# Structures of Words & Sentences

## Morphology tips + practice

## Example Together rerolling

## Our Theory's Morpheme Rules

V + [abl] = A $V + [i_i] = N$ (readable) (reader) V + [d] = V $A = [i_i] + A$ (bored) (happier)  $A + [n\epsilon s] = N$ V + [in] = A(happiness) (running) [nn] + V = V[j] + V = V(untie) (retie)  $[\Lambda n] + A = A$ N + [z] = N(unhappy) (shoes)

#### **Trees: Just Visual Representation of Rules**





Since these are our hypothesized morpheme rules...

V + [abl] = A $V + [i_i] = N$ (readable) (reader) V + [d] = V $A = [i_i] + A$ (bored) (happier)  $A + [n\epsilon s] = N$ V + [ij] = A(happiness) (running) [nn] + V = V[j] + V = V(untie) (retie)  $[\Lambda n] + A = A$ N + [z] = N(unhappy) (shoes)

...we should be using one of these each time you attach a morpheme in our derivation trees! V + [abl] = A $V + [i_i] = N$ (readable) (reader) V + [d] = V $A = [i_i] + A$ (bored) (happier)  $A + [n\epsilon s] = N$ V + [ij] = A(happiness) (running)  $[\Lambda n] + V = V$ [j] + V = V(untie) (retie)  $[\Lambda n] + A = A$ N + [z] = N(unhappy) (shoes)

V + [abl] = A V + [i] = N(readable) (reader)  $A = [i_i] + A \qquad V = [b] + V$ (bored) (happier)  $A + [n\epsilon s] = N$  V + [iŋ] = A(happiness) (running) [n] + V = V(*untie*) [ıij] + V =V (*retie*)  $[\Lambda n] + A = A \quad N + [z] = N$ (shoes) (unhappy)

## re roll ing

## V | re roll ing

V + [abl] = A V + [i] = N(readable) (reader)  $A = [i_i] + A \qquad V = [b] + V$ (bored) (happier)  $A + [n\epsilon s] = N$  V + [iŋ] = A(happiness) (running)  $[nn] + V = V \qquad [iij] + V = V$  $(untie) \qquad (retie)$  $[\Lambda n] + A = A \quad N + [z] = N$ (unhappy) (shoes)

∨ ?? ∨ | | re roll ing

"reroll"

V + [ab] = A V + [i] = N(readable) (reader) V + [d] = V  $A + [i_i] = A$ (bored) (happier)  $A + [n\varepsilon s] = N \quad V + [n] = A$ (happiness) (running)  $[nn] + V = V \qquad [iij] + V = V$  $(untie) \qquad (retie)$  $[\Lambda n] + A = A \quad N + [z] = N$ (unhappy) (shoes)





### Key Differences between Inflectional and Derivational

1) inflectional affixes never change the category of the word (derivational affixes can **but don't have to**)

2) inflectional affixes can apply to any member of the category they attach to.

For example, every verb has a past tense(inflectional) form, but not every verb has an "-able" (derivational) form.

3) "Morpheme Ordering Constraint": A derivational affix can't be added to a word that already has an inflectional affix attached.

For example, you can't get "bakeder", where you would have to add "er" (derivational, someone who does X) to "baked" (already has -ed past tense, inflectional).

## Morphology Derivation Reference Sheet

- Each step in your tree should correspond to one of the morpheme rules
- Mark parts of speech
  - Right hand head rule
  - Not inflectional morphemes
- Each step should yield a real/possible English word by itself
  - e.g. not "unredo" in "unredoable"
- Morpheme ordering constraint
  - Can't attach derivational after inflectional

 $V + [i_i] = N$ V + [abl] = A(readable) (reader) V + [d] = V $A = [i_i] + A$ (bored) (happier)  $A + [n\epsilon s] = N$ V + [in] = A(happiness) (running)  $[\Lambda n] + V = V$ [iij] + V = V(untie) (retie) N + [z] = N $[\Lambda n] + A = A$ (unhappy) (shoes)

## Syntax tips + practice

Deriving sentences instead of words



Our theory's syntax ("phrase structure") rules:

https://umamherst.instructure.com/courses/9157/files/3405843?module\_item\_id=5 67195  $N \rightarrow car,$  her, Sam, children, discussion, elf...

 $V \rightarrow eat$ , give, put, stand, scream, mix...

 $P \rightarrow$  to, in, on, until, with...

 $A \rightarrow$  blue, happy, small...

 $D \rightarrow$  the, that, a, some, many...

Aux  $\rightarrow$  have, be, must, may, can, should...

 $C \rightarrow$  that, if, whether

$NP \rightarrow D \overline{N}$	$CP \rightarrow CS$	$VP \rightarrow VP PP$
$NP \rightarrow \overline{N}$		$VP \rightarrow VP CP$
	$S \rightarrow NP VP$	$VP \rightarrow V NP$
$\overline{N} \to A \overline{N}$	$S \rightarrow CP VP$	$VP \rightarrow Aux VP$
$\overline{N} \rightarrow \overline{N} PP$		$VP \rightarrow V$
$\overline{N} \to \overline{N} CP$	$PP \rightarrow P NP$	
$\overline{N} \to N$	$PP \rightarrow P$	$\alpha \rightarrow \alpha$ and $\alpha$ ,

 $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha$  and  $\alpha$ , where  $\alpha$  is a phrase:  $\overline{N}$ , NP, VP, S, CP, or PP

They walked in the mud

#### N V P D N They walked in the mud

## N N V P D N They walked in the mud

$$\overline{N} \rightarrow N$$



 $NP \rightarrow D \overline{N}$ 



 $N \rightarrow N$ 



They walked in the mud



 $PP \rightarrow P NP$ 



 $VP \rightarrow V$ 







## Sam pets dogs on the bus

## The children on the bus cried

## Sam can pet dogs and cats

## Sam can pet dogs on the bus

## Dogs and cats like Sam

## Sam left me on the bus

#### Assignment 6: Constraints vs Rules

A constraint is a generalization about the forms found in a whole language. It states that some combination of values isn't allowed in that language.

For example, in English, a constraint is that you can't have a voiced sound after a voiceless one in a coda.

Constraint: No voiced sounds after voiceless sounds in a coda

Not a constraint: voiced sounds turn voiceless after a voiceless sound in a coda

-This is a rule, not a constraint

-It tells us how English fixes violations of the constraint, not what the constraint is

-A language with that same constraint could fix violations some other way, like deleting the voiceless sound

#### Assignment 6: Morphology/Phonology interaction

Step 1: Brains add the morpheme they want, e.g. /z/ for past tense

e.g. [kæt] + [z] or [dɑg] + [z]

Step 2: Brains check if the result violates any of the constraints in their language

[kætz] violates "\*[voiceless][voiced] in coda"

[dagz] is fine

Step 3: Brains apply the rule their language has for fixing that constraint violation

Change voicing of past tense: [kæts]