Modelling Exponents

Ash Asudeh (Rochester), Tina Bögel (Konstanz), Dan Siddiqi (Carleton)

This paper discusses the interface between (lexical) morphology and phonology in the recently established L_RFG framework (see, e.g., Asudeh and Siddiqi 2022 and references therein). In particular, it focuses on the morphological and phonological constraints modelled in v(ocabulary)-structure, the output of the ν -mapping from c-structure, and how different Vocabulary Items (VIs) interact and map to surface prosody and phonology. The goals of this paper are as follows: 1) Develop a model of what is on the right side of the exponence function, 2) Describe a factorial typology of phonological dependence in formal terms, and 3) Exemplify the system with the English deadjectivizing verbalizer affix *-en*.

Example (1) shows the template for a VI entry, which contains morphological, morphosyntactic, and phonological features and constraints.

(1) $($ $)$ ν	PHON(OLOGICAL) REP(RESENTATION) P(ROSODIC)FRAME DEP(ENDENCE) M(ORPHOPHONOLOGICAL)DOMAIN CLASS TYPE	phonological realization & conditions prosodic unit {LT, RT} 1 2 {inflectional classes} VERBAL NOMINAL ADJECTIVAL	
(1) (,) →	HOST	$\begin{bmatrix} \text{IDENT}(\text{ITY}) & \text{AUNT} \text{NIECE} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\$	

Phonological features and constraints

- PHONREP contains the phonological representation in terms of basic segments. We assume that the form can be underspecified in terms of features. It can also be a memorized, conditioned list, as it is the case with the phonologically conditioned allomorphs of the English indefinite article *a/an*.
- PFRAME determines the prosodic/metrical frame. For example, *swear*-insertion in English is is sensitive to foot structure: $(Ala)_{ft}$ - $(fucking)_{ft}$ - $(bama)_{ft}$. Similarly, *-um*-infixation in (Austronesian) is sensitive to syllable structure (Roark and Sproat 2007, 30–31, Orgun and Sprouse 1999, 204).
- DEP describes the dependencies of the VI: to the left (LT), to the right (RT), or both.
- MDOMAIN specifies at which morphophonological domain the constraints on the v-structure are evaluated (e.g., primary vs. secondary affixes). For example, English geminates can only appear as secondary morpheme boundaries. Similarly, some Germanic prefixes are footed and are therefore primary affixes and others are not.

Morphological features and constraints

- CLASS stores morphology-specific information such as declension or conjugation.
- TYPE specifies coarse-grained morphological categories (verbal vs nominal vs adjectival). For example, verbal reflexes of agreement features are realized via subject agreement, while nominal reflexes of these features are realized via pronouns, and adjectival reflexes are realized via nominal concord.

Morphosyntactic features and constraints

- HOST has a value that is a hybrid object. HOST captures constraints on the host in terms of the features and constraints discussed above. HOST also contains an IDENTITY attribute.
- IDENTITY describes the identity of the c-structure and f-structure correspondents of the host v-structure. The feature IDENTITY thus regulates vocabulary insertion. There are two possible values for IDENTITY: AUNT and NIECE. Both involve reference to c-structure and f-structure.

An example. The approach will be exemplified with an analysis of the English affix *-en*, as in *blacken*. This affix is productive (i.e., works for appropriate nonce words) but has lots of constraints on its distribution, which are captured in its v-structure:

- The affix is consistently pronounced as /ən/: [PHONREP /ən/]
- It is a syllable that is the last in its foot: [PFRAME $(\dots (\cdot)_{\sigma})_{ft}$]
- Its form is subject to local word-level phonotactics, which indicates it is a primary affix: [MDOMAIN 1]
- It is dependent to its left; i.e. it is a suffix: [DEP LT]
- The resulting verb is a weak verb (in the Germanic sense); e.g. it takes *-ed* in the past participle, unlike strong verbs like *write*, which take *-en*. For the purpose of illustration, we identify two classes in English, *weak* and *strong*: [CLASS *weak*]
- It 'lowers' to the head of its complement: [HOST IDENT NIECE]
- The affixed form must meet phonological and prosodic conditions on the host. In the case of *-en*, the output form of the base must be no longer than one syllable and end in an obstruent, optionally preceded by a sonorant (per Halle 1973). For example, *soften* is legal despite a seemingly illegal base, because the final /t/ in the base is not present in the output [sɑfən]. It can be assumed that this is a phonological constraint on the host and not a general phonological rule in English, because unaffixed forms with similar phonology are legal (e.g., **dryen* but *lion*, **dimmen* but *women*): [HOST {[PHON.REP /...([**son**])[**obs**]/]}] &

$$[\text{HOST} \{ [\text{PFRAME} (\ldots)_{\sigma}] \}]$$

• The affix *-en* can only attach to adjectives: [HOST {[TYPE ADJECTIVAL]}]

Vocabulary Item for *-en*. The complete VI for *-en* is shown in (2); the righthand side of $\xrightarrow{\nu}$ is the v-structure.

In the equivalent description below, • is used to represent "this v-structure" and \cdot to represent "the p-structure correspondent of this v-structure" (i.e., $\rho(\bullet)$).

(3) (• PHON.REP) = /an/

 $(\bullet \text{ PFRAME}) = (\dots (\cdot)_{\sigma})_{ft}$

$$(\bullet PLEVEL) = 1$$

- (• DEPENDENCE) = LT
- $(\bullet$ CLASS) = weak

(• TYPE) = VERBAL (• HOST IDENT) = NIECE (• HOST \in PHON.REP) = /...([son])[obs]/ (• HOST \in PFRAME) = (...)_{σ} (• HOST \in TYPE) = ADJECTIVAL Consequences. Consider these examples:

- (4) a. The bananas *yellowened/yellowed and then blackened/*blacked in the fridge.
 - b. The maple leaves reddened/*redded and then *brownened/browned in the fall.

Focusing on (4a), based on the entry (2) for *-en*, the re-ordering of affix and host is induced in p-structure, as in (5) for well-formed *blacken*. The less marked alternative is a zero-marked form, shown in (6).



These representations show the mapping from c-structure to v-structure, via the ν correspondence function, and the mapping from v-structure to prosodic structure, via the ρ correspondence function.

Representation (5) illustrates a well-formed instance of *-en* suffixation, and also illustrates how v-structures may be re-ordered in the mapping to prosodic structure. Representation (6) is a result of the fact that Pac-Man Spanning (Melchin et al. 2020) is always competing with overt exponence (L_RFG does not employ zero affixation). Pac-Man Spanning is the result of the three **MostInformative** constraints (see, e.g., Asudeh and Siddiqi 2022) preferring portmanteaus, whenever the DEP requirements of *-en* are not satisfied. For example, in (4a) *blackened* is well-formed, but *yellowened* is ill-formed. Thus, the alternative Pac-Man-spanned form, *yellowed*, is preferred.

We also derive the factorial typology in (7), based on the v-structure features DEP \times HOST in (1).

(7)		¬[● HOST]	[• HOST IDENT AUNT]	[• HOST IDENT NIECE]
	[• DEP]	<i>clitic_a</i> (leaner/simple clitic)	clitic _b (special clitic)	affix
		English: the car you are in's fender	French: Je t'aime.	English: black en

 $\neg [\bullet DEP]$

free form

English: Bob

clitic_c (*phonological clitic*)

English: drink**a** pint**a** milk

Lastly, we discuss the relationship between the features in the v-structure in (1) and the prosodic structure that it maps to. In other words, we discuss the relationship between v-structure features and prosodic features, the latter of which we model in terms of Bögel's theory (see, e.g., Bögel 2015).

References

- Asudeh, Ash, and Daniel Siddiqi. 2022. Realizational Morphosemantics in L_RFG . To appear in the Proceedings of the LFG22 Conference.
- Bögel, Tina. 2015. The Syntax-Prosody Interface in Lexical Functional Grammar. Ph.D. thesis, University of Konstanz.
- Halle, Morris. 1973. Prolegomena to a Theory of Word-Formation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4(1): 3–16.

Melchin, Paul B., Ash Asudeh, and Dan Siddiqi. 2020. Ojibwe

Agreement in Lexical-Realizational Functional Grammar. In Miriam Butt and Ida Toivonen, eds., *Proceedings of the LFG20 Conference*, 268–288. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Orgun, Cemil Orhan, and Ronald L. Sprouse. 1999. From "MParse" to "Control": Deriving Ungrammaticality. *Phonology* 16(2): 191–224.

Roark, Brian, and Richard Sproat. 2007. *Computational Approaches to Morphology and Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.