

Meeting 3: Lexical Issue

Louisa Sadler

University of Essex

May 30, 2012

Table of contents

1 Attributive Adjectives

2 Verbs

3 Other Targets

Setting

- It is sometimes assumed that members of a word class behave identically.
- In Archi in no word class does every member have a morphological slot for agreement: most adjectives show agreement, as do about half the verbs and a handful of adverbs and particles.
- This presents a challenge for defining word classes.

General Approach

- In LFG it is possible to adopt an approach to syntactic agreement which is totally lexically driven.
- The assumption that all members of a word class will behave identically in terms of syntactic agreement is not required.
- This does not mean that the agreement behaviour of elements of a word class is predicted to be random - rather *some* members of a given word class would be expected to share the same agreement behaviour (eg by inheriting from the same templates)
- the definition of word classes is a matter for the morphological component.

Attributive Adjectives

Overview document: two inflectional classes of attributive adjectives

- non-derived adjectives, a class with 33 members in the dictionary, which includes the nationality adjectives. These adjectives show no agreement. A small set of quantifier adjectives fall into this non-inflecting set.
- derived adjectives, which are derived by suffixation of *t:u* to various bases, and which realize gender in the singular and do not realize case. Hence the morphosyntactic feature set for non-derived adjectives includes Num and Gend with a feature co-occurrence restriction such that values of Gender do not co-occur with Num:Pl.

Examples

- (1) jamu-r lo marči žihil-til-če-s kłan
 that-II.SG girl(IV)[SG.ABS] all youth(I)-PL-OBL.PL-DAT love
 de-ke-r-ši e(r)di
 II.SG-become-IPFV-CVB [II.SG]be.PAST
 All lads were in love with that girl
- (2) jamu-r lo mut:-ib žihil-til-če-s
 that-II.SG girl(IV)[SG.ABS] handsome-PL youth(I)-PL-OBL.PL-DAT
 kłan de-ke-r-ši e(r)di
 love II.SG-become-IPFV-CVB [II.SG]be.PAST
 Handsome lads were in love with that girl

Inflectional Morphology

- the inflectional morphology might distinguish 2 classes
- Class 1 will inflect for Num and Gend
- a FCR will exclude Gend if Num=PI

Morphology-Syntax Correspondence

Category	MFeat	Syn Info
Attr Adj	{I, Sg }	@I.SG((ADJ ↑) CONC)
Attr Adj	{II, Sg }	@II.SG((ADJ ↑) CONC)
Attr Adj	{III, Sg }	@III.SG((ADJ ↑) CONC)
Attr Adj	{IV, Sg }	@IV.SG((ADJ ↑) CONC)
Attr Adj	{ Pl }	@PL((ADJ ↑) CONC)

Templates

$$(3) \text{ I.SG(P)} \equiv \begin{array}{l} (\text{P GEND}) = \text{I} \\ (\text{P NUM}) = \text{SG} \end{array}$$

$$(4) \text{ II.SG(P)} \equiv \begin{array}{l} (\text{P GEND}) = \text{II} \\ (\text{P NUM}) = \text{SG} \end{array}$$

Simple Dynamic Verbs

Lexical Problem Doc: 150 inflecting simply dynamic verbs and 19 noninflecting. Inflecting verbs agree in Gend and Num with the absolutive argument in the clause.

- (5) ajša boq'fo
 aisha return.PFV
 Aisha returned.
- (6) ajša da-qfa
 aisha II.SG-come.PFV
 Aisha came.

Morphology-Syntax Correspondence

The verb agrees with the INDEX of its ABS argument

Category	MFeat	Syn Info
V	{I, Sg }	@I.SG(↑ GF IND)
V	{II, Sg }	@II.SG(↑ GF IND)
V	{III, Sg }	@III.SG (↑ GF IND)
V	{IV, Sg }	@IV.SG(↑ GF IND)

Morphology-Syntax Correspondence

Category	MFeat	Syn Info
V	{I, Sg, Iv }	@I.SG(↑ SUBJ IND)
V	{I, Sg, Tv }	@I.SG(↑ OBJ IND)
V	{II, Sg, Iv }	@II.SG(↑ SUBJ IND)
V	{II, Sg, Tv }	@II.SG(↑ OBJ IND)

Stative Verbs

Stative verbs mainly fall into a non-inflecting class, with a small number falling into the inflecting class. This is a matter for the morphology. Assuming that inflecting stative verbs exit the morphology with morphosyntactic agreement features, they would behave like other inflecting verbs from the point of view of the syntax.

Complex Verbs

- (7) šipiʔ-li e(b)ʔu-li tumank
 Šhapi(I)-SG.ERG <III.SG>put.PFV-CVB1 gun(III)[SG.ABS]
 kammu-li
 shoot.PFV-EVID
 Šhapi, having put the gun (i.e. having aimed), shot.
- (8) Patimat d-irχwin
 Patimat(II)[SG.ABS] II.SG-work.IPFV
 Patimat works.

Complex Verbs

- The nature of the problem here is not clear to me. At first I thought I thought the issue was to do with the relation with the converb, but now it seems it is just to do with the agreement contrast between shoot.PFV-EVID and II.SG-work.IPFV
- if this is so, then it seems again to be just a matter of lexical variation (agreeing vs non-agreeing verbs)

Non Agreeing Forms

- There is no commitment in LFG to all members of a word class carrying the same, or complete, information, so an approach in which *only* those elements which do reflect the intrinsic features of the agreement controllers actually introduce agreement constraints would seem to be the natural one.
- an alternative (from a syntactic point of view) would be make those members of a given word class which do **not** realize agreement features to be treated as syntactically ambiguous (ie associating them with a disjunction of agreement constraints), but it is not clear what would motivate such an analysis.

Adverbs, Postpositions and Particles

Again, the issue here seems to be really one for the morphological system. These example sets provide evidence that **some** but not all (a few?) of the members of these word classes show agreement. The agreement controller is the absolutive argument in the clause. One approach, then, is simply to associate the relevant (inside out) agreement constraints with the inflected elements.

One way to do this might be the following (for (9)):

- (9) *dit:a<t'>u/ early* (\uparrow PRED) = 'EARLY'
 ((ADJ \in \uparrow) GF) = %AGRC
 (% AGRC CASE) =_c ABS
 @I.PL(% AGRC CONC)

Paths to Agreement Controllers?

As noted in discussion of the domain problem, there is a question concerning the syntactic relationships possible between the absolutive argument controller and the agreeing element. How deeply embedded in the structure can an agreeing element be? This question arises e.g. in connection with the agreeing element $ej(b)u$ in (13)