

Discussion guide: Hyman (2003) vs. Baker (1985)

- (1) In the beginning of his paper, Hyman (2003) shows that inflectional prefixes in Bantu languages always occur in a fixed order. Must we conclude that this phenomenon is caused by a template effect? Or is it possible to think of a way in which this might be a Mirror Principle effect? (Hint: Look at the categories of inflectional morphemes we are dealing with here, especially TNS and ASP.)
- (2) In §4, Baker (1985: 402) discusses what kind of evidence would show whether “the second assumption in section 2.1—that morphology proceeds by doing one thing at a time to a basic stem—is true or not” even in languages that have a morphological template. Crucially, in a language with a template controlling affix order, “it would not be possible to get information about the order of these morphological processes from a superficial look at morpheme order; instead, more detailed morphophonological information would be needed.” [For RR, answer both parts of this question.]
 - (a) §5 in Hyman (2003) is relevant to this discussion by Baker. Explain why this is, by discussing one of Hyman’s examples and explaining what he is using it to show.
 - (b) Based on Hyman’s evidence, what do you think Baker would conclude about the applicability of the Mirror Principle to the examples of morphological-template languages that Hyman is discussing?
- (3) Baker states pretty clearly that he does not know whether the Mirror Principle applies in languages other than agglutinative ones. If it does not, what are the implications for the architecture of the grammar? (Consider the diagrams in (66a-b) in Baker 1985: 409. What kinds of changes might we make to accommodate morphological templates?)
- (4) [This question was also included on the first Hyman discussion guide, so don’t use this for your RR again if you’ve already submitted it.] Recall that Chimwiini was an important case study in Baker’s argument about the “syntactic” approach over the “lexical” approach to a combined morphological/syntactic model. Does the additional information that Hyman presents affect the conclusions that Baker should be able to draw from this language? Why or why not?
- (5) [not for RR] Hyman states (2003: 249): “...neither semantic compositionality—nor its syntactic analogue, the MP—is the default in Bantu, as has been previously assumed. Rather, [the CARP template in] (5) is.” Are there typological or cross-linguistic implications of this claim?