]

TYPE 2: LACK OF PHONOLOGICAL INFO IN INPUT

- The logically same contradiction can be induced for *phonological* properties lost between cycles.
- English COMPARATIVE ADJECTIVES are formed analytically (*more* A) and synthetically (A-*er*).
- /-er/ used when base is 1 syllable or 2 with a v. light second:

(23)   a. bigger/*more big   c. cleverer/[?]more clever
        b. taller/*more tall   d. gentler/[?]more gentle

- Analytic form is used elsewhere: *foolisher, *intelligenter, . . .
- But /un-/ is a problem again here:

(24)   unhappier   (25)   unluckier   (26)   unfriendlier

TYPE 2: LACK OF PHONOLOGICAL INFO IN INPUT

- The logically same contradiction can be induced for *phonological* properties lost between cycles.

- English COMPARATIVE ADJECTIVES are formed analytically (*more* A) and synthetically (A-*er*).

- /-er/ used when base is 1 syllable or 2 with a v. light second:

(23) a. bigger/*more big   c. cleverer/*more clever
      b. taller/*more tall   d. gentler/*more gentle

- Analytic form is used elsewhere: *foolisher*, *intelligenter*, . . .

- But /un-/ is a problem again here:

(24) unhappier   (25) unluckier   (26) unfriendlier

TYPE 2: LACK OF PHONOLOGICAL INFO IN INPUT

- The logically same contradiction can be induced for *phonological* properties lost between cycles.
- English COMPARATIVE ADJECTIVES are formed analytically (*more* A) and synthetically (A-*er*).
- /-er/ used when base is 1 syllable or 2 with a v. light second:

(23) a. bigger/*more big   c. cleverer/[?]more clever
      b. taller/*more tall   d. gentler/[?]more gentle

- Analytic form is used elsewhere: *foolisher, *intelligenter, . . .
- But /*un-*/ is a problem again here:

(24) unhappier   (25) unluckier   (26) unfriendlier

TYPE 2: LACK OF PHONOLOGICAL INFO IN INPUT

- The logically same contradiction can be induced for *phonological* properties lost between cycles.

- English COMPARATIVE ADJECTIVES are formed analytically (*more* A) and synthetically (A-*er*).

- /-er/ used when base is 1 syllable or 2 with a v. light second:

(23) a. bigger/*more big   c. cleverer/[?]more clever
      b. taller/*more tall   d. gentler/[?]more gentle

- Analytic form is used elsewhere: **foolisher*, **intelligenter*, . . .

- But /*un-*/ is a problem again here:

(24) unhappier   (25) unluckier   (26) unfriendlier

TYPE 2: LACK OF PHONOLOGICAL INFO IN INPUT

- The logically same contradiction can be induced for *phonological* properties lost between cycles.

- English COMPARATIVE ADJECTIVES are formed analytically (*more* A) and synthetically (A-*er*).

- /-*er*/ used when base is 1 syllable or 2 with a v. light second:

(23) a. bigger/*more big   c. cleverer/$^{??}$more clever
      b. taller/*more tall   d. gentler/$^{??}$more gentle

- Analytic form is used elsewhere: *foolisher*, *intelligenter*, . . .

- But /*un*-/ is a problem again here:

(24) unhappier   (25) unluckier   (26) unfriendlier

TYPE 2: LACK OF PHONOLOGICAL INFO IN INPUT

- The logically same contradiction can be induced for *phonological* properties lost between cycles.
- English COMPARATIVE ADJECTIVES are formed analytically (*more* A) and synthetically (A-*er*).
- /-*er*/ used when base is 1 syllable or 2 with a v. light second:

(23)   a. bigger/*more big   c. cleverer/$^{??}$more clever
       b. taller/*more tall   d. gentler/$^{??}$more gentle

- Analytic form is used elsewhere: **foolisher, *intelligenter*, . . .
- But /*un-*/ is a problem again here:

(24)   unhappier   (25)   unluckier   (26)   unfriendlier

TYPE 2: LACK OF PHONOLOGICAL INFO IN INPUT

- The logically same contradiction can be induced for *phonological* properties lost between cycles.
- English COMPARATIVE ADJECTIVES are formed analytically (*more* A) and synthetically (A-*er*).
- /-*er*/ used when base is 1 syllable or 2 with a v. light second:

(23)   a.   bigger/*more big   c.   cleverer/[?]more clever
       b.   taller/*more tall   d.   gentler/[?]more gentle

- Analytic form is used elsewhere: **foolisher, *intelligenter*, . . .
- But /*un-*/ is a problem again here:

(24)   unhappier   (25)   unluckier   (26)   unfriendlier

TYPE 2: LACK OF PHONOLOGICAL INFO IN INPUT

- The logically same contradiction can be induced for *phonological* properties lost between cycles.
- English COMPARATIVE ADJECTIVES are formed analytically (*more* A) and synthetically (A-*er*).
- /-*er*/ used when base is 1 syllable or 2 with a v. light second:

(23)   a. bigger/*more big   c. cleverer/$^{??}$more clever
       b. taller/*more tall   d. gentler/$^{??}$more gentle

- Analytic form is used elsewhere: **foolisher, *intelligenter*, . . .
- But /*un*-/ is a problem again here:

(24)   unhappier   (25)   unluckier   (26)   unfriendlier

TYPE 2: LACK OF PHONOLOGICAL INFO IN INPUT

- The logically same contradiction can be induced for *phonological* properties lost between cycles.

- English COMPARATIVE ADJECTIVES are formed analytically (*more* A) and synthetically (A-*er*).

- /-er/ used when base is 1 syllable or 2 with a v. light second:

(23) a. bigger/*more big   c. cleverer/[??]more clever
      b. taller/*more tall   d. gentler/[??]more gentle

- Analytic form is used elsewhere: *foolisher, *intelligenter, . . .

- But /un-/ is a problem again here:

(24) unhappier   (25) unluckier   (26) unfriendlier

TYPE 2: LACK OF PHONOLOGICAL INFO IN INPUT

- The logically same contradiction can be induced for *phonological* properties lost between cycles.
- English COMPARATIVE ADJECTIVES are formed analytically (*more* A) and synthetically (A-*er*).
- /-*er*/ used when base is 1 syllable or 2 with a v. light second:

(23) a. bigger/*more big   c. cleverer/$^{??}$more clever
      b. taller/*more tall   d. gentler/$^{??}$more gentle

- Analytic form is used elsewhere: **foolisher, *intelligenter*, ...
- But /*un*-/ is a problem again here:

(24) unhappier   (25) unluckier   (26) unfriendlier

TYPE 3: SEQUENCE DOESN'T MATCH CYCLE

- Finally, we can just plain get the order of affixes wrong.
- There is a Level 2 /-able/ in English:

(27) deˈcipher → deˈcipherable

(28) reˈpair → reˈpairable

(29) deˈbate → deˈbatable

(30) inˈflate → inˈflateable

- But all the following are perfectly well-formed:

(31) read-abil-ity

(32) depend-abil-ity

(33) reli-abil-ity

(34) spread-abil-ity

(35) sell-abil-ity

(36) elect-abil-ity

TYPE 3: SEQUENCE DOESN'T MATCH CYCLE

- Finally, we can just plain get the order of affixes wrong.
- There is a Level 2 /-*able*/ in English:

(27) deˈcipher → deˈcipherable   (29) deˈbate → deˈbatable

(28) reˈpair → reˈpairable   (30) inˈflate → inˈflateable

- But all the following are perfectly well-formed:

(31) read-abil-ity   (33) reli-abil-ity   (35) sell-abil-ity

(32) depend-abil-ity   (34) spread-abil-ity   (36) elect-abil-ity

TYPE 3: SEQUENCE DOESN'T MATCH CYCLE

- Finally, we can just plain get the order of affixes wrong.
- There is a Level 2 /-*able*/ in English:

(27) deˈcipher → deˈcipherable   (29) deˈbate → deˈbatable

(28) reˈpair → reˈpairable   (30) inˈflate → inˈflateable

- But all the following are perfectly well-formed:

(31) read-abil-ity   (33) reli-abil-ity   (35) sell-abil-ity

(32) depend-abil-ity   (34) spread-abil-ity   (36) elect-abil-ity

TYPE 3: SEQUENCE DOESN'T MATCH CYCLE

- Finally, we can just plain get the order of affixes wrong.
- There is a Level 2 /-*able*/ in English:

(27) deˈcipher → deˈcipherable

(28) reˈpair → reˈpairable

(29) deˈbate → deˈbatable

(30) inˈflate → inˈflateable

- But all the following are perfectly well-formed:

(31) read-abil-ity

(32) depend-abil-ity

(33) reli-abil-ity

(34) spread-abil-ity

(35) sell-abil-ity

(36) elect-abil-ity

TYPE 3: SEQUENCE DOESN'T MATCH CYCLE

- Finally, we can just plain get the order of affixes wrong.
- There is a Level 2 /-*able*/ in English:

(27) deˈcipher → deˈcipherable

(28) reˈpair → reˈpairable

(29) deˈbate → deˈbatable

(30) inˈflate → inˈflateable

- But all the following are perfectly well-formed:

(31) read-abil-ity

(32) depend-abil-ity

(33) reli-abil-ity

(34) spread-abil-ity

(35) sell-abil-ity

(36) elect-abil-ity

TYPE 3: SEQUENCE DOESN'T MATCH CYCLE

- Finally, we can just plain get the order of affixes wrong.
- There is a Level 2 /-*able*/ in English:

(27) deˈcipher → deˈcipherable

(28) reˈpair → reˈpairable

(29) deˈbate → deˈbatable

(30) inˈflate → inˈflateable

- But all the following are perfectly well-formed:

(31) read-abil-ity

(32) depend-abil-ity

(33) reli-abil-ity

(34) spread-abil-ity

(35) sell-abil-ity

(36) elect-abil-ity

TYPE 3: SEQUENCE DOESN'T MATCH CYCLE

- Finally, we can just plain get the order of affixes wrong.
- There is a Level 2 /-*able*/ in English:

(27) deˈcipher → deˈcipherable

(28) reˈpair → reˈpairable

(29) deˈbate → deˈbatable

(30) inˈflate → inˈflateable

- But all the following are perfectly well-formed:

(31) read-abil-ity

(32) depend-abil-ity

(33) reli-abil-ity

(34) spread-abil-ity

(35) sell-abil-ity

(36) elect-abil-ity

TYPE 3: SEQUENCE DOESN'T MATCH CYCLE

- Finally, we can just plain get the order of affixes wrong.
- There is a Level 2 /-*able*/ in English:

(27) deˈcipher → deˈcipherable

(28) reˈpair → reˈpairable

(29) deˈbate → deˈbatable

(30) inˈflate → inˈflateable

- But all the following are perfectly well-formed:

(31) read-abil-ity

(32) depend-abil-ity

(33) reli-abil-ity

(34) spread-abil-ity

(35) sell-abil-ity

(36) elect-abil-ity