

Discussion questions: Haspelmath (2002), day 2 (sec 4.4)

Haspelmath, Martin. 2002. Chapter 4, Inflection and derivation. *Understanding Morphology*, 60-84. London: Arnold.

- Reminder: The phrase “architecture of the grammar” generally refers to the way that the different modules of the linguistic system (morphology, phonology, syntax, semantics, etc.) interact with each other. This is often illustrated using boxes and arrows.
 - Note: The symbol S in syntactic tree structure as seen on p 78 is an older notation for what we would now call IP (or TP in some models); it represents the constituent *sentence*.
- (1) On the “dichotomy approach”
 - (a) What, if any, is the relationship between syntax and morphology that is presented in the discussion of the dichotomy approach? Explain how these two modules of the grammar interact, and make your explanation concrete by including examples. You are encouraged to try creating your own examples from languages that you know, but you may use examples given in the reading if necessary.
 - (b) If there is a dichotomy between inflection and derivation, is the type of morphology/syntax relationship (i.e., grammar architecture) seen in the model presented in this section *logically necessary*? Why or why not?
 - (2) On the “continuum approach”
 - (a) What, if any, is the relationship between syntax and morphology required by the continuum approach?
 - (b) What is a *continuum*, and why is that term relevant for this conception of inflection and derivation? Think about the ‘+’ and ‘-’ symbols in Table 4.7 as you compose your answer.
 - (c) Does Haspelmath seem to prefer the dichotomy approach or the continuum approach? What evidence does he give for his preference?
 - (3) On the “tripartite approach”
 - (a) What are the three categories distinguished in this approach? What types of morphemes or types of functional/semantic elements belong to each category?
 - (b) Does this approach allow the architecture of the grammar to explain *any* of the observed differences in behavior among morpheme types? If so, give examples.
 - (c) Does this approach allow the architecture of the grammar to explain *all* the phenomena that Haspelmath raised in the discussion of the continuum model? If so, explain why. If not, give examples of phenomena that would remain unexplained.
 - (4) [not for RR] Considering the goal of developing a theory of human mental grammar, why is it important to decide whether inflection and derivation are distinct or not? In other words, how does the answer to this question have deeply significant theoretical implications?