

Reading guide: Baker (1985), day 2 3 (sec 5-6)

Baker, Mark. 1985. The Mirror Principle and morphosyntactic explanation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16: 373-415.

For this assignment, focus on sections §5-§6 of this paper, but it may be helpful to use the discussion and examples in §1-§4 to help you evaluate these new sections.

- (1) The discussion in previous sections has focused on agglutinative languages. Now, in §5, Baker considers implications of the Mirror Principle for languages with other types of morphology. Baker doesn't say too much here, but this is worth thinking through.

What does Baker have to say about the following morphological types? Does the Mirror Principle make any predictions about their behavior? Can these types be used to falsify or argue against the Mirror Principle? [If you choose this discussion question for your RR, you may focus your discussion on just *one* of the following categories—but be sure to make your discussion concrete and explicit, with reference to either data from the paper or data that you have thought of.]

- umlaut (and other changes that appear internal to a stem, not as an affix)
- non-concatenative, root-and-pattern morphology (sometimes called “templatic” morphology)
- “template” morphology (note that this is different from the previous category!)
- infixation

- (2) What does Baker have to say about *clitics*? Does he judge them to be a counterexample to the Mirror Principle? In your discussion, present and explain an example that Baker gives to address this point.
- (3) What about cases of *multiple exponence*, as in a typical “inflecting” language like Latin, where a single morpheme expresses multiple semantic features such as PERSON + NUMBER + TENSE? Baker doesn't address this, but can we make any predictions about how the morphology of this type of language should behave if the Mirror Principle is correct?
- (4) In §6, Baker draws a distinction between linguistic frameworks under which the Mirror Principle must simply be stipulated, and linguistic frameworks under which it follows from the properties of the framework.
- (a) Is this an important conceptual distinction? Why or why not?
- (b) How do the frameworks of GB Theory (in a “Very Strong Lexicalist” version), Anderson's (1982) Extended Word and Paradigm model, and Relational Grammar measure up, in Baker's opinion?
- (5) Baker argues that there are two possible ways of developing a syntactic/morphological framework that are compatible with the Mirror Principle, a “lexicalist” and a “syntactic” approach, as represented in example (66) (p 409).
- (a) What different predictions do the two versions make? Which does Baker think is more successful, and why?

- (b) Can evidence from the morphological types addressed in questions (1)–(3) on this handout be brought to bear on this question as well?
- (6) [Advanced students are strongly encouraged to attempt this question for their RR.] To what extent does the ChiMwi:ni data in (67) help distinguish between the two approaches to a Mirror-Principle-enforcing grammar outlined in (66)? Does this seem compatible with Baker’s desire to have a grammatical model where the Mirror Principle is an unavoidable consequence rather than a stipulation (see (65) and the surrounding discussion)?
- As discussed in class on W Feb 8, the process of going through and “unpacking” a claim like this is an essential skill to develop for reading linguistics papers