

Reading guide: Hyman (2003), part 2

Hyman, Larry. 2003 [sic]. Suffix ordering in Bantu: A morphocentric approach. In Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 2002*, vol. 3. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 245-281.

For this assignment, focus on sections §4-§6 of this paper. (We will not be discussing the Appendix, but I'd be happy to talk to people about it outside of class if they are interested.)

In §4-§5, Hyman doesn't do a great job of telling the reader what the structure of the argument is. **The best way to get a sense of where he is going is to start by looking at the “Morphological Generalization” in (47) on p 272** — this is what Hyman is leading up to. Be able to state this Morphological Generalization, and be able to discuss how the preceding discussion relates to or supports this claim.

- (1) In the first half of §4, Hyman talks about two kinds of causatives that appear in different Bantu languages. Try to answer the following questions from the information in this section, and see if you can relate the overall discussion to that Morphological Generalization in (47). [If for RR, pick *one* of the subquestions to respond to, but for full credit you *must* include discussion relating the point at hand to the Morphological Generalization. Don't forget to clearly state which question your RR is addressing.]
 - (a) What were the two causative markers in Proto-Bantu (the reconstructed ancestor of the Bantu languages)? What was their internal morphological structure like — were they simple or complex themselves?
 - (b) Where in the template of extension suffixes did these two causative markers appear? Hyman thinks we can ultimately trace this back to the morphological origins of their phonological shape; what does he say about this? (Hint: What was the phonological shape of the proto-Bantu passive suffix, and how is that relevant?)
 - (c) Descendant languages may have one or both of the proto-Bantu causative-forming elements. How does the position of the applicative marker compare to the position of the long and short causative markers? Is this position determined by the morphological template or by the Mirror Principle?
 - (d) What is interesting about example (26b)?
- (2) Upshot of the causatives discussion in the first part of §4: Hyman thinks the Bantu causative facts are “an argument for autonomous morphology” (p 263). What does this mean? How does it relate to the issues that Hyman discusses in the very first paragraph of the paper?
- (3) The second half of §4 is speculation about why languages might develop to have template morphology. What does Hyman say here? Comments?

- (4) §5 is a discussion of phonology, especially with respect to causatives again. Hyman's purpose here is relate the phonological facts to the discussion of causatives from §4, ultimately leading up to the Morphological Generalization in (47). Go through each phonological example carefully and be able to explain how it provides evidence for the M.G. (or critique it if it doesn't really do that). [If you choose this for your RR, you should focus your discussion on *one* example.]
- (5) Overall: Are there aspects of Bantu affix ordering that remain unexplained in Hyman's account? Are there examples or proposals from previous readings that are interesting in light of Hyman's proposal? If for RR, choose one or two points to discuss, but develop them well, probably by including concrete examples from the reading in your discussion.