

Incorporating the Insights of Autolexical Syntax*

Arnold M. Zwicky

Ohio State University and Stanford University

1. **The scheme of Sadock (1985)** is designed to provide a uniform mode of description for a number of phenomena, including at least those of the following sorts, all involving some apparent 'mismatch' between syntax and morphology. (The labels are merely descriptive; no theoretical claims are being made by this taxonomy.)

1.1. Noun incorporation, as in West Greenlandic and Southern Tiwa (described in some detail by Sadock).

1.2. Compounding, including compounds with the same shape as syntactic combinations (like *American history*).

1.3. Derivation, including derivative affixes attached to multi-word (that is to say, compound) units (like *-ian* attached to *formal grammar* in *formal grammarian*).

1.4. Bound word clitics, whether obligatorily bound (as are the Finnish 'particle clitics' described by Nevis 1985) or optionally bound (as are the English nonmodal auxiliaries *is*, *has*, etc.); bound word clitics typically exhibit both promiscuity of attachment and also attachment to i-forms (inflectional forms) of words rather than to bases.

1.5. Phrasal affix clitics which are attached to a margin of a phrase (like the English possessive *'s*) and so exhibit both promiscuity of attachment and attachment to i-forms.

1.6. Phrasal affix clitics which are attached to the head of a phrase (like the Finnish 'possessive particles' described by Nevis, or like the pronominal clitics of most Romance languages); these exhibit attachment to i-forms, but not promiscuity (since they are attached to the head - N in NP for the Finnish example, V in VP for the Romance examples).

1.7. Inflection, in which items that are syntactically unitary are morphologically complex.

2. **Points of agreement.** The core of Sadock's proposal is that all such phenomena are to be described by three sets of conditions: what I will call set S, of conditions on tree structures; what I will call set M, also of conditions on tree structures; and what I will call set L, of conditions on the pairing of S structures (the structures admitted by set S) with M structures (the structures admitted by set M).

At this level of generality, the picture is a familiar one. I have painted it myself on occasion (for instance, Zwicky 1983). In my most recent exposition of an overall theory of grammar (Zwicky 1986), which I will take as my frame of reference for the following remarks, S is labeled

SYNTAX, M is labeled SHAPE (MORPHOSYNTACTIC SHAPE would be a more informative, though also more mouth-bending, name), and L is labeled LIAISON. In Sadock's presentation, S is labeled SYNTAX, M is labeled MORPHOLOGY, and L has no fixed name, though ASSOCIATION (on analogy with Goldsmith's 1976 treatment of autosegmental phonology), LINKING, or MATCHING would all be suitable.

Sadock and I concur on more than this. We agree that S comprises a set of conditions on S structures, and that S structures are to be identified with syntactic representations; we thus reject 'derivation-think' (as Geoff Pullum is fond of calling it) in syntax. We also agree that M comprises a set of conditions on M structures; we reject derivation-think with respect to M as well as S. Indeed, in Zwicky (1986) I propose abandoning derivation-think for all components of grammar except the specifically phonological components, and by making plausible a nonderivational view of L (a component that I had earlier conceived of, without reflection, as derivational in character) as well as S and M, Sadock encourages this reconceptualization.

Finally, both Sadock and I view M structures as primarily morphosyntactic, rather than primarily phonological, organization of linguistic material. That is, we follow writers like Fudge (1969, appositely cited in this connection by van der Hulst and Smith 1982:30) in assuming two distinct sorts of organization, one involving morphemes, stems, words, phrases, and so on, the other involving syllables, feet, phonological words, phonological phrases, and so on. And despite occasional loose talk, for instance about clitics forming 'phonological words' with their hosts, we take M to be an account of the former sort of hierarchical organization. (This is not to deny that M structures are systematically related to hierarchical organization of the latter sort - only to deny that they are hierarchical organization of the latter sort).

3. **A disagreement I believe to be irrelevant.** Throughout his article on Autolexical Syntax, Sadock is critical of highly modular theoretical frameworks. Falling under his opprobrium are the approaches of Anderson (1982) and Kiparsky (1982), as well as my own. He objects in particular to 'a fragmentation of the morphology into small components scattered throughout the grammar' (383) in these approaches and is pleased that his own scheme avoids 'the postulation of either separate levels of morphology or separate small-scale modules of grammars' (398).

Now there are points of real difference here - see the next section - but the number of components (be it 1, 2, or 17) and their 'scale' (however one measures this) do not seem to me to be relevant variables. Against the metatheoretical virtue of simplicity (which is promoted, *ceteris paribus*, by keeping the component types to a minimum, in the fashion of Postal 1972) can be set the metatheoretical virtue of restrictiveness (which is promoted, *ceteris paribus*, by positing a large number of components, each subject to its own general conditions, in the fashion of my own theorizing), and I cannot see any way of deciding the matter ahead of time, at least so long as the component divisions are (putatively) given by universal grammar.

4. **Points of difference.** At least three genuine issues arise when we try to square Autolexical Syntax with the sort of interfacing scheme I have advocated. I am inclined to see these as matters of detail - important detail, granted - within the same set of fundamental assumptions; but perhaps not everyone would agree. Let me try to bring the points of difference out in relief. (Here I disregard disputes over whether L should be invoked in the analysis of particular sets of data, for instance in the analysis of Upper Sorbian possessive adjective agreement (417-9).)

4.1. **The universality of L.** Sadock assumes that the entire content of L is universal, his list of principles (V) through (VIII) constituting a first approximation to the whole business. This view is a welcome corrective to earlier, highly parochial, views of L; any language-particular conditions on cliticization, in particular, are located by Sadock not in L but in M, which is in any event a repository of parochial conditions. Presumably it is the claimed universality of L that causes Sadock to speak of his framework as lacking a component of cliticization (385), an assertion that makes his organization of grammar seem more unlike mine than it actually is. However, a fully universal L would constitute a substantial improvement to my theoretical framework, so that I believe the hypothesis should be energetically explored.

(A few words on the conditions that Sadock formulates. Principle (VI) - assume one-to-one association between S structures and M structures wherever possible (409) - expresses the default assumption about the relationship between the two sorts of structures. Principle (V), 'Constraints on morpheme order are inviolable' (408), describes a systematic exception to (VI). The two remaining conditions distinguish (bound word) cliticization from noun incorporation and place limits on how divergent from one another the S and M structures can be.)

4.2. **Morphological or morphosyntactic M.** The burden of description lies of course on M, which Sadock labels 'morphology', despite the fact that many of the units of M structures are quite unlike the 'words' of traditional linguistic analysis - things like *stopped's'll*, composed of the inflected verb *stopped*, the phrasal affix possessive clitic 's, and the bound word auxiliary clitic 'll. (A contextualization: *I don't know which of those rugs those guys are making I'd really prefer, but I guess the man who just stopped's'll suit me just fine.*). Certainly these units are word-like from the point of view of phonology, but we are not claiming that M structures are phonological. I would prefer to say no more than that they are morphosyntactic, but Sadock appears to want to claim that they are more specifically morphological.

If this difference is not merely terminological, what is at issue is the contents of the lexicon, in particular whether lexical entries include not only information about the phonological, semantic, syntactic, and morphological properties of individual (basic or derived) words, plus information about the association of i-forms of these words with sets of morphosyntactic features - this is the already rather rich view of the lexicon I now take, and have sketched very briefly in Zwicky (1986) - but also information about the properties of i-forms in combination with clitics of various sorts.

I am then embracing Sadock's position with respect to noun incorporation, compounding, derivation, and inflection, but not with respect to (one or more of) the types of cliticization listed in section 1. In my framework, clitic groups are not (in general) listed in the lexicon, any more than syntactic phrases (in general) are. Several predictions follow from these assumptions. First, we do not expect idiosyncratic GAPS in the list of clitic groups, though these do occur in the list of derived words and in the list of i-forms for particular words. Second, we expect idiosyncratic PHONOLOGICAL FORMS in the list of clitic groups to be rare, though full or partial suppletion is common in the lists of i-forms. Third, we do not expect idiosyncratic SEMANTICS for clitic groups above the level observed for syntactic combinations (that is, idiomaticity in clitic groups should be about the same as in syntax generally), though idiosyncratic semantics is common in the list of derived words. The third prediction is hard to assess, but the other two are relatively straightforward.

What I am predicting is that we expect to find no missing clitic groups except insofar as would follow from conditions on host words or on clitics individually (certainly there are plenty of such conditions) or from generalizations of the 'surface structure constraint' sort (the latter are simply conditions in M). Idiosyncratic gaps in the list of clitic groups would be describable in my framework, and in Sadock's whether or not clitic groups are listed in the lexicon, but in my framework only by direct stipulation, that is, by a condition in M saying that the combination of a particular host i-form W and a particular clitic C, or of two particular clitics C₁ and C₂, is ungrammatical. In Sadock's framework, such gaps should be about as common as gaps in morphology of the ordinary sort.

There is a similar difference with respect to phonology. Portmanteau forms do occur, and are presumably to be described by stipulations in M (an analytic option that is available in both Sadock's framework and mine), but in Sadock's framework they should be about as common as (partial) suppletion in morphology of the ordinary sort.

These differences between my framework and (my interpretation of) Sadock's then turn out to be fairly subtle ones, given that (for both of us) the component M can have quite a variety of parochial conditions in it.

4.3. **Articulated or unitary M.** And there lies a final difference between us. I assume a highly articulated M, with five subcomponents (labeled IMPLICATION, FORMATION, REALIZATION, LEXICON, and SHAPE CONDITIONS in Zwicky 1986), while Sadock assumes a unitary M, with no 'minicomponents' or 'tiny modules' (383). What corresponds in Sadock's framework to my (rather complex, but putatively universal) scheme of subcomponent interactions, in combination with the (parochial) assignment of individual conditions to particular subcomponents, is the (entirely parochial) assignment of morphosyntactic units to different bar levels, accompanied by the assignment of dependent morphemes to different classes of 'affixes' (the relevant universal assumption for Sadock being a version of the Head Feature Convention applying in M). Either framework can be used to predict that the unmarked situation is for dependent morphemes to be layered out from a base in the following order: derivational affixes, inflectional affixes, phrasal affix clitics, bound word clitics.

Now Sadock is quite explicit in saying that his 1985 article advocates 'neither a theory of syntax nor a theory of morphology' (387), that is in my terms here, neither a theory of S nor a theory of M (but only a theory of L), so that it is perhaps unfair to dwell on his assertions about M. Certainly his hypotheses about L entail no position on the internal organization of M; our frameworks are in fact compatible with one another on this point, despite his distaste for subcomponents. Perhaps if he considers the phonological and semantic details associated with the sorts of morphosyntactic combinations listed in 1.1 through 1.7, his tastes will change.

Note

*Thanks to the floating population of my Linguistics 219L class at Stanford, winter quarter 1986, but especially to Jonni Kanerva. This is the version of 1 March 1986.

References

- Anderson, Stephen R. 1982. Where's morphology? *LingI* 13.571-612.
- Fudge, Erik. 1969. Syllables. *JL* 5.253-87.
- Goldsmith, John A. 1976. An overview of autosegmental phonology. *Linguistic Analysis* 2.23-68.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1982. From cyclic phonology to lexical phonology. In van der Hulst and Smith (eds.), *The structure of phonological representations (Part I)*. Dordrecht: Foris, 131-75.
- Nevis, Joel A. 1985. Finnish particle clitics and general clitic theory. PhD dissertation, OSU.
- Postal, Paul M. 1972. The best theory. In Stanley Peters (ed.), *Goals of linguistic theory*. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall, 131-70.
- Sadock, Jerrold M. 1985. Autolexical syntax: A theory of noun incorporation and similar phenomena. *NLLT* 3.4.379-439.
- van der Hulst, Harry and Norval Smith. 1982. An overview of autosegmental and metrical phonology. In van der Hulst and Smith (eds.), *The structure of phonological representations (Part I)*. Dordrecht: Foris, 1-45.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1983. An expanded view of morphology in the syntax-phonology interface. *PICL* 13.198-208.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1986. The general case: Basic form versus default form. *BLS* 12.