Class discussion: Hyman (2003) vs. Baker (1985)
M Feb 27

(1)   Main points of the Hyman article, as proposed in class:
    (a)   There are languages in which the order of at least some affixes is determined by a morphological template
    (b)   This is important evidence for the existence of a morphological component of the grammar

(2)   Not all invariant affix order effects are necessarily template effects
    There could be Mirror Principle effects that lead to invariant order, if the relevant syntactic structures or operations always apply in the same order themselves

(3)   The existence of template effects has important implications for Baker's proposal that the morphological and syntactic portions of GF-rules and agreement rules should be unified
    (a)   When templates are seen for these kinds of morphemes, we need to be able to dissociate morphological processes from syntactic ones
    (b)   Still a question to consider: Are there any morphological processes for which the morphology and syntax really should be unified?

(4)   An important aspect of the Hyman article to consider:
    (a)   The surface order of morphemes in his system is determined by either the Template or (one of the) Mirror constraints, depending on which is ranked higher in a language
    (b)   But there is still a role for something like a 'conceptual representation' that represents the order of semantic (or syntactic) information being added to the structure — this is the structure that the Mirror constraints are making reference to
       • This may be what the syntax 'does' for the morphology; then, a variety of principles, including but perhaps not limited to Template and Mirror, determine what the final surface order of morphemes is going to be